

A LINGUISTIC ETHNOGRAPHY  
OF LITERARY TRANSLATION:  
IRISH POEMS  
AND DUTCH-SPEAKING TRANSLATORS



Ghent University

—  
Faculty of Arts and Philosophy

—  
Department of English

*A Linguistic Ethnography  
of Literary Translation:  
Irish Poems  
and Dutch-speaking Translators*

**PETER FLYNN**

Proefschrift ingediend tot het behalen van de graad van  
Doctor in de Taal- en Letterkunde: Germaanse Talen  
aan de Faculteit Letteren en Wijsbegeerte



2005

Promotor: Prof. Dr. S. Slembrouck



To my parents James Flynn and Bridget Byrne



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>PREFACE</b>	13
<b>I.      EMIC JOURNEYS AND ETIC SHIFTS: TOWARDS AN ETHNOGRAPHY OF TRANSLATION</b>	17
I.1.   Contrastive Analysis and the Quest for Authority	17
I.2.   From Language System to Text Function: the genesis of an academic discipline	20
I.3.   Word-for-Word and Sense-for-Sense: dragons' teeth or seeds of debate	22
I.4.   Ferdinand's Ghost: of langue and parole	24
I.5.   The Many Guises of Ferdinand and the Horns of a Dilemma	28
I.6.   James S. Holmes or the Big Picture	33
I.7.   From Text Function to Social Function: the new frontier	36
I.8.   The Goal of Translation: action replay	40
I.9.   International Relations: evidence and contention	42
I.10.  An Ethnographer in Search of Translators: modes of representation	45
I.11.  Emic and Etic: resolution or postponement	51
<b>2.      AN ETHNOGRAPHY OF TRANSLATION: SOME INITIAL STEPS</b>	53
2.1.   Translation: from text to activity	53
2.2.   Translation as Practice?	56
2.3.   Asking the Translators	59
2.3.1. Drawing up the Questionnaire	59
2.3.2. Transcribing the Data	61
2.3.3. Coding the Data	63
2.4.   Exploring the Questionnaire Perspective: plausible scenarios of translation	64
2.4.1. Preamble	64
2.4.2. The Questionnaire, Section A – The Translator: narratives of inception and literary affinities	66
2.4.2.1. A1: What brought you to translation?	66
2.4.2.2. A2: Have you translated many poets?	69
2.4.2.3. A3: Do you have a special affinity with Ireland?	70
2.4.3. The Questionnaire, Section B – Translating as Such: tales from the workplace	73
2.4.3.1. B1: How do you go about it?	73
2.4.3.2. B2: What do you do when you are stuck for a word/reference?	81
2.4.3.3. B3: Do you work closely with the poets you translate?	84

2.4.3.4.	B4: Do the publishers put you under a lot of pressure?	86
2.4.4.	The Questionnaire, Section C – When the work is done?	88
2.4.4.1.	C1: What happens after you've sent in the drafts?	88
2.4.4.2.	C2 & C3: What do the publishers do and do you have a lot of work at this stage?	93
2.4.5.	The Questionnaire, Section D – After Publication: the end of an affair?	96
2.4.5.1.	D1: How do you feel when you receive your published work?	96
2.4.5.2.	D2: What about the critics? And D3: Are their comments useful?	100
2.5.	Initial Conclusions: nutshell views or the germs of ethos?	105
2.5.1.	Section A	105
2.5.2.	Section B	105
2.5.3.	Section C	106
2.5.4.	Section D	106
2.5.5.	Skopos and the Variables of Function: a comparison of functions and findings	106
2.5.5.1.	Commission	107
2.5.5.2.	Brief	107
2.5.5.3.	Skopos	108
2.5.5.4.	Translatum	109
2.5.5.5.	The Variables of Function	110
3.	<b>AN ETHNOGRAPHY OF TRANSLATION: INDICATIONS OF HABITUS</b>	113
3.1.	Exploring the Interviewee Perspective: a matter of practice	113
3.2.	Exploring the Interviewee Perspective: orders of salience	116
3.3.	Ethos	119
3.3.1.	Ethos: a definition	119
3.3.1.1.	Of Cannibals and Adventurers	119
3.3.1.2.	Of Bulldozers and Antennae	120
3.3.1.3.	On Developing the Craft	121
3.3.1.4.	Skin to Skin: orders of readership	121
3.3.1.5.	The Impassioned Insane	122
3.3.1.6.	Protecting Little Children	123
3.3.1.7.	Of Setting Tasks for Typewriters	124
3.3.1.8.	The Paradoxes of Profession and Persuasion	126
3.3.2.	Ethic Orientations: a map or an outline?	128
3.4.	Language Ideologies	129
3.4.1.	Perceptions of Dutch: of time and distance	132
3.4.1.1.	Language Foibles: of pedantry and beauty	134
3.4.1.2.	Language Change: trendsetting and timelessness	136
3.4.1.3.	Language Dominance: the logic of the market	137



3.4.1.4.	Our Second Language: Dutch	138
3.4.1.5.	Correct Language Use: de-nationalising the issue	139
3.4.1.6.	Language Variety: expecting tolerance	141
3.4.1.7.	Bringing Language to Book: fashion and tradition in another guise	142
3.4.1.8.	Time and Distance Confirmed?	142
3.4.2.	Perceptions of Language(s): other characterisations	146
3.4.2.1.	Language as a Collective Substratum	146
3.4.2.2.	The Being of a Language	147
3.4.2.3.	Language Sensitivity: trials of the foreign	149
3.4.2.4.	English: terse and pithy	150
3.4.2.5.	Dutch: flowing and melodious	151
3.4.2.6.	Dutch: of the (non)-gifts of our language	152
3.4.2.7.	Language Ideological Characterisations: whose discursive authority?	153
3.4.3.	Language Ideologies Revisited	156
3.5.	Genre	158
3.5.1.	From Text Types to Activity Types: evolving definitions or opposing perspectives?	158
3.5.1.1.	The Fire and the Finish: creative spark and formal care	164
3.5.1.2.	To the Bone of Text	165
3.5.1.3.	Tinkering with Little Machines	166
3.5.1.4.	The Poet's Breath: 'linguistically objectifiable'	167
3.5.1.5.	Skin to Skin Again: the evaluative contours of commitment	169
3.5.1.6.	Sweaty Hands: anxiety and entitlement to the canon	170
3.5.1.7.	Recipes for Writing: openness to change	171
3.5.1.8.	A Fascination for Things Difficult: modernism and beyond	171
3.5.2.	Genre and the Translators: some tentative conclusions	173
3.6.	Versions of Culture	177
3.6.1.1.	A Land of Poets	185
3.6.1.2.	A Certain Atmosphere	187
3.6.1.3.	Of Hedges and Ditches	188
3.6.1.4.	Of Storytellers and Philosophers	189
3.6.1.5.	Of Cultures and their Climates	191
3.6.1.6.	Forever Lagging Behind	192
3.6.1.7.	Of Landscapes and their Characters	193
3.6.1.8.	Culture as (Aesthetic) Movement	195
3.6.2.	Culture and the Arts	196
3.7.	Various Elements of Habitus: translators and translation	198
3.7.1.	Norm Theory and the Data	199

3.7.1.1.	Toury's Norms and the Data	200
3.7.1.2.	Chesterman's Norms and the Data	205
3.7.2.	The Profession of Study and the Study of a Profession	208
4.	<b>AN ELECTRONIC TRANSLATION CORPUS: IN SEARCH OF SITUATED PRACTICE IN TEXTS</b>	209
4.1.	Choosing a Model of Textual Analysis: a discussion	210
4.1.1.	A Historical Model of Translation Analysis	210
4.1.2.	Emic and Etic: evidence in translation corpora	212
4.1.2.1.	Translation Corpora: an empirical stance	212
4.1.2.2.	Shifts: values and descriptions	214
4.1.2.3.	Shifts: manual and computer-assisted searches	217
4.2.	Building the Corpus: practical and related theoretical issues	219
4.2.1.	Finding the Data	220
4.2.2.	Formatting the Data	221
4.2.3.	Coding the Data: initial steps	224
4.2.3.1.	Coding the Data: stage 1 – linguistic and poetic codes	227
4.2.3.2.	Coding the Data: Stage 2 – deeper levels of distinction	231
4.2.3.3.	Coding the Data: stage 3 – deeper codes per section of corpus, poet and translator	235
4.2.4.	Categories and Codes: deconstruction and reconstruction	237
4.2.4.1.	Categories and Codes: a tentative line of demarcation	237
4.2.4.2.	Categories and Codes: b)-type shifts – an outline of their distribution	239
4.2.4.3.	Categories and Codes: a)-type linguistic and poetic features	243
5.	<b>ANALYSING THE CORPUS DATA</b>	245
5.1.	Analysing the Data: a)-type linguistic features	245
5.1.1.	Names and Places	246
5.1.2.	Idiomatic Choice	247
5.1.3.	Pragmatic Choice	250
5.1.4.	Ling-codes	251
5.1.5.	Index	253
5.1.6.	a)-type Linguistic Features: some tentative conclusions	256
5.2.	Analysing the Data: a)-type poetic features	256
5.2.1.	Line Overflow	257
5.2.2.	Line Break Difference	260
5.2.3.	Rhyme	263
5.2.4.	Rhyme: local	267
5.2.5.	Sound: various	268
5.2.6.	a)-type Poetic Features: some tentative conclusions	270

5.3.	Analysing the Data: b)-type features	271
5.3.1.	Clause Level Shifts	272
5.3.1.1.	Clause: non-finite to finite	273
5.3.1.2.	Clause: complex shift	275
5.3.1.3.	Clause: clause to phrase	276
5.3.2.	Phrase Level Shifts	279
5.3.2.1.	Noun Phrase Shifts	279
5.3.2.2.	Verb Phrase Shifts	288
5.3.3.	Other b)-type Features	290
5.3.3.1.	Explicitation	291
5.3.3.2.	Implication	294
5.3.3.3.	Elision	295
5.3.3.4.	Possible Mismatch	302
5.3.3.5.	Word Choice	303
5.3.3.6.	Word Order	304
5.4.	Regrouping a)-type and b)-type Features: evidence and justification of a theory of practice	307
6.	<b>QUALITATIVE DATA AND AN ELECTRONIC CORPUS: A CONTRAST OF THE FINDINGS</b>	317
6.1.	The Common Ground of Habitus and Textual Practice	329
6.1.1.	From Metatext to Metonymics: translated texts as evidence of cultural change	332
6.1.2.	A Corpus as Evidence of a Translator's Style	334
6.1.3.	Habitus and a Translator's Style	338
6.2.	Tying the Two Strands of Inquiry Together: conclusions of the study	341
	<b>NOTES</b>	349
	<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	373



## PREFACE

The first time I ever heard ‘Flemish’ spoken was on the docks in Zeebrugge during the summer of 1973. Shay Crowe and I were on our way to Amsterdam to view that fair city and learn something of the new wave of civilisation that it epitomised at the time. While I was walking along the docks, my ear strained to the accents of the men directing the lorries off the ferry; it was our first time on the continent, our first time arm-in-arm with a strange language that somehow whispered to us familiarly, that gave us a nod of recognition. I didn’t know then that from where I stood listening all the way up to Groningen in the north east people conversed in the same tongue – and with a bit of good will, could understand each other – and that the language they shared was called Dutch. Back then Flanders was as mystical and mysterious to me as Tír na nÓg, with its ancient cities and secret language that only a few outside its borders could vaguely understand. Little did I know, when hitch-hiking up to Antwerp and waiting for another lift at the ‘Sterre’, that I would one day be writing this in the shadow of the ‘boekentoren’ of Ghent University Library. Since then Dutch has betrayed some of secrets to me but has lost none of its charm. The cities of Flanders have become known to me in some respects but still retain their mystery.

I embarked on a similar journey when undertaking this Ph.D. There was so much to discover and so much I didn’t know – and still have to learn. This was to be a reckoning, a coming to terms with things, a push to consolidate some small corner of understanding, a concerted effort at something, if not entirely useful, at least consistent with itself, a gesture of rebellion, particularly against my own distraction. The corner I sought to explore was intersected by the thoughts and explorations of so many others. The closer I looked the more I discovered that these thoughts stretched back into the past and outward into various disciplines and areas I knew little or nothing about. I was reminded of the lines from Seamus Heaney’s ‘Bogland’:

*Our pioneers keep striking  
Inwards and downwards,*

*Every layer they strip  
Seems camped on before.*

Though somewhat clear at the outset, the destination I had envisaged seemed to fade in the process and the urgency of arriving lessened. Arriving seemed dangerous or bordering on the pretentious. And at times scholarship seemed to shine for itself in its own light. Next to this,

the farther I went the stronger the realisation became that searching could begin where you stood, in the elusive stuff of the day-to-day.

But where was I standing? On the brink of a beginning, certainly, but was I imagining the bog land bordering the Shannon in Heaney's lines or the flat expanse of "veen" stretching out beyond Groningen in Peter Nijmeijer's lines:

*Onze pioniers blijven  
Naar binnen en omlaag stoten,*

*Iedere laag die wordt blootgelegd  
Schijnt eertijds al bewoond geweest.*

I contemplated Rushdie's notion of oneself being translated rather than translating. The feeling was not unfamiliar though it struck me in the end as being tragically light-footed. Being translated meant that you literally had no 'say' in the matter of any language. The notion seems to have been spawned in a world where you were condemned to speak one language only and live forever to regret the fact. I rebelled against this because, like millions of others, I have been living in and through languages for a major part of my life and have long since grown 'used to' being lost to any one language at a time. I've never understood it in terms of loss only. As a child, my native language was supposed to be Irish, though my mother never spoke it to me except for the odd word of affection. So, I bow in recognition to Rushdie's sorrow but refuse to acquiesce, at least not entirely. 'Les grand récits' are often wearisome in their desire and haste to generalise and reach closure: displacement and exile are more commonplace than the stability they gainsay. And displacement is sometimes driven by a thirst that no native spring can immediately quench.

Out of all this grew a dual obligation: firstly, to be true to the subject matter I was about to study and to (the spirit of) those observed in its practice and secondly to build on the knowledge and observations of the people who had visited these places before me. I am indebted to all those who have helped me in both rites of passage. I would firstly like to thank my supervisor Stef Slembrouck for clearing the ground for me in so many ways, for holding me on course when I had lost my bearings and for steering me clear of the hazards of linguistic inquiry. His knowledge is staggering, as is his determination to remain true to the task at hand. Thanks to him I've also been able to benefit from the advice of Jim Collins, Alexandra Jaffe, Monica Heller and Kay McCormick, whom I would like to thank for their inspiration and sound comments. I would also like to thank Moira Inghelleri and Mona Baker for their encouragement during my first shaky steps into an ethnography of translation at SS14.

My appreciation and thanks also go to our Head of Department, Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen for her guiding hand and belief in me as a teacher. I wish to extend a word of thanks to our librarian supreme Chris Bulcaen, who not only can find what you need but also can tell you what it is about. Then there are those with whom I've travelled part of the

proverbial road. My particular thanks go to Ellen Van Praet for her kindness, encouragement and resolve and to Bernard De Clerck for his good spirits and his courage. I thank Mieke Van Herreweghe for her wisdom, Jim O'Driscoll for his honesty, Miriam Taverniers for her wizardry, Ellen Simon for her aplomb, Tine Dufour for her vibrancy and Claudine Muylle for being her unequalled self.

Here I would like to take the opportunity to thank all the translators who agreed to take part in this study, who for reasons of anonymity cannot be mentioned by name. The knowledge you imparted will remain with me for many years to come, along with the friendship you showed me along the way. My thanks also go to Inge Claerhout for her painstaking reading and correction of the interview transcripts.

I extend a special thanks to all those at Poetry International in Rotterdam: without your help this study would never have been completed. I would like to thank my son Arion and Riet Desopper for helping me scan all the documents for the corpus – a time-consuming job if ever there was one. The work that follows would have been a shambles were it not for the eagle eye of Martine Krichel. Karl De Raeymaecker is the man who gave this book its form: may his skill and wit grow and flourish. I thank my wife Kaat for standing by me in word and deed from before the beginning of this work till its last full stop and beyond: I could not have done it without you.

Then there are those I wish to thank for standing behind me and for forgiving my absence, both physical and mental: to my parents, my brothers and sister and to my friends, one and all for your support, patience and understanding. I wish to thank Kaat's family for your encouragement and for bearing with me, particularly over the last few months; my son Leander who has had to wait so long to find out how Finn Mac Cool saved a local chief's house from a demon spouting ball lightning – there are more stories where they came from; to Arion for his knack of puckin' a sliothar and for his understanding of things; to all those whom I have not mentioned here by name but whom I hold dear.

It is time now to close this chapter, so that we can move on to another.

Peter Flynn

Ghent

1 November 2005





# I. EMIC JOURNEYS AND ETIC SHIFTS: TOWARDS AN ETHNOGRAPHY OF TRANSLATION

## I.I. Contrastive Analysis and the Quest for Authority

The terms *emic* and *etic*<sup>1</sup>, first coined by the famous linguistic anthropologist Kenneth Pike (1954-56<sup>2</sup>; 1966), have long since become familiar and widely-used distinctions in the study of language use in society, not to mention other fields within the humanities and beyond. The terms have been attributed a number of meanings over the years and are used in various ways in the disciplines concerned (Headland et al. 1990<sup>3</sup>). The terms have also found their way into the field of Translation Studies and, with regard to language description, are outlined by Michael Hoey and Diane Houghton in Baker (1998<sup>4</sup>: 47-48) as follows:

An **etic** description is one that makes use of predetermined categories found to have been of use in accounting for other languages; it is by its very nature imposed on the data. An **emic** description on the other hand makes use of categories that are formulated in response to the needs of the language under study; they can only be formulated by someone intimately familiar with the language. The categories of an *emic* description may draw upon familiar terminology (e.g. noun, passive, instrument) but the definition and significance of any category is always dependent on those of all the other categories in that language (and no other). By their very nature *emic* descriptions are not comparable and yet no *etic* description can be considered satisfactory other than as a preliminary step towards a proper *emic* one. *Emic* and *etic* descriptions are on a cline. No description is perfectly *emic* and few are totally *etic*.

This outline echoes the insider/outsider distinction alluded to in the title of this chapter in that it sees the *etic* as ‘imposing’ categories on the data and the *emic* as formulating categories ‘in response to the needs of the language under study’ and such categories can only be formulated by ‘someone intimately familiar with the language’. It is also in keeping with the view formulated by Pike<sup>5</sup>:

The **etic** view is an alien view -- the structuring of an outsider. The **emic** view is domestic, leading to units which correspond to those of an insider familiar with and participating in the system.

I have chosen to use the distinctions *emic* and *etic* as a point of departure because they offer me a framework – albeit a provisional one – within which I can formulate some basic questions and outline some of the problems I’ve been faced with in the course of my research. The two quotes cited above raise many questions that mirror my preoccupations, which will be dealt with in detail in the ensuing discussion.

Before embarking on the discussion, I would first like to provide further justification for my use of emic-etic as a point of departure. This mainly hinges on the alien/domestic dichotomy set out in Pike. I see myself as being involved with the subject of this dissertation in two ways. Before starting at Ghent University and beginning my research within the field of Translation Studies, I had worked as a professional translator for a number of years. In this respect, I consider myself as having a domestic view of the field, as far as my professional experience as a translator is concerned but also as having an alien one at the same time, in that my research involves structuring the field I come from for the purposes of study. Emic and etic could be considered as encapsulating this dual perspective and hence prove useful at this initial stage of the debate. On the whole, the perspective involves using my experience to gain insight into theories of translation available in the literature and harnessing those theories to explicate many aspects of the field I possessed a pragmatic understanding of when working within it. The purpose, by the end of the journey, is to resolve the duality of the domestic and alien view or render it possible to understand both in terms of each other.

To begin the discussion, I would like to examine the Hoey and Houghton's stance on language description given above. For someone who has spent many years at a desk surrounded by (translation) dictionaries, grammars and specialised lexicons, theirs seems like an obvious point of ingress as language description would allow us to place aspects of any two languages in common (superordinate or deeper) categories, thereby also allowing us to make statements about their nature and hence suggest certain lines of action with respect to their translation or minimally to make the results of the study available for those who could 'apply' them or use them in some way.

The underlying assumption of practical application expressed in the last sentence is a realistic one and often crops up in discussions within Translation Studies, as the following statement illustrates: "... it must not be forgotten that this is a discipline firmly rooted in practical application" (Bassnett 2002<sup>6</sup>). This statement not only places those who conduct studies, be they etic or emic or both, under a certain onus to return something to the 'translation community', it somehow posits a teleology, the ultimate goal perhaps being the formation of better translators (viz. the increasing number of colleges offering translation and interpretation courses and the burgeoning of Translation Studies as an academic discipline<sup>7</sup>). On the whole the line between theorising on the nature of translation and commenting on how particular translations were, are or should be done has been a fuzzy one. Whether these two lines of inquiry should be kept separate is open for discussion, however, (see the comment on Holmes further on in this chapter). The point I wish to make here is that in discussing the emic-etic contrast Hoey and Houghton recognise the importance of translators in the whole equation or at least place them within the field of inquiry, though not in such explicit terms. Though this might sound like a commonplace nowadays, it is, nonetheless, of vital importance to the discussion I am embarking on, as many discussions of translation in the literature have excluded translators, either intentionally or otherwise. Next to all this and perhaps more fundamentally, it raises questions about the very nature of the object of study.

So to put it briefly, it begs the question: what constitutes language(s)? How complete or focused should our picture of a language be before we can call it a description? And is the term description a fitting one? It would seem that these questions have to be answered first before we can move on to contrasting languages for the purpose of translation.

According to Hoey and Houghton's view, an emic description would have to take into account formulations made "by someone intimately familiar with the language", by someone with a 'domestic' or 'insider' view. The shift from etic to emic in the citation implies moving from the comparative study of languages as independent systems to studies, 'pragmatic', 'functional' or otherwise, within or across languages that draw on insights provided by those who are 'intimately familiar' with those languages. Nonetheless, they state that "[b]y their very nature, emic descriptions are not comparable". Is this because those who are 'intimately familiar' with the languages under contrast use different sets of categories of language description? Or does this involve an unspoken assumption that emic implies 'subjective' versus etic which is 'objective' or rather that emic is 'ad hoc' and 'functional' versus etic which is 'systematic' and hence 'scientific'? Much depends on what we understand by "someone intimately familiar with the language". Pike's initial distinction between (phon)emic and (phon)etic (Pike 1954) contrasts "intrinsic phonemic differences that are meaningful to users of a particular language" with "accurate extrinsic phonetic descriptions" of these differences drawn up by scientists. So, are the people Hoey and Houghton refer to the native speakers of each language – or both languages – or native-speaker scientists studying the language? In this respect, earlier studies by scholars like Catford have been criticised for containing made-up examples that serve to illustrate particular translation phenomena (see Snell-Hornby 1988<sup>8</sup>: 20). Whatever the answer may be, because Contrastive Analysis compares language systems, which, by the very nature of the construct, are seen as self-contained units, there is no room for emic overlap, i.e. for those who might be intimately familiar with two languages or more – the domain of the translator, but by no means exclusively so. To resolve the dichotomy that stems from using any dual pair of concepts, Hoey and Houghton place emic and etic descriptions on a cline, the etic being "a preliminary step towards a proper emic one", no description being 'perfectly emic' and few being 'totally etic'.

Their exposé on emic and etic belongs in the entry, Contrastive Analysis and Translation (Baker 1998: 45-49), which also contains a section on "the relevance of CA (Contrastive Analysis) to translation" that offers (at least) two points of interest to translators:

At a practical level, it is probably most useful in pointing out areas where direct translation of a term or phrase will not convey accurately in the second language the intended meaning of the first. At a global level, it leads the translator to look at broader issues such as whether the structure of the discourse for a given text-type is the same in both languages. (Baker 1998: 47)

It is not unlikely to assume that facts like these have become and will continue to become known to translators or even that some knew them already. If they do know, the question then would be: how? Did they follow a course in translation or did they discover such things through experience? Furthermore, if they do know, to which extent do they know? Is their

knowledge systematic or intuitive or are such categories redundant? Moreover, if they know these things already, to what extent would the studies be useful to them? In the best of situations, one can imagine how such studies might inform and become part of a translator's knowledge base. Nor is it the intention to shun the important work of lexicographers in this area, particularly now with the growing importance of corpora. However, one can still justifiably ask just how emic contrastive analyses can be, particularly given the importance attached to emic in Hoey and Houghton's exposé, if they fail to examine emicity among bilingual and multilingual users, including translators. On the whole, my argument should not be misconstrued as a plea for the abandonment of contrastive analysis (see chapter 2), but should rather be seen as a question regarding the givens of contrast (see chapter 4). In other words, what are we contrasting? In order to set off and illustrate systems, contrastive analysts have to draw on language material. This material can be either invented for the purpose by the scholar – as was often the case in the past – or drawn from natural language use in all its forms. These two approaches build on decidedly different stances with respect to language as a field of study, which are also visible in the debate within Translation Studies. Therefore, we can also ask what we are doing when we analyse languages and hence texts along with their translations for the purposes of contrast. In this respect, Hoey and Houghton do recognise that:

CA deals with systems rather than users of systems. Consequently, it tends to be relevant to translations as products rather than to the process of translation – which many current translation specialists (e.g. Hatim & Mason 1990; Bell 1991) see as central to an adequate theory of translation. (Baker 1998: 48)

So at this stage, it would seem logical to assume that any theory of translation is informed (minimally) by a theory of language(s). These range from those that regard languages as autonomous self-regulating systems to those that see them as being inextricably bound to their users and their socio-cultural contexts. There are also various positions in between.

## **1.2. From Language System to Text Function: the genesis of an academic discipline**

Viewed historically and particularly with respect to 20th-century thinking on translation, one can consider the debate within Translation Studies as mirroring these concerns, as a move away from the study of languages as systems used to develop theories of and approaches to (possible) translation, towards studies of language use in translation in the fully 'situational' sense (viz. functional and pragmatic approaches to translation study). In discussing the notion of genre, Vološinov ([1930] 1973<sup>9</sup>: 184) defines the situational<sup>10</sup> in the following way:

What is at stake in the first instance is the actual status of a work as a social fact: its definition in real time and space; its means and mode of performance; the kind of audience presupposed and the relationship between author and audience established; its association with social institutions, social mores, and other ideological spheres; in short – its full “situational” definition.

Nowadays, Translation Studies are generally considered to be concerned with texts and their translations in the broadest contextual sense, including the translation process (Hatim and Mason 1990). Similarly, Umberto Eco sees translation as being concerned with the following:

Translation does not involve comparing a language (or any other semiotic system) with another language or semiotic system; it involves passing from text ‘a’, elaborated according to a semiotic system ‘A’, into a text ‘b’ elaborated according to a semiotic system ‘B’. (Eco, in Baker 1998: 221)

Though this quote seems to place semiotic systems at the centre of discussion in the way it uses capitals for systems and lower case letters for texts, it nonetheless indicates a shift in focus. Likewise in discussing various definitions of equivalence – a concept that has generated much debate within the discipline – Dorothy Kenny also points to a change in approach within the field:

Thus the general view in Translation Studies soon came to be that equivalence was a relation between texts in two different languages, rather than between the languages themselves. This step liberated Translation Studies from the debates on interlingual translatability based on entire language systems with all their unactualized meaning potential (Koller 1979; Pym 1995: 157-8). Such debates had centred on incompatibilities between the worlds inhabited by the speakers of different languages and on the structural dissimilarities between languages. Once attention was focused on texts and utterances, many of the potential multiple meanings and functions of words and structures in a language system could be eliminated by reference to the cotext and context, making translation not only more tractable, but also more realistic. (Kenny in Baker 1998: 77-80)

This step from language study to forms of (contextualised) textual or utterance study needs further elucidation as it can be considered as belonging to the broader debate on language use in context within 20th-century linguistics. The decades between the publication of Vološinov’s work ([1930] 1973) in English translation and the recognition that the work received in the final quarter of the century bears witness to this. But in terms of translation proper, it would be safe to say that there always has been recognition (either tacit or explicit) of the importance of social and culture-specific constraints and hence (textual) difference within the reflection on translation from the very outset.

### 1.3. **Word-for-Word and Sense-for-Sense: dragons' teeth or seeds of debate**

The various stances taken within the word-for-word and sense-for-sense debate (Bassnett 2002) among classical and early Christian translators (and similar debates involving dual oppositions in translation description) can be understood not merely as expressions of varying loyalty to source and target text but also as comments on how these texts were perceived to function within the respective languages and cultures concerned by those involved in the translation process and by this I do not merely mean the translators themselves. Even St. Jerome's defence of the Greek translators at Alexandria<sup>11</sup> can be understood as a translation strategy that, willingly or not, elided the materiality of the source language/culture by grounding 'the word of God' in terms that he perceived to be in keeping with the doctrine of the early Christian Church. Whatever the preference (word-for-word or sense-for-sense), the question remains: what did classical and early biblical translators understand by language and its relation to text? Great caution has to be exercised in approaching this question. Though the debate at the time ostensibly revolved around the numinous (divine or aesthetic) that was either 'locked' within or represented in classical and biblical texts, in the conveyance and transfer of their (absolute or rhetorical) meaning, it can also be understood in terms of those who could claim access to such meaning. This involved and still involves making claims to or seeking legitimization – a highly risky business as Tyndale was to discover much to his detriment or, more recently, even Salmon Rushdie for that matter. So the debate is not just about degrees of deference to the (sacred/aesthetic) source text but also about particular translators and others who can legitimately claim to understand it and hence represent it to a target audience. In fact, I can think of no better example of 'situated' texts than those of purportedly divine origin, were it only for the intensity and even violence of the debate they generate both within and outside translation circles. So, it is not merely a matter of a bilingual speaker or translator being capable in the Chomskyan sense of producing an unlimited number of grammatically correct sentences in two or more languages, it is also a matter, to paraphrase Bourdieu, of the capacity "to make oneself heard, believed, obeyed and so on" (Editor's Introduction Bourdieu 1992<sup>12</sup>: 8). In this respect, an individual's capacity to translate particular texts is by no means a guarantee that his or her translations will be accepted as constituting valid, good or fair translations. It would be rather ingenuous however to blame St. Jerome for failing to step outside the ideological struggle he was involved in or more particularly for failing to see how this determined his translation strategies. All that the above demonstrates is the present writer's capacity to marshal a couple of givens of power-oriented analysis, if at all. But the point being made is not unfounded. It is clear from reading St. Jerome's letter to Pammachius<sup>13</sup> that translation was in no sense an academic exercise conducted in the serenity of a monk's cell that had little bearing on the outside world. In fact his was a profession fraught with danger and as such difficult to disassociate from the context in which it was conducted. So, even then word-for-word and sense-for-sense were not just

linguistic categories of translated text but choices that were subject to sanction or approval by all and sundry and, more importantly, by state (institutional) and ecclesiastic authorities. For example, in his letter, St. Jerome cites illustrious authors in justifying his translation strategies:

Now I not only admit but freely announce that in translating from the Greek – except of course in the case of Holy Scripture, where even the syntax contains a mystery – I render, not word for word, but sense for sense. For this practice I have behind me the authority of Cicero himself; he employed it in his versions of Plato’s *Pythagoras*, the *Oeconomicus* of Xenophon, and those two noble and beautiful orations of Aeschines and Demosthenes delivered against each other. What additions, omissions and alterations Cicero made, substituting the idiom and peculiarity of his own language for the original Greek – this is not for me to say. As far as I am concerned, it will be sufficient merely to quote his own justification for translating as he did. “I have considered it right”, Cicero remarks in the prologue to the Latin version of the above orations. (Robinson 1997: 25)

As has been pointed out above, in claiming allegiance to authoritative forebears like Cicero, Horace, St. Anthony of Egypt and others, St. Jerome posited two translation strategies and linked them to different text types (genres) i.e. Biblical texts and the Classics. Elsewhere in the letter, he also draws on notions now known as audience (Nida in Venuti 2000: 128) and commission (Vermeer in Venuti 2000: 229) to justify and defend (the private nature of) a translation he had been publicly attacked for:

Eusebius began to entreat me to translate it for him into Latin, and at the same time, to arrange and simplify the content so that he could more easily understand it, for he had no knowledge of Greek. This I agreed to do. Calling on the secretary, I quickly dictated a translation, briefly paraphrasing on the margin the argument in each main section. The point is that Eusebius asked me to translate a copy only for himself; and in return I requested that he keep the copy private and not circulate it publicly. (Robinson 1997: 24)

What remains to be seen is whether St. Jerome kept to the strategies he set for himself in translating the text types he identified – something only an analysis of his translations would uncover, which alas is beyond the scope of this study. What can be stated, however, is that an examination of his comments would help to disambiguate the apparent duality of word-for-word and sense-for-sense, for although he does mention languages and the various degrees of skill his fellow translators possessed in them, the main thrust of his discussion concerned the texts he and others had been working on. What can also be said is that word-for-word and sense-for-sense are strategies first and foremost and not intrinsic qualities of language or text. They are things people do that become visible to varying degrees in text. This premise draws on a notion of language that is bound to its users and context, with the proviso that St. Jerome clearly provides us with evidence to posit such a premise, even though it may be anachronistic to do so. Whether he held such views on language himself is clearly another matter, whence the caution called for above. Nonetheless, it cannot be denied that St. Jerome was keenly aware of the society or societies he was a member of and the audience(s) he was translating for.

Otherwise, why go to such passionate lengths were it solely to articulate the difference between word-for-word and sense-for-sense? St. Jerome also demonstrates that he was pertinently aware of differences between texts and their translations, viz. his copious comments throughout the letter on the omissions, changes and additions to scripture he found in the course of his study. His analysis of these texts was not merely conducted for the purposes of linguistic comparison and contrast or to demonstrate his knowledge of the languages he was working in but mainly to justify and legitimise his own translations. So it could certainly be argued that his work was grounded in and that it affected and also was affected by the socio-cultural context of his day. Then again all this could be passed off as an a-historical reading of his work, which I would not deny. On the other hand, one can wonder to which extent recent comments on the word-for-word and sense-for-sense polemic found in St. Jerome's writings and elsewhere have been informed by 20th-century paradigms of language system and are therefore more a discussion of such paradigms than anything else.

To relate the above to the on-going inquiry into emic and etic, it would not be difficult for an insider (translator) to identify with the vehement tone of St. Jerome's letter to Pammachius. It is not uncommon today for translators to encounter similar forms of rivalry and misjudgement in the course of their work and if polemics should ensue they are usually fought out with such weapons as dictionaries, grammars and other authoritative sources. So, in the same way St. Jerome drew on illustrious authors to shore up his textual decisions, translators nowadays cite authoritative sources of language description in whatever form to lend credence to their choices. Viewed etically, it would, therefore, seem ill advised to ignore factors such as users (translators and others) and context if we wish to get a full description of the object of study. Likewise, it would also seem ill advised to disassociate language from texts and their users. The question then would be: what do we understand by users and context and how should they be seen in relation to texts as expressions of language?

#### **1.4. Ferdinand's Ghost: of langue and parole**

Whatever disciplinary perspective we use to explore Classical and early Christian translations, it cannot be denied however, that binary forms of categorisation such as those put forward by St. Jerome or Latin authors like Horace and Cicero (Bassnett 2002: 49) remained potent far into the 20th century. This does not imply that such binary pairs of translation types meant the same thing to 20th-century scholars. Venuti (2000: 121-124) cites a number of scholars like Nida, Newmark, and House, among others, as using binary concepts in different ways and sees equivalence as being central to the debate within translation during the nineteen sixties and seventies. To 20th-century scholars, the notion of equivalence was squarely based on the two language systems under comparison and drew on de Saussure's dichotomy of *langue* and *langage/parole*. To be brief, the criticism levelled against equivalence in the literature is not unlike Hoey and Houghton's comment on Contrastive Analysis<sup>14</sup> cited above. Most scholars who have used the term were quick to point out various types of equivalence, next to formal



equivalence, that stemmed in the main from recognitions of language use in context, which were listed initially on the side of *langage/parole*.

I will provide a brief overview of such dual approaches here to illustrate my point. I would firstly like to draw on two quotes taken from Roman Jakobson's "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation" ([1969] in Venuti 2000). The first quote clearly reflects the tenor of the piece in the way it focuses on comparative study both within and across languages and semiotic systems:

Equivalence in difference is the cardinal problem of language and the pivotal concern of linguistics. Like any receiver of verbal messages, the linguist acts as their interpreter. No linguistic specimen may be interpreted by the science of language without a translation of its signs into other signs of the same system or into signs of another system. Any comparison of two languages implies an examination of their mutual translatability; widespread practice of interlingual communication, particularly translating activities, must be kept under scrutiny by linguistic science. It is difficult to overestimate the urgent need for and the theoretical and practical significance of differential bilingual dictionaries with careful comparative definition of all the corresponding units in their intention and extension. Likewise differential bilingual grammars should define what unifies and what differentiates the two languages in their selection and delimitation of grammatical concepts. (Jakobson in Venuti 2000: 115)

As this quote illustrates, Jakobson considers translation as an important, even vital aspect of language study and provides ample discussion and illustration throughout the piece to support his position. On the whole, the piece is of capital importance to Translation Studies in that it formulates translation as a continuum that does not merely involve interaction between languages and other semiotic systems but continues on within them: see particularly his notions of intralingual and intersemiotic translation (Jakobson in Venuti 2000: 114). Note too that that in intralingual translation equivalence remains problematic for even "synonymy, as a rule, is not complete equivalence." So the problem of equivalence poses itself initially within any given language and can only be solved with reference to use in context before the enterprise of translation can be engaged. So, in summing up his discussion, Jakobson states the following:

If we were to translate into English the traditional formula *Traduttore traditore* as "the translator is a betrayer" we would deprive the Italian rhyming epigram of all its paronomastic value. Hence a cognitive attitude would compel us to change this aphorism into a more explicit statement and to answer the questions: translator of what messages? Betrayer of what values? (Jakobson in Venuti 2000: 118)

Though it could be argued that rendering the aphorism as 'the translator is a traitor' or 'translator traitor' might partly help restore the rhyme, this is not the issue at hand. Even Jakobson's rendition contains assonance, which does some justice to the original. In making recourse to a cognitive approach, Jakobson shifts from language to messages delivered by translators, hence particular instances of language use (texts). He also cites the values they

betray. Whether a cognitive approach will allow us to fully uncover these values is not a matter for discussion here. What is important for the discussion is that Jakobson relates text to values and that values are usually held and expressed by (a section of) a particular society, which ostensibly grounds the translation and translator in the society concerned. On the face of it, my arguments do nothing to upset the basic binary paradigm of *langue* and *langage*, but they do point to a shift in position on the nature of translation and in the concerns of Translation Studies, which are apparent in the quotes taken from Eco and Kenny above.

Eugene Nida is another translation scholar who discussed equivalence at length. He opens his *Principles of Correspondence* (Nida [1964] in Venuti 2000: 127-140) with the following statement:

Since not two languages are identical, either in the meanings given to corresponding symbols in or the ways in which such symbols are arranged in phrases and sentences, it stands to reason that there can be no absolute correspondence between languages. Hence there can be no fully exact translations. (Nida in Venuti 2000: 127)

In pointing out “two basic orientations in translating”, he identifies formal and dynamic in which the formal “focuses attention on the message itself” and the dynamic “aims at complete naturalness of expression,” (Nida in Venuti 2000: 129).

Within the formal orientation “one is concerned that the message in the receptor language should match as closely as possible the different elements in the source language”, whereas the dynamic orientation “tries to relate the receptor to modes of behaviour relevant within the context of his own culture; it does not insist that he understand the cultural patterns of the source-language context in order to comprehend the message” (Nida in Venuti 2000: 129). Nida sees most translation types as falling between these two poles but remarks that “during the past fifty years, however, there has been a marked shift of emphasis from the formal to the dynamic” (ibid.: 130). Here we find echoes of the word-for-word and sense-for-sense discussion commented on above where the formal can be seen as ‘a gloss’ (a method that is often used in classrooms when students are learning another language, for example) and the dynamic as seeking ‘equivalent effect’. Not only do we encounter differences in directionality in Nida’s orientations, we also notice a separating out for the purposes of (practical) approach of message (form and content) and cultural relevance. Here again we are dealing with two strategies in approaching already existing instances of language use (Biblical texts in Nida’s case; see also translation and language ideologies in chapter 3), both of which can be explained in terms of the notion of audience which Nida himself posits. As Peter Fawcett puts it: “[t]hus it can be said that Eugene Nida’s theory of dynamic equivalence is, in fact, nothing less than a sociolinguistics of translation (quoted in Baker 1998: 121). And yet, whatever strategy one uses (formal/dynamic), neither can be separated from the context concerned. The question remains, given the ‘shift ... to the dynamic’, as to how the dichotomy of formal and dynamic might remain of use beyond its initial recognition of differences between languages, which is more evidenced in retrospect by a formal approach. It would seem from Nida’s writings that the notion of audience is more salient in dynamic rather than in formal translations, dynamic

translations being, in the main, more (re)contextualised than formal ones. Nevertheless, one wonders whether it might not be more appropriate to regard formal and dynamic as two consecutive steps in any translation process, which would be determined by the audience and purpose of the translation concerned, rather than consider them as two mutually exclusive and irreconcilable approaches.

Catford ([1965] in Venuti: 141-147) also uses formal correspondence as his starting point in discussing translation, which he sees as involving ‘shifts’ or

departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from the SL (source language) to the TL (target language). Two major ‘shifts’ occur: *level shifts* (1.1) and *category shifts* (1.2). (Catford [1965] in Venuti: 141)

Level shifts mean that items found at one linguistic level in the SL are rendered at another linguistic level in the TL (e.g. grammar to lexis), whereas category shifts are seen as “departures from formal correspondence in translation” (e.g. the clause structure shift from English to Gaelic cited by Catford). Regarding category shifts Catford states:

The concept of ‘category-shift’ is necessary in the discussion of translation; but it is clearly meaningless to talk about category-shift unless we assume some degree of formal correspondence between SL and TL; indeed this is the main justification for the recognition of formal correspondence in our theory. (Catford [1965] in Venuti: 143)

Catford further distinguishes ‘unbound’ (‘normal’, ‘free’) translation in which “... equivalences are set up at whatever rank is appropriate” and ‘rank-bound’ translation where equivalence is “*deliberately limited* to ranks below the sentence, thus leading to ‘bad translation’ i.e. translation in which the TL text is either not a normal TL form at all, or is not relatable to the same situational substance as the SL text” (ibid.: 143). It goes without saying that this statement is informed by a type of language ideology viz. ‘bad translation’ and ‘not a normal TL form’ that has been much criticized in more recent translation scholarship (Venuti 1998<sup>15</sup> and Bassnett & Trivedi 1999<sup>16</sup>) but this belongs to a debate that will be conducted later on in this study (see chapter 3). What is important to note here is Catford’s reference to ‘situational substance’. The purpose here is also to point once again to the binary nature of the model put forward by Catford. It is to show that formal correspondence between languages formed the mainstay of his reasoning. However, the reasoning draws on the ‘situational substance’ of forms, no matter how narrow his interpretation of situation might be. Douglas Robinson (Baker 1998: 125) sees Catford’s theory as an attempt “to obviate the confusions inherent in the loose terms word-for-word, literal, sense-for-sense and free by speaking of rank-bound translation and unbound translation”. Nevertheless, despite Catford’s typology of translation shifts and its usefulness in identifying literal and free translations, we are still left wondering why literal or ‘word-for-word’ approaches have such a long lineage in Western translation (Robinson in Baker 1998: 125-127) or why, as Catford puts it, equivalence “is *deliberately limited* to ranks below the sentence.” How are we to understand ‘deliberately’? Is it an indication of obstinate or wilful action against better judgement, or a matter of conscious choice? Moreover,

the notion of ‘shift’ itself is a recognition not only of formal differences between language systems but also of the contextual meaning of particular utterances or texts, as the many examples in his piece illustrate.

## 1.5. The Many Guises of Ferdinand and the Horns of a Dilemma

I would like to open this section with a quote from Bourdieu on the relation between language and the social:

It was therefore necessary to draw out all the consequences of the fact, so powerfully repressed by linguists and their imitators, that the ‘social nature of language is one of its internal characteristics’, as the Course in General Linguistics asserted, and that social heterogeneity is inherent in language. This must be done while at the same time being aware of the risks involved in the enterprise, not the least of which is the apparent crudeness which can accompany the most rigorous analyses capable – and culpable – of contributing to the return of the repressed; in short, one must choose to pay a higher price for truth while accepting a lower profit for distinction. (Bourdieu 1992: 34)

Bourdieu’s rather trenchant statement would obviate a re-examination of de Saussure’s seminal work (Vološinov 1973; Bourdieu 1992; Thibault 1997<sup>17</sup>; Harris 2000<sup>18</sup>), even though his blanket condemnation of linguists seems to brush aside those who have always considered language as a social fact. In his *Cours de linguistique générale*<sup>19</sup>, Ferdinand de Saussure speaks of language (*langue*) in the following terms:

Mais qu’est-ce que la langue? Pour nous elle ne se confond pas avec le langage; elle n’en est qu’une partie déterminée, essentielle, il est vrai. C’est à la fois un produit social de la faculté de langage et un ensemble de conventions nécessaires, adoptées par le corps social pour permettre l’exercice de cette faculté chez les individus. (de Saussure 1974: 25)

Si nous pouvions embrasser la somme des images verbales emmagasinées chez tous les individus, nous toucherions le lien social qui constitue la langue. C’est un trésor déposé par la pratique de la parole dans les sujets appartenant à la même communauté, un système grammatical existant virtuellement dans chaque cerveau, ou plus exactement dans les cerveaux d’un ensemble d’individus; car la langue n’est complète dans aucun, elle n’existe parfaitement que dans la masse. (de Saussure 1974: 30)

Elle est la partie sociale du langage, extérieure à l’individu, qui à lui seul ne peut ni la créer ni la modifier; elle n’existe qu’en vertu d’une sorte de contrat passé entre les membres de la communauté. (de Saussure 1974 :31)

La langue est un système de signes ... On peut donc concevoir une science qui étudie la vie des signes au sein de la vie sociale; elle formait une partie de la psychologie sociale, et en conséquent de la psychologie générale ; nous le nommerons sémiologie. (de Saussure: 33) - (my emphasis)

De Saussure insisted that *langue* was a system and that as a system it should be studied in its own right (See *Éléments internes et externes de la langue*, p. 40-43), which in effect, many, many linguists have done since. How he addresses *langue* in the above citations remains troubling, however, in that he nowhere treats language as being independent of society. He does stress that it constitutes a system and hence should be studied as such, but he also says that the system is there only by grace of its users. He argued for independent studies of the subcategories of a single entity (*langage*) but not that these subcategories are separate entities in themselves. Hence it can be asserted that any attempt at tracing systemic regularity and rule in any of these subcategories must still bear in mind “une sorte de contrat passé entre les membres de la communauté”. Moreover, he defines *sémiologie* as the science that studies the life of signs at the heart of social life (my translation). Here again it is the life of signs that constitutes the object of study and not the signs as such. In commenting on *langue* as ‘the product of social work’ (sic) (le produit social?), Thibault says the following:

In other words the language system is constantly produced and re-produced in and through the language-using practices of the community. These practices are the social work whereby the language system is maintained and changed. An important consequence derives from this: the language system can only exist by virtue of the speech practices which the system itself makes possible. That is, *langue*, as Saussure points out, is itself a product of the socio-linguistic work of the users of the language. This also means that *langue* has no independent existence in relation to *parole*. Thus, language users do not only fashion their speech practices in and through the resources which *langue* makes available to them; they also make and re-make the very resources and conditions through which *parole* itself is possible. This further implies that *langue* is not and cannot be, independent, or autonomous, with respect to the speech practices of *parole*. (Thibault 1997: 28)

As Harris (2001) points out, the readings of de Saussure are legion and have informed discussions within and outside linguistics throughout the 20th century. He provides numerous examples of this. Citing a work by Mounin (Mounin 1968), in which de Saussure was termed ‘*structuraliste sans le savoir*’, he states the following:

Now if calling Saussure a ‘structuralist’ were merely a question of giving Saussure a retrospective label he would not have recognised, it might not matter a great deal. But it entails much more than that. It involves putting a particular slant on his teaching and making certain assumptions about the relative importance and purpose of various points, including quite specific passages in the surviving textual sources. (Harris 2001: 4)

Next to being an attempt at providing a full description of what language constitutes, de Saussure’s ‘Cours’ can also be seen as a manifesto for a science of linguistics in the way it attempts to define and outline its object of study while placing it alongside other related sciences: see i.a. *Chapitre II Matière et Tâche de la Linguistique; Ses Rapports avec les Sciences Connexes* (de Saussure 1974: 20-22). However, one can reasonably ask to which extent the various subcategories and definitions outlined in the ‘Cours’ can be considered as

having a ‘working’, *de jure* or even a *de facto* status. Here too Harris expresses caution concerning how we should regard de Saussure’s work. He identifies three de Saussures:

1. The putative author of the ‘Cours ...’ ... who did not write it;
2. The name of the lecturer who actually gave the course of lectures...;
3. The putative theorist ‘behind’ the Geneva lectures. (Harris 2001: 3)

Regarding the third de Saussure he adds:

[T]he theorist for whom the lectures were a way of trying out various ideas about language that he had been pondering for a long time, hoping to be able to put these ideas into a coherent form that would be accessible and useful for his students. ... But whether this theorist reached a mature, definitive formulation of his linguistic views before his death is open to question.

(Harris 2001: 3)

Short of re-reading the whole of de Saussure’s work, can we proceed with a reflection on what he meant by *langue*? In the quotations provided above (see especially the first), de Saussure does establish a clear link between a language and the society it stems from. But perhaps it is easier to return to de Saussure now and point to the social nature of his definition of *langue*, since the historical drive among linguists to establish and elaborate upon abstract linguistic systems has somewhat waned. It would be hard to understand Vološinov’s critique of de Saussure and his many followers if this drive had been absent. However, Vološinov had already resolved the dichotomy of *langue/langage:parole* or at least refused to see language as consisting of mutually exclusive categories. Vološinov points out that the ‘social’ is usually thought of in binary opposition with the ‘individual’, and hence we have the notion that the psyche is individual while ideology is social:

Notions of that sort are fundamentally false. The correlate of the social is the “natural” and this “individual” is not meant in the sense of a person, but “individual” as natural, biological specimen. The individual as possessor of the contents of his own consciousness, as author of his own thoughts, as the personality responsible for his own thoughts and feelings – such an individual is a purely socioideological phenomenon. Therefore, the content of the “individual” psyche is by its very nature just as social as it is ideological, and the very degree of consciousness of one’s individuality and its inner rights and privileges is ideological, historical, and wholly conditioned by sociological factors. Every sign as sign is social, and this is no less true for the inner sign than for the outer sign. (Vološinov 1973: 34)

As always we focus on what we want to see and this is often dictated by the paradigms of the day, to the abandonment of a fuller picture, a picture Vološinov continued to strive for. Taken even at face value, the quotes on *langue* gleaned from the ‘Cours’ and included above can be considered as significant for the present study in that they problematize binary notions of equivalence in the theories of translation discussed till now. If the social is situated in *langue* or *langue* in the social, this would mean that all primary constituents of binary categories like ‘denotative’, ‘text-normative’, ‘formal’, ‘Korrespondenz’, etc. (Baker 1998: 77-78) are equally

social in nature. So formal analyses of this type could (must?) also lay bare what Bourdieu called [the] “social heterogeneity ... inherent in language” or, in the case of translation, that all sub-categorisations within a translation model can all be brought back to language(s) as socio-cultural facts. Where does this leave all the actualized translations (all the secondary components of binary translation categories) and their sources texts which Kenny sees as being the object of study? Can they be considered as instances of *parole* or *langage* and be left at that? If we regard *langue* and *parole* as separate entities, this would do nothing more than relocate the problem, which is not the purpose of this discussion, nor is it in keeping with what de Saussure or Vološinov say about language.

This places us belatedly on the horns of dilemma beyond which translation scholars have moved either by dint of exhaustively exploring equivalence – as the scholars like Catford and others have done – or by rejecting it as scholars like Gentzler have done (see below). Nowadays the term is maintained “for the sake of convenience – because most translators are used to it rather than because it has any theoretical status” (Baker 1992<sup>20</sup>: 5-6). Dorothy Kenny further points out that:

[t]he problem of pinning down the essential nature of equivalence seems to be related to the problem of pinning down the nature of linguistic meaning. Pym (1992a<sup>21</sup>) avoids this difficulty by moving away from the strictly linguistic to view translation as a transaction, and equivalence as **equality of exchange value**. Equivalence becomes a negotiable entity, with translators doing the negotiation. (Kenny in Baker 1998: 78; bold face in the original)

Both Baker and Pym place the notion of equivalence squarely back in the realm of the social. They regard it as something translators do or make recourse to both when working on a translation as such or when negotiating particular meaning with other actors in the field (fellow translators, proof readers, publishers, etc.). So perhaps the search for essential equivalence proves to be a vain one in that it would require agreement on every particular item from all those who play a part in the translation process, no matter how removed or minute their participation might be. We could also conclude that the notion of equivalence based on comparisons of language systems has also lost credence in the move towards functional and pragmatic studies within Translation Studies and that this is probably concomitant with or perhaps contiguous to the establishment of Translation Studies as an independent yet multi-disciplinary academic field.

Moreover, the notion of ‘convenience’ attached to the term by Baker in the above quote may constitute a proverbial train (of thought) hiding another. If equivalence has acquired a negligible status in translation theory, it is still of practical everyday use among translators. Have translators, therefore, been “suckled in a creed outworn”, to quote Wordsworth. Is this a matter of academic thinking on the nature of translation (and equivalence) being too far ahead of those notions held by its practitioners? Or is there something more important hidden from view here? Can we not consider this very situation as resolving the Saussurian dichotomy once and for all and corroborating Vološinov’s view? It would seem commonsensical for a translator to posit equivalence as a means to an end, i.e. translating a given text, for the very reason that

a second text in another language will (hopefully) ensue in some form or other from the exercise. So in studying translations, we are faced from the very outset with at least two texts that required some form of interaction, which was carried out minimally by a translator, whatever way we choose to subcategorise the various aspects of that interaction (binary or otherwise). Even the target-oriented focus of Translation Studies (post-Toury) cannot avoid recognising this. For the equivalence a translator might seek is not between language systems first and particular instances of language use as a result but something that involves at least both at the same time and include other factors besides (viz. the work of Reiss, Vermeer, Hatim & Mason, among others). So to quote Pym (1998<sup>22</sup>: 107) again, we arrive at a notion of equivalence “as something translators produce, not as a set of eternal rules they should eternally follow”.

And perhaps it might be even true to say that the two-step disassociations (formal / dynamic, etc.) discussed above are abstractions predicated onto the situation that prevent us from seeing the full canvas. To echo Vermeer et al, what we are witnessing is translators involved in social action, languages being a vital part and medium/channel of that action. An examination of this canvas will lay bare data of use to those interested in comparative linguistics and in languages as systems, but translation models that posit initial dichotomies (issuing historically from *langue* and *langage/parole*) have prevented us, either intentionally or unintentionally, from gaining an overall view of that canvas in the first place, while at the same time, rendering equivalence a virtually redundant theoretical category. Nevertheless, the notion of equivalence continues to return in various guises, another being that it forms part of the responsibility of the translator and issues from ‘skopos’ (Vermeer 1998<sup>23</sup>: 41-68), which still remains pretty much in step with Pym’s notion quoted above. Vermeer issues the following proviso however:

It is often maintained that a translation, however different from a source-text surface structure, should have the “same” or nearly the same “effect” on the target-culture recipients. The process, culture and skopos concepts “dethrone” not only such ideas as fidelity and equivalence, but consequently also that of effect. “Effect” is one of those scientifically incomparable and therefore interculturally unmeasurable concepts which have hitherto blurred the idea of translating. (Vermeer 1998: 52)

In the light of this, to return briefly to the emic-etic cline suggested by Hoey and Houghton in discussing contrastive analysis, it could be argued that the distinction is not between the two poles of ‘system’ versus ‘particular use/user’ or ‘systemic’ versus ‘intuitive knowledge’ of languages but rather between poles of varying, though interrelated, purpose – something that can only be grasped by attempting to sketch the perimeters of the canvas mentioned above. And clearly the study of translation needed to search for such a big picture.



## 1.6. James S. Holmes or the Big Picture

To discuss the broader canvas touched on above, I would first like to turn to the seminal work of James S. Holmes<sup>24</sup> (1988 [1972]: 67-80; 2000: 172-185). In his work, Holmes opts for the term Translation Studies (not before examining other terms, in a number of languages) and draws on a quote taken from Werner Koller (1971<sup>25</sup>: 311) to delineate the subject:

Übersetzungswissenschaft ist zu verstehen als Zusammenfassung und Überbegriff für alle Forschungsbemühungen, die von den Phänomenen 'Übersetzen' und 'Übersetzung' ausgehen oder auf diese Phänomene zielen.

He considers Translation Studies as an 'empirical discipline' and as a "field of pure research ... quite apart from any direct practical application outside its own terrain" and sees the discipline as having 'two main objectives':

to describe the phenomena of translating and translation(s) as they manifest themselves in the world of our experience [which he calls *descriptive translation studies*];

to establish general principles by means of which these phenomena can be explained and predicted [which he calls *theoretical translation studies*]. (Venuti 2000: 176)

Holmes further divides Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) into three major areas of research: product-oriented, function-oriented and process-oriented. In outlining the scope of product-oriented research, he mentions translation corpora and sees a general history of translation as one of the possible goals of this research-focus. He sees function-oriented DTS as involving the study of the 'recipient socio-cultural situation' of translations, the "study of contexts rather than texts." This would involve discovering, inter alia, "which texts were (and, often as important, were not) translated at a certain time and in a certain place." Here he calls for the "development of a field of translation sociology" or what he calls 'socio-translation studies'. He sees process-oriented DTS as a systematic attempt at uncovering "exactly what takes place in the 'little black box' of the translator's mind." Here, he hopes for the future development of "an area of study that might be called translation psychology or psycho-translation studies" (Venuti 2000: 176-177).

Two remarks can be made at this stage, which are considered relevant to the discussion. Firstly, despite Holmes' admirable attempt at comprehensiveness in encompassing the field of DTS, one wonders whether the 'translation sociology' called for in the function-oriented focus, given its clear textual bias, might not be in danger of becoming more like a history of texts, thereby reducing sociology and context to mere container metaphors. Secondly, in process-oriented DTS, translators are portrayed as thinking entities and not at all as social beings (see the Vološinov quote above). The focus on "analysing and describing ... complex mental processes" might elide translators as individual agents in leaving us, perhaps more safely, with the intricacies of the 'little black box' and their visible traces in texts. This seems somewhat out of step with Jiří Levý's<sup>26</sup> view on translation as 'a process of communication' and translating as a "decision process: a series of a certain number of consecutive situations ...

imposing on the translator the necessity of choosing among a certain ... number of alternatives” (Venuti 2000: 149). I mention Levý here because of Holmes’ close connection with Czech and Slovak researchers during his career (Hermans 1999<sup>27</sup>: 17-30).

Holmes sees theoretical Translation Studies or translation theory as being interested in “using the results of descriptive translation studies, in combination with the information available from related fields and disciplines, to evolve principles, theories, and models which will serve to explain and predict what translating and translations are and will be” (Holmes in Venuti 2000: 177-178). He then goes on to group and outline partial translation theories which fall within the remit of a general theory of translation and also discusses applied Translation Studies, which I will not go into at this stage. Suffice it say that he sees translation theory as playing an important role in applied translation and in improving the general lot of translators. Holmes concludes his survey with two points, the first of which I would like to quote here:

[D]escriptive, theoretical, and applied translation studies have been presented as three fairly distinct branches of the entire discipline, and the order of presentation might be taken to suggest that their import for one another is unidirectional, translation description supplying the basic data upon which translation theory is to be built, and the two of them providing the scholarly findings which are to be put to use in applied translation studies. In reality, of course, the relation is a dialectical one ... Translation theory cannot do without the solid specific data yielded by research into descriptive and applied translation studies, while on the other hand one cannot even begin to work in one of the other two fields without having at least an intuitive theoretical hypothesis as one’s starting point. (Venuti 2000: 183)

This quote is considered important for two reasons: firstly because Holmes cites ‘solid specific data’ as a prerequisite for sound theory building and secondly, because he recognises that no researcher can (or probably ever does) come to a field of study without ‘at least an intuitive theoretical hypothesis’. Seen in terms of the emic-etic debate, we can find in Holmes’ thinking a clear indication of the cline set out by Hoey and Houghton above. What remains to be examined then is what constitutes ‘solid specific data’ and how this might inform or be informed by an ‘intuitive theoretical hypothesis’. In doing so, I will now turn to the work of Hatim and Mason and also discuss developments in ‘German’ (please forgive the generalisation) approaches to Translation Studies.

Hatim and Mason (1990<sup>28</sup>: 3 – bold face in the original) echo Levý in setting out their central concern at the beginning of the book: “**translating as a communicative process which takes place within a social context**”. In discussing translation product and process, they state the following:

The view that underlies this book then, is of translation as a process, involving the negotiation of meaning between producers and receivers of texts. In other words, the resulting translated text is to be seen as evidence of the transaction, a means of retracing the pathways of the translator’s decision-making procedures. In the same way, the ST (source text) itself is an end-product and gain should be treated as evidence of the writer’s intended meaning rather than as the embodiment of the meaning itself. (Hatim & Mason 1990: 3-4)

Though it might be tempting to file this approach under process-oriented focus in Holmes' taxonomy of DTS and leave it at that, this choice would ignore a fundamental stance taken by Hatim and Mason with respect to translation as a product. Hatim and Mason anchor such products within the social contexts in which they were commissioned, negotiated and carried out, as they constitute "evidence of a transaction", as do all texts: "... all texts are seen as evidence of a **communicative transaction taking place within a social framework**". (1990: 2 – bold face in the original) So a great degree of delicacy would be needed to extricate such products from their contexts, if this were the intention, which I doubt:

[T]exts can be seen as the result of **motivated choice**: producers of texts have their own communicative aims and select lexical items and grammatical arrangement to serve those aims.

Naturally, in translating, there are potentially two sets of motivations: those of the producer of the source text and those of the translator. (Hatim and Mason, 1990: 4 – bold face in the original)

Given that Hatim and Mason place translating and translations squarely within their social framework(s), any product-oriented focus (Holmes) would necessarily also be a process-oriented one, and a function-oriented one as well:

The translator's motivations are inextricably bound up with the **socio-cultural context** in which the act of translating takes place. Consequently, it is important to judge translating activity only within a social context. Before there is a translation, for example, there has to be a need for translation. The need may be client-driven, as when someone commissions, asks for or otherwise requires a translation; it is often market-driven, when publishers perceive demand for a work of foreign literature; it may even be translator-driven, as when a work of ancient literature is translated or re-translated because someone feels that, by doing so, he or she can communicate something new. (Hatim and Mason 1990: 12-13, bold face in the original)

So in terms of theory, the three foci of description set out by Holmes would become three aspects of one and the same description in Hatim and Mason's model. So the 'solid specific data' Holmes referred to would then have to draw on all three aspects in order to be solid and specific enough, the initial hypothesis being that translating and translations are carried out by translators as social agents. It is then up to the researcher to lay bare the social context in which translators operate in order to gain insight into the texts and textual choices they make. Hatim and Mason, therefore, place translators solidly in the middle of the field of study and do not see them merely as the arbitrary perpetrators of translations who can be ignored in the final textual analysis. And they were not alone in doing so. Consider the following quote taken from Itamar Even-Zohar, for example:

In other words, not only is the socio-literal status of translation dependent upon its position within the polysystem, but the very practice of translation is also strongly subordinated to that position. And even the question of what is a translated work cannot be answered *a priori* in terms of an a-historical out-of-context idealized state; it must be determined on the grounds of the operations governing the polysystem. Seen from this point of view, translation is no longer

a phenomenon whose nature and borders are given once and for all, but an activity dependent on the relations within a certain cultural system. (Even-Zohar in Venuti 2000: 195)

Though this quote begs a definition of polysystem, it clearly states that “translation ... is an activity dependent on the relations within a certain cultural system.” As such, it mirrors shifts that occurred within functional approaches to translation leading up to the work of Hatim and Mason and others like Vermeer and Nord, to name but two.

## 1.7. From Text Function to Social Function: the new frontier

In discussing the difference between the notion of equivalence in contrastive linguistics and translation (science) Werner Koller (1976<sup>29</sup>: 76) states the following:

Uebersetzungsäquivalenz bezieht sich auf parole-Sprachvorkommen: Uebersetzt werden immer Äusserungen und Texte, der Uebersetzer stellt Äquivalenz her zwischen AS-Äusserungen/Texten und ZS-Äusserungen/Texten (AS = Ausgangssprache, ZS= Zielsprache), nicht zwischen Strukturen und Sätzen zweier Sprachen. Kontrastive Linguistik zielt aber gerade auf Systemvergeleich im Bereich von übereinstimmenden und divergierenden Strukturen; sie operiert auf der Ebene der *langue*.

Having said that, Koller treats in detail what he considers to be the various levels (5) of equivalence identified in the ‘übersetzungstheoretischen Literatur’ and as obtaining for any given translation:

Es gibt, m.E. fünf Bezugsrahmen, die bei der Festlegung de Art der Übersetzungsäquivalenz eine Rolle spielen:

- ... denotative Äquivalenz (cited elsewhere in the literature as “inhaltlicher Invarianz”);
- ... konnotative Äquivalenz (called “stilistischer Äquivalenz” elsewhere in the literature);
- ... textnormative Äquivalenz (also falling under “stilistischer Äquivalenz” elsewhere in the literature);
- ... pragmatische Äquivalenz (“kommunikative Äquivalenz“, elsewhere);
- ... formale Äquivalenz (“expressive Äquivalenz,” etc. elsewhere). (Koller 1976: 81)

Koller lists translation on the side of *parole* and devotes much time to outlining the five aspects of equivalence listed above. Nevertheless, listing translation as *parole* seems at variance with treating equivalence in terms of language function. As the five forms of equivalence draw upon Bühler’s functions of language as expanded upon by Jakobson (see Sampson 1985<sup>30</sup>), one could consider Koller as one of the scholars, along with Reiss, who laid the foundations for such a functional approach to translation that has developed within the German tradition. In approaches that see translations as forms of interlingual communication (drawing on Bühler’s intitial categorisations of language function and including the work of translation scholars such as Lévy, Popovic, Koller, Reiss, House, Vermeer, Nord, Hatim and Mason, *inter alia*),

equivalence is regarded on the whole in terms of function. This seems to mark the completion of the shift from a focus on translation as involving interactions between language systems to one that regards translation as involving the study of socially and culturally situated texts across languages.

Juliane House's work (1977<sup>31</sup>) builds on the insights provided by Koller and Reiss in setting up a model for translation quality assessment that gives preference to such a functional approach. In doing so she also draws both on the work of Austin and Searle in exploring the pragmatic nature of translation and the work of Halliday, more particularly his notions of ideational and interpersonal function, in analysing the texts in her corpus. Her work is important in a number of ways.

Firstly, it makes a distinction between 'pre-linguistic' studies of translation, which deal with translation quality assessment "in an anecdotal and largely subjective manner" and "a series of theoretical and experimental studies in which an attempt to objectify translation quality assessment has been made ...[also including] the observable response a translation is supposed to elicit in its receptor(s)" (House 1977: 5). This statement not only links translation to perceptions of the readers of translated texts, it also posits linguistic approaches to translation as valid in that they deal with objectively verifiable data, a point that has generated much debate over the last decade (Gentzler 1993; Venuti 1998<sup>32</sup>). In this respect, one cannot help but notice the constructivist nature of the statement: "an attempt to objectify translation quality assessment" (my emphasis) although this was probably not the intention at the time (see the discussion of subjectivity below). To be fair, House has the following to say about objectivity:

To be concerned with "objectivity" as a goal in itself, i.e. to aim at a strictly objective and exclusively empirical procedure at the cost of gaining useful insights into a phenomenon seems a futile exercise. (House 1977: 63)

Her largely empirical stance traces its genealogy back to Firth, a position also adopted by Dorothy Kenny (2001<sup>33</sup>) in her corpus-based study of lexis and creativity in translation.

Secondly, in conducting her case-study, House drew up a corpus of source and translated texts, which she classified according to text type. These types have been identified in terms of the functions they fulfil (viz. reader expectations and responses) in a particular society:

If the function of a text is to be characterized through referring the text to the situation in which it is embedded, we will have to look for ways of breaking down the notion of situation into more specific situational dimensions. The most elaborate and refined system of situational dimensions to date is the one suggested by Crystal and Davy<sup>34</sup>. (House 1977: 38)

However, she does point out that the various functions she identifies cannot be unambiguously equated with these text types and rejects any clear-cut identifications of this sort. In fact she stresses that attempts to identify different types of 'translation equivalence relationships' by setting up a text typology would prove unfruitful and instead proposes 'a typology of translation':

In other words, our basic question ... is not, what different kinds of source text we are here handling? but, what different kinds of translation types have our analyses revealed? There is, however, clearly some relation between source text type and appropriate translation type. (House 1977: 188)

This further confirms her empirical stance and prevents (possible) prescriptivist dictums from creeping inadvertently into the discussion. What I mean to say here is that, though texts may function in different albeit similar ways in different societies, House does wish to assert that there is no one-to-one functional correspondence between text types across languages from which we could automatically predict the make-up of a subsequent target text:

We claim that an approach to listing translation equivalences which fails to take into account pragmatic-situational relationships revealed by the suggested situational dimensions is not adequate. (House 1977: 187)

Nonetheless, despite the various angles of approach that come together so usefully in her “eclectic model of multi-dimensional analysis of the source text and of comparison of source and translation texts” (House 1977: 38), House puts forward a basic dichotomy of translation types, overt and covert translation. One can then wonder what the relationship is between these two translation types and the two broader functions she classifies her text types under: the ideational and the interpersonal (Halliday). House defines overt and covert translation in the following way:

An overt translation is one in which the TT addressees are quite “overtly” not being directly addressed; thus an overt translation is one which must overtly be a translation, not, a “second original”. In an overt translation, the ST is tied in a specific way to the source language community and culture ... (1977: 189)

A covert translation is a translation which enjoys or enjoyed the status of an original ST in the target culture. The translation is covert because it is not marked pragmatically as a TT of an ST but may, conceivably, have been created in its own right. A covert translation is thus a translation whose ST is not particularly addressed to a target culture audience, i.e. not particularly tied to the source language community and culture. (1977: 194)

One cannot help feeling that this dichotomy sends us all the way back to Cicero and St. Jerome and can also wonder why such a dichotomy was needed, particularly given the refined nature of the analytical tools House used in developing and applying her translation quality assessment model and the caution exercised throughout the work with respect to drawing overhasty conclusions regarding similarities between ST and TT texts and contexts. To be brief, one could say that an overt translation is visibly a translation and a covert one is not or, as they say in the business and not necessarily in derogatory terms, an overt one would ‘smell of translation’ and a covert one would not. Can we then consider this dichotomy as a continuation within a functionalist approach of dual categories set up by Nida, Catford, and others? Again one can ask: why should there be two basic translation types? Perhaps the tendency to reduce things to pairs is so strong in Western theory-building or in thinking

generally speaking that we just can't help avoiding it. Next to pointing backwards to St. Jerome, the overt/covert dichotomy also anticipates both similar models and criticism from proponents of the 'cultural turn' within Translation Studies and such notions as foreignising / domesticating strategies; prospective/retrospective translation, which initially owe their currency to Schleiermacher<sup>35</sup>. For example, one is struck by the marked resemblance between House's notions of overt and covert translation and Jacquemond's dichotomy of endogenous versus exogenous text (Jacquemond 1992<sup>36</sup>: 139-158). As both House's translation types are functional and grounded in different ways in their respective contexts, minimally, they demonstrate varying degrees of loyalty to the source text or differing orientations with respect to the target audience, which again can be considered as possible poles of strategy but not as fundamentally different types of translation. Only a further investigation of translations and their source texts would allow us to say whether any given translation is overt or covert and whether this is absolutely the case in each instance. Moreover, as many contemporary translation scholars would be quick to point out, the difference is not one of translation type but rather of the ideology informing each type. The next step then, in the case of an overt translation, would be deliberately to deploy a particular strategy for these particular purposes, not unlike Catford's notion of rank-bound translation being "*deliberately limited* to ranks below the sentence, thus leading to 'bad translation' i.e. translation in which the TL text is either not a normal TL form at all, or is not relatable to the same situational substance as the SL text", but without its negative connotations. Whether one were consistently overt in all one's choices would still remain to be seen, however. To summarise, House states the following on equivalence:

The suggested basic requirement for equivalence of a given textual pair (ST and TT) is that the TT should have a function – consisting of two functional components, the ideational and the interpersonal – which is equivalent to ST's function, and that TT should employ equivalent pragmatic means for achieving that function. (House 1997: 244)

Our understanding of this quote turns on how we read the modal 'should' in the second line: do we understand it as an expression of advisability or one of prospective expectation? It is clear from the second 'should' in the quote however, that the latter is not the case. I do wish it were for it would have been in keeping with the empirical tenor of House's work, with a 'let's-wait-and-see' attitude that is conducive to interesting discovery and which on the whole is present in the book. Then again, perhaps it is impossible not to make normative statements about equivalence. Even stating that we should first see how a translation actually functions in a particular target culture – notwithstanding a translator's initial perceptions of these functions – before making any pronouncements on the matter, could be understood as a normative stance. Nonetheless, it is the stance I would prefer to adopt, as it fits in with the general empirical line of thinking being pursued in this discussion.

## 1.8. The Goal of Translation: action replay

Perhaps the best known theory to stem from functional and pragmatic approaches to translation is skopos theory. It deserves consideration here as it takes the notion of function further than previous approaches while making translation subordinate to the social framework within which it takes place. To quote from Vermeer's "short sketch on [his] *skopos* theory" (cf. Vermeer 1978<sup>37</sup>, 1983; Reiss and Vermeer 1984<sup>38</sup>; Vermeer 1986<sup>39</sup>; and also Gardt 1989<sup>40</sup>):

The skopos theory is part of a theory of translational action (translatorisches Handeln – cf. Holtz-Mänttari 1984<sup>41</sup>; Vermeer 1986: 269–304 and also 197–246; for the historical background see e.g. Wilss 1988<sup>42</sup>: 28). Translation is seen as the particular variety of translational action which is based on a source text (cf. Holtz-Mänttari especially p. 42f; and Nord 1988<sup>43</sup>: 28). (Other varieties would involve e.g. a consultant's information on a regional economic or political situation, etc.)

Any form of translational action, including therefore translation itself, may be conceived as an action, as the name implies. Any action has an aim, a purpose ... The word skopos, then, is a technical term for the aim or purpose of a translation. (Vermeer in Venuti 2000: 221)

As the quote indicates, the actual translated text (*translatum*) is but one aspect of a nexus of considerations relating to translational action, including skopos itself, commission, status of source text, translator, etc. In functional terms we can therefore see translation as taking place within that nexus, which takes the reasoning a step further than seeing translation as being concerned with source texts and how they function textually and socially along with their functionally relevant target texts. On the face of it, it would seem that, within skopos theory, actual translations have been relegated to a lower rung on the ladder of importance only to be reinstalled to their central position. Consequently, it would seem logical to assume that we can only understand a *translatum* by placing it alongside and examining it together with the other aspects of translational action, which raises questions about how these aspects relate to each other in resulting in a given *translatum*. Vermeer has the following to say about the role of the translator, among other things, in translational action:

The translator is "the" expert in translational action. He is responsible for the performance of the commissioned work. Insofar as the duly specified skopos is defined from the translator's point of view, the source text is a constituent of the commission, and as such the basis for all the hierarchically ordered relevant factors which ultimately determine the *translatum* ...

As regards the translator himself: experts are called upon in a given situation because they are needed and because they are regarded as experts. It is usually assumed, reasonably enough, that such people "know what it is all about"; they are thus consulted and their views are listened to. Being experts, they are trusted to know more about their particular field than outsiders. In some circumstances one may debate with them over the best way of proceeding, until a



consensus is reached, and occasionally one may also consult other experts or consider further alternative ways of reaching a given goal. (Vermeer in Venuti 2000: 222)

On the whole, it could be said that skopos theory and translational action provides us with a social model within which particular types of language use, including translation, occur. This has a number of consequences for the language use under discussion. A closer examination of the above quote will hopefully lay bare some of those consequences. Firstly and perhaps most importantly, with respect to the meaning or sense of a given *translatum*: meaning can not only be seen as the result of an interplay of the signifiers in a given sense unit or units within the text (part of the translator's work, strictly speaking). It is also determined through negotiation among the players (translation experts, those who commission the work, etc.) in the field in question (a basic tenet in discourse analysis, inter alia; Hatim and Mason 1990). In this respect, Vermeer posits consensus with regard to the goal to be achieved (Gutt 1991<sup>44</sup>). Whether consensus is reached in reality, particularly with respect to the *translatum*, would require closer analysis, however. Vermeer further states that the 'relevant factors' in the field are 'hierarchically ordered', which implies that there are various levels of importance in his inclusive model. One can ask, therefore, whether this hierarchy belongs purely within the model in reflecting levels of analysis or methodological steps, or whether it reflects a certain social hierarchy in the real world of translation. The following quote illustrates how some of the 'relevant factors' are ordered:

The source text does not determine the variety of the target text, nor does the text variety determine *ipso facto* the form of the target text (the text variety does not determine skopos either); rather, it is the skopos of the translation that also determines the appropriate text variety. A "text variety" in the sense of a classificatory sign of a *translatum*, is thus the consequence of the skopos, and thereby secondary to it. In a given culture it is the skopos that determines which text variety a *translatum* should conform to. (Vermeer in Baker 2000: 232)

It is clear from the above quote that in Vermeer's approach the notion of function is taken much further than in House's, for example, and as such it does reflect a certain social hierarchy in the real world of translation. And this has consequences for language use, which are of a more constraining or contestational order: this gives us a real point of entry into uncovering translational norms (Hermans 1999: 72-85). A third consequence is related to the translator as 'expert', which ushers in notions of language use as markers of professional identity or minimally the professionalisation of a type of language use. The basic question, therefore, is whether Vermeer's model is functional in that it points to all the relevant factors of any translation situation and uses them to gain insight into the results of the interaction, i.e. translations, or functional to the extent that it posits an obvious useful social framework – without overtly questioning the givens of that framework. Vermeer defends criticism of his model with considerable verve and makes a solid case for upholding the basic components of the theory, such as skopos itself and commission, for example. However, I do feel that much could be gained by further examining the (social) framework of skopos theory and taking it

one further step into the realm of the functional. This would involve taking a closer look at the ‘relevant factors’ put forward by Vermeer and examining how they relate to each other in a given social or cultural context. Before doing so and reaching the goal of this discussion – a plea for an ethnography of translation – I would like to examine the work of two other translation scholars that deal in various ways with translation in context and as such are emblematic of particular developments in the field: Dorothy Kenny and her work on translation corpora and Anthony Pym and his concept of (translation) regimes.

### 1.9. International Relations: evidence and contention

Pym’s notion of regimes (Pym 1998) belongs within his exploration of a methodology for writing translation history and will be touched on here as it has a bearing on the discussion at hand, mainly because of a degree of similarity between it and skopos theory and because of a critical stance found in Pym’s work that is also part and parcel of the apparatus of linguistic ethnography (Duranti 1997<sup>45</sup>: 9). Ostensibly, Pym is in search of a way of adapting norms and systems “to the specific concerns of translation history”:

What I am looking for is a way to make them appropriate to a conflict perspective that is primarily intercultural, in touch with desires and perceptions, and of current importance. This might be done, I believe, by considering the relative importance of regime theory. (Pym 1998: 125)

Pym then goes on to give a collective definition of regimes, which expands on the notion set out in Ruggie (1975<sup>46</sup>: 570):

Sets of implicit and explicit principles, norms, rules and decision-making procedures around which actors’ expectations converge in a given area of international relations. Principles are beliefs of fact, causation and rectitude. Norms are standards of behaviour defined in terms of rights and obligations. Rules are the specific prescriptions or proscriptions for action. Decision-making procedures are prevailing practices for making and implementing collective choice (quoted in Krasner 1983<sup>47</sup>:2).

One can easily imagine regimes as applying to translation at any given time across a given set of cultures and Pym puts the notion to good use in discussing translation in 12th-century Toledo, *inter alia* (Pym 1975: 128-142). There is also a clear resemblance between regime theory and skopos theory in that both try to set out the perimeters of a particular type of action and the principles and norms that inform that action. One major difference lies in the term ‘conflict’ cited above. It could be said that regime theory is more dynamic in the sense that it recognises conflict, whereas skopos sketches the actors and the field within which they operate, and arranges the relevant factors in order of ontological or perhaps chronological importance. It is not unreasonable to assert that conflicts have often occurred in the world of translation from the very outset, or more generally and perhaps more relevantly, that contestation is part and parcel of how things get done in translation circles. This would imply taking a closer look

at the ‘relevant factors’ of skopos theory and rendering the approach more dynamic by examining how these factors play out ‘on the ground’, to borrow a military metaphor. But it is not the intention of this dissertation to refine skopos theory or to apply regime theory to the data gathered in the course of my research. The purpose here is to point to the growing importance within Translation Studies of social models that contextualise translation to a greater extent than functional text-based models have done in the past. Once a social model has been posited, the question then would be whether its components stand up to scrutiny as rendering a plausible account of the complex phenomena under examination. To put it simply, this means going out and finding out for ourselves – a basic given in linguistic ethnography. But before we go out, we need ‘the wherewithal’ that will help us find what we are looking for: this includes a method that will allow us to glean data in situ and an intellectual tradition that will help us understand the nature of the data we are dealing with and in part constructing (see chapter 2 & 3).

There are many ways of gathering data, one of which is the construction of corpora of ‘naturally occurring’ text (see chapter 4), which brings me to a brief discussion of the work of Dorothy Kenny. In her opening chapter ‘Is Linguistics singular or plural?’ (Kenny 2001), Kenny discusses various linguistic approaches and criticisms levelled at such approaches by other translation scholars, which she sees as:

[G]athering momentum with the continuing rise of cultural studies in translation, Rosemary Arrojo<sup>48</sup> (1998), Edwin Gentzler (1993) and Lawrence Venuti<sup>49</sup> (1996, 1997) in particular used the philosophical apparatus of postmodernism to critique linguistically-oriented translation studies, questioning linguists’ pretensions to objective neutrality, their promotion of scientific models, and their views of language itself. (Kenny 2001: 1)

Kenny regards this criticism as stemming from a failure to see the great diversity of approaches within language study as a whole and from a tendency to consider linguistics merely as the Chomskyan variety. She then points to the long tradition of approaches – which she labels ‘Firthian’ or “neo-Firthian – that adhere to the school of ‘British Contextualism’” (Lehr<sup>50</sup> 1996). She considers her own approach as belonging within this school and cites Firth as framing her approach to corpus linguistics, in that she draws on notions such as context of situation, meaning as involving “situational relations in context of situation” (Firth 1957<sup>51</sup>:19), the relevant features of participants, the relevant objects and the effect of the verbal action, (Firth 1957: 182). The corpus study in her book is, therefore, attentive to these notions and her data comprise ‘real texts’ that have been assembled ‘in a principled way’ (Kenny 2001 chapter 2). I felt it important to provide this very brief outline of Kenny’s work, firstly, because of her willingness to engage with criticism positively while at the same time pointing out the long tradition within linguistics that deals explicitly with language in its social and cultural context, hence somewhat defusing the conflict:

I am mindful of the fact that my work has its roots in (a certain kind of) linguistic theory, and of the (justified or unjustified) prejudices that this might arouse. I am also aware of the sobering lessons that (some) linguists have learned from postmodern philosophy and will

studiously avoid any suggestion that mine is a definitive, exhaustive or completely objective treatment of my research question. (Kenny 2001: 15)

This conflict has been addressed more pertinently by Mona Baker (2001<sup>52</sup>):

Let us start by acknowledging that translation studies is not developing in an intellectual vacuum. Like other disciplines in the humanities, including new emerging disciplines that have a status pretty much like our own (for example cultural studies, postcolonial studies, gender studies) translation studies is developing as part of a general intellectual movement which cuts across all areas of the humanities and even the sciences ... There is, in other words, a set of features which characterise a broad intellectual debate that is influencing just about every academic discipline we know today, particularly – but not exclusively – the humanities. (Baker 2001: 8)

She gives various examples of areas, all within linguistics, where this debate is being conducted, which, as she sees it, has meant “questioning practically all the basic assumptions of the discipline itself ... grappling with questions of methodology, [and] complicat[ing] its very object of inquiry” (Baker 2001: 9).

Baker identifies a number of features, next to others, that characterise the broad debate within the humanities and beyond and which reflect “some of our own concerns in translation studies”:

- ◆ Increased interest in the impact of phenomena on human life (including social life) rather than on their internal workings or structures;
- ◆ A marked tendency towards self-reflexivity;
- ◆ Increased recognition of the role of subjectivity in scientific research;
- ◆ Legitimation of scientific research as a form of political action in its own right;
- ◆ Growing concern with methodology, particularly with the need to balance subjectivity and objectivity in order to conduct credible academic research;
- ◆ Rejection of neat categorisations and idealised constructs and increased recognition of the complexity inherent in all phenomena;
- ◆ Growing stress on inter/multidisciplinarity. (Baker 2001: 18)

She also notes:

- ◆ A questioning of normative approaches and increased attention to human agency;
- ◆ Increased interest in questions of ideology and ethics;
- ◆ Increased interest in and respect for qualitative (as apposed to quantitative) methods of research. (Baker 2001: 18)

It is rather sobering to conclude at this stage that the thrust of my argument till now has done nothing more than reflect the concerns of the day. There are many other important scholars in

the field of Translation Studies whose work has not been quoted in any significant detail so far, but this does not mean I have deliberately ignored them. The work of those quoted until now can be considered illustrative of certain on-going developments in the field of Translation Studies, particularly as far as linguistic approaches are concerned. It was not my intention, however, to provide an exhaustive list of quotes from the work of previous scholars in illustrating these developments. The main purpose of the argument was to show a type of genealogy which I consider as leading up to a linguistic ethnography of translation or that would suggest linguistic ethnography as the next step in a development whose roots can be traced to back to scholars such as Malinowski, to name but one. I see this step as a logical follow-through of linguistic approaches to translation that have increasingly taken the context of translation into account over the last fifty years. I recognise that there is a certain amount of hubris involved in taking this step but, at the same, I do realise that a considerable number of researchers are turning to linguistic ethnography as a fruitful approach to examining translation phenomena as forms of social action. To illustrate my point: a simple Google search for ‘ethnography of translation’ threw up no less than 20,000 hits.

### **1.10. An Ethnographer in Search of Translators: modes of representation**

Scholars who have examined translation from a communicative or functional perspective, Reiss (1984<sup>53</sup>) and Nord (1991<sup>54</sup>) among others, stress the importance of context in determining how a particular text is to be translated. Mason (in Baker 1998: 30) cites Nord (1991: 36) as drawing on a formulation of communication as: “who says what in which channel to whom with what effect?” (Lasswell 1948), to which were added “the further refinements of *when?* *where?* *how?* and *why?* to encompass the full range of factors effecting language in use”. How these factors play out has been illustrated to some extent in the discussion of skopos theory above. Mason (in Baker 1998: 31) also points to another strand of influence in communicative/functional approaches to translation, namely the work of Del Hymes and more particularly his seminal article “On Communicative Competence” (Hymes 1971<sup>55</sup>). As Hymes’s work belongs within the field of linguistic anthropology and ethnography and hence is of considerable importance to the discussion unfolding on these pages, I would like to dwell on his article here and discuss it in relation to Mason’s comments and more particularly his adaptation of Bell’s (1991<sup>56</sup>) use of Canale’s (1983<sup>57</sup>) four-part classification of communicative competence with respect to translation:

Mason’s classification:

For the purposes of studying the translator’s communicative competence, we may adapt the four-part classification proposed by Canale (1983) to account for the “underlying systems of knowledge and skill required for communication” as follows:

*Grammatical competence*: in the translator's case, this entails passive command of another language system, in the sense of possessing the knowledge and skill required to understand and express accurately the literal meaning of utterances;

*Sociolinguistic competence*: the translator's ability to judge the appropriateness of utterances to a context, in terms of such factors as the status of participants, purposes of the interaction and norms and conventions of interaction;

*Discourse competence*: the translator's ability to perceive and produce cohesive and coherent text in different genres and discourses (Hatim and Mason 1990);

*Strategic competence*: the translator's ability to repair potential breakdowns in communication and to enhance the effectiveness of communication between source-text producer and target-text receiver.

Bell's classification:

*Grammatical competence*: knowledge of the rules of the code, including vocabulary and word-formation, pronunciation/spelling and sentence structure, i.e. the knowledge and skills required to understand and express the literal meaning of utterances.

*Sociolinguistic competence*: knowledge of and the ability to produce and understand utterances appropriately in context, i.e. as constrained by topic, the status of the participants, purposes of the interaction, etc.

*Discourse competence*: the ability to combine form and meaning to achieve unified spoken or written texts in different genres. This unity depends on cohesion in form (the way in which utterances are linked structurally to facilitate interpretation of text) and coherence in meaning (the relationships among the different meanings in a text; literal meanings, communicative functions or social meaning).

*Strategic competence*: the mastery of communication strategies which may be used to improve communication or to compensate for breakdowns (caused by limiting factors in actual communication or to insufficient competence in one or more of the other components of communicative competence). (Bell 1991: 41-44)

By now we find ourselves at three removes from Hymes's notion of communicative competence, which has been built upon and added to, to fit the field under investigation, namely translation. On examining Mason's and Bell's four-component model, we note one major difference: nowhere does Bell mention "passive command of another language system". And yet the passage quoted by Mason is attributed to Bell. Why should we assume passive command only? Would it not be more appropriate to inquire first before making such assumptions? Bell, on the other hand, only mentions one code. He also sees his four-component classification as being valid for all communicators and the fourth component as particularly applying to translators:

What, after all, are translators doing when they struggle with the text other than coping with 'limiting factors in actual communication' (typically, ambiguities in the source text) and compensating for 'the insufficient competence in one or more of the other components', i.e. grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse? (Bell 1991: 43)

But is this so? Why should strategic competence be the most important of the four? One can imagine how strategic competence might lead to a translator using 'explicitation' or 'manipulation' strategies for a particular text, as being an area in which the translator would become most visible in a translation. Underlying the above quote we can also surmise a norm of maximum communication but how do we know whether this is what the translator actually does? Furthermore, I fail to see how strategic competence is particular to translation as such. Following Jakobson, it could be argued that this holds for the recontextualisation of any message and not necessarily across languages. Hence, we are left with a shifting four-component classification that hails from Canale and that has been mapped onto the phenomenon of translation, along with the basic tenet that translation is a form of communication, which is difficult to deny. Canale's four-component classification, in turn, purports to build on Hymes's notion of communicative competence, to be a further explicitation of the ideas set out in Hymes's article. But this is not entirely the case. In his model Canale makes a distinction between grammatical and sociolinguistic competence, among others. One wonders whether this is what Hymes had in mind when writing his article. Hymes talks of sociolinguistic interference across varieties and codes, but on the whole calls for "*an integrated theory of sociolinguistic description*" (Hymes 1971: 228) that would also include the grammatical as an integral part, as "[t]here are rules of use without which the rules of grammar would be useless" (Hymes 1971: 278):

We have then to account for the fact that a normal child acquires knowledge of sentences not only as grammatical but also as appropriate. He or she acquires competence as to when to speak, when not, and as to what to talk about to whom, when, where, and in what manner. In short, a child becomes able to accomplish a repertoire of speech acts, to take part in speech events, and to evaluate their accomplishment by others. This competence, moreover, is integral with attitudes, values, and motivations concerning language, its features and uses, and integral with competence for, and attitudes toward, the interrelation of language with the other codes of communicative conduct. (Hymes 1971: 277-278)

The focus of Hymes's article was language acquisition among children, whereas Canale's article deals with research into second language pedagogy, an area germane to translation, it can be argued. So Canale's notion of grammatical competence involves "the mastery of the language code (verbal or non-verbal) itself... [A]s such grammatical competence will be an important concern for any second language programme" (Canale 1983: 7). So it can be deduced that the grammatical competence Canale is referring to concerns formal training in grammar using grammar books and other pedagogical means, whereas Hymes's notion of the grammatical does not necessarily imply formal training of the kind, at least not initially. As we

have seen with Mason and Bell above, it is hard to disassociate the use of such notions and terms from their research contexts, with the result that the researcher who comes across these terms can be left nonplussed by the various meanings these very same notions acquire in those research contexts. But Hymes does not consider language acquisition as being solely a monolingual affair, nor does he consider language as being undifferentiatedly related to a single cultural space:

In short, we have to break with the tradition of thought which simply equates one language, one culture and takes a set of functions for granted. In order to deal with the problem faced by disadvantaged children, and with education in much of the world, we have to begin with the conception of speech habits, or competencies of a community or population and regard the place among them of the resources of historically-derived languages as an empirical question. As functioning codes, one may find one language, three languages; dialects widely divergent or divergent by a hair; styles almost mutually incomprehensible, or barely detectable as different by the outsider; the objective linguistic differences are secondary and do not tell the story. What must be known is the attitude towards the differences, the functional role assigned to them, the use made of them. (Hymes 1971: 289)

What Hymes proposes is a model of language use that is neither monolingual nor monocultural or monolithic in excluding speakers or users living at a certain remove from a given cultural space (viz. emigrants for example, or translators for that matter). It also relies for its explicitation on an empirical investigation of the various aspects set out in his article, which involves discovering, among other things:

Whether (and to what degree) something is formally *possible*;

Whether (and to what degree) something is *feasible* in virtue of the means of implementation available;

Whether (and to what degree) something is *appropriate* (adequate, happy, successful) in relation to a context in which it is used and evaluated;

Whether (and to what degree) something is in fact done, actually *performed*, and what its doing entails. (Hymes 1971: 281)

One can imagine Canale's four-component classification as stemming in part from Hymes's four basic questions, but as we have seen above, his research focus places these terms in a different relation to each other than the one proposed by Hymes.

Not unlike Canale's, Hymes's notion of competence goes hand-in-hand with a view that is rooted in the socio-cultural behaviour of people:

I should take *competence* as the most general term for the capabilities of a person... Competence is dependent upon both (tacit) *knowledge* and (ability for) *use*. *Knowledge* is distinct, then, both from competence (as part of it) and from systemic possibility (to which the relation is an empirical matter). (Hymes 1971: 282)



So, in this respect grammatical competence is not equal to all the potential possibilities extant in given language varieties or codes but is mediated by an individual's particular knowledge of those possibilities.

It is easy to see the 'when?', 'where?', 'how?' and 'why?' of functional and communicative approaches to translation as being common to Hymes's view on language use and the difference between his view and those of Nord or Reiss or Vermeer as being more one of degree. As he says himself, Hymes's article on communicative competence is 'theoretical' or 'programmatically' to the extent that it wishes to formulate an adequate theory of language that can perhaps be summed up by the following quote:

Concepts that are unquestionably postulated as basic to linguistics (speaker-listener, speech community, speech act, acceptability, etc.) are, as we see, in fact sociocultural variables, and only when one has moved from their postulation to their analysis can one secure the foundations of linguistic theory itself. (Hymes 1971)

Much rises or falls on what is understood by 'analysis' in the above quote. In relation to translation, it can be demonstrated that many functional approaches do take these sociocultural variables into account. The question is to what extent. From the brief outline of skopos theory above, for example, it is clear that Vermeer et al. have attempted to set up a model of social (translational) action that includes a number of relevant parameters. And this is where the notion of analysis enters the picture, or to put it another way: are the parameters of skopos theory and translational action and earlier functionalist approaches to translation merely postulates or not? For anyone who has worked as a professional translator it is easy to see that the 'when?', 'where?', 'how?' and 'why?' variables are important to any translation situation and to see the importance of such notions as skopos and commission, to name but two. So, do we take these postulates as given and proceed to analyse them separately (or hierarchically) in order to reconstruct the picture, or should we wonder initially how they relate to each other and then hopefully reach an emergent view, no matter how tentative it might be? As many functionalist approaches to translation draw on Hymes's work, I felt it important to discuss his much quoted article, the purpose being to nudge functionalist approaches a step further, again by drawing on Hymes.

The idea then is to take what Vermeer calls the 'relevant factors' of skopos and see how these factors play out by conducting an ethnographic inquiry into translation, which I see as being in line with what Hymes would consider to be an analysis. This involves drawing on the apparatus of ethnography, which will be set out in the next chapter, in an attempt to map out the linguistic and the sociocultural nature of translation at one and the same time, and perhaps (though not purposely) attempting to heal the false dichotomy pointed out by Baker. To do so, I need a point of entry, a point from which I can examine the various phenomena of translation and gain insight into their complexity. It is not my intention, however, to add unnecessarily to the multiplicity of theoretical terms and sets of notions already extant in Translation Studies, though this will be unavoidable to a certain extent. Nor do I plan, in one fell swoop, to replace existing terms or challenge their validity, a ploy that would constitute

the epitome of hubris. I do hope in the course of the ensuing discussion to point to connections between these terms as my inquiry unfolds and hence not overburden the reader with a new set of schemes, flow charts and typologies. The point of entry I have chosen is translators and to narrow the field, those who have been involved in translating Irish literature (more specifically poetry) into Dutch. I am aware that notions such as Irish literature and Dutch are hard to pin down and are also somehow at variance with the thrust of my argument till now. Nonetheless, one has to start somewhere, and hopefully these notions will take on a more definite shape in the course of the ensuing discussion and analysis.

My purpose as an apprentice ethnographer is to represent the complex nature of translation as seen through the eyes of translators, much in the same way they re-present texts in other languages, thereby gaining insight into the workings of translation. I am aware that this representation will be coloured by the decisions I make in the choice and selection of data and what I consider to be salient in the data, but in this I have little choice but to embrace the subjective and be continually aware that it will be with me throughout:

And so, the question often posed to anthropologist-ethnographers about the dangers of 'losing one's objectivity' in the field is really quite beside the point. Our task requires of us only a highly disciplined subjectivity. (Scheper-Hughes 2000<sup>58</sup>: 132)

The purpose of this ethnographic study is not to discover the mental processes that inform translational choices and translatorial processes, to unlock the 'black box' of the translator's mind as it were, but rather to pursue the inquiry into translation as a form of social action that is constrained by breadlines and deadlines and perhaps other features as yet unconsidered, all of which impact on and are constructed through particular types of language use. In so doing, I must remain open to what I am told by those in the field, while at the same time keeping abreast of and using the scholarly apparatus placed at my disposal. This involves coming to grips with and searching for patterns of relevance in the many stories I would be told by those I planned to interview. Here again I would rely on what Hymes says on the matter:

The general problem of social knowledge is two-edged: both to increase the accumulated structural knowledge of social life, moving from narrative to structurally precise accounts, as we have commonly understood the process of science, and to bring to light the ineradicable role of narrative accounts. Instead of thinking of narrative accounts as an early stage, we may need to think of them as a permanent stage, whose principles are little understood, and whose role may increase. [...] If narrative accounts have an ineradicable role, this need not be considered a flaw. The problem is not to try to eliminate them, but to discover how to assess them. [...] The question of narrative brings us to another aspect of ethnography. It is continuous with ordinary life. (Hymes 1980<sup>59</sup>: 98)

Soliciting the opinions and perceptions of translators can only go part of the way towards discovering what translation constitutes in a particular society, as a complete study would require an exploration of how the other actors in the field regard translation, viz. publishers, critics, readers, etc. Theories of translation and views on its practice as put forward by

academics have been explored briefly in the above pages and will continue to be discussed in what follows, all with a particular goal in mind, i.e. to point to the relevance of ethnography in the study of translation. In this respect, as translators are the people who actually do the translations in the main, they seemed to form the most obvious starting point for an inquiry. In the interviews conducted with them, they discuss their professions and give accounts of how they go about their work. In a way analogous to the one outlined by Hymes above, we will return to their accounts and examine them from two perspectives: this will form the body of the next **two** chapters.

## **1.11. Emic and Etic: resolution or postponement**

In the above pages, I have attempted to trace shifts in approaches to the study of translation that range from seeing translation as being ancillary to or an essential aspect of the study of two or more language systems, to those approaches that regard translation as a form of social action constrained by the actors and other sociolinguistic factors pertaining to a particular field. On the whole, these shifts run parallel with shifts in the focus of inquiry within linguistics in general. However, it was not the purpose in tracing these shifts to assert that all former approaches are without value or to state that the time has come for ethnography to supplant these approaches or to assert that there is some form of teleology involved in which ethnography constitutes the end point. Such an assertion would be grossly beside the point<sup>60</sup>.

To return to the notions of emic and etic with which this debate was opened, I think that the emic has become an increasingly present aspect of inquiry in Translation Studies, in the way the discipline pays attention to the social context and actors involved. To put it another way, the cline proposed by Hoey and Houghton with regard to contrastive analysis has been transformed in subsequent approaches into something resembling a dialectic machine or oscillatory device (pardon the metaphor) in which emic insight has added consistently to etic structurations of the field of study. Next to that, the search for universal rules that typify the earlier goals of norm and system theory have become tempered by more recent calls for in situ examinations of translation, involving “[q]uestions of value and evaluation, of the translator’s agency, and of the problematic position from which statements about translation are made” (Hermans 1999: 158-161).

As a scholar, I am obliged to demonstrate competence in etic approaches to the field I purport to be studying. Till now this has involved my trying to gain an understanding of what an etic approach to translation might constitute, while remaining mindful of the dualist nature of the pair of concepts it belongs to. To quote Harris:

If behavioural events are described in terms of categories and relationships that arise from the observer’s strategic criteria of similarity, difference and significance, they are etic; if they are described in terms of criteria elicited from an informant, they are emic. (Harris 1976<sup>61</sup> : 340)

So as an observer, I must first be familiar with the body of knowledge assembled by translation scholars till now, as it will inform and shape the hypotheses I formulate with regard to the field of study.

In engaging with the emic side of the proposition, I have travelled to various places in the Netherlands and Belgium and have met and interviewed literary translators and asked them about their work – and have since worked with some of them *en passant* – and have also drawn on my own experience as a professional translator and my knowledge of the field in which translation takes place. In my travels in Belgium and the Netherlands I've spoken to thirteen translators and made minidisk recordings of our conversations. The interviews vary in length from thirty minutes to over an hour and a half. I have also drawn up an electronic corpus of the translations made by some of the people I've spoken to, along with the originals they translated from. In short, I have spoken to those who possess their own criteria with regard to translation. In real terms, therefore, I find myself straddling a fence between the two notions, emic and etic and wondering whether the fence is really there. On the one hand, it still remains to be seen whether the results of my findings can contribute in some small way to a body of cross-cultural knowledge – and whether this is desirable or not is open to discussion (Duranti 1997: 172-174). On the other hand, an exploration of the practices of translators may throw up observations that are relevant to the on-going discussion on the nature of translation without wishing to make claims to universality. As I see it, emic and etic are terms in a state of perpetual flux, interrelated terms that beg resolution, a resolution, however, that is condemned to perpetual postponement.

## 2. AN ETHNOGRAPHY OF TRANSLATION: SOME INITIAL STEPS

### 2.1. Translation: from text to activity

By drawing on the views on language use set out in Bakhtin (1990<sup>62</sup>), Medvedev and Bakhtin (1978<sup>63</sup>), Hanks (1996<sup>64</sup>) and Hymes (1970<sup>65</sup>; 1971; 1972<sup>66</sup>; 1974<sup>67</sup>) we can approach translators as people who also use language in particular ways in relation to particular activities and also as people holding and expressing opinions and values about the nature of the activity they are involved in as well as on how language fits into and structures that activity. This means letting go of the tendency to identify a speaker with one particular language only on the grounds that he or she lives in a country where that language is spoken. As many a sociolinguistic study has shown, it is seldom if ever the case in reality that the population of a given country only speaks one language (Crystal 1997<sup>68</sup>: 34-37). Moreover, any given speaker may command various varieties within and across languages. It is, therefore, not unreasonable to assume that a knowledge of English can be considered as forming part of a Belgian or Dutch person's communicative repertoires. Whether this is the case or not is 'an empirical question' (Hymes 1971: 271). Whatever the case may be the point of departure remains speakers. How, otherwise, could we account for varying degrees of affinity with and competence in different language varieties. This is not to say, however, that national languages are to be ignored. As they are considered as 'natural' to a nation and are powerful constituents and builders of identity, ignoring them would be detrimental to the study being undertaken here because as constructions they have a real impact on language practice. It is not the intention either to lightly brush aside any sense of identity, be it national or local, expressed by the interviewees.

As has been shown in the preceding chapter, there has been a noticeable shift within Translation Studies from formal to functional approaches with increasing attention being paid to translation as a social act carried out by actors in particular circumstances and under certain constraints. The echoes a more general shift in approaches to linguistic study – a shift that is clearly visible in linguistic anthropology (Hanks 1996, Duranti 1997). Actors and circumstances form the cornerstone of skopos theory, whereas the constraints involved have been dealt with in considerable detail by those working within norm theory like Toury and Chesterman (Hermans 1999: 72-98). Translation scholars have moved out from (translated) texts to examine the contexts in which they were produced and relate them to those cultural, social and historical contexts (Venuti 1995<sup>69</sup>; Pym 1998; Tymoczko 1999). This involves seeing a particular translator's strategies as being determined by the constraints of the time and place

in which he or she lived and works with the assumption that evidence can be found in texts to corroborate or falsify this. This would hence result in claiming that a particular translator either flaunted or complied with the rule of the day in the society in which he or she lived (Venuti 1998: 124-157). This has brought with it lengthy discussions of the subservient role played of translators particularly in the 19th and 20th centuries and calls for resistance to this position, for a heightened visibility of the translator as someone who plays an important role in cultural transfer. This in turn has led to radical positions being taken with respect to translation, which is now considered as a locus of power through which orders of dominance can be subverted and the voice of the (subaltern) other could be rendered more audible (Bassnett & Trivedi 1999; Spivak 1992<sup>70</sup>; Venuti (ed.) 1992<sup>71</sup>, among others). All these calls stem from analyses that have clearly demonstrated the complexity with which power-relations are played out in and across societies through the field of translation and as such have done credit to writers like Foucault, Bourdieu, Fannon, Said and others who have done much to uncover this complexity. All this has indeed led to a heightened visibility of translators, were it only within the discipline of translation studies. Except of course for the famous and illustrious, Cicero, St. Jerome, Lord Longford, and others, they are no longer the faceless producers of translations for public consumption and for analysis within the discipline, but (key) actors in the whole process, at least as far as recent theoretical models of translation are concerned<sup>72</sup>. They have been awarded the epithet of 'expert' in skopos theory and *translatorisches Handeln* for example, though not without a panoply of incumbent duties.

Whatever way one looks at it, there are serious consequences attached to factoring translators and other actors into translation models, the most important perhaps being that we can no longer examine text alone or make translated text the sole or ultimate focus of our analysis. Nor can we use context and actors to explicate textual choices and patterning, as merely the useful and insightful explanatory packaging that has to be carefully removed to reveal the 'true' nature of translated text. To continue in the same metaphorical vein however, can we remove the packaging without damaging the product? This question stems from the assumption that the product always has arrived and always will arrive in the package of action and context. But the product and package metaphor clearly falls short in portraying the reality of translation. How then are we to theorize it, short of describing the world?

What if we regard translation as a form of language use mediated by those involved in the activity – a statement that could apply to any form of language use? We could then explore the specifics of the situation – the when, where, how and why mentioned in the Nord quote in chapter 1. The underlying assumption here is that language use cannot be separated from its users or from the context in which it is used and therefore that we can only gain insight into what is happening when we take these factors into consideration. This is not unlike the basic assumption of skopos theory or other functional approaches to translation and leads us to the question already asked in the previous chapter with regard to skopos theory: how do these factors relate to each other? All of these factors have been recognised in some way or other in different configurations in the body of literature of Translation Studies. Till now we have

identified actors, the context of their action, the products of their action and the values that inform their action. Language use either underscores or forms the medium of the three factors in which the actors are involved. Can an approach be suggested, therefore, that awards equal importance to each aspect without reducing any or most to functions of one?

As was stated in the previous chapter, the main reason for researching translation was to find out how translators went about their work and what they actually thought about it. The only way of doing so was to ask the translators themselves. In fact, I could see no other way of finding out how the factors pointed out by Vermeer and others relate to each other. Though functional approaches to translation recognise the importance of the social in translation and structure their models accordingly, they do not really propose a way of getting at the social and finding out how it relates to translation.

Should we turn then to sociological studies in order to flesh out the field mapped out in functional approaches to translation by drawing on methods like quantitative analysis that would throw up data on professional trajectories, gender distribution, social background, etc.? This is certainly a worthwhile venture that will provide and has already provided interesting information on the profession of translation (de Jong 1998<sup>73</sup>; Hermans & Lambert 1998<sup>74</sup>). The approach opted for in this study, however, belongs within the remit of linguistic ethnography, an approach that studies context, activity, values and language use at one and the same time and that considers these aspects as forming one empirical whole. Within linguistic ethnography studies have been carried out on situated language use in numerous settings and professions (Jaffe 1990<sup>75</sup>; Tusting 2000<sup>76</sup>) but how can we conduct and structure such studies in order to gain valid insights with respect to translation. Or, as someone asked at a poster presentation of my research: what is the scientific value of your interviews? I understood this question in the following way: will the data gleaned from the interviews with translators corroborate or falsify the features found in their respective translations? In other words, do translators do what they say or, for that matter, say what they do? If they did do what they say, then the whole exercise would prove vacuous. If they did not, then the onus would be on me to explain the discrepancies. And how should I go about that? It seems to me that the premise underlying this reasoning is that the truth lies in the translated text, that the translation provides verifiable data when contrasted with the text it was translated from. Furthermore, the reasoning builds on the assumption that the people being interviewed are unaware of what they are saying and that it is up to the researcher to find items of significance in their utterances. This form of reasoning was never my point of departure. I already knew from experience that the space and time in between source text and target text was occupied by events and actors that influenced the form of the target text, no matter how slight that influence was. If anything, I was rather strident in my wish to have translators moved to the centre stage of translation, whence my desire to interview them. But that was **my** agenda, an agenda that not only belongs in the realm of academic discussion on approaches and methodologies but also stems from a wish to see translators gaining wider recognition for their work. In designing my interview questions, I relied on my experience as a professional

translator and subsequently considered the interviews as a learning experience and wished to remain open to what might emerge during them. In this respect, I drew on Briggs (1986<sup>77</sup>) who argues for a reflexive approach to interviewing and points to how the researcher brings all sorts of preconceptions to the interview that causes him or her to read the situation in a particular way. Following Briggs and Holstein and Gubrium (1995<sup>78</sup>), Fontana (2002<sup>79</sup>) states:

They specifically apply to interviewing the perspective that the interview is a social production between interviewer and respondent. In other words, it entails collaborative construction between two active parties. Because the interview is situationally and contextually produced, it is itself a site for knowledge production, rather than simply a neutral conduit for experiential knowledge, as traditionally believed. (Fontana 2002:166)

In adhering to this stance, I had to pay particular attention to what would emerge in the course of the interviews, to how knowledge was ‘produced’ and set my agenda aside, precisely in the interests not only of academic rigour but also of fairness to those interviewed. This meant that the knowledge produced was just as much theirs as mine, if not more so. It was not my intention, therefore, to use the interview data to verify or falsify translational features per se. I would consider this a mechanical approach that in no way can do justice to the complex nature of translation as a human activity. Nonetheless, if a contrast of the interview data and translation features did bring something interesting to light, then well and good. As I had only begun to explore the field, I felt that it would be premature at that stage to aim for generalisable conclusions. So at no time would I be left to explain the discrepancies mentioned above, as discrepancies cannot be posited as a point of departure, simply because we would not be in a position to say what these discrepancies constituted. As I understand it, we firstly had to gain an understanding of translation as a whole, while remaining hesitant about setting up one-to-one falsifiable correspondences between actors and actions or the assertions of translators and their translations. As the body of research in translation studies mainly deals with texts (also as expressions of normative behaviour) and to a lesser extent with their authors and the socio-historical contexts in which they were written or spoken, it would also seem premature to seek falsifiable proof of the correspondence between translation products and the assertions of their producers. Perhaps someone can do this at some later stage, when more has been learned about how the various factors identified above relate to each other. For the purposes of this study, this meant discarding the idea of explaining discrepancies and casting translators, their work and the attitudes they bear towards their work in a more positive light, which further involved seeing translation as a form of social practice and analysing it as such. To do so we firstly must provide an outline of what is understood by practice in the literature.

## **2.2. Translation as Practice?**

In this section, I would like to present a series of points in quotation, mainly taken from Hanks (1996), which should help clarify the notion of practice, and point to the notion of



practice as a possible approach to understanding the phenomena of translation. In the first quote, Hanks provides some programmatic considerations concerning what he calls a 'practice approach':

... [A] practice approach does not assume that the central function of language is to convey objective information that can be judged cleanly as true or false. Utterances are typically multifunctional, and the linguistic systems reflect that fact. ... The idea is that in a practice approach language forms and uses take on a much more active force in defining the world than they are accorded in formalist approaches. To say that language objectifies does not therefore mean that we must hold it aside in search of a nonobjectified reality. No such pristine reserve exists in social experience, nor can it be reproduced by a retreat into naive subjectivism. **The challenge is to enter into the process of objectification with your eyes wide open and without forgetting that we, too, are part of the world we describe – as both objects and objectifiers.** This follows from the value-charged status of discourse, the power dimensions of action, and the general idea that to engage in speech is to occupy the social world, the terms of engagement perhaps having real consequences. (Hanks 1996: 14 – my emphasis)

Hanks proposes a scholarly approach to language use that wishes to engage with language in all its complexity. His approach is also reflexive in the sense that he recognises that scholars are also objectifiers of the fields they study and must remain aware of the fact at all times. He points out that 'utterances are multifunctional', which implies that people attempt to achieve various goals at the same time when speaking or using language. Like Hymes, he sees language as doing more than conveying objective information. The notion of practice, therefore, encapsulates the various functions of language use in social settings. It forms a point of departure from which the intricacies of language can be explored:

However else one chooses to define "practice", it is the point at which three things converge: the law of system, the quick of activity, and the reflective gaze of value. ... It is crucial to see that the three aspects of form, activity, and ideology require three different modes of analysis. (Hanks 1996: 11)

Though he argues for separate modes of analysis regarding the various aspects of practice, Hanks insists throughout that no adequate model of speech (or language use) can ignore the three aspects of form, activity and ideology indicated in the two quotes above. Further on in his book, he summarises the various premises upon which a practice approach is built:

In a practice approach, we start from the premise that speech is a form of engagement in the world. This has the following entailments: (1) Language and the world of human experience are everywhere interpenetrated, so that even the inner logic of a linguistic system bears the trace of the routine practices to which it is adapted. (2) To speak is to occupy the world, not only to represent it, and this occupancy entails various modes of expression, of which propositional meaning is but one. (3) Speakers and the objects they talk about are parts of the same world; a division between subjects and objects is one of the products of linguistic practice, something people create with language, not the irremediable condition against which language

must work. (4) We do many things through language, of which thinking and reasoning are a part – but not the only part. We also realize ourselves, effect changes in our worlds; connect with other people; experience beauty, rage, and tenderness; exercise authority; refuse; and pursue our interests. (Hanks 1996: 236)

On the whole, the notion of practice and its attendant aspects constitute a powerful tool for exploring language use in society. But the question then is: what has all this got to do with translation? The answer hinges on what we understand by translation. Is it a product or process of both? Or is it more? As was pointed out in chapter 1, various functional approaches to translation have attempted to map the complexity of the field. I wish to argue here that a practice approach to translation would encapsulate the many aspects already pointed out by scholars within the discipline and, not only that, it would provide us with a cogent whole from which an analysis could be launched. As was powerfully argued by Vermeer (Venuti 2000), translation does not take place in a vacuum. It is an activity involving language varieties carried out by people in a social framework, an activity that is subject to and regulated by sets of values held by those involved in the field. In this respect, translation can be considered as a form of social practice within which meaning is created, negotiated and maintained in various ways by its practitioners. This brings us to another quote, taken from Wetherell et al., which discusses processes of semiosis in relation to social practices or how meaning is constructed and negotiated in social situations:

Semiosis figures in broadly two ways in social practices. First, it figures as a part of the social activity within a practice. For instance, part of doing a job (being a shop assistant) is using language in a particular way; so, too, is part of governing a country. Second, semiosis figures as representations. Social actors within any practice produce representations of other practices, as well as "reflexive" representations of their own practice, in the course of their activity within the practice. They recontextualise other practices (Bernstein, 1990<sup>80</sup>; Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999<sup>81</sup>) – that is, they incorporate them into their own practice, and different social actors will represent them differently according to how they are positioned within the practice.

Representation is the process of social construction of practices, including reflexive self-construction – representations enter and shape social processes and practices. (Wetherell, Taylor & Yates 2001<sup>82</sup>: 234-235)

The above quote could also be seen as applying to translators. The task then would be to find out what translators say about their work or how they represent their own work and that of others (colleagues and possibly rivals) and how they make sense of what they do and the context in which they do it. Following this inquiry, we could then see whether the positions taken by Hanks, Wetherell and others on the notion of practice also hold with respect to translators. Therefore, the question remains open as to how the values and beliefs held and expressed by translators relate to and are reflected in their work. An analysis of the interview data will provide some indication of that relation. Before moving on to the analysis however, I would like to close this section with another quote from Hanks:

In a practice approach, the values attached to language by native speakers are themselves social facts. (Hanks 1996: 14)

This small quote is interesting in more ways than one and important for the discussion being conducted in these pages, as shall be outlined in the following section.

### 2.3. Asking the Translators

If, as Hanks argues, “the values attached to language by native speakers are themselves social facts” then expressions of such values comprise more than mere anecdote, as they can be considered to inform practice. His statement resonates with Vološinov’s on the distinction between the social and the natural. It is the scholar’s job, therefore, to take these values as they emerge in speech seriously and not cast them as the opposite pole or poor cousin of informed opinion or scientific fact. As ‘social facts’ they can be explored empirically and be considered as constituting a vital part of the overall picture, as informing practice in complex ways still not fully understood. As was argued in the previous chapter, models of translation are dependent upon models of language use, a practice approach being, to my mind, the most useful way of bringing language use and translation together. It remained to be seen whether this was feasible or not, i.e. whether and how a practice approach would prove fruitful in exploring the phenomena of translation or proceeding conversely, whether and how an exploration of these phenomena would allow us to suggest that practice forms a cogent model for framing translation.

#### 2.3.1. Drawing up the Questionnaire

In order to discover what translators do and think of their work, I undertook a series of interviews. Before doing so, I drew up a questionnaire which was invariably sent to the interviewee in advance once he or she agreed to the interview. The questions in the questionnaire, which were asked during interviews with a number of literary translators in Belgium and the Netherlands, were drawn up with a view to covering what I considered to be important aspects of (literary) translation. When drawing up the questionnaire, I began by placing sets of questions under general headings that reflected these aspects.

Those under the first heading, i.e. **General Questions**, were designed to elicit responses as to:

1. How the translator first began translating literary texts or became a professional translator;
2. Which writers or poets he or she had translated in the course of his/her career or time spent translating; and
3. Whether the translator felt an affinity with Ireland?

The third question was included here to focus the enquiry, as the (translated) work under scrutiny in the fourth chapter of this dissertation was written by Irish poets.

The second set of questions, which fell under the heading, **Translation as Such**, were designed to elicit responses regarding the actual translation of literary texts (poems, in this case). They enquire into:

1. How the translator sets about translating;
2. What he or she does when caught in an impasse or **when** he or she experiences difficulty (if at all) during the actual translation process;
3. Whether the translator consults the poet he/she is translating (if this is possible);
4. Whether he or she is put under pressure by those who commission the work, i.e. the publishers (if this is the case)?

The questions falling under the third heading – **When the work is done!** – were designed to elicit data relating to events and perceptions following on the completion of the translation:

1. What happens after he/she sends in the drafts of the translated work;
2. What the publishers do with these drafts;
3. How much work is involved at this stage for the translator?

The fourth and final heading, **After your work has been published**, comprised questions relating to:

1. How the translator felt on receiving the published version(s) of his or her work;
2. How the work was received in the media;
3. Whether critics had anything (positive) to contribute to the reception of translated literature (poetry in this case) and whether this had a bearing on their translation practice?

On the face of it, this questionnaire<sup>83</sup> is chronological in its approach, as it attempts to trace the various steps involved in many a (professional) translation process. It also enquires beforehand into how the person concerned became a literary translator and into his or her preference for certain literatures. It would be ingenuous however, to assert that the questionnaire does not have any theoretical underpinnings. The general purpose of this dissertation as a whole is to trace translation practice as a situated activity, which means that we can only gain insight into how a translation is made by conducting empirical research among real translators in real-life situations along with their translations.

As has probably become clear in the reasoning till now, the hypothesis underlying the questionnaire is that translation belongs in a social context that implies career choices and training in some form, be it professional or other. Those who do not work as full-time literary translators often arrange their careers in such a way as to be able to translate. Whatever the case may be, translators then seek out various channels of publication either by becoming involved in literary magazines as editors for example, or by negotiating and seeking commissions from magazine editors and publishing houses or by proposing projects to them in order to find an outlet for their work. This may involve forms of long-term investment in a network with little or no initial result in terms of publication or subsequent remuneration.

In drawing up the questionnaire, I set the questions in such a way as to reflect the various stages of the translation process from inception – including the wish to become a translator –

to publication and reception of the translated work. It is important to stress, however, that this was just a point of departure and that I wished to remain open to what might emerge from the interviews in situ and also remain aware that I was constructing a conceptual grid and laying it down upon the life-worlds of the people I was interviewing. This would oblige me to become acutely aware of any data that fell outside the conceptual grid I had constructed, not because it was extraneous to my research or irrelevant to the hypothesis I was seeking to corroborate but rather because it would force me to re-examine my point of departure in each instance. My goal was not to seek proof of my hypothesis or its falsification for that matter but to explore situated aspects of translation. I was, therefore, not merely looking for answers to the questions I set but also, and perhaps more importantly, for patterns of behaviour or practice that might emerge from the responses, the reasoning being that it is not enough to provide indications of the existence of a social network but rather to unearth its whys and wherefores.

My reasoning furthermore was that there is more to be gained from examining more closely the notion of 'system' (literary or other) in terms of tension and contention, contradiction and contestation rather than glibly moving on after having accepted a 'system' as comprising seemingly automatic shifts from centre to periphery and from periphery to centre at any given time.

### **2.3.2. Transcribing the Data**

The approach decided upon in interviewing the translators was a qualitative one and a transcription of the recorded data yielded approximately 167 pages of transcript. The meaning of the interviews was firstly mediated by the list of questions drawn up by the interviewer. As was indicated above, these questions were drawn up with a particular goal in mind. At each stage, the interviewee was asked how he or she perceived how these events came about and what his or her opinion was. Each interviewee was informed prior to the interview about the purpose of the research. The interviews were framed by the interviewer's prior professional experience as a translator and the threshold of access to the data provided by the interviewees was lowered by the fact that I could talk 'shop' in Dutch with all concerned, albeit with varying degrees of deference.

Regarding the form of the transcriptions: it was the interviewer's desire to let the interviewee tell his/her own story as much as possible and this is reflected in the way the turns are structured in the transcriptions<sup>84</sup>. The writer is aware that the recordings can be transcribed and used in other ways for other purposes and that the transcription strategy opted for is arbitrary in this sense and far from approximating the totality of what happened on each occasion (Briggs 1998; Bucholz 2000<sup>85</sup>).

The chronology of the interviews has been maintained on purpose in the ensuing discussion<sup>86</sup> as the interviewer felt that they formed an organic whole in the sense that they mirrored a learning process from the outset. From the second interview on, each respective interview was informed by knowledge and insight gleaned from the interview(s) preceding it, and as such was influenced in this way by those that went before it. As a result emerging

intuitions were pursued through more pertinent questioning, notwithstanding the fact that the questionnaire was adhered to throughout unless otherwise stated. So all subsequent discussion, interpretation and analysis of the interview data respects the order in which the interviews were conducted. In the interests of their privacy, the interviewee's initials were changed and rendered anonymous.

As much emerged in the asking and the telling, the interviewer did not always stick to the questions as they were ordered in the questionnaire but tried where possible to enquire further into issues as they arose. The interviewer also asked the interviewee whether the mini-disc recorder could remain switched on after all the questions in the questionnaire proper had been asked. This provided extra data in a similar vein to the data stemming from the questionnaire as the conversations that ensued from the interviews further explored comments made by the interviewees during the interviews per se. To say that these conversations are unstructured in relation to the other data would be misleading, however, as they build on issues touched upon in the interview proper, albeit without the structure of the questionnaire. These conversations were considered just as important as the questionnaire data proper for a number of reasons, the main one being that they index the translators' interest in their profession and the topic of translation in more complex ways than a questionnaire can encapsulate.

All the interviewees but one have translated 'Irish poetry' into Dutch while working as translators. The one interviewee who has not translated Irish poetry has translated Joyce's *Ulysses* however, a feat that took seven years to accomplish. Because the interviewee in question is considered by colleagues and critics alike, to be one of the best translators in the Low Countries it was important that he be interviewed. This particular interview only sticks loosely to the questionnaire and allows the interviewee to expand on his vision on translation and literature in more general terms.

Of the twelve people interviewed (7 men and 5 women), eight have published their own collections of poetry or works of prose. Of these, five have gained reputations as writers with varying degrees of recognition, whereas two more are gaining respect as emerging writers and the seventh is pursuing a career in academia and has not published any literary work for some time. One of the twelve has published extensively within translation studies and enjoys a considerable reputation within the field. All those interviewed have had or continue to have varying degrees of engagement with the profession of translator and with reflection on the profession, either through workshops or through extended academic involvement (3). Some work full time as professional translators; others have arranged their professional careers so as to be able to translate, whereas others (2) only engage in the exercise sporadically, either when requested or within the framework of workshops, etc. The majority of those interviewed produce translations on a regular basis (e.g. translations of most of those interviewed have also been published in anthologies<sup>87</sup> of poetry).

Interviewees	12
Man	7
Woman	5
established/emerging reputation as a writer	7
published own works of poetry/prose	9
Academics	3

**Table 2-i: details on interviewees**

### 2.3.3. Coding the Data

All the interviews were conducted in Dutch. The transcribed data were coded in three ways. Firstly, the transcripts contain a set of codes mentioning where the interview took place, the initials of the interviewer and interviewee, other items<sup>88</sup> relevant to the event, etc. Secondly, each question and response was assigned a letter and number in accordance with its place in relation to the questionnaire (section/question). Subsequent questions that arose during the course of each interview were called ‘sub’ and bear the same letter and number of the related question in the questionnaire (Warren 2002<sup>89</sup>: 86-87). Conversations following on the interviews proper were called “ensuing conversations”. All the transcribed data was entered into a software programme for qualitative data analysis called Kwalitan, version 5.0.9. This programme is similar to more sophisticated software packages like NVivo and the Ethnograph.<sup>90</sup> All the letters and numbers assigned to the questions and responses were listed as codes in the Kwalitan program. This allowed all responses to a particular question to be grouped and analysed together. These particular codes were assigned to their respective segments in each interview. Text fragments within each segment were further coded for other salient features, all of which will be discussed in chapter 3. Suffice it to mention here that such salient features were not confined to any segment in particular and arose unsolicited in various answers to different questions. At a lower level still, the segments were coded for even smaller stretches of utterance and certain lexical items (e.g. metaphors as indicators of practice, modal forms as possible indicators of normative attitudes or behaviour). On the whole, the interviews will be examined in what follows from two perspectives:

1. In terms of the actual answers given to the specific questions asked. The purpose here is to relate and contrast the utterances of the translators with commonly held views on translation found in the literature (chapter 2);
2. In terms of themes and values relating to translation that emerged from the exchanges (chapter 3).

The findings distilled from these two perspectives will then be contrasted, which involves analysing and comparing the data filed under questionnaire or segment codes with data filed under text fragment or lower unit codes. Here again the writer remains aware of his own purpose and presence in structuring the data, or as Briggs (2002<sup>91</sup>) states:

Interview researchers ... imagine the social worlds depicted in the content of responses, creating images of political participation, family life, work experience and so forth. But

interview materials simultaneously imagine an interpsychic world for the interviewee, a space inhabited by opinions, memories, emotions, plans, preferences, and desires. As I argue in *Learning How to Ask*, interviews are saturated by images of the social dynamics of the interview itself, projections of the social context in which it takes place, the roles and power dynamics of interviewer and respondent, and their respective agendas. But a fourth sphere is being constructed, that of the imagined texts that will be created through the use of interview data. (Briggs 2002: 914)

However, I would like to dwell for a moment on ‘the imagined texts’ referred to by Briggs above. In designing the questionnaire and subsequently in conducting the interviews, the obvious intention was to write up and comment on the plausible responses given by the interviewees to those questions. In this respect, the trajectory is fairly straightforward in that the themes found in the answers are not that far removed from the concerns of those writing on translation from an academic perspective. They do deal with translation after all. It would, therefore, be fairly easy to view the responses in terms of translatorial and translational norms and strategies, for example, and fit all this into the whole body of work in this area. But then again there are those texts that were unimagined, neither when designing the questionnaire nor when conducting the interviews. These texts only began to be imagined during the many replays of the recordings and during the transcription process. These incipient texts cut a swathe through and across those already planned and forced me to re-examine how the planned texts should be written. The turning point in all this was not exactly what the translators said during the interviews in reply to the questions they were asked but how they spoke about their work and other related topics. This how only emerged with time and rereading and hinged on the difficulty I found in attempting to categorise unambiguously many of the statements made by the interviewees. The categories and subdivisions set out in the questionnaire would allow me to trace certain plausible patterns, which may be considered as constituting the first perspective mentioned on the previous page. I consider “how the translators talk about their work”, or the second perspective, as intersecting and further complicating the projected or ‘imagined’ texts mentioned by Briggs above.

## **2.4. Exploring the Questionnaire Perspective: plausible scenarios of translation**

In what follows, I will examine the findings gleaned from the questionnaire, arranged under their four main headings (coded as a, b, c and d) before reaching some initial conclusions in in section 5 of this chapter.

### **2.4.1. Preamble**

The oldest translator I interviewed began translating soon after he was demobbed from the Dutch Navy following his military service and the youngest completed his studies in



Germanic Philology at Leuven University in the early 1990s. These two interviewees form the two poles between which the other interviewees fall, both in terms of age and engagement with the profession of translator or translation in general. To be explicit, the former has been a practicing literary translator for forty years and more whereas the latter works as a computer programmer and only translates occasionally and even insists that he has received no formal training as a translator. Such a statement is indicative of a change in attitude towards translation, i.e. it is now clearly recognised as a profession which requires formal training to practice, which was not always the case in the past.

On either side of the mid-point between the two poles I have placed an interviewee; one is a renowned translator who also teaches translation and the other is a renowned lecturer in translation studies who also translates. However, not all those interviewed have received formal training as it is known today, either because it was not available at the particular time or place or for other reasons that do not emerge in the interviews. Of the eleven people interviewed, five have in fact followed graduate courses in translation, whereas nearly all have participated in translation workshops and classes and events of a similar nature and remain keen to keep abreast of any developments in these areas. For all interviewees but one, their interest in such workshops is mainly of a practical nature – i.e. how do fellow translators tackle specific problems of translation – and this seldom involves broader theoretical issues, extant in the literature, relating to the nature of translation. What all the interviewees have in common is that they have translated Irish literature in some form over the last thirty years and in the majority of cases (all but two) have translated Irish poetry written by one or more of the poets whose work is included in the corpus drawn up for the purposes of this study (see chapter 4). Of the two who have not translated Irish poetry, one has translated a major work of Irish prose (*Ulysses*) and major poets working in other European languages (e.g. French, German, Italian and English), whereas the other mainly translates prose from other English literatures (e.g. Canadian, Scottish, English). On the whole, their utterances ran parallel to those of the other interviewees, as shall be demonstrated in the second perspective. The figure below provides an overview of their professional situation at the time of interview:

Situation	Translator
Full-time translator	EJ; CJ; VDK; NP
Part-time translator (also otherwise gainfully employed)	KH; IJ; CP; BM
Occasional translator (otherwise gainfully employed)	HJ; VVDK; HT; RW
Published as poets and/or writers (no order of importance)	KH; CJ; EJ; HJ; IJ; VVDK; CP; NP; RW

**Table 2-ii: professional situation of interviewees at time of interview**

The term part-time in the above table is slightly misleading in that it does not reflect real time occupation, sense of professionalism or intensity of involvement with translation. It is used here as a means of institutional differentiation only. I thought it also interesting to note that most of those interviewed have published work of their own and that the two remaining

interviewees (VDK and BM) do entertain the possibility of publishing their own work someday.

#### **2.4.2. The Questionnaire, Section A – The Translator: narratives of inception and literary affinities**

This section deals with the responses to the questions in section A of the questionnaire. The key issues to emerge from the responses to these three questions are the following:

1. Professional training alone does not make the translator;
2. Translating from one language is not always professionally viable;
3. An affinity with a given culture is important but not all encompassing.

##### **2.4.2.1. A1: What brought you to translation?**

When asked how they began translating (code a), all but one of the interviewees identified moments in their lives at which a desire to translate or work as a translator arose. Their narratives of inception form insightful cameos of decisions that would determine their lives and careers, as well as providing justifications for those decisions. The quotes from the interviews provided below (and throughout the rest of this work) are meant to be illustrative rather than exhaustive. All quotes respect the chronology of the interviews (as mentioned above) and are taken from the three professional subcategories (full-time translator; part-time translator and occasional translator) set out in Table 1-ii above:

EJ: ... op de middelbare school heb ik ontzettend veel gelezen ja ik heb een gymnasiumopleiding gehad en dat is eigenlijk een vertaalopleiding dus Latijn, Grieks, Frans, Duits, Engels ... op de middelbare school op het gymnasium moest je altijd vertalen natuurlijk en ik las ook heel erg veel. Toen ben ik in 45 in militaire dienst gegaan ... maar toen ik terugkwam ... kreeg ik een tijdschrift in handen Argosy heette dat een Schots tijdschrift ... en daar stond een gedicht in Epithalamion van John Donne en dat heeft mij enorm getroffen dus zodra ik thuis was heb ik dat vertaald ....

RW: Ik ben begonnen met gedichten te vertalen om beter te kunnen doordringen in de in eh een vreemde tekst ... Met een gedicht in een andere taal is dat nog veel moeilijker en om het gedicht dus goed te begrijpen goed te kunnen analyseren vond ik het gewenst van dacht ik dat het eh het beste middel was om die tekst te vertalen zodanig dat je werkelijk kunt doordringen in die tekst tot op het bot. Het was dus voor mij een hulpmiddel om de invloed van die dichter veel dieper te kunnen ondergaan eigenlijk om voor mezelf een verrijking te hebben als dichter.

NP: Ik denk dat dat gelijktijdig was hoor, (ja?) toen ik geïnteresseerd eh was in, in eh poëzie of toch op de middelbare school daar eh in de vierde of vijfde klas van het atheneum, gymnasium zeg maar in geïnteresseerd raakte, begon ik ook buitenlandse dichters te lezen en had altijd wel een soort zendingsdrang om dat ook door te geven en daardoor ook buitenlandse dichters te vertalen... Ik heb ook een Amerikaanse zwager en een Engelse oom en ik ben in Nederland al opgevoed binnen een semi-Engelstalige omgeving, heb in Engeland gewoond ...

IJ: Dus dit is denk ik één invalshoek geweest dus ik heb gedichten vertaald die ik zelf had willen schrijven. Daarnaast heb ik ook gedichten vertaald, denk ik, gewoon om de mensen te laten zien of critici of andere dichters te laten zien, kijk dit bestaat ook (ah, ja) om een beetje de literaire traditie of de poëtische traditie die wij in Vlaanderen hebben eh te verbreden eh naar het Europese vlak of naar andere vlakken. (ja) En daarin heeft lang enfin heeft mij heel lang geïnteresseerd maatschappelijke engagement en laat ons zeggen politieke standpunten in poëzie... Aanvankelijk ik was bijvoorbeeld heel geobsedeerd door de poëzie van César Vallejo, ... met name door een gedicht dat heet 'Zwarte steen op witte steen' en ik heb dan drie jaar avondlessen Spaans gevolgd om dat gedicht te kunnen vertalen.

VDK: Eehm, eigenlijk heb ik Romaanse filologie gestudeerd (ja) dus omdat ik met literatuur wilde bezig zijn. (em) Maar ik ben een aantal jaren in het onderwijs dat stond mij helemaal niet aan ik ben daar uitgestapt dan heb ik in een kunstgalerie gewerkt (ja) maar dat ging slecht; het was crisis en ik wilde eigenlijk altijd met literatuur bezig zijn dus ik ben in Leuven een seminarie gaan volgen Vertalen algemeen op Europees niveau, tekst en eigenlijk concreet en daar was één module bij met literair vertalen.

KH: Ja, voor mij is het heel simpel, ik heb altijd willen vertalen.

Ik heb ook vertaalstudies aangevat enfin, (ja, ja) ik heb een diploma vertaler (PF: ja) en dat was altijd met in mijn achterhoofd het idee van literatuur te vertalen.

Ik heb mijn eindverhandeling ... een vertaling gemaakt van de gedichten van Rilke maar dat is dan een aantal jaren allemaal blijven liggen tot vijf of zes jaar geleden denk ik en dan heb ik de kans gekregen om met de literatuur eindelijk te beginnen (PF: fantastisch dus). Een lang gekoesterde droom die in in vervulling is gegaan.

#### Extract 2-1: selection from responses to question a1

In these six little narratives we note different orientations towards translation and different notions of what it means to become a translator. There is a clear dividing line between the first four and the last two in terms of formal training. For EJ and NP becoming a translator is linked to the type of secondary education they received and the foundation that provided. Next to that, NP cites the bi-lingual environment he grew up in, whereas EJ cites his travels and contacts as being of importance. Both cite a simultaneous interest in writing and translating, which has remained till this day, i.e. they both became poets and translators more or less simultaneously. RW and IJ position themselves somewhat differently with respect to translating: initially, both used their own writing as their point of departure, a point beyond which they moved to explore new means of poetic expression in other languages and hence enrich themselves and their own work. Translating remains an important activity for both RW and IJ, though neither of them relies on it as a primary source of income. IJ did express a wish to do so, however.

KH and VDK began their careers as translators later than the other four and can provide proof of profession in the form of certificates that they are (officially) translators – something which the others cannot. This does not mean, however, that they did not have a similar experience as the other four: that particular moment when they wished to become a translator.

Similarly, their narratives contain their own myths of inception – both in the sense of entering a projected collectivity or community and crossing a threshold of individual realisation.

Myth is understood here not in the sense of false ideology or in the strictly Barthian sense of mechanisms that reproduce middle-class ideology (Van Gorp et al. 1986: 269) nor as “a collective and collectively appropriated product” (Bourdieu 1992: 167), but rather in an aetiological sense, as a pivotal moment lying at the heart of a narrative. In this way, it is not far removed from a sense given to it in Classical Greece:

Mythos betekent dan “verhaal van de dichter”, terwijl logos een betrouwbaar verslag of waarheidsgetrouwe uiteenzetting was. ... Niettemin, onderscheidde men in de oudheid vaak een dubbel niveau in de mythe: enerzijds de idee achter het verhaal en anderzijds de narratieve inkleding die niet letterlijk begrepen moest worden. (Van Gorp et al. 1986: 269)

The stories they and the other interviewees told were not expected by the interviewer when designing the questionnaire. In fact much more prosaic answers were expected like ‘then and there’, ‘in that year’, etc.

KH and VDK cited a desire to work with literature as a determining factor in their choice and both indicate that the paths they took involved some difficulty and were not without obstacle. For VDK, translation is her main source of income, whereas KH has a job that allows her to work at translating (on an increasingly frequent basis, it must be added). All narratives contain elements of legitimisation (schooling, background, experience) and a pivotal moment of epiphany (in the Joycean sense) that culminated in inception as a translator. It could be argued that all these narratives are post-hoc rationalisations of what happened. This, however, does not weaken the significance of the way in which they were told and hence experienced by the interviewees:

Le mot de Claudel « connaître c’est naître avec » s’applique ici à plein, et le long processus dialectique, souvent décrit comme « vocation » par lequel « on se fait » à ce par quoi on est fait et on « choisit » ce par quoi on est « choisi », et au terme duquel les différents champs s’assurent les agents dotés de l’habitus nécessaire à leur bon fonctionnement, est à peu près à l’apprentissage d’un jeu ce que l’acquisition de la langue maternelle est à l’apprentissage d’une langue étrangère ... (Bourdieu 1980 : 113)

It would seem from the data, therefore, that one needs more than formal training to encompass what it means to become a (literary) translator. It is also clear that the interviewees possess various orientations towards translation as an activity and as a profession which bear a close resemblance to Bourdieu’s (1980) notions of ‘field’ and ‘habitus’ (see chapter 3). In this respect we can make a distinction between personal trajectories and the structural possibilities obtaining in the field. The data displays a range of personal trajectories but it must be stated that nowadays structural possibilities clearly involve professional training in translation, which was not always the case in the past.

#### 2.4.2.2. A2: Have you translated many poets?

All told, those interviewed have translated an impressive number of poets from various languages and literatures into Dutch, as can be seen from the following quotes from the data:

EJ: Ja, dat heb ik dus gedaan ik noemde al Yeats en Dickinson, en Walcott heb ik vertaald en dan Seamus Heaney en Craig Raine en nou ja tientallen anderen zeg maar eh (ja) en eh Irish poetry dus natuurlijk (waarom?)

RW: Veel ja inderdaad van veel uit vele landen maar in hoofdzaak toch wel uit het Angelsaksische gebied. Maar ik heb ook eh ja een beetje uit alle mogelijke landen vertaald.

NP: Zeker eh Nederlands-Engels denk ik dat ik wel een vijftigtal, zestigtal Nederlandse en Vlaamse dichters vertaald heb en Ieren misschien een twintigtal, Engelse Amerikanen, ja tijdschriften, bundels denk ik een bundel of dertig (ja) en ik heb ook nog eens anderhalf jaar Duits gestudeerd dus ik heb ook nog wel een aantal Duitse (laughs) Enzensberger, Hans Arp, eh Paul Celan (eh) maar dat is minder.

IJ: Ja, ja. Ik heb eh em naast Ikmet was eigenlijk de eerste vertaling die ik publiceerde van Tahar ben Jelloun. Uit Zuid-Afrika heb ik daar heb ik ook heel wat dichters vertaald Massisi Kueneni, een Zulu dichter die ook in het Engels schrijft en Dennis Brutus, Mungane Wally Serote, dat zijn zo de de belangrijkste uit Zuid-Afrika. Kofi Awoonor uit Ghana, ja die heb ik nog vertaald Taban lo Liyong uit Oeganda en ja (ja) en dan ben ik dus na m'n Afrikaanse periode ben ik meer eh Engelstalige poëzie uit het Europese continent gaan vertalen, vooral Ieren.

VDK: Wel veel eh eh ik heb eigenlijk al vrij veel vertaald maar nog niet zo veel uitgegeven. Voor ... heb ik Borges vertaald, wel een stuk of vijftien... Ze kiezen daar dan uit. (he ja) Hetzelfde voor Seamus Heaney heb ik een tiental gedichten vertaald... voor het laatste voor het nieuwe nummer van de Poëziekrant heb ik een vijftiental gedichten van Dylan Thomas vertaald (oh!) en er een essay over geschreven. (em em) Dan die Eileen Ni Chuillenain (ja) voor Deus Ex Machina em dan gedichten van Saint Jean Pearse ook em, dan heb ik zo een aantal gedichten, allemaal verschillende ars poetica's van em diverse Franse auteurs... nu em wel eerstdaags verschijnt er een dichtbundel met een keuze van em ja een ruime keuze met gedichten van Anne Sexton... dat is een echte een eerste serieuze publicatie eigenlijk. Het zal em een driehonderdtal pagina's zijn hoor.

KH: Ja, de meeste vertalingen zijn in tijdschriften gepubliceerd en dat is heel divers voor Deus Ex Machina zelf dus een aantal Franstalige ook Duitstalige en één bundel van Rimbaud die ik vertaald heb en dan nu dus voor die anthologie ook eh. (PF: eh, ha)

CJ: Uit het Afrikaans heb ik poëzie vertaald van Daniel Hugo en Ina Rousseau en enfin eigenlijk nogal veel eh Zuid-Afrikaners. (PF: ja, wat?) En, en uit het Frans en Nederlands-Frans dus ik heb gedichten van Joris Iven, in het Frans vertaald en (ah) en van Frans Brocatus die zijn ook verschenen en van Sujata Bhatt in het Frans. (PF: ah! ehm) Dat is liefhebberij.

**Extract 2-2: selection of responses to question a2**

As can be gathered from these extracts, those interviewed have a wide range of interests as far as literatures are concerned. This stems both from personal initiative in translating as well as from the work they are commissioned to do. The data indicates that experience and reputation play a role here. Experienced and reputed translators often prefer to approach publishers with their own choices. There is a degree of negotiation involved as well as most translators have their preferences not only for certain poets but also for certain poems. Translators select poems that they consider to be typical of a certain poet and in the main do not avoid 'difficult' poems, though they do recognise that they may not succeed in translating them well enough in accordance with their own standards. Having said this, there is one point that all those interviewed are categorical about: they definitely prefer not to translate work they feel no empathy with. This does not mean that they will not accept the challenge to translate work with which they are unfamiliar and are willing to accept new challenges as this is considered as being part of the profession. Nonetheless, it is clear from the extracts above that none of the translators stick to one literature or to one language for that matter. EJ, IJ and NP express a preference for English literatures and especially Irish literature. WR and VDK express a preference for English literatures including Irish literature, whereas KH and CJ express other preferences including English literatures. The responses given to the first questions made the third question in section A redundant in certain ways, though not entirely.

#### **2.4.2.3. A3: Do you have a special affinity with Ireland?**

My purpose in asking this question was to determine whether an affinity with a certain country (in this case Ireland) would influence a literary translator's choice of material to translate. As was seen in the answers to a2, a preference for a certain language or literature did not prevent anyone from translating from other languages and literatures. The reason for this is quite matter of fact. It would prove difficult for any one translator to earn a living from translating from a single literature, though NP has gone a long way towards doing this and earned quite a reputation in doing so. Building a reputation requires time and patience and certainly involves spreading and developing one's resources and including work from other literatures and languages in order to keep the wolf from the door long enough to secure that reputation. It could be argued that monetary considerations do not apply to occasional translators as they already have a source of income. This is not entirely true, as an enhanced reputation may make a translator decide to become a full-time professional. Therefore, being known and having a reputation are important assets for all three subcategories but not only for financial reasons: here we can see clear examples of the importance of what Bourdieu (1992: 230) calls cultural and symbolic capital. Acquiring a reputation and being recognised for one's competence is not only transferable or explainable in monetary terms:

The position of a given agent in the social space can thus be defined by the position he occupies in the different fields, that is, in the distribution of the powers that are active in each of them. These are, principally, economic capital (in its different kinds), cultural capital and social capital, as well as symbolic capital, commonly called prestige, reputation, fame, etc.,

which is the form assumed by these different kinds of capital when they are perceived and recognised as legitimate. (Bourdieu 1992: 230)

However, such realities do temper the potential idealism of affinity with a country, as it is posed in the question, but do not do away with affinity entirely, as can be seen from the following extracts:

EJ: Nou omdat ik dat prachtige dichters vind het is een heel poëtisch land een grote poëtische productie mag ik het zo maar zeggen en ja de, de combinatie denk ik van mythologie en modern psychologisch inzicht wat je toch ook heel sterk bij, bij Yeats vind ik en bij Heaney.

Dus het is niet zomaar zweverig maar heel concreet en daar hou ik van ja ... ja ik ben er niet vaak geweest, drie keer. Ik vond het een prachtig land.

RW: Niet speciaal een voorkeur maar er is wel een bepaalde sfeer bij de Ierse dichters die totaal verschillend is van de Engelse dichters en van de Amerikaanse dichters zeker en die typische Ierse sfeer die trekt mij bijzonder aan. Die sfeer vind je niet alleen bij de dichter, vooral bij de dichters maar ook bij de prozaschrijvers en zelfs bij de Ierse schilderkunst die mij toch ook wel interesseerde en het was dat typisch Ierse gevoel dat mij bijzonder aanspreekt ja. (ja)

NP: Nu ook wel Engeland omdat ik daar ook lang gewoond heb maar met Ierland heb ik een speciale band omdat mijn vrouw Ierse was, mijn ex-vrouw omdat ik daar sinds '72 kwam eh, eh 's zomers, eh, en ik ben er toen in '87 vijf jaar gaan wonen om te kijken of dat kon dat, dat, dus met Ierland heb ik inderdaad wel een, een specialere band dan met andere landen maar de band met bepaalde dichters is natuurlijk het en dat, dat, dat met dat zijn dichters met wie ik affiniteit heb en dat kan ook Amerikanen zijn (ah ja) of Engelsen of Schotten (ja) maar goed met Ierland 'an sich' heb ik een speciale band maar ik heb er ook veel over geschreven.

IJ: Nu ik kende wel een aantal Ierse dichters eh em laat ons zeggen uit bloemlezingen en dergelijke en ik ben dan in 1996 uitgenodigd geweest op een poëziefestival in Dun Laoighaire, en in 1997 ben ik daar nog eens uitgenodigd geweest. Dat was voor mij dan wel een gelegenheid om persoonlijk ook kennis (ja) te maken met een aantal dichters en door dat ik dan in de rand van dat festival ook nog een Ierse vriendin heb leren kennen waren m'n bezoeken aan Ierland frequenter en frequenter (both laugh) en leerde ik dus ook meer dichters en schrijvers eh kennen (ja) en het feit dat je een mens ook persoonlijk kent ja dat motiveert toch ook om te vertalen. (ja) ja

VVDK: Ik ben daar toevallig terecht gekomen.

PF: Ja, toevallig?

VVDK: Ja, half toevallig om verder te studeren en dat ik daar kansen kreeg die ik hier in België niet had en als je daar woont voor mij toch is het maar doodnormaal dat je er dan ook in de literatuur van dat land gaat interesseren en ook heel veel gelezen was ik onder de indruk van heel veel goede poëzie zowel in het Engels als in het Iers en mijn kennis van het Iers is maar miniem dus al de vertalingen heb ik wel in samenwerking met eh ja "native speakers" gedaan en em eh ja het was een ontdekking voor mij en em dan ja als je vol bent van iets

em "waar het hart van vol is loopt de mond van over" dan wil je dat verder vertellen (ja) en en daar iets meer mee doen.

VDK: Ik heb een zus die in Ierland woont (ja) in em eh tegen Belfast (ah) dus we zijn er al geweest.

Eh, ik vind het een heel mooi land maar ik heb eigenlijk niet echt, weet je, ik ben van eh opleiding eigenlijk romanist dus eigenlijk ken ik eh de Angelsaksische literatuur echt niet goed. (em)

Dus ik lees wel en ik lees eh ja gewoon in het wilde weg zoveel mogelijk maar ik heb altijd het gevoel dat ik achterop hink omdat ik weinig bagage heb, in de Franse literatuur is het anders natuurlijk, maar eigenlijk doe ik veel liever, vertaal ik liever uit het Engels ja. (ja)

CJ: Band met Ierland, bedoel je?

PF: Ja, of een voorkeur voor een bepaald land? Of een literatuur van een bepaald land?

CJ: Ah, duidelijk Afrikaans en Frans maar ik lees heel graag Iers en ik ik hoor heel graag Ierse muziek (PF: eh, ha) dus maar ik kan niet zeggen.

PF: Ja. En en ben je ooit naar Ierland geweest? Nee?

BM: Neen, maar wel ... wel naar Schotland en dan in Schotland trekken mij de eilanden aan. (ja) Ik heb iets met eilanden. (ja) En eh ik ben met eh mijn oudste zoon eens in de zomer naar Ierland geweest en hij had heel mooie opnamen gemaakt. Ik denk, ja, 't is enigszins vergelijkbaar, denk ik (ja) beetje een woest landschap en al die kleuren van de zee, zelfs in 't noorden, echt zoveel kleuren in de lucht (ja) het wisselt. Het wisselt om de om de halve minuut (ja) of nog sneller (ja, ja) en dat, ik vind het prachtig (ah ha) en ik had eigenlijk al heel lang graag naar Ierland kunnen gaan. Maar ja, dat is zo.

Vakanties zijn, toen de kinderen klein waren, dan moet je warmte hebben en zon en strand en dan hebben we (ja) altijd gekozen voor Frankrijk en zo (ja) dan ben ik op een bepaald moment in mijn eentje naar Schotland gegaan (ja) ik denk, de Hebriden, dat is het aards paradijs, maar ik denk Ierland kan best vergelijkbaar zijn.

### Extract 2-3: selection of responses to question a3

An affinity with Ireland is phrased in these extracts mainly in terms of writers, especially among those who have lived there or visited the island regularly (esp. NP, VVDK & IJ). EJ sees Ireland as a beautiful country, a poetical land – as I understand it, he is not referring to the landscape but to the fact that Ireland has produced many poets – whose poets combine the mythological with a real sense of psychological insight and also a country that has produced a considerable amount of poetry. WR points to what he considers to be a special atmosphere pertaining to Irish cultural production. NP and IJ are even more specific in underlining their affinity with writers, whereas VVDK underlines her discovery when living in Ireland of a lot of fine writing. VDK is more hesitant to the extent that she somehow sees her former studies as standing in the way of or delaying her acquisition of knowledge of writing in English in general and Irish writing in particular. She is also wary of equating writers with the country or culture they come from and prefers to see them as individuals (see a3(sub2) in the same interview). Though BM has never been there, she casts Ireland as an earthly paradise



comparable to Scotland, full of changing light and colour, and elsewhere in her interview sees the landscape as being an important aspect of Dermot Healy's writing (see *br* in same interview), so much so that his characters could not belong in any other landscape. As can also be seen in some of the remarks above (*EJ*, *WR*, *VDK*, and *MD*), landscape and a certain atmosphere also seem to form part of people's perceptions of Irish cultural production. Though the question specifically sought responses regarding an affinity with Ireland, responses to other questions also provided data on attitudes towards Ireland or Irish culture. One can wonder to which extent such perceptions influence translation strategies – a topic tackled in the next chapter.

### **2.4.3. The Questionnaire, Section B – Translating as Such: tales from the workplace**

The data discussed in this section contain evidence of how translators go about their work. Among the key factors involved are:

1. The translators' professional relations with the field of translation;
2. Their place and stances within a network of professional practices;
3. Their views on language, writing, reading and relations with the writers and poets they translate.

#### **2.4.3.1. *Br*: How do you go about it?**

Initially, this was the part of the questionnaire that intrigued me the most, as it is arguably the topic most written about in translation studies. Though Descriptive Translation Studies outlawed the normative as in "this is the way you should translate", normativity never went away, viz. the vast body of work on norm theory. Norms are recognised as being part and parcel of translation and are studied as such. Next to this, over the last two decades, there has been criticism of hegemonic translation regimes from various quarters: post-colonial studies, gender studies, cultural studies, etc. In this respect, the normative has ironically reasserted itself in the form of what might be called 'counter-norms' (Bassnett & Trivedi 1999; Genzler 1993; Venuti 1998) or in a laudable advocacy of critically aware translation strategies that remain attentive to the politics of the translation situation, in the broadest sense of the term. Such things spring to mind when approaching translators with questions on how they actually translate. Next to these, there are approaches like 'think-aloud protocols' (Kussmaul 1993<sup>92</sup>, 1995<sup>93</sup>), the 'black box' theory or what happens in the translator's mind and other studies at the interface of language and mind that explore what translators do. Rather than adopt any of these approaches at this stage, I was content to explore the translators' responses to the above question and see what emerged from those responses. An analysis of their statements has allowed me to draw a couple of tentative conclusions. As the following extracts will illustrate, there is quite a degree of disparateness in the translators' **responses** which seemed to defy generalisation. A closer inspection did throw up patterns of approach held by all concerned:

EJ: Nou op een gegeven ogenblik lees ik iets van een bepaalde dichter en denk ik dat wil ik hebben, dat is voor mij. Het is een soort kannibalisme – je, je vreet het op en je maakt er een vertaling van en ook wil je het aan een ander laten zien kijk eens wat mooi zo. En ja dan begin ik daaraan en ik heb ook de gewoonte, als vertaler word je altijd ingepeperd door mensen die daar wetenschappelijk mee bezig zijn je moet eerst het hele werk lezen en dan pas ga je beginnen. Maar ik begin eerst omdat ik het avontuur wil vasthouden. Ja de spanning moet er in blijven. Ik heb een ontzettende hekel aan om me te vervelen dus ik eh ja ik begin dus bij het begin en dan moet ik vaak veranderen want dan blijkt, uit het vervolg blijkt dat ik verkeerd vertaald heb maar ik wil dus die spanning behouden (eh, ja).

En, ja dat is mijn enige methode eigenlijk. Ik zou ja ik zou zeggen "all you need is love, and a good dictionary" natuurlijk – laughs.

PF: En als je dan een dichter begint te vertalen hoe doe je dat dan? Lees je dat grondig eerst of begin je zomaar te vertalen?

RW: Dat hangt er vanaf of het dus een dichter is die ik uit eigen initiatief ga vertalen ofwel of het een opdracht is.

Wanneer het een dichter is die ik uit eigen initiatief ga vertalen dan lees ik meestal een hele bundel eerst zonder aan vertalingen te denken en het is pas wanneer een gedicht mij bijzonder treft dat ik denk God daar wil ik toch heel diep op ingaan en dat spreekt mij bijzonder aan dan ga ik het herlezen met de bedoeling van: kan ik het vertalen? (ah, ja) Wanneer er iets inzit van: ik denk God ja dit is te moeilijk dit kan ik nooit tot een goed einde brengen dan geef ik het op en dan ga ik dan soms naar een ander gedicht dat mij wat gemakkelijker lijkt waarvan ik denk ja daar zitten nog wel problemen in maar daar kom ik wel uit (ja).

NP: ... Ik heb het gedicht gelezen, ik heb een bepaalde eerste impressie daarvan ja of het moet een gedicht zijn dat ik al jaren ken maar stel dat ik een eerste impressie heb dan wil ik eigenlijk het liefst een hele snelle eerste versie hebben omdat ik die toon en die visie op dat gedicht eh, eh onbeschadigd wil laten en daarna ga ik kijken dan laat ik desnoods wel eens een woord open of zet ik vraagtekens of zet ik nog twee of drie keuzes naast elkaar (ah, ha) maar ik wil die directe die directe lezing van het gedicht die directe opinie wil ik hebben (ah) als ik daar zeker van ben dat die daar staat, dan ga ik analyseren, zowel voor een Engelstalig gedicht dat ga ik dus niet analyseren voor die tijd (ah) dat ga ik analyseren daarna (eh ha) en dan kom ik natuurlijk ook op andere zaken maar dan heb ik die, die basis dan (ja, dus je moet eerst) ja maar dat kan alleen nu na 25 jaar vertalen (ah ja) omdat ik dat vertrouw omdat ik vertrouw (ja) dat ik dat kan in eerste instantie.

IJ: ... Eerst een letterlijke vertaling maken en dan een literaire waarbij dat ik denk dat in de eerste fase eh de, gewoon vertalen denk ik is de kennis van de brontaal essentieel (ja) maar in het literaire vertalen denk ik is wat daar dan vooral een rol begint te spelen is de kennis van de doeltaal, namelijk je moet een grote kennis hebben van alle mogelijkheden die de doeltaal heeft om het origineel te benaderen (ja, ja) en kennis van de ja laat ons zeggen van poëtische technieken. Je moet eigenlijk een dichter heel goed begrijpen om hem goed te kunnen vertalen, denk ik. Je moet weten wat is prioritair voor die dichter en daaraan je je vertaalprocédé aanpassen. Dus ik vermoed dat ik toch nog altijd begin met een quasi gewoon prozaische gewone vertaling. (en, en, eh) Althans in m'n hoofd, misschien schrijf ik ze niet (ja) altijd uit maar dan heb ik ze toch in mijn hoofd gemaakt en

maak ik al een literairdere variant terwijl ik het uitschrijf. (ja) Ik denk heel in het begin is het toch een gewone, gewone vertaling tenzij dat het echt om moeilijke poëzie gaat. Ik heb bijvoorbeeld gedichten vertaald van Wole Soyinka, die Nigeriaanse Nobelprijswinnaar. Dat is dan zo moeilijke poëzie dat je ze niet kan vertalen, dat je al meteen moet beginnen interpreteren en dergelijke en dan loopt, het loopt de eh de gewone vertaling en de literaire vertaling lopen dan door door elkaar. Dan moet je ze samen doen denk ik. Maar (maar) normalerwijs start ik vanuit doe je het zo.

And also in b1 (sub1) IJ: Ik denk het wat vooral eh belangrijk is is denk ik elke dichter heeft zijn adem, heeft, dat is niet een metrum maar het is een (ja ja, ja) een adem en ik denk het is belangrijk om die adem te die adem moet je gegrepen hebben denk ik voordat je begint te vertalen want die adem moet ook in de vertaling mee.

PF: Dus eh eigenlijk vertaal je de adem van de dichter, bij wijze van spreken.

IJ: Ja, ja dat staat toch want als ik dan zeg enfin want ik begin na de letterlijke vertaling literair te vertalen dan denk ik is dat de essentie dat ik in het Nederlands moet de adem van die dichter klinken of resoneren zoals hij in zijn eigen taal resoneert (ah) dat eh ja en dat leidt dan tot allerhande ingrepen waarbij dat je het, de letterlijke vertaling enigszins verlaat.

VVDK: Het begint met te lezen en te herlezen en te herlezen en zeker als het dan over de Ierse taal gaat om eh de, als er een Engelse versie is, de Engelse versie naast de Ierse versie te lezen in detail en voor mij komt er dan natuurlijk ook een woordenboek bij te pas voor het Iers. Maar dan, ik denk dat ik eerder met een parafraze begin, of soms bepaalde zinnen die eruit springen waar je onmiddellijk een equivalent voor voelt in het Nederlands (ja) en dan is het eh zo ja het is moeilijk te beschrijven ja je begint er gewoon aan en je leest een regel en eh ik denk dat ik het meeste geleid word door em het ritme van een gedicht dat is het eerste wat, dat is wat ik het belangrijkste vind om over te brengen als je het ritme kan overbrengen naar de andere taal (eh em) em dan op simplistische manier gezegd dan volgt de rest vanzelf (eh, ha) maar als je het ritme niet kan vinden in een andere taal dan gaat het gewoon niet, een vertaling en.

VDK: Eerst lezen - laughs - (allez eerst lezen) en.

VDK: En dan probeer je meer te weten te komen over de dichter zelf.

Dus als die nog leeft eh dan kun je eventueel eh contact opnemen maar ik probeer dat zo veel mogelijk te vermijden omdat ik er vanuit ga als je een gedicht leest dan ben je ook alleen en uiteindelijk ben je als vertaler ook in de eerste plaats lezer en dan heb je jouw interpretatie en ik vind dat ja dat daar een zekere vrijheid moet kunnen bestaan dus.

Behalve, er is een verschil tussen interpreteren en echt met bepaalde zinnen, voor een bepaalde zin staan waar je helemaal niet weet waarover hij het heeft dan moet je natuurlijk, dan moet je contact opnemen dan (maar dat was mijn volgende vraag) ja.

CJ: Poëzie of proza?

PF: Ja dan.

CJ: Er is een groot verschil enfin bij mij toch (PF: ja, ja). Als het poëzie is dan begin ik met potlood A-B, A-B (PF: ja) onderstrepen, eh em lettergrepen tellen, je maakt eerst helemaal de, hoe moet ik zeggen, de

morfologische analyse van dat gedicht. (PF: ja) Dan ga je zien of je dat in het Nederlands kunt benaderen. Als het lukt bijvoorbeeld uit het Afrikaans is dat heel moeilijk omdat de vervoeging daar heel anders is dus daar zit je hoe dan ook altijd met met langere verzen omdat er meer lettergrepen zijn dus daar zit je al met dat probleem maar goed, maar dan dat is voor straks ik heb er dan met de dichter over gesproken die vond dat nu juist mooier in het Nederlands omdat het dan vloeiender en zangeriger wordt. (PF: ah ha) Terwijl hij vindt dat het in het Afrikaans nogal sec (makes a chopping movement with her hand) is nogal kort is. (PF: eh, ja) Dus dat is mijn methode om, om gedichten, in ieder geval en dan ja bij woorden ga je dan aan de slag met je synoniemenwoordenboek om te zien eh het gaat dan vooral om zo goed mogelijk de connotaties weer te geven want "er staat niet wat er staat," he.

PF: Ja, want je zegt nu een woord, connotatie is dat (CJ: dat is heel belangrijk) ja dus je hebt bij een connotatie minstens twee betekenissen. (CJ: ja)

CJ: Ben je aan het interpreteren ook?

PF: Ja, ja maar je hebt dus eh em dus zoals Heaney zegt, hij gebruikt een begrip uit de oorlog dus "depth charges" noemt hij dat als je zo een onderzeeër wilt raken smijt je iets overboord en, en dat explodeert in de diepte en dat gaat in alle richtingen uit. Zo hij ziet, een gedicht doet dat, je leest iets en dat zet zo explosies af ontketent een reeks explosies in uw bewustzijn.

CJ: Ja, dat is juist.

KH: Daarom voor mij is het ontzettend belangrijk dat ik mijn eerste indruk meteen op papier zet.

Dat heb ik gemerkt in de poëzievertaalworkshop dat iedereen dat had die met gedichten bezig was.

Dus ik lees een gedicht en ik begin niet meteen in een woordenboek te zoeken of ik alle woorden wel wel begrijp (ja) maar d'er komt een eerste versie waarin die het gevoel dat het gedicht bij eerste lezing bij jou oproept meteen ook in het Nederlands omzet. Dan heb je dus al een soort onbewuste keuze, (PF: ja) woordkeuze en dan pas dan begin ik op te zoeken de woorden die ik niet begrijp dus. In de eerste versie staan er dus kruisjes of lege plekken (PF: ja) maar ik probeer over te brengen wat er, wat de explosies.

And also in c1 (subl) KH: Maar ik blijf er bij wat ik daarnet ook zei voor poëzievertalingen zeker dat de eerste indruk belangrijk is omdat je in die zin je niet vooringenomen mag zijn tussen aanhalingstekens door al wat je al gelezen hebt en wat je van die schrijver weet (PF: ja) dat je echt je eerste indruk op papier zet en pas achteraf jezelf documenteert en nagaat wat kan d'r allemaal aan betekenissen achterzitten.

CP: Dat hangt er vanaf uiteraard eh chi, ssh (hesitates). Ik bedoel sheeush. Ja je zou eigenlijk een concreet iets moeten nemen eh, em laat ons zeggen eh ik wil een sonnet van Shakespeare vertalen dan ga ik eerst alle uitgaven van Shakespeare bekijken en alle commentaren lezen en er naast leggen en fotokopiëren enzovoort om te weten waarover dat gaat. Dus bij Shakespeare is het bijvoorbeeld zo dat, dat Engels niet meer ons Engels is en dat bijna bij alle woorden een andere betekenis hebben dus inderdaad dan ga je in de lexica kijken en bij de commentaren tot dat je dat ongeveer hebt en dan em psst ja psst dat, dat weet ik nu ik weet hoe een Shakespeareaans sonnet in elkaar zit, dus ik heb dat in mijn hoofd eh hoe die kwatrijnen moeten rijmen en hoe daar een slotregel is enzovoort dus ja dat is iets wat je, wat je als routine al hebt als je veel poëzie hebt vertaald. Dus je weet uiteraard dat dat jamben zijn en je weet ook hoe die rijmen zullen zitten. Eh je weet ook wel ongeveer wat de moeilijkheid zal zijn wat ik daarnet zei dat het uitdijt in het in het Nederlands dus dat je echt naar de korte woordjes zult moeten zoeken en inderdaad wat misschien bij Shakespeare een beetje vulsel is

maar eh maar het is moeilijk bij Shakespeare vulsel te vinden hoor dat je dat toch misschien beter eruit laat en dan ja dan doe ik het eh doe ik het regel per regel en dan het rijm is een beetje moeilijk in het Nederlands zoals ik al zei.

**Extract 2-4: selection of responses to question b1**

The struggle of the researcher was to lay bare and attempt to articulate the commonality in the disparateness and richness of expression regarding the act of translating evident in the above extracts. I found myself grasping for circumscriptions, for terms like ‘immediacy of engagement’, for a phrase that would encapsulate expressions like ‘cannibalism’, ‘adventure’, ‘fear of boredom’ (EJ), ‘deep impression’ (WR), ‘an undamaged first impression’ (NP), ‘the poet’s breath’ (IJ), ‘the rhythm’ (VDK), ‘your freedom as a reader’ (VDK), ‘finding connotation’, ‘what’s there isn’t there’ (CJ), ‘the first impression’ (KH). All translators begin by reading, but what does this mean? It would seem that in EJ’s case for example, translation begins almost on reading the very first line, which involves going back and adjusting all ‘mis-readings’ – something he prefers and finds no difficulty in doing. So perhaps ‘first impression’ is the common denominator after all as it brings together attempts to capture ‘breath’ and ‘rhythm’, ‘the freedom of the reader’, being ‘deeply impressed’ by a poem and hence translating it, ‘a fear of boredom’, a desire ‘to consume and possess’ and other statements made in the extracts above. KH stresses that getting a first impression down on paper is common practice at translation workshops. Gaining a first impression involves both the act of contextualising the poem in question and entextualising it for the first time in the new language, in giving it material form with varying degrees of urgency. This, it would seem, is a vital first step after which various stages of analysis and adjustment can take place. Without this first impression no valid translation can take place. It involves the physical act of writing something down in a language other than one you began reading in. This involves leaving gaps and open spaces in lines, exploring, eliminating and reducing possibilities in the margins, working ‘literally’ – in the word-for-word sense – as an initial stage in a process of turning something into ‘literature’, paraphrasing, grasping the more salient things first, etc. It involves the oscillatory action of both recognising and constructing what Bakhtin (Bakhtin 1990<sup>94</sup>) would call an utterance (poem) and it is only within the unity of this utterance that its various facets can take form in relation to each other, or as one translator put it: “the ultimate norm is that it has to be a poem in Dutch,” something on which all those interviewed agree<sup>95</sup>. This does not mean that there is agreement across the board on what constitutes a poem in Dutch – a matter that will be discussed in the next section of this chapter (see chap. 2-5 below). But there is clearly an expressed desire to make a poem in Dutch by using the material of the original poem and we have to take this desire seriously if this is the norm they set themselves. So perhaps we could equate the notion of ‘first impression’ with the recognition that there is a particular utterance – in this case a poem – and the gaps and try-outs in the margin provide us with physical evidence of recognition that the composition of the utterance needs closer attention. It is also proof that none of those interviewed ever translate something in one sitting. By the very act of

committing the first impression to paper or word processor, the ‘new utterance in the making’ has been given a structure that resembles the original but which from that moment on is also mediated by similar utterances (poems) in the target language – in this case Dutch. It is not yet finished and will not be for a while. These steps merge into each other so imperceptibly that they become invisible, but I consider it important to stress again the material aspect of this process. In this respect, equivalence is indeed not framed by (potential) relations between lexical items and phrases across languages (as has already been pointed out by translation scholars – see Kenny quote at the beginning of chapter 1) but by the internal and external ‘logic’ (functionalist and formalist concerns at one and the same time) of a specific utterance (poem) and not in absolute terms but in those perceived by the translator:

If we tear an utterance out of social intercourse and materialise it, we lose the organic unity of all its elements. The word, grammatical form, sentence, and all linguistic definiteness in general taken in abstraction from the concrete historical utterance turn into technical signs of a meaning that is as yet only possible and still not individualised historically. The organic connection of meaning and sign cannot become lexical, grammatically stable, and fixed in identical and reproducible forms, i.e. cannot in itself become a sign or constant element of a sign, cannot become grammaticalized. This connection is created only to be destroyed, to be reformed again, but in new forms under the conditions of a new utterance. (Medvedev & Bakhtin 1978<sup>96</sup>: 121)

Similarly we can witness a scenario of work and amendment emergent in the data that comprise acts of formulating in response to the process of meaning discovery in reading that forms part of translational practice. So the translator responds to the original poem and his or her response involves rendering it in another language (see the notion of metatext<sup>97</sup> as used by Van Gorp et al. 1986: 251), an act of translation that takes place in more than one phase and which is fraught with danger and doubt or as one translator put it:

HJ: Ik denk dat dat bij proza iets minder het geval is omdat poëzie vaak zo gecondenseerd is iets kan veranderen door één woord, of door één komma, zeg maar. (ja, ja) Er is allez alles ontstaat vanuit dat gedicht of zou opnieuw moeten ontstaan vanuit het (ja) gedicht vanuit dat vertaalde gedicht (ja, ja) en dat maakt het zo kritisch ook als ge één woord door een ander vervangt dan kan dat soms iets totaal anders teweeg brengen. (in d2 (sub1))

#### **Extract 2-5: selection relating to the difficulty of making translational decisions**

The urgency and immediacy of committing this first impression to paper or whatever medium, of giving it its first material form then gives way to the importance of time or duration (pointed out by all those interviewed), as can be gathered from the following extracts:

RW: Dat moest dan onder een enorme tijdsdruk, heel snel gebeuren en de kwaliteit van de vertalingen liet daarbij te wensen over gaf ik mij wel rekenschap van. Want dat kun je niet zo. Vertalen kun je niet snel. Kan nooit snel. (em dus...)

Ik werk ja ik doe het dus meestal in twee, drie keer meestal meestal in drie keer (em) dus, eerst een snelle vertaling maken die ik wegleg en na verloop van tijd sta je tegenover die vertaling als een vreemde. En dan kun je duidelijk zien wat je allemaal fout hebt gemaakt. (ja)

Dan herwerk ik die vertaling en dan leg ik die weer weg (ja) en dan de derde keer bekijk ik het en dan vind ik nog dingen. (ja) **(in b3)**

PF: Maar soms alle dichtbundels worden in elkaar gestoken en soms is het niet altijd duidelijk wat het verband is tussen gedicht nummer één en gedicht nummer twintig bijvoorbeeld alhoewel dat ze in hetzelfde bundel zitten maar de recensent leest daar dingen in (ja, ja) die soms misschien wel daarin zitten of weet ik niet ik weet het niet.

NP: Dan moet je achteraf dat toch zelf ook kunnen maar als ja, die deadlines worden steeds strikter met "Vereffeningen" was dat helemaal erg natuurlijk (ja) maar dan heb je soms de tijd niet om het even te laten bezinken en afstand te nemen en dan zelf te kunnen zien dat de toon in je vertaling dan scheef zit tussen het gedicht één en twintig dat zou kunnen. (ja maar ja) Het hangt er een beetje van af eh of er ook één toon is, in de Vereffeningen wel maar bijvoorbeeld in de "Verjaardagsbrieven" van Hughes niet, daar zitten drie types gedichten in nou ja er is de anekdotische, de Sylvia-Plathachtige, (ja) de filosofische en de ja enzovoort en die moet je dus steeds anders vertalen en dan is het wel goed om het per gedicht te doen. (ja OK) Maar ja dat is, ik doe het liefst per gedicht (maar ja het kan niet altijd) maar niet altijd nee, nee. **(in ensuing conversation)**

IJ: Eh ja ik doe het nooit in één beweging eh wel nooit ik heb eh maar ik denk dat heeft te maken met de dichterlijke praktijk.

Ik schrijf ook nooit een eigen gedicht of zeer zelden een eigen gedicht in één beweging, bijna nooit.

Meestal werk ik denk ik een half jaar tot één jaar aan een gedicht zo met tussenpauzen: ik laat het liggen, ik neem het terug, ik laat het liggen, ik neem het terug enzovoort (gelijk Robert Graves, hij deed dat ook, ja) ja ja eh en eh en eigenlijk en vaak is het eindpunt van dat dus ik eh.

In het begin is dat vrij intensief en dat dat vermindert (eh ha) omdat het na een tijd toch wel goed begint te zitten en zo is het met vertalingen net zo.

(ja) Ja ik denk de vertalingen van Paula Mehan die heb ik gemaakt, dus de eerste vertalingen dateren van eh '98 en die worden nu dus voor het eerst gepubliceerd dat is dus na drie jaar (ah oh o.k.), ja.

PF: Ja, dus je doet daar veel tijd over. (ja)

IJ: Dus laat ons zeggen die laatste twee jaar heb ik soms nog eens iets veranderd. (ah ja)

Maar in die dat eerste jaar heb ik verscheidene versies (maar beslis je zelf?) en die hebben allemaal te maken met het benaderen van de adem. **(in b3 (sub1))**

VVDK: Eh, eh laten liggen (both laugh) en em (ja) een dag later terugkeren of een week later en, en dan ga ik soms ook met mensen praten. **(in b2)**

VDK: En dan ja meestal als ik dan mijn eerste versie klaar heb dan laat ik dat een week of twee, drie vier liggen (ja) het hangt er vanaf wanneer het moet binnengebracht worden (ja) en dan maak ik een nieuwe versie

meestal lijkt die niet meer op die eerste versie of ja soms soms kan dat wel heel erg verschillen zie je dingen die je in het begin helemaal niet gezien hebt.

Daarvoor ik vind echt elke tekst moet rijpen eh (ja dat is een noodzaak, dus?) ja. **(in b2)**

PF: Kan je daar een beetje over vertellen. Is dat afstand?

KH: Het is belangrijk.

PF: Het is belangrijk.

KH: Zeker voor poëzievertalingen.

CJ: Ja.

KH: Ik denk nog belangrijker dan dan voor prozavertalingen.

CJ: Ik vind voor de twee.

KH: Ja ja misschien wel.

PF: Maar de afstand is duidelijk nodig.

(KH: ja, ja)

CJ: Eigenlijk in het beste geval denk ik dat je als vertaler zou moeten kunnen doen wat je als schrijver doet namelijk een hoofdstuk eventjes laten liggen en er dan later eens helemaal opnieuw naar kijken en vertimmeren maar ja die die die kans krijg je niet eh.

KH: Ook al in functie van het geheel als je een roman vertaalt op het einde weet je meer dan in het begin eh dus eigenlijk zou je dan alles nog eens helemaal door moeten nemen (CJ: Ja) en als je daar tijd voor hebt dan doe je dat ook. **(in c1)**

BM: Je moet dus ook de nodige afstand nemen.

Want als je er te dicht met je neus op zit, zie je zie je bepaalde zaken niet die je slecht gedaan hebt en zo (ah) en eh (ja, ja) soms, soms probeer je te geforceerd te schrijven en dat moet eh als het heel gewoon of vlot moet klinken en je schudt niet zo een hele gewone vlotte zin meteen uit je mouw, dan moet je daaraan werken tot de indruk wel is eh van: dat is dat klinkt vanzelf zo (ah ha) maar dat is soms het resultaat van veel, veel schrappen en, en doen, en daar moet je tijd voor hebben, maar dat viel bij die uitgeverij best mee. **(in b4)**

CP: Ja dus ik eh eh voor dichtvertalingen laat ik ja, ook voor prozavertalingen trouwens, laat ik alles in principe, maak ik alles dus een eerste keer.

Ben ik misschien min of meer tevreden over, ik leg het weg en na een maand na twee maanden bekijk ik het nog eens ik zet het op de computer, ik, ik herneem het ontelbare keren dus ik bedoel Rimbaud bijvoorbeeld de eerste versies van de gedichten van Rimbaud die zijn veertig jaar oud (wel dat is tamelijk, wel er werd tamelijk wat gelezen?)

Ja. Ja ik bedoel als ik nu - ik heb ik heb de hele Rimbaud vertaald - als ik die nu weer bekijk dan weet ik dat ik daar toch weer veranderingen zou in aanbrengen.

(‘t Is nooit af) Nee dat is echt nooit ach wel sommige gedichten wel hoor. (ja) Maar ja als je weer eens met een fris oog kijkt en ook bijvoorbeeld de taal evolueert heel sterk.

Nederlands is een taal die sterk evolueert dus inderdaad sommige dingen ver; verouderen dus.



Bijvoorbeeld de gij-vorm is was dertig jaar geleden niet verouderd is het nu wel dus dat moet veranderen dat moet aangepast worden (ah ja). (in b1 (sub3))

#### **Extract 2-6: selection on the importance of time and duration in translating**

Most of the translators believe that, generally speaking, publishers provide enough time to translate poetry, from which we can gather that they too recognise the importance of having enough time to translate a given work. On the other hand, they do not think this is the case for prose and the more recent practice of launching a work in several languages at once puts translators under extra pressure (see discussion of replies to b4 below); But what emerges from the above extracts (both data extracts relating to ‘first impression’ and ‘the importance of time’) is indeed that the initial urgency is followed by interrupted periods of attention, which implies that translation is a sequentially accomplished process involving various stages of entextualisation (Silverstein & Urban 1996). The translators often express this second phase of the process in terms of distance, of having to take distance from a particular poem or collection of poems. It would seem that various goals are achieved at this stage: **a**) exhausting and limiting possible meaning (e.g. filling in the remaining gaps in lines, etc.); **b**) making the text ‘more’ Dutch<sup>98</sup>; **c**) re-adjusting **a** and **b** with respect to each other. Distancing oneself from a particular work or collection allows one to approach it again with ‘fresh eyes.’ It allows one re-read and perhaps detect misreadings or what translators call ‘clear mistakes’. It also allows one to begin to read the translation for its own sake as a work of its own and adjust it in terms of the genre it is understood to belong to in the language concerned.

To conclude, it would seem, therefore, that ‘first impression’ and ‘time and distance’ (distance being a metaphor of time in this case) are two important factors in the translation process as far as the those interviewed are concerned and that their norm (both in translatorial and translational terms) is that their translations of poems should also become poems in Dutch.

#### **2.4.3.2. B2: What do you do when you are stuck for a word/reference?**

The extracts below report instances of consultation and cooperation among translators and between translators and others. They also show that consultation and cooperation take place both with respect to the source text and to the target text:

EJ: Ja, ja, dan moet ik dan ga ik naar andere boeken en af en toe heel af en toe raadpleeg ik iemand ja die er meer van afweet van een bepaald onderwerp.

(and in b2 (sub1)) EJ: Nou neen dat doe ik eigenlijk nooit ik heb Maartje Traag wel eens geconsulteerd dat is een een kenner van het Keltisch, zij was hoogleraar zij is heel oud geworden maar zij is toch gestorven intussen eh ook over de uitspraak van eh Ierse woorden, Ierse namen want dat is vaak ja moeilijk ja (ja).

RW: Wanneer ik er niet aan uit kan wanneer ik het dus niet via het woordenboek vind wanneer ik het niet vind via laat ons zeggen de intuïtie of de eigen taalgevoeligheid dat ik denk: ja ik loop kans dat ik het verkeerd doe

of ik begrijp het gewoon niet, dat kan ook gebeuren, eh dan, dan ga ik bij iemand te rade liefst dan iemand van dit taalgebied.

NP: Ja, dan ga ik bellen eerst zoeken of bellend. Ik heb voldoende research-lieden in Ierland.  
Vroeger had ik mijn ex ... (ja je gaat te rade bij vrienden) bij vrienden of ik kan het ook vaak wel opzoeken ...

IJ: Ja, ja, ja dan eh ja, ja, ja dus daar heb ik een hele - laughs - ja, dus naast woordenboeken, heb ik ook allerhande Engelse verklarende woordenboeken (ja) natuurlijk maar ook synoniemenwoordenboeken in het Nederlands, dat is ook belangrijk vaak om vaak is eh meestal is het niet moeilijk niet zo moeilijk om een uitdrukking in een andere taal over te brengen maar de juiste uitdrukking in de eigen taal te vinden, dat vind ik eh. (ja) Dus ook synoniemenwoordenboeken en dergelijke maak ik gebruik van.  
Eh de beste bron is altijd de dichter zelf ...

VVDK: En dan ga ik soms ook met mensen praten. Em in Ierland zeker heb ik een paar goede vrienden die ook met poëzie bezig zijn met, met wie we soms een uur lang over eenzelfde gedicht praten (ja) en eh ik denk dat als je een vertaalprobleem hebt is het niet zozeer van hoe vertaal ik het is niet zozeer een probleem van een equivalent te vinden in het Nederlands maar om, om de meerdere betekenissen die er zijn bepaalde aspecten, bepaalde kleuren die je niet letterlijk kan, kan overnemen (ja) omdat dat je moet een omweg vinden om op hetzelfde punt uit te komen en dan praten over een gedicht of ergens met andere mensen overleggen, ongeacht het feit of zij de Nederlandse taal kennen of niet maar meer om ergens andere perspectieven te zien van eenzelfde beeld en dat je dan zo em een uitweg vindt voor het vertalen (ah ja, dus niet louter taalkundig dan?)  
Nee wel. Ik gebruik ook soms wel eens een synoniemenwoordenboek (eh), dat is soms wel handig, bepaalde dingen waar je soms gewoon niet opkomt.

VVDK: Ja, ja neen neen dat mag je nooit zien dat het om een vertaling gaat dus em.  
Je moet proberen van Nederlands te schrijven maar eh dus eh maar dat is natuurlijk voor mij niet altijd evident ja want ja Engels is pas mijn derde taal en soms voel ik niet genoeg aan of denk ik eh of een bepaalde uitdrukking echt idiomatisch Engels is of dat dat ook in het Engels al een gezochte constructie is dat daar en dat is wel moeilijk (ja) want als je idiomatisch Engels moet je gewoon door idiomatisch Nederlands vertalen. Maar als het een bewust een stijlfiguur is dat die zelf heeft gemaakt of eh een woordspeling of ja dan ja dus daarom ik laat het altijd nalezen door verschillende mensen. Ook door native Engelse vertalers jaa ja. (ah ja)  
PF: En dus stel dat je. Kan je beroep doen op kennissen?

VVDK: Ja ja dus Marijke bijvoorbeeld die nu in Amerika, wij lezen altijd elkaars teksten. Wel niet alles de teksten die belangrijk zijn dus romans, literaire teksten zal ik zeggen, niet non-fictie daar moeten we zelf omdat ja je moet elkaars handje niet heel de tijd vasthouden maar, maar met poëzie ik laat haar dat elke keer nalezen.

HJ: Sowieso woordenboeken, alles opzoeken. (ja) Ik denk dat een doorsnee-gedicht dat je vertaalt dat ik daar bijna alle woorden van, van zoek sowieso, om zoveel mogelijk informatie (ja) te hebben (ja) over dat woord en wat de mogelijke associaties (ja) zijn dan natuurlijk ehm 'native speakers' consulteren (ja) als dat mogelijk is als je het echt niet weet en dan nog denk ik dat ge sowieso veel verliest.

PF: Mijn volgende vraag gaat ook, het is ook een soort technische vraag eigenlijk, als jullie eh ja een bepaald woord of uitdrukking niet vinden eh of niet verstaan of als er problemen zijn, wat doe je?

Grijp je naar de woordenboeken?

Eh, bel je?

Reply B2 & B3.

CJ: Dat sowieso.

KH: Ja.

PF: Ja, sowieso.

CJ: Uiteraard, maar dat is dikwijls niet genoeg eh, dan bellen we mekaar dat is ook altijd heel handig dan gaan wij in encyclopedieën opzoeken.

KH: Ja en als je.

CJ: Internet.

#### Extract 2-7: selection of responses to question b2

Either the translators consult native speakers of the language they are translating out of or others who possess 'native,' academic or otherwise trustworthy knowledge of the field, culture, society or particular item related to the translation in question. They also consult others about their translations and have them read and commented on them. So next to the importance of having good reference works of all types at one's disposal, we see here how translators also draw on and maintain networks of friends, colleagues and experts in practising their profession. The translators also provide particular illustrations examples of how 'native' or 'expert' knowledge is important for their work (e.g. see EJ's discussion of trolleys in Hull as an instance of misreading in c1; NP exposé on how hedge and ditch mean different things to different people, depending on the country you are living in a3(sub1); CJ and KH on their search for the names of the various parts of a guillotine in b2 & b3). But perhaps the following extract is the most telling:

CJ: Dat zijn allemaal gepassioneerde gekken die dus alles doen om dat eh zo goed mogelijk.

KH: Dat denk ik ook ja, ja, dat merk je ook aan de discussies ook.

CJ: Jaa.

KH: En als je met een probleem zit eh en je gaat ervoor te rade bij collega's die zijn bij wijze van spreken altijd bereid (CJ: ja) om je te helpen en om mee te zoeken omdat (CJ: ja) ze weten hoe frustrerend het is als je voor iets geen oplossing vindt. (PF: ja, ah, ha, ja)

PF: Dus dat is aangaande je krijgt altijd een respons als je dat vraagt.

CJ: Ja, ja, ik mag niet zeggen dat ik ooit niet dat er oplossingen (KH: ja dat is waar) binnenkomen waarvan je zegt van ach dat was het maar de inspanning van iedereen om je te helpen dat is wel ja zeer reëel.

PF: Dat vind ik ook heel belangrijk als gegeven, eh, eh.

KH: Daarvoor zijn die vertalershuizen ook zo ontzettend belangrijk eh. Daar die ontmoetingsplaatsen die daar gecreëerd worden die dienen hoofdzakelijk om ervaringen uit te wisselen en om elkaar te helpen als je niet

verder kunt en om contacten te leggen zodanig dat als je daarna thuis zit en je zit met een probleem dat je dan die mensen die je daar hebt leren ook kunt consulteren. (PF: ja) (d1 sub2)

PF: En hecht je daar veel belang aan dus dat dus onderhoud je die relaties om die dingen dus het is belangrijk voor u?

CJ: Wel, je moet een netwerk hebben je moet een soort support hebben, eh (PF: ja) van mensen die je kunt mailen meestal dat is meestal mailen (PF: ja) en voor Sujata Bhat toen ik die in het Frans vertaalde heb ik samengewerkt met een Belgische dichteres Caroline La Marche die zelf ook dichteres is.

KH: En er zijn ook fora op internet he waar je dingen kunt vragen eh.

CJ: Kunt vragen eh ja. (in b2 & b3)

#### **Extract 2-8: responses illustrating networks of expertise**

Here we have a clear indication that, though translation seems a solitary occupation and that the translator holds the ultimate responsibility for the quality of his or her work, translators remain open to requests for cooperation and consultation and keep such lines of communication open as they form an important aspect of their profession.

#### **2.4.3.3. B3: Do you work closely with the poets you translate?**

The following extracts provide clear instances of translators working together with poets and writers but one can also notice a certain amount of reserve when it comes to contacting the author or consulting him or her too frequently. This reserve mainly stems from a wish to maintain a degree of autonomy but also forms a display of translational competence:

EJ: Ja wat hier? (want anders ...) Do you consult people? Do you work closely with poets?

EJ: Ja (ja). Ja, als het geval zich voordoet.

RW: Dat is een, een paar keer gebeurd meestal niet nee, meestal totaal los, soms werk ik zelfs zonder dat hij het weet, vertaal ik hem. Dat kan gebeuren ook. Meest, meestal heb ik dus een vertaling gemaakt in opdracht.

NP: Het is zelfs zo, Matthew (Sweeney) vindt dat ik het te weinig doe maar dat komt omdat het zo, zo duidelijk voor mij is (ah ja) die, die, die monoloog maar die, die zou eigenlijk wel willen dat ik wat meer aan hem vroeg (ah ja) maar ik doe het meeste doe ik wel met Heaney, Sweeney, maar ja Kavanagh is dood (ja, Kavanagh is dood ja) dan ga ik wel eens naar Antoinette hoe heet ze ook al weer (ja) die het grote boek over Kavanagh gepubliceerd heeft op eh Trinity College, ik weet niet meer hoe ze heet maar die is heel (Kinnelly?) nee die is het niet die ken ik ook nee Antoinette ik ben haar achternaam even kwijt die heeft voor de Penguin the Selected Poems (ah ja) samengesteld (oh ja) en zij heeft een grote studie. Montague vraag ik zelf; Mahon is niet zo benaderbaar, ja Muldoon ga ik niet meer mee verder want dat is niet meer te vertalen tegenwoordig (emphatic but kind) Sweeney, Hartnett kende ik (and what about eh Paul Durcan?) die heb ik niet vertaald ja een paar gedichten

(and in d2-reprise) Er zit echt "Seeing Things", dat is er de helft van (ja), dat is gelijktijdig verschenen met "Vereffeningen" in het Nederlands. Maar Seamus Heaney die bleef dingen sturen. Het begon met een manuscript

waarvan tien gedichten uiteindelijk vervangen werden en niet in het manuscript, het uiteindelijk manuscript. (ja) Ik kreeg van Seamus zelfs tweede drukproeven met allerlei strofen die dus nog veranderd moesten worden en er staan dus in mijn vertaling van "Vereffeningen" dingen die niet in het Engels staan want die kon ik echt niet meer veranderen. Dat lukte me niet meer. Daar kon ik niets voor bedenken (dat vind ik fantastisch eigenlijk) ja eigenlijk wel maar dat werd dan geconstateerd of dingen die ik veel te snel moest veranderen omdat hij bleef maar dingen veranderen. (ja) Toen kreeg ik echt een kijkje in de keuken hoor (ja) er werd heel veel veranderd ja daar kon ik veel te kort over nadenken en ik had tegen de uitgever moeten zeggen van ja jongen ja hallo, dat hou ik ja dat hou ik niet meer bij. (laughs)

IJ: Ja ja, ja. Dat is nogal verschillend denk ik van geval tot geval. Indien het makkelijkere poëzie is dan heb je minder behoefte om samen te werken denk ik met eh met de dichter. Maar als het over moeilijker poëzie gaat dan is het ja soms noodzakelijk en vaak gewenst ja, ja, ja, ja. (both laugh) ... Eh ik heb eh, eh bijvoorbeeld voor Paula Mehan (ja) heb ik een aantal gedichten vertaald en ik heb die eh ik heb die enfin ik had dacht ik geen gesprek nodig dus ik heb die gedichten eens in het Nederlands gelezen (ah, ha) en ze zei dat lijkt me goed em maar gedichten, vertalingen die ik gemaakt heb gedichten van Pearse Hutchinson, niet die deze nu maar andere daar heb ik een aantal zinnen, een aantal zinnen met hem grondig besproken en zo. (ah ha)

VVDK: Als, als ik als ik het kan. Ik heb het zeker voor Cahill O'Séarcaigh gedaan en voor Louis De Paor. Louis De Paor woont in Galway ook en ik heb toen ook samen met hem. Ik had eh, hij heeft zelf zijn gedicht vertaald naar het Engels em wel sommigen niet allemaal maar dat dat ene nu wel. En ik had ook ergens dingen ontdekt in de Ierse en de Engelse versie die niet helemaal overeen kwamen en dan hebben we daar over gesproken ook van eh welke versie volg ik.

VDK: Ik zou, maar, ik denk dat het ontzettend afhangt van het soort poëzie dat je moet vertalen eh. Als je met een heel duistere poëzie bezig zit, die met een zware symboliek geladen is ja dan (ja) zou je natuurlijk zou het ideaal zijn om dat samen met in samenspraak met de dichter te kunnen doen maar ik wil de mensen ook niet nodeloos storen en ik denk, eh dus ik doe dat ik zou dat alleen maar doen als het echt nodig is (ja) dus omdat ik vind elke lezer leest het gedicht voor zichzelf interpreteert het zoals hij wil dus ik (ja) vind dat je dat als vertaler ben je de eerste lezer of de dichtste lezer dan zit je de dichter echt echt al op de huid - laughs - en dus je mag dat niet gaan overdrijven. (o.k. ja)

KH: En als de (ja) en als de auteur nog leeft dan kan je.

CJ: Dan kan het vragen.

KH: Dan neem je contact met hem of haar op eh.

PF: Dus je doet dat.

CJ: Ja, ja, ja.

KH: Ik doe dat het liefst altijd bij wijze van spreken ik check ja.

CJ: Als hij nog leeft wel ja.

PF: Maar bij Rilke was dat niet mogelijk.

CJ: En bij Maeterlinck kan je dat ook moeilijk.

PF: Neen. - laughs

KH: Maar daar heb je dan weer zoveel eh litter-, historisch en eh ander materiaal over (PF: ja) dat je qua interpretatie veel hulpmiddelen hebt als het over grote dichters gaat.

BM: Als het kan. Ik denk, als het zin heeft. Je kunt niet een schrijver om de haverklap lastig vallen met de met een klein vraagje. (ah ja) Je kunt bijvoorbeeld eens afspreken, of desnoods via de uitgeverij van, mag je contact maken, is hij daarvoor te vinden? (ja) En dan eh, dan spaar je de problemen een beetje op (ja) en dan eh. Nu met e-mail, dat is eh dat is de prachtigste uitvinding voor de vertaler, denk ik, om met een auteur contact te maken. Want je kunt toch niet allerlei dingetjes aan, aan de telefoon, stel dat het intercontinentale gesprekken zouden zijn (ja). Dat gaat toch, dat gaat gewoon niet (ja) maar met e-mail kun je zo veel en heel snel en, en eh, dat heb ik met Boulder dan wel gedaan (ja) en eh over, dat het Engels een woord heeft wat ergens, een 'gate' enfin, ergens een eh er komen mensen aan bij eh een boerderij, met met klanten.

#### **Extract 2-9: selection of responses to question b3**

For example, WR prefers not to contact the author unless it is absolutely necessary and VDK says it depends on the type of poetry she has to translate. Moreover, it would seem that, though they are not averse to contacting the author, the translators wish to maintain a certain degree of autonomy. This is expressed in terms of bearing the responsibility for and demonstrating skill in reading, interpreting and rendering the text in the new language (which I do not think is merely an example of an allegiance to the tenets of New Criticism). In the case of NP, IJ and VVDK, the threshold of reserve seems lower, however, which raises the question as to whether their frequent visits to Ireland and the time they spent there may not have been of influence in this respect. A familiarity with social behaviour in a given culture might lower the threshold of deference in approaching someone, in this case a poet or writer. On the whole, such expressions of autonomy with regard to the target text cast a shadow on the much-voiced complaint about a translator's invisibility. The matter is not as simple as it seems. The trajectory of a literary translator's visibility belongs to the workaday world of publishing as well as to the world of literary reception. Stated briefly, translators do not seek parity of recognition with the author but they do rightly seek recognition for their work and this is played out the context being sketched in the ongoing discussion.

#### **2.4.3.4. B4: Do the publishers put you under a lot of pressure?**

As has been pointed out above, the translators interviewed for this study were happy in the main about the amount of pressure involved in doing their work. They tend to relate pressure to the type of text involved and make a distinction between poetry and prose or other types of texts they may translate in the course of their work:

EJ: Ja, dat. Ja dan zeg ja ik kalm aan (ja).

PF: Maar ze doen dat wel.

EJ: Ja, soms ja zoals nu die Byron vertalingen. Ja, "kan het niet een maand eerder?" Neen, het is al krankzinnig dat ik het in drie maanden tijd doe. Hele lappen Don Juan en Beppo heb ik en eh dus geen haast en ik heb ook

nog een ouderwetse schrijfmachine en dan willen ze het vaak op een floppy hebben wel neen ik weiger, ik zeg dan als je me goed genoeg vindt dan moet je dat ook accepteren en ik werk snel dat weet ik dus eh en ik werk ook veel voor Poetry voor last-minute translations, zo dat soort dingen. Dat vind ik leuk om te doen die pressure daar hou ik van eigenlijk, ja.

PF: Zo moet er een beetje spanning. (ja, de spanning)

EJ: Ja de spanning daar gaat het om en wat ik dus ook heb met vertalen dat ik direct midden in het water spring en ik begin in medies res en dan zie ik wel of het goed is en als het niet goed is dan ga ik terug naar het begin en dan ga ik dat verbeteren.

NP: Ja, dat is tegenwoordig helaas eh Nobelprijs moet het gelijk de maand uit of de Verjaardagsbrieven van Ted Hughes dat was eens een "scoop" (ja) onaangekondigd in Engeland dus het moest gelijk zo snel mogelijk en, nou ja dat is wel eens vervelend. (en, eh) Ja daarom heb ik ook wel liever eh als ik zelf in het geniep in het geheim ja aan iets werk en daar pas mee naar buiten kom als ik daar als ik bijna klaar met ben. (ah ha dus dat blijft een geheim) Ja, maar het is niet altijd zo he (ja ja ja) Ted Hughes was een opdracht. Toen Heaney de, de prijs kreeg moest dat eerst ook sneller, nou ja.

IJ: De keren ja je hebt toch een half jaar tot een jaar dat vind ik. (dat is redelijk) Dat vind ik redelijk ja, ja - laughs - ja, ja, ja, ja, ja. (maar zie je dat) Maar ja je kan poëzie niet vertalen onder tijdsdruk. (nee dat gaat niet) Mij lukt dat niet.

VDK: Voor die poëzievertalingen, ik weet wanneer het af moet en meestal heb je daar tijd genoeg voor. Ik denk niet, wel voor eh proza eh dat is heel anders eh liefst gisteren, liefst gisteren vertaald en eh voor die opdrachtjes voor de Munt of voor de Filharmonische Vereniging bijvoorbeeld, dat heeft maar ja met literatuur niets te maken, dat is altijd, twee dagen later moet die tekst binnen zijn. Maar eh het probleem is dikwijls toch een keer je hebt een eh een vertaling. Ze vragen je om een vertaling en dan eigenlijk eh duurt het dan soms heel lang voor het in een tijdschrift gepubliceerd wordt omdat er dan toevallig in de actualiteit zich iets voordoet of er een of ander festival en dan brengen ze een speciaal nummer uit dan dat festival en zo gaat. (ah o.k.) Het is dikwijls dus zo, ik heb eh vorig eh em kort na de aanstelling van Andrew Motion tot poet laureate een zestal gedichten vertaald dus eh van hem of zes of zeven gedichten vertaald en die zullen pas nu in het eerste nummer van volgend jaar (2002) verschijnen van de PoëzieKrant.

CJ: Bedoel je met alleen maar de deadline of?

PF: Ja, deadlines en zo ...

CJ: Ah, ja die moet je naleven eh.

PF: Maar zijn die korte deadlines of ja.

CJ: Tja.

KH: Ja, het hangt er vanaf.

PF: Voor proza is het waarschijnlijk meer het geval ik weet het niet, ja.

CJ: Ik zou het verschil maken tussen opdrachten en wat je zelf uit liefhebberij doet he.

Bij opdrachten vind ik ja voor Julia Frank heb jij genoeg tijd gehad, dat ging.

KH: Ik mag niet klagen, maar je hoort het wel vaak van.

Waitress: Alstublieft. (places three glasses of white wine on the table)

KH: Collega's dat ze erg onder druk gezet worden.

PF: Ja.

CJ: Ik, ik heb een eh een, maar dat was niet literair maar dat was eh "De Begijnhoven", ... weet je dat nog.

Dan, dan de uitgever was er gewoon te laat aan begonnen dan heb ik denk ik tot veertien uur per dag vertaald om dat af te krijgen. Ik had dat uitgerekend dat het moest. Maar dat neem je aan of niet aan eh maar gewoonlijk wordt dat gehonoreerd dat is dan een dringende vertaling, eh.

PF: Ja o.k. je hebt een andere.

CJ: Maar als je dus weet, ik reken tarief dringende vertaling enfin uiteindelijk is dat niet doorgegaan bon maar dat is dan een ander verhaal. Maar dan, dan weet je dat je, jezelf heel echt onder hoogspanning brengt.

BM: Ik denk, nu ja, misschien gaf de uitgever mij boeken waar hij een half jaar op kon wachten, omdat hij weet dat ik een voltijdse baan heb (ja) maar ik zou die baan willen reduceren tot bijna niks, dat gaat nu niet (ja) en eh dan krijg ik wel een half jaar. Soms iets minder, maar eigenlijk eh ja, of neem nu van februari tot, tot juni of zo. Dat vind ik dan voor een jeugdboek wel te doen (ja) als mijn werk eh niet te niet te lastig is (ja) en dan heb je, ik vind het wel nodig dat je het op tijd kunt laten liggen.

#### Extract 2-10: selection of responses to question b4

The more recent strategy of publishing a work simultaneously in several languages has heightened the pressure on translators, as has been indicated by NP and EJ.

#### 2.4.4. The Questionnaire, Section C – When the work is done?

In many ways, the responses to the questions in this section form a continuation to those in B1 as they are mainly concerned with the actual work of translating. It is at this stage that the poems in translation take on their final form, perhaps not in absolute terms but certainly in terms of what the reader will be presented in published form soon afterwards. It is at this stage that final adjustments are negotiated and made and the poem or collection of poems becomes what can be considered a self-contained unit or, as Bakhtin (1990: 76) would have put it, it is about to become "finalised" to the extent that it is about to take on a more or less definitive form and be made available to the public at large and critics and specialised readers in particular. It is here that translation would seem to end but this is not entirely true for some of the translators interviewed, as shall be seen in the responses to the questions in section D of the questionnaire. The questions in section C of the questionnaire deal with the period after the proofs have been sent back to the translator.

##### 2.4.4.1. C1: What happens after you've sent in the drafts?

As the following extracts indicate, the number of corrections found in proofs varies according to text type. Judging from what the translators say, relatively few corrections are made to poems in comparison to novels or short stories.



EJ: Eeh, nou dan wordt het gezet en dan krijg je de drukproeven toegestuurd en dan ga je corrigeren en al corrigerend vind je wel eens een betere vertaling en ehm. Het kan toch beter zus of zo en dat eh dat breng je dan aan (em) maar ik, ik word nooit op mijn vingers getikt van dit is fout of dat had je anders moeten doen of zo.

PF: Dat gebeurt nooit?

EJ: Nee (en, en word je) en soms soms denk ik wel God iedereen heeft wel eens een, ik denk, alle, elke vertaler heeft wel eens een "howler" een echte vreselijke fout gemaakt (em) en daar wordt dan niet over gesproken maar het zijn niet de uitgevers die je daar op wijzen.

PF: En krijg je opmerking als je dat terug, instuurt bijvoorbeeld om gepubliceerd te worden krijg je dan opmerkingen van, van de opdrachtgevers of eh?

RW: Nee nooit, (nooit nee) ook niet van Poetry niet (nee) nooit reacties op gekregen (neen). Het werd zo, die mensen hadden ook de tijd niet om dat na te kijken. (ah, ja) Het moest allemaal zo snel gaan en ik publiceer dus meestal in literaire tijdschriften mijn vertalingen.

PF: En em dus en als je gedaan hebt zo met ja ik weet niet of dat goed uitgedrukt is maar als je iets vertaald hebt dan stuur je dat op naar de uitgevers, wordt dat ook gelezen of?

NP: Ja bij de goede uitgevers wel, bij de kleinere wat minder maar de goeie uitgever die gaat die zet er iemand op en bij Meulenhof waren dat vaak de directeurs zelf omdat het ook dichters waren dat vond ik wel leuk en die komen dan met suggesties en ik blijf beslissen maar het is altijd wel leuk (ah ja) en ik heb sommige vertalingen laat ik ook wel eens door mensen lezen want eh op dit moment bijvoorbeeld heel binnenshuis omdat mijn vriendin zelf dan heel erg alert is maar het kan ook een collega zijn of ik heb ik vind het wel prettig (ja) om eens te kijken of het werkt.

IJ: Ja dus em de proefdr. . . eh de proefdrukken sturen ze altijd, ja. En daar zitten altijd fouten in (die niet in uw?) die niet in het origineel ja zoals nu met diskettes stuur je iets op of je mailt het ja toch zitten daar fouten in als je de drukproef krijgt. Eh enkele keren zijn er ook suggesties bij ja, ja (ah ja en hebben ze dan) dat vind ik een (vind je dat interessant?) over de (ja) interpretatie (ja, dus dat wordt nagelezen?) ja, ja dus eh enfin ik heb dat is nu dus de laatste ervaring daarmee dat was een bundel met poëzie van Nobelprijswinnaars door uitgeverij P gepubliceerd en dat werd nagegaan . . . die hadden als redacteur Paul Claes wat nu toen een (als vertaler is hij ja) ja eh een schitterende vertaler is (ja, ja) en Paul Claes heeft had daar dan opmerkingen bij geschreven die terecht waren ja. (ja, ja)

VVDK: Neen alles was klaar. Ik heb het gewoon in die versie ingestuurd en ergens vind ik het jammer em dat er geen feedback kwam, dat er geen em 'editor' nog heeft naar gekeken of em en ik heb ja die vertalingen zijn dan em eigenlijk naar niemand anders gegaan om na te lezen wat ik eigenlijk wel graag gehad had dat bijvoorbeeld iemand als Peter Nijmeijer ze zou doornemen die werkt ook voor de Poëziekrant (ja) en em dat vind ik wel nodig zeker als je begint te vertalen, ik heb nog niet veel vertaald om zo een beetje een leidraad te hebben of em.

VDK: Meestal ja soms eh als je met een uitgever werkt dan krijg je de drukproeven natuurlijk dus als ze dingen wijzigen dan ben je de eerste die het ziet maar.

PF: En? Gebeurt dat?

VDK: Weinig. (weinig) Meestal ben ik het zelf die dan bij die lezing nog van alles wil veranderen en zeg van dat en dat en dat - laughs - dus.

PF: En als het over redactie gaat? Je hebt zelf, je bent zelf redacteur (ja) geweest eh. Krijg je daar zo opmerkingen over je vertalingen dan? (ja, ja zeker, ja) En hoe was dat of hoe is dat?

HJ: Ja ik moet zeggen meestal was dat vrij summier dat was niet zo grondig ook niet omdat ik denk ehm sowieso als ge iemand vertaalt er is altijd weinig tijd en god weet wat om echt een goed oordeel te kunnen hebben over een vertaling moet je het eigenlijk zelf geprobeerd hebben (eh, hem) om dat gedicht of dat proza te vertalen (ja) weten waar de moeilijkheden zitten. Maar soms komen er dan ook wel spontane reacties van mensen die het Nederlands lezen en zeggen tiens dat vind ik toch een vreemde, een vreemde constructie of ik begrijp dat niet goed (ja) en dat wordt dan discussieert ge' rover en dan past ge vertaling wel aan soms in die zin. (eh, he)

PF: Dus dat is wel ehm en als alles afgegeven is dan wat gebeurt er dan?

Krijg je dan de proefdrukken terug? En brengen ze daar verandering in?

KH: Bij proza zeker, zeker wel (PF: ja) ja alle ja dus gerenommeerde uitgevers zo (PF: ja) die zichzelf een beetje au sérieux nemen hebben hebben correctoren in dienst (PF: ja) "persklaarmaker" heet dat tegenwoordig in Nederland.

PF: Je weet daarvan?

CJ: Alsjeblieft, alsjeblieft.

KH: En dan krijg je een manuscript vol met rood terug en (PF: ja) en dan begint het vind ik toch wel één van de moeilijkste fases in hoever dat je die correcties accepteert want je hebt als vertaler altijd het recht om te zeggen ik accepteer dit niet (PF: ja) en ik denk hoe zelfzekerder je bent hoe vaker je vertaald hebt hoe minder je zal zult accepteren maar in het begin, dan ben je zo onzeker, zeker als Vlaming bij een Nederlandse uitgever zit dat je eigenlijk geneigd bent om bijna alles te aanvaarden omdat je denkt mijn, het zal dan mijn Vlaams zijn, wat dat niet altijd het geval is hoor ...

BM: Ja. Dus ik krijg altijd opnieuw inzage, dus niet zo van eh: jij bent klaar, je geeft het aan de uitgever en dan doen ze maar. Dat doen dat gebeurt dus niet. Je krijgt het echt terug (ja) en dan worden, dat is in ieder geval wel een goed systeem. Als iets echt fout is dan wordt er in een bepaalde kleur, maar het hoeft geen rood te zijn (ja) iets bijgeschreven dat suggesties zijn, in potlood (ah ha) en zo, en eh (ja) en ook een keer is zo een persklaarmaker-maakster bij mij thuis geweest en hebben we samen dan eh gewerkt. Dat vond ik echt wel prettig, want.

PF: En als u uw vertalingen instuurt.

Worden daar commentaar, wordt daar commentaar op gegeven?

CP: Heel weinig, te weinig misschien (ja?)

PF: Maken ze daar zo correcties bij aan.

CP: Eigenlijk alleen maar in de inleidingen en de notities. Nauwelijks, hier en daar wel hoor nauwelijks in de tekst zelf. Ahh fss ja ik zal maar zeggen omdat ze zo goed zijn veronderstel ik eh, eh ik heb de indruk dat er bij andere vertalers wel meer meer wordt gecorrigeerd maar ja het is ook wel moeilijk als het metrische dingen zijn om daar dan, dan moeten zij ook iets anders voorstellen (ah ja) en dat is niet zo voor de hand liggend natuurlijk. Maar ik heb zelf al jaren lang alle mogelijke varianten bedacht eh dus eh. Het zal maar een enkele keer gebeuren dat dat inderdaad het geval is.

**Extract 2-11: selection of responses to question c1**

KH's response regarding prose gives us an insight into the sociolinguistics of the situation. KH is a Belgian translator working for a Dutch publisher and their proofreaders ('persklaarmaker' or 'persklaarmaakster') are invariably Dutch as well. Some of the corrections found in manuscripts are made on the grounds that the Belgian translator has used Flemish (read non-standard) expressions or syntax in his/her translation. But as some of the translators point out, this is not always true: certain constructions are branded as Flemish when in fact they are not<sup>99</sup>. This means that a considerable amount of negotiation can take place with respect to a given text and this negotiation depends on the position and reputation of the translator and his or her relationship with a given proof reader. Translators object strongly to what they see as pedantic corrections, which in their view fail to take into consideration the dynamics and style of a literary text – a criticism they level at certain reviewers also. Though they do recognise the importance of proofreaders (see NP's comment), they are aware that proofreaders may sometimes be overearnest in wishing to demonstrate their competence to the publishers, for the simple reason that further freelance contracts may depend on it. Belgian translators, who initially may have felt disadvantaged by publishers and proofreaders alike on the grounds that they were perceived to use non-standard language, realise with time that they can contest these perceptions and opinions and defend their own translation choices. So the divide between Flanders and the Netherlands in terms of "correct" language use among translators is not as clear-cut as that.

The translators interviewed tend to see the distinction between the Netherlands and Flanders as belonging within a broader divide between centre and periphery, the centre being Amsterdam and its 'Randstad' (conurbation) and the periphery being all the Dutch-speaking regions outside it – roughly speaking an area stretching from Friesland to West Flanders<sup>100</sup>. They consider the centre as setting the norm for 'correct' language use, which may or may not be at variance with the norms set by the Nederlandse Taalunie<sup>101</sup>, an international body whose task it is to develop and propagate the 'responsible' use of Dutch in the Netherlands and Belgium, among other things. Nonetheless, the stronger a translator's reputation, the less his or her work will be put into question. By this time such translators will have already worked with particular proofreaders and established good working relations with them, all of which reduces the possibility of potential conflict or disagreement on textual choices, (see in particular BM's comment above). So it can be surmised that growing competence becomes expressed in terms of increasing reputation, which in turn results in a reduction of potential

contestation among the parties involved in the work. All this is linked to a translator's credibility and hence to his or her habitus, which is further formed and influenced by sanctions and stimuli from the linguistic market. What still has to be discovered is whether a particular translator's reputation may wane and if ever this happens, when and why. More basically, we can state that competence and hence reputation grows with experience and no translator begins his or her career as a perfectly accomplished professional – something that goes without saying but, nevertheless, needs to be said. It also goes without saying that the dynamics of the situation outlined above **are** played out and becomes materialized in the translated texts that have been worked on. Consider the following quote, in this respect:

The choice of the object of study is rendered more delicate in function-oriented Descriptive Translation Studies because of the so-called historical invisibility of translators, not to mention the fact (predictable in view of their arch-dominated status ) that their work, more than that of authors, has commonly been tampered with – to the effect that many texts left to our appreciation are in fact adulterated, with little hope for the analyst to disentangle the various hands, minds and hearts responsible for the final product. (Simeoni 1998<sup>102</sup>: 32)

In the discussion of the questionnaire responses till now, I have attempted to show how translation takes place in a social context in which various actors and institutions play a role. It is difficult, therefore, to speak of 'tampered' translations as Simeoni does, for it is considered advisable by publishers, proofreaders and translators alike to have translations reread for second and third opinions all in the interest of arriving at the best possible translation. One could hardly call this collusion. As has been pointed out above, translators are in fact capable of speaking up and do speak for themselves in defending their translation choices, which is not to say that all is rosy in their world. So the stereotypical view of the invisible docile translator is only true in part and only perhaps for a particular stage in a professional translator's career<sup>103</sup>. Next to this, people working within the profession will recognise and praise/criticise their work. In this respect, they are highly visible, as such criticism has a more immediate impact and can be extended to all forms of translation, not only literary.

The question remains as to just how visible a translator should be or indeed wishes to be. Even if this is a programmatic question, it still cannot be answered without first asking translators for their opinion. If translators' texts are 'adulterated' as Simeoni suggests, then we must presume that there was a moment either *in illo tempore* or at some stage of the translation process when they were not. How then are we to pinpoint this pristine moment? Can it be located at the moment the translator puts his or her 'first impression' on paper? Given the ensuing consultation and discussion that goes on among translators and the people in their networks, this moment of purity can only be but a fleeting one. The choice of the object of study is indeed delicate mainly because of its basic complexity and not because of the difficulty of separating out an illusory moment of pristine translatorial expression from the tampering of proofreaders and editors.

To return to the proofs of poems sent back to the translator, it would seem that the publisher does not change much in the drafts. The translators themselves often wish to,

however (see especially EJ, NP en VDK's comments above). This can be also be seen as constituting the last stage of phase two of the translation process discussed above in 4.3.1, a phase in which time and distance also play an important role. The few changes (if any) that the publisher might carry out are now included and indicated in the proofs and the translator can bring about any further changes he or she wishes. Seeing the work again after some time and in another form (different font, layout, other page format, etc.) can sometimes help the translator to spot misreadings (see VDK: c1(sub1)) or find better solutions to particular problems (see EJ: c1(sub1)). Judging from the translators' comments, the changes carried out at this stage are limited in comparison to adjustments made before the drafts were sent in.

#### **2.4.4.2. C<sub>2</sub> & C<sub>3</sub>: What do the publishers do and do you have a lot of work at this stage?**

The answers to C<sub>2</sub> were mainly given in the replies to C<sub>1</sub> which rendered asking the question redundant in most cases. Some replies to C<sub>3</sub> are also to be found in answers to C<sub>1</sub>. The following extracts are included for the sake of completeness as they give an indication of the number of changes that are carried out once the proofs are sent back to the translator:

EJ: Nou dan ga je uiteraard corrigeren maar al corrigerend kom je dan wel eens op andere oplossingen maar dat is heel zelden want ik als het de deur uitgaat dan moet het toch in mijn eigen ogen dan goed zijn (ja) maar het komt wel voor zoals nu met Byron dat ik eh één of twee dingen toch anders heb vertaald dat ik de regel te lang vond of dat ik met een korter woord kon volstaan (ah, ja) (in c1 (sub1))

NP: Nou jaa, over het algemeen zijn het maar hele kleine dingetjes vaak omdat ik ben er natuurlijk heel lang mee bezig geweest en zij kijken naar buiten van buiten af kijken naar binnen bedoel ik en, en zien dan soms dingetjes die je handiger zo of zo zou kunnen doen (ja) en een enkele keer zet ik ook wel eens vraagtekentjes zelf ook al in het manuscript om te zeggen van hier vind ik dat het wringt dat het de zin niet goed loopt (ja) de regel niet goed loopt weet jij iets. Meestal heb ik dat daarvoor al, al, al gecheckt maar als ik er echt niet uit kom maar nee het zijn kleine dingetjes vaak.

IJ: Nu ik moet zeggen dat is het blijdst om het ernst het voor was het ook wel ernstig (het is ook ernstig). Ik denk het is niet het moment dat het gepubliceerd wordt, geeft inderdaad een soort eh kortstondig euforisch gevoel was bij mij altijd erg kortstondig (ja) maar wat, het beste gevoel is als de vertaling af is, als je ze ook als af beschouwt, als je voelt hier vallen de twee ademen samen. (in d1)

VDK: O em. Neen want eh zolang het eigenlijk niet niet in drukvorm staat ben ik zo ongerust. En blijf ik het lezen en opnieuw lezen dus eh denk ik van ik heb misschien ergens iets over het hoofd gezien en soms gebeurt dat echt he want in die Sexton bijvoorbeeld stond er em. Ik heb het em. Ik heb er een jaar aan gewerkt.

HJ: Het, het zijn dan eerder kleine, kleine dingetjes. (ja, ja, ik snap het)

KH: Maar ik heb daar ook een hele discussie over gehad met eh de uitgever want wat die persklaarmaakster had gedaan in het begin in haar eerste correcties dat was inderdaad heel veel punten en puntkomma's zetten waar die in het Duits niet stonden (KH: ja, ja) en ik heb mij daartegen verzet en eh ik er met de auteur ook over gesproken en zij heeft mij bevestigd dat ik vind het belangrijk dat dat zo blijft staan die, die eh.

CJ: Die flow eh.

PF: Ja, ja.

KH: En dan in een tweede versie, ik heb er dan met de uitgever over gecorrespondeerd en hij heeft mij gelijk gegeven hij heeft gezegd dat is goed daar moet je op staan op dit soort dingen en dan daarna heeft hij er ook met de persklaarmaakster over gesproken en die heeft dat toen ook toegegeven dat ze veel te veel gekapt had.

BM: Oh, ik neem toch alles opnieuw door (ja) en dan eum ik overweeg echt wel alles wat ze aan opmerkingen bijschrijven (ja) en eh dat overweeg ik echt (ah ha) en soms denk ik: ah het hoeft niet echt, maar ik vind het wel goed klinken. Het gaat dan niet om fout of niet fout (ah ha) maar ja, je kunt zoveel dingen doen met een zin. (ja) Je geeft dat aan tien vertalers en je krijgt tien verschillende zinnen (ja) en dan denk ik: ja, dat is een andere vertaler (ja) en dan eh dat voel je ook als de persklaarmaker zelf ook vertaalt tegenover iemand die alleen maar kijkt van: is het grammaticaal en lexicaal in orde?

#### **Extract 2-12: selection of reponses to question c2 & c3**

The last two of these extracts discuss works of prose whereas the rest are about poetry. Though proofs of works of prose are shown to contain more remarks on and changes to the drafts, this does not mean that the translators necessarily agree with them or are willing to change the text accordingly, as KH and BM's comments indicate. It can be deduced from all these extracts that the corrections and changes to the proofs carried out by the translators are fewer in number when compared to adjustments made to the drafts before they were sent to the publishers. I argue here that the process of finishing the utterance has been almost completed by the time the drafts are sent in and that, generally speaking, subsequent changes are more a matter of fine tuning than anything else. If we apply the norm stated by those interviewed, i.e. that the translation has to be a poem in Dutch, then the process of a translation becoming a Dutch poem has largely taken place by the time the drafts are sent in. The strategy of using distance and time has been largely played out (as described in the extracts in chapter 2.4.3.1 above), or to put it more colourfully:

IJ: Dat dat is eigenlijk het orgastische moment denk ik en (dat dat kan dat is vóór publicatie uiteraard) dat is vóór de publicatie, ja. Dat is als (knipt) Dit is het! Dan dan loop ik thuis nog zo door de living dat nog eens hardop lezen: fantastisch! fantastisch! (denkt nu heb ik het) 's anderendaags kom ik thuis, neem ik dat gedicht weer, loop ik weer door de living ja ah fantastisch. - laughs (in D1)

#### **Extract 2-13: illustration of the norm: "it has to be a poem in Dutch"**

It could be argued too that through the use of time and distance a translator moves progressively away from an intercultural (Pym 1998) or interlingual (Simon 1996) space into a single generic space within a language variety, that a translator's initial vigorous to-ing and fro-ing from a generic utterance in one language and the construction of a similar generic

utterance in another, slowly gives way to movement within a single generic space in one language. It is then that an utterance is adjusted in order to become consistent with itself and its genre expectations in the language in question. This is usually judged (minimally at least) in terms of it being rendered in correct or appropriate Dutch or English or whatever the language variety may be:

NP: maar over de vertaling wordt er erg weinig geschreven meestal alleen in negatieve zin of in één zinnetje 'de vertaling las goed', 'las als een Nederlands gedicht' en dan heb je dat gehad em ja. (ja) (in d2 – reprise)

IJ: Als de lezer het gedicht leest of de vertaling leest denk ik moet die het lezen alsof het in het Nederlands geschreven was origineel en mag hij op geen enkel moment denken ach dit is vertaald uit het Engels. - laughs - ah, ja (in b1 (sub2))

VDK: Ja vertalen, als auteur ben je oppermachtig, en zeg je het zoals je wilt; als vertaler moet je proberen te benaderen wat er gezegd wordt in een zo correct mogelijk Nederlands zo dat zo dicht mogelijk bij de stijl en de taal van de auteur aanleunt. (in d2)

#### Extract 2-14: illustrations of 'correctness in translation'

The next and final section of the questionnaire deals with topics relating to the period after publication of the translators' work, ranging from how they feel about the publication to how it was received in the press. Looking back over the responses to the questions till now, I found it increasingly difficult to conceive of translation outside or beyond the various processes and contexts within which it occurs and likewise helps to construct (Goodwin 1994<sup>104</sup>):

- ♦ Reading and getting one's first impression down on paper;
- ♦ using time to carry out revisions and run trials in the margins of pages before;
- ♦ transferring a poem to a word processor;
- ♦ seeing the work in a new form when the proofs arrive and carrying out further minor changes;
- ♦ taking a publisher's changes into account, etc.

All these are not acts or gestures that are ancillary to or follow on from some mental moment of translation; they also constitute translation. We cannot conceive of the dynamics in which translation leads to publication without recognising the role(s) of the various actors involved<sup>105</sup>; likewise it would be impossible to imagine the completion of a line or stanza in translation without the trial pieces in the margin. Whether the translator has been commissioned beforehand or acts with a possible commission in mind, he or she has to sit down and open a book and read a page, pick up a pen or turn to his or her word processor and begin to write, in other words engage in the material process of translating. This writing is intersected at various stages – no matter how briefly or insubstantially – by the contributions of others, were it even only to approve (the role of the publisher, ultimately), or express a desire to change slightly some aspect of a text (e.g. the role of the proof reader or those consulted for advice). The text takes on various forms and is committed to various bases

(electronic, paper). It is in and through this matrix of material engagement with texts, oscillations between genres across languages and intersections with actors and changes of form that translation happens<sup>106</sup>.

#### **2.4.5. The Questionnaire, Section D – After Publication: the end of an affair?**

The responses in this section contain views on the relationship between authored work and translations. They also cover translators' views on readers in the field, particularly professional readers like newspaper reviewers and critics. Among other things, it emerges from the data that critics are taken seriously only if they themselves have had professional experience in the field of translation.

##### **2.4.5.1. DI: How do you feel when you receive your published work?**

One of the reasons for asking this question was that the responses might provide indications, albeit in an indirect way, of job satisfaction and professional pride. As I knew that many of the interviewees had published work of their own, very early on in the interview process, I began asking whether they felt any different on receiving their translations or their own work in published form. Though this did not apply to all the interviewees, I found it an interesting way of framing the question for those to whom it did apply:

EJ: Nou ja, How do you feel? You feel good, vooral als het mooi is uitgegeven. (ja) Ik heb hier een uitgever, een vriend van mij en die doet dat prachtig en eh, ja daar ben ik dan heel tevreden mee en.

RW: Ja, dat is dat is ja wanneer je een boek publiceert is dat natuurlijk altijd een grote vreugde als, vooral als het een boek van jezelf is maar (ja) ook voor, voor een vertaling is dat een plezierige ervaring dat misschien wat minder is dan een boek dat je zelf geschreven hebt. (ja) Eh want het is tenslotte het boek van die auteur (eh) dat je vertaald hebt maar er zit toch een stukje van jezelf ook in. **(and in d1 (sub1))**

RW: Ja, maar het is toch zijn naam die in het groot op het boek staat en jouw naam staat maar in kleine lettertjes van onder (ja) ja "vertaald door".

PF: Maar het is toch dankzij uw, uw vertaling dat het ...

RW: Ja, maar je bent toch maar een medium, de, de, de het hulpje van de auteur, van de dichter die je vertaald hebt, vind ik. (eh) Het is niet zoals een bundel die je zelf geschreven hebt. (ah ja o.k.)

NP: Laughs, altijd ik zei al ik heb een soort zendingsdrang maar natuurlijk daar is het andere uiteinde is de trots als het eenmaal is (ja) is eh en kijk poëzie verkoopt niet zo veel maar het staat wel in bibliotheken en het is opvraagbaar en ik weet dat dat soort dingen worden uitgeleend want ik krijg elk jaar een afrekening, overigens schandalig weinig, maar er staat het aantal keren bij een steekproef in 30% van de bibliotheken en dat vind ik dat weer erg leuk dat het gebeurd is **(and in d1 (sub1))**

NP: Nou met de leeftijd is het toch nog veel zal ik het prettig, ook nog prettig vind ik vind ik ook nog prettig om meer aan eigen werk te werken maar ik geef het niet op. Ik blijf wel vertalen en ik vind ik ontdek ik heb zelfs op mijn computer een lijstje staan van dichters die ik waarschijnlijk postuum zal moeten vertalen.



IJ: Het is niet helemaal hetzelfde als een eigen dichtbundel maar het het benadert het toch.

VVDK: Trots natuurlijk. (both laugh) Neen maar het was het eerste uitgebreide artikel dat ik ooit voor de Poëziekrant alhoewel ja. Het was een combinatie eigenlijk van interviews, een kritisch artikel en vertalingen (ja) en em ik was zo blij omdat ik voelde dat daar iets was dat nog nooit eerder gedaan was.

VDK: Zeer gemengde gevoelens. (ja) Meestal ben ik bang. Dus ja ik leg dat daar een tijdje. Ik doe dat boek niet meer open en dan zal ik zo na een week of wat heel discreet eens proberen te kijken naar een blad ja neen. Ik ga niet, ik ben niet iemand die onmiddellijk gaat zitten nalezen en checken, ik vind dat echt, ik denk niet dat ik al ooit één tekst (sorry, salut: says goodbye to his son's school teacher) of dat ik al ooit een tekst of eh boek eh opnieuw uitgelezen heb, ik durf dat gewoon niet. Het is waar eh.

HJ: Sommige dingen lukken goed he (ja, natuurlijk) dan zijt ge blij. (ja, dat vind ik ook al) Soms lukt het soms lukt het (ja) dan is dat schitterend en soms lukt het niet (ja) en ja ik denk dat dat echt niet soms echt niet lukt en dat dat dan dan heeft het ook weinig zin om dat te forceren. Dan ja, dan moet het daarbij blijven.

CJ: Het hangt er vanaf van de hoeveelheid rood. (all laugh)

KH: Als het helemaal af is.

PF: Ja, als het af is eh.

KH: Och, gemengd denk ik. Ik denk dan dat je aan de ene kant wel fier bent op eh wat je gedaan hebt maar dat je aan de andere kant als je er dan terug doorkijkt denk ik vind je dan toch ehm ssht misschien had ik dat toch beter zo gedaan.

PF: Dus het blijft bezig, bij wijze van spreken.

KH: Ja voor mij wel ja.

**(and in D1 (sub1))**

PF: Ja, en voor uw eigen werk dus ja o.k. je hebt romans geschreven en je hebt romans vertaald is het gevoel gelijkaardig als je dat gedrukt, neen.

**(and in d1 (sub1))**

CJ: Neen, neen ik weet niet hoe die verhouding ligt maar ik geloof dat vertalen minder intens is en ehm en precies BM die ook had opgemerkt dat er zoveel schrijvers zich uiteindelijk ook aan het vertalen zitten, die vroeg zich af of dat dat geen placebo was.

KH: Voor het eigen werk.

CJ: Voor het eigen werk. (KH: ja) Je bent minder moeilijk bezig; je bent met hetzelfde bezig; je bent met taal bezig; je bent met betekenis bezig; je bent met mooie zinnen maken bezig maar eigenlijk gevoelsmatig ben je daar heel veel minder bij betrokken dus is het relatief gemakkelijker.

KH: Om afstand te nemen.

CJ: Om afstand te nemen, om het te doen, om het gewoon te doen, natuurlijk . . . vind ik wel.

BM: Ja, dat vind ik echt wel em ik denk omdat ik weet dat ik het zelf doorgemaakt heb dan vind ik: er zit veel van mijn eigen werk in. Dus ik ben geen ik ben niet zomaar een, een schrijfmachine zo van: je koopt een

bepaalde merk schrijfmachine en je draait een tekst erdoor en voilà. (ah ha) Dan eh dat is anoniem. Ik vind niet dat je als vertaler heel, heel eh een anonieme machine moet zijn. Er zit ook een beetje van mij in en dan ben ik trots als het er als. Maar als ik denk van: dat is niet goed genoeg gedaan, ik heb één keer gedacht van eh: dit, dit is niet. Maar ik had ook geen affiniteit met het boek en dat, dat eh is toch iets wat echt eh niet goed is.

CP: Neen (neen). Ik beschouw dat even goed als een deel van mijn totaal oeuvre (ah ha) en het komt enfin dat heb je wel kunnen lezen of ik zie die als mijn project eigenlijk fsht met een groot woord. De Europese literatuur in ons taalgebied brengen op alle gebieden dus zowel door te vertalen als door te bewerken als door commentaar op te leveren en zo ik zie dat als mijn roeping, zoiets (ja, ja, ja).

#### Extract 2-15: selection of responses to question d1

Those who had published their own work expressed the difference in terms of degree of involvement or intimacy. It would seem from their statements that none of them consider writing and translating to be totally separate acts (see esp. the CJ quote above). Here we see translation intersecting with what might be called cultures of writing/reading. To paraphrase CJ, both involve working with language, with meaning, with beautiful sentences, but in terms of feeling there is less involvement and this makes it easier. BM also insists that she is not just a glorified typewriter but someone who makes a personal contribution to the work in translation. WR sees the translator as a medium for the author but also states that a translation also bears something that partly belongs to the translator. NP's satisfaction lies in his role as cultural ambassador, in seeing his 'missionary urge' realised in a publication, i.e. in making works of literature from other languages known to Dutch readers. As far as these translators are concerned, publication is a pivotal moment when their inward and outward gazes converge, or in Bakhtinian terms a moment of finalisation when the utterance becomes open to response.

The finalisation of the utterance is, if you will, the inner side of the change of speech subjects.

This change can only take place because the speaker has said (or written) *everything* he wishes to say at a particular moment or under particular circumstances. (Bakhtin 1990:76)

The inward gaze is reflected in terms of involvement with (the internal structure of) texts (original and translation) in the ways pointed out by the translators in the data extracts; the outward gaze concerns involvement with the possible trajectories of their translations<sup>107</sup> after publication. It is safe to say that there is a certain amount of anxiety involved here, which the notion of finalisation can help us understand. Some of the translators express mixed feelings about receiving the published versions of the translations or about reading earlier translations they had done. These mixed feelings point to a concern with their work which is professional in nature. In this respect much hinges on what is meant by '*everything*' in the Bakhtin quote above. Translators working within the constraints set by a publisher (a very real deadline, for example), may feel that they did not say 'everything' they could have said in translating a collection of poems, for example. This is often expressed in terms of finding better solutions

when translating the same lines or particular images, etc., after publication. In a certain sense, a translation is never finished in that new re-readings will often throw up other solutions:

VDK: Ja, ja absoluut en het is nooit af want soms na jaren of na maanden dan denk je oh neen en eigenlijk zou dit een veel betere oplossing zijn geweest en ja. (in b3)

CP: ('t Is nooit af) Nee dat is echt nooit ach wel sommige gedichten wel hoor. (ja) Maar ja als je ze weer eens met een fris oog kijkt en ook bijvoorbeeld de taal evolueert heel sterk. Nederlands is een taal die sterk evolueert dus inderdaad sommige dingen ver-, verouderen dus. Bijvoorbeeld de gij-vorm is was dertig jaar geleden niet verouderd is het nu wel dus dat moet veranderen dat moet aangepast worden. (ah ja) (in b1 (sub3))

#### **Extract 2-16: illustration of views on re-reading translations**

But in real terms it has been finalised by the act of publication and is hence open to response from its readers, some of whom act in a professional capacity as academics or as reviewers in newspapers and magazines. In fact, in real terms there may never have been an *'everything'* in this case were it not for the publisher. So the anxiety and mixed feelings found in the extracts stem in part from an awareness of unrealised potential meaning in a translation, which is understood or 'translated' professionally in terms of "a job well or badly done". They may also stem from the knowledge that one is not in a position to affect or change the product once it has been released on the world, as it were. Publication helps construct a public persona for translators; through it they are placed in a public arena that is larger than the networks and professional circles they work in. Minimally, this involves anticipating possible (professional) comment on their work. So in this case, the visibility or invisibility of translators (Simeoni 1998) has to be seen in relation to this broader social context of reputation and response (and hence increasing commissions and a steady income) and not merely in terms of translators playing second fiddle to writers.

At all times, visibility or invisibility is a matter of who is looking and who wants to be seen. Hence a translator's invisibility is no primordial ontological state but certainly belongs within and is a consequence of the interplay of certain social factors, which this study is attempting to unearth. This does not exclude the possibility of invisibility becoming a strategy or at least a preference to the extent that a translator wishes to remain outside the broader public arena mentioned above. It cannot be automatically assumed that the dynamics of reputation and, as a result, acclaim and possible financial success are the same for translators as they are for writers. Invisibility, it would seem, is anathema for a writer, which does not mean that it cannot play an important role in constructing an author's public persona – it might index his/her rejection of contemporary poetics or orthodox writing practices, for example. On the other hand, invisibility is assumed to be the continuing situation of a translator, the basic position he or she is assumed to maintain, despite the social persona that might accrue with increased renown. Much of the discussion on invisibility has been framed by the role translators play in introducing readers in their native language to (new and/or famous) works of literature from other languages and cultures, a discussion within which voices have been

raised in support of the creativity of translators in this process (Venuti 1998<sup>108</sup>). Perhaps the debate could be recast in terms of hegemonies of creativity, for is it not so that the ancillary position of literary translators (see metaphors of (genderised) subservience in Bassnett & Trivedi 1999<sup>109</sup>; Simon 1996<sup>110</sup>; von Flotow 1997<sup>111</sup>) stems from their perceived incapacity to author a work of literature on their own? It is clear from the professional and life trajectories of those interviewed that no clear dichotomy can be made between writers and translators along such lines, even though they do maintain the categories of writer and translator in their discussions and attribute varying levels of prestige and privilege to them. This may mean that we can only approach this phenomenon by positing a more general category, like the notion of cultures of writing/reading mentioned on the previous page, in which the struggle for creative dominance can be played out. At a more immediate level, publication renders possible a myriad of readings, some of which are professional. What they bear in common are expectations pertaining to the text within genre in question, expectations similar to those that guided the translator. These expectations constitute a locus of contestation that the translator may or may not have to deal with.

The final two questions of the questionnaire deal with the role of critics and reviewers in receiving literary translations and translators' perceptions of these critics. Though we can never fully predict how a published translation may fare, or any publication for that matter, as so much depends on what readers do with a text, we can plot the opinions of professional reviewers and the roles they play in launching or sinking a new publication. This was the researcher's assumption in drawing up the last two questions in section D.

#### **2.4.5.2. D<sub>2</sub>: What about the critics? And D<sub>3</sub>: Are their comments useful?**

The extracts on criticism and reviews listed below bring two main issues to light both of which show that these translators are perfectly aware of their professional situation and what this involves:

EJ: Het is vaak dat zijn vaak muggenzifters dat eh em of vaak maar of vaak dat ik wel eens denk verdorie je weet er ook weinig van en eh.

PF: En wat doen ze vooral volgens u, critici? Wat is een 'critic' enfin een recensent (ja)?

EJ: Muggenzifters dat ik ik heb het ik zal dat opsturen ik heb het niet bij de hand ja maar een paar bijbelvertalers die hebben in, in hun tijdschrift een kritiek geschreven op mijn Yeats vertaling en eh, dat is daar is op gereageerd in de krant op een hele leuke manier voor mij leuke manier van waar bemoeien ze zich mee en zo ze weten er niets van enzovoort maar eh, dat zal ik opsturen want dat is wel eh, verhelderend denk ik (ja)

PF: En wat is allez uw kritiek over de critici? (eh, eh) Dat ze muggenzifters zijn of?

EJ: Nou kijk als zo iemand - misschien dat ik dat ook - eh, eh de bibliotheken (ja) laten zich raden door zogenaamde kenners (ja) en die hebben altijd ja schoolmeesterachtige opmerkingen wat ik daarnet zei dat je een liggend rijm staand hebt vertaald of zo eh (ja) ja en ja, en ja dat soort of dat het niet goed rijmt of eh ik gebruik ontzettend veel halfrijm en eh kwatrijms en zo of als het maar muzikaal is eh (wat veel voor, in Ierse poëzie komt dat veel voor, ja).

RW: Nee, want dat waren dus meestal dezelfde mensen die de recensies schreven die over je eigen werk schreven en die dus over die vertalingen wat bijschreven. Het waren dus geen specialisten in dat bepaalde taalgebied. (ah ja) Het waren dus gewoon literaire recensenten en die omdat die bundels dus ook meestal niet tweetalig waren verschenen omdat de uitgever beslist had om het slechts in de vertaling te publiceren en niet de originele tekst erbij omdat anders het boek te dik en dus te duur zou worden (ja) daardoor kon dus die recensent ook niet vergelijken (ah ha) laat staan dat hij er zelf toe bekwaam zou zijn dat hij zo goed die andere taal zou kennen dat hij zou kunnen kritiek uitoefenen, (wat is er...) wat ik ook al betwijfel. Maar kom het, de mogelijkheid bestaat altijd. Maar dus op dat gebied werd er weinig, zeer weinig kritiek uitgeoefend. De tekst werd gewoon als een literaire tekst eh besproken. (em, ja, ja)

NP: Dat was toen nog zeer veel maar het wordt minder behalve of het Heaney of Hughes is maar bloemlezingen toen in '88 werd er nog wel over geschreven en ook zeer positief maar eh, eh tegenwoordig er is zo het aanbod is zo erg groot dat. Ik heb wel eens het idee dat er in Vlaanderen meer over geschreven wordt dan in Nederland. **(and in d2 - reprise)**

NP: - eating biscuit - Wel yum (ja goed, dat hoort erbij!) (laughs) Er wordt heel weinig over de vertalingen geschreven. Meestal gaat het over de dichter . . . maar over de vertaling wordt erg weinig geschreven meestal alleen in negatieve zin of in één zinnetje 'de vertaling las goed' 'las als een Nederlands gedicht' en dan heb je dat gehad em ja. (ja) Ik heb het wel gehad met de Verjaardagsbrieven van Hughes dat iemand echt mooie vondsten ging, ging opschrijven waarom dat zo was. Dat vond ik wel leuk dat is één keer maar gebeurd. Meestal was het is het is me vier of vijf keer overkomen dat iemand wat te mekkeren had en het lulligste is dan als ie maar één woord neemt.

IJ: Ja, als dat in eh maar ja het is nu lang geleden dat ik nog een vertaling in boekvorm gepubliceerd heb. In boekvorm dan komen er altijd eh reacties, ja. Niet op een tijdschriftpublicatie tenzij van enkelingen dan dus men de reacties op Tahar ben Jelloun en Nazim Ikmet zijn de boekpublicaties zijn altijd heel gunstig geweest. (ja)

VVDK: Em. Wat ik achteraf gehoord heb was dat veel mensen het heel interessant vonden (ja) om over Ierstalige literatuur iets te lezen em maar één deelcommentaar, maar ik geloof achteraf zei Willy Tibergien dat het jammer was dat er niet meer vertalingen in waren dat één gedicht van elk van de auteurs een beetje te weinig was (ah ja ok) en em hij zei zeker Peter Nijmeijer vond dat vooral.

PF: Of reacties achteraf?

VVDK: Wel in Ierland. (ja) Ik heb naar de auteurs het artikel een fotokopie van het artikel teruggestuurd en wel die vonden dat heel leuk. Louis De Paor vond het heel tof en oh ja ook iemand een prof in Ierland die zelf in Leuven gestudeerd heeft vroeg mij die wist dat ik er aan werkte had mij een kopie gevraagd en die vond het heel interessant het artikel. Hij kan een beetje Nederlands en hij had het gelezen en hij zei dat bijvoorbeeld Nuala Ni Dhomhnaill in dat interview dingen gezegd heeft die ze nog nooit in Ierland gezegd heeft bepaalde uitspraken die hij hoorde van haar die hij niet verwacht had en dat, dat vond hij vooral vond hij interessant.

VVDK: De meeste critici weten niet wat vertalen is dus ik hecht daar weinig belang aan, aan wat ze vertellen.

PF: - laughs - Leg het een keer uit. Zeg eens.

VDK: Oh ja ze gaan als er al iets over de vertaling gezegd wordt dan is het meestal ergens een zin die ze eruit pikken die ze niet goed vinden lopen of dat ze zelf een andere oplossing voor zouden hebben. Dus die wordt er dan uitgehaald, er staan dan duizend andere zinnen waarmee ze wel akkoord gaan op die niet opvallen. Dus ik vind em meestal die kritiek eh ja. Ik vind echt dat ze gewoon niet weten wat ze zeggen. Ze kunnen wel natuurlijk zeggen dat een boek is slecht vertaald of een boek is goed vertaald maar de meesten halen er dan hier en daar een zin uit die ze uit de context rukken waarvan dat ze helemaal zich niet afvragen waarom vertaal je hem zus of zo dus zeg laat het maar voor wat het is. Allez je leest de hele tijd toch polemieken in de krant tussen recensenten en vertalers.

Ja vertalen, als auteur ben je oppermachtig, je zeg het zoals je wilt; als vertaler moet je proberen te benaderen wat er gezegd wordt in een zo correct mogelijk Nederlands zo dat zo dicht mogelijk bij de stijl en de taal van de auteur aanleunt.

...

VDK: Neen! Neen nee neen em wat ik eruit leer is dat ze dat die mensen ofwel niet weten waarover het gaat ofwel dat ze zich helemaal geen moeite hebben gedaan om ofwel naar het origineel te gaan kijken ofwel om zich de vraag te stellen waarom dat je bepaalde dingen vertaalt zoals ze er staan en ofwel dat er andere motieven achter schuilen die met vertalen helemaal niets te maken hebben maar die ja te maken hebben met rivaliteit.

KH: Maar over het algemeen denk ik dat er heel weinig aandacht besteed wordt in de kritieken aan de vertaling.  
(CJ: ja)

CJ: Vaak wordt uwen naam niet eens vermeld.

KH: Neen.

PF: Neen? Of het feit dat het een vertaling is?

CJ: Jawel, dat wel.

PF: Dat wel ja, dat wel.

CJ: Maar, zonder de naam van de vertaler te vermelden en zonder iets over de kwaliteit van de vertaling, ik denk dat, dat in 90 percent van de gevallen is.

KH: Je moet er maar eens op letten (CJ: ja) zowel in de Standaard als in de Morgen het wordt niet systematisch gedaan, de vertaler vermelden. En meestal, als er opmerkingen komen, dan zijn het (CJ: ja, negatieve) negatieve.

...

KH: Heel soms.

KH: Maar het is toch wel uitzonderingen hoor meestal worden er ah wordt er aandacht aan de vertaling besteed als het gaat om, om eh grote auteurs (CJ: ja) maar als het gaat om minder bekende auteurs, dan nooit, (CJ: nee) denk ik.

PF: En zijn er volgens u recensenten die op de hoogte zijn van vertalen of eh die dat kunnen inschatten wat dat.

CJ: De hoofdredacteur van de Standaard der Letteren is een vertaler, een Shakespearevertaler.

PF: Ah dus!

CJ: Dus die moet toch weten hoe belangrijk het is dat er vertalingen zijn.

KH: Maar ook in de Standaard zijn de namen van de vertalers niet consequent vermeld.

CJ: Maar ook in de Standaard zijn de naam van de vertaler niet altijd, en wordt ook geen recensie geschreven over de kwaliteit van de vertaling, tenzij dat het echt bar slecht is en dan, dan hang je.

PF: Dan hang je.

CJ: Ja. (all laugh)

KH: Ja voor echte vertaalkritiek gebeurt er alleen in vaktijdschriften.

CJ: Ja.

PF: Ja.

KH: Filter bijvoorbeeld, dat is zo'n.

BM: Ah eh ... als je als je complimenten krijgt, ben je natuurlijk vereerd, dat doet wel eens deugd.

En of naast andere kritiek, bijvoorbeeld ja vanuit Nederland of, of zo heel kleine recensies, soms voor bibliotheken en eh dan dacht ik: ja ik steek er wel wat van op. Eum het is nooit neutraal hè.

Het is eh je bent er te meer te zeer mee verbonden om te zeggen: "Ah ja schrijven ze dat?" Neen, dat gaat wel dieper dan bij een bedrijfsvertaling natuurlijk (ja) en één keer ben ik heel erg geraakt geweest door eh iemand die, die vond dat ik. "Mensen, dit is een pracht van een boek, maar lees het alstublieft niet in de vertaling. Lees het in het origineel." En dan dacht ik: dat was niet fair, want dan zo'n opmerking van eh: "Ze heeft er stilistisch niks mee gedaan of niks aangepast of zo." Ik dacht: maar wat bedoel, ik ben het haar gaan vragen: "Wat bedoel je nu eigenlijk met wat ik stilistisch anders zou moeten doen. Ik denk, want mijn interpretatie van, van trouw aan de auteur, dat is niet zo van: o.k. bedankt voor je scenario en nu schrijf ik ... mijn boek (ah ha). Ik schrijf toch nog altijd zijn boek (ja).

Dat wil niet zeggen dat er niets van mij mag inzitten, maar ik bedoel eh ...

CP: Neen ik ben een van de weinige Zuid-Nederlanders die geen kritiek krijgt op mijn Nederlands maar je weet waarom het zo is he ik heb mij echt ... Alle Vlaamse die het ooit gewaagd hebben om een boek te publiceren hier hebben in het Noorden recensies gehad waar vertalers in staat 'toch wel erg Vlaams taalgebruik' of 'is dit wel Nederlands' dus ik verzin dit niet. (maar em ..)

...

PF: Maar is dat niet en beetje uit gemakzucht eerder van de kant van de Nederlanders die, die je em in feite een soort taalimperialisme hanteren?

CP: Ja natuurlijk je kunt ja maar goed. Em (ondanks) ik bedoel hetzelfde hetzelfde heb ik gehoord is in Duitsland het geval, dus bijvoorbeeld ook daar is het Hoogduits de norm en dus al die Beierse schrijvers die moeten zich daar aan aanpassen zeker de vertalers. Dus als Beierse schrijver kon je ook wel populaire ja zo meer dialectale (couleur locale) dat is dan leuk eh. Zoals de Nederlandse critici ook Claus heel leuk vinden als hij wat dialect schrijft en zo maar waag het dus niet als vertaler dat te doen (nee) ja ik bedoel ja. Je kunt dat betreuren en je kunt zeggen ja de taal zou erdoor verrijken door dat soort dingen aan te nemen maar in feite zijn zij het de broodheren dan ik bedoel wij schrijven voor die uitgevers en die uitgevers verkopen 90 procent van hun boeken in Nederland (ja) niet in België zo is het in feite.

Dus ja de klant beslist tenslotte eh dus je kunt niet eisen van een Nederlandse lezer dat hij al die rare Zuid-Nederlandse woorden kent of uitdrukkingen.

**Extract 2-17: selection of responses to question d2**

The first issue to emerge from the data above is the generally negative stance translators adopt with respect to reviewers and critics. Again, this mainly stems from their own sense of profession and the experience they have gained in practising it. They maintain that critics know nothing about what translation entails and are, therefore, not in a position to comment. As the extracts demonstrate, it is not enough to comment on words and say they are wrongly translated. These words have to be seen in context and examined within the overall strategy adopted by the translator in dealing with particular problems as they presented themselves in the original text. Only then can a balanced evaluation be made of a translation. Hence the notion of ‘wrong translation’ has to be examined more closely if it is to remain a valid tool for critics. It is striking to note that the reasoning here is not unlike Bakhtin and Medvedev’s (1978, 1990) in their discussion of utterance and genre. The translators are seen to be working and reasoning from within their own practice. Their experience as translators allows them to position themselves with respect to ‘outside’ criticism, hence also confirming their professional skill or ethos and likewise affirming their profession. For all intents and purposes, reviewers and critics who have not worked as translators are considered outsiders and hence as lacking credibility (see full transcript of d2 and d3 in KH & CJ interview on CDROM). Moreover, KH points to *Filter*<sup>112</sup> as one of the few valid platforms for criticism. Viewed in terms of the various actors that play a role in the translation process from commission to publication and afterwards, critics do, in fact, come from outside, to a certain extent. As ‘professional’ readers, they mediate not only literary meaning but also authorial reputation, and this may involve literally effacing the translator from the text of social and cultural appreciation, i.e. effectively denying their existence both professionally and socially. On the whole, the shift from contestation to negotiation that became visible between translators, proofreaders and publishers does not seem to occur when it comes to critics.

The second issue that arises in these extracts is language (empowerment), which of course is bound up with and probably inseparable from the first issue. Critics base their judgements on notions of grammar and correct language use (mainly of the target language), which allow them to comment on particular items in a translation or make pronouncements on whether a translation is good or bad. An important parameter of language use here involves notions of standard and dialectic or regional variety. This has already been discussed in responses to section C of the questionnaire, with regard to publishers and proofreaders. As can be gathered from the translators’ comments (particularly CP’s), critics’ negative judgements of the work of Flemish translators are often couched in terms of their use of local or regional expressions and lexical items which may not always be judged ungrammatical. But the line between notions of correct grammar and correct variety is a notoriously fuzzy one, which makes language an on-going locus of contention, even though access to the standard is everyone’s right and its rules are regulated by an impartial international body (Nederlandse Taalunie). Here again we can notice degrees of empowerment with respect to the standard. Such empowerment is not automatically assumed or granted by critics when it comes to reviewing translations. As was pointed out in the previous paragraph, contestation is unlikely to mellow to negotiation



between translators and critics, as it would seem there are no common professional grounds for doing so. On the whole, contestation and negotiation of language use in the data lays bare a range of attitudes to language that deserve closer examination. This will be dealt with under language ideologies in the following chapter. Next to language ideologies, other salient themes that emerged from the data, like ethos, perceptions of genre and versions of culture, will be treated.

## **2.5. Initial Conclusions: nutshell views or the germs of ethos?**

In section 4 of this chapter an attempt was made to trace ‘plausible scenarios’ of translation, which involved examining the life and professional trajectories of a number of translators, how they deal with translation both textually and professionally and the values and opinions they hold with respect to their work and the various other players in the field. An exploration of the questionnaire data has brought to light a number of items which are outlined in brief below. The main points to emerge from the data will be listed in bullet points below for each section of the questionnaire:

### **2.5.1. Section A**

- ◆ Decisions to become a translator related in ‘narratives of inception’ comprise two pivotal factors:
  - a moment of epiphany (positive or negative) and
  - a learning process (schooling, higher education, ‘bilingual’ lifestyle, travel).
- ◆ Translators have various orientations to translation both as an activity and as a profession (see also Table 2-i and 2-ii above).
- ◆ Though affinity (cultural and individual) plays a role in a translator’s choice of poet/writer, translators do not translate from one literature or language only or can seldom afford to.

### **2.5.2. Section B**

- ◆ Translation is also very much a material process that takes place in various stages in which two major strategies are used:
  - Getting the first impression on ‘paper’ (reading/writing) and
  - Using time and distance to complete the job;
  - The most commonly expressed norm in this process is that a source text poem must become a poem in Dutch.
- ◆ Translators draw on and maintain networks of colleagues, experts and friends for consultation and cooperation, next to using dictionaries, lexicons, internet forums, etc.
- ◆ Translators work with the poets or writers they translate if they can but
  - Do wish to maintain a degree of independence and
  - Do not wish to overburden poets/writers with questions.

- ♦ Time pressure differs according to text type (prose, poetry). Simultaneous publication of collections of poetry in two or more languages has increased pressure to prose level.

### 2.5.3. Section C

- ♦ Language competence is a vital aspect of professional competence: there is a shift from stances of contestation between translators and proofreaders (and publishers) to configurations of negotiation and cooperation as a translator's reputation increases.
- ♦ Norms of language use are set by the centre with respect to the periphery and not by state institutions that regulate the standard. Publishers are mainly housed in the centre.
- ♦ Post-proof changes made to a translation are usually smaller in number than those made to drafts.

### 2.5.4. Section D

- ♦ No clear dichotomy can be set up between authoring and translating.
- ♦ In real terms, translation is finalised by publication but potential translational meaning may not be exhausted on publication.
- ♦ Readings by critics remain a locus of contestation that is informed by perceptions of translational competence and language empowerment.

These thirteen points are generalisations made from the data and not generalisations, period. They could not have been made without the data and next to this, they also reflect the researcher's selection processes and focuses within the data – a particular perspective on events that was mediated first and foremost by the questionnaire. The purpose of the questionnaire was to discover patterns in an already existing complex reality. The lengthy quotes and extracts from the interview transcripts<sup>113</sup> used in the discussion not only give an indication of these patterns, they also display a richness of comment made by the interviewees that deserves to be examined in greater depth, precisely because it gives us an insight into that complex reality. This examination will be conducted in the following chapter. Before conducting the examination, the findings from the data will be contrasted with the basic tenets of functional theories of translation in general and skopos theory in particular.

### 2.5.5. Skopos and the Variables of Function: a comparison of functions and findings

In what follows the generalisations made from the data will be contrasted with points made in the Translation Studies literature discussed in chapter I. This mainly involves exploring them in relation the 'when, where, how and why' postulate found in Reiss (1984), Nord (1997<sup>114</sup>) and more specifically with respect to Vermeer's 'relevant factors' (Vermeer in Venuti 2000). The question asked in the previous chapter with respect to Vermeer's 'relevant factors' (*commission, brief, skopos and translatum*) was how the factors relate to each other in reality. Vermeer speaks

of a hierarchy of relations within skopos theory, which can be examined here in the light of the findings.

#### **2.5.5.1. Commission**

As Vermeer points out, there always is a *commission* and the fact that some translation work is not initially commissioned by a publisher does not mean there is no *commission*. There is a *commission* set by the translator and also in the end, albeit post factum, if the work is published. As has been indicated in the interview data, some translators propose certain works of translation to publishers either when they have already finished the translation or beforehand. Though this can be regarded as the negotiation of a *commission* and hence neatly prove Vermeer's point, the dynamics of agency becomes obscured if we only regard the publisher as issuing the *commission*. As the data has also revealed, the power to suggest a *commission* is almost always directly proportionate to a translator's reputation, hence it proves important to highlight the negotiation involved as it is illustrative of varying power relations between publishers and translators. Hence, such explorations provide indications of distribution of power, competence, etc. within a given translational habitus, as it cannot be supposed that such roles and relations are always fixed or focused in a given way. Moreover, we also have a real indication in the data that a company's publishing policy is influenced by translators, no matter how small that influence may be.

#### **2.5.5.2. Brief**

The specifications regarding how a translation job should be done are not always made explicit by the publisher. Again, this does not mean that there is no brief. A brief can be both tacit and explicit at the same time. A translator may be asked to follow a publisher's style sheet, for example, and receive no further instructions. Though I did not ask the interviewees specifically whether they received explicit translation instructions from their publishers, their statements do allow us to make some remarks concerning translation briefs. As Vermeer states, a translator is an expert to be consulted in the event of a translational action: "it is thus up to him to decide, for instance, what role a source text plays in his translational action. The decisive factor here is the purpose, the skopos, of the communication in a given situation" (Vermeer in Venuti 2000: 222). They are assumed to know what needs to be done and Vermeer adds "[i]n some circumstances one may debate with them over the best way of proceeding until a consensus is reached" (Vermeer in Venuti 2000: 222). That it is up to them to decide what the role of the source text is in their translational action is not entirely borne out by the data gathered for this study. A consensus is not always reached beforehand but rather during the translation process and the proof reader plays a role in arriving at that consensus. The greater a translator's reputation, the less his or her translation will be altered at the proof stage, however – this is clearly visible in the case of EJ and CP. On the other hand, a consensus may not always be reached: some translators may disagree with the title given to a work in translation by the publisher, for example (see KH & CJ interview) or to changes made

to a translation without prior consultation with the translator (see VDK interview). On the whole, it would seem in this particular study that the notion of brief is heavily informed by the genre-related expectations of all the actors involved (see section 5 of the following chapter for an in-depth discussion of genre perceptions among the interviewees).

### 2.5.5.3. Skopos

Vermeer defines skopos in the following way:

‘The word, *skopos*, then is a technical term for the aim or purpose of a translation... The aim of any translational action, and the mode in which it is to be realised, are negotiated with the client who commissions the action. A precise specification of aim and mode is essential for the translator. – This is of course analogously true of translation proper: skopos and mode of realization must be adequately defined if the text-translator is to fulfil his task successfully’.  
(Vermeer in Venuti 2000: 221)

As was pointed out in the discussion of *brief* above, the clarity with respect to skopos and mode of realisation that is desired in the above quote may be lacking in reality. This does not mean that it is not desirable, in principle. Though a client may have a very clear aim and demand that the translator pitch the text to achieve that aim, there is still no guarantee that the text will in fact have the desired effect. Any seasoned advertiser knows that such aims can backfire grandiosely, despite all the precaution and care taken in carrying out the skopos<sup>15</sup>. It might also be the case that a client and a translator agree on the aim but do not agree on the way to achieve it, or to put it more simply, what the text should look like. Basically speaking, outside the ideal maximum rapport and explicitness set out in Skopos theory there are a number of possible relations between client and translator which can only be discovered through empirical study. In other words, we cannot presuppose maximum communication in the outlining of a skopos, no matter how desirable that might be. For example, the basic norm of most of the translators interviewed for this study was that the poem or collection of poems they were translating had to become a poem or collection of poems in Dutch. This is a standpoint they bring with them to the negotiation table, as it were. The publishers’ standpoints are not that different but this does not mean that there is total agreement and explicitness on what this means. The dynamics of translating within this framework has been shown in the discussion of sections B and C of the questionnaire. Though for all intents and purposes there is a skopos, expecting maximal explicitness may prevent us from seeing how aims are set up in reality. For example, Nord in referring to Vermeer’s idea of a ‘dethronement’ of the source text states **that**:

The role of the source text in functionalist approaches is radically different from earlier linguistic or equivalence-based theories. It is adequately captured by Vermeer’s idea of a ‘dethronement’ (Entthronung) of the source text. The source text is no longer the first and foremost criterion for the translator’s decisions; it is just one of the various sources of information used by the translator. (Nord 1997: 25)

The norm expressed by the translators in this study (remark on poem in Dutch above) can be regarded both in terms of equivalence of form and of function or more pertinently in terms of genre expectations, which includes both the formal and the functional. We have also seen how these translators draw on various sources and networks to broaden their view on the texts they translate. They are also aware of how the (text) genres they work within function in their culture. All of this comes close to meeting the demands set out in skopos theory, with one basic difference: it lacks the (enthusiastic) programmatic overtures apparent in the above quote. Dethronement is more than just a shift of focus; it is an ideological stance that should be tested for its politics, despite its good functionalist intentions. Again it is a matter of firstly finding out how translation in the broadest sense is done before making any pronouncements. Perhaps dethronement can best be understood in the context of translator training, in which a focus on the function and pragmatics of the target text helps young translators gain insight into possible translational solutions in their own language variety.

#### 2.5.5.4. **Translatum**

Vermeer describes *translatum* in the following terms:

The target text, the *translatum*, is oriented towards the target culture, and it is this which ultimately defines its adequacy. It therefore follows that the source and target texts may diverge from each other quite considerably, not only in the formulation and distribution of the content but also as regards the goals which are set for each, and in terms of which the arrangement of the content is in fact determined. (Vermeer in Venuti 2000: 223)

On the face of it, the goals of a translated collection of poems and the source collection may not be all that different, substantially. On the other hand, they may indeed diverge considerably, as Vermeer rightly points out. In fact it is hard to say either way without an investigation of each case. For example, would Samuel Beckett have imagined *Waiting for Godot* as being emblematic of life in prison<sup>116</sup>? Perhaps he might have, but it is what people do with the text that is significant here. Translators and publishers may agree on the goal of a particular text and translate it accordingly but they might be surprised by what readers actually do with that text. I have attempted to point to this in the discussion of sections C and D of the questionnaire. Again, much of this is determined by the players' understanding of genre in the society they are acting in or as Vermeer puts it: "the decisive criterion is always the skopos" (Vermeer in Venuti 2000: 223). The question remains: who sets the skopos? Is it the client (for the purposes of this study, the publishers), is it the translator or is it both parties? Or is skopos also mediated in some way by prospective readers' expectations (envisaged sales and financial success)? Indeed a *translatum* must function in the new language in the new society and is indeed oriented towards it – this is something on which all those interviewed would agree and, in fact, work towards in various ways. But it can also be deduced from the interview data that, as far as the translators and publishers are concerned, the target text is also pointing backward from whence it came in the ways it reflects certain political, cultural,

aesthetic stances or canonical positionings. Are they too not part of the *skopos* in that they drive translators to work on a *translatum*?

It is not the purpose of this study to discredit *skopos* theory. On the contrary, the discussion above bears witness to the validity of the theory as a whole, including its “relevant factors”. The study has, in fact, shown that these factors stand up to scrutiny and has also given us an indication of how they relate to each other in reality in a given context (literary translations). More importantly, it has shown that these factors should be regarded not merely as hierarchical stages in a linear process but important sites of contestation and negotiation<sup>17</sup> that determine a process which is linear perhaps only in its outcome. It is not the validity of these factors that is being contested but rather the absence of a means of seeing how they operate – something which an ethnographic approach allows us to do.

#### 2.5.5.5. The Variables of Function

The time, place, manner, reason, recipient, purpose variables found in functional approaches to translation ground all acts of translation historically and socio-culturally. Recipient and purpose have been largely covered in *skopos*. Though the literature maps out prospective avenues of function for given texts in given societies at given times, any study that wishes to discover how these prospective functions play out can only be retrospective. They can only be expressed in terms of what happened then and there, etc. The data gathered for this study certainly do provide us with some useful insights into how these variables play out, but some caution has to be taken in transposing them directly into the functionalist paradigm. The ‘when’ or time frame of the translations included in this study is roughly the last thirty years of the 20th century: some of the original poems were published before 1970, however, but mainly no earlier than 1960. So given this particular period, one could conduct an inquiry into the other variables listed above. But firstly, despite the historical framework, ‘when’ gives no immediate indication of duration of translation – a factor the data has shown to be **important** and **which** indeed forms an aspect of ‘when’. ‘Where’ provides us with an answer: **the** Netherlands and Belgium and also allows us to show that the target language is Dutch **and** hence partly answer ‘how’. But secondly, this would give us no indication of the sociolinguistic issues laid bare in the interviews. ‘How’ forms the subject of chapters 4 and 5 of this dissertation, which provide contrast analysis of source and target poems in an electronic corpus. But thirdly, ‘how’ extends beyond ‘textual’ translation practices to include the circumstances and frameworks of expectation – indicated in the data – in which the translations were made. Moreover, ‘how’ also includes duration, which further complicates matters. And fourthly, we must take agency into account in order to give a complete answer to ‘why’, as a translator’s ‘missionary urge’ for example, may also play a role in why a work gets translated. As we can see, the way in which these variables relate to reality and to each other is far from simple:

Passer du schème pratique au schéma théorique, construit après la bataille, du sens pratique au modèle théorique, qui peut être lu soit comme un projet, un plan ou une méthode, soit comme

un programme mécanique, ordonnance mystérieuse mystérieusement reconstruite par le savant, c'est laisser échapper tout ce qui fait la réalité temporelle de la pratique en train de se faire. La pratique se déroule dans le temps et elle a toutes les caractéristiques corrélatives, comme l'irréversibilité que détruit la synchronisation ... Il y a un temps de la science qui n'est pas celui de la pratique. Pour l'analyste, le temps s'abolit ... (Bourdieu 1980<sup>118</sup> : 136-137)

In other words, to return to one of the concerns of the previous chapter, the constraints being exerted by the emic – in this case, the various views brought to light in the interview data – renders it difficult to adopt wholesale an already existing etic structure, like functionalist situational variables for example, and lay it down across the data for the purposes of analysis. The complexity of the views demands that the etic model be adapted in the direction of practice; otherwise the interrelated factors of the emerging functionalist model would become as complex as the reality it is attempting to map and hence render itself extremely cumbersome to use.

In the chapter that follows the interview data will be examined for a second time to see whether it can be viewed in terms of practice. This does not mean a capitulation to the emic or a negation of the etic, however. In this case an inquiry into translation is also an inquiry into a way of understanding it. A second examination of the data indicates that the notion of practice allows us to get to the heart of the data through the interviewee perspective (mentioned at the end of 4.1.) mainly because of its visibility in the data. The writer is aware, however, that the term 'interviewee perspective' is not entirely accurate in that the perspective has also been mediated by the interviewer and will lead to interpretations and resultant structurations that the interviewees play no part in or may not necessarily agree with. The research question that underscores the discussion in the following chapter also concerns 'practice' as an etic notion. The question is whether it can be considered as a valid tool within the framework of translation studies.





### 3. AN ETHNOGRAPHY OF TRANSLATION: INDICATIONS OF HABITUS

This chapter comprises a second analysis of the interview data in which closer attention will be paid to salient items that were not specifically envisaged in the interview questions.

#### 3.1. Exploring the Interviewee Perspective: a matter of practice

The interview questions comprised in this study were mainly posed in terms of action, relations and value, within a certain type of activity: “what do you do ...”; “what happens ...”; “do you have an affinity ...”; “do you work closely ...”; “are their opinions useful ...” etc. So it is hardly surprising that the responses were framed in the same terms. As was already stated, the purpose of the interviews was to find out what translators did and thought about their work. The task of the researcher then was to discover patterns of reflection on behaviour and value relating to a particular activity that are sufficiently general to be worthy of consideration, (viz. the generalisations drawn from the data in chapter 2 above). These generalisations have already been contrasted with the literature, more particularly with that of skopos theory and other functionalist approaches to the study of translation. The field of activity was taken for granted, i.e. literary translation, but we have seen that those practising literary translation, even on a full-time basis, often have to rely on other forms of translation work or other work to get by. This does not mean that they do not possess and use different approaches to the various types of translation work. Though literary translation remains the focus of this study, it is nonetheless worth noting that in practice it intersects with other forms of translation, as the interview data demonstrates. This means that no clearly unambiguous subfield of literary translation can be identified without resorting to degrees of abstraction that would be at variance with observable practices.

So this brings us to a more fundamental question that is already visible in the Bourdieu quote at the end of the previous chapter. In this case, can the actions and expressions of value that belong to particular forms of translation work be transposed into (academically) valid sets of impersonal processes and timeless transformations across languages? The socially and historically grounded nature of translation has already been amply argued within functionalist approaches (chapter I). This renders such notions as “timelessness” and the “impersonal” invalid in absolute terms. But this should not prevent us from seeking significant historically and socially grounded patterns, which are generalisable though nevertheless contingent, that might help us gain insight into the complex nature of translation. Would this, therefore, allow

us to cut to the chase and take things one step further than functionalism by simply using practice as a basic starting point from here on? After all, the point of departure of skopos theory is ‘action’ or ‘purposeful activity’ as Christiane Nord (1997<sup>119</sup>) puts it. And as Hanks (1996: 11) points out, practice not only offers us activity, but also ‘the law of system’ and ‘the reflective gaze of value’ – the last two properties could be encapsulated within Nord’s pre-modifier ‘purposeful.’

Before reaching a conclusion, let us first turn to our second analysis of the interview data, or to the ‘interviewee perspective’ mentioned above. This should allow us to decide whether we can posit things in terms of practice or not. But at the same time, it is also important to banish the looming spectres of self-fulfilling prophesy and circular argument. As was pointed out above, the questions asked did concern forms of action, relations and value but what other form could these questions have taken? At all times, they concerned practical or working situations. So as such, these research questions were not informed by an *a priori* notion of ‘practice’ as understood by Bourdieu, Hanks and others but rather by a desire to discover what translators actually do in practical terms, which is not the same thing at all. Again as such, there was no unifying principle initially posited under which these disparate forms of action and value could be placed, besides the fact that those who were engaged in them work to varying degrees within literary translation. Moreover, the way Bourdieu and others use practice differs considerably from the dictionary definition:

1. habitual action or performance (the practice of teaching; makes a practice of saving).
2. a habit or regular custom (has been my regular practice).
3. a repeated exercise in an activity requiring the development of skill (to sing well needs much practice).
- 3.b a session of this (time for target practice).
4. action or execution as opposed to theory.
5. the professional work or business of a doctor, lawyer, etc. (has a practice in town).
6. an established method of legal procedure.
7. procedure generally, esp. of a specified kind. (OED<sup>120</sup>: 1136)

If anything, practice includes all this but more importantly, to the scholars mentioned above, it is an etic notion that is rooted firmly in the empirical. In this sense, it is neither opposed to theory nor does it ignore the emic. On the contrary, it is a notion in which ‘theory’ and ‘practice’ meet or out of which they emerge. It is, as it were, hypothesis put into action and activity theorised at one and the same time: both the horns of an epistemological dilemma and the two prongs of inquiry that fit together antagonistically onto the handle of scrutiny:

La théorie de la pratique en tant que pratique rappelle, contre le matérialisme intellectualiste, que les objets de la connaissance sont *construits*, et non passivement enregistrés, et, contre idéalisme intellectualiste, que le principe de cette construction est le système des dispositions structurées et structurantes qui se constitue dans la pratique et qui est toujours orienté vers des fonctions pratiques. (Bourdieu 1980: 87)

To Bourdieu, not only must practice be seen in its own terms, it must also be understood as belonging within a certain habitus which it helps to construct and maintain and by which it is determined. He defines habitus in the following way:

Les conditionnements associés à une classe particulière de conditions d'existence produisent des habitus, systèmes de dispositions durables et transposables, structures structurées prédisposées à fonctionner comme structures structurantes, c'est-à-dire en tant que principes générateurs et organisateurs de pratiques et de représentations qui peuvent être objectivement adaptées à leur but sans supposer la visée consciente de fins et la maîtrise expresse des opérations nécessaires pour les atteindre, objectivement « réglées » et « régulières » sans être en rien le produit de l'obéissance à des règles, et, étant tout cela, collectivement orchestrées sans être le produit de l'action organisatrice d'un chef d'orchestre. (Bourdieu 1980: 88-89)

Bourdieu warns his reader about being overhasty in stepping from practices observed in the field to a-temporal schemata that attempt to map out these practices (Bourdieu 1980: 135-165), or as Goodwin<sup>121</sup> puts it:

An event being seen, a relevant object of knowledge, emerges through the interplay between a domain of scrutiny (a patch of dirt, the images made available by the Rodney King video) and a set of discursive practices (dividing the domains of scrutiny by highlighting a figure against a ground, applying specific coding schemes for the constitution and interpretation of relevant events, etc.) being deployed in a specific activity (arguing a legal case, mapping a site, planting crops, etc.). ... It is not possible to work in some abstract world where the constitution of knowledge through a politics of representation has been magically overcome. (Goodwin 1994: 606-607)

That translation is a profession is taken for granted in all functional approaches to translation and it was also taken for granted in drawing up my questionnaire. The interview findings discussed in chapter 2 have indicated a variety of stances towards the profession among those interviewed (see Table 2-i and 2-ii in chapter 2). These now require closer scrutiny. Despite prior professional experience as a translator, the view held by the interviewer regarding the profession could best be framed in terms of a 'container metaphor' (Lakoff & Johnson<sup>122</sup> 1980) which indexed 'profession' as the medium in which translators found themselves, not unlike fish in water or the 'bucket' theory of context<sup>123</sup>. If anything, the interview data seem to indicate that profession is something that is also 'inside' the translator (see the discussion of the responses to **A1** in chapter 2). So, as has been indicated in the first discussion of the interview data, on the whole, the interviewees speak as professionals within a profession and/or at a certain remove from that profession, hence the difficulty in reducing their utterances to translational or textual strategies alone or of fitting these utterances unambiguously into the categories of extant functional models of translation. To continue the analogy set out above, it was becoming increasingly difficult to imagine the fish without the water.

### 3.2. Exploring the Interviewee Perspective: orders of salience

Once the interviews had been coded into question and answer segments per question, questionnaire section and interviewee, the data were re-examined on a number of occasions for salient statements of any kind. The salience I refer to here is not question or section specific but rather concerns statements that crop up throughout the whole questionnaire and that are more or less of the same order. The task then was to find appropriate headings under which to classify these statements and then to see whether levels of sub and super-ordination could be established between them, while still remaining mindful of the fish and water analogy mentioned above. One of the most striking observations to emerge from the interviews was how the translators used metaphorical<sup>124</sup> and metonymic expressions<sup>125</sup> to describe what they do. These expressions seemed very much at variance with academic models that strove for precision and detail in outlining translation processes at various levels. On the face of it, as expressions, they seemed fuzzy and enigmatic, and consequently, of little use. On further examination, however, this ‘fuzziness’ seemed to reflect more on the researcher than anything else or to state it in other terms, the apparent variance between scholarly translation models and the utterances gleaned from the translators could not be resolved by merely contrasting such models, which are based on well-considered scholarly reflection and textual observation (viz. the considerable body of writing within Translation Studies on such models) and the largely ad-hoc translatorial or translational opinions found in the interviews.

As this was the first time I had interviewed translators, in doing so I was coming to the situation with a number of hypotheses that drew heavily on my reading within translation studies. I somehow expected to hear or discover something akin to the schematic conciseness of the models I had been studying, albeit in other terms. However, it is known that translators are not generally privy to such models and if they are (through schooling or training, for example), they seldom use them over-consciously or explicitly in their work. It was up to me, therefore, to make sense of the salience that had emerged following various re-readings of the interview data. The expressions I refer to were couched in stretches of mainly ‘matter-of-fact’ discourse on the topic at hand and often accompanied by changes in voice quality which seemed to indicate a quickening of emotion, that the speaker had arrived at a clarity of vision or expression on the topic concerned. It occurred to me when examining these expressions that the speakers who used them were performing and achieving or at least attempting to perform and achieve several things at the same time. Take the following extract for example:

NP: "... maar het is fantastisch dat is dat is Banville het zit heel gehaaid in elkaar gecomponeerd dus (ja, ja, ja) en dat is te vergelijken met gedichten en dan (ah ha) loopt het op een veel groter terrein, prachtig ... daarom heb ik hem ook vertaald dat herken ik." (ensuing conversation)

#### Extract 3-1: sharky composition

This short statement alone is noteworthy for the complexity of its positioning. It is not the purpose of this study to provide a full discourse analysis of the interviews however, nor is it the writer’s plan to subject the data to the intricacies of an analytical framework like Hymes’s

Speaking Grid (Hymes 1972<sup>126</sup>) for example, nor the useful insights provided by other modes of analysis, though undoubtedly these approaches would bring much of interest to light. The basic purpose at this stage is to discover categories which suggest themselves from the data in which to place salient features gleaned from the interviews and having done so to see whether these categories can be contrasted with those available in existing translation models. It might be prudent to state at this stage that this ‘raw’ interview data will not be (and perhaps cannot be) contrasted with existing translational categorisations as the balance of scholarly precision is tipped too far in favour of these categorisations. To comply with the old adage, kind can only be compared with kind; so the task is first to identify comparable kind as it emerges from the data. So, let us now turn to a brief analysis of the above extract.

In this extract, the interviewee is commenting on a particular novel by the Irish writer, John Banville, two of whose books he had already translated in the past. Banville’s work is described as being ‘sharky’ or crafty in its composition and structure. This “sharkiness” is emblematic of why the translator found it so intriguing and in fact identified with the writer and wanted to translate his work. The ‘sharkiness’ of the work is also compared to the intricacies of poetry<sup>127</sup> – another point of identification for the translator. So ‘sharky’ (a word [gehaaid] that seems slightly out of place in the original Dutch in that it bears mainly negative overtones and is cognate with sly and cunning) indexes positive personal empathy, textual complexity and the identification of a genre (poetry) at one and the same time. It bears witness to a desire to translate which stems from that empathy and reveals his recognising something personal in Banville’s work that is related both to how he perceives that language and texts work and how the translator ticks. The statement as a whole and the metaphor ‘sharky’ in particular encapsulate elements of reference, recognition, apperception and reflexivity or as Merz<sup>128</sup> puts it in her discussion of the structure of spoken exchanges:

The fascinating insight here is that language's basic structure is fundamentally multifunctional: talk that purports to be referential simultaneously performs metalinguistically. And, as metalinguistic talk is always a matter of linguistic exchange and communication, power is involved as much as in shaping the linguistic aspects of the exchange as in formulating its non-linguistic aspects. Performative metalinguistic talk is not morphologically distinguished from referential talk. Ecclesiastics' maxim does not hold here: there is no 'time' (or medium or locus) for seemingly-separate things to be performed separately, inter alia, because, in the complexity of communication, things are never that separate. (Mertz & Yovel 2000: 9)

Once my eye had been drawn to these metaphors and metonyms (some of which are lexicalised in the original Dutch<sup>129</sup>), I began to encounter them regularly in the data. Seen within and alongside the general discourse, these constructions allowed me to carry out my first (tentative) attempt at categorising the features I considered to be salient in the data. I initially identified four main types of statement relating to:

- ♦ The profession of translator both in the broadest and in the most specific textual sense;
- ♦ Language (use) including the characteristics of (national) varieties, and genre-specific aspects, etc.;

- ◆ Text type and genre including what might be called the ‘politics of aesthetics’;
- ◆ Culture, including national cultures and their differences, literature as (an expression of) culture, etc.

On further reflection, I arrived at the following categorisations, which I consider to be more pointed and yet more general and inclusive than the previous four as they seemed more of the order of description than categorisation:

- ◆ *Ethos*, as it also covered individual perceptions of the profession of translation including social and textual practices taken together and as such formed a recognised category in a variety of disciplines (viz. anthropology, sociology, psychology, language studies, communication studies, etc.);
- ◆ *Language ideologies*, also because it could include individual perceptions of language and hence also be seen within the framework of current thinking on language and ideology that is visible in important work<sup>130</sup> in this area;
- ◆ *Genre* (including text type), also because of the versatility of more recent approaches that regard genre as a mode of social action<sup>131</sup> and not merely as a set of discursive features and hence can include individual stances and perceptions;
- ◆ *Versions of culture*, again because this could house and ground individual perceptions of culture and what the notion embraces and bring them into play with the other three categories.

Whether these categories can be arranged hierarchically or whether it is desirable to seek a hierarchy in the first place still remains to be seen. Language – or languages, if you will – forms the basic raw material in any translator’s workplace. His or her workplace also houses tools<sup>132</sup> in the form of dictionaries, lexicons, writing materials, word processors, reference works, networks, etc., the relevance of which has been pointed to in chapter 1. In the first analysis of the interview data, the professional embeddedness and material nature of translating has been discussed along with the relevance of time or duration as an important factor in the process. Other factors have also been discussed, such as networks of colleagues and others who possess knowledge that is linguistically, generically and culturally relevant for the translations at hand. In short, the four categories set out above go a long way towards encapsulating the findings thrown up by the data that were dealt with in the first analysis, whether they be profession or network-based or textually or culturally-oriented. As the analysis of the ‘sharky’ extract has shown, there is a clear overlap between the four categories outlined above, in that no particular utterance made by the interviewees can be said to relate solely to one category and to one category only. Here the image of a Venn diagram springs to mind in which the various categories are encompassed by circles which would intersect at various points depending on the focus of the utterance, but we are a far cry yet from consolidating our findings in this way. Let us turn therefore, to our second analysis of the interview data or to what has been called the ‘interviewee perspective’ above.

I will now examine a selection of utterances grouped under each category in turn, starting with Ethos and ending with Versions of Culture. The number of utterances grouped under the first heading is greater by far than those under the other three:

Ethos: 136                      Language Ideologies: 54                      Genre: 47                      Versions of Culture: 40

This difference in number stems in part from the way the interview questions were formulated and pitched, whereas the utterances that fall under the other three categories could be argued to have emerged unsolicited from the various interactions. It seemed somehow obvious to assume that those interviewed would speak from within their profession – and as mentioned already, many of their utterances listed under the four categories do contain matter-of-fact information about various aspects of their practice – but nevertheless, this is far from being a argumentative non-starter, as many studies on translation presuppose professional involvement but seldom study its dynamics as such.

### **3.3. Ethos**

#### **3.3.1. Ethos: a definition**

The Collins Cobuild<sup>133</sup> English Dictionary defines ethos as: “the set of ideas and attitudes that is associated with a particular group of people or with a particular activity”, or as the New Oxford Dictionary of English<sup>134</sup> puts it, “the characteristic spirit of a culture, era, or community as manifested in its attitudes and aspirations.” These ideas and attitudes can be said to define and construct how people go about their lives and professions or rather, as far as this study is concerned, that the indications of ideas and attitudes gleaned from the data should allow us to gain insight into what translatorial and translational ethos consists of. The examples that follow resemble the ‘sharky’ example given above in that, though they are couched in more “matter-of-fact” discourse, they often hinge on metaphor or metonymic uses of language, which it would seem, serve as key moments or factors in the discourse.

##### **3.3.1.1. Of Cannibals and Adventurers**

The two metaphors used in this extract concern eating (the translator as cannibal) and travelling (translating as adventure).

EJ: Nou op een gegeven ogenblik lees ik iets van een bepaalde dichter en denk ik dat wil ik hebben, dat is voor mij. Het is een soort kannibalisme je, je vreet het op en je maakt er een vertaling van en ook wil je het aan een ander laten zien kijk eens wat mooi zo. En ja dan begin ik daaraan en ik heb ook de gewoonte als vertaler word je altijd ingepeperd door mensen die daar wetenschappelijk mee bezig zijn je moet eerst het hele werk lezen en dan pas ga je beginnen. Maar ik begin eerst omdat ik het avontuur wil vasthouden. Ja de spanning moet er in blijven. (I.1/b1)

**Extract 3-2: of cannibals and adventurers**

A double movement can be detected in this statement: an outward movement that positions the speaker negatively with respect to prescriptive ‘scientific’ codes or translational norms and also more positively with respect to potential readers of a translation. There is also an inward movement towards text which is cast as the adventure of maintaining the tension of the work in translation. In the statement, a way of working becomes visible that has been acquired through experience and that is in defiance of a well-known translation norm which requires thorough prior knowledge of a work, if it is to be translated properly. The translator casts himself as a cannibal<sup>135</sup>, as someone who devours foreign writers/texts for their beauty, but this act of appropriation also involves showing this beauty to a new audience. In contrast, those who lay down the laws of translation are believed to over-spice (too much pepper) the dish, hence rendering the eating (translating) a chore and ridding it of adventure and tension, which results in insipid translation<sup>136</sup>. So there is a commitment here to the perceived beauty of a text and to the potential readers and new discoverers of that beauty.

### 3.3.1.2. Of Bulldozers and Antennae

In this extract, the ignorant roughshod behaviour of bulldozers is contrasted with the cultural and textual sensitivity of antennae:

NP: Kijk vertalen is in zeker opzicht ook herkennen wat je niet weet. Je weet namelijk niet alles maar als je er als een bulldozer overheen raast: (ja) wie zijn dood zal dat wel wezen? Dat is het dus niet he, je moet heel gevoelig zijn om te weten hier gebeurt iets, maar ik weet niet wat (ah) en wat, want er kan iets staan iets geloof nou, iets buiten het woordenboek betekent? nou dat zal wel . . . maar je moet een soort antenne hebben en die antenne gaat ook niet altijd werken dat weet ik ook wel maar je moet een antenne hebben dat je denkt hier gebeurt iets meer dat meer is (ah ha) er zit iets onder nog dat moet ik eigenlijk nog even bekijken en dat ga ik vragen (schitterend) (I.3/b2)

#### Extract 3-3: of bulldozers and antennae

Here a sound sense of professionalism requires recognition of one’s own limitations. It demands an awareness of the fact that as far as texts are concerned “er staat niet wat er staat” [what’s there isn’t there] – as one interviewee so succinctly put it (I.8/b1). So sensitivity –the ‘antenna’ metaphor – is concomitant with awareness of possible misreading and also of the need for cooperation with those who are better placed to know. Here again the textual and the social co-occur in forming professional practice. A refusal to recognise one’s lack of knowledge and a consequent refusal to seek advice is equated with acting like a bulldozer. It is not so much a matter of networks of friends, colleagues and experts bolstering one’s individual knowledge but more a case of professional knowledge and translation arising from and being maintained in situations and rapports of this type. Hence sensitivity is both an embodied stance and a professional tool, all of which falls under ethos.



### 3.3.1.3. On Developing the Craft

The metonym 'craft' carries a whole set of associations along with it, including the development of skill over time and the search for perfection in an on-going engagement with one's work:

PF: Maar, zie je daar een soort rijpingsproces in? Em zie je u bijvoorbeeld em in de toekomst em meer gaan vertalen of em en daar beter in worden of wat denk je daarover?

VDK: Ja, wel het heeft zeker iets te maken met em ja het is een "craft" ook je moet het je moet er mee bezig zijn en blijven schrijven ... maar je voelt als je er bezig mee bent, als je er mee bezig bent een tijdje mee bezig bent dan word je veel kritischer tegenover je eigen taal en je eigen vertalingen en em ik, ik werk heel graag samen met iemand anders om te vertalen omdat je dan ook gedwongen wordt om afstand te nemen van je eigen werk en em ik denk dat ik op die manier eum de beste dingen vertaald heb. (1.5/C1 (sub1))

#### Extract 3-4: on developing the craft

The interviewee compares translation to a craft i.e. something that requires practice and time to develop and improve. According to the interviewee, one crucial aspect of this is the act of forcing oneself to take a distance from one's own work and language use, which can be brought about by working with others on translations. It is as if a degree of objectivity and perspective is created by such inter-subjective exchanges among translators working together on the same text. Working with others makes one aware of one's own practices or, perhaps more significantly, it makes one aware of the fact that one has particular practices in the first place. As a result, the translator's work becomes both de-personalised and personalised in that the translator affiliates him or herself with recognisable textual practice within a profession, thereby helping to construct such practice, while interiorising and personalising it at one and the same time. And by a curious paradox, it is through this de-personalisation that the craft is conceived as tangible and objective and through its personalisation that the craft is maintained by being personally verifiable by the translator concerned in his or her own specific work.

### 3.3.1.4. Skin to Skin: orders of readership

Compared to other 'readers,' the translator is closest to or skin-to-skin with the poet in terms of reading and interpreting:

PF: Eh he em en o.k. dus eerst lees je zeg je en dan?

VDK: En dan probeer je meer te weten te komen over de dichter zelf.

Dus als die nog leeft eh dan kun je eventueel eh contact opnemen maar ik probeer dat zo veel mogelijk te vermijden omdat ik er vanuit ga als je een gedicht leest dan ben je ook alleen en uiteindelijk ben je als vertaler ook in de eerste plaats lezer en dan heb je jouw interpretatie en ik vind dat ja dat daar een zekere vrijheid moet kunnen bestaan dus.

Behalve, er is een verschil tussen interpreteren en echt met bepaalde zinnen, voor een bepaalde zin staan waar je helemaal niet weet waarover hij het heeft dan moet je natuurlijk, dan moet je contact opnemen dan (maar dat was mijn volgende vraag). Ja. (1.6/b1) ....

#### Extract 3-5: skin to skin – 1

VDK: Ik zou, maar, ik denk dat het ontzettend afhangt van het soort poëzie dat je moet vertalen eh. Als je met een heel duistere poëzie bezig zit die met een zware symboliek geladen is ja, dan (ja) zou je natuurlijk, zou het ideaal zijn om dat samen met, in samenspraak met de dichter te kunnen doen maar ik wil de mensen ook niet nodeloos storen ik ik denk eh, dus ik doe dat ik zou dat alleen maar doen als het echt nodig is (ja) dus omdat ik vind elke lezer leest het gedicht voor zichzelf interpreteert het zoals hij wil dus ik (ja) vind dat je dat als vertaler ben je de eerste lezer of de dichtste lezer dan zit je de dichter echt al op de huid (laughs) en dus je mag dat niet gaan overdrijven (o.k. ja). (1.6/b3)

#### Extract 3-6: skin to skin – 2

The reasoning in this extract sheds a strange light on the idea of the translator's invisibility discussed so often in the literature (Venuti 1998; Simeoni 1998). Though the translator is considered as being the person closest to the writer or poet, when it comes to reading and interpreting the poet's work ('skin-to-skin'), he/she believes that a certain degree of freedom is needed and appropriated in order to maintain that closeness. The translator is expected to know his or her job and in this sense bothering the poet too often might be understood as a sign of incompetence. There are limits to this of course. As the extracts indicate, there are at least two types of reading and two types of interpreting. A reader can read and interpret a poem to his or her heart's content but a translator cannot. The translator's reading and interpretation must fall within the realm of the plausible and be somehow verifiable, either through contact with the poet or with others within the professional network who are in a position to provide authoritative suggestions. What distinguishes the translator as a reader from other readers is the professional responsibility involved and the reputations that are at stake. In the worst of cases, interpretation is understood as uninformed conjecture and in the best, as an expression of the degree of freedom required to conduct one's profession properly. So the translator's invisibility is not so much a matter of not being placed on an equal footing with the author or poet but more a matter of not becoming ill-considered within one's own profession. Though translator and author are seen as being skin-to-skin in text-user terms, in the interests of a 'good' translation they somehow must maintain a certain professional distance. So this closeness comes at a price: viewed within the translator's profession, reading and interpreting can never be noncommittal, as the continuation of his or her profession may depend on it.

#### 3.3.1.5. The Impassioned Insane

The enthusiasm shared by translators for their work is at variance with the financial benefits or fame to be gained from practicing the profession:

PF: Beschouw je dan uw vertaalwerk als een stuk vakwerk eh? Heb je daar een soort eregevoel bij, ja is dat voor u heel belangrijk?

CJ: Voor alle vertalers dat durf ik nu echt zeggen.

KH: Ja, ja.

CJ: Dat zijn allemaal gepassioneerde gekken die dus alles doen om dat eh zo goed mogelijk

KH: Dat denk ik ook ja, ja, dat merk je ook aan de discussies, he.

CJ: Jaa.

KH: En als je met een probleem zit eh en je gaat ervoor te rade bij collega's die zijn bij wijze van spreken altijd bereid (CJ: ja) om je te helpen en om mee te zoeken omdat (CJ: ja) ze weten hoe frustrerend het is als je voor iets geen oplossing vindt. (PF: ja, ah, ha, ja)

PF: Dus dat is aangaande je krijgt altijd een respons als je dat vraagt.

CJ: Ja, ja, ik mag niet zeggen dat ik ooit niet dat er oplossingen (KH: ja dat is waar) binnenkomen waarvan je zegt van ach dat was het maar de inspanning van iedereen om je te helpen dat is wel ja zeer reëel. (1.8/d1 (sub2))

#### **Extract 3-7: the impassioned insane – 1**

As pointed out elsewhere in the interview (1.8/a3 (sub1)), there is little profit or fame to be had from translation. Nonetheless, those who practice it take pride in a job well done and are always willing to help a colleague find an answer to a particular translation problem. This is what makes them impassioned mad people – who else would make such foolish sacrifices? In this respect, things are done for the love of the craft:

Je kunt alleen maar zelf heel plezierig bezig zijn en het gevoel hebben kijk nu kennen ze in Parijs Sujata Bhatt (PF: ja).

#### **Extract 3-8: the impassioned insane – 2**

This is more than just a veiled complaint about a lack of recognition and hence a lack of appropriate remuneration for translated work – a ‘normal’ wage for a ‘normal’ day’s work, as it were. In fact it does much to reaffirm the status of the profession from within; being enthusiastic about the work and being willing to cooperate in the resolution of translation problems without compensation would make no sense or would be short-lived were they not part of a professional continuum. It is also common knowledge among translators that they are largely responsible for the fact that writers become known to readers of languages other than their own: for example, people don’t generally read ‘Dostoyevsky in English’ but rather ‘Dostoyevsky’, nor have I ever read Bakhtin in the original, for that matter. Of the many checks and compensatory balances within the profession of translation, being an impassioned madman is not only an indication of one’s textual prowess but also of the generally ‘unrecognised’ status of translators as linguistic and cultural ambassadors. To be sure, the debt of recognition is still outstanding in society as a whole but not within the profession, where the symbolic capital accruing to such ‘madness’ is not negligible. In this respect, the much bemoaned invisibility of translators needs to be re-examined and perhaps redefined.

#### **3.3.1.6. Protecting Little Children**

Proofreaders cannot just disregard or strike out the creative efforts of translators: the following extract provides an illustration of the negotiation involved in completing a translation as well as perceptions of how proofreaders differ from translators.

BM: Het gaat dan niet om fout of niet fout (ah ha) maar ja, je kunt zoveel dingen doen met een zin (ja). Je geeft dat aan tien vertalers en je krijgt tien verschillende zinnen (ja) en dan denk ik: ja, dat is een andere vertaler (ja) en dan eh dat voel je ook als de persklaarmaker zelf ook vertaalt tegenover iemand die alleen maar kijkt van: is het grammaticaal en lexicaal in orde?

Dat is een groot verschil (ah ha) en denk ik ja en af en toe ga ik hem wel zo moeten leren afstappen van zinnen waar ik dan zelf aan gehecht was van: hé, dat heb ik goed gezegd, dat laat dat geef ik niet zomaar meteen eh (ah ha) En af en toe, ja dat is in het begin altijd moeilijk, (ja) maar gaandeweg vind ik dat makkelijker behalve als het heel speciale zinnen zijn, bijvoorbeeld eh als het om echt poëtische zinnen gaat (ja). Dus het blijft wel proza, maar dan denk ik eh: "Nee, dat pak je me niet af!" Dat is toch zo'n beetje mijn kind zo dan moet je daar moet je van af blijven (ah ja) als het niet fout is natuurlijk (ja, ja, ja, ja) dus je kunt. (1.9/c3)

#### Extract 3-9: protecting little children

Poetic sentences are like little children; they need to be protected from the outside world. Such sentences stem from the translator's creativity and should be handled with care by the proofreader. In this little scenario, the proofreader embodies grammatical and lexical rule and is portrayed in the worse of cases as someone akin to a strict school master. This is not always the case however, as the extract also indicates. On the whole, there is a tension between the rules of language as system, (personified by the proofreader) and the constructed nature of meaning in translation along with the need for creative leeway (personified by translators). So, textual tension, i.e. striking a balance between perceived rule and creative impulse, is mirrored in the professional tension between the proofreader and the translator. The translator is willing to hand over his/her children if and only if they will not be chastised with the blunt instrument of mere grammatical and lexical correctness. The proofreader must be aware of the relative nature of any given translation (1 sentence + 10 translators = 10 different translations) but at the same time translators must be willing to take a distance from their own creations and allow them to be subjected to the scrutiny of a system expert. If the proofreader understands the translator's predicament or is a translator him or herself, then the ground is levelled for constructive cooperation, the underlying perception being that creativity builds on system or acquiesces to it in the case of error. It is also plausible to posit that proofreaders also maintain standards of creativity and may refuse to be type-cast as strict school masters. In this way, both texts and professional positions are mutually constructed, negotiated and maintained.

#### 3.3.1.7. Of Setting Tasks for Typewriters

The quality of a translation is proportionate to the degree of affinity the translator feels with the author and the material well-being which the profession provides:

PF: Ja. Dus als dan na dit wordt het boek uitgegeven (ah ha) en dan krijg je daar een exemplaar van (vijf, vijf normaal) ja? En hoe voel je dan? Is dat? (hmm) Heb je daar een?

BM: Ja, dat vind ik echt wel em ik denk omdat ik weet dat ik het zelf doorgemaakt heb dan vind ik: er zit veel van mijn eigen werk in. Dus ik ben geen ik ben niet zomaar een, een schrijfmachine zo van: je koopt een

bepaald merk schrijfmachine en je draait een tekst erdoor en voilà. (ah ha) Dan eh dat is anoniem. Ik vind niet dat je als vertaler heel, heel eh een anonieme machine moet zijn. Er zit ook een beetje van mij in en dan ben ik trots als het er als. ...

PF: Maar is dat zeer belangrijk voor u?

BM: Nu, je moet het niet overdrijven, vind ik, (ja) want ik denk, als je, nu als je echt gewoon tegen een boek zou zijn, dan wil je het waarschijnlijk niet vertalen hé. (ja) Maar als het zo een beetje eh halfslachtig is, dan denk ik, als ze doorhebben dat je er niet te veel voor voelt, ga je, gaan ze jou verdenken van, van nonchalance of slordigheid, van: het doet er toch niet toe, het is geen het is geen goed boek. (ja ah ha) En dan ben je misschien extra voorzichtig waardoor extra scrupuleus maar het geeft niet zoveel voldoening. Zo eh (ah ja) terwijl als je vindt van: goh, ik vind het een geweldig boek, dan moet ik er het beste van maken, alleen al uit respect voor die auteur. Dan is het dat is toch een andere situatie dan wanneer je zo, wanneer ik dat soort zaken om den brode, als dat mijn enige inkomen zou zijn, dan denk ik, zoals je in Vlaanderen betaald wordt, dan moet je zodanig veel produceren dat de kwaliteit er natuurlijk ook onder moet gaan lijden. (1.9/d1)

#### Extract 3-10: of setting tasks for typewriters

As can be judged from the above excerpt, translating is not a mechanical process, nor can translators be reduced to machines that transfer texts from one language to the next. Though this might sound clichéd to translators and translation scholars alike, the overall drift of the narrative initiated by the ‘typewriter’ metaphor is striking. A translator’s work is neither mechanical nor anonymous: this rejection of the ‘machine’ is anticipatory rather than the result of real accusation, and functions in the discourse as a point of orientation from which a particular field of possible stances (3 in all) can be mapped out. The mapping is mainly achieved by way of example in which four basic situations are sketched, namely:

- a) Identification and hence acceptance;
- b) Non-identification and hence rejection;
- c) Ambivalent acceptance tempered by a sense of professionalism;
- d) Enforced acceptance stemming from economic need and resulting in diminishing translation quality.

The best case scenario is encapsulated by a) and b) as both imply situations in which the translator has the freedom and the means (including financial means) to accept or reject a commission at will, which can be seen, therefore, as being part and parcel of the same stance (stance 1). The feeling of being treated like a machine is more likely to arise in the case of d) (stance 3), but then again it must be said that not everyone can afford a life of a) and b) only. In this respect c) (stance 2) seems to strike a balance in that it implies a recognition or acceptance of the fact that you must face the challenges of the profession, or as another interviewee put it:

KH: Het leuke daar aan, is dat je een dichter ontdekt eigenlijk die je niet ken, die je uit jezelf dus nooit zou vertalen dat heeft ook zijn charmes want je wordt een beetje erin gegooid verplicht om het mooi te gaan vinden bij wijze van spreken. (1.8/a3 (sub1))

#### Extract 3-11: challenges of the profession

So, though those interviewed ultimately prefer to choose whom to translate, there is a general acceptance that this is not always possible and that one should be prepared to accept new challenges, as this is considered to be ‘part of the job’. But there is a limit to this too. The acceptance of such challenges is underscored by an understanding of reasonable working conditions, pay and proper deadlines; otherwise translators might effectively turn themselves or allow themselves to be turned into ‘typewriters’ thereby corroborating their most-feared cliché. So translation quality is directly related to the material conditions under which it is produced and translators have to negotiate in order to optimise these conditions.

### 3.3.1.8. The Paradoxes of Profession and Persuasion

In the following extract the term professional translator is interpreted quite narrowly and corresponds roughly to those translators found under heading d) above. By contrast, the interviewee in this extract clearly positions himself under heading a) & b). This ‘under-extensive’ use of ‘professional translator’ serves to make a distinction. There are those who are obliged to accept any work that might come their way and those who have the liberty to accept or refuse:

CP: Meestal ben ik het die het hen aanbied; behalve in het geval van xxxxxxx was het inderdaad xxxxxxx die mij dat vroeg omdat ik al een reputatie heb en zo, natuurlijk dat ik dat soort dingen kan (ja, ja). Maar ik werk bijna nooit in opdracht. Een enkele keer (ja, ja) ... Een Duitse dichter heb ik eens in opdracht vertaald maar dat was een dichter die mij lag. Ik bedoel ze moeten niet aankomen met een dichter die mij niet ligt. Dat doe ik niet (dat is, ja) (het moet zo) ja dus. Eh fsst alles trouwens ook proza ja dus ik ben niet, gelukkig, geen beroepsvertaler want dan zou ik dat wel moeten doen, alles wat ik vertaal is echt iets waar ik met hart en ziel achter sta fsst en het voordeel is dat ik daar ook meer tijd kan voor uitrekken dan een beroepsvertaler zou kunnen een beroepsvertaler ja. Je weet de paradox van de vertaler eh? Hoe beter hij zijn vertalingen maakt hoe slechter hij betaald wordt (both laugh) ja zo is het toch eh! (1.10/b1 (sub5))

#### Extract 3-12: of profession and persuasion

The majority of the extracts examined up to this point have illustrated the importance of a sense of profession and professional solidarity among translators and to demonstrate that textual practises are squarely situated within networks of expertise and collaboration. The extract above however, curdles the milky homogeneity of the picture that has been emerging till now. In the discussion of the ‘typewriter’ metaphor, the threat of being turned into a machine is largely understood as coming from outside the profession or excusably as a role translators are forced into as a result of outside pressure. Now in the above extract the term ‘professional translator’ seems to be placed on a par with ‘typewriter’. The premodifier ‘professional’ has taken on an almost pejorative sense as it indexes someone who has little choice but to accept the commissions offered to him or her (stance 3) as opposed to a ‘unmodified’ translator (to coin a phrase) who can refuse or accept a commission at will or preferably propose the commission him or herself (stance 1). Stance 2 seems to have disappeared in this portrayal of events, thereby heightening the contrast between stance 1 and 3.

In reality however, a translator might adopt any of these three stances during the course of his or her career and not necessarily in a permanently ascending order. A translator can embody and uphold the persuasion visible in stance 1 with any degree of permanence only after he or she has established a certain reputation within the profession.

On the whole, all the interviewees quoted in this section speak in terms of establishing the best conditions for translating and in so doing continually relate text to context on each occasion. The last interviewee quoted is no exception in this respect. Yet, though their discourse constructs images of collaboration within the profession and inner unity against outside forces, all in the interest of enhanced translation quality, his discourse constructs differentiation within the field by making distinctions between those who can focus entirely on translation quality (stance 1) and those who can do so only to a certain extent (stance 3). Textual quality and professional stance go hand in hand, the best guarantee of optimum translation quality being stance 1. Yet, on the face of it, it seems that the final interviewee has somehow committed an unprofessional act of economic suicide by deciding to translate only what he prefers and refusing commissions except on the odd occasion. This is not the case in reality, despite the paradox at the end of the quote. The paradox can be spelled out in full in the following terms: the longer one works at a translation the better it gets (an opinion that is not held by all). Yet, the longer one works the less one gets paid in real terms as fees for translation commissions are usually fixed. So economic gain is sacrificed for translation quality or conversely, immediate economic gain can inhibit translation quality and should be considered as secondary. This leads us to another paradox: how do those who are persuaded that stance 1 is the only stance possible survive? Such a stance must be seen in relation to the perceived stances of others within the field of translation and cannot be understood without them:

La théorie des pratiques proprement économiques est un cas particulier d'une théorie générale de l'économie des pratiques. Lors même qu'elles donnent toutes les apparences du désintéressement parce qu'elles échappent à la logique de l'intérêt « économique » (au sens restreint) et qu'elles s'orientent vers les enjeux non matériels et difficilement quantifiables, comme dans les sociétés « précapitalistes » ou dans la sphère culturelle des sociétés capitalistes, les pratiques ne cessent pas d'obéir à une logique économique. (Bourdieu 1980: 209)

We must assume therefore that, for a variety of reasons, stance 1 becomes affordable and viable at some stage during the career of a translator, that the discursive strategy of differentiation pointed out above is founded on a sense of relative independence within the field as a whole, which is not to say a lack of commitment to translation as such. On the contrary, stance 1 is posited as the ultimate commitment to translation; but, as Bourdieu points out, this does not liberate translators of this persuasion from the laws of the market or place them above the economy of practices. The stress on quality over financial advantage or, to be more precise, positing that economic necessity, including the obligations and desires it creates, has an adverse effect on translation quality, clearly reflects the ideological edges of the distinction Bourdieu draws between various forms of capital, in this case between economic and symbolic

capital. Engagement with the symbolic is portrayed as the superior form of engagement, all the more so because it is represented in terms of economic sacrifice (the translator's paradox). So both paradoxes cease to be so when considered as expressions of the interplay between forms of capital which in turn belong within a field-specific economy of practices.

### 3.3.2. Ethic Orientations: a map or an outline?

In chapter 3.3.1. to 8., an attempt was made to uncover specific aspects of ethos in the interview data. What has emerged can best be described as contrastive ethic orientations in that the ethic standpoints found in each of the utterances examined point in at least two directions at the same time. The following table provides a schematic overview of these standpoints:

Ref	Key metaphor / metonym	Textual orientation	Social orientation	Focus / Relation
3.1.1. Ext. 3-2	Kannibalisme / avontuur / spanning	Raw beauty vs. Blandness; Adventure vs. Beaten tracks	Prospective Readers vs. Prescriptive 'Scientists'	Audience
3.1.2. Ext. 3-3	Bulldozer / antenne	Sensitivity vs. Heavy-handedness	Consultation vs. Unilateral action	Network of expertise
3.1.3. Ext. 3-4	Craft / afstand	Committed distance vs. Untested awareness	Collaboration vs. Unilateral action	Network of expertise
3.1.4. Ext. 3-5 & 6	op de huid	Responsible reading vs. Non-committal interpretation	Translators vs. Others (inc. writers & readers)	Client / Principal
3.1.5. Ext. 3-7 & 8	gepassioneerde gekken	Quality vs. Expedience	Consultation vs. Unilateral action	Network of expertise
3.1.6. Ext. 3-9	mijn kind	Creativity vs. Language system/rules	Translators vs. Proofreaders / Client	Client / Principal
3.1.7. Ext. 3-10 & 11	schrijfmachine	Human variation vs. Mechanical reproduction	Translators vs. Others (inc. Clients)	Client / Principal
3.1.8. Ext. 3-2	beroepsvertaler	Quality vs. Hack work	Translator vs. Professional	Orders / Contestation of expertise

**Table 3-i: ethic orientations: a schematic overview**

In each of the cases outlined the interviewee positions him or herself both textually and socially with respect to translation, both parameters merging to reflect aspects of the ethos of those concerned. On the whole, fields of tension were constructed in their discourse both with respect to textual practice and social stance within which or at the extremities of which those interviewed positioned themselves. Translators defined themselves and their textual practices



(antagonistically) in terms of contrast with other professions (e.g. writers, proofreaders, language scientists, publishers) or others, like other readers of the original texts they translate, for example. They invoked unity and collaboration among themselves and others in their network of expertise, all in the interest of good textual practice and of improving the quality of translation. They also posited differentiations within their own profession to the extent of even considering ‘the professional’ inadequate, hence negotiating stances with respect to these differentiations, again in the interest of good textual practice and of improving translation quality. The field being sketched here has become visible through discursive strategies of inclusion and exclusion, of consultation and collaboration but also through strategies of rejection and contestation. Through this sketch we begin to get a picture of the translator’s ethos and also discover that expressions of ethos are complex in that they comprise textual and social practice at one and the same time. Such expressions of ethos also provide us with a clear indication of an aspect of Bourdieu’s notion of habitus, i.e. « ... [P]rincipes générateurs et organisateurs de pratiques et de représentations qui peuvent être objectivement adaptées à leur but » (Bourdieu 1980: 88). As pointed out above, particularly though not exclusively in the discussion of ‘craft’, embodied translation skills (where the innate and the acquired meet) become objectively verifiable both in text and in forms of professional behaviour. To use Bourdieu’s terms once again, what we witness here is: « le long processus dialectique, souvent décrit comme « vocation » par lequel « on se fait » à ce par quoi on est fait et on « choisit » ce par quoi on est « choisi » » (Bourdieu 1980: 113).

### 3.4. Language Ideologies

Before the data is examined for instances of language-ideological utterances, the term ‘language ideologies’ and what is understood by it must firstly be outlined. For this purpose, I mainly draw on the detailed discussion<sup>138</sup> throughout Schieffelin, Woolard, Kroskrity, (eds.) (1998) including Silverstein’s comments<sup>139</sup> on Part I (Schieffelin; Woolard; Kroskrity (eds.) 1998: 123-145) along with Kroskrity’s further exposé (Kroskrity<sup>140</sup> 2004) on the topic. In doing so I will examine a number of definitions of language ideology given in the book in order to discover how they can be put to use in the analysis of the data at hand.

In her introduction to the volume, Woolard not only outlines how the term is understood and used by the various scholars, she also traces various interpretations given to ‘ideology’ since its coinage by the French philosopher Destutt de Tracy at the end of the eighteenth century (Silverstein 1998: 123). She identifies four ‘recurring strands’ of interpretation used by those investigating ‘language ideology’ ‘linguistic ideology’ or ‘ideologies of language’, as the phenomenon is variously known:

1. An understanding of ideology as ideational or conceptual, referring to mental phenomena; ideology has to do with consciousness, subjective representations, beliefs, ideas...;

2. A conceptualization of ideology as derived from, rooted in, reflective of, or responsive to the experiences or interests of a particular social position, even though ideology so often (in some views always) represents itself as universally true ...;
3. Ideology is seen as ideas, discourse, or signifying practices in the service of the struggle to acquire or maintain power. ....;
4. A distortion, illusion, error, mystification, or rationalization. (Woolard et al. 1998: 5-7)

Woolard (1998: 7) goes on to state that “THE GREAT DIVIDE in studies of ideology” (block capitals in the original) lies between 2 and 3, between what she calls “neutral and negative values of the term”. Whether we consider ideology as sets of beliefs or as being reflective of particular social positions on the one hand, or as signifying practices in the struggle for power or rationalisations, etc. on the other, it is not difficult to see how the former can provide evidence of and for the latter and vice versa. The differences traced by Woolard are very much a matter of the various perspectives taken on the same phenomenon, the former set of perspectives gaining its neutrality from its seeming lack of conflict or contestation – hence its observational or ‘scientific’ stance – and the latter gaining its ‘negativity’ precisely from the way it renders problematic or perhaps politicises the observable – hence its antagonistic stance. The corollary of ‘error’ in 4 becomes visible in 2 in the often unspoken ‘correctness’ it betrays. Besides, Woolard is quick to point out that there is no ‘neutral’ perspective as such, as all preferential takes on ideology reflect one’s own. In terms of research agendas, ideology must firstly be observable in and not merely projectable onto a situation (Collins 1998: 268), which may involve the researcher challenging his or her own ideological givens in order to be able to see it; conversely, pinpointing distortion, error, mystification and rationalisation could also be a form of ideological cover up.

The contributors to the Language Ideologies volume see language use and ideology as connecting in a number of ways:

- ♦ Silverstein’s<sup>141</sup> definition, i.e. “sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use<sup>142</sup>” (Woolard et al. 1998: 4) is perhaps the most prevalent;
- ♦ Irvine adds a further definition to an earlier one (Irvine 1989) “[T]hose complex systems of ideas and interests through which people interpret linguistic behaviours.” (Irvine 1998<sup>143</sup>: 53);
- ♦ Hill<sup>144</sup> (p. 72) draws on Silverstein’s definition, as does Kroskrity (1998<sup>145</sup>: 104);
- ♦ Mertz sees linguistic ideology as emergent in linguistic structure: “this framework takes linguistic ideology not as a mere false frame that distorts our vision of ‘reality,’ but rather as part and parcel of the linguistic practice that we study. ... [L]inguistic ideology is part of the structure and practice of speaking (or writing or signing)<sup>146</sup>, emergent in linguistic structure but not completely determinative of or identical with the linguistic praxis in process. Thus linguistic ideology can simultaneously distort or misrepresent, and shape or reflect, linguistic practice” (Mertz 1998<sup>147</sup>: 151);

- ♦ Spitulnik expands on an earlier definition by Irvine and replaces the term ‘ideas’ by “a wider set of possibilities: Language ideologies can be ideas, cultural conceptions, processes of meaning construction, implicit evaluations, and explicit comments “ about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests (Irvine<sup>148</sup> 1989)” (Spitulnik 1998<sup>149</sup>: 164);
- ♦ Briggs sees it as an aspect of practice: “While I believe that the cultural roots of linguistic ideologies are profound, I suggest that they may be best characterized not as a homogeneous cultural substratum but as dimensions of practices that are deployed in constructing and naturalizing discursive authority” (Briggs 1998<sup>150</sup>: 232);
- ♦ Collins also sees it as practice: “ideology is situated; it is a practice, a producing of language and the social, not an abstracted conceptual grid. Representations of the real are weapons in the struggle to define the real (Bourdieu 1984) ... We do not escape ideology with a science that studies language use rather than grammar, that considers power as well as context, though we may sharpen our historical appreciation of the interpenetrating conflicting visions and practice of language that comprise ‘our’ ideologies and ‘theirs’ (Collins 1998<sup>151</sup>: 268);
- ♦ Kroskrity (2004: 497) furthermore, opts for the plural ‘Language ideologies,’ because it underscores “the importance of multiplicity and contention in language-ideological processes”.

In the work under discussion (Woolard et al. 1998), linguistic ideologies are shown to be at play at all levels<sup>152</sup> in the cultures and countries in which the research was conducted. Similarly, as stated already, there are also clear indications of language ideologies in the data under scrutiny in this study. In fact, the notion of language ideologies renders analysable a variety of disparate language-use related phenomena in the data. Such meta-talk falls into two main categories, i.e.

1. issues relating to the Dutch language as such;
2. more general language-use related issues.

It seems advisable, nonetheless, in examining these phenomena to build in some methodological and epistemological safeguards for our investigation by drawing on several aspects of the definitions of language ideologies set out above; the phenomenon under investigation in the interview data will therefore be considered as:

1. “emergent in linguistic structure but not completely determinative of or identical with the linguistic praxis in process” (Mertz);
2. “best characterized not as a homogeneous cultural substratum but as dimensions of practices that are deployed in constructing and naturalizing discursive authority” (Briggs); and
3. “a practice, a producing of language and the social, not an abstracted conceptual grid, [r]epresentations of the real [being] weapons in the struggle to define the real” (Collins).

The first analysis of the interview data threw up one complex sociolinguistic issue in particular, i.e. perceptions of centre and periphery regarding norms of usage of Standard Dutch and

subsequent positioning among the respondents with respect to language variety within the region, all of which had a bearing on their work as translators. What was initially understood as a stereotypical illustration of the north-south divide between Northern and Southern Dutch or, in more common parlance, between Dutch and Flemish, was later shown to be concomitant with perceptions of a difference between the centre and the periphery, i.e. between ‘de Randstad’ and all the other Dutch-speaking areas of the Netherlands and Belgium. ‘De Randstad’ corresponds roughly to Amsterdam and its conurbation (see chapter 2.4.4.1.). Though there were no specific questions regarding such matters in the questionnaire, comments on the Dutch language and more particularly on the relationship between the varieties spoken in the Netherlands and Flanders are to be found throughout practically all, if not all the interviews<sup>153</sup>. In this respect, perceptions of the relationship between Dutch and ‘Flemish’ and their speakers form the most salient language-ideological point of discussion throughout all of the interview data. In what follows a number of extracts will be discussed that highlight the arguments put forward in this section so far. The extracts to be examined will be divided into two types:

- a) Extracts that illustrate the ‘Dutch-Flemish’ debate either directly or obliquely;
- b) Extracts that illustrate other aspects of a more general language-ideological debate.

Regarding the extracts mentioned under a), I will depart from the metaphorical and metonymic expressions that have formed the focus of the investigation in section 3 of this chapter but plan to return to such expressions when examining the extracts grouped under b).

### **3.4.1. Perceptions of Dutch: of time and distance**

The two notions, time and distance, are central to a study<sup>154</sup> on perceptions of language use among immigrants in Flanders but can be shown to be of relevance in other contexts, which is one the conclusions reached at the end of section 4.1. Time and distance come into play in various ways and can be considered as variations or developments of the theme of centre and periphery in that ‘time,’ on the one hand, encompasses perceptions of remove from a relevant and obvious linguistic ‘now’ and ‘distance,’ on the other hand, encompasses perceptions of remove from an imagined pivotal physical space. For the immigrant, such remove comprises both the community he or she has left and the one he or she has moved to. In the case of this study, ‘time’ and ‘distance’ index forms of language use within a single language community, no matter how tentative such a notion can be shown to be. Such expressions of ‘time’ and ‘distance’ take on various forms, as is illustrated in the various parts of this section.

As illustrations of the language-ideological debate on Dutch in the Netherlands and Belgium (from here on, referred to as the debate), the extracts discussed below are far from exhaustive (there are many other relevant extracts in the interviews) but they do highlight the most obvious aspects of the debate to be found in the data. I use this expression as shorthand for a highly complex phenomenon to which the expression does little justice. The complexity involved stems not only from political, regional or geographical differences but also from institutional, professional and social trajectories that intersect (construct, deconstruct) these

differences at various levels and which lead to different terms being used to describe the language variety in different situations. The term best suited for encompassing this complexity is ‘scaling’ (Blommaert, Collins & Slembrouck 2004<sup>155</sup>). I will discuss each of these extracts in turn before examining them together in a broader framework. As was pointed out already in chapter 2, 5.1-4, a translator’s individual competence was not a fixed given but something that had to be asserted and contested and hence negotiated and renegotiated through time. This competence is often cast in terms of competence in Standard Dutch, knowledge of other language varieties being basic to the profession of translator or minimally to the task of translating. Hence negotiations regarding competence and the building of reputation form prime sites for language-ideological formulations, or to put it more aptly, such negotiations are framed in terms of assertions and contestations that have a language-ideological component. In one sense, they do constitute “[a] rationalisation[s] and justification[s] of perceived language structure and use” (Silverstein 1979), not so much because they can be placed next to and contrasted with language structure and use as a whole and hence can be rendered more visible and accessible to scrutiny for the purposes of falsification, etc. but more because such rationalisations and justifications are often indexical of sets of language practices pertaining to a particular activity or profession. I consider it plausible to assume that these rationalisations and justifications are also intimately linked with the genre (activity and text type) concerned and hence do not merely constitute comments on or assumptions about a particular standard language and its varieties *sui generis* but also evoke ‘agreed’ or potentially agreeable types of language use in given situations, the types of language use in this case being largely related to translating texts of various genres into Dutch. The interviewees draw on their experience – both institutional and textual – as translators to give credence to their utterances on Dutch and ‘Flemish’ or to put it another way, it is this experience that constructs a certain degree of authority in their utterances, as it indexes participation in a symbolic market (Bourdieu 1991). But before launching into the debate proper, I will provide some ‘basic’ information regarding Dutch in the Netherlands and Belgium. The following is taken from the official website of the Nederlandse Taalunie at <http://taalunieversum.org/>:

Wie zijn wij?

De Nederlandse Taalunie is de beleidsorganisatie waarin Nederland en België samenwerken op het gebied van de Nederlandse taal, taalonderwijs en letteren.

[Who are we?

The Dutch Language Union is a policy organisation in which the Netherlands and Belgium work together in the area of the Dutch language, language education and literature.] (My translation)

Een taal, twee landen

Het Nederlands is de moedertaal van zestien miljoen Nederlanders en zes miljoen Vlamingen. Nederland en Vlaanderen delen dan ook de zorg voor hun gemeenschappelijke taal. Ze ontwikkelen een gemeenschappelijk beleid voor het Nederlands op het gebied van taal, taalonderwijs en letteren. Die samenwerking is in 1980 vastgelegd in het Verdrag inzake de Nederlandse Taalunie.

[One Language, two countries

Dutch is the mother tongue of sixteen million Dutch people and six million Flemish people. So the Netherlands and Flanders [shall] also share care for their common language. They [shall] develop a common policy for Dutch in the area of language, language education and literature. This cooperation was laid down in 1980 in the Treaty on the Dutch Language Union.] (My translation)

**Extract 3-13: selection from the ‘Taalunie’ website + my translation**

As is evident from the above quote, the Dutch and the Flemish people share a common language<sup>156</sup>. It is nonetheless important to point out that there are varieties of this common language, which are termed differently depending on the context in which they are used. A variety known as Belgian Dutch is recognised by academics, though most Dutch people would call that variety Flemish. On the other hand, most Flemish people would say they speak ‘Nederlands’ (Dutch) and reserve the term Flemish for dialects spoken in Flanders. Codified Standard Dutch holds for users in both countries though the Belgian public broadcasting corporation, VRT also propagate a pronunciation standard for Belgium<sup>157</sup>, which is often personified by and embodied in the habitus of its newsreaders.

So, outside official definitions of the terms Dutch and Flemish, much depends on the perceptions of the speakers and the context in which these definitions are being negotiated. It is beyond the scope of the present study to offer an exhaustive overview of perceptions of the Dutch language and all the complexities involved in the debate, as others are much better placed to conduct such a debate. The purpose here is to throw light on a salient aspect of the interview data, which I consider as falling within the categorisation ‘language ideologies,’ and to argue that these ‘language ideologies’ inform translation practice.

**3.4.1.1. Language Foibles: of pedantry and beauty**

In the first two extracts quoted below, the Flemish-Dutch debate is conspicuous by its absence and only surfaces obliquely in the third, where a distinction is made – “he said / we in the Netherlands say” – between how the Dutch and the Flemish would say “at the very end of the corridor”. The interviewee predicates the evaluation ‘prachtig’ [beautiful, wonderful] onto the Fleming’s way of putting the phrase in contrast to the more ‘matter-of-fact’ Dutch way, thereby focussing on perceived differences between the two varieties of the language. ‘Vlaams’ is “net iets anders” [just that little bit different] and appreciated precisely for that difference. As a variety of Dutch, it is exotic and close, understandable yet strange, all of which constructs a sense of underlying unity<sup>158</sup> and appreciated difference.

EJ: Eeh, nou dan wordt het gezet en dan krijg je de drukproeven toegestuurd en dan ga je corrigeren en al corrigerend vind je wel eens een betere vertaling en ehm. Het kan toch beter zus of zo en dat eh dat breng je dan aan (em) maar ik, ik word nooit op mijn vingers getikt van dit is fout of dat had je anders moeten doen of zo. (I.1/c1)

**Extract 3-14: language foibles – 1**

EJ: Muggenzifters . . . weten er niets van enzovoort maar eh, dat zal ik opsturen want dat is wel eh, verhelderend denk ik (ja).

PF: En wat is allez uw kritiek over de critici? (eh, eh) Dat ze muggenzifters zijn of?

EJ: Nou kijk als zo iemand – misschien dat ik dat ook – eh, eh de bibliotheken (ja) laten zich raden door zogenaamde kenners (ja) en die hebben altijd ja schoolmeesterachtige opmerkingen wat ik daarnet zei dat je een liggend rijm staand hebt vertaald of zo eh (ja) ja en ja, en ja dat soort of dat het niet goed rijmt of eh ik gebruik ontzettend veel halfrijm en eh kwartrijm en zo of als het maar muzikaal is eh (wat veel voor, in Ierse poëzie komt dat veel voor, ja). . . .

PF: Ze, ze, ze hun commentaren zijn meestal volgens u schools? . . .

EJ: Ja, ja, schoolmeesterachtig (ja) niet dat ik iets tegen schoolmeesters heb maar ja dat is overdrachtelijk dan. . . . Een vrek noemen wij zo iemand. Ken je die uitdrukking niet? (nee, nee, wat betekent dat?) Vrek. Een schoolvrek. Dat is een schoolmeester die op alle slakjes zout legt. (ah, ja) Dus het moet niet zus maar het moet zo. (ah ja, ja o.k.) (I.1/d2 & d3)

#### Extract 3-15: language foibles – 2

EJ: Ja, zoals laatst in Antwerpen dan heb ik ja een lezing gehouden over Heaney met veel, veel, vertalingen doorspekt zeg maar (eh, he) ja, maar ik kom graag in België, want eh, ook om de taal het is weer het is net iets anders, (ja) het Vlaams. Dat laatste keer, dat was in de Vlaamse Schouwburg en eh toen vroeg ik aan de portier: “Waar moet ik zijn?” Zei die: “Dan heb je die gang en gans ten einde” dus helemaal op het einde zeggen wij in Nederland; “gans ten einde” dat vind ik prachtig, ja, ja. (I.1/ensuing conversation ej)

#### Extract 3-16: language foibles – 3

The second and third extracts (15, 16) can be situated entirely within the Netherlands, where the interviewee lives and works. In the first extract, a scenario is sketched involving the translator and the editors. The translator is seldom if ever pulled up (literally, tapped on the fingers) by the proofreaders and editors for mistakes in his manuscripts. If criticism does arise (as indicated in extract 2), it mainly stems from those who are termed as hair-splitters ‘muggenzifters’ (mosquito sifters), “who know nothing about it” or skin-flints (literally, school miser ‘schoolvrek’), “a schoolteacher who pours salt on every slug he sees.” In other words, the interviewee holds forth against pedantry – something he considers as contagious. He distances himself from those who apply the letter rather than the spirit of the law of language and, more particularly, who know little about what the translation process involves. Such criticism is mainly levelled at the way in which the translator uses Standard Dutch<sup>159</sup> but also covers conventions of prosody. The fact that there is little criticism from editors and proofreaders is evidence, in this case, of the translator’s reputation but can also be attributed to the fact that he lives within the area designated by other translators, especially those in Flanders, as the centre, that area of the Dutch-speaking region that is considered to dictate appropriate language use. This is not to say that the interviewee participates in composing these dictates or imposing them, however. What is being pointed out is not the absence of language criticism in any form (and hence an emergent language ideology) but its obvious though unstated absence in these extracts – in contrast to the extracts taken from the other interviews – of judgemental criteria that draw on the possible ‘negative’ influence of Flemish on a translator’s use of Standard Dutch. So on the face of it, this translator is unaffected by the

debate, as is also the case with the interviewee in chapter 3.4.1.7., below, the difference being that the latter is perceived as having risen above the debate as a result of his use of the standard and his long-established reputation. Even though the debate still forms an important aspect of his discourse, it hardly arises for the former, except in the terms visible in Extract 3–16 (I.1/ensuing conversation EJ).

### 3.4.1.2. Language Change: trendsetting and timelessness

In the following extract we find a view that is held by many of the interviewees regarding those who set language norms for the Dutch-speaking regions. The interviewee quoted here has lived and worked in the Netherlands and Belgium and has first hand experience of how attitudes with respect to Dutch and Flemish play out on a day-to-day basis within the profession of translation in the two countries. It is clear from the extract that the interviewee is not of the opinion that language norms for Standard Dutch are set by the ‘Nederlandse Taalunie’ (see chapter. 2.4.4.1.), but by users in Hilversum (also the main location of Dutch TV stations), Amsterdam and the Hague (the administrative capital of the Netherlands where the most prestigious<sup>160</sup> variety of Dutch is spoken). What emerges also is a generally negative stance regarding how these norms are set. Within the area indicated, words are declared either mad or boring and those who use them are considered the same. Other words are declared old-fashioned and replaced by new ones and those who continue to use the old words are equally old-fashioned. The picture painted here is of fickle change in response to the subconscious demands of fashion. Flanders on the other hand, is considered as falling outside this type of language behaviour or largely as ignoring such caprices. Expressions and words are long lived, as it were, and can resurface again after falling into seeming disuse. This is considered as inspiring by the interviewee. On the whole, the debate is portrayed in terms of unconscious erratic limitation and a loss of linguistic versatility at the centre in contrast to relative linguistic stability at the periphery, which seems to function as a sort of storehouse of Dutch usage. The opposition set up between Dutch and Flemish or rather between language use in the larger metropolitan areas of the Netherlands and language use in Flanders is not so much one of old versus new but rather one of short-sighted temporariness versus well-considered timelessness.

NP: Het Nederlandse taalgebruik wordt eigenlijk door ja in Hilversum, Den Haag en Amsterdam bepaald, he. (ah ja) Ze hebben ons uitgerekend dat er maar eigenlijk maar een soort is, duizend woorden bestaan die de Nederlander gebruikt en, en de andere woorden zijn of ouderwets of gek of saai (laughs) en die worden dan door een aantal mensen, vooral bij de media dan op een gegeven moment wordt er kennelijk onderbewust besloten dat dertig woorden zijn afgedaan en die worden door anderen vervangen en wie die dertig woorden nog gebruikt die is dan wel vreselijk ouderwets aan het worden. (ja, ja)



Dat vind ik wel jammer; terwijl hier in Vlaanderen het juist het omgekeerde geldt, als je een leuke uitdrukking kent en dan heb ik het niet over de ongeschoolde Vlaming. Ja, een beetje ja daar komen soms uitdrukkingen boven die ik al jaren niet meer gehoord heb (ja, ja) en dat inspireert heel erg, vind ik erg leuk. In Nederland wordt dat al gauw als je bent dan of excentriek of je bent saai. (I.3/ensuing conversation NP)

**Extract 3-17: language change**

### **3.4.1.3. Language Dominance: the logic of the market**

The following extract was taken from an interview with a Belgian translator who has worked for publishing houses<sup>161</sup> in the Netherlands and Belgium. In the extract a link is made between dominant language use and economic power. As the majority of Dutch-language publications are edited and printed in the Netherlands and the majority of their readers also live there, it seems only logical to the interviewee that the language norms used in editing these publications should be dictated by those who run the publishing houses. Should they decide to cater more for readers in Flanders, they might do so at the risk of losing the majority of their readers in the Netherlands. So viewed from this perspective, language use is constrained by the 'logic' of the market.

IJ: Ja, ja Vlaams is eh ja Vlaams is eh niet goed voor een publicatie eh in een tijdschrift of in een eh boek. (niet) Ja die eh enfin ik vind ja ja ik vind daar niks verkeerd aan en soms opteer ik ook om de Vlaamse variant te laten staan.

PF: Wel ik bedoel ik dacht dat de standaard eigenlijk niet bij Nederland hoort maar 'stricto sensu' ik bedoel dat is een algemene...

IJ: Neen, maar de economische macht zit in Nederland: ik bedoel, de uitgevers zijn daar zij die beslissen over uitgaven zitten in Nederland en de de lezers zitten ook in Nederland, ik bedoel.

PF: Is het publiek voor poëzie groter in Nederland dan in Vlaanderen?

IJ: In Nederland zijn ze sowieso met 11 miljoen en wij met. (dus numeriek gezien, wel) Numeriek gewoon. Ik denk dat inderdaad Nederlandse uitgevers en de grote uitgevers zijn allemaal Nederlandse uitgevers die maken 80 procent van hun omzet in Nederland en die willen dat dat Nederlandse Nederlands in de boeken staat (ja) om niet te riskeren dat het publiek afstand gaat nemen van een boek om omwille (maar, om, om te vergelijken, o.k.) van Vlaamse. (I.4/d2 & d3 (sub1))

**Extract 3-18: language dominance**

It is not so much a matter of Dutch publishers purposely forcing their own norms on others; it is more a matter of their having no choice but to do so. The language agenda is set a fortiori by the major publishers in 'de Randstad', though ironically, through no expressed desire of their own. As a result, it would seem that all readers, writers and translators can do, no matter where they live, is to comply to this agenda, though not unilaterally or without resistance. As was pointed out in chapter 2.4.4 & 5.3, translators increasingly negotiate language use with their editors and proofreaders as their reputations grow. It is perhaps best to view the above extract as containing recognition that publishing houses dominate the field in terms of language use and not merely as an illustration of acquiescence to that dominance.

### 3.4.1.4. Our Second Language: Dutch

In this extract, the interviewee, a Belgian translator, discusses the dynamics of translation and contrasts it with points of criticism made by reviewers in newspapers and magazines. The first issue raised is what is understood by a mistake in a language and hence right and wrong language use, an ideological discussion par excellence. The argument runs as follows: as there is no officially calibrated procedure for translating from one language to another, translations can and do differ. That one's translation might differ from another's does not make it wrong; it just makes it different. But why, if reviewers consider searching for mistakes an important aspect of reviewing translations, do they overlook the hundreds of stretches of seemingly 'good' language use within which these mistakes are to be found? This makes translating an ungrateful task. A possible source of error is then explored which mainly stems from "interference" from the source language. Such interference can be remedied by careful revision and it is here that the debate enters the equation.

VDK: Dat ze dat ze altijd vallen over iets wat zij als fout beschouwen waar dat je voor één foutje eh ja het hoeft daarom nog niet fout te zijn, het kan over een bepaalde visie gaan maar dat je voor een van hun vermeende fouten misschien twintig vondsten gedaan hebt waar ze maar over lezen omdat ja dingen die goed klinken daar lees je gewoon over heel dikwijls en dat is wel een beetje ondankbaar. (ja) En dat kan soms om heel kleine vondstjes gaan maar te snel door aan een vreemde taal door aan een tekst in een vreemde taal te lezen ben je automatisch al een stuk van je eigen taal vergeten of dan dringt die vreemde taal zich eigenlijk op en dan kun je al heel blij zijn dat je door bij de tweede versie bijvoorbeeld alle niet idiomatische wendingen uit het Nederlands kunt uitgooien dingen die je gewoon hebt uit het Engels of uit het Frans hebt gehaald (ja) en ik heb wel het gevoel dat in Nederland de vertalers te weinig kritisch met het Nederlands omgaan dat ze heel erg geneigd zijn om Engelse constructies zo maar eh over te nemen in het Nederlands zonder er bij stil te staan omdat ze het gevoel hebben van Nederlands is onze taal en wij kennen dat en wij als Vlaming hebben eh eigenlijk Nederlands als een soort tweede taal moeten leren eh (ja) omdat op school werd er slecht Nederlands gesproken, thuis sprak men meestal dialect (ja) dus eh je staat echt gehandicapt.

PF: En dus dat ligt vooral bij de Nederlandse ...

VDK: En dus neen wat ik bedoel is dat wij automatisch denk ik heel veel gaan opzoeken, heel sterk gaan twijfelen altijd aan de manier waarop wij dingen zeggen ik in elk geval ik kan niet voor andere vertalers spreken maar ik zoek elk woord toch wel op van een gedicht en dan ook als ik het vertaald heb dan ga ik nog eens alle Nederlandse woorden gaan opzoeken naar mogelijke foute voorzetselverbindingen enzovoort.

PF: Dus het moet uitstekend het moet uitstekend Nederlands zijn.

VDK: Ja, ja. Ja van een schrijver, een schrijver mag Vlaams schrijven maar een vertaler moet Nederlands vertalen. Dus dat is echt elke uitgever eist dat je in een onberispelijk Nederlands vertaalt dus. (1.6/ensuing conversation VDK)

#### Extract 3-19: our second language - Dutch

Dutch translators are perceived to be somewhat uncritical in their revision and unwittingly allow English syntax to creep into their translations. On the other hand Flemish translators, precisely because of their perceived inferiority in matters of standard Dutch, are doubly careful

in revising their texts. Much time is given, therefore, to looking up word order and prepositional preference, for example.

A further justification for this care stems from the perception that Flemish people consider standard Dutch a second language, as many were brought up in a local variety or dialect, hence their added care when it comes to translating from another language into the standard. Here the perceived dominance of the centre over the periphery is subverted and language insecurity is used as a discursive lever to upset the balance of linguistic power. The extra care taken by those in the periphery leads to better translations. Note again that the language debate is not conducted in absolute terms but relates to concerns of translation and professional practice.

### 3.4.1.5. Correct Language Use: de-nationalising the issue

In the following extracts the debate is placed in the broader context of the whole Dutch-speaking area, hence the Dutch-Flemish dichotomy is viewed from a different perspective. The focus given to the debate here effectively de-nationalises it. Contention on language use is not seen as occurring between speakers in Belgium and speakers in the Netherlands but rather between speakers in 'de Randstad' and the other areas where the language is spoken.

KH: Het is niet alleen met Vlamingen tegenover Nederlandse uitgevers hoor (PF: Ah nee?) want ik heb het achteraf gehoord ook van Nederlandse collega's die dan zeiden maar wij hebben net hetzelfde probleem hoor. Iemand die niet uit Amsterdam is die wordt ook als uit een randgebied beschouwd. Bijvoorbeeld, xxxxxx ... die is zelf afkomstig van Friesland uit het hoge noorden en zij zegt voor een Amsterdammer is Groningen net zozeer periferie als Antwerpen dat is en zij krijgt ook voortdurend opmerkingen over taalgebruik dat niet correct of geen Randstad Nederlands zou zijn geen algemeen aanvaarde norm em.

PF: Ja, em.

KH: En ze zei ik heb dat ook moeten leren om me ertegen te verzetten.

PF: Dus er wordt er dus degelijk tegen verzet? (1.8/c1)

#### Extract 3-20: correct language use

PF: ... en ik dacht zelfs binnen de vertaalwereld hoe de verhouding tussen Vlaanderen en Nederland weerspiegelt, dat vond ik wel interessant. laughs

Want ten slotte als je naar de quizzen en dergelijke of het Nederlandse dictee kijkt dan weet je dat de Vlamingen heel goed hun taal beheersen ... (CJ: ja, ja, ja)

KH: Ja maar er is een verschil, de Vlamingen beheersen hun spelling heel goed (CJ: maar de spreektaal minder) maar hun spreektaal minder.

PF: Hun spreektaal, maar dat versta ik niet

CJ: Ja, in de oren van de Nederlanders spreken wij niet correct ja archaisch en vooral niet correct - heel veel voorzetselfouten en.

KH: En het is ook zo dat de taal in Amsterdam wordt gemaakt eh dus je merkt dat op een bepaald moment dat een uitdrukking die bij ons heel courant is (PF: ja) en die wij bij ons als correct beschouwen (PF: ja) dat die in Nederland niet meer correct is.

PF: Niet meer?

KH: Ja.

PF: Ah!

KH: Dus de taal wordt, de evolutie wordt bepaald in Amsterdam (PF: ja) en wij hinken achterop.

CJ: Ja.

PF: Ja.

...

KH: Tja.

CJ: Ja, maar eh, wij wonen in de periferie van onze cultuurhoofdstad, de cultuurhoofdstad van de Nederlandse taal is Amsterdam of je dat nu leuk vindt of niet.

KH: Het is de markt gewoon.

PF: Het is de markt?

KH: Maar ja. (1.8/ensuing conversation KH & CJ)

...

KH: En voor een stuk verarmt het Nederlands, bijvoorbeeld het geslacht van de woorden wordt hoe langer hoe meer, bijvoorbeeld dingen die voor ons evident vrouwelijk zijn (PF: ja) worden in Amsterdam als mannelijk beschouwd en dat gaat zo ver dat als je dingen volgens het spelling volgens de het eh (CJ: van Dale) de woordenlijst? Volgens het groene boekje (PF: ja) inderdaad nog vrouwelijk zijn als je die vrouwelijk laat staan dat je daar correcties op krijgt en dat men zegt dat de uitgever zegt ja sorry maar dat is.

CJ: Dat is lachwekkend.

KH: Dat ja, een Nederlander.

CJ: De kast zij eh (ja) de kast staat daar voor ons. In het Nederlands is dat een 'she' ik weet dat dat in het Engels idioot is (PF: ja, maar neen o.k.) maar in Nederland is dat een hij.

PF: Ah het is al een hij.

KH: Ja, ja.

CJ: Ja, ja en voor ons is dat heel vreemd een kast eh een "hij"? (1.8/ensuing conversation kh & cj)

### Extract 3-21: correct language use

As the extracts illustrate, speakers draw on professional practice to lend credence to their opinions and in fact it would be hard to formulate such an opinion were it not for such practice. In the course of the discourse in the second extract, the interviewer draws on evidence<sup>162</sup> to support his argument that Flemish people share equal competence in Dutch with their northern neighbours. In response to this assertion the interviewees make a distinction between spelling (which the Flemish people are perceived to have a good command of) and spoken language (which the Dutch are perceived to be better at). This distinction postpones (perhaps permanently) the interviewer's attempt at closure. This is a highly interesting rationalisation in the Silversteinian sense in that a certain group of speakers is regarded as being better at one aspect of a language than another group. In addition to this, it is argued that Dutch people think Flemish speakers use archaic language and have a poor command of prepositional use. Moreover, decisions on what constitutes correct language are

made in Amsterdam; in this respect Flanders is always lagging behind because Amsterdam is the cultural capital of the Dutch-speaking region. Whether one accepts it or not, this is perceived to be the reality in matters of language use, and people from the periphery have no choice but to acquiesce. Then again this is never without contention. Here again, we find evidence of the opinion that it is the people of Amsterdam and not the ‘Nederlandse Taalunie’ (whose official task is to uphold the use of the language in various ways) that set the norms of correct language use. This is pointed to further on in the interview (see the final extract in **1.8/ensuing conversation KH & CJ**) with respect to the gender of nouns. It seems that certain nouns are/were or have become pertinently masculine in ‘de Randstad’, even though they are still listed as both masculine and feminine in “het groene boekje”<sup>163</sup>. This is seen by the interviewees as an impoverishment of the language. It would seem therefore, that contention of and resistance to shifts in language use occurs at an individual level within a particular profession as the greater socio-linguistic given of centre and periphery, within which the debate is posited as belonging, is perceived as unlikely to change.

### **3.4.1.6. Language Variety: expecting tolerance**

The following extract also contains criticism of the remarks of certain reviewers but from a different perspective to that found in chapter 3.4.1.1. In contrast to chapter 3.4.1.1., the debate is very much centre stage in the quote below. The interviewee recalls an occasion when she was criticised (somewhat sarcastically) by a Dutch reviewer some years previous for using a Flemish turn of phrase. The reviewer pretended he or she didn’t understand and waded a guess at the possible meaning of the phrase or how it should best be put in Standard Dutch, thereby in fact, demonstrating understanding of the Flemish phrase. His/her comment, therefore, formed a withering lesson on standard usage.

BM: Dan onthoud je die dingen. Want als je 't niet belangrijk vindt dan en 't is jaren geleden, dan ben je 't al lang vergeten ook, maar kom, ik onthoud ze dan wel. En bijvoorbeeld vond ik het niet prettig om te horen dat waar ik een keer geschreven had: "Twee kinderen" en dan heb ik er de Vlaamse uitdrukking gebruikt, van eh "ze waren verloren gelopen". En dan stond er in de recensie van een Nederlander: "God, wat bedoelt ze toch? Zou ze bedoelen van: ze waren de weg kwijt geraakt?" En dat vond ik pijnlijk (ah ja). Dat vond ik pijnlijk. Ik dacht: het is perfect verstaanbaar, het zal niet de norm zijn, o.k. Maar je gaat me niet, niet eh niet, niet wijsmaken dat je niet weet wat ik geschreven heb, dat je het niet goed snapt (ah ja, ja) en als het daarover over zulke dingen gaat, dan denk ik: ja, daar eh. Daar wil ik niet zomaar automatisch toegeven (ja) zo van: ach ja, wij weten het niet, jullie weten het wel (ah ja) dat, dat vind ik niet terecht. Maar andere zaken kan ik heel goed accepteren. Natuurlijk heb ik fouten gemaakt hè (ja) dus eh. Maar dit soort lexica zaken, waarvan ik vind: in de context is het zo duidelijk, dan moet je ons als deel van een groot taalgebied toch ook wat gunnen. (1.9/a1 (sub1))

#### **Extract 3-22: language variety**

But the interviewee’s argument here is: if there is understanding, why not keep the Flemish variant? In this respect, the reviewer could not plead ignorance – on the contrary. This is not to say that the translator accepts mistakes; translators do make mistakes and these mistakes

should be corrected. If, on the other hand, the meaning is clear even though the phrase is not strictly Standard Dutch, why not leave it? In such a large language area, there should be room for and knowledge and tolerance of local variation. One emergent ideological twist is that the debate is cast in terms of knowledge and ignorance, in terms of those who know their language and those who do not, only to be recast – in the counter-argument – in ethical terms, i.e. as an acceptance of difference, which again makes recourse to an underlying notion of linguistic unity.

#### **3.4.1.7. Bringing Language to Book: fashion and tradition in another guise**

A similar discursive strategy to the one identified in 4.1.1.4 is also visible in the following excerpt. The apparent disadvantage of being behind the times language-wise is turned into an advantage. This advantage is predicated onto perceptions of language use which in turn are extended to particular types of literary work that require translation.

CP: Neen maar ik bedoel ik zal ook niet alle boeken kunnen vertalen dus ik zal bijvoorbeeld niet kunnen vertalen een boek dat laten we zeggen een Amerikaans boek dat speelt in een junkiemilieu. Dat ga ik nooit vertalen want ik ken absoluut niet genoeg Hollands junkiejargon om dat te kunnen vertalen. Dus ik zal dat niet doen (ah ha) eh dus ik weet wel wat ik kan en niet dus ik kan nogal klassieke dingen vertalen waar het modieuze taalgebruik van de Hollanders minder speelt zo is dat dus laat dat maar door de Hollanders doen (em). Het gevolg is natuurlijk is dat de vertaling binnen de twee jaar verouderd is eh want de Hollandse vertalers gebruiken alle idiomen wat zij op dat ogenblik horen zeggen dat erin en (ja) het boek is verouderd (ah, ja) en dan zegt mijn em Hollandse uitgever ja gelukkig met een Vlaming verouderd het niet zo makkelijk omdat wij wat conservatiever zijn qua wat het taalgebruik betreft dat is dan een voordeel wat wij hebben. (I.10/d2)

#### **Extract 3-23: bringing language to book**

To be more specific, the argument runs as follows: though Dutch translators may be abreast of the latest fashions in slang and other forms of trendy expression, the apparent advantage this presents is short-lived. Because they fill their translations of works depicting hip culture with the latest phrasing, their translations are doomed to premature aging and repeated translation. Flemish translators on the other hand, use more conservative language; hence their translations can better stand the test of time. It is precisely for this reason that Flemish translators are asked to translate established works in the literary canon. The link between professional practice and language ideology is perhaps at its most visible in this excerpt in that translation practice is seen to be founded on and justified by the (perceived) characteristic language use of particular groups within a language area.

#### **3.4.1.8. Time and Distance Confirmed?**

In this part, I will summarise the various aspects of the debate on Dutch in the Netherlands and Belgium identified in the excerpts discussed in 4.1.1-7. For this purpose, I have drawn up a table that lists key concepts in the debate and perceptions both of Dutch and Flemish separately along with the terms in which the debate has been cast in the various extracts. It

can be noted in these extracts that the line between a language variety and its users is quite blurred. The characteristics of users are often predicated onto or conflated with language variety<sup>164</sup>. The fear, therefore, of anthropomorphising language is real, yet on the other hand, one cannot sidestep the ways the interviewees themselves represent the language varieties they refer to. The question in fact is: how do we unravel such conflations? Notions such as rationalisation or justification incline us towards setting up comparisons or contrasts with a greater 'reality' or 'truth' of language<sup>165</sup>. But generally speaking, it can equally be argued that these rationalisations and justifications or perceptions are part and parcel of practice and often constitute 'reality' for those who use them, i.e. the greater whole they belong to is not understood as the totality of a language and all its ramifications but the totality of everyday (language) actions and exchanges that make up their lives and guarantee their professional well-being. For this reason, I will draw on the safer term 'ideological characterisations' to encapsulate the utterances on language quoted above and listed in the following table.

Ref.	Metaphor / Metonym	Perceptions of Dutch	Perceptions of 'Flemish'	Terms of the Debate	Parameter/ Orientation	Professional Axis
4.1.1. Ext. 3 -13,14 & 15	muggenzifters / schoolvrek / prachtig	not expressed / "internal" contestation	positive	Flemish turn of phrase is beautiful / wonderful" / Dutch under attack from pedants	Distance	Translation
4.1.2. Ext. 3 -16	gek / saai / ouderwets / inspirerend	Fickle / fashion-conscious / intolerant of difference	Timeless / storehouse of language use /	short-sighted temporariness versus well-considered timelessness	Time	ditto
4.1.3. Ext. 3 -17	economische macht / omzet / risico van verlies	Dominates esp. through market share in media	Not allowed in publications	Dictated by market share in publications	Distance	ditto
4.1.4. Ext. 3 -18	tweede taal fout / visie / handicap/ onberispelijk	Second language / Standard	Dialect / handicap	Advantage versus disadvantage Carelessness versus caution	Distance	ditto
4.1.5. Ext. 3 -19, 20 & 21	randstad/ andere regio's/ spelling / spreektaal archaisch / modern	Only valid variety / dominant	Old-fashioned / inaccurate	Central dominance versus peripheral resistance Threat of impoverishment versus preservation of variety	Distance and Time	ditto
4.1.6. Ext. 3 -22	pijnlijk / verstaanbaar / één groot taalgebied	Correct / knowledgeable / exclusive	Negative / unknowledgeable / variety	Intolerance of difference versus preservation of variety	Distance and Time	ditto
4.1.7. Ext. 3 -23	modieus / conservatief taalgebruik	Fashionable / racy / liable to age quickly in translation	More conservative / longer lasting / more secure in translation	Trendy versus conservative Shorter-lived versus longer-lasting	Time	ditto

**Table 3-ii: ideological characterisations: the debate on Dutch – a schematic overview**

In the main, the notions of time and distance, as applied to perceptions of language use, succeed in encompassing the various characterisations distilled from the extracts above. Conceived of graphically, time and distance can be considered as parameters used to map out degrees of remove from a perceived discursive centre, the zero point of ideology or the place where ideology ceases to be visible to language users, in the same way speakers of RP (Received Pronunciation) are perceived as being accentless. Along the time axis we can set up a continuum from past to present or posit orientations towards the future or the past, hence



mark off perceptions worded in terms of fashion in the broadest sense predicated onto language variety and language users, as is the case in 4.I.5 (Extract 3–20 to 22), for example. The distance axis would contain expressions of spatial polarity or differentiation with respect to a perceived centre, as is the case in 4.I.3 & 4 (Extract 3–18 & 19), for example. In order to take perceptions particular to certain social or professional practices into account, a third axis would have to be posited that intersects the other two vertically. The characterisations set out in table Table 3-ii, all come from the translators. It would be interesting to discover which ideological characterisations might be formulated by people from other professions, say journalists or long-distance lorry drivers, for example. It would also be interesting to discover whether a comparison of characterisations from different professions (situated along this axis) would also bear indications of social class. As was mentioned already, what is relevant for our inquiry here is how this relates to translators and translation, hence in this context we can call the third or professional axis the translation axis.

The table above and the data it was distilled from allow us to outline the following steps in identifying language ideologies in discourse:

Language Ideologies

- Ideological characterisations emergent in data
  - Identifiable Subject(s) of Characterisations
    - Discursive Parameters of Characterisations
      - Identifiable Professional / Social Positioning

In this case, we identified ideological characterisations on the subject of (varieties of) Dutch in the Netherlands and Belgium. These characterisations were conveyed in terms of remove (time & distance) from a discursive centre (Amsterdam, Randstad) and the stances adopted with respect to this remove indexed points along a professional trajectory of translation (reflected degrees of physical or professional closeness to a perceived discursive centre). These stances ranged from silence (discursive centre or zero point of ideology) to acquiescence to the perceived order of discursive power, and further to resistance and subversion of that order<sup>166</sup>.

To return to the methodological and epistemological concerns expressed above, we must now consider whether the conclusions drawn from the findings are in keeping with the safeguards expressed in chapter 3.4. above. As Mertz suggests, the ideological characterisations pointed to in the extracts are emergent in the discourse but do not entirely determine linguistic praxis. This also clearly indicated by the recognition of and degrees of contestation of perceived orders of discursive power stemming from variations in ('correct') language use. Following Briggs, we can see how 'discursive authority' is 'constructed and naturalised', particularly in chapter 3.4.I.I. (Extract 3–16), and chapter 3.4.I.7., (Extract 3–24) and more pertinently how "[r]epresentations of the real are weapons in the struggle to define the real" particularly in chapter 3.4.I.2 to 6 (Extract 3-17 to 23). However, the thrust of Briggs's definition depends on how we understand 'constructed and naturalised'. If we consider the two participles as forming steps in a strategy of dominance (intentional or otherwise), then their corollary in strategies of resistance would be the participles 'deconstructed and problematised',

while not forgetting that those who resist would consider their own stances as natural. This would place us squarely in a conceptual hall of mirrors, something which Collins's remark happily prevents when taken as a complement of Briggs's, as it applies to all parties involved in any potential discursive struggle, including those who study it. As has been pointed out already, in this sense the real here is not a possible 'totality of the facts' yet to be fully discerned, but more immediately, the day-to-day business of getting by, a business which is very much rooted in language use. At the same time, like all parties involved, the academic cannot be exempted from 'defining the real,' nor can anyone claim an ideological stance – neutral and above suspicion – from which the other can be observed in tranquillity.

### **3.4.2. Perceptions of Language(s): other characterisations**

The extracts to be discussed in chapter 3.4.2.1 to 6 comprise language-ideological utterances of a slightly different order. In the main, they comprise statements about language in general and those that draw comparisons between the perceived characteristics of Dutch and other languages. As was the case in chapter 3.4.1-8., each extract will be dealt with separately and then examined along with the others in order to see whether there are any emergent patterns of, or orientations in, ideological portrayal. In this examination, the steps taken above in identifying ideological characterisations and their discursive parameters will also be taken.

#### **3.4.2.1. Language as a Collective Substratum**

As the following extract indicates, language use is not only considered as individual expression but also as a phenomenon that draws on or rests on a substratum or foundations that are social and collective in nature. Each collectivity uses words in ways that differ within the collectivity and that also differ from those of other collectivities. As a result, there is no single one-to-one correspondence between words and referents in any collectivity. This collective or social substratum becomes manifest in the range of possible reference any given lexical item can have or conversely, **in** the number of lexical items that can index the same item. This diversity is considered as being both internal (within a language variety) and external, (across language varieties). Seen in the context of translation, this is both a blessing and a bane. On the one hand, internal variation in reference for any given word hinders word choice in the target language. On the other hand, because the range of possible reference can be discerned, a combination of the items in this range can help dam in possible meaning somewhat ('een beetje indammen') i.e. limit the number of items the translator has to choose from. In this sense, meaning is fluid and has to be contained or fixed by using the correct combination of words. Words, therefore, have more than one meaning and meaning only becomes specific or explicit – albeit layered – when words are placed together in a particular way<sup>167</sup>:

NP: Het heeft natuurlijk ook te maken met het feit dat je probeert zo'n van het ene machientje een ander machientje, apparaatje te maken ja dat ook werkt het knutselen, te proberen om te kijken of hetzelfde effect teweeg kan brengen. (dat is mooi) Bah het is toch altijd iets anders omdat elke taal een onderlaag heeft die elk woord dat is niet alleen individueel maar dat is ook sociaal of collectief is dat uiteraard bepaald, elk woord heeft

natuurlijk een verwijzingsgamma dat, dat anders is in een andere taal (ja) en dat kun je door de combinatie van die woorden natuurlijk wel een beetje indammen (ja) waardoor je effecten krijgt die gelijkaardig zijn maar het is natuurlijk altijd anders (eh, eh) en daar heb ik me bij neergelegd (ja) anders zou ik niet meer vertalen namelijk. (I.3/ ensuing conversation)

#### **Extract 3-24: language as a collective substratum**

It would be erroneous to consider this extract – or any other extract for that matter – as comprising a sketch of a particular model of language that the interviewee uses when translating or as a watered-down or badly-remembered version of some linguistic model. The model, if one could call it that, has emerged from the practice of translating, from struggling with difference, and as such can be called a rationalisation or justification, after the fact of translation: languages differ hence translations cannot but differ. This is not put forward as an issue to be solved but as a given; it is the ground against which the translator is seen to achieve respectful approximation – and not duplication – in turning one little poetic machine into another in another language. In this sense duplication or any attempt at it would constitute a mechanical act, a negation of language(s) as understood by the interviewee, a vain exercise. As can be noticed, the language-ideological argument found in this extract, though it draws on broader notions of the social and the collective, is intimately linked with specific genre considerations (see the discussion of the same extract in chapter 3.5.2.3 below). Action within a given genre (in this case poetry/translation) is founded on considerations of language difference and differences between historical languages as we know them.

#### **3.4.2.2. The Being of a Language**

In the next extract below, language is portrayed as a living organism, as something with its own separate existence. Translation consists, in this case, in importing a poem into another language; the poem has to take on the being/nature of the new language in the process. Hence it has to come alive or have life instilled into it, as it were, in the new language. The logical consequence of this stance on language as being is that English poetry has to become Dutch poetry, which is considered as the first norm of (literary) translation. We can surmise therefore that one of the qualities of poetry is its aliveness, which, in following the reasoning in the extract, stems from the fact that language is a living thing:

IJ: Eh) ja dat (eh) dat vind ik eh dat een, een vertaling is een gedicht importeren in een andere taal en dan moet het het wezen van de ander taal aannemen.

Dus eh ik denk dat Engelse poëzie in Nederlandse vertaling moet Nederlandse poëzie worden (OK) Ja. Dat vind ik dat is misschien toch wel de eerste standaard. (I.4/b1 (sub1))

#### **Extract 3-25: the being of a language**

So pieces of language, poems in this case, can be and are moved across language borders on condition that they remain alive or are given new life. Here we are also faced with an ethical problem, in the sense given to the term in section 3 of this chapter. Next to being a textual norm, the fact that poetry must remain or become living poetry in translation, can also be

understood in terms of professional commitment and practice. There is also an obligation to keep language alive, as it were. The two main language-related metaphors to be discussed are therefore ‘import’ and ‘being.’ Firstly, language as a living being is a common enough metaphor but what are the discursive parameters of the ideological characterisation in this particular case? ‘Wezen’ can index life both as recognisable substance and as tangible form, which rules out overly essentialist views of the term as applied to the ‘being’ of language here (see continuation of the extract quoted here in chapter 3.5.1.4., below). Following Bourdieu (1980), we could argue that portraying language as being forms a strategy<sup>168</sup> that effectively removes language from the world of tangible interaction and projects it entirely into the realm of the symbolic. This would allow the speaker of the utterance a stronger position from which to negotiate his or her (translational) language competence by claiming recourse to knowledge of the more obscure aspects of a language or languages, something that seems plausible when dealing with prestigious forms of language use like poetry. But since the interviewee considers notions similar to this, such as ‘the poet’s breath’ as *“een zeer objectiveerbaar linguïstisch iets”* (something that is very much linguistically ‘objectifiable’ or verifiable), it would be erroneous to consider the strategy as one of romantic obfuscation, as a heightened state of sensitivity that draws on an allegiance to some hoary imagined language community. Hence the translator is bound to the source text and language in ways that are textually and professionally verifiable, which once again places the ideological characterisation (language as being) mainly within the discursive parameters of genre and professional practice.

Secondly, ‘import’ is not an uncommon metaphor for translation either and also deserves examination in language ideological terms. The import metaphor is also used in a paper by Itamar Even-Zohar (1997<sup>169</sup>) in which he makes a distinction between import and transfer, a notion central to the construction of what he calls ‘culture repertoire’<sup>170</sup>:

When goods – material or semiotic – are imported, if they are successful on the home market, they may gradually become integral part of the target repertoire. ... I would like to call the state of integrated importation in a home repertoire “transfer”. Transfer, in short, is the process whereby imported goods are integrated into a home repertoire, and the consequences generated by this integration. (Even-Zohar 1997: 358-359)

The semiotic goods being imported in our case are poems from English and Irish. Similarly to Evan-Zohar’s view, import is only successful (hence transfer) when the goods stay alive or are instilled with new life in the target language. But this presupposes more than just acceptance by the target audience, thereby making the goods part of their culture repertoire. The goods have to be imported (translated) first before they can be transferred. The translator is involved in initiating transfer and this is expressed in terms of poetry in one language becoming poetry in another, which involves taking on the ‘being’ (form and substance) of the language in question. However, ‘import’ and ‘being,’ next to being clearly language-ideological characterisations, are also used in the extract as shorthand for a number of actions involving language that belong within particular translation practices and not to an overarching cultural model in the sense given to ‘import’ in Evan-Zohar (1997). Though there may be precedents in

and genealogies of characterisation, metaphor or metonym, e.g. accepted terms in disciplines and professions, this does not imply that all meaning can or should be brought back to their inceptive moment of coinage, if such a moment can be found, or to what they are understood as meaning in a given discipline only.

### 3.4.2.3. Language Sensitivity: trials of the foreign

In the following extract the interviewee is struggling with a definition of language while at the same time trying to dispel any associations of social class that might be implied in that definition. The interviewee describes the difficulty experienced when trying to write in or translate into her mother tongue while living abroad. This is explained in terms of language levels or, more poignantly, the potential remoteness of a particular language level.

VVDK: Het is een bepaald taalniveau het is een soort hoger niveau van de taal waar je em waar je in denkt en in schrijft als je met literatuur bezig bent iets ja hoger en lager heeft onmiddellijk andere connotaties.

Het is niet zo dat ik bedoel, het is iets anders het is een taal die bovenop de omgangstaal op de dagelijkse omgangstaal circuleert en ik heb moeite om dat niveau terug te vinden en eh en als ik veel Nederlandse boeken komt dat terug (ja, ja) en dikwijls als ik zo aan het vertalen ben of zo dat ik gewoon ga kijken in mijn boekenkast wat ik daar nog heb staan om het even wat Nederlandse poëzie te lezen of andere boeken omdat dat gevoel die taal terug aan te voelen.

PF: Dus en dat is em een reële ik zou het misschien probleem noemen iets reëels

VVDK: Ja oh ja dat dan dat voel je onmiddellijk als je probeert te schrijven of probeert te vertalen.

Ja. Ik heb dan het voordeel in Ierland dat ik het contact heb met de mensen voor de brontaal waaruit je vertaalt (ja) maar ik voel me zowat afgesneden van de, de doeltaal dan, de waar je naartoe vertaalt

(I.5/c1 (sub2))

#### Extract 3-26: language sensitivity

Language is portrayed here as comprising various levels or at least a level above the colloquial that is needed if one wants to write or translate well. This level is hypostasized as language above language, yet within the same language. It is characterised by the interviewee as a level one can reach or remain in touch with mainly by being in the community where the language is spoken. When at a remove from the community (e.g. living and working in a country where the language is not spoken), one has to use resources such as works of literature and other means to 'regain' or 're-enter' the 'level' needed to write and translate in. In this sense, competence in a given language is not seen as immutable, even for a native speaker, but as something one can lose touch with and that has to be maintained through use. Here this is expressed in terms of somehow being 'cut off' from the target language, in this case the native language of the translator, despite clear input and assistance from those on the source language side. So the rationalisation involved does not merely constitute an oblique recognition of what is commonly known as register<sup>171</sup> or even genre but rather an awareness of potential language insecurity caused by remove from a language community. This is also expressed in terms of a vertical segmentation of aspects of language use. Again, this awareness

arose within the immediate practice of translation, though plausibly it could occur to any bilingual involved in other practices who spends time away from any one particular language community.

#### 3.4.2.4. English: terse and pithy

In the extract below, the interviewee sets up a tentative taxonomy of relations between languages, viz. English, Dutch and French. These relations are expressed in terms of ease of translation. Dutch and English are seen as being more related and hence mutually easier to translate in and out of, which is less the case between Dutch and French. These differences are further evidenced by the ways poets are perceived to work: most poets [working in English] do not go counting syllables as French poets do but are more concerned with stress patterns<sup>172</sup> and because Dutch works in a similar way, this facilitates translation. The big drawback as far as Dutch is concerned is the large number of muted sounds in the language, which make the words longer. In this respect English is considered a more compact language,<sup>173</sup> which allows you to say more with fewer words. The words brought into play in English poetry are also considered to be relatively shorter than their Dutch counterparts<sup>174</sup>. Furthermore, these muted sounds in words render it more difficult for the translator to make a poem sound well in Dutch translation.

VDK: Ik vind de talen zijn verwanter en em het is makkelijker denk ik. Ja ze werken ook op een andere manier eehhh (ja) dus zonder eh gewoon de meeste dichters gaan gewoon geen lettergrepen tellen in het Engels. Zij werken met heffingen dus wij hebben ook meer een taal die op die manier werkt (ja) denk ik dus dat maakt het al makkelijker. Het grote probleem van het Nederlands zijn alle doffe klanken die de woorden dan heel lang maken daar zit je dan.

Engels is ook een korte taal heel bondig kan heel gebald dingen zeggen dus dat is ook niet eenvoudig hoor om dat in het Nederlands mooi te laten klinken. (1.6/a3 (sub1))

#### Extract 3-27: English – terse and pithy

This extract provides us with a clear link between practice and language ideology. The characteristics of a particular language are seen as having a bearing on how poets work, and such characteristics can in turn be put to use by translators. At the same time, problems encountered in translation practice and the solutions found in solving or getting round them are extrapolated to a language or languages and posited in terms of its/their characteristics. The translation problems<sup>175</sup> encountered in particular texts, therefore, are not seen as being particular to those texts alone but also to the language they are written in or to a particular writer's style in that language. It could be argued that the extract discussed here contains 'rationalisations' not of a language or languages, but of translation practice within a particular genre, i.e. poetry, across languages. These rationalisations are, nonetheless, expressed in terms of perceived differences between languages and must be considered as such.

### 3.4.2.5. Dutch: flowing and melodious

The reasoning visible in the following extract is not unlike that in the previous one, in that lines of poetry in Dutch translation are experienced as being longer than in the original Afrikaans. On the face of it, this would somehow put Afrikaans on a par with English but this conclusion is not drawn. The relatively longer Dutch line is still considered to be potentially problematic, however. Nevertheless, the ground work of counting syllables and attempting to match word length by searching for synonyms is carried out in order to reduce line length as much as possible and limit the perceived discrepancy. The difficulty in translating from Afrikaans into Dutch is expressed in terms of the difference between the conjugation systems of the two languages. As Afrikaans derives historically from Dutch, there are clear grounds for this argument and in fact in this respect it is not surprising that the translator links the two languages, albeit with the metonym, conjugation, as there is clearly more to any language than its verb system. The expected value judgement – that the poems would be too long in translation – was not confirmed by the poet. In fact, he found the Dutch translations more beautiful because they were more flowing and sonorous, a quality that was then attributed to Dutch in contrast to Afrikaans which is considered ‘drier’ or more blunt in this respect:

CJ: Poëzie of proza?

PF: Ja dan.

CJ: Er is een groot verschil enfin bij mij toch (PF: ja, ja).

Als het poëzie is dan begin ik met potlood A-B, A-B (PF: ja) onderstrepingen, eh em lettergrepen tellen, je maakt eerst helemaal de, hoe moet ik zeggen, de morfologische analyse van dat gedicht. (PF: ja)

Dan ga je zien of je dat in het Nederlands kunt benaderen.

Als het lukt bijvoorbeeld uit het Afrikaans is dat heel moeilijk omdat de vervoeging daar heel anders is dus daar zit je hoe dan ook altijd met langere verzen omdat er meer lettergrepen zijn dus daar daar zit je al met dat probleem maar goed, maar dan dat is voor straks ik heb er dan met de dichter over gesproken die vond dat nu juist mooier in het Nederlands omdat het dan vloeiender en zangeriger wordt. (PF: ah ha)

Terwijl hij vindt dat het in het Afrikaans nogal sec (makes a chopping movement with her hand) is, nogal kort is. (PF: eh, ja)

Dus dat is mijn methode om, om gedichten, in ieder geval en dan ja bij woorden ga je dan aan de slag met je synoniemenwoordenboek om te zien eh het gaat dan vooral om zo goed mogelijk de connotaties weer te geven want "er staat niet wat er staat." (I.8/b1)

#### Extract 3-28: Dutch flowing and melodious

It is interesting to note that the relative shortness of line in Afrikaans poetry is not viewed in the same positive sense as its English counterpart. The reason for the positive evaluation of Dutch in this case may perhaps be sought in the historical link between the two languages: a link in which Dutch could conceivably be attributed the role of classical antecedent, of an older European language that lends itself better to the use of an ‘older’ poetics in which sonority would play an important role. As this is not discussed in the data however, we can indeed only speculate.

In the extract above, we can again see that if a language is characterised, it is always in relation to another language. So the characterisations are made and must be understood in a framework of comparative relations and not in absolute terms. Such characterisations are based in part on the (accumulated) experience translators have of particular phenomena in various languages. That a line is long in a Dutch poem is not problematic in itself; more than likely, the line would simply be categorised according to the rules of prosody. It does become problematic, however, when it comes to translation, at the moment that the translator is confronted with the givens of the situation, one of which is the length of a line in the source poem and the aesthetic and functional values that are attached to it.

#### **3.4.2.6. Dutch: of the (non)-gifts of our language**

The following extract can be considered as forming a coda to the other five in 4.2., as its language-ideological characterisations, while continuing in the same vein as those in the preceding excerpts, thoroughly conflate perceptions of language and translation practice. In this respect, French is portrayed as a language that is easy to rhyme in and Dutch as a language that resists rhyme and at best requires other forms of prosody (unspecified) that are better suited to its nature. In fact, this extract points forward to the next part of the discussion, as it also embraces perceptions of genre and poetics (and their politics). According to the interviewee, one can take nothing for granted when it comes to translating the prosody of a particular poem into Dutch. So the propensity French poets have for rhyming in a particular way is portrayed as a characteristic of the French language – a similar form of projection to that found in the other extracts above. As is also indicated elsewhere in the same interview, rhyme is a dangerous and perhaps unnecessary thing, particularly when considered as badly done (see **1.10/b1 (sub1)**, where it is scornfully depicted as belonging a tradition of ‘Saint Nicolas’ rhymes or in **1.10/a3 (sub1)** where it is given the pejorative name ‘caramel verse’). At this stage, language almost becomes subsumed under poetics, a stance that is much less visible in the other extracts in 4.2.:

CP: Dat hangt een beetje af van ja of vrije verzen zijn natuurlijk makkelijker dan rijmende en metrische verzen dus rijmend ze en metrische verzen zijn altijd moeilijk. Dus je krijgt nooit iets cadeau in onze taal. ... ik merk ik kan in het Frans onmiddellijk rijmen vinden en het is veel makkelijker om in het Frans iets te vertalen of zo dan in het Nederlands. Dus het Nederlands is echt wel een taaie taal wat betreft prosodisch vertalen. (ah ja) Het is zelfs fsssh. Ik heb zo bijna de indruk bijna dat het onmogelijk is in vele gevallen er zijn heel wat gedichten die je niet goed krijgt in het Nederlands als je ze dus rijmend en metrisch wil vertalen. (**1.10/b1 (sub1)**)

#### **Extract 3-29: Dutch of the (non)-gifts of our language**

The drift of the argument is that, in numerous cases (see further in **1.10/b1 (sub1)** and also **1.10/a1 (sub3)**), it would be better to abandon rhyme altogether, if one wishes to do justice to poems in Dutch translation. As mentioned already, the justification given for this is the nature of the language (‘few presents’, ‘tough’), which is why the quote have been included under language ideologies, even though the discussion in the extract is mainly about issues of genre.



### **3.4.2.7. Language Ideological Characterisations: whose discursive authority?**

One can ask whether the notions of time and distance, which proved useful in aligning the utterances in the debate on Dutch, can be of use to us in the case of the claims discussed in 4.2.1-6. This firstly requires a re-examination of the methodological and epistemological premises set out in 4, especially the safeguards outlined in discussing the data in 4.1.

1. Following Mertz, we have identified a number of ideological categorisations that emerge in the discourse. These categorisations portray languages as functioning in contrasting ways or as possessing contrasting characteristics which determine subsequent linguistic practice, including literary practice.
2. Following Briggs, we can ask once again what type of discursive authority is thus being constructed and naturalised in these extracts.
3. And in keeping with Collins, we can inquire into the extent to which we are dealing with “representations of the real” as “weapons in the struggle to define the real”.

The following table provides an overview of the various ideological characterisations found in the extracts discussed in chapter 3.4.2.1. to 6.

Ref.	Metaphor / Metonym / Expression	Subject of characterisation	Discursive Parameters of Characterisation	Professional / Social Position	Related Pivotal action
4.2.1. Ext. 3-24	Taal is sociaal, collectief bepaald	Language (as such) / languages	Collective nature of language determines lexical variation in and across languages	Translating involves using lexical variation and hence containing possible meaning.	“het knutselen, het proberen om te kijken of hetzelfde effect te weeg kan brengen”
4.2.2. Ext. 3-25	Importereren / wezen van de taal	Language (as such) / Dutch/English	As language is alive poetry (must) reflect(s) that life	Translated poetry must take on the being (form and substance) of the new language.	“een vertaling is een gedicht importereren in een andere taal”
4.2.3. Ext. 3-26	Bovenop omgangstaal / afgesneden zijn van doeltaal	Language (as such) / native language	Potential (vertical) disassociation of aspects of language when a person is at a distance from community	In contrast to the colloquial, a ‘higher’ language level is needed for writing and translating	“en eh en als ik veel Nederlandse boeken lees (ja, ja) komt dat terug”
4.2.4. Ext. 3-27	Kort / bondig / gebald / dof / lang	Dutch / English / French	Similar language structures implies similar poetic practices	Relatedness of language structure and hence poetics facilitates translation	“Zij werken met heffingen dus wij hebben ook meer een taal die op die manier werkt”
4.2.5. Ext. 3-28	Vervoeging / vloeiend / zangerig / sec	Afrikaans / Dutch	conjugation systems determine line length in poems: longer lines in Dutch translations may prove problematic	Dutch translations are more melodious: a positive, yet unexpected consequence of longer lines	“Als het poëzie is dan begin ik met potlood A-B, A-B ... onderstreping... lettergrepen tellen”
4.2.6. Ext. 3-29	Geen cadeaus / taai	Dutch / French	French is easier to rhyme in than Dutch which resists rhyme	Rhyme may have to be abandoned to achieve good Dutch translations	“Dus het Nederlands is echt wel een taai taal wat betreft prosodisch vertalen”

**Table 3-iii: other ideological characterisations of language(s) - a schematic overview**

The table provides details on the characterisations, their subjects, the discursive parameters they belong within, the professional/social position from which they were uttered and, importantly, the pivotal action these characterisations coincide with. It is important to point out at this stage that the writer takes the characterisations of language and languages found in

the extracts examined in chapter 3.4.1.1.-7. and 4.2.1.-6. (Extract 3 – 1 to 30) to be more than just ad-hoc rationalisations, i.e. as belonging merely within the contours of the interviews. Not only are they emergent in the discourse, they can also be considered as building on the experience and experiences the translators brought with them to the interview. One can clearly notice on examining the extracts that the generalisations or characterisations made by the interviewees are usually related to specific or pivotal moments of professional action or practice (see particularly underlined sections in Extracts 3 – 24 to 29 and Table 3-iv, column 6). I argue here that the characterisations cannot be abstracted from such pivotal moments, i.e. that they are practice related and not versions of universal translational or translatorial norms that can be projected onto behaviour and text from a certain era or culture in the sense posited by Chesterman (1993) in formulations resembling “in situation X, translator A<sub>T</sub> will perform action Y” (see the discussion of Norm Theory in chapter 3.7.1 below). In their characterisations, the interviewees often portray language(s) and texts as states or sets of contrastive characteristics that stem from and/or are corroborated by the various actions involved in translating. They belong in a framework of and also form illustrations of professional skill, somewhat akin to the way a carpenter might explain how something is done by also engaging in the action itself<sup>76</sup>. Thus action/interaction is generalised as state and hence further characterised, which effectively constructs and naturalises discursive authority, albeit not entirely. This authority can be and is contested during the translation process by proofreaders, editors, etc.

It would be a vain quest to search in these characterisations for an exactness of description similar to that obtaining in academic models of language description. In this sense, their utterances reveal what Briggs calls ‘dimensions of a practice’ which involve an engagement with languages. Indeed they are not ‘a homogenous cultural substratum’ that might be equated with partly or incompletely or even ‘erroneously’ portrayed structures of a given language or languages. In other words, though language represents reality – one of its many functions – it is also part of the reality it represents, in this case the everyday reality of translating texts. Language is the material that translators work with, in and through; it is what they reflect on, discover pattern and regularity in, etc.

The utterances discussed above can, therefore, be considered as ‘representations of the real’ that also include the realities of languages and their everyday (professional) use, next to being “weapons in the struggle to define the real” (Collins 1998) in their workaday lives. As was pointed out in the discussion of Ethos (see table 3-i above), translators orient themselves both textually and socially when tackling a given translation problem. All this forms part of the overall task of meaning-making and this meaning has to be corroborated (networks of expertise, proofreaders, editors, etc.). Foreign texts form a reality in themselves but are also representations of (a foreign) reality. Translators need a certain degree of authority in tackling these texts, otherwise they will not be believed professionally. The characterisations outlined above give us an indication of how translators deal with that reality. Central to the construction and naturalisation of discursive authority or its corollary here is the ‘asserted’

power to tackle texts in one language and translate them into another. The reality being defined, therefore, includes translation and hence the ideological characterisations form the weapons needed to tackle that reality.

I also argue that these characterisations manifest varying degrees of naturalised authority, the most naturalised being the last (chapter 3.4.2.6.) in which language characteristics are subsumed under poetics and the least being the third (chapter 3.4.2.3.) in which potential language insecurity is expressed in terms of a vertical separation of language into various levels that are more or less available to the user depending on his or her degree of remove from the community in which the language is spoken. The premises found in the extracts discussed in chapter 3.4.2.2.; 4. and 5. can be considered as similar in that they all clearly posit both translation and literary possibility as being determined by or as issuing from perceived language structures.

On the whole, what is interesting to note (yet again) is the continuum between perceived language structure and literary possibility as it plays out not only in a given (source) poem but also in its translation. This may seem like unneeded repetition, but it might prove convenient here to recall criticism of linguistic approaches to translation levelled by those working within cultural studies (e.g. Genzler 1993). As these extracts demonstrate, translators are aware of and work with differences and express these differences in terms of aspects of language structure. Consequently, it is important that models – cultural or linguistic – that intend to map out translation products and processes take such factors into account.

To return to the question asked at the beginning of chapter 3.4.2.7., there is no immediate indication of time and distance in the interview fragments discussed in chapter 3.4.2.1. to 6., and outlined in Table 3-ii. In these cases, the distinctions made were usually cast in terms of structural/lexical differences and similarities in and across languages and the consequences these differences and similarities have for (literary) expression in any two languages under discussion. Though similarity and difference can be expressed metaphorically as degrees of time or distance, it would add little to the discussion of the second set of extracts if we were to do so. However, the two sets of extracts (chapter 3.4.1.1. to 7. and chapter 3.4.2.1. to 6.) can be considered to coincide in the way they bear indications of contestation/naturalisation of discursive power. The ideological characterisations of particular languages or of language in general found in the two sets of extracts all indicate various stances towards language(s) based on certain claims to authority which stem not solely from the interviewees' belonging to a language community but mainly from their belonging to a 'profession' whose raw material and modus operandi is language use. In this sense discursive power involved here can also be taken quite literally.

### **3.4.3. Language Ideologies Revisited**

In the discussion of Ethos in section 3.2. of this chapter, I have indicated what I consider to be orientations in the discourse which I termed 'social' and 'textual'. In each case, I identified a focus in which these social and the textual orientations came together. The consideration that

the various aspects of Ethos belonged in a single framework gave rise to the following question: can the utterances involving language ideology discussed in chapter 3.4.1 and 4.2 above also be considered as belonging together in a larger framework? Can they be seen as related aspects of a single phenomenon and if so, which? Both the debate on Dutch and the other items discussed in chapter 3.4.2 bear indications of how translators position themselves in the linguistic market. As was pointed out in chapter 3.4.1 to 8, none of the utterances on language can merely be equated with expressions of national or ethnic identity as these expressions also voiced more specific professional and broader social concerns – see for instance how national differences were subverted by an appeal to the common international ground of Standard Dutch in chapter 3.4.1.4 and 5. In fact, all contestations of perceived linguistic bias, whether regional, national or otherwise, make recourse to this common transnational standard. Furthermore, if this common international standard were not there, those at the periphery would find it even harder to be gainfully employed as translators. Consequently, it is important that they position themselves squarely within the commonality of the standard language. This commonality radiates out horizontally to include language use in all its various settings, one of which is the profession of translation. And this is where the second set of language-ideological characterisations (4.2.) come in. The interviewees not only position themselves with respect to the language they translate into but also with respect to the other languages they translate out of and which form part of their competence. This competence becomes manifest in the ways they attribute certain characteristics to these languages and to language generally speaking and in the way these characteristics form the foundation for their own linguistic practices and their perceptions of (literary) genre and culture. Throughout the discussion of language ideologies I have continuously located the utterances found in the data within their social and professional settings. As a result, these utterances should not be regarded as universalistic declarations on the nature of language(s) or otherwise as wishing to vie with full descriptions of languages in all their complexity, but as practice-based characterisations that help us gain insight into the workaday world of translators. The argumentation followed in this section can be summed up nicely by the following quote:

Thus translation is metalinguistic and metacultural activity which makes explicit contrasts and conflicts between modes of discourse and modes of linguistic value and power which are able to remain buried or implicit in much of everyday life and in some other forms of writing. (Jaffe 1999<sup>177</sup>: 42)

Two of the items mentioned in the quote i.e. ‘modes of discourse’ and ‘metacultural activity’ will be discussed in the next section under genre and in the final section of this chapter under versions of culture, respectively.

### 3.5. Genre

The third set of salient utterances i.e. those categorised under genre<sup>178</sup> will be dealt with in this section but again not before a preliminary discussion of the term genre and the various meanings that have been attached to it in the course of time. As was argued above (chapter 3.2.) more recent approaches to genre, which regard it as a form of social action, will be focused on in the discussion and analysis. The word ‘recent’ is misleading, however, as such definitions of genre can already be found in the work of Medvedev & Bakhtin ([1928] 1978) and more explicitly in Vološinov ([1930] 1973). Nevertheless, ‘recent’ is also apt in that it highlights the prominence scholars have given to genre as social action<sup>179</sup> over the last twenty years. I will now proceed to examine a number of these definitions and attempt to detect their common features. Then I will turn to the genre-related utterances found in the data<sup>180</sup> and see whether and if so, to which extent, their emergent features match those posited in the definitions.

#### 3.5.1. From Text Types to Activity Types: evolving definitions or opposing perspectives?

The search for a definition of genre led me back to Vološinov ([1930] 1973), whose view on genre has much in common with the more recent definitions I had found, e.g. Martin’s (1984) and Hanks’s (1987). At first sight, such resemblance, though obvious, puzzled me, and brought to mind a river that had disappeared underground only to reappear again some miles further, perhaps in another country, with the very same aplomb and self-evidence; or was the river always there and had I simply failed to notice it in my research? It is not the purpose here, however, to trace broader genealogies of the approaches to language within which definitions of genre are couched<sup>181</sup>, but rather to arrive at a working definition of genre that is mindful of the thinking on the subject outlined below, a definition that will help us understand and frame the utterances found in the data. As was mentioned already, the discussion here begins with Vološinov ([1930] 1973), who clearly recognized genre as an ‘activity type’ involving language use, as the following two quotes illustrate:

Social psychology is first and foremost an atmosphere made up of multifarious *speech performances* that engulf and wash over all persistent forms and kinds of ideological creativity: unofficial discussions, exchanges of opinion at the theatre or a concert or at various types of social gatherings, purely chance exchanges of words, one’s manner of verbal reaction to happenings in one’s life and daily existence, one’s inner word manner of identifying oneself and identifying one’s position in society. Social psychology exists primarily in a wide variety of forms of the utterance of little *speech genres* of internal and external kinds – things left completely unstudied to the present. All these speech performances are, of course, joined with other types of semiotic manifestations and interchange – with miming, gesturing, acting out, and the like. (Vološinov 1973: 19-20)

A book, i.e. a verbal performance in print, is also an element of verbal communication. It is something discussable in actual, real-life dialogue, but aside from that, it is calculated for active perception, involving attentive reading and inner responsiveness and for organised printed reaction. ... Moreover, a verbal performance of this kind orients itself with respect to previous performances in the same sphere ... Thus the printed verbal performance engages, as it were, in ideological colloquy of large scale: it responds to something, objects to something, affirms something, anticipates possible responses and objections, seeks support, and so on. (Vološinov 1973: 95)

As we can see from these quotes, 'written' genres (literary, scientific, etc.) belong in the broader context of verbal performances which include all speech genres. Again as the quotes illustrate, genres are considered from the very outset to be interactional and mediated by social circumstance, in fact, as being embedded totally within the social and historical contexts in which they came about, a view which Vološinov shares with Bakhtin:

Language is realized in the form of concrete utterances (oral or written) by the participants in the various areas of human activity. These utterances reflect the specific conditions and goals of each such area. ... Each sphere in which language is used develops its own relatively stable types of these utterances. These we may call genres<sup>182</sup>. (Bakhtin 1986: 60)

It can be argued that Vološinov was then presenting a new philosophy of language that wished to be in tune with a Marxist vision of society<sup>183</sup> and, given the failure of the Marxist project, that we can happily drop the whole affair and move on. However, moving on, in this case, means arriving back at Vološinov's basic stance. For example, one cannot help but notice a formulation akin to what is now called intertextuality (Kristeva 1974<sup>184</sup>) in the second Vološinov quote above. Furthermore, the first quote recommends the study of speech genres in situ, something we can happily do nowadays and have been doing for a considerable time thanks to traditions in participant observation and the increasingly refined recording equipment at our disposal.

We can detect a clear 'return' to Vološinov's position which sums up a position commonly held in linguistic anthropology in the following quotes:

Genres are not sets of discourse features<sup>185</sup>, but "orienting frameworks, interpretive procedures, and sets of expectations" (Hanks 1987: 670)

In regards to genre, for example, the emphasis of the late 1960s through the mid 1970s was on structural definitions of individual genres, stimulated by the translation into English of Propp's *Morphology of the Folktale* (1968) and the burgeoning of interest in the work of Lévi-Strauss, and on the culturally established systems of classification discovered through the techniques of ethnoscience. More recently, these concerns have been tempered by a conception of genre as a dynamic expressive resource, in which the conventional expectations and associations that attach to generically marked stylistic features are available for combination and recombination in the production of varying forms and meanings (Hymes 1975; Sherzer 1979; Urban 1985). (Richard Bauman in Duranti & Goodwin 1992: 127)

Are these instances of the river resurfacing in another country, as it were, or conclusions drawn by scholars who basically have followed their own paradigms in drawing on research and observation in the field? Compare these quotes again with the following two taken from Vološinov:

Genre is that area where construction and theme meet and fuse together, the area precisely where social evaluation generates forms of that finalised structuredness [zaveršenie, zaveršimost], which is the very differentia specifica of art. (Vološinov [1930]1973: 184)

What is at stake in the first instance is the actual status of a work as a social fact: its definition in real time and space; its means and mode of performance; the kind of audience presupposed and the relationship between author and audience established; its association with social institutions, social mores, and other ideological spheres; in short – its full "situational" definition. (Vološinov [1930]1973: 184)

Vološinov defines theme “as the significance of a whole utterance” (1973: 99) and the fact that the genre referred to in the quote is literary changes little to the reasoning. The features of Hanks’s tripartite definition for example are nascent in Vološinov’s.

In a similar way to Hanks and Bauman, the scholars quoted in the following two extracts could be considered as drawing on research paradigms that would allow them to reach related conclusions:

A genre is a staged goal-oriented, purposeful activity in which speakers engage as members of our culture. / Genres are how things get done, when language is used to accomplish them. (Martin 1984: 25 & 1985: 248 and in Eggins 1994: 26)

Genres are diverse ways of acting, of producing social life, in the semiotic mode. Examples are: everyday conversation, meetings in various types of organizations, political and other forms of interview, and book reviews. (Wetherell, M., Taylor, S. & Yates, S.J. 2001: 235)

And not to make too blunt a point of pushing Vološinov to the fore as a significantly early formulator of the contemporary definition of genre, consider the following statement by Medvedev and Bakhtin:

If we tear an utterance out of social intercourse and materialise it, we lose the organic unity of all its elements. The word, grammatical form, sentence, and all linguistic definiteness in general taken in abstraction from the concrete historical utterance turn into technical signs of a meaning that is as yet only possible and still not individualised historically. The organic connection of meaning and sign cannot become lexical, grammatically stable, and fixed in identical and reproducible forms, i.e. cannot in itself become a sign or constant element of a sign, cannot become grammaticalized. This connection is created only to be destroyed, to be reformed again, but in new forms under the conditions of a new utterance. (Medvedev & Bakhtin [1928] 1978: 121)

One can then ask why genre began to be (re)considered as a ‘dynamic expressive resource’ (Bauman) or “orienting frameworks, interpretive procedures, and sets of expectations” rather



than a 'set of discourse features' (Hanks). Did this stem in part from the recognition, following on research that a particular set of discourse features<sup>186</sup> was not concomitant with a given genre and that one had to turn or move out from such text-specific features to a broader framework in order to grasp the notion of genre? It could be argued that the more recent definitions are research driven or finally emergent from a increasingly refined paradigm<sup>187</sup>, in comparison to Vološinov's, Medvedev's and Bakhtin's, which can be considered to be philosophical stances that anticipated verification in further research, which perhaps failed to materialise. It is ironic and also crucial to note that the Russians mentioned here would probably have rejected out of hand any definition of genre that limited itself to sets of discourse features<sup>188</sup> and would probably find themselves vindicated by the more recent definitions given above (Martin, Hanks, Bauman, Wetherell). On the face of it however, discourse features, presuming they are text-based, are relatively easier to discover than sets of features of situated utterances because such features extend outward from and inward to specific language use and users.

Another discernable difference between the older and more recent definitions of genre – to the exclusion of those formulated in the middle period – can perhaps be cautiously attributed to focus. Though Medvedev and Bakhtin reject, in referring to literary genre, the notion of genre as “a certain constant, specific grouping of devices with a defined dominant” (Medvedev, P.N. & Bakhtin, M.M. ([1928] 1978: 129), a definition they attribute to the Formalists, they somehow remain focused on the work as such, or product, if you will, despite their desire to situate it fully in socio-cultural and historical terms. Arguing within the field of literature they state:

Poetics should really begin with genre, not end with it. For genre is the typical form of the whole work, the whole utterance. A work is only real in the form of a definite genre. Each element's constructive meaning can only be understood in connection with genre. If the problem of genre, as the problem of artistic whole, had been formulated at the right time, it would have been impossible for the formalists to ascribe independent constructive significance to abstract elements of language. (Medvedev, P.N. & Bakhtin, M.M. [1928] 1978: 129)

I believe however, that this must also be understood in its historical context: books after all were/are concrete recorded evidence of the existence of genre. More recent definitions that see genre as a 'resource', 'an activity' or 'a way of acting' could be considered as focusing more on process than on product<sup>189</sup>, particularly now that process can be more easily observed and recorded, which does not mean that they ignore the historical language or other semiotic material constructed through or framing such processes. The older definitions contextualise and historicise particular forms of language use, whereas the more recent definitions also see language use as contextualising and historicising the particular types of action that it belongs with. So to return to Hanks's definition, the discourse features that were considered earlier as constituting genre have not gone away but are now subsumed under a broader definition of genre as activity, outside of which the discourse features identified or recognised as pertaining to a particular genre would make no sense.

This leads us to the following question: where does any particular genre begin? Or more pertinently and for the purposes of this study, how does genre relate to translation? Seen in the light of current definitions of genre, these two questions are closely related. Let us firstly contrast four recent definitions of genre here before attempting to answer the questions. In Bauman’s formulation, the notion of genre as discourse features is still visible but subordinate to the broader definition of ‘dynamic expressive resource’, which also includes evaluation in the form of expectations and associations. Its tangent of (accompanying) action is not ‘explicitly’ indicated, at least not as clearly as in Martin’s and Wetherell et al’s definitions, which I do not think can be taken narrowly as meaning speech acts. In contrast to the other three definitions, Hank’s is more generalised and harder to tie down. It belongs within a broader definition of practice, which will be discussed below. One can see a parallel between the aspects of his definition and Martin’s, particularly with regard to orientation and expectation, both of which imply a goal and evaluation. All four definitions hinge on forms of meaning making which involve interaction and as a result the production of social life in some visible/audible form.

Action	Activity	Ways of acting	Dynamic expressive resource
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Orienting frameworks</li> <li>◆ Interpretive procedures</li> <li>◆ Sets of expectations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Staged</li> <li>◆ Goal-orientated</li> <li>◆ Purposeful</li> <li>◆ Language use</li> <li style="text-align: center;">+</li> <li>◆ Culture</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Producing social life in semiotic mode</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Conventional expectations and associations</li> <li>◆ Combination / re-combination of generically marked stylistic features</li> <li>◆ Production of varying forms and meanings</li> </ul>
(Hanks)	(Martin)	(Wetherell et al.)	(Bauman)

**Table 3-iv: features of genre definitions**

I consider the following three features to be common to each of the definitions listed in Table 3-v:

1. Particular forms of language use (or other semiotic use);
2. Accompanying expectations/evaluations;
3. Framing activity.

Nevertheless, it is hard to establish clear-cut lines of separation between these three features (or the features of the definitions for that matter). For example, when Wetherell et al. speak of the ‘semiotic mode’ or Martin of “using language to get things done”, one might be inclined to conflate (1) forms of language use with (3) framing activity. In other words, the ‘things’ we get done could be ‘language things’ along with their resultant ‘meaning making.’ On the other hand, when one considers the examples of genre used to illustrate the definitions given, one discovers events or activities like “everyday conversation, meetings in various types of organizations, political and other forms of interview, and book reviews” (Wetherell, Taylor &

Yates 2001: 235), all of which extend further into gesture and setting and the use of various materials that are vital to our understanding of the particular genre in question. For example, one needs a book to write a book review on, material to write the review with, one has to comply with certain editorial constraints in doing so, etc. At the same time, the (language) material that is part of the activity, the layout of an annual report handed out at a meeting for example, orients meaning making, which implies that form predicates expectation/evaluation (genre as sets of discursive features).

Moreover, we can assume, in drawing on the statements quoted above, that genres have a certain history<sup>190</sup> of their own, which is probably why scholars have treated them as sets of formal discursive features. In other words, they possess a regularity – which is not to say a highly ritualised predictability, though this may be so in some cases – that goes beyond singular arbitrary individual exchanges and yet cannot be reduced to sets of textual features. If genres constitute a ‘dynamic expressive resource’, as Bauman suggests, then they must be available to and negotiated by individuals or groups as such, given that any concrete expression or performance only provides historical evidence of the existence of a genre and is not the genre itself. This availability is probably coextensive with Hank’s ‘orienting frameworks’, with a capacity that becomes manifest in and through performance. If we are to consider genre as a resource or a form of action or activity, then we also have to inquire into the ‘whom?’ of genre, along with the ‘what?’ which should help us discover ‘where/how?’ genre begins. Dynamic expressive resources are not given absolutes that are equally available to all, nor are all activities carried out by all or engaged in solely and entirely by a select few; they are distributed (unevenly) among the members of any given society (Hanks, 1996: 229-267). Most of us engage in the art of conversation or with literary genres and hence help construct them in some way, but we may not all be engaged in writing plays, for example. In the same way, we may not all have been involved in drafting the Maastricht Treaty, but we may have experienced its consequences or even helped in some small way in formulating its articles through political pressure groups, corporate lobbying, referenda, etc. So any definition of genre also has to enshrine those engaged with it and the perspectives they bring with them to it. This is what the recent definitions do.

So to answer the second question regarding the relation between genre and translation, genre begins again or rather continues where the translator engages with it; this is the specific ‘whom’ we have to examine in this instance, along with all the rest. The engagement ostensibly involves an instance of translation or interpretation. In real terms the translator is handed or takes on a work to translate or is asked to interpret an instance of speech within a particular setting. It is in such instances that genre comes into play, a point made by Hatim and Mason (1990) within translation studies:

Genres are ‘conventionalised forms of texts’ which reflect the functions and goals involved in particular social occasions as well as the purposes of the participants in them (Kress 1985: 19)  
From a socio-semiotic point of view, this particular use of language is best viewed in terms of norms which are internalised as part of the ability to communicate. (Hatim & Mason 1990: 69)

If, as Hatim and Mason suggest, a particular use of language reflects “internalised norms which are part of the ability to communicate”, then the conventions of the genre concerned are not merely textual – a point that has been stressed throughout this section. The ‘dynamic expressive resource’ in question is not locked in the work that is to be translated nor in the mouths of the interlocutors during an instance of speech that requires an interpreter but must also be shared, *a fortiori*, by the interpreter or translator involved. It is not only the features of ‘conventionalised forms of text’ that allow translators to translate effectively but also their (awareness of) being engaged in a particular type of activity that requires particular modes of action and hence what Hanks calls “interpretative strategies and sets of expectations”, without which there would be no translation<sup>191</sup> for the translator would be unable to situate or carry out the commission required of him or her, neither in terms of the source text, nor in terms of the target text. So when a translator engages in a commission – to express it in Skopos theory terms – he or she also engages in genre and this does not merely mean the generic features of the text that comprises the commission or those of the ‘translatum’. We will now turn to a number of excerpts from the data to see how this plays out.

### 3.5.1.1. The Fire and the Finish: creative spark and formal care

The utterances to be discussed here (and those in the other extracts to follow) would be understood traditionally as formulations pertaining to an overall translation strategy, but they can also be understood as typifying the various features of genre identified above, which in fact any translation strategy would have to take into account. The prerequisites of translation set out by the interviewee in this extract involve a) **love/fire**, b) **a good dictionary/finish**, c) **an immediate engagement with the text**, d) **a respect for the source text, which ties the translation to it and restrains the translator’s possibilities** (aspects that traditionally fall under equivalence and adequacy) and e) **painstaking revision**.

Love and a good dictionary are not only what the translator takes to the text (orienting frameworks), they also index the creativity and formal care that should become visible in the finished work of translation. The same can be said of the ‘fire and the finish’, a term borrowed from the American poet Robert Lowell<sup>192</sup>, which is postulated as a) being present in the original or source texts, b) as the *modus operandi* needed to do justice to those originals and c) as traits that should be manifest in the target text or translation. It is interesting to note in this case that the axes of action extend both towards the creative and towards formal care, which on the face of it refutes the commonly held perception that literary translators have and do take more leeway with a text than their colleagues in legal, business or other areas of translation, for example. Add to this the expressed requirement to stay close to the original and not to re-create the work as the translator might see fit (a stance visible among all interviewees) and we can say that the presupposed leeway is considerably reduced, which is not to say absent. Creativity and formal care remain the two tangents of orientation, action and prospective result.

EJ: Ik zou ja ik zou zeggen "all you need is love and a good dictionary" natuurlijk - laughs. (I.1/b1)

...

PF: Zo moet er een beetje spanning. (ja, de spanning)

EJ: Ja de spanning daar gaat het om en wat ik dus ook heb met vertalen dat ik direct midden in het water spring en ik begin in medias res en dan ik zie ik wel of het goed is en als het niet goed is dan ga ik terug naar het begin en dan ga ik dat verbeteren.

PF: Dus u wordt direct aangesproken door de taal (ja) je gaat dan niet.

EJ: Maar de spanning je hebt als origineel dichter of (ja) van je eigen werk (ja) die moet je ook proberen te behouden bij het vertalen vind ik niet in die zin (em) dat je het herschept op jouw manier want je moet je echt aan de, de brontekst houden dat vind ik wel maar dat eh dat vuur moet er zijn ja eh (dus je doet) "the fire and the finish" ja, ja (ja, ja) wat Lowell zegt. Dat vind ik een prachtige formulering. De "fire" moet er inzitten maar de "finish" ook.

Dus dat je het dat zo mooi mogelijk maakt (ah ja, ja) dat bedoelt hij met "finish" neem ik aan.

Even kijken hoor waar zegt hij het (takes up book of Lowell's translations of ...) even kijken (pause) oh ja, ja: "I've tried to keep something equivalent to the fire and finish of my originals. This has forced me to do considerable rewriting" ja, "the fire and the finish" (the fire and the finish) (I.1/b4)

#### **Extract 3-30: the fire and the finish**

It is clear from this extract that 'love' or 'the fire', though they are easy to associate with literary genre, were not merely seen as traits of the work to be translated but also evidenced a disposition and a way of working, all of which can be encompassed by the definitions of genre discussed above. The translator must emulate or match the creativity of the original, which is not entirely the same thing as matching the linguistic structures visible in the text. While translating, the translator also engages in the genre in question which brings with it the leeway mentioned above. This is expected of a literary translator, and also conforms to general expectations regarding a literary genre.

#### **3.5.1.2. To the Bone of Text**

In the following extract, the interviewee explains why he began translating poetry. Initially, the purpose was to gain a better understanding of a poem in a foreign language and as a result be more open to influence from the poet in question and thereby improve his own poetic practice. The best way of cutting 'to the bone' of a foreign poem and hence of understanding it as completely as possible was to translate it. In this sense, translating initially involves a kind of in-depth reading, an analysis that goes along with translating the poem into the other language. Analysis is not there for its own sake but for the purposes of translation, upon which, the translator arrives at a deeper understanding of the original. The reason provided was that even in one's own language poems have to be read a number of times before they are understood and this is even more the case with poems in another language. The genre of poetry is typified therefore, in terms of difficulty and layered meaning, as something that

requires a number of rereadings, all of which can be encompassed by the notions orienting frameworks and interpretative strategies (Hanks).

WR: Ik ben begonnen met gedichten te vertalen om beter te kunnen doordringen in de in eh een vreemde tekst, een tekst van een auteur die ik niet volledig kon vatten omdat die in een andere taal was die ik niet ten volle begreep, ook een gedicht van een Nederlandse dichter moet je herhaaldelijk lezen vooraleer je, voor je hem volledig kunt opnemen.

Met een gedicht in een andere taal is dat nog veel moeilijker en om het gedicht dus goed te begrijpen goed te kunnen analyseren vond ik het gewenst van dacht ik dat het eh het beste middel was om die tekst te vertalen zodanig dat je werkelijk kunt doordringen in die tekst tot op het bot.

Het was dus voor mij een hulpmiddel om de invloed van die dichter veel dieper te kunnen ondergaan eigenlijk om voor mezelf een verrijking te hebben als dichter. (I.2/a1)

### **Extract 3-31: to the bone of text**

Initially translation belonged within the interviewee's practice as a poet and gradually gained importance in its own right. However, at no time can we say in this particular case that translation became detached from poetic practice. We can only ask which belongs within which. It is clear, however, that, in either case, genre is a way both of typifying and of acting that informs translation practice. In the extract, an instance of genre is expressed in terms of what one has to do with it (in order to understand it) and how one has to approach it and only subsequently what it is. But, whatever definition of genre one uses, it is beyond a doubt that the interviewee's translation practice is informed by notions of genre.

Viewed metaphorically, translation is the sharp instrument that allows the interviewee to cut 'to the bone' of text and hence generate understanding. Curiously enough, this generation of understanding applies both to the original poem and to its translation or to source and target text at one and the same time. In itself, this idea is quite thought-provoking for most translation models depict meaning as something found in a text that has to be transferred (safely, partly, entirely or otherwise – with all the ensuing discussion) to another text in another language. Here we see meaning coming about in the process of translation and the multiple rereadings functional to it.

#### **3.5.1.3. Tinkering with Little Machines**

This extract has already been discussed above (4.2.1.) in illustrating an instance of language ideology but it can also be read in terms of genre. The notion of genre expressed here builds on the perceived foundations of language (difference). A translation can never be identical to its source text not only because the languages involved are not identical<sup>193</sup> but also because of the variety of meanings attached to any given word within a language. This variety or variance is both the ground and the result of translation. The work to be translated, in this case a poem, is depicted in dynamic terms, as a little machine or piece of apparatus. It is the translator's task to make sure that the "little machine" functions in the new language. This involves tinkering with the 'device' until it works approximately in the same way, the operative word being

‘approximately’ as ‘exactly’ is considered impossible. So a poem is an instance of genre that is attributed certain (unspecified) functions; it is something that effects people in different ways and is constructed so as to have such an affect. The translator must be practised in these functions, i.e. capable of constructing and achieving them him or herself and not merely of recognising them in the source poem. On the whole, this is expressed in terms of (recommended) action, in which we can distinguish recognisable generically marked stylistic features (Bauman), a way of acting (Wetherell et al.) and a goal (Martin), all of which are encompassed by the machine metaphor.

NP: Het heeft natuurlijk ook te maken met het feit dat je probeert zo'n van het ene machientje een ander machientje, apparaatje te maken ja dat ook werkt, het knutselen, het proberen om te kijken of hetzelfde effect teweeg kan brengen. (dat is mooi) Bah dat is toch altijd iets anders omdat in elke taal een onderlaag heeft die elk woord dat is niet alleen individueel maar ook sociaal of collectief is dat uiteraard bepaald, elk woord heeft natuurlijk een verwijzingsgamma dat, dat anders is in een andere taal (ja) en dan kun je door de combinatie van die woorden natuurlijk wel een beetje indammen (ja) waardoor je effecten krijgt die gelijkaardig zijn maar 't is natuurlijk altijd anders (eh, eh) en daar heb ik mij bij neergelegd (ja) anders zou ik niet meer vertalen namelijk. (I.3/ensuing conversation)

#### Extract 3-32: tinkering with little machines

It is interesting to note that the interviewee has resigned himself to the fact that difference is basic to translation and not a regrettable yet surmountable obstacle. This places translation within the realm of the plausible and tames to a certain extent the endless permutations of what is linguistically possible and hence regrettably missing in a target text. As can be seen from this extract, notions of genre play a key role in framing the plausible.

#### 3.5.1.4. The Poet's Breath: 'linguistically objectifiable'

These are perhaps the two most striking genre-related extracts to be found in the data. Both deal with what the interviewee calls 'the poet's breath'. According to the interviewee, breath is 'linguistically objectifiable' as it is also manifest in the rhythm, sound quality and metre of the original poem and particularly visible throughout a poet's work. Furthermore, it is the poet's breath that determines the relationship of the words in a poem to each other. It is the translator's task, therefore, to "catch the breath" and allow it to resonate in the new poem in translation. A translation is successful only when this breath resounds in the new poem.

IJ: ...Dus ik bedoel bijvoorbeeld als je dichters hebt die waarvoor, waarbij het ritme heel belangrijk is.

Als je dat merkt na een aantal gedichten denk ik dan moet je dat ritme ook proberen mee te nemen in de Nederlandse vertaling. Ik denk het wat vooral eh belangrijk is denk ik elke dichter heeft zijn adem, heeft, dat is niet een metrum maar het is een (ja ja, ja) een adem en ik denk het is belangrijk om die adem die adem moet je gegrepen hebben denk ik vóór dat je begint te vertalen want die adem moet ook in de vertaling mee.

PF: Dus eh eigenlijk vertaal je de adem van de dichter, bij wijze van spreken.

IJ: Ja, ja ja dat staat toch ja want als ik dan zeg enfin ik begin want na de letterlijke vertaling literair te vertalen dan denk ik is dat de essentie dat ik in het Nederlands moet de adem van die dichter klinken of resoneren zoals

hij in zijn eigen taal resoneert (ah) dat, eh ja en dat leidt dan tot allerhande ingrepen waarbij dat je het, de letterlijke vertaling enigszins verlaat. (1.4/b1 (sub1))

Wat uiteindelijk bepaalt welk woord je gaat kiezen is het geheel van dat gedicht en hoe dat, dat ritmisch en qua klankwaarde en zo voorts in het geheel (ja) en dus: Welk is de beste keuze? Van dat woordje, het woord dat het best past in het geheel eh met respectering van ritme, klankwaarde enzovoort en (ja) het is eigenlijk dat geheel van ritme en klankwaarde en dergelijke dat die adem bepaalt, uiteindelijk. Ja want die adem kan op iets abstracts lijken maar natuurlijk is dat een zeer objectiveerbaar linguïstisch iets. Dat heeft te maken met metrum, met klanken met woorden die zich binnen een gedicht met mekaar verhouden. (1.4/b4 (sub1))

### **Extract 3-33: the poet's breath**

At first sight, this seems like a fanciful way of formulating the task of a translator of poetry. The interviewee hands us a heading, 'breath', under which we can place the various aspects of a poem, particularly its prosody. But this way of establishing relations in a poem is also a way of working with a poem. Moreover, the heading not only covers a particular poem but also the work of a poet. In a similar way to the genre-related utterances found in the other extracts in this section, what we witness here is not only a recognition of generic features in a given poet's work or oeuvre but also a translator's *modus operandi* and the goal to be achieved in translation.

In order to show that the formulation found in the above extracts is not as fanciful as all that, I ask you to consider the following:

But in the break away from Western written texts, the issue became how to justify the "chunking" of any verbal work into relevant parts. In an oral medium, or even in a written text with no line breaks or punctuation, what would be the criteria for division? This may seem like an arcane question of little consequence to understanding, but in fact the opposite is true. The units into which a text is divided make up the intervals over which parallelism is established, and these define the positions according to which semantic equivalences are produced. Indeed, it would not be an exaggeration to say that division into units is one of the most significant phases of stylistic analysis. ... The alliteration might suggest one way of dividing lines, the syntax another, the images based on word meanings another, and the pauses made by someone reading yet another. (Hanks 1996: 188-189)

In the interviewee's reasoning, we can discern a poetic and generic stance, i.e. the importance of the spoken indexed by 'breath' even in relation to the written texts he is asked to translate. Hence an identification of possible stylistic features or an identification of 'breath' is no neutral exercise. It also runs parallel with a view of genre that has political and social consequences in terms of which poets and which type of poetry the translator prefers to translate. The interviewee expressed a preference for poetry on themes related to social and political injustice - (see 1.4/a1; see also 6.1.4. Of Storytellers and Philosophers below). It is safe to say in this case that perceptions or notions of genre are intersected by a politics of representation, which "catching the poet's breath" can be considered as illustrating, and this involves a focus on the oral or perhaps more pertinently on the audible even in the legible.



### 3.5.1.5. Skin to Skin Again: the evaluative contours of commitment

This extract provides an illustration of how perceptions of genre play a role in a translator's decision to reject a proposed commission or request for translation. The first analysis of the data discussed in chapter 2 has shown that translators do negotiate commissions and can reject them or accept them to a certain degree and that this power of choice reflects a translator's reputation within the field as a whole (see chapter 2.5.3 and 2.5.5.1 and chap 3.3.1.4). The extract below gives us an insight into possible grounds for the rejection of a commission, which are cast in terms of conventional expectations along with action and investment of time and energy. The work proposed for translation was judged inadequate by the translator at a number of conventional levels: meaning, form, prosody. It was also considered inconsistent with itself – sometimes it rhymed/used metre and sometimes it did not – and its overall structure was thought to be long-winded. These negative evaluations were concomitant with the translator's lack of empathy with the author but as perceived generic features they also formed the terms of negotiation with the publisher, i.e. they are not simply generic features *an sich*.

Je wordt totaal vrij gelaten meestal dus vragen ze, ofwel vragen ze je kies een aantal gedichten uit ofwel sturen ze je een aantal gedichten op en als je zegt van neen dat gedicht dat ligt me totaal niet dus dat heb ik nu onlangs gehad bij die Franstalige dichters was er daar een bij "no way"!

(no way) (laughs) Ik kon het echt niet.

Dan bel ik op en ik zeg sorry maar ik heb daar geen voeling mee, ik snap niet waar ie naar toe wilt, ik vind het metrisch niet goed hij rijmt soms, soms niet.

Ik zeg ofwel kies je voor metrum en rijm ofwel (laat je het gewoon eruit) laat je het gewoon eruit maar ik zeg dit hier is helemaal omslachtig slecht gemaakt en ik weet het niet ik kan het niet.

Allez ja ik heb het gevoel als ik er mijn tijd in steek dat eh ten eerste het nooit iets zal worden of als het iets wordt dat het zo ver van de tekst zal staan dat het ja. (ja)

Ik wil het ook niet doen als ik het slecht vind dan gun ik het eigenlijk de auteur niet dat ik zoveel aan een tekst gewerkt heb die ik slecht vind, (ja) ik kan dat niet.

Ik wil alleen maar, zeker zeker in poëzie omdat dat toch dicht omdat dat op je huid zit gewoon. (ja)

Ik wil niet met iets bezig zijn dat ik slecht vind. (1.6/b4)

#### Extract 3-34: skin to skin again

The translator was unwilling, therefore, to put time and effort into translating a work of the type. The concluding argument in the rejection of the piece draws on a particular view of poetry that is formulated in terms of physical intimacy. Poetry eliminates physical distance as it were; it touches or should touch the translator's skin. But this intimacy cannot take place without empathy, which implies that a commitment to carrying out a particular translation involves reciprocity. This reciprocity or its absence in this case, is justified in terms of genre. Genre features here are not fixed properties of the work to be translated but form a set of expectations according to which the work was judged.

### 3.5.1.6. **Sweaty Hands: anxiety and entitlement to the canon**

This extract forms a clear though less obvious illustration of genre considerations among translators. In the extract, one of the interviewees returns to an issue that had been raised earlier in the interview regarding who can or should translate poetry (see 1.8/a1 (sub1)). The criterion referred to earlier on with reference to a specific collection of poetry in translation was that the translator had to have published a collection of poetry him or herself in order to participate in the project. The ensuing debate dealt with the advisability/fairness of such an approach. The topic resurfaces in the extract below and is examined again in the light of one of the translator's (unpleasant – 'sweaty hands') experience of translating poems by Seamus Heaney. The interviewee says as a result that she can understand the dismal prospect (for translators) that it might be better to let a poet translate one of the big (literary) guns.

CJ: Ah, duidelijk Afrikaans en Frans maar ik lees heel graag Iers en ik hoor heel graag Ierse muziek. (PF: eh, ha) dus maar ik kan niet zeggen. Heb ik al iets uit het Iers vertaald? Ja Seamus Heaney zeker, die dat essay heb ik eh voor xxxxx vertaald en daar kwamen stukken poëzie maar daar kreeg ik klamme handen van. Ikke poëzie van Heaney vertalen, ik vond het niet leuk! ... Dat is toch een waagstuk he? en Pearse Hutchinson (PF: waarom klamme handen?) want die komt daar ook in voor, ... neen dan denk ik dan begrijp ik Hilde haar standpunt waar ze zegt dat je misschien toch best zelf dichter bent om ja je aan zo'n grote kanonnen te wagen. (1.8/a3)

#### **Extract 3-35: sweaty hands**

I consider genre as being used here to delineate areas of competence. As a rule, translators tend to specialise in a particular area of action, be it literature, business, law, etc. It has been pointed out in the previous chapter that translators do not confine their activity to literary texts alone – at least not those interviewed for this study. As can be gathered from the extract, not all literary translators feel comfortable translating poetry. Therefore, it would seem sensible – in following the reasoning in the extract – to allow poets to translate other poets, given that they practice the genre of poetry themselves and are more familiar with it, as it were. This remains a dismal prospect for some translators as it amounts to a denial of competency and narrows the notion of genre to certain practitioners, for it could equally be argued that being a poet does not necessarily make one a good translator. Here we can see lines of intersection and separation being drawn within translation and literary genres, in which translational competency is appropriated by/attribution to authors/poets on grounds of their generic practice. The following propositions can be distilled from the above reasoning:

- a) A literary translator does not necessarily translate poetry/prose;
- b) A translator who does is not necessarily a poet/author;
- c) A poet/author does not necessarily make a (good) translator.

We can speculate whether perspectives or stances might shift if the poet(s)/author(s) being translated were less well known or unknown. In other words, certain translators are reticent to translate canonised poets though they might otherwise attempt translations of lesser known poets. This probably also has to do with heightened visibility and potential loss of reputation / face in the larger generic space.

### 3.5.1.7. Recipes for Writing: openness to change

The interviewee in the following extract draws an interesting parallel between writers and translators, which again could be understood traditionally in terms of translation strategy. The parallel drawn constitutes a rejection of any fixed translation strategy that a translator might bring with him or her to any proposed text. Given that writers have no fixed recipe for writing a book and may vary in the way they write from book to book, it would prove useless for a translator to apply the same hard-and-fast method to each book he or she translates. Furthermore, each writer is different; so each translation should be proportionately different from author to author and from book to book. As the interviewee states, this involves starting from scratch on each occasion and building a translation in the same way a novel is constructed. This is not entirely without precedent however, as the interviewee mentions guidelines (unspecified) within which to operate. Such an approach to translation would be unimaginable without the (tacit) notion of genre that is visible in the extract. The course of action to be taken is based on a set of (generic) expectations the translator had already learned to work with in varying constellations.

BM: (eh ha) Maar eh, 't is net alsof je, je, de manier waarop je het gaat aanpakken, opnieuw moet van nul af eh opbouwen als je aan een nieuw boek begint.

PF: Ah? Vertel daar, dat, dat vind ik interessant. Vertel daar iets over.

BM: Omdat je, elke auteur is anders. (Ah ja.) Een auteur werkt ook niet met een recept van: zo moet je een boek schrijven. Ik bedoel, er zijn natuurlijk wel richtlijnen, maar als een auteur nu plots iets totaal nieuws doet en hij overtuigt de lezer, dan moet de vertaler meegaan in dat nieuwe.

Dus daar is ook geen vast recept voor. En eum natuurlijk je moet weten voor wie je de vertaling moet maken.

Net zoals bij om het even welke vertaling, moet je, je doelgroep toch min of meer kennen.

(ah ha) En het hangt dan ook wel een beetje van de uitgeverij af, als zij mikken op een andere of enigszins andere doelgroep, dan de originele auteur, dan heeft dat ook wel consequenties, denk ik. (1.9/a1)

#### Extract 3-36: recipes for writing

Another aspect that surfaces in the extract is audience, which in this case is the target audience the publishers aim for and not the audience imagined by the author, either in the original language or in translation. Here again the translator may have to pitch the translation for a particular audience (children, adolescents, etc.), which involves acting within the limits of audience expectations with regard to the genre in question. This in turn will have a considerable impact on language use in translation.

### 3.5.1.8. A Fascination for Things Difficult<sup>194</sup>: modernism and beyond

The final extract to be dealt with in this section on genre echoes some of the reasoning found in 5.1.2. Translation is considered as a means of getting closer to the original and understanding it more completely, as a means of overcoming the difficulty of a particular work. Elsewhere, the interviewee also states that translations serve as a step up for readers in crossing the threshold to the original (1.10/a1 (sub1)). Next to this, he expresses a preference for

'difficult' poets, something he considers ironically to be a sort of personal aberration. These poets date for the most part from the Modernist period (see I.10/a1 (sub1-6)) or belong to earlier movements like Symbolism for example.

PF: En ligt dat aan de basis van uw, van uw drang naar vertalen?

Wil je dat dan gaan vertalen of laat je (ja dat, dat je, dat je) dat

CP: Dat is een soort afwijking denk ik (ja, ja) eh, eh zoals ik al net zei het zijn vaak moeilijke dichters en een manier om die moeilijkheid dan te overwinnen is toch het te gaan vertalen omdat ik dan pas het echt heb. Dus Mallarmé vond ik heel mooi maar ik weet nu pas wat Mallarmé is nu dat ik hem helemaal vertaald heb. Het was heel ingewikkeld met onvoorstelbaar syntactische moeilijkheden dus je moet daar echt door zwoegen en kijken voor je echt begrepen hebt. (I.10/a1 (sub7))

### **Extract 3-37: a fascination for things difficult**

In fact, there are clear references to elements of orthodox literary theory in this interview, more so than in the others. The interviewee's preference for Modernist writers has allowed him to focus on this particular period and research the lives and styles of those he translates and also consult academic studies on the period. This does not mean that the other translators do not research the writers they translate; they all do so to varying degrees. What I am trying to highlight here is a concordance of translational preference with scholarly views on a particular period in the Western arts. This is much less the case with other translators who may translate works from a variety of periods. Perhaps it would be safer to phrase the observation in the following terms: it seems that in terms of translational preference we have an indication of a breaking off point between earlier and more recent forms of expression within literary genres. How should we understand this? Obviously, writers and poets will continue to write and new translators will replace older translators and all concerned are involved in a general discussion on genre the various stances with respect to which become visible historically in the written and spoken texts they produce. This takes the discussion to a level that has traditionally been treated within system theories and more particularly within polysystem theory. But it is not the intention to move to that level quite yet. The extracts dealt with in chapter 3.5.1.1 to 7 contain less 'visible' articulations of genre than in chapter 3.5.1.8., whose reference to scholarly terms is concomitant with making distinctions regarding periods of expression within genre. The complexity and difficulty of the texts and the considerable effort and time needed to translate them would, it seems to me, raise the potential symbolic value of the result. The focus therefore, is on translating prestigious works that are long established in the literary canon and on being in tune with the standard reference works that accompany such works, which could imply an embodying of historical or canonised generic practices. This opens a door to the history of translation as perceived by scholars such as Anthony Pym (1998), but it is interesting to note how different generic stances coexist with, though not necessarily run parallel to, the stance visible in the extract discussed here. It is also interesting to note that the 'transfer' of meaning from one text to another – a common way of expressing the whole process of translation – is subsumed within gaining a deeper under-

standing of the source text through translation, as was the case in chapter 3.5.1.2. So in an odd sort of way translation seems to fall from view or become occluded, though not entirely.

### **3.5.2. Genre and the Translators: some tentative conclusions**

The purpose of the analysis in chapter 3.5.1.1 to 8 was to demonstrate that the translators interviewed formulate conceptions and uphold notions of genre which they consider as having a bearing on or defining how to translate or how they translate. The table below lists the salient formulations that express such conceptions along with their related language use and accompanying expectations or evaluations. All of this is framed by the broader activity of translation, which comprises the four aspects dealt with separately in each section of this chapter. Each formulation also highlights a corresponding individual focus within or approach to the genre in question:

Ref.	Metaphor/ Metonym	Form of language use	Accompanying expectations/ evaluations	Framing activity	Focus / Approach
5.1.1 Ext. 3-30	“The fire and the finish” / “love and a good dictionary”	Translating poetry	Respect for the original in every sense	Translation	Creative immediacy and formal care in translation
5.1.2 Ext. 3-31	“Doordringen in een tekst tot op het bot”	Translating poetry	Improvement of poetic/translation practice	Translation	Meaning making through translation
5.1.3 Ext. 3-32	“Van één machinetje een ander machinetje, apparaatje maken”	Translating poetry	difference in/across language(s) forms basis for leeway in a genre	Translation	Shifting dynamic functions of poems forms framework of translation
5.1.4 Ext. 3-33	“De adem van de dichter”	Translating poetry	A poet’s breath determines his/her poetry	Translation	Breath as a means of analysis and translation
5.1.5 Ext. 3-34	“Dicht op je huid”	Translating poetry	(Possible disappointment at) a poet’s generic shortcomings	Translation	Empathy as a basis for translational action
5.1.6 Ext. 3-35	“Klamme handen”	Translating poetry/ prose	Anxiety regarding poetic/ translational competence	Translation	Orders of generic competence: exclusion from /inclusion in translation
5.1.7 Ext. 3-36	“Geen vast recept”	Translating prose	Eye for individual or changing literary styles	Translation	Engaging with/ identifying difference within known generic frameworks
5.1.8 Ext. 3-37	“Een soort afwijking”	Translating prose/ poetry	(Preference for) certain historical expressions within genres	Translation	Understanding Pre and High Modernism

**Table 3-v: genre-related utterances in the data – a schematic overview**

It must be stated, notwithstanding the neat headings in the table, that it is hard to maintain a strict line of division between engaging in a (literary) genre and translating within or across genres, on the assumption that the genres in question are familiar/common to both speech communities. One can ask in this case whether translation involves a particular type of

engagement in a given genre, i.e. whether it is a particular way of doing genre. But one can equally ask in the context of this study whether engagement in a particular genre is not framed by the broader activity of translation – the main thrust of the argument in this section. It has been shown that people engage in genre in various ways within any given language and that in doing so in fact define and construct generic form and meaning through time. Such an argument would sit well with those working within polysystem theory and largely conforms to orthodox literary views on the matter:

Deze en gelijkaardige ordeningen steunen, net zoals die onder de drie hoofdgenres op een zgn. genrebewustzijn, d.w.z. een soort kader waarin men teksten schrijft en leest, of nog: een verwachtingshorizon die opgeroepen wordt door formele, inhoudelijke en pragmatische gegevens. Zulke genrebewustzijn is echter geen statisch concept. Immers teksttypes van welke aard ook evolueren voortdurend binnen een ruime marge: schrijvers parodiëren, nemen over, verbeteren, reageren en willen het heel vaak anders doen, en lezers voelen zich thuis in een genre, of ontgoocheld, vervreemd ... (zie esthetiek van de identiteit, – oppositie. M.a.w. genres en subgenres functioneren m.b.t. het geheel van andere genres op een bepaald moment van de geschiedenis, en dit geheel gedraagt zich als een systeem in beweging (zie polysysteemtheorie). Overigens blijft die interactie niet beperkt tot zgn. literaire genres. Literaire genres en subgenres reageren nl. ook op andere ‘teksten’ die de cultuur uitmaken: plastische kunsten, film, religieuze, politieke, en juridische vormen van discours, enz. Dit alles wijst erop dat de genrestudie niet alleen een kwestie is van ‘vormen’, maar ook van normen en waarden ... (Van Gorp e.a. 1986<sup>195</sup>: 162)

Here we are given a view of genre as belonging to a self-regulating system that recognises yet somehow occludes human agency in that the genres themselves are seen as reacting to each other; is this purely in a manner of speaking? Yet, translators are expected for the purposes of their profession to be versed in a variety of genres, even though they may specialise in one or two with time. Not only that, they also engage in genre within and across historically known languages. An examination of the data has clearly demonstrated their involvement with conceptions of genre. The genres examined in this study are literary, even though those interviewed are shown to be engaged in variety of other genres and often rely on them to maintain a steady income. So ostensibly, competence in genre is part of a broader translational competence but as the extract in chapter 3.5.1.6 also demonstrates, competence in genre can be contested and the position of the literary translator can for all intents and purposes be usurped by others who are considered ‘more closely’ engaged in the genre in question (writers and poets), even though they may have little or no experience in translation. Is there a conceptual middle ground where this conflict of interests can be resolved or at least understood?

To consider this question we must return to the findings discussed in chapter 2. As was indicated in the discussion, the line between authoring and translating is not a clear-cut one. Perhaps the problem can best be understood then in terms of impinging/overlapping (textual and professional) practices. If the criterion for taking part in a particular translation project was that one had to be a published poet oneself (see chapter 3.5.1.6.), then this would

effectively prevent a number of literary translators from participating. Curiously enough, it would also exclude poets who had not published a volume of poetry, which implies that publishing is somehow vital to being a poet. Difference is created and negotiated, therefore, in positing the requirement but cannot be considered as absolute in practice for, as the extract in chapter 3.5.1.5. illustrates, a translator can and does use trenchant criteria of evaluation in deciding whether to accept to translate a particular poet or not. Interestingly, most of those interviewed for this study have published work of their own. Perhaps this would allow us to extrapolate and include all this in a more general field of (professional/literary) writing practices or poetics, which does not merely mean the products of those practices. Unfortunately, this would take us beyond the scope of our study.

What the data does show us is that competency – not to mention competence<sup>196</sup> – in a genre is not given but arrived at or achieved through contestation and negotiation and that the specific features of a particular expression of genre also form sites of negotiation and contestation that reflect the poetics and politics of those concerned, (see chapter 3.5.1.4. and 6.). What it also shows us is that there is no one-to-one correspondence between a particular genre and a particular set of practitioners. Another significant point to emerge is that a translator should rather have an eye for individual creativity within a given generic framework and not simply lay down an unmediated grid of preset generic features on the work to be translated (see chapter 3.5.1.7.). We have also seen how poetry as a pre-eminently written form in some cultures is challenged by an approach to genre based on ‘breath’ found in chapter 3.5.1.4., which also evinces the themes of contestation and negotiation. This is further related to the interviewee’s general oppositional stance to particular perceptions of genre held in the Dutch language area and his desire to introduce other approaches to genre and views on poetics through translation, (see chapter 3.6.1.4. below). In chapter 3.5.1.2., we can notice a tendency to couch approaches to genre in terms of understanding and meaning making, one of the purposes of which is to enhance individual literary practice. We have also discovered a tendency to conflate genre perceptions with particular historical practices (Pre and High Modern) within literary genre, which also involves limiting translation in practice to preferred historical expressions in the literary canon, (chapter 3.5.1.8.). In chapter 3.5.1.1. and 3. on the other hand, what emerges is a sense of professional distance concomitant with the (creative and formal) limits set by the texts to be translated and the shifting functions of genre and words within and across languages. Despite the variety in perception visible in the discussion so far, it must be stressed that the focuses thrown up by analysis are not the sole or the full views on genre held by those interviewed. Basically, the purpose of the analysis was to show that such perceptions do exist and that, together with the other aspects dealt with in this chapter, they inform practice.



### 3.6. Versions of Culture

In the section that follows I will attempt to show how the versions of culture that emerge in the data extracts examined below form an important aspect of translation practice. It will also be shown that they echo to some degree discussions of culture in the literature. For the purposes of this study, I will mainly draw on the chapter on culture in Duranti (1997), but also refer to other works (Burke, Crowley & Girvin 2000<sup>197</sup>; Eggins 1994; Katan 1999<sup>198</sup>; Sealey & Carter 2004).

Of the four notions dealt with in this chapter, (versions of) culture is the most obviously present in discussions within translation studies (and elsewhere) and yet somehow the hardest to pin down. Culture is everywhere and nowhere, all pervasive and elusive at the same. It forms the cornerstone of a critique of linguistic approaches to translation (Gentzler 1993) and yet has been a vital part of many such linguistic approaches from the outset (viz. Nida's notion of dynamic equivalence is unimaginable without an awareness of cultural difference).

Culture is seen by some as being what language use is 'about'. To others, language (and other forms of semiosis) constructs culture in its various forms (see the discussion of Duranti 1997 below). Yet, on the whole, specific definitions of culture are conspicuously absent in the literature of translation studies, despite the fact that the word/notion itself is used profusely throughout. A random sample of references to culture in indexes to works on translation evinced the following:

**Baker & Malmkjaer** (1998) culture: competence 62; constraints on dubbing 76; foreignizing 126-7; ideology 110, 280; incompatibilities 122; linguistic models 280; metaphor of translation 149-53; post-colonial 152-3.

**Bassnett** (2002) cultural approach to translation 2-10; culture of target language 17, 30, 38-41; cultural untranslatability 37, 38-41; culture and language 21-2.

**Gentzler** (1993) cultural studies 188-91, 198; systems 114-25.

**Hatim & Mason** (1990) cross-cultural, 35; cultural codes, 70; cultural norms, 125.

**Peterelli** (2003<sup>199</sup>) culture – and language, see Language and culture; – planning and translation, see Translation; – and culture planning; – repertoire and transfer, see Translation; – and transfers; – translating culture, 391-392.

**Venuti** (2000) cultural studies 3, 6, 333, 335, 340, 453; cultural theory 4, 333.

Likewise, in the context of this study, culture is shown to inform a range of decisions from micro-level translational choices (see the discussion of 'hedge' and 'ditch' in chapter 3.6.1.3., below) to macro-level orientations that will further determine micro-level choices (see the discussion of landscape in chapter 3.6.1.7., below). And yet at no time is the word culture ever mentioned in the excerpts discussed in this section, except in chapter 3.6.1.5., Extract 3 – 44, where we find a reference to literary culture. Nevertheless, an analysis of the data cannot be conducted without a prior examination of the notion of culture, nor can the term, 'versions of culture' be suggested as relevant within translation practice without a perusal of the literature. Therefore, I will first examine a number of theories found in the literature before proceeding

to identify what I consider to be versions of culture held by the interviewees, the purpose being, as has already been stated, to show that their views inform their translational preferences and textual practices.

The term, ‘versions of culture’, encapsulates culture as it emerges in the discourse with the interviewees, and is considered as practice related. This term does not imply incompleteness with respect to a full view or theory of culture, however (in the same vein, see the discussion of ‘language ideologies’ in chapter 3.4. above). Rather, it serves to index an aspect of translation practice and needs to be seen in conjunction with that practice, as shall become visible in the discussion of the extracts below. In this respect, consider the following quote:

‘Culture’ ..., infuses all of the domains, which are, in any case ‘completely interdependent’ (Layder 1997<sup>200</sup>: 77). Ideas available in the cultural system are known and responded to by individuals (psychobiography); utilized in interactions (situated activity); reinforced through routinized practices, whether explicitly articulated or not (social settings); and differently available to different groups of people, both in themselves and as a result of inequitable distributions of material goods (contextual resources). (Sealey & Carter 2004<sup>201</sup>: 141)

Similarly, all interviewees draw on versions of culture related to the languages they translate out of and in this way add to, change and/or propagate existing views on culture held by those both within and outside that culture. They not only research and engage with (translate) representations of specific cultures in the form of artistic and other works, they also engage in various ways with the cultural environments these works emerge from, (living in the culture concerned, forming and working with networks of friends and colleagues in those cultures, etc.). In this way too, they can also be seen as cultural brokers<sup>202</sup>, in the sense that they mediate in the exchange of cultural products across linguistic and cultural borders:

PF: U vertaalt mevrouw vooral uit het?

CJ: Uit het Afrikaans heb ik poëzie vertaald van Daniel Hugo en Ina Rousseau en enfin eigenlijk nogal veel eh Zuid-Afrikaners. (PF: ja, wat?) En, en uit het Frans en Nederlands-Frans dus ik heb gedichten van Joris Iven in het Frans vertaald en (ah) en van Frans Brocatus die zijn ook verschenen en van Sujata Bhatt in het Frans. (PF: ah! ehm) Dat is liefhebberij. (PF: ja) - laughs - (PF: fantastisch) Ken je Sujata Bhatt (PF: ja, ja) mooi eh. (PF: ja ja) (I.8/a2 (sub1))

### Extract 3-38

Yet, as was stated already, none of the interviewees mention the word culture in the extracts under scrutiny in this section, which does not mean that the term is absent from their discourse<sup>203</sup>. They take the notion ‘for granted,’ it would seem, and consider it as something quite ‘natural’ and as such as not requiring any strict definition. In fact, on the face of it, providing a definition of culture is a precarious exercise fraught with many pitfalls as the notion itself indexes the inalienable right of all to what we consider to be a vital part of our identity. So, any given definition is bound to exclude or alienate alternate views, whether this is intended or not (see chapter 3.6.1.1.). On the other hand, accommodating all possible visions of culture would only lead to the formulation of a highly schematic or abstract definition,

which in turn would prove of little use for this study. Moreover, culture has formed and will continue to form and the object of numerous PhDs without ever exhausting the topic and as such falls outside the scope of this enquiry. This having been said, culture still has an undeniable impact on translation and hence cannot be ignored in any valid examination of the phenomenon.

In his discussion of a number of cultural models, Katan (1999: 16-33) points out how their propounders, next to indicating visible aspects of culture, also consider certain important aspects of culture as being invisible or hidden:

- ♦ Trompenaars's inner layer of basic assumptions (1993: 22-23);
- ♦ Hofstede's onion model with its core of values (1991: 7-9) and;
- ♦ Hall's Iceberg Theory, in which most aspects of culture are considered to be "below the waterline" ([1952], 1990) viz. value orientations.

Katan also points to similar divisions in other models of culture, like Kluckhohn's (1952<sup>204</sup>: 357) distinction between 'explicit' and 'implicit' and R Linton's (1936<sup>205</sup>) 'covert' and 'overt.' On the face of it, this leaves us with the problem of getting at such hidden aspects. Moreover, if they are considered as internalised in or embodied by the members of a given culture, as the three authors quoted by Katan suggest, how can they be rendered explicit and visible. In this respect, it has been shown in the discussion of genre that value orientations and expectations become visible in the ways people engage with genre (see chapter 3.5.1. and 2., above). So, to the extent that values are culture related they can also be accessed. It remains to be asked then, whether particular aspects of such engagements can be termed strictly cultural as distinct from other features, or in relation to the discussion in chapter 3.5., whether genre is entirely encapsulated by culture, as it were, which brings us back to our initial questions concerning the level at which culture as such can be considered as primarily or predominately active. If we follow the view set by Sealey and Carter in the above quote, we can conclude that culture is active at all observable levels or to be more precise that people engage with and bring about culture at all observable levels. Theoretically speaking however, whether genre belongs entirely within culture has not been concluded – as of yet – in this study.

Another view on culture can be found in Eggins (1994). Consider the following quote, in this respect:

It seems then, that in order to understand how people use language we need to consider both the context of situation and the context of culture. There is a sense, however, in which the context of culture is more general or abstract than the context of situation. (Eggins 1994: 30)

This quote belongs to conclusions regarding a particular illustration of genre (viz. placing a bet) which, in keeping with systemic functional linguistics, places context of culture at a higher order of abstraction than context of situation. In a similar way to the approaches illustrated above (Trompenaars, Hofstede, Hall), culture, or rather certain aspects of culture, seem harder to separate out or pin down than other more easily identifiable aspects of context of situation, e.g. the more visible aspects of a service encounter like setting, spoken interaction,

etc. As we have already seen in chapter 3.5.I.I., above, Martin, who also works within the systemic functionalist paradigm, includes “members of our culture” in his definition of genre:

A genre is a staged goal-oriented, purposeful activity in which speakers engage as members of our culture. / Genres are how things get done, when language is used to accomplish them.

(Martin 1984: 25 & 1985: 248 and in Eggins 1994: 26)

Given that it is as members of a culture that we engage in genre, one can wonder what happens when there are members of more than one culture involved in the activity – a situation most translators and more immediately, interpreters are confronted with in some form on a regular basis (see Pym’s notion of ‘interculture’ in Pym 1998). This brings with it the prickly question of who is and who is not a member of a particular culture (see chapter 3.6.I.I.). In an attempt to avoid such a dichotomy and the *regressio ad infinitum* that would result from identifying discrete sets of contrastive factors of membership and non-membership, the notion of ‘cultural competence’ (Saville-Troike 1982<sup>206</sup>: 23) proves useful at this stage. Saville-Troike sees Hymes’s communicative competence as being embedded in a notion of cultural competence, (something Hymes already accounts for tacitly in his model):

The concept of communicative competence must be embedded in the notion of cultural competence, or the total set of knowledge and skills which speakers bring into a situation. This view is consonant with a semiotic approach which defines culture as meaning, and view all ethnographers (not just ethnographers of communication) are dealing with (cf. Geertz 1973<sup>207</sup>; Douglas 1970<sup>208</sup>). The systems of culture are patterns of symbols, and language is only one of the symbolic systems in this network. Interpreting the meaning of linguistic behaviour requires knowing the meaning in which it is embedded. (Saville-Troike 1982: 23)

The theory of culture visible in this quote is dealt with by Duranti (1997: 33-39) under the heading culture as communication (see below). The theory offers us one clear advantage in that in principle it sets no bars on membership to any given culture or binds it in terms of territory, specific language(s) or ethnicity, nor attempts to conflate any of these three. Seen within such a framework and in the sense that they also engage in meaning making, translators can develop and display cultural competence in their practices in the same way they develop and display communicative competence.

The reasoning thus far can only lead us to a ‘dynamic’ (Katan 1999: 21) notion of culture in which culture is seen as “constantly being negotiated by those involved” (Robinson 1988<sup>209</sup>: 11), that is, if we are to account for the various versions of culture visible in the data. Sealey and Carter’s view is also ‘dynamic’ to the extent that it is based on notions of structure and agency that are structurationist:

Thus for structuration theory, social practices reflect the ability of human beings to modify the circumstances in which they find themselves (by creatively interpreting rules and deploying resources), whilst simultaneously recreating the social conditions (rules, knowledges, resources) which they inherit from the past. (Sealey & Carter 2004: 9)

But this still leaves us with the matter of what exactly is being negotiated (Robinson 1988) and in which way – negotiation has been present in the construction of all the aspects discussed so far (ethos, language ideologies and genre) – particularly given that all this mainly stems from and happens through language use. In other words, if the unit of analysis is (versions of) culture, how are we to identify it in the data?

In his discussion of culture, Duranti (1997: 23-49) provides an overview of some of the main theories of culture over the last hundred years. As was mentioned already, the views in the data echo some of the stances found in these theories and hence will be examined in their light. It is not the intention here however, to adhere strictly to one theory of culture and to one theory only as this might exclude or hide the underpinnings visible in some of the versions of culture emergent in the data. In this sense, though the view will be held that culture is constructed, we still have to discover which versions of culture are being constructed and how such versions form part of translation practice. There is every reason to believe that, given the diversity of theories of culture, we will not discover one single overarching version of culture that will unite the views of all those interviewed.

Duranti examines theories of culture from the perspective of linguistic anthropology and opens his chapter with the following statement:

If the premise of linguistic anthropology is that language must be understood as cultural practice, our discussion of the field must include a discussion of the notion of culture (Duranti 1997: 23)

If, as Duranti asserts, language is cultural practice, then all forms of language use are cultural and hence all the aspects of translational practice discussed in this chapter so far are encompassed by culture. Generally speaking, that language is cultural practice concurs with the views set out in Eggins (1994), Katan (1999), Martin (1984 & 1985), Saville-Troike (1982) and Sealey & Carter (2004). So we can conclude for all concerned that language use and other forms of semiotic use cannot be disassociated from culture. Duranti identifies six main theories of culture, the principle points of which are outlined below, namely:

I. **Culture as distinct from nature** (cf. the work of Boaz, inter alia.):

- ♦ Culture as acquired through (language) socialisation as opposed to human behaviour as product of nature or genetics;
- ♦ Stems from views of culture as a process of rising above natural human instincts (Kant, Hegel) to ‘pan-human values’;
- ♦ Language as part of culture, hence languages as rich (yet arbitrary) systems of categorisations of natural and cultural phenomena (Duranti 1997: 24-26).

To paraphrase Duranti, in the wake of such views of culture and language much attention was paid to differences in classification systems across languages and the cultural differences they reflected:

Attention to lexical distinctions of this sort was very much part of the structuralist programme in linguistics, as exemplified in Europe by the work of Trier (1934) and Hjelmslev ([1949]1961) and in the United States by the proponents of componential analysis (Concklin 1962/1969;

Goodenough 1956; Lounsbury 1956). In these studies, language is seen as a system of “abstractions” that identifies classes of objects (most typically through nouns), classes of actions (through verbs), classes of properties (through adjectives), classes of relationships (through prepositions and postpositions), classes of events (through verb phrases), classes of ideas or thoughts (through full sentences [Boas 1911:21]). (Duranti 1997: 27)

2. **Culture as knowledge** (cf. the work of Goodenough, inter alia.):

- ◆ Culture as knowledge of the world, as shared patterns of thought, ways of understanding the world, making inferences and predictions, etc. (cognitive view of culture);
- ◆ A culture is like a language: both are ‘mental realities’; so describing a culture is like describing a language, hence ‘cultural grammars’;
- ◆ Culture as propositional and procedural knowledge needed for participation in a given community, hence the search for cultural ‘rules’;
- ◆ Later, ‘rules’ replaced by categorical schemata readily available to the human mind: natural kinds (Duranti 1997: 27-30).

Duranti further outlines more recent developments in this approach to culture:

Although [the] new generation of cognitive anthropologists claim to be less dependent on linguistic analysis than their predecessors, the shift of focus from the description of separate cultural systems to the universal bases of human cultures reproduces the shift from behaviourist to innatist theories of languages in the last thirty years. (Duranti 1997: 30)

Within ‘Culture as knowledge’ there is **Culture as socially distributed knowledge** (cf. the work of Lave and Wenger, inter alia.):

- ◆ Knowledge does not reside exclusively in a person’s mental operations but is distributed across mind, body, activity, culturally organised settings, etc.;
- ◆ Knowledge is also distributed across participants and tools, hence what a member of a culture needs to know cannot be represented by a set of propositions;
- ◆ Because it is distributed, not all members of a community have the same knowledge and may differ widely in their beliefs and values (Duranti 1997: 30-32).

In discussing language in this context, Duranti states:

Language, not only as a system of classification, but also as a practice, as a way of taking from and giving to the world, comes to us with many decisions already made about point of view and classification. (Duranti 1997: 32)

3. **Culture as communication:**

- ◆ Culture as a system of signs (a semiotic theory of culture);
- ◆ Culture as a representation of the world (making sense of reality), as an appropriation of nature through story, myth etc.; hence culture has to be communicated to be lived (Duranti 1997: 33).

**a. *Levi Strauss's semiotic approach:***

- ♦ All cultures are sign systems that express deeply held predispositions to categorize the world in terms of binary oppositions;
- ♦ The human mind is everywhere the same and cultures implement basic abstract logical properties of thinking, hence there is no basic difference between 'primitive' and modern thought patterns; patterns of myth and science, etc.;
- ♦ Culture communicates itself through its social actors;
- ♦ Similarities found in historically unrelated cultures are read as universal categories of human thought (Duranti 1997: 33-36).

**b. *Clifford Geertz's interpretative approach (see also Gadamer and hermeneutics):***

- ♦ Humans are suspended in webs of significance of their own spinning (Max Weber): culture springs from such 'webs' of meaning making;
- ♦ Human beings create and interpret culture: a product of human interaction;
- ♦ 'Thick' description, as part of a never-ending process of interpretation in which the ethnographer adds new layers of significance to the observed;
- ♦ People involved in coordinated behaviour not only communicate but produce worldviews (Duranti 1997: 36-37).

**c. *The indexicality approach and metapragmatics (Silverstein; see also Pierce and Jakobson)***

- ♦ Culture's communicative force lies not only in representing aspects of reality but also in connecting individuals, groups, situations, etc. with other contexts;
- ♦ Communication is not just using symbols to stand for beliefs, feelings, identities etc. but also as a way of pointing to, presupposing, or bringing into the present contexts such beliefs, etc., hence communicative forms are vehicles for cultural practices;
- ♦ A language, through its indexical uses of elements, provides a theory of human action or a metapragmatics (Duranti 1997: 37-38).

**d. *Metaphors as folk theories of the world:***

- ♦ Metaphors as ways of controlling our social and natural environment (functional view);
- ♦ Metaphors are processes by which we understand and structure domains of experience in terms of others (cognitive view);
- ♦ As opposed to checklists of sets of discrete properties, metaphors are seen as cultural schemata or prototypes, i.e. simplified generalised views or folk theories of experience (Duranti 1997: 38-39).

4. **Culture as a system of mediation:**

- ◆ Tools (inc. language) are used by humans to mediate with their environment: a tool can be anything from an umbrella to a concept;
- ◆ Culture includes such material and ideational tools (from umbrellas to belief systems) with which people mediate their relationship with the world;
- ◆ Culture is hence a set of related but different systems of mediation (Duranti 1997: 39-42).

Duranti points to how, in this view, culture loses its power to represent an entire population or group and goes on to state the following:

The theory of culture as a mediating activity between people and the world they inhabit (mentally and physically) is but an extension of the notion of language as a mediating system. It is based on the similarity of tools and signs (words included) and builds on that metaphor. ... The instrumental view of language implies the theory of language as a system of classification since it recognises that linguistic expressions allow us to conceptualise and reflect upon events while giving us the means to exchange ideas with others. But this also assumes that linguistic expressions are not just representations of the external reality; they are very much part of that reality and instruments of action in the world. (Duranti 1997: 45)

5. **Culture as a system of practices** (poststructuralist, cf. Bourdieu, inter alia.)

- ◆ Diachronic and historical approach to culture: cultures as fluid and contaminated entities;
- ◆ Inextricable relationship between knowledge and action-in-the-world, past and present conditions (Bourdieu's notion of habitus);
- ◆ Social actors are neither entirely the product of external material conditions nor socially conscious intentional subjects (Duranti 1997: 43-45).

Duranti describes the view on language in this theory as follows:

A language is itself a set of practices that implies not only a particular system of words and grammatical rules, but also an often forgotten or hidden struggle over the symbolic power of a particular way of communicating, with particular systems of classification, address and reference forms, specialised lexicons and metaphors (for politics, medicine, ethics). (Bourdieu 1982: 31; Duranti 1997: 45)

6. **Culture as a system of participation** (cf. Hanks, inter alia.)

- ◆ Builds on culture as a system of practices: all action-in-the-world (inc. language use) is basically social and participatory;
- ◆ Language is constituted, challenged and changed through acts of speaking;
- ◆ Participation requires cognition and shared resources (Duranti 1997: 46-47).

In the outline of theories of culture above we can see a gradual accommodation in the theory of differentiation and contestation. As Duranti points out, (a theory of) culture as distributed knowledge brings with it notions of varying degrees of access to that knowledge among



members of a given community. Next to that, (a theory of) culture as mediation also weakens the view of culture as a homogenous whole contributed to uniformly by its members. Finally, (a theory of) culture as a system of practices opens the door completely to numerous contesting and conflicting views on culture that might be held by members of any given culture.

Next to the above considerations there are other aspects of culture or other interpretations given to the term that must also be taken into consideration. In the literature one also finds discussions on the difference between anthropological culture in the sense given to it by Duranti and culture in the sense of high and popular culture (Sealey & Carter 2004: 131), in the sense indexed by ‘opera’ or ‘rock and roll’. Next to this again there is the highly explosive mixture of culture and nation state (see Paulin<sup>210</sup> in Burke, Crowley & Girvin 2000) and forms of cultural nationalism (Burke, Crowley & Girvin 2000) or the even more inflammable conflation of culture, nation or ethnic group and a single language (see the notion of homogenism in Blommaert & Verschueren 1991<sup>211</sup>). Bearing all this in mind, I will now turn to an examination of the data.

### 3.6.1.1. A Land of Poets

In the extract that follows a line is traced by the interviewee from Yeats’s work to Heaney’s, which effectively spans more than a century of literary production in Ireland. The link being made is not a direct one between one poet and another but rather involves both poets and many others besides drawing on a common literary or cultural heritage from which their poetic practice is seen to stem. The considerable production of poetry in Ireland is understood as issuing from or relying on a combination of mythological and modern psychological insight that is concrete rather than woolly or fanciful, as the notion of mythology might suggest:

EJ: Ja, dat heb ik dus gedaan ik noemde al Yeats en Dickenson, en Walcott heb ik vertaald en dan Seamus Heaney en Craig Raine en nou ja, tientallen anderen zeg maar eh (ja) en eh Irish poetry dus natuurlijk (waarom?)

Why Irish poetry?

Nou omdat ik dat prachtige dichters vind het is een heel poëtisch land een grote poëtische productie mag ik het zo maar zeggen en ja de, de combinatie denk ik van mythologie en modern psychologisch inzicht wat je toch ook heel sterk hebt bij, bij Yeats vind ik en bij Heaney.

Dus het is niet zomaar zweverig maar heel concreet en daar hou ik van ja ... (I.1/a2)

#### Extract 3-39: a land of poets

On closer examination, we can also note that the commonality among Irish writers evoked by the interviewee not only stretches back in time but also goes beyond political regimes and divides: pre and post-independence Ireland, and Northern Ireland – another aspect indexed by the link between Yeats and Heaney. It must be stressed that the interviewee is quite aware of the history of Ireland, particularly its most recent phase. He also spent some time in Northern Ireland as a young man. In this respect, he calls the Northern Irish poet, Louis MacNiece<sup>212</sup> a ‘typical Belfast man’ who had been somewhat neglected in favour of his friend Auden though

he was a good poet too (see I1/a3), but a typical Belfast man, nonetheless. This evocation of a commonality based on mythology and modern psychological insight can also be considered as pertaining to MacNiece, i.e. that he too drew on the same sources to fuel his poetry. There is nothing new in focusing on the Irish MacNiece (see Kiberd 1996<sup>213</sup>: 473-474 among others) but it remains interesting to note how these poets are seen as belonging to or drawing on a single cultural space that either ante-dates or transcends (divided) political and literary developments in Ireland. Such traits became visible in theme and the manner of handling poetic genre and hence offer the translator a horizon of expectation within which to operate. Nonetheless, the vision evoked by the interviewee offers more than just a stereotypical view of Irishness (Leersen 1996) as visible in literary expression in that the juxtaposition of mythology and modern psychological insight banishes woolly romanticism or an over-adherence to the exotic on the one hand, and provides a corrective to over-psychologized characterisation on the other. This is not out of step with debates on what constitutes Irishness as a cultural notion and how it 'should be'/has been represented in artistic form. In Yeats's day, there was strong public reaction to his vision of an idealised Celtic mythic past and its perceived denial of contemporary realities, as became visible in the 1916 Rising and Yeats's subsequent tributary poem *Easter 1916* (Yeats 1990), which bows to such realities. Conflicting views of nation and culture<sup>214</sup> had already resulted in riots on the streets of Dublin at the time. The debate on representation did not end there however, and continues to be waged today:

When it comes to canon making, however, aesthetic pleas often seem of less account than the politics of language and nation. To make the Irish case, anthologies of Irish poetry have recently engaged in a complex quarrel about traditions, which have thrown into question understandings of Irish literary history since 1921. Hence Thomas Kinsella's reactionary *New Oxford Book of Irish Verse* (1986). Kinsella pronounces the muse of Irish poetry to be "a past heavy with loss", yet contradictorily insists on a Platonic unity that transcends linguistic and historical difference. (Longley 1994: 628)

Some contemporary writers continue to find this to their dismay (viz. national and local criticism of Roddy Doyle's *The Woman Who Walked into Doors*). Here again we can clearly see the struggle for symbolic power involved in deciding on matters of a national literary canon and the versions of Irishness it should or should not represent. It would also seem appropriate to consider Foucault's view on culture at this point, as it is clearly corroborates the antagonism visible in the Longley quote and forms a corollary to the notion of culture as (shared) knowledge outlined above:

un système d'exclusion (système historique, modifiable, institutionnellement contraignant).  
(Foucault 1971<sup>215</sup>: 16)

The linguistic and historical difference Longley is referring to embraces the Northern Irish conflict and its roots in Irish and British history, within which we can see various (conflicting<sup>216</sup>) cultures and languages at play. It also alludes to a tendency in the early years of the new Irish state to pursue a solitary course in artistic production in an attempt to redefine

Irish culture in its own image to the exclusion of dissident versions of Irishness (Kiberd 1996: 471-561). Longley places aesthetic considerations above those of language and nation in an attempt to posit a broader more realistic unity in diversity – something which Kinsella seemingly failed to do. More recent contributions to the debate are often constructivist in approach in that they examine how the arts have formed and responded to (popularly held) views of Irish culture, society and nationhood (Kiberd 1996; Leersen 1996; O’Toole<sup>217</sup> 1994, 1996). To return to our data, it would be both anachronistic and clearly ingénu to accuse the interviewee of professing a ‘platonic unity’ of the kind advocated by Kinsella in his preface to *The New Oxford Book of Irish Verse*<sup>218</sup>. Nonetheless, a commonality is being constructed in the discourse that does go beyond historical and political borders and that indexes perceived shared cultural resources which are drawn upon to create new literary representations. Here we can detect echoes of “culture as shared knowledge” or more specifically in this instance, culture as a form of shared knowledge, as a common way of looking at the world that becomes manifest in poetry, which in other contexts might be understood as shared aesthetic codes. I do not believe that it would be an accurate portrayal of the process however, to attribute this to aesthetic codes only.

### 3.6.1.2. A Certain Atmosphere

In this extract a similar type of commonality is evoked that is not qualified to the same extent as the previous one. The interviewee points to a perceived difference between British, American and Irish poets which he identifies as a certain atmosphere in the work of the third, something that he also finds in the work of Irish prose writers and painters. It was this atmosphere that particularly attracted him and made him want to translate Irish poets in the first place:

Niet speciaal een voorkeur maar er is wel een bepaalde sfeer bij de Ierse dichters die totaal verschillend is van de Engelse dichters en van de Amerikaanse dichters zeker en die typische Ierse sfeer die trekt mij bijzonder aan. Die sfeer vind je niet alleen bij de dichter, vooral bij de dichters maar ook bij de prozaschrijvers en zelfs bij de Ierse schilderkunst die mij toch ook wel interesseerde en het was dat typisch Ierse gevoel dat mij bijzonder aanspreekt. ja (ja) (1.2/a3)

#### Extract 3-40: a certain atmosphere

The commonality evoked here is seen as extending across genres and as embracing literature and painting or is considered to be equally visible in them all. I understand this reference to atmosphere as indexing a common artistic or aesthetic trait in these genres which points to a common or shared origin or source that is reflected somehow in theme and form, (viz. atmosphere). What exactly this atmosphere consists in is left unsaid; nonetheless, it remains tangible enough for the translator to continue to act upon and develop relations with Irish poets, who have in turn translated his work into English and Irish. I consider the version of culture being constructed in this extract as similar to that in the previous extract in its evocation of commonality and as echoing the theory of culture as shared knowledge. This

commonality evoked is synchronous, however, and is not portrayed in terms of tradition as was the case in the first extract discussed in this section.

### 3.6.1.3. Of Hedges and Ditches

One of the issues raised by the interviewee in the next extract involves the culture-specific use of certain words (here 'hedge' and 'ditch'). This issue forms an important point of discussion in translation studies literature, particularly in Venuti's work, (Venuti 1998: 8-30). Generally speaking, the discussion usually focuses on culture-specific lexical items that have no equivalent in the target language or culture. It is through the existence of such terms and other items in a translated text that we can deduce its foreign origin. The list of such items is extensive, some of the most obvious being names and kinship terms (the famous case of Russian), rituals and related objects, clothing, food items, etc. The discussion forms part of broader one on the (postcolonial) politics of representation of the cultural other (Bassnett & Trivedi 1999; Tymoszko 1999; Venuti 1998<sup>219</sup>; Spivak<sup>220</sup> 2000, to name but a few). The words cited in the extract, 'hedge' and 'ditch', are obviously listed in the dictionary, widely distributed in the English-speaking world and apparently do not pose too big a problem for translators. Next to their dictionary meanings however, 'hedge' and 'ditch' are also used in a slightly different sense in Ireland, which raises the problem in this case of how they should be translated into Dutch. The hedges one comes across in the Irish countryside are traditionally impenetrable affairs full of hawthorn, whitethorn, alder, crab-apple and bramble, designed to keep livestock in and intruders out. As a result, the translator, in rendering the word as 'haag' in Dutch, might feel obliged in such a case to make the potential reader aware of the difference in question – a common enough problem in the profession.

PF. En voel je voel je een soort dat leren een andere manier hebben om het Engels te hanteren?

PN. Ja, ja zeker qua toon ook wel bepaalde woorden net als hier in Vlaanderen eh bepaalde woorden zoals 'precies' of in een net iets andere betekenis gebruikt worden maar eh er is er is ook een andere een andere toon van, van, van, van de zin dan in het Engels en die moet je op een iets andere manier vertalen maar ik vind zeker dat het enigszins afwijkt hetzelfde verschil, het is miniem maar hetzelfde verschil eigenlijk als tussen Vlaams en Nederlands (ah ja) omdat er uitdrukkingen bestaan die teruggaan tot ja tot eh het misschien wel letterlijke vertalingen uit het Gaelic zelf zoals "I'm after doing this" (Ja, "I'm after doing" ja dat is letterlijk uit het lers) dat is letterlijk uit het lers (ja, ja ja, ja inderdaad) (laughs) eh dat soort dingen moet je wel herkennen, en moet je proberen door niet door er iets heel gek van te maken maar door een bepaalde toon of, of, of, of volgorde van woorden toch, toch neer te zetten waardoor het net iets anders wordt (ah ha) maar het gaat mij te ver zoals sommige vertalers wel gedaan hebben om daar een soort Vlaams van te maken om aan te geven eh ja (ja dat is moeilijk ja, hoe doe je hoe vertaal je dialecten ja, dat is een moeilijke klus, ja, ja) of ja 'ditch' ja dat is ook een ander hele bekende 'ditch', 'hedge' dat zijn (ja) dat zijn woorden die dan vaak toch net iets anders betekenen dan in het Engels (ja), 'ditch' zeker (ja, ja) ... (1.3/a3 (sub1))

**Extract 3-41: of hedges and ditches**

Likewise, sometimes a ditch includes or specifically indexes the earth rise next to the ditch proper or the embankment flanking a dip at the edge of a field, as is evidenced by the colourful expression, ‘the hurler on the ditch’. Note on and not in, in this case. Though ditch would be rendered as ‘sloot/gracht’ in Dutch, it might be appropriate perhaps to render it as ‘dijk’ or ‘richel’ in certain cases, which is confusing, on the face of it. Imagine the disgruntled feeling a Dutch reader might experience upon reading ‘de hurleyspeler op de sloot/gracht’. A perusal of the OED threw up a common etymological source for both words, which further complicates the issue. Are we dealing here with sociolinguistic variation or older (archaic) usage? Whatever the explanation, the translator is faced with a decision which can be aided or remedied by knowledge of local usage. As was said already, there is nothing in this short exposé that translators and translation theorists would not immediately recognise. A lot of ink has flowed in attempts to solve such and similar problems but then again much depends in practice on the extent to which the translator is aware of potential discrepancy or variance with dictionary definitions, which is where versions of culture come in, among other things. In this particular extract, the interviewee elaborates on his knowledge of the Irish countryside and other aspects of cultural and linguistic practice and as such illustrates the consequences of acquiring or cultivating such knowledge. It is clear from the extract that the interviewee possesses native knowledge on the matter and that such knowledge informs his textual practice. Though there are clear echoes of culture as shared knowledge emergent in this extract, one can also see culture as communication at work here, more specifically, indexicality and metapragmatics. The two words connect the speaker with the landscape, the layout of fields and agricultural practices in the Irish countryside where he used to live. This in turn finds its way, in some noticeable yet not too obvious fashion, into the new language.

#### **3.6.1.4. Of Storytellers and Philosophers**

The first three extracts discussed above have served as illustrations of translators’ awareness of the cultures out of which they translate. In the extract that follows the interviewee broaches the subject of poetry in society, the role played by poets and the responsibilities they must assume in doing so. Though the debate clearly involves perceptions of genre, it is the particular vision or version of culture in which genre is situated that forms the focus of discussion here.

IJ: Dat is eigenlijk nu enfin nu zijn we zo een beetje in het heden. (ja) Ik ben eigenlijk nogal ontevreden met het soort eh poëzie dat hier enfin in Vlaanderen en Nederland wordt geschreven en ja die ontevredenheid ik kan die misschien best als volgt zo omschrijven. Ik vind de traditie in Vlaanderen en in Nederland nogal erg geïnspireerd op de Duitstalige tradities en dat resulteert in een vrij gesloten hermetische poëzie die ik echt niet die ik echt niet kan niet kan eh waarderen omdat een dichtbundel in Vlaanderen of Nederland wordt nu gedrukt denk ik op zo gemiddeld vijfhonderd exemplaren dus poëzie is een verschrikkelijk marginaal verschijnsel en als je dan als dichter het de lezer nog extra moeilijk gaat maken met zeer hermetische gesloten poëzie te schrijven dan vind ik dat eigenlijk een beetje onverantwoord. Dat vind ik eigenlijk een beetje immoreel als dichter. Want je maakt het eh je maakt het, je maakt je eigen stiel marginaal eh en ja dus dat kan ik wil enfin ik een andere staan voor een

ander soort poëzie ook in mijn eigen schrijven (ja) en wat mij aanspreekt laat ons zeggen in de Angelsaksische traditie en meer bepaald dus ook in de Ierse is toch daar is nog een kern aanwezig van het eh verhalen vertellen. Daar is toch nog een; poëzie is geen medium om een verhaal te vertellen maar het, het kan narratief gebruikt worden en ik eh ik vind de dat er narratieve elementen sterker aanwezig zijn bijvoorbeeld in de Ierse poëzie en in de Angelsaksische poëzie misschien wel in het algemeen die ik, ik wil bekend maken of die ik wil promoten ook binnen ons literair landschap.

Dat is eigenlijk de reden waarom dat ik met Ierse poëzie bezig ben. (I.4/a3)

#### **Extract 3-42: of storytellers and philosophers**

The discussion in this extract brings together the cultural, the political and the generic in one argument. The interviewee laments what he perceives as the closed hermetic nature of current poetic practice in the Netherlands and Flanders, which is understood as stemming from the German (philosophical) tradition. The result of such practice is that poets have cut themselves off from their readers; major poetry collections are published at a mere 500 volumes per edition, which has marginalised poetry as a form of cultural expression. That poets continue in this manner is considered rather immoral because they are seen as marginalising their own craft. Poetry hence falls from public view and the voices of the poets and the messages they convey become inaudible. One way of remedying the situation is to draw on other traditions of poetic practice that are more narrative in approach (English-language poetry in general and Irish poetry in particular) and not only introduce readers to poets from these traditions through translation but also to get local poets to tell their own stories in a similar way.

One can of course ask whether there are grounds for such views on the state of poetry in the Netherlands and Belgium. Marginalisation is a reproach often heard from poets on the subject, but the causes for this are usually situated in the camp of commercialisation, the trivialisation of (high) culture, the dictates of commercial TV, global markets, etc. Interestingly, the interviewee places the cause squarely within poetic practice and among the poets themselves. Interestingly too, in recent years, the performance side of poetry has been receiving increasing attention in the Netherlands and Belgium, (viz. poetry slams and other forms of poetry performance including rap, music and other genres and media at Poetry International, Rotterdam; De Nachten, Antwerp; Crossing Borders, Amsterdam and elsewhere). This is far from saying, however, that the phenomenon is entirely new (see the work of older poets like Simon Vinkenoog and Lucebert, *De Nacht van de Poëzie*, etc.). What matters here is not the truth factor of the utterances in the extract but rather the stance of the interviewee. Dominant genre practices can be contested through translation<sup>221</sup>, among other things, and to do so one can draw on how such practices are seen to function in other cultures and language communities. In defending his position, the interviewee sketches a picture of story telling<sup>222</sup> through poetry still extant in Irish and other cultures – a picture that is not without substance. As the critic, Edna Longley puts it:

There are less obvious forms of Celtic blood transfusion. Generally speaking, the survival of oral traditions<sup>223</sup> – strongest in Ireland – has kept the rhythms, the corpuscles moving. Forms of verbal display are still valued: recitation, story telling, contests of wit. (Longely 1994: 627)

One can detect a (nascent) poetic programme or a politics of aesthetics in the interviewee's utterances that comprise or construct versions of culture which have a direct influence on the type of poets/writers he translates, and hence determine his textual practice from the very outset.

Generally speaking, the version of culture visible in the discourse is contrastive if not to say confrontational. Forms of cultural practice are compared not for their own sake but to bring about change. Here we get a glimpse of the hidden conflict for symbolic power discussed by Duranti under culture as systems of practice. One can also detect notions of high and popular culture at work in the sense that hermetic poetry is considered as elitist whereas narrative poetry is considered as more available to a broader public.

### **3.6.1.5. Of Cultures and their Climates**

The discussion in this extract is ostensibly about degrees of access to the field of literature. The interviewee comments on the relative ease with which young writers and poets can find an audience in Ireland and how the Arts Council there facilitates this through festivals, competitions and publications. In this respect the literary circuit in the Netherlands and Flanders is considered to be more difficult to gain a foothold in. This difficulty is expressed in terms of a higher threshold of acceptance in contrast with the higher popular appeal of poetry in Ireland. This difference in literary practice is also expressed in terms of reception, i.e. that there is more openness to new voices among the organisers of festivals and the audience in Ireland. This is further explained in terms of varying climates in the countries concerned, where climate is used a metaphor for a series of contrastive literary and related social practices, which broadly speaking can be understood as falling under the heading of culture:

VVDK: Op technisch aspect bedoel je of de hele cultuur of? (ja)

VVDK: Ik vind dat de literaire cultuur anders is in Ierland, dat de drempel veel lager ligt en in Vlaanderen en Nederland denk ik dat de mindere goden minder kans krijgen, heel, heel weinig kans, dat het heel moeilijk is om er om in het circuit te komen. Er is een circuit van goede dichters in Vlaanderen en Nederland en dat wordt heel moeilijk doorbroken en ik denk dat er een soort eh dat het een beetje vastzit terwijl er in Ierland veel meer interesse is voor jongere dichters en nieuwe stemmen en dat die ook veel meer steun krijgen van de overheid. The Arts Council heeft een goed programma voor er om beginnende dichters te steunen en je en je voelt dat het klimaat daar anders ligt, dat je op literaire festivals niet altijd dezelfde grote namen ziet terugkomen maar heel dikwijls jonge groepen dat men ook met workshops integreert in literaire festivals waar beginnende schrijvers aan bod komen ook ja. Dat vind ik het grootste verschil.

Op esthetisch vlak weet ik niet of ik eigenlijk een misschien ja één ding ja dat Ierse dichters meer bezig zijn met wat is Iers zijn? wat is Ierland? wat is ons 'heritage'?

(eh ha) eh en er wat betekent het om Iers te zijn? en om te schrijven in een zeker voor de Ierse taal te schrijven in een taal die nauwelijks nog gelezen of gesproken wordt. (1.5/a3 (sub1))

**Extract 3-43: of cultures and their climates**

The interviewee also notes what she sees as the importance of national/cultural identity as a theme among Irish writers and poets along with the role played by the Irish language in defining such identity (see chapter 3.6.I.I.). On the face of it, we can take the unspoken contrast evoked by the Dutch comparative 'meer' to be between Irish poets, on the one hand, and Flemish and Dutch poets, on the other. Whom are more preoccupied with identity in all its forms is open to discussion but the interviewee's observation about the Irish concern with identity certainly can be substantiated, viz. Longly (1994) but also Heaney's discussion of Patrick Kavanagh and other Irish poets (Heaney 1988: 3-14 and 30-35), not to mention Kiberd (1996), the title of whose book is particularly apt: *Inventing Ireland: the Literature of the Modern Nation* and Leersen's seminal studies of the literary representation of Ireland (1996, 1996). One can wonder where this on-going engagement with identity stems from. Perhaps it can be partly explained by the conflation of culture and nation (as the title of Kiberd's book suggests) and the contradictions and paradoxes that ensue from such a project. On the other hand, it could also be considered as a knock-on effect of enforced silence under colonial domination, a policy the leaders of the new nation did not shy away from either<sup>224</sup>. In this respect, it is sometimes hard to know when and where post-colonialism ends.

On the whole, the awareness or construction of cultural difference visible in this extract can be aligned with those in chapter 3.6.I.I. to 3., to the extent that it also shows the interviewee's orientation to the culture and languages out of which she translates. The version of culture emergent in the extract is comparative and is cast in terms of how things are done in given cultural domains and the issues that preoccupy those involved. In this respect I consider it as echoing (the theory of) culture as a system of practices. We can also gather from the discourse that one of the functions of literature is to provide a platform to discuss broader social and cultural issues, in this case identity and heritage.

### 3.6.I.6. Forever Lagging Behind

In the extract that follows, the interviewee weighs former studies and translational preference in pointing candidly to what she considers a weakness in one aspect of her translation practice, namely a seemingly patchy knowledge of the English-speaking culture(s) out of which she translates. Whether this is really the case or not is hard to judge but the interviewee offers us an interesting reflection on what she calls 'baggage' (cultural/intellectual) and how it is acquired:

VDK: Ik heb een zus die in Ierland woont (ja) in em eh tegen Belfast (ah) dus we zijn er al geweest.  
Eh ik vind het een heel mooi land maar ik heb eigenlijk niet echt, weet je, ik ben van eh opleiding eigenlijk Romanist, dus eigenlijk ken ik eh de Angelsaksische literatuur echt niet goed. (em)  
Dus ik lees wel en ik lees eh ja gewoon in het wilde weg zoveel mogelijk maar ik heb altijd het gevoel dat ik achterop hink omdat ik zo weinig bagage heb. ... Maar eigenlijk doe ik veel liever vertaal ik liever uit het Engels (ja) (1.6/a3)

Extract 3-44: forever lagging behind



The reasoning is that because she has not studied English literatures and cultures in a formal sense, she will be forever lagging behind, no matter how extensive and varied her reading has been since her studies. This seems to underscore the legitimacy of cultural models taught in higher education or more specifically, programmes in which the history, arts, languages, cultures, etc. of particular countries are taught. Note in this respect the reference to ‘Angelsaksische’ literature – a somewhat anachronistic term in my opinion, yet of common usage in the Dutch language area, that could be glossed nowadays as English-language literatures. It emerges from the discourse that such programmes provide a foundation that is difficult to equal, if one wishes to become competent in translating literary works that stem from the cultures concerned. In the discourse one can also notice a distance between the perceived beauty of the country she visited and its representation in literature – something which in practice may someday be resolved. One can ask why no such doubt was expressed by those who have either lived in the country or established relationships with writers, poets and others living there who are involved in the production of cultural artefacts, as is the case for the interviewees quoted in the extracts in chapter 3.6.I.I. to 5.

The version of culture emergent in the extract seems to be built on sets of identifiable and verified features that can be acquired through study and reading. This is perhaps best understood as belonging somewhere between (a theory of) culture as mediation – to the extent that knowledge of specific cultural features provides one with a key to understanding literary discourse and genres from that culture – and (a theory of) culture as communication in the Geertzian sense, given the importance the interviewee attaches to meaning making (see also chapter 3.3.I.4. and 3.5.I.5.)

### **3.6.I.7. Of Landscapes and their Characters**

In the extract quoted below an interesting parallel is drawn between landscapes in Ireland and Scotland and how landscape is represented in writing and more particularly how such representations interlock with characterisation. But perhaps parallel is not the correct word here. In the extract we can observe a development from natural landscape (to the extent that any landscape is natural) observed and experienced by the interviewee on her travels to the imagined landscapes of the work she has translated. According to the interviewee, the characters found in the writing would be out of place in any other landscape, an Italian landscape for example. So in this case, certain landscapes index certain cultures or to be more precise certain landscapes cannot be disassociated from the cultures that inhabit them. Likewise, imagined landscapes are not seen merely as additions or backdrops against which the action in a novel takes place but as being intricately interlaced with the characters in a work and therefore as vital to a work as a whole. The interviewee feels drawn to islands and describes the islands of Scotland as an earthly paradise, wild places where the sky and sea are full of ever-changing colour. She sees Ireland as being similar to Scotland in this respect:

PF: Ja.

En, en ben je ooit naar Ierland geweest?

Nee?

BM: Neen, maar wel ... wel naar Schotland en dan in Schotland trekken mij de eilanden aan (ja) ik heb iets met eilanden.

(ja) en eh ik ben met eh mijn oudste zoon is in de zomer naar Ierland geweest en hij had heel mooie opnamen gemaakt.

Ik denk, ja, 't is enigszins vergelijkbaar, denk ik (ja) beetje een woest landschap en al die kleuren van de zee, zelfs in 't noorden, echt zoveel kleuren in de lucht (ja) het wisselt.

Het wisselt om de om de halve minuut (ja) of nog sneller (ja, ja) en dat, ik vind het prachtig (ah ha) en ik had eigenlijk al heel lang graag naar Ierland willen gaan.

Maar ja, dat is zo.

Vakanties zijn, toen de kinderen klein waren, dan moet je warmte hebben en zon en strand en dan hebben we (ja) altijd gekozen voor Frankrijk en zo (ja) dan ben ik op een bepaald moment in mijn eentje naar Schotland gegaan (ja) ik denk, de Hybriden, dat is het aards paradijs, maar, ik denk, Ierland kan best vergelijkbaar zijn.

PF: Ah ha ja, wat je zegt, the Hybriden dat is ja 't is, wel het westen van Ierland misschien of Donegal (ja, ja) vergelijkbaar.

Ja.

BM: Maar eigenlijk eh zo die eh het landschap dat viel me wel op bij, bij jullie dan.

Dat is niet zomaar landschapsbeschrijving als toevoeging, maar dat is zo dat is zo geïntegreerd in eh in dat boek, dat heeft echt zo'n functie.

Ik denk eh diezelfde figuren tref je niet aan in Italië, denk ik.

PF: Ah ha en ze horen daar echt bij.

BM: Ja. (1.9/b1)

### Extract 3-45: of landscapes and their characters

On the whole, the interviewee sees a tacit poetics in the writing that is given credence by her own observations in situ. The view expressed here contains strong echoes of eighteenth-century discussions on the arts. Consider the following quote from Leerssen in which he discusses characterisations of the Irish in British literature and the then new notion of the 'sublime' in landscapes:

The Irish barbarity or alienness, is no longer an object of loathing or a desire to reform; instead, a nearly benevolent interest, a willingness to be entertained or amused by Irish peculiarities, becomes noticeable. ... Such trends were noticeably influenced by a new appreciation of the Irish landscape. Wild and mountainous country was the natural stronghold of 'old barbarities' – and as the aesthetic appreciation of the one grew, so did the political attitude to the other ameliorate. As roads improved and a certain amount of law and order was established even in the remotest districts, those aspects of the landscape which would previously have inspired a traveller with unease – forests, mountains – could now be viewed with a less apprehensive state of mind. Furthermore, the concept of the 'sublime' was now beginning to create a matrix for the aesthetic appreciation of such landscapes. ... Especially Edmund Burke<sup>225</sup>'s milestone *An inquiry into the origin of our ideas of the sublime and beautiful* (written around 1750 and published

in 1757) linked the sublime definitively to notions like ‘terror’, ‘obscurity’, ‘vastness’, and ‘infinity’ (chapter headings). It is obvious that ‘wild mountainous regions’ could thus, from the traveller’s half-admiring, half-disconcerted point of view, easily become examples of sublimity. (Leerssen 1996: 67)

It is not the intention here to pass off the view formulated in the extract above as antiquated. On the contrary, it can be considered as an attempt by the interviewee to ground literary representation in observable ‘reality,’ and to link artistic expressions or artefacts with the cultural environment in which they were produced. It is interesting to note that the reality observed or the version of culture being constructed is not out of step with long-standing perceptions of the ‘Celtic fringe,’ as Leerssen amply demonstrates in his work.

In more general terms however, the discourse can be seen as providing an illustration of the difficult task a translator faces in understanding the cultural ‘other’. As such, this must be given serious consideration and not only in terms of ‘foreignising and domesticating strategies’ à la Venuti, or Schleiermacher for that matter.

In relation to this, it is not uncommon for writers and poets to challenge received perceptions of national or ethnic character, which further complicates matters for the translator, as this forces him/her not only to be informed of commonly accepted views on and within a given culture or ethnic group but also of voices that challenge such views in constructing alternative social realities. Elsewhere in her interview, the interviewee is shown to be wary of generic, aesthetic and cultural stereotypes and prefers to take a writer or poet on his or her individual merit and mode of expression in order to counter such stereotyping, (see chapter 3.5.1.7.). As regards the version of culture being constructed in the extract, I consider it as echoing (a theory of) culture as communication: landscapes (both real and imagined) are seen as having significance and are read as such. Next to this, such landscapes index cultural features embodied by their inhabitants (real and imagined).

### **3.6.1.8. Culture as (Aesthetic) Movement**

In the following extract, culture is viewed in terms of historical periods of artistic expression which are both united and divided across nations, cultures and languages. For example, romanticism is seen as beginning earlier in some countries than in others and as tempered by the languages and literary traditions found in the various countries concerned. According to the interviewee, this makes historical translation difficult in certain cases, which becomes pertinently visible in a translator’s choice of verse form. Blank verse is a case in point as it was not commonly used in the Low Countries at a time when it was used extensively in England:

CP: Ah fsst ja dat hangt af van de tijd inderdaad.

Je hebt “blank verse” en je hebt geen.

Enfin dat zijn tijdsstijlen inderdaad (ja) die van literatuur tot literatuur eh verschillen uiteraard.

En de moeilijkheid is dat je bepaalde tradities hebt in één cultuur of in één taal en dat die tradities in een andere taal anders lopen eh de evolutie gaat anders.

Hier is de Romantiek al begonnen, hier nog niet dat soort decalages (ja) maken het bijzonder moeilijk.

Ook bijvoorbeeld om een historische vertaling te maken eh absoluut.

Bijvoorbeeld wij hebben niet, geen blank verse gehad. (ah ha) Onbekend dus ja, - laughs - ja (hoe moet je dat omzetten) ja.

PF: Dus vorm en inhoud zijn eigenlijk belangrijk voor u of?

CP: Zeker ja dat is nu net poëzie ja. (1.10/a1 (sub6))

#### Extract 3-46: culture as (aesthetic) movement

Ostensibly, the discussion here concerns poetics or literary history but the fact that things are viewed from this angle deserves some comment as on the whole it does demonstrate a certain version of culture. Possible translational action is informed here by knowledge of particular writers, the period to which they belong, together with the language and literary traditions such writers worked within. This implies that time needs to have elapsed and reflection and comment on the various contexts (socio-cultural and other) of the writers in question needs to have become stabilised to a certain extent. In this way writers and poets can be seen as exemplars of or as epitomising more general trends and styles in historical genres and cultural phenomena that reach beyond the confines of a given language or culture. At the same time, the various features being posited as common to aesthetic movements or exemplified by certain artists, scholars, philosophers, etc., can also be considered as basically the same yet adapted to/by the local culture in various ways. The interviewee also speaks elsewhere (1.10/b1) of the research he conducts into comments and criticism by scholars and others when translating such writers, for example. All this is in keeping with the particular interviewee's translational preferences, i.e. for writers and poets belonging to periods up to and including 'high' modernism (+/- the 1940s), most of whom are no longer living. Hence we are dealing with stabilised expressions of genre and a considerable critical apparatus that allows us to contextualise such expressions and to ground them in received visions of (high) culture. This is linked further to the translator's practice in the sense that he has cultivated these preferences since his youth. Therefore, I consider the version of culture being constructed in the extract as echoing (a theory of) culture as communication or the semiotic system posited by Lévi-Strauss, in the sense that a basic cultural unity is being suggested in the extract along with its diverse expressions that vary across countries at given periods. The French word 'décalages' (shifts, displacements) also indexes that unity. Cultural expressions are passed on, modified and read as particular sets of signs that belong within a larger framework of aesthetic or high culture.

### 3.6.2. Culture and the Arts

On the whole, the extracts discussed in chapter 3.6.1. to 8. mainly treat culture in conjunction with the point of view of the arts, and more specifically with literature. Literature is a form of culture and in Dutch the word 'cultuur' is synonymous with the arts and in many instances with 'high' culture. Nevertheless, it emerges from the data that in dealing with the arts and their countries and cultures of origin, the interviewees construct a version of culture that allows them to deal with the origins of artistic expressions and ground them in the cultures they

stem from. The table below provides an overview of the various versions of culture discussed above along with the salient term, its overarching view and the specific instance in which it was used to illustrate the view and finally the theory of culture I consider to be echoed in the instance:

Ref.	Salient term / metonym / metaphor	Version of culture	Specific emergent instance	Related Theory of Culture
6.I.1. Ext. 3-39	Een zeer poëtisch land	Poetic practice drawing on a common cultural tradition, inc. aesthetic codes: diachronic	Common source of theme and inspiration for poets from Yeats to Heaney	Cultured as (shared ) knowledge
6.I.2. Ext. 3-40	Een bepaalde sfeer	Artistic practices drawing on common cultural ground, inc. aesthetic codes: synchronic	Common ‘theme’ / atmosphere across the arts	Cultured as (shared) knowledge
6.I.3. Ext. 3-41	‘Hedge’ en ‘ditch’	Culture-specific use of English lexicon	Irish or Hiberno-English variety	Culture as communication; indexicality
6.I.4. Ext. 3-42	Een beetje immoreel	Politics of contrastive poetics/ contrastive (generic) traditions: diachronic	Narrative versus philosophical reflection in poetry	Culture as systems of practice
6.I.5. Ext. 3-43	Een ander klimaat	Contrastive cultural/literary practices: diachronic	Degrees of access to literary field across cultures	Culture as participation
6.I.6. Ext. 3-44	Achterop hinken	Orders of translatorial legitimacy/cultural competence: synchronic	(Lack of) Formation in English literatures	Culture as mediation / communication
6.I.7. Ext. 3-45	Niet zomaar landschapsbeschrijving als toevoeging	Real/ imagined landscapes index embodied/imagined cultural traits: synchronic	Wild landscape as ground for ‘wild’ Irish characters	Culture as communication
6.I.8. Ext. 3-46	Décalages	Asymmetric developments within unity of cultural / artistic movement(s) : diachronic	Historical use of blank verse as opposed to rhyme across languages and cultures	Culture as communication / semiotic system

**Table 3-vi: versions of culture – an overview**

As can be judged from most of the extracts, culture is closely linked with literary or artistic practice or expression. These practices and expressions are not seen just as representations of the culture from which they emerge but also as (part of) the culture itself. This hardly seems surprising as far as literary translators are concerned. Nonetheless, it is also clear from the extracts that the versions of culture that emerge are not merely ‘bookish’ in the sense that they draw entirely on the received wisdom about the culture extant in publications. In this respect,

all of the interviewees but one draw on some form of direct or first-hand experience with it in some way, either through living there and visiting there regularly or through networks of relations with artists, poets, publishers, family, friends, etc.

To return to the Jaffe quote above regarding translation as "... metacultural activity ...", it can be stated that the contrasts, comparisons and reflections extant in the extracts discussed above provide ample proof of such metacultural activity. Reflecting on culture and contrasting cultures, etc., takes place in practice in the day-to-day business of translation and involves the networks of friends and experts discussed in chapter 2. As stated already in 3.6. and demonstrated in chapter 3.6.1.3., this reflection, etc., is part and parcel of decisions taken at the deepest textual level regarding word choice, hence demonstrating that it is not merely a matter of word choice, strictly speaking. We have also seen in chapter 3.6.1.7., how a version of culture is at play from the very outset in contextualising a given form of artistic expression.

The terms synchronic and diachronic have also been included in order to make a distinction between the versions of culture emergent in the extracts and outlined in Table 3-vi. I use the terms to indicate the temporal perspective taken by the interviewee in evoking a version of culture, which I consider either as being on-going or a-temporal, in a manner of speaking. Regarding the theories of culture I consider as being echoed in the extracts, it has been demonstrated that no single theory of culture matches all the versions discovered. I consider this important as it does in fact show the significance of a theory of culture as a system of practices. The theories echoed in the extracts might have cancelled each other out in the analysis or have been made redundant or inconclusive given their diversity if they were not linked to forms of practice in some way, something which the notion of system of practices encompasses.

### **3.7. Various Elements of Habitus: translators and translation**

However else one chooses to define "practice", it is the point at which three things converge: the law of system, the quick of activity, and the reflective gaze of value. (Hanks, 1996:11)

The four elements identified in the data and discussed in this chapter namely ethos, language ideologies, genre and versions of culture, are considered as being salient aspects of translation practice or habitus. As was stated already at the beginning of chapter 2 and 3, these aspects and more general assertions have been posited on the grounds of qualitative data analysis stemming from in-depth interviews with translators. Chapters 2 and 3 provide detailed discussions of the data gleaned from the interviews and as such form an important part of the study conducted within the framework of this dissertation. The next chapter (4) consists in a study of a translation corpus comprising original poems in English and Gaelic and their Dutch translations, many though not all of which have been translated by two of the interviewees. Traditionally speaking, this corpus could easily have served as an object of research into translation norms. As such norm theory provides a theoretical framework for the

translational and translatorial behaviour visible in translations and other forms of related texts. Moreover, it provides a point of departure for empirical explorations of what translators actually do and have done in the past. As norm theory has formed such a rich area of debate within translation studies, any study of translation would be incomplete if it did not address it in some way. In chapter 3.7.1., below I will examine the premises of two major theories on norms (Toury's and Chesterman's) in the light of findings from the data. In what follows, it will be argued that a theory of norms can only make sense within the (broader) framework of a theory of practice.

### **3.7.1. Norm Theory and the Data**

The four characteristics under which the various phenomena emergent in the data have been listed and discussed in chapter 3.3. to 6., are considered as being of relevance to norm theory in DTS. The discussions in the interviews and their analyses above have thrown up points that have all been touched on in some way or other to a lesser or greater extent in the literature of translation studies. Generally speaking, these characteristics and others are considered here as elements of social action or as forming aspects of a particular mode of practice or habitus called translation. Such characteristics have mainly been sought in previous studies in translated texts, translators' forewords and explanatory notes, correspondence between translators, etc. (Toury 1995<sup>226</sup>; Nord 1991<sup>227</sup>). The reasoning is that translated texts from a particular period and culture bear witness to specific sets of translational and translatorial norms, all of which vary across languages, periods and cultures. Though this seems like an obvious enough statement requiring little or no effort to corroborate, it is argued here that an investigation of translated texts alone will not suffice in gaining insight into norms at any given time in a society or culture (viz. Anthony Pym's broader approach in *Method in Translation History*). To put in another way, norms may be uncovered in translations but they may not be the translator's, at least not solely or entirely. As has been shown in chapters 2 and 3, translated text comes about through a process of negotiation involving a number of participants, no matter how slight their contributions might be to the finished work, next to the translator's. Translated works are often proofread and edited, to name but two obvious aspects of the process. Therefore, translated works come about in a particular system of practice that is both embodied and socially distributed (see chapter 2). So, as norms are not manifest in texts alone or if they are, cannot simply be equated with those of the translator, and since they are not just in translators – pardon the preposition – but are socially distributed, how can we set about locating them?

The analysis so far has shown that the characteristics drawn from the data are embodied, engaged with, used, negotiated, contested, shared, and entextualised all at the same time or in varying orders of succession in a network of actors in which translators play a significant role. So if these characteristics were to be regarded as aspects of norms, we could conclude that any single norm cannot be located in one place only, be it embodied, physical, conceptual, cognitive, pragmatic or otherwise. This brings us to a quote on norms by Toury:

Sociologists and social psychologists have long regarded norms as the translation<sup>228</sup> of general values or ideas shared by a community – as to what is right and wrong, adequate and inadequate – into performance instructions appropriate for and applicable to particular situations, specifying what is prescribed and forbidden, as well as what is tolerated and permitted in a certain behavioural dimension (the famous ‘square of normativity’, which has lately been elaborated on with regard to translation in De Geest 1992<sup>229</sup>: 38-40). Norms are acquired by the individual during his/her socialization and always imply sanctions – actual or potential, negative as well as positive. Within the community, norms also serve as criteria according to which actual instances of behaviour are *evaluated* (italics in the original). (Toury in Venuti 2000: 199)

As can be judged from the quote, norms are squarely rooted in a community (and not just in text), which is what the data used for this study corroborates, with one proviso, i.e. a reluctance to use the word community too loosely. Next to that, the data does not throw up a blueprint from which shared values and ideas have been translated (see discussion of theories of culture in chapter 3.6., in this respect). Nowhere are such agentless processes visible in the data. What they do show is how these values and ideas are negotiated and contested and hence become manifest, which also includes processes of socialization of translators as translators (see especially chapter 2.4.2.1. to 3.). So perhaps it is safer to assert as this stage, given the identification and exploration of the four characteristics above, that norms are not a priori unformulated givens that are translated into forms of behaviour/action, language use or evaluation, but are, much like the relevant factors of Skopos theory or the variables of functionalist approaches to translation (see chapter 2.5.1. to 5.), sites of contestation and negotiation, involving translators and all the other actors involved in the field, from which translations eventually stem.

Having contrasted the general principle of norms with the findings from the data, I would now like to examine individual norms set out in Toury and Chesterman (Toury in Venuti 2000; Chesterman 1993 5/1: 1-20) in the light of the same findings from the data. I will firstly examine Toury’s and then move on to Chesterman’s.

### 3.7.1.1. Toury’s Norms and the Data

Toury identifies three main types of norm:

1. **Preliminary**, including
  - a. translation policy;
  - b. directness of translation.
2. **Initial**, including
  - c. adequacy (source oriented), or
  - d. acceptability (target oriented) translation.
3. **Operational**, which is further subdivided into
  - e. *Matricial*: macro-textual structure, segmentation, etc. (what is included, left out of a work and how it is set out in contrast to the original);



- f. *Textual linguistic*: the selection of material to formulate the target text, which is either general (translating as such) or particular (text type or mode).

Each of these norms and their subdivisions will now be contrasted with findings from the data.

### **Preliminary Norms**

By a) translation policy, Toury (2000: 202) means “those factors that govern the choice of text types or even individual texts” translated in certain cultures during certain periods. In the context of this study, what the data has shown is that:

- ♦ The factors are largely determined by publishers, institutions (e.g. Poetry International in Rotterdam), or literary magazines, though not entirely (see all interviews);
- ♦ Publishers, etc. usually commission translations of major, emerging or popular authors and poets but some of these commissions are suggested by the translators (see interviews 3, 4, 5 and 10);
- ♦ One of the factors determining whether a writer’s oeuvre will be translated is access to the language in which the work is written. If the language can be read in the area in question, fewer works will be translated. Compare the work of Symborska (from Polish) and Heaney (from English) in translation for example (see interview 3);
- ♦ Translators often select from the works/collections of poems they are asked/wish to translate (all interviews) unless otherwise commissioned to translate a particular work or an entire collection. (see all interviews).

By b) directness of translation, Toury (2000: 202) means considerations involving “the threshold of tolerance for translating from languages other than the ultimate source language: is indirect translation permitted at all?”

Judging by the data, the answer to this question is yes.

- ♦ Some translators work with a native speaker of a language they do not know themselves (see interviews 4 and 5);
- ♦ Some learn a language specifically to be able to translate a poet or writer they admire (see interview 4);
- ♦ Some work indirectly by contrasting translations in several languages they do know before translating the original into Dutch (see interview 2);
- ♦ Some consult translations into other languages before translating directly from the original (see interview 10);
- ♦ For minority languages like Gaelic all translate via an intermediary English translation but try to consult with poet or writer if possible (see interviews 2, 3, 4 and 5).

### **Initial Norm**

According to Toury (2000: 200-201), the initial norm is constituted by the basic choice, that is made by the translator between the requirements, of two different sources. On the one hand, he or she can be led by the original text and hence subscribe to the norms of the source language and culture, thereby providing what he terms an adequate translation. On

the hand, he or she can comply with the norms of the target culture and thereby produce an acceptable translation.

The data shows that the distinction between adequacy and acceptability is in fact based on a false dichotomy:

- ♦ All those interviewed stressed that a translation should be a valid work of literature (e.g. poem) in its own right yet must remain as close as possible to the original. This eliminates the basic distinction in orientation (source/target). If anything, the translators in this study choose both at the same time;
- ♦ Some translators see translated poems as providing a step up to the originals and hence prefer bilingual editions complete with footnotes and commentary. This is not always feasible however, given the higher cost of such editions. Here too the orientation is dual, as translators seek to provide high quality translations to place alongside the originals;
- ♦ None of the translators apply either source or target culture norms indifferently, exclusively or entirely: see the comment on and criticism of source and target literary practices in all the interviews. For example, a plea for less rhyme in translations of well known poets like Rimbaud or Baudelaire or Dante for that matter (see esp. interviews 6 and 10) is made not on the grounds of target culture poetics/aesthetic codes – which are spoken of pejoratively in such instances – but more out of respect for the original.

It could be argued that an initial norm can only be ascertained *a posteriori* following an analysis of the translation and that, therefore, what translators say they do is of little or no consequence here. However, the translator seldom makes the choice alone and much depends on the stipulations of the commission. Furthermore, it is hard to maintain that an adequate translation upholds source target norms. An interlinear gloss of an epic poem in no way fulfils any source functions of the original: though its rationale is based on a respect for the word order of the original, etc., its purpose is often target culture academic, e.g. language learning, studies in prosody/poetics, etc. (Tymoczko 1999: 56). Translations for popular readership could not afford to follow such a strategy for the simple reason that they would not sell, which does not mean however, that they necessarily elide all traces of the source culture in the process. Nevertheless, if adequacy and acceptability can be considered as types of equivalence there certainly is evidence of such in the data.

### **Operational Norms**

Within operational norms, Toury makes a distinction between a) matricial and b) textual linguistic norms. Matricial norms pertain to decisions regarding the macro structure of a work: is it in all respects a structural carbon copy of the original or not? If not, how does it vary, etc?

On the face of it, such norms seem to overlap with preliminary norms to a certain extent:

- ♦ The data shows that in the case of poetry, translators select from a number of poems they are commissioned to translate, i.e. they do not always translate all the poems they are asked to translate or may work with the publishers in choosing a selection. In this

way they take a particular series of poems from one collection and some from another and publish them together in the same volume. This results in a publication that does not exist at all in the source culture, let alone differ or vary with the original.

So in practice, matricial norms may and clearly do go together with preliminary norms.

Toury defines textual linguistic norms as follows:

Textual-linguistic norms, in turn govern the selection of material to formulate the target text in, or to replace the original textual and linguistic material with. Textual-linguistic norms may either be *general*, and hence apply to translation qua translation, or *particular*, in which case they would pertain to a particular text-type and/or mode of translation only. Some of them may be identical to the norms governing non-translational text-production, but such an identity should never be taken for granted. This is the methodological reason why no study of translation can, or should proceed from the assumption that the later is representative of the target language or of any overall textual tradition thereof. (Toury 2000: 207)

As far as I can understand, general textual-linguistic norms can only be discovered following an in-depth comparison of any two languages in all their aspects, which is the daunting task of comparative linguistics (see chapter 1). Next to that, any single translation can be nothing else but specific in all the terms identified in translation studies, even in cases where its use turns out to be other than that desired by its commissioners or the person(s) who translated it (see also chapter 1). The important point made by Toury in the final sentence of the above quote has since led to the construction and study of parallel corpora, i.e. corpora of texts written within a given genre in a language and texts translated into that language within the same genre. Studies of such corpora can, among other things, throw up instances of what Pym calls *interculture* (Pym 1998) and also identify different ways of handling genre across languages (Kenny 2001; Baker 2000<sup>230</sup>). The nature and bearing of such textual features will be discussed in more detail in the next chapters following an analysis of the translations made by the interviewees. Nonetheless, the following findings gleaned from the interview data can be mentioned here:

- ♦ Textual-linguistic norms are subject to negotiation and contestation. In this respect, any translation product may not necessarily reflect the normative linguistic behaviour of its translator alone, (see the section on language ideologies above);
- ♦ One cannot assume that standard grammatical usage or language system forms the norm against which a particular translation is contrasted prior to publication (see also discussion on language ideologies above);
- ♦ Textual-linguistic factors are inseparable from genre considerations, (see discussion on genre above **and findings from corpus analysis in chapter 5**).

#### Toury's Norms and Practice

Following his identification and discussion of the various types of norms, Toury suggests various ways of studying them and points to two major sources for the reconstruction of translational norms, i.e.

1. *textual*: the translated texts themselves (*primary* products of norm-regulated behaviour);

2. *extratextual*: semi-theoretical or critical formulations (merely *by*-products of the existence of the activity of norms) (2000: 207).

Before doing so he states the following:

However, what is actually available for observation is not so much the norms themselves, but rather norm-governed instances of behaviour. To be more precise, more often than not, it is the products of such behaviour. Thus even when translating is claimed to be studied directly, as is the case with the use of “Think-Aloud Protocols”, it is only the *products* which are available, although products of a different kind and order. Norms are not directly observable, which is all the more reason why something should be said about them in the context of an attempt to *account* for translational behaviour. (Toury 2000: 206)

If norms are not directly observable (and we can only see their products), we will be forever chasing the ends of scholarly rainbows and the crocks of intellectual gold to be found there. I wish to argue that norms have little meaning beyond their products or manifestations. True, various expressions of norms can, following analysis, be grouped under the one heading. This is something the scholar has to do but beyond that there is only endless potential normative behaviour and the will-o'-the-wisp enterprise of trying to map it out. In this sense all norms are historical, since they can only be observed post-factum, following instantiation. So perhaps, the operative word in Toury's argument is 'directly.' Indeed they are not directly observable: time and distance being needed for norms to become visible – something that comes about when a study is undertaken. Beyond that there is not gene-pool of normative behaviour that translators and others involved in the process illustrate or act out willy-nilly and unconsciously which the scholar can pin-point in an act of disinterested neutral observation. This study has shown quite clearly that translators are all too well aware of their actions and the consequences that stem from them.

Furthermore, Toury also asks us to treat each extratextual source with “every possible circumspection; all the more so since – emanating as they do from interested parties – they are likely to lean toward propaganda and persuasion”. This casts a long shadow of doubt over the very purpose of my study till now, since the data upon which I base my observations are, according to the definition given above, “extra-textual”. This derives from treating translations as primary texts, which of course is only normal. Nevertheless, if anything, this study has shown that textual sources should also be treated with an equal amount of circumspection. At no time can we assume that they provide unequivocal evidence of a particular person's normative behaviour. What we may be able to lay bare is the normative behaviour of a community of practice rather than the individuals that form that community. Moreover, this study has never eschewed the ideological and has consistently factored it into the overall equation, one of the reasons being that persuasive discourse is not de-facto negative: take for example arguments regarding the status of translation as a profession and other ethical issues that have a bearing on translation quality. The main reason for this, however, is that no source ('textual' or 'extratextual') can be considered free of ideology. One of the favourable aspects of

text – perhaps the only one – is that it has a material form and hence is only slightly easier to study. Apart from that, there is nothing that raises it above the suspicion meted out to the extratextual. Another thing demonstrated by this study is that the actual line between the textual and the extratextual is a very blurred one indeed, i.e. that textual practice is situated (see chapter 4). This means that we should also be extremely careful in drawing the line between the textual and the extratextual.

On the whole, an attempt has been made thus far to demonstrate the relevance of translators to our understanding of translation. There is an obvious place in norm theory for translatorial and translational behaviour, which, it can be asserted, forms the very cornerstone of the theory. It has not been the purpose here to reject the theory following the remarks and findings set out above. Rather, it is the purpose to show that norms belong within a theory of practice without which they would fail to make sense or provide any conclusive evidence of particular forms of behaviour.

### 3.7.1.2. Chesterman's Norms and the Data

Chesterman identifies social, ethical and technical norms of translation (Hermans 1999: 77). He divides these into two subsets “one behavioural and one textlinguistic ... *professional norms* and *expectancy norms*” (Chesterman 1993: 8).

1. **Professional (production) norms:** these govern the accepted methods and strategies of the translation process; they are constituted by professional behaviour and comprise three ‘higher-order’ norms:
  - a. *The accountability norm* (ethical) – involves translator’s loyalty to original writer, commissioner, readership; integrity, thoroughness, responsibility, etc.;
  - b. *The communication norm* (communication) translator should optimize communication between original writer, commissioner and readership;
  - c. *The relation norm* (type and degree of equivalence) translator should ensure appropriate relation between target and source text.

These norms are validated by:

2. **Expectancy (product) norms:** higher order norms than 1, established by the receivers of the translation.

#### Professional Norms

The data largely corroborates the existence of professional norms:

- ♦ Notions of accountability and relation are certainly present. Examples of both are amply visible in the data (see the discussion of ethos and genre in particular). All this clearly involves notions such as loyalty, integrity, thoroughness, responsibility, though they may not be expressed in such specific terms;
- ♦ The notion of equivalence underlying relation is also clearly visible in all the interviews, despite the difficulty involved in defining equivalence and notwithstanding its fall from theoretical grace in translation studies;

- ♦ The least obvious norm in this respect is the communication norm as none of those interviewed speak of optimizing communication as such between the various actors involved.

What is present is a clear awareness of difficulty and less obvious aspects of linguistic structure, which becomes manifest in such statements as ‘what’s there isn’t there’. Yet, going beyond the bounds set by the text or the person who commissioned the work is considered by most to be a precarious affair and as stepping outside the brief of translating as such (see interviews 1, 4, 6, and 10). One can then ask whether this particular norm does not belong strictly speaking to a Gricean framework of supposed relations of appropriateness or felicity that might encompass translation phenomena. Many of those interviewed do not think that it is their task to explain or further ‘explicitate’ aspects of or items in a work that might be obscure, the danger being that such explanation might disturb the structure of a work or damage it in some way. Only one of the interviewees (interview 10) mentioned using footnotes and other textual apparatus openly. Nevertheless, they do consider it important that they themselves know about such matters in detail (see discussion of ‘hedge’ and ‘ditch’ in chapter 3.6.1.3. above, or the discussions on the nature of a particular gate in I.3/d2 (sub1) and I.9/b3, among other things).

### **Expectancy Norms**

As far as expectancy norms are concerned, the data show that they cannot be placed on the receiver side of the equation alone:

- ♦ One recurrent theme is the importance of reading for the translation process (interviews 2-10). Expectancy already forms part of the equation at this stage: how should the work be pitched, etc. for the new readership in the new language? At no time are potential readers absent from the considerations of translators;
- ♦ Expectancy also features in relations between publishers and translators;
- ♦ Proofreaders also approach a translated work with a set of expectations;
- ♦ Critics who read the works after publication command little respect among translators unless they themselves have translated works and can speak from experience.

All of these points have been discussed at length in the section on genre and amply illustrated by extracts from the data. The question remains as to what we understand by the receiver side. Should this be interpreted as comprising all others except the translator or should it be understood as only comprising the end-users of a translation? Whatever the answer may be, at no stage can expectancy be excluded from the equation. The subsets of expectancy norms suggested by Chesterman: syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic are central to the discussion during each of the stages mentioned above. Or as Chesterman himself states:

It is in thus seeking to meet the *expectancy* norms as adequately as possible that the translator *de facto* conforms to the professional norms. (Chesterman 1993: 10)

Perhaps the conformity is not as *de facto* as all that, however, but expectation is there from the outset in some form or other.

### Chesterman's Norms and Practice

Like Toury's, Chesterman's norms are also rooted in the social, as the following quote illustrates:

*Target language norms.* A translator performs act A because of the expectancy norms of the target language community regarding grammaticality, acceptability, appropriateness, style, textuality, preferred conventions of form or discourse and the like. (Chesterman, 1993: 17)

Nevertheless, this seems like quite an agenda to comply with for any translator, were it not for the simple but oft forgotten fact that the translator is also a member of that language community too and hence is familiar with or embodies the agenda in question often to a heightened degree. Here we have more proof that expectancy runs throughout the whole process from alpha to omega. This tends to make Chesterman's argument sound circular or redundant as the translator has already acquired these expectations at various stages of his/her socialisation and has learned to use them in the practice of translation. So predicting (probabilistic) laws of translation behaviour (Chesterman 1993:15) of the type formulated above might prove self-fulfilling, if no research is done on what translators actually do and say.

In fact, why should behaviour be predictable in the first place? If norms are descriptive – the basic tenet of norm theory – then the behavioural phenomena from which they have been distilled are interesting enough in themselves and worthy of detailed studies before we can consider refining norms. Predicting what a translator A might do in a given situation B still needs a lot more groundwork, as we have barely scratched the surface of what they actually have done and how. If predictability is sought in the interests of improving translator training, much can be learned directly from translators themselves.

To return to the various types of norms outlined by Chesterman, we can see from discussions of the data gathered for this study that the expectancy norm can be fitted into genre, with one advantage, namely that the set of expectations would concern the same linguistic phenomena albeit from varying perspectives. This would provide a degree of continuity across the various stages of any translation process. Expectancy is an aspect of evaluation, which forms an aspect of practice as outlined in the quote by Hanks at the beginning of this section. Next to this, Chesterman's professional norms can be placed within ethos and language ideologies as discussed in chapter 3.3. and 4., both of which relate to the other two components in his definition namely 'the law of system' and 'the quick of activity.' Hanks allows for system in that it is socially constructed and hence observable, not because it forms an *a-priori* ground or given to which patterns of human and linguistic behaviour (are supposed to) comply. Speculation on normative behaviour among translators cannot be conducted without knowledge of the conditions in which they work and produce texts. As has been stressed already, the evidence provided by text will not suffice unless it is seen within the framework of a given mode of practice or habitus of translation. Along with this, relations of power, dominance, etc., can be included in the equation or at least would not be excluded from it.

### **3.7.2. The Profession of Study and the Study of a Profession**

The four aspects or characteristics identified in the analysis of the data and discussed in 3-3 to 6 above are not considered as being definitive and exhaustive in any way. If anything, they comprise an attempt at providing a tentative structure that could bridge the gap between those who study translation and those who translate or, to be more precise, those whose profession it is to study translation and those whose profession it is to translate. This brings me back to the original dilemma posited in chapter 1, i.e. regarding the emic and the etic sides of the equation in this study. Clearly, the notions of practice and habitus have proved useful in helping us understand the nature and content of the qualitative data collected for this work. They have also rescued the utterances contained in the data from a-priori mistrust and given them a legitimate place in the field as worthy of examination in themselves and basic to our understanding of translation as a social phenomenon. In this respect, they have helped to heal the rift – albeit slightly – between theory and practice in the old-fashioned sense. Have they effectively proved beyond a doubt the existence of a habitus or mode of practice in this particular case? This still remains to be seen but the apparatus provided by Bourdieu, Hanks and others certainly has allowed us to uncover certain elements of a potential translation practice or habitus.

The chapters that follow comprise a study of translations made by those interviewed and translations by others whom, for various reasons, I failed to interview. Some are no longer with us, others had stopped translating and had taken up other professions and others still were hard to reach, i.e. were living in the USA and elsewhere at the time. Each of them have translated Irish poets at some stage of their career over the last thirty years. An analysis of their translations should take us a step closer to an understanding of translation practice.



## 4. AN ELECTRONIC TRANSLATION CORPUS: IN SEARCH OF SITUATED PRACTICE IN TEXTS

In this chapter we turn to an examination of the translated poems collected for the purposes of this study. Given the premises set out in the previous three chapters regarding the situated nature of the language use, values and practices informing translation, the task presented itself of finding out how these factors played out in the translations themselves. The question was: why was an analysis of translated texts needed if abundant aspects of practice had been thrown up by the ethnographic study? Most ethnographic studies also involve participant observation in which the researcher follows the participants in the field and witnesses their daily actions and interactions. The data gathered from such observation can then be triangulated with the qualitative data in the study. In this case, the researcher is also a translator and hence part of the field of study. During the course of the in-depth interviews, I was asked by one of the interviewees to participate in a translation project<sup>231</sup> involving Irish poets and writers, which I gladly agreed to. Some of the other interviewees were also involved in the project. The collaboration provided me with a number of insights that helped me to understand better the views emerging in the interview data, though I have not discussed the observations as such in the study. As I understood it observing the field also meant examining the products of those who work in the field, in this case translations. I had already decided to examine translations before I was asked to participate in the translation project. In itself the project would not have provided me with enough textual data to draw any significant conclusions regarding textual practices among those concerned. In contrast, a larger body of work might allow me to draw such conclusions. In this respect, 55.5% of the poems in the electronic corpus proposed and analysed below were translated by two of the translators who participated in the ethnographic study. The remaining 44.5% was translated by others outside the ethnography. It was considered important to include work by others in the corpus in order to set up a broader scope of textual comparison and hence temper over-hasty generalisations with regard to the work of the interviewees. In this way we were looking beyond those involved in the ethnography while still remaining within the field of translation.

To discover evidence of practice in translated texts an appropriate model of textual analysis was needed. Translation studies literature provides a range of textual models to choose from and it was clear from the outset that the model adopted would have a considerable bearing on the way I approached and even regarded the textual material made available in the corpus. The textual model decided upon will be discussed in detail in this chapter before we go on to explain how the electronic corpus of source texts and translations was built and coded.

The coding was designed to facilitate textual analysis. The analysis itself and its results will be dealt with in chapter 5.

#### **4.1. Choosing a Model of Textual Analysis: a discussion**

Models of textual analysis in translation are drawn up for various purposes. Many functional models of translation propose methods of textual analysis to be carried out prior to or during any act of translation (House 1977, Reiss & Vermeer 1984, Nord 1997, Hatim & Mason 1990, Vermeer 1986, inter alia). Many of these models build on valuable insights gained from various studies on language use within the general area of linguistics, as was demonstrated in chapter 1. Some models could be considered more pointedly historical in that they examine existing translations with a view to finding out what they achieved (or failed to achieve). The most emblematic of such models is Van Leuven-Zwart's shift model for the analysis of literary prose. Van Leuven-Zwart also combines approaches to linguistic and literary analysis in formulating her model.

##### **4.1.1. A Historical Model of Translation Analysis**

Van Leuven-Zwart's articles in *Target* (1989, 1/2: 151-181 & 1990, 2/1: 69-95) contain 2 models of translation analysis one descriptive and the other comparative, each of which is considered as complementary to the other. The comparative model

is designed for the classification of shifts in sentences, clauses and phrases, i.e. on the micro structural level. With the aid of this model only those shifts are determined and classified which may contain indications of interpretation or strategy. Such shifts result from a conscious or unconscious choice on the part of the translator, and may occur on any one of the levels – semantic, stylistic or pragmatic – which substantially affect meaning. (Van Leuven-Zwart 1989: 155)

This model clearly links linguistic changes to the translator's conscious or unconscious choices, something that has been discussed at length in the previous two chapters of this work, although the terms conscious and unconscious have been shied away from in favour of a more socially-grounded approach. The descriptive model

[I]n turn, focuses on the effects of microstructural shifts on the macrostructural level, i.e. on the level of the characters, events, time, place and the other meaningful components of the text. (Van Leuven-Zwart 1989: 155)

In her descriptive model there is a clear link established between the linguistic aspects of a work of fiction and its 'macrostructural' meaning. However, in constructing the comparative model, Van Leuven-Zwart put forward notions such as:

- ♦ transeme ('a comprehensible textual unit') or basic unit of translation, and
- ♦ architranseme – 'the common denominator in the establishment of similarities' between source text transeme and target text transeme.

This approach projects the meaning of both source and target text onto a third plane of evaluation (*tertium comparationis*) thereby forestalling, perhaps unintentionally, the post-factum or the historical, which is difficult to circumvent in any analysis of translations (Pym 1998). Nevertheless, as Van Leuven-Zwart points out, there can be no similarity without dissimilarity, no matter how one proposes to investigate it. In his section on *tertium comparationis*, Chesterman (1998<sup>232</sup>) quotes Krzeszowski (1990<sup>233</sup>: 20) on the topic:

We compare in order to see what is similar and what is different in the compared materials; we can only compare items which are in some respect similar, but we cannot use similarity as an independent criterion in deciding how to match items for comparison since similarity (or difference) is to *result* from the comparison and not to *motivate* it (italics in original).

The features identified as shifts or changes in the body of texts studied for this work draw on such notions of similarity and dissimilarity without providing such an (extensive) definition of what similarity and dissimilarity entails. Bearing Krzeszowski remark in mind, the grounds for similarity and dissimilarity still have to be explored further before a decision can be reached.

Would it be correct, therefore, to use Van Leuven-Zwart's model without taking on board the complex apparatus of analysis and the particular use of certain terms that goes along with it? Van Leuven-Zwart's notion of transeme for example, is based on criteria drawn from Dik's Functional Grammar (Dik 1978<sup>234</sup>) and in keeping with Dik's views, she divides transemes into 'state of affairs' and 'satellite' transemes (Van Leuven-Zwart 1989: 155-156). Her descriptive model draws on the notion of levels in a literary work as developed by Ball (1980<sup>235</sup>) and that of function as used by Leech and Short (1981<sup>236</sup>), who founded their notion on the tripartite distinction of interpersonal, ideational and textual function developed in Systemic Functionalism<sup>237</sup> (Halliday 1973<sup>238</sup>) (Van Leuven-Zwart 1989: 171-172). No matter how fine-grained and effective such an analytical model proves, adding its apparatus to the terms and means (linguistic ethnography, theory of practice) already in use in this work would make the overall approach top heavy and cumbersome. It would also effectively move the methodological goalposts by parachuting in a linguistic model that has nowhere been debated or suggested in the previous chapters. In this respect too, terms such as 'architranseme' would also be at variance with the overall stance in this work, which till now has sought explanations for meaning in the (social) actions and textual artefacts of translators.

Hence, the dilemma remained:

- a) Which form of textual analysis and, moreover,
- b) Which (definitions) of terms should be used to conduct an inquiry into "shifts" in the translation data assembled?

Vinay and Darbelnet's use of the term 'modulation' for example, is not quite the same as van Leuven-Zwart's, who further refines the terms by including semantic and stylistic modulation<sup>239</sup>. Yet, the categories set up by Vinay and Darbelnet (2000: 84-93, Catford (2000: 141-147), Levý (2000: 148-159), Van Leuven-Zwart (1989: 151-181 and 1990: 69-95) and others remain points of departure from which to initiate a discussion. They are, in the main, just one step up (in level of abstraction) from directly observable traces of translation practice and

hence relatively easy to retrace, no matter how fuzzy the borders between the various categories might be. And it was observable practice that I was after. Despite the variety of their interpretations, shifts or changes are observable phenomena in translations and also can be safely considered a shared notion and part of the apparatus of translation studies<sup>240</sup>. The question then was: how refined should the definition be, and hence the various categories of shift, in order to be used as tools of analysis? A second question issuing from this was whether particular uses of terms and categories – discrete, sharply defined or otherwise – can exist outside a given framework of analysis, including the textual artefacts that are subjected to that analysis. In this respect, we must continue to bear in mind that Van Leuven-Zwart’s model was designed to investigate translation strategies in literary prose, though it has been used with success elsewhere: “[t]hus the method could be considered as a research tool which is applicable to the entire field of translations studies” (Van Leuven-Zwart 1989: 154).

#### **4.1.2. Emic and Etic: evidence in translation corpora**

The above discussion brings us back briefly to the themes **emic** and **etic** explored in chapter 1. It is an observable fact that practicing translators seldom if ever use models of analysis put forward by translation scholars, which does not mean that they never conduct analyses of the works they translate. As I understand it, a post-factum or historical model of translation analysis is obliged to draw on observable practice in order to construct and refine its tenets, which does not mean that scholars cannot use the wherewithal of their discipline to do so or that practice should dictate the model entirely. Van Leuven-Zwart draws on the emic by using observable translation practice but somehow postpones its impact by positing a middle or tertiary ground of signification – a ground, it must be stressed, which is in keeping with the rigour of academic practice<sup>241</sup>. No such ground is posited here as the purpose of this study is to discern patterns in translation data as they present themselves in the texts under scrutiny. In combination with the ethnographic findings discussed in the previous two chapters, such patterns might help us draw a picture of situated textual practice among translators. A form of textual analysis was needed in order to be able to find those patterns: an examination of shifts seemed the most obvious way of doing so.

##### **4.1.2.1. Translation Corpora: an empirical stance**

Regarding definitions and approaches, it proved interesting, in this respect, to turn to a basic assumption found in translational corpus linguistics, which, in contrast to Van Leuven-Zwart’s model, may strike one as being rather matter of fact. The task of finding solid theoretical foundations for similarity seems to be sidestepped in translation corpora, where a more empirical approach is evident, an approach that could be summarised in very simple terms as follows: “here is source text *a* and here is its translation or target text *at*; let us now proceed to align both texts in a corpus and see what we can find<sup>242</sup>.” And given the corpus software now available, the possibilities of analysing long strings of text electronically seem endless. Regarding the assumption mentioned above, consider the following quote from an

article on parallel corpora. Its object of concern is not translation as such but rather what can be learned, from a semantic and lexicographic perspective, from systematically comparing originals and translations:

Parallel corpora, in which original texts are aligned with their translations into another language, are a rich source of semantic information. Translations come about when translators evaluate the degree of interpretational equivalence between linguistic expressions in specific contexts. In many ways such evaluations, made without any theoretical concerns in mind, seem more reliable as sources of semantic information than the careful paraphrases of the semanticist or the meaning descriptions of the lexicographer. (Dyvik 2004: 1')

These rather bold opening few sentences display an empirical stance that dispenses with too much prior definition in terms of what particular lexical items, syntactic structures or discourse features mean across languages and how they should be categorised. As I understand it, the assumption is that meaning has been (re)created in certain contexts and that context is important to our understanding of how that meaning comes about. In this respect, the translated items are reliable to the extent that they manifest contextual choices and decisions regarding meaning making and are worth investigating as such. A similar stance is also visible in the use of the term, 'correspondence' in the literature on parallel corpora, which is seen as an empirical or observable given:

From the beginning of our work with multilingual corpora, my students and I have used the notion of correspondence. Correspondence is what we can see, equivalence is what we want to discover. Equivalence is a troublesome notion, because there are so many different kinds. What sort of equivalence does the translator want to achieve? (Stig Johansson<sup>243</sup>)

This indeed postpones the rather prickly discussion on equivalence<sup>244</sup> to a later stage in the analysis, but it does not dispense with it. The above quote is very much in keeping with the opinion voiced by Chesterman regarding the field of translation studies:

It would appear that the study of translation equivalence is, in fact, the study of what translators actually do, or what they tend to do or have tended to do. (Chesterman 1998: 31)

If this reasoning is followed, translational equivalence can only be discerned *a posteriori* following on an analysis of the parallel texts. This effectively allows us to put into perspective any *a priori* definition of equivalence or its subdivision into types. Equivalence becomes historical and only observable post factum, which is very much in keeping with the position on (the historical nature of) language use set out in Vološinov and Bakhtin (and adopted at the very beginning of this study). This also fits in with the notion of translation as a form of situated language use, in that the equivalence sought would be determined by the interplay of textual and contextual features perceived by the translator and others involved and hence become manifest in the products of translation. Equivalence then would become equivalence in a given socio-cultural historical context and not in absolute terms. Equipped with this insight, I returned to the notion of shifts and the categories they may be listed under.

#### 4.1.2.2. Shifts: values and descriptions

Shifts, as Jeremy Munday points out, have a considerable genealogy:

Catford (1965) uses the term “translational shifts,” which he defines as “departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from SL to TL” (1965: 73). His strictly linguistic definition, illustrated with decontextualized and idealized sentences, is much expanded in later writing on translation shifts. Miko (1970), for instance, concentrates on stylistic rather than syntactic or semantic changes, while Popovic (1970: 85) asserts the importance of the shift concept as a way of bringing to light “the general system of the translation” along the lines of Toury’s later norm concept. (Munday 1998: 2)

But given this quote, it can be remarked that correspondence is a flexible notion too or, to be more precise, that we cannot drop the premodifier ‘formal’ from Catford’s definition of correspondence without knocking it off kilter, that Catford’s notion of correspondence and the one set out by Johansson, though similar, are not the same. In fact, Catford would call the ‘correspondences’ observable in translation ‘translation equivalents’ (Catford in Venuti 2000: 147). Yet, it must be stressed here that the discussion still concerns translation or minimally the juxtaposition and comparison of texts in one language and their translations in another language.

I had, therefore, reached a stage where I was difficult to disassociate (linguistic) form from its evaluation (in categories or higher orders of significance) or, to express it otherwise and borrow a phrase from Michael Toolan (Toolan 2004<sup>245</sup>), that ‘Values are Descriptions’ and a related and equally potent one from Seamus Heaney, that ‘description is revelation’ (Heaney: 1975). I consider this a two-pronged process. It can be asserted that no matter how ideologically neutral terms like clause or noun phrase may be, attempts at their categorisation in higher units of significance and ensuing discussions on what the limits of a particular category might be and what makes that category different from another are all value laden (Vološinov 1973:10). Moreover, these categories also reflect the framework in which they are used (Chesterman and Arrojo 2000<sup>246</sup>: 151-160). For example, if we discover an added lexical item or the choice of a different lexical item in a translation, as a result of which a more explicit expression emerges in the target text, it is hardly ever the intention to leave the discussion at that. In this respect alone, ‘description is [also] revelation’, in that analysis gives us an insight into ‘hidden’ textual processes. The ways and means of description still remain open to question and discussion however, as is also visible in Heaney’s poem<sup>247</sup>. But, on observing a given phenomenon, we will invariably want to know why it was done at that particular place or at least try to evaluate the situation in some way. More often than not we will see it as evidence of a particular strategy. The particular phenomenon described above is observable in translations and is known as (a type of) explicitation (Klaudy in Baker 2000: 80-84). Interestingly in the light of translation corpora, it was considered a basic factor of translation before corpus tools could attest its distribution or frequency. So the step towards attributing certain values to observable linguistic phenomena, or its corollary of searching in language use for evidence of such posited values, is quasi-instantaneous. Even attesting shifts

in ‘formal correspondence’ in texts stems from an ideology of (systemic) resemblances<sup>248</sup>, for linguists are quite aware that the link between form and meaning is arbitrary (Saussure) especially when it comes to comparing forms across languages. In other words, why should a target text unit of form necessarily have to match a source text one? Catford in fact, confirms that this is not the case in his comparison of articles (definite and indefinite) in French texts and in their English translations (Catford in Venuti 2000: 147). Chesterman (1998: 31-32) also reaches a similar conclusion in discussing system equivalence:

This is a relation that may hold between paradigms which are comparable by virtue of a common grammatical label, such as “pronoun” or “article”. We can thus compare pronoun or article systems in the different languages. Clearly, however, the initial assumption of comparability based on “cognate grammatical terms” is open to amendment, the whole system (the category of pronouns for instance) may actually function differently in the two languages, and the grammatical labels may turn out to be misleading.

So if lexical categories are to be used as labels for types of shift, the labels can only serve as indications of where in a given text a particular change has occurred (to the extent that the labels are more or less compatible in the two language systems involved). These labels index the sites of change but do not as such form explanations for the changes carried out. In the case of Catford’s articles, the explanation lies in the decisions taken by the translators, based on their judgements of the various aspects of text and context involved. Hence, evaluation forms part of the equation from the very outset, next to being tied in with the overall evaluation of a target text or as Mona Baker states:

A detailed description of linguistic features is not an end in itself for a translation scholar: it is merely a means to an end, a first step towards understanding the pressures and constraints under which translators operate and which inevitably leave traces in the language they produce. (Baker 1999: 93)

A similar concern is observable in Toolan (2004). Commenting on the ‘interface’ between literary and linguistic studies, Toolan has the following to say:

In summary, many literary critics seek, find, invoke and explore values in their analyses of and commentaries on texts; they often imply that literary criticism is essentially ‘about’ values. By contrast, linguists and stylisticians tend to claim they can provide neutral, even perhaps objective, descriptions of texts and their elements. ... I argue that the assumed gulf between values and descriptions is much over-stated, that a cline of abstractness/concreteness must notionally link the most literary value statements with the most linguistic descriptive statements; and that one of the tasks of literary linguists and others is to articulate the transformation of ‘concrete’ linguistic descriptions into ‘abstract’ literary evaluations, or vice versa. (Toolan 2004: 12)

Toolan uses corpus tools like WordSmith, for example, to analyse literary texts in English and in his discussion of the findings of one particular analysis he links the frequency of particular structures and lexical items to a number of recurring themes in a novel. The overall goal is to

discover how meaning comes about in a given text and how meaning is marshalled through the use of its linguistic material. This approach is not that far removed from shift analysis, the main difference being one of purpose or focus (viz. Van Leuven-Zwart's micro and macro level shifts mentioned above). Ostensibly, the former inquires into the construction of meaning in a given text 'in one language' whereas the other inquires into the reconstruction of meaning in a text 'in another language', along with the 'shifts' that occur in the attempt to recreate that meaning. In this respect, the latter is also concerned with how a 'seemingly given' meaning was rendered in a target text and not only that but also how (or to which extent) it was oriented towards the new readership. Hence the 'shifts' observable in translations – what Van Leuven-Zwart sees as resulting from 'a conscious or unconscious choice on the part of the translator' – can be considered more positively as 'purposeful' (Nord 1997) and not as digressions from an ideal translational form (or hypostatic meaning embodied in the original) or mainly as the result of language system constraints. In fact they are part of the only observable data or 'correspondences' we have, as Johansson would put it. They are enmeshed in the *prima facie* evidence of translation. Hence, though they can be seen as fitting into or illustrating particular categories, the shifts attested by translation scholars cannot be entirely disassociated from the source texts they are related to, the (internal and external relations) of the target texts they belong to, and more particularly from the values used by those who carried out the shifts in the first place. It is asserted, therefore, that they form textual evidence of translational practice to the extent that they are not entirely explainable in terms of the target language system.

Next to this, a shift is presumably a shift away from something – usually explained as away from a given or pre-established meaning (and form), which is a highly problematic notion. It has been shown in fact that, as cultural artefacts, their production and interpretation continually revolves around their being entextualised and re-contextualised; hence their meaning is also constantly renegotiated through time in the culture such texts originated in (Silverstein and Urban 1996<sup>249</sup>). If this has been shown to be the case by scholars, why is it so that the original is generally considered to be the fixed star in a continually moving firmament of translation?

Shift may also be understood at the same time as a move towards something, an attempt at bringing the source text home, as it were. In this respect, one can ask whether a target reader's initial experience in reading a translated poem is one of shift or change, unless of course he or she is familiar with the original. Shifts cannot exist outside of comparison or independent of prior relations, which means that they do not pertain to the target text alone, neither are they specific to translation across languages (viz. Jakobson's intralingual translation). Moreover, shifts occur against the backdrop of 'non-shifts' as it were i.e. forms of translation that do not appear to digress enough to be considered salient or significant enough. In this respect, Van Leuven-Zwart uses the term 'substantial' shifts (van den Broeck & Lefevere 1984<sup>250</sup>: 89). A shift, therefore, is a selection criterion that is based on observable differences both across texts and within them. Moreover, shifts are important because they



index visible contextual and textual choices and hence may provide additional or other forms of significance (unexpected perhaps) alongside those also found in the source text. Similar to Jakobson's intralingual translations, they would be unimaginable outside the contexts they were performed in. However, few would treat the rewording<sup>251</sup> involved in intralingual translations in terms of formal shift, for example, even though it might prove interesting to do so. The ensuing question then is: how systematic is the scholar in finding such shifts?

#### 4.1.2.3. Shifts: manual and computer-assisted searches

Initially, searches for shifts were carried out manually, whereas word frequency counts and other searches in electronic corpora are much more systematic. As was mentioned already, shifts are considered as significant units of change made during the translation process and their shadow side is the considerable amount of non-significant units that accompany them, the units that an analyst would gloss over or set aside as being non-illustrative of a particular solution to a research question – the practical and/or theoretical blind spot of manual searches. Corpora are now used to examine such shifts systematically and comprehensively. For example, Mona Baker (2000<sup>252</sup>) used data gleaned from parallel corpora to investigate style among literary translators. Dorothy Kenny examined a parallel corpus of German and English novels for instances of creativity in translating metaphor (Kenny: 2001<sup>253</sup>). In such an approach significance, in whatever terms, emerges – seldom unintentionally – from the various searches conducted, the advantage being that electronic corpus searches are thorough, as the computer delivers all instances of a particular item requested. One drawback is that certain things might be missed, even though visible in the context of the searched item in a concordance for example. Further manual perusal might pick out or even help throw up such items – the practical and/or theoretical blind spot of machine searches:

In order to be able to provide any kind of explanation of the data provided by the corpus, rather than mere statistics, analysts really need substantially more context than computers tend to search and display. (Malmkjaer in Kenny 2000: 53)

As Kenny (2000: 53) also points out, corpus linguistics:

has always been data driven; it has proceeded from the bottom up, using concrete facts to make generalisations about particular languages (Baker 1997: 185). Much current translation scholarship, however, proceeds top down: theorists are interested in finding evidence to support abstract hypotheses.

The overtly empirical stance underscoring corpus linguistics offers definite advantages, particularly to the extent that patterns of occurrence can be uncovered that might not have been initially visible to the researcher. Building a corpus and using corpus software seemed like the obvious choice, therefore, as it would allow me to discover shifts and process **them** systematically at clause and phrase level, etc. There was one major problem however: the nature of the textual material I planned to use for the corpus, i.e. poetry. In common parlance poetry is a matter both of sense and of line and both aspects would have to be examined in

each case if the shifts found were to be correctly understood. Jakobson has the following to say on what he sees as the poetic function in language:

What is the empirical linguistic criterion of the poetic function? In particular, what is the indispensable feature inherent in any piece of poetry? To answer this question we must recall the two basic modes of arrangement used in verbal behaviour, selection and combination. If “child” is the topic of the message, the speaker selects one among the extant, more or less similar, nouns like child, kid, youngster, tot, all of them equivalent in a certain respect, and then, to comment on this topic, he may select one of the semantically cognate verbs – sleeps, dozes, nods, naps. Both chosen words combine in the speech chain. The selection is produced on the basis of equivalence, similarity and dissimilarity, synonymy and antonymy, while the combination, the build-up of the sequence, is based on contiguity. The poetic function projects the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection into the axis of combination. Equivalence is promoted to the constitutive device of the sequence. (Jakobson 1981<sup>254</sup>: 27)

Next to providing an insight into how the poetic function operates in language use, Jakobson states specifically that the poetic is a function of language (and not just of literary texts), which means that it is available to all, but subject to distribution and varying levels of competence as not everyone would use language poetically on a regular basis. This had consequences for viewing how translators translate poetry. Following Jakobson’s reasoning on the projection of “the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection to the axis of combination”, how could shifts be explored in a parallel corpus of poetry given the fact (also pointed to by translators in the interview data discussed in the previous chapters) that shifts at phrase and clause level were also determined by shifts in poetic form. For example, the choice of a particular lexical item in a line may have been determined by another similar choice three lines up or down in a stanza:

A fundamental problem, however, is the lack of a theoretical basis for standards of equivalence in poetry translation, partly because there is no overall agreement as to what constitutes the basic unit of translation. Although equivalence remains an important factor in discussions about translation, there is disagreement as to what types of equivalence are most crucial, given that it tends to be difficult to achieve on every level. For example, in order to maintain equivalence of sound patterns, it will usually be necessary to sacrifice equivalence on a syntactic or semantic level. (Connolly in Baker 2000: 174)

As far as I could understand, a concordancer would not help me find links between line and sense in the source text, let alone between the source and target texts. My ignorance of programming made me shy and cautious and I began to search for simpler solutions.

Notwithstanding the discussion on shifts carried out so far, my search for an appropriate model of textual analysis was also driven by very practical considerations. On the one hand, I had gathered what I considered to be a significant amount of textual material (6021 lines of Irish poetry and the same number of lines of poetry but one in Dutch translation, which amounted to 74,377 words in all) and needed a means of processing the material other than

manually. On the other hand, this processing required analysis along two main axes (syntax and line, broadly speaking) which would have to be laid across each other in the final analysis. The decision was to transform the paper-based material I had gathered into an electronic version and subject it to a search for shifts in syntax and line – that much was clear. How I was to attest the shifts and categorise them was still unclear as yet.

A pilot test offered an initial solution. I cut and pasted several poems and their translations next to each other into the columns of an Excel file. The intention was to mark particular lines for shifts, which could later be filtered out. This proved interesting as all these lines could be viewed together on the same page or screen. The process was unwieldy, however, and the programme offered no means of viewing simultaneously filtered data from 25 different files in which the poems and translations had been stored (a total of 194 poems by 18 poets translated by 7 (teams of) translators). What it did allow me to do was to save the files in a format that was accepted by Kwalitan, the programme I had used to process the raw interview data. When working in a ‘segment’ window in Kwalitan, one can select fragments of text and attribute codes to these selections and then view together all text fragments listed under that particular code from all the documents in the range of analysis. A segment window could hold and display a poem and its translation parallel to it. A document could comprise all such windows for a given poet and his/her (team of) translators. This method offered another advantage: when selecting text, I was not confined to a given parallel line of source and target text, as is the case in a concordance. I could even select the whole poem, if required, as an illustration of a given code. A means of semi-systematic qualitative textual analysis had thankfully presented itself.

#### **4.2. Building the Corpus: practical and related theoretical issues**

In the section that follows I will provide a general outline of how the corpus used for this study was built and coded, ranging from finding and choosing the texts in the first instance to saving and ordering the text fragments used to illustrate the initial findings examined further on in chapter 5. The method employed will be discussed at each stage along with the practical and theoretical issues encountered in the process. As was already mentioned above, Kwalitan, the program used to process the data, was designed for qualitative data analysis. Next to being a means of structuring and coding raw interview data, it also performs keyword in context (*kwic*) searches and word frequency counts. It, therefore, permits the systematic analysis of *running* text. So the possibility presented itself of also conducting standard corpus searches, despite the reserve expressed above as to whether this was the correct way to proceed. But firstly, the translation data had to be found and then made available electronically in the right format. Next to allowing one to view text fragments related to a particular code, Kwalitan can also generate a considerable amount of statistics on word and code frequency and distribution. Hence it would be possible to determine what particular (coded) shift was used and how frequently, for example. Moreover, Kwalitan also allows you to divide the corpus into relevant sections and run filtered searches for particular items in these sections,

which can later be contrasted. To echo Malmkjaer's words above (Malmkjaer in Kenny 2000: 53) however, with all these statistics there was a real danger of losing sight of the forest for the trees. Fortunately, the program's segment window allows one to view the larger textual context or co-text of each poem, which effectively counters this danger. The quality of corpus research very much depends on a skilled reading of what the corpus contains and the results it throws up: this was the challenge I faced and had to meet.

#### 4.2.1. Finding the Data

My search for translations of Irish poets led me to one obvious address: Poetry International<sup>255</sup> in Rotterdam. I knew that Irish poets had performed there regularly over the years and still do and that Poetry International always provides Dutch translations of the work of those who appear there each summer. The following Irish poets participated in the festival between 1973 and 2000:

Poet	Poetry International	Translator
Montague, John	1973	Guido Golüke
O hUanachain, Micheal	1973	Ruud Löbler
Heaney, Seamus	1977	Peter Nijmeijer <sup>256</sup>
O' Grady, Desmond	1980	Bob den Uijl
Murphy, Richard	1982	Ruud Hisgen & Adriaan van der Weel
Murphy, Richard	1983	Jan Eijkelboom <sup>257</sup>
Tom Paulin	1983	Bob den Uijl
Heaney, Seamus	1985	Cees Buddhing' & Jan Eijkelboom
Heaney, Seamus	1986	Peter Nijmeijer
Durcan, Paul	1987	Ruud Hisgen & Adriaan van der Weel
McGuckian, Medbh	1988	Jan Eijkelboom
Muldoon, Paul	1990	Ruud Hisgen & Adriaan van der Weel
Heaney, Seamus	1993	Jan Eijkelboom
Heaney, Seamus	1996	Jan Eijkelboom
Carson, Ciaran	1997	Peter Nijmeijer
Sweeney, Matthew	1998	Peter Nijmeijer
Kennelly, Brendan	1999	Peter Nijmeijer
Dhomhnaill, Nuala Ní	2000	Peter Nijmeijer

**Table 4-i: Irish poets and their translators at Poetry International: 1973-2000**

I wrote to Poetry International and asked if I could visit their archive for the purposes of my doctoral research. They kindly granted permission and allowed me to make copies of the poems and translations involved, on condition that they were used for research purposes only. I also made a selection of poems by the same poets and translators from a collection of Irish poetry in translation published by Meulenhoff<sup>258</sup> in 1988, the purpose being to compare their traits with the findings gleaned from the Poetry International section of the corpus. The main question underscoring this was whether any noticeable differences could be discovered between a regular ‘publication’ and the (the more occasional or event-oriented<sup>259</sup>) translations found in the Poetry International archive. Another possible area of inquiry also presented itself. Given the period of time between the first appearance of an Irish poet (1973) and the last to be covered in this study (2000), perhaps evidence of period-related translation strategies might be discovered in the data (Pym 1998). It was feared, however, that the period would prove too short to draw any substantial conclusions in this respect.

#### 4.2.2. Formatting the Data

The next step was to make these texts available electronically, which meant scanning the copies I had collected (a time-consuming affair which also involved checking and rechecking the scanned texts for scanning errors). After that I began to align<sup>260</sup> the poems and the translations in parallel columns in Excel files, align being quite literally the operative word. In this case it meant making sure that the lines of the poems corresponded not only per poem but also per stanza and individual line. As a result of this preliminary work, some differences emerged that would not have been visible were one merely to count the number of lines<sup>261</sup> (n° of lines of Irish poetry: 6021; n° of lines of Dutch translation: 6020). The differences are marked in bold face in the two tables below (Table 4-ii and 4-iii). Each table gives an overview of the poets in each section of the corpus (Meulenhoff and Poetry International) along with the number of lines in each of his or her poems – in the same row. Directly under each of these rows one finds the number of lines per translated poem and the initials of the (team of) translator(s) concerned. The total number of lines per poet and the total number of lines per (team of) translator(s) are listed under the headings ‘**eng.**’ and ‘**nl.**’, respectively. The differences between these respective totals are marked in the following column under ‘**diff.**’. The year of publication of the Meulenhoff edition was 1988. The Poetry International table marks the year of appearance of each poet from 1973 to 2000. The apparent causes for the differences in poem length will be discussed in detail under ‘Line Overflow’ and ‘Line Break Difference’ in chapter 5.

Meulenhoff		poems																		
year	poet	n° of lines per poem													eng.	nl.	diff.	trans.		
1988	P. Durcan	53	28	32	61	30	37										= 241			
		<b>34</b>	28	32	61	<b>38</b>	<b>41</b>											=234	- 7	RH & AVDW
	S. Heaney	31	16	44	28	52	44	96	44	24								= 379		
		<b>33</b>	<b>20</b>	44	28	<b>53</b>	44	96	44	24								=386	+ 7	PN
	M. McGuckian	28	17	20														= 65		
		28	17	20														=65		PN
	J. Montague	37	33	104	24	40	25											= 263		
		37	33	104	24	40	25											=263		PN
	P. Muldoon	36	14	14	18	13	14											= 109		
		36	14	14	18	13	14											=109		PN
	R. Murphy	22	84	52	21	24	14											= 217		
		22	84	52	21	24	14											=217		JE
	M. Sweeney	24	21	24	18	16	20	16	20	20								= 179		
		24	21	24	<b>20</b>	20	20	<b>18</b>	<b>22</b>	20								=189	+10	PN
Total n° of lines in Meulenhoff section												1453	1463	+ 10 lines						

**Table 4-ii: n° of lines per poet/translator in Meulenhoff - see bold face for line differences.**

P. International		poems																						
year	poet	n° of lines per poem														eng.	nl.							
1973	J. Montague	40	27	4	27	28	10	4	6											= 479			diff.	translator
		40	<b>27</b>	27	28	10	4	6													= 477	- 2		GG
1973	M. O hUanachain	46	24	30	29	19	9	24	22	52	43	7	14								= 319			RL
		<b>47</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>29</b>	29	19	9	24	22	52	43	<b>8</b>	14								= 319			
1977	S. Heaney	33	20	44	28	44	40														= 209			
		<b>35</b>	20	44	28	44	40														= 211	+ 2		PN
1980	D. O'Grady	34	32	31	81	26	27	14													= 245			
		34	32	31	<b>80</b>	26	27	14													= 244	- 1		BDENU
1982	R. Murphy	21	21	21	35	21	60	4	21	16	10	26	33	14							= 303			
		21	21	21	35	21	60	4	21	16	10	26	33	14							= 303			RH & AVDW
1983	R. Murphy	14	14	14	14	33!	26!														= 115!			
		14	14	14	14	33!	26!														= 115!			JE
1983	T. Paulin	43	16	14	22	18	20	24													= 157			
		43	16	14	22	18	20	24													= 157			BDENU
1985	S. Heaney	82	13	13	16	27	26														= 177			
		82	13	13	16	27	26														= 177			CB & JE
1986	S. Heaney	13	15	13	25	39	24														= 129			
		13	15	13	25	39	24														= 129			PN
1987	P. Durcan	32	40	26	20	18	30	17	9	81	36	19	22								= 350			
		32	40	26	20	18	30	<b>14</b>	9	81	36	19	20								= 345	- 5		RH & AVDW
1988	M. McGuckian	24	15	10	19	22	33	26	18												= 167			
		24	15	10	19	22	33	26	18												= 167			JE
1990	P. Muldoon	14	38	21	20	14	20	42	18	14											= 201			
		14	38	21	20	14	20	42	18	14											= 201			RH & AVDW
1993	S. Heaney	60	48	82	24																= 214			
		60	48	82	24																= 214			JE
1996	S. Heaney	17	48!	82!	24!																= 171			
		17	48!	82!	24!																= 171			JE
1997	C. Carson	66	18	16	30	19	20	20	14	20	20										= 243			
		64	17	17	30	19	20	20	16	20	20										= 243			PN
1998	M. Sweeney	24	32	27	26	30	26	24	34	30	20	25	27	20	20						= 365			
		24	32	27	<b>27</b>	30	27	24	34	30	20	24	<b>28</b>	20	20						= 367	+ 2		PN
1999	B. Kennelly	46	15	53	30	35	82	41	29	20	94										= 445			
		46	16	53	30	35	82	41	29	20	94										= 446	+ 1		PN
2000	N. Ni Dhomhnaill	16	21	32	25	34	48	22	40	41											= 279			
		16	21	32	25	<b>30</b>	48	22	<b>37</b>	<b>40</b>											= 271	- 8		PN
Total number of lines in Poetry International section:																4568	4557	-11						
Total number of lines in corpus:																6021	6020	- 1						

**Table 4-iii: n° of lines per poet / translator in Poetry International (+ total in corpus) – differences marked in bold face – ! = same poems as previous year**

An examination in the text of the slight discrepancies in line number visible in the tables above revealed two main features:

- ♦ Creative solutions to the limitations of page space (Meulenhoff);
- ♦ Creative solutions to problems of rhyme and meter both in Meulenhoff and Poetry International.

These features will be discussed at the beginning of the following chapter. Suffice it say here that individual differences per poem and its translation were not only to be understood in terms of additions or deletions in target poems.

As was mentioned already, to align the poems and their translations, I cut and pasted them next to each other in the columns of Microsoft Excel files – one file per poet for Meulenhoff and one file per poet (and performance) for Poetry International. I then saved them as tab-delimited files and after that as plain text files, a format accepted by Kwalitan. This was the format used to store the interview data discussed in chapters 2 and 3. Before the files were loaded into Kwalitan, one basic code @ was inserted before each poem in each plain text file. Kwalitan recognises @ as a segment break, which meant I could then view, examine and further code each poem and its aligned translation in a separate segment window.

All of this handling and formatting caused two problems. Firstly, converting files from one format to the next resulted in some odd changes in punctuation, which required close scrutiny and correction by contrasting electronic versions with the originals on paper. Secondly, lines that were initially separated by tabs in the plain text files were now stuck together in the segments in Kwalitan. This made viewing and reading difficult, which in turn meant reinserting tabs and also reducing the font pitch to 8 in some places to keep each original line and its translation at the same level. This policy was hard to maintain in the case of some of Paul Durcan's and Ciaran Carson's poems. Both poets use long lines. However, it was important to be able to view the original layout in each case in order to trace parallel patterns of rhyme or assonance or their absence, if that proved to be the case. Though Kwalitan permits *kwic* searches, as stated earlier, I was interested in discovering possible translation features not only in syntax and lexis but also with respect to line and stanza and, more particularly, with regard to the interaction between them. To do so I had to code extracts of text and stanza manually for what I considered to be salient features and later view all such coded fragments together per code.

#### **4.2.3. Coding the Data: initial steps**

Once the segmented plain text files had been loaded into Kwalitan, coding was carried out in three stages:

1. Poems were subjected to initial coding (initial code categories were formulated) per corpus section;
2. Coded text fragments were selected and subjected to deeper-level coding per corpus section;



3. Text fragments, categories and deeper level codes were grouped per poet / translator / corpus section.

The steps taken in coding were as follows. The corpus was firstly divided into two ‘work files’ named Meulenhoff and Poetry International. These two ‘work files’ or sections of the corpus were further divided into documents per translator / poet, each segment of each document comprising a poem and its aligned translation. An example of a composite code indicating all of these details is **pnmsh** where **pn** stands for Peter Nijmeijer, **m** for Meulenhoff and **sh** for Seamus Heaney.

Once this initial coding was done, each segment could be coded for various salient features, i.e. observable (formal) linguistic and poetic changes. All the data coded was then regrouped per translator/poet and per section of corpus.

The following two tables provide an overview of the number of lines and poems per poet and translator for both sections of the corpus. It was considered important to draw up these tables as they give an idea of the relationship between number of lines and poems, some of which take up several A4 pages in the collection of photocopies. The tables also provide the total number of lines translated by each translator per section of the corpus:

	poet	lines (NL.)	translator						
			RH & AVDW	PN	JE	RL	B DEN U	CB & JE	GG
Meulenhoff 1988	P. Durcan	234	6						
	S. Heaney	386		8					
	M. McGuckian	65		3					
	J. Montague	263		6					
	P. Muldoon	109		6					
	R. Murphy	217			6				
	M. Sweeney	189			9				
44 poems =		1463	6 (234)	32 (1012)	6 (217)				

**Table 4-iv: n° of poems and lines per poet / translator in Meulenhoff**

	year	poet	lines	translator						
			Nl.	RH & AvdW	PN	JE	RL	B den U	CB & JE	GG
Poetry International	1973	J. Montague	477							6
	1973	M. O hUanachain	319				12			
	1977	S. Heaney	211		6					
	1980	D. O'Grady	244					7		
	1982	R. Murphy	303	13						
	1983	R. Murphy	115£			6				
	1983	T. Paulin	157					7		
	1985	S. Heaney	177\$						6	
	1986	S. Heaney	129		6					
	1987	P. Durcan	345	11						
	1988	M. McGuckian	167			8				
	1990	P. Muldoon	201	9						
	1993	S. Heaney	214*			4				
	1996	S. Heaney	171#			4				
	1997	C. Carson	243		10					
	1998	M. Sweeney	367		14					
	1999	B. Kennelly	446		10					
2000	N. Ni Dhomhnaill	271		9						
Total: 149 poems =			(4557)	33 (849)	55 (1667)	18 (667)	12 (319)	14 (401)	6 (177)	6 (477)
Total: 193 poems =			(6020)	39 (1083)	87 (2679)	24 (884)	12 (319)	14 (401)	6 (177)	6 (477)

**Table 4-v n° of poems and lines per poet/translator in Poetry International (+ total in corpus)**

£ 2 of the 6 poems were the same as the previous year

\$ Includes 2 different translations of the same poem.

\* Includes a translation by S. Heaney of 'Na de bevrijding' by J.C. Bloem.

# 3 of the 4 poems were the same as the previous year.

() = total n° of lines in poems

The figures gleaned from the two tables above were used in the following table which provides an overview of the percentage of translation work carried out by each team of translator(s) in each section of the corpus:

<b>% of lines in corpus per translator</b>							
Translator	RH & AVDW	PN	JE	RL	B DEN U	CB & JE	GG
Lines in Meulenhoff: 1463	234	1012	217				
% in Meulenhoff	15.99	69.17	14.83				
Lines in P. International: 4557	849	1667	667	319	401	177	477
% in Poetry International	18.60	36.55	14.85	7.00	8.75	3.85	10.50
Total n° of lines in corpus: 6020	1083	2679	884	319	401	177	477
Total %	17.99	44.50	14.68	5.30	6.66	2.94	7.92

**Table 4-vi: Percentage of lines per translator in Meulenhoff and Poetry International**

#### **4.2.3.1. Coding the Data: stage 1 – linguistic and poetic codes**

In conducting the first analysis, each poem and translation was examined at clause and phrase level in order to discern salient linguistic features, as well as at stanza and line level in order to discover salient formal poetic features. While coding, I was confronted with one insurmountable problem, i.e. Nuala Ní Dhomhnaill poems, all of which are in Gaelic, and their translations by Peter Nijmeijer. I knew that these translations had been done through English but when I compared the Dutch translations with existing English translations by Paul Muldoon and others, I knew that they had not served as the basis for the Dutch versions. It seems that the translations were done using English glosses which are no longer available. As a result no comment could be made on the nature of the shifts in the translations of these poems without first viewing the glosses. As various attempts to reach the translator failed, the sad decision had to be taken to leave these poems and translations out of the analysis. Hopefully, they can be analysed at a later date when this study has been completed. It was discovered that three of the four poems translated in 1996 were the same as those translated in 1993, one of which contained a translation by Seamus Heaney of a poem by J.C. Bloem called 'Na de bevrijding'. Similarly, two of the poems read by Richard Murphy in 1983 were the same as the previous year. All told, this reduced the range of analysis by a further 508 lines to 4049 in Poetry International and hence to 5512 lines in total. This produced the following readjusted line percentage table:

<b>% of lines in corpus per translator in the range of analysis</b>							
Translator	RH & AVDW	PN	JE	RL	B DEN U	CB & JE	GG
Lines in Meulenhoff: 1463	234	1012	217				
% in Meulenhoff	15.99	69.17	14.83				
Lines in P International: 4049	849	1396	433	319	401	177	477
% in Poetry International	21.0	34.50	10.69	7.75	9.90	4.50	11.60
Total n° of lines in analysis 5512	1083	2408	650	319	401	177	477
Total % in analysis	19.65	43.66	11.80	5.75	7.28	3.21	8.65

**Table 4-vii: percentages of lines per translator in the analysis**

The first analysis led to the identification of the following categories (Sinclair 1991<sup>262</sup>: 35) of shift or sets of features:

- Tree n° 1 – (formal) codes -----
- (1) Linguistic Codes - Form (Level 1)
- (2) - Phrase (adjective)
- (2) - Phrase (noun)
- (2) - Phrase (verb)
- (2) - Clause
- (2) - Clause (adverbials)
- (1) Linguistic Codes (Level 2)
- (2) - Code
- (2) - Elision
- (2) - Explication
- (2) - Idiomatic Choice
- (2) - Implication
- (2) - Indexicality
- (2) - Names, Places, etc. (changed)
- (2) - Names Places, etc. (kept)
- (2) - Possible Mismatch
- (2) - Pragmatic Choice
- (2) - Word Choice
- (2) - Word Order
- (1) Poetic Codes - Form (Level 1)
- (2) - Line Break Difference
- (2) - Line Overflow
- (2) - Rhyme Kept
- (2) - Rhyme Not Kept
- (2) - Some Rhyme: Kept/Not Kept
- (2) - Rhyme: local
- (2) - Sound-various

**Table 4-viii: overview of (code) categories after stage 1 analysis**

While identifying and coding fragments of text for level-1 sets of linguistic features (see tree diagram), certain patterns emerged that were relatively easy to classify under headings discussed extensively in the literature, like ‘**explicitation**’ and ‘**implication**’ (Klaudy in Baker 2000 80-84), for example. Such items and their headings were brought together under Linguistic Codes (level 2), as shown above. Those items that could not be immediately classified under level 2 were kept at level 1 for closer examination. In this case, level 2 implies a level of abstraction or evaluation above that of level 1. This produced a seemingly disparate set of items, as the different headings demonstrate, all of which would require further examination. A preliminary purview of the items brought together under the categories listed above confirms Van Leuven-Zwart’s observations on (defining) these and other categories of shift. In commenting on the categories she derived from Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) and Levý (1969) and those she drew up herself, she states the following:

Although a great many of the shifts could be classified under one of the above-mentioned categories [the general to the specific, the abstract to the concrete, and the objective to the subjective and vice versa. In addition there were shifts that could be characterized as explicitation, implication, amplification, reduction, addition, deletion, intensification and archaization (Van Leuven-Zwart 1989: 153)] I was soon to encounter two major difficulties. In the first place the categories were not clearly defined, so that one particular shift might reasonably be considered specification, explicitation, amplification and intensification all at once. Moreover, the dividing lines between categories such explicitation, amplification and addition on the one hand and implication, reduction and deletion on the other were vague and imprecise. My original classification of shifts turned out to be ambiguous and confusing. (Van Leuven-Zwart 1989: 153)

Given Van Leuven-Zwart’s comments, it seemed that the data fragments I had listed in a given category might have to be shifted to another and vice-versa. Only further analysis could determine what belonged where.

In contrast, the headings used to distinguish sets of poetic features were fairly rudimentary and were drawn up following an examination of the poems and translations in the corpus. Given a desire to remain as general as possible, I did not draw on recognised terms and systems of poetic classification, hence the categories ‘**line break difference**’ and ‘**line overflow**’ for example (see below). The poems were firstly checked for rhyme. Of the 179 (out of a total of 194<sup>263</sup>) poems analysed for this study, 137 were found to have no strict end rhyme – 35 in Meulenhoff and 102 in Poetry International. Though no strict rhyme scheme was detected, some of these poems did rhyme in places. The category ‘**rhyme: local**’ was invented to cover such instances of rhyme. Here too the translations were checked for rhyme at the same level to see whether it had been kept or not. It was observed that where it had not been kept, forms of assonance were often found that compensated for the absence of rhyme. The category ‘**sound – various**’ covers other noticeable poetic features like assonance and alliteration in the line.

Where a rhyme scheme was found, the translations were checked for corresponding rhyme. In such cases, source rhyme schemes were not always complete in each stanza, the poet

sometimes relying on assonance or meter alone in some places. Of the 41 poems with a rhyme scheme, end rhyme was largely kept in 21 cases (4 in Meulenhoff and 17 in Poetry International and not kept in 9 translations (1 in Meulenhoff and 8 in Poetry International). Of the 21 cases with rhyme, the rhyme was almost **'fully kept'** in 9 translations, **'mainly kept'** in 9 others and **'partly kept'** in 3. Therefore, next to the two main (fuzzy) sub-headings, **'rhyme kept'** and **'rhyme not kept'**; **'rhyme kept'** was further extended to include 'fully, mainly and partly kept'. There were 12 poems remaining with **'some end rhyme'**, which was kept in 7 of the translations. The absence of end rhyme in a translation did not mean, however, that no attempt at rhyme had been made, as shall be demonstrated in the next chapter (see Rhyme in chapter 5.2.3. for a discussion of the findings). The following tree diagram provides an overview of rhyme absent and present in the poems in each section of the corpus:

----- Tree n° 2: poems -----

Poems:

- 194 poems in corpus
- 179 poems in range of analysis
- 137 poems **without end rhyme**
  - 35 in Meulenhoff
  - 102 in Poetry International
- 21 poems - **rhyme fully/mainly/partly kept**
  - 4 in Meulenhoff
  - 17 in Poetry International
- 9 poems - **rhyme not kept**
  - 1 in Meulenhoff
  - 8 in Poetry International
- 12 poems - **some end rhyme**
  - 4 in Meulenhoff (2 not kept)
  - 8 in Poetry International (3 not kept)

**Table 4-ix: poems and rhyme in Meulenhoff and Poetry International**

As some translations were observed to be longer or shorter than the originals (see Table 4-ii and 4-iii above), these were listed under the category **'line overflow'**. If a translation was longer or shorter than the original, an attempt was made to detect precisely where in the translation the discrepancy arose or where the lines were pushed 'up' or 'down' as the case may have been. Once detected all these data fragments were saved in separate files in Kwalitan.

The category with the largest number of occurrences within poetic codes was **'line break difference'**. This category was drawn up on observation of differences in line ending between originals and translations. The main question begged by this observation was whether such changes could be explained by differences in (English versus Dutch) syntax alone. The answer proved complex (see **'Line Break Difference'** in chapter 5.2.2. for a discussion of findings from the data).

All the initial codes (and categories) listed under the three headings (**Linguistic Codes – Form (level 1)**; **Linguistic Codes – Form (level 2)** and **Poetic Codes – Form (level 1)**) above were then examined for distribution per poet and translator both in the Meulenhoff and Poetry International sections of the corpus<sup>264</sup>. All data fragments corresponding to each category were then saved for further analysis.

#### 4.2.3.2. Coding the Data: Stage 2 – deeper levels of distinction

The data fragments saved under the various headings in **Tree 1 – (formal) codes** in the Kwalitan project ‘**Translation Analysis**’ were subjected to further analysis in a sub-project called ‘**Data Analysis**’. In this analysis each category found under the three main headings was further examined and coded for deeper-lying features. Not all categories were subject to this further examination and coding, however. Under the heading **Linguistic Codes level 2** for example, the categories ‘**Idiomatcity**’ and ‘**Pragmatics**’ were not further analysed, as it was deemed sufficient to have demonstrated that such forms were used quite extensively (as the frequency of tokens of these codes indicate) in the translations without having to make an inventory of differences within them. It can be stated here that where such structures occur, they match the idiomatic form in the original in striking a similar tone and register in the translation. The findings that fall under ‘**Idiomatic**’ and ‘**Pragmatic Choice**’ will be discussed in more detail below (see ‘**Idiomatic**’ and ‘**Pragmatic choice**’ in chapter 5.1.2. & 3).

The categories or sets of features that were examined in this second analysis revealed an extensive paradigm of formal changes, as the following tree diagram illustrates:

----- Tree n° 3: overview of categories and deeper codes -----

Description:-

Linguistic Codes - Form (Level 1)

%Phrase (adjective)

adj.: generalised (same field)

adj.: complex shift

adj.: other (collocation)

adj.: other (context)

adj.: other (metaphor)

adj.: same (register or length)

adj.: specified (same field)

%Phrase (noun)

noun: collocation

noun: generalised (same field)

noun: complex shift

noun: noun to adjective

noun: noun to prepositional phrase

noun: noun to pronoun

noun: other (collocation)

noun: other (register or length)

noun: phrase to clause

noun: plural to singular  
noun: pre- to postmodifier  
noun: same (register or length)  
noun: singular to plural  
noun: specified (same field)  
noun: system constraint  
noun: target reader

%Phrase (verb)

verb: generalised (same field)  
verb: complex shift  
verb: other (collocation)  
verb: other (metaphor)  
verb: other (register or length)  
verb: register  
verb: specified (same field)  
verb: to verb + noun  
verb: verb to adjective  
verb: verb to adverb  
verb: verb to coordinated verbs  
verb: verb to noun  
verb: verb to preposition  
verb: verb to prepositional phrase  
verb: verb to verb + adverbial  
verb: verb to verb + complement

%Clause

cl: - adverbial  
cl: - object  
cl: + adverbial  
cl: + object  
cl: + verb  
cl: active to passive  
cl: adj. to past participle  
cl: adverb to conjunction  
cl: adverbial  
cl: adverbial to determiner  
cl: adverbial to modifier  
cl: apposite to complex  
cl: aspect  
cl: clause to phrase  
cl: complex to compound  
cl: compound to complex  
cl: compound to simple  
cl: finite to non-finite  
cl: infinitive  
cl: modifier to adverbial  
cl: complex shift



- cl: passive to active + subject
- cl: phrase to clause
- cl: reduced to full clause
- cl: sub to main clause
- cl: subclause
- cl: time shift
- cl: to verbless clause
- cl: non-finite to finite
- cl: verb to noun

%Clause (adverbials)

- cl adv: generalised (same field)
- cl adv: complex shift
- cl adv: other (collocation)
- cl adv: same (register or length)
- cl adv: specified (same field)

Linguistic Codes - Form (Level 2)

%Codeswitching/mixing

- ling-code: register
- ling-code: adj. - german
- ling-code: adj. - obscure
- ling-code: adj. - irish slang
- ling-code: adjective - archaic dutch
- ling-code: conjunction - german
- ling-code: hiberno-english syntax
- ling-code: phrase - irish gaelic
- ling-code: noun - archaic
- ling-code: noun - colloquial dutch
- ling-code: noun - colloquial english
- ling-code: noun - dublin slang
- ling-code: noun - french
- ling-code: noun - scottish gaelic
- ling-code: noun - swedish
- ling-code: preposition - colloquial
- ling-code: relative pronoun - colloquial
- ling-code: verb - archaic
- ling-code: verb - ulster scots

%Elision

- elision: adjective dropped
- elision: adverb dropped
- elision: adjective dropped
- elision: clause dropped
- elision: complex shift
- elision: noun dropped
- elision: verb dropped
- elision: phrase dropped

## %Explicitation

- explicit: + adjective (phrase)
- explicit: + adverbial
- explicit: + noun (phrase)
- explicit: + verb form
- explicit: adjective (phrase)
- explicit: adverbial
- explicit: noun (phrase)
- explicit: verb (phrase)

## %Idiomacity

### %Implication

- implicit: clause
- implicit: noun
- implicit: phrase
- implicit: verb

### Indexicality

- index: hip culture
- index: irish history/society/politics
- index: literature
- index: music

### Names, Places, Etc. (changed)

### Names Places, etc. (Kept)

### %Possible Mismatch

- possible mismatch: adjective
- possible mismatch: clause
- possible mismatch: noun
- possible mismatch: preposition
- possible mismatch: verb

### Pragmatics

### %Word Choice

- word choice: other (collocation)
- word choice: same (register or length)

### %Word Order

- w-o: inversion - assonance
- w-o: inversion - dutch syntax
- w-o: inversion - meter
- w-o: inversion - narrative strategy
- w-o: inversion - rhyme
- w-o: inversion - line length

### Poetic Codes - Form (Level 1)

### %Line Break Difference

- lbd: assonance
- lbd: eye rhyme
- lbd: line length
- lbd: meter

lbd: other  
 lbd: rhyme  
 lbd: syntax  
 lbd: layout - whole poem  
 Line Overflow  
 Rhyme Kept  
 Rhyme Not Kept  
 Rhyme: local  
 Sound-various

**Table 4-x: overview of categories and deeper codes after stage 2 analysis**

It was at this level of analysis that possible explanations for the changes began to present themselves, as is indicated by the tags attached to the codes (see those listed under ‘**Word Order**’ and ‘**Line Break Difference**’ = **lbd**, for example). Once again, at this level some of the phenomena observed were easier to classify than others. The main category struggled with was ‘modulation’. Initially, I had decided to use Vinay and Darbelnet’s definition of ‘**modulation**’:

Modulation is a variation in the form of the message, obtained by a change in the point of view. This change can be justified when, although a literal, or even transposed, translation results in a grammatically correct utterance, it is considered unsuitable, unidiomatic or awkward in the TL. (Vinay & Darbelnet in Venutit 2000: 89)

The example of ‘**modulation**’ they give is:

It is not difficult to show ... Il est facile a démonter ....

In some of the cases in the data, more than modulation was visible or the difference between what Vinay and Darbelnet call transposition (e.g. *expéditeur* -> *from*) and ‘**modulation**’ (*shallow* -> *peu profound*) was not entirely clear in the instances under examination, as Van Leuven-Zwart points out (Van Leuven-Zwart 1989: 153). In this respect, I decided to place all such phenomena under the general heading of ‘**complex shift**’ and examine it as a separate category. This category was of particular interest to me as it covered an area of decision-making in which language ‘system’ and language practice<sup>265</sup> overlapped and were mutually constraining, as can also be gathered from Vinay and Darbelnet’s definition above.

#### **4.2.3.3. Coding the Data: stage 3 – deeper codes per section of corpus, poet and translator**

As mentioned above, possible explanations for all the phenomena observed and listed in Tree n° 3 above were beginning to present themselves, but before these explanations could be explored, the paradigm outlined above had to be tested for distribution and frequency per poet and translator for Meulenhoff and Poetry International alike. To do so the data fragments were copied into a second sub project called Final Data Analysis, even though the program could have carried out this operation in the first sub-project. Nevertheless, as the data had to be ‘filtered’<sup>266</sup> 24 times in all (7 for Meulenhoff and 17 for Poetry International) in order to separate out the codes, their frequencies and their related fragments per poet and translator, it

seemed safer to do so in a separate project. The purpose of this filtering was to discover possible differences regarding the use of particular shifts among the various translators both in the Meulenhoff and Poetry International section of the corpus. The table below provides an overview of the various steps taken in arriving at the instances of codes, frequencies and related data fragments that will be discussed in the rest of this chapter **and the next**:

----- Tree n° 4: overview of complete Translation Analysis Project inc. sub-projects -----

Description: -

- (1) 1: Trans-Analysis1 (Main Project)
- (2) - Meulenhoff (work File)
- (3) . - Poet/Translator (documents)
- (4) . . - Poems + translations (segments)
- (5) . . . - Coded fragments (Level 1 & 2 ling. and poetic categories)
- (2) - Poetry International
- (3) . - Poet/Translator (documents)
- (4) . . - Poems + translations (segments)
- (5) . . . - Coded fragments (Level 1 & 2 ling. and poetic categories)
- (1) **Data Analysis** (sub-Project - a): - Coded Fragments Level 1 & 2
- (2) - Meulenhoff (work File)
- (3) . - Linguistic code categories (level 1) (docs.)
- (4) . . - Per poet/translator (segments)
- (5) . . . - Deeper codes + related excerpts (fragments)
- (3) . - Linguistic code categories (level 2) (docs.)
- (4) . . - Per poet/translator (segments)
- (5) . . . - Deeper Codes + related excerpts (fragments)
- (3) . - Poetic codes (docs.)
- (4) . . - Per poet/translator (segments)
- (5) . . . - Deeper codes + related excerpts (fragments)
- (2) - Poetry International
- (3) . - Linguistic categories (level 1) (docs.)
- (4) . . - Per poet/translator (segments)
- (5) . . . - Deeper codes + related fragments (fragments)
- (3) . - Linguistic categories (level 2) (docs.)
- (4) . . - Deeper codes + related fragments (fragments)
- (3) . - Poetic categories (docs.)
- (4) . . - Deeper codes + related fragments (fragments)
- (1) **Final Data analysis** (sub-Project - b): - Deeper codes + related fragments
- (2) - Meulenhoff Ling. (work File)
- (3) . - Level 1 & 2 categories (docs.)
- (4) . . - Per poet/translator (segments)
- (5) . . . - All deeper codes + related fragments (fragments)
- (2) - Poetry International Ling. (work File)
- (3) . - Level 1 & 2 categories (docs.)
- (4) . . - Per poet/translator (segments)
- (5) . . . - All deeper codes + related fragments (fragments)

- (2) - Poetic (Meulenhoff & Poetry International)
- (3) . - Level 1 poetic categories (docs.)
- (4) . . - Per poet/translator (segments)
- (5) . . . - All deeper codes + related fragments (fragments)

**Table 4•xi: overview of complete Translation Analysis Project: 3 stages of coding**

#### **4.2.4. Categories and Codes: deconstruction and reconstruction**

As was mentioned above, following stage two of the coding process, further patterning suggested itself and was marked up in the tags ‘**generalised**’, ‘**specified**’, etc. attached to the deeper level codes, such as ‘**verb: generalised (same field)**’, for example, field at this level referring to field of use. Given the lengthy paradigm of level 1 shifts (see Table 4-x above), it was thought necessary to review the number and nature of level 1 and 2 linguistic categories with a specific goal in mind: to give a general overview of shift distribution and frequency for Meulenhoff and Poetry International, before moving on to a closer examination of the data. Ostensibly, the task at hand was one of attributing classification terms or headings to items in the corpus, but the main question underlying any such classification was why? Why did the translator carry out this or that particular shift? Was there an explanation visible in the broader context and text? This was also the case for more obvious terms like ‘**explicitation**’, for example. The goal was not to find evidence of ‘explicitation’ as such and hence comment on its place in translations or make generalisations about explicitation *sui generis*, but rather to see:

1. Whether there was a relationship between these phenomena and other contextual constraints;
2. Whether all this might provide an insight into situated translational and genre practices;
3. Whether there were visible differences in tendencies of practice between both sections of corpus.

These questions will be dealt with in detail in the following chapter (see the discussion of ‘explicitation’ in chapter 5.3.3.I. among other things) and summarised in chapter 6.

##### **4.2.4.1. Categories and Codes: a tentative line of demarcation**

To return to the more immediate task of classification, the reason why more general level 1 linguistic headings were not set out in the first place was that it was important to get a detailed picture of the inventory of shifts. Proceeding too quickly to more general levels of classification like ‘explicitation’ for example would have obscured individual solutions to particular problems encountered by the translators in these texts. It emerged, for example, that some deeper level codes were found either in Meulenhoff or in Poetry International only. A desire to fit items into general categories from the outset may have rendered this fact invisible.

Nonetheless, for all the items that had been coded for linguistic significance and for poetic significance, one tentative line of demarcation suggested itself. A distinction could be made between:

a) Whether an item had been kept/not kept in the target poem

And

b) Whether an item had been changed in the target poem.

In the light of the discussion on shifts conducted so far, it seemed logical to place shifts under b). Level 1 and 2 categories of code were also regrouped along these lines. The rationale underlying this decision was as follows. Regarding the linguistic codes, once the following patterns of significance had been identified and subsequent (level 2) headings had been attributed, i.e.

- ◆ idiomatic choice;
- ◆ pragmatic choice;
- ◆ code (switching/mixing);
- ◆ places, names, etc.
- ◆ indexicality;

the main question was whether these patterns of significance had been kept in the target poems or not. Did translator *x* keep a name like ‘O’Connell Street’ for example or a unit of measure like ‘foot’ or not? Did the translator match an idiomatic expression found in the source poem with one in the target poem? This seemed to be very much the case, as a closer examination of the 120 occurrences of idiomatic choice attested in the corpus will show (see chapter 5.1.2. for a discussion of findings from the data).

The same question could be asked for poetic codes. Was the rhyme scheme of poem kept or not? Were line and stanza breaks the same? As has been shown already (see Tables 4-vi and vii above), the answers to these questions were less clear-cut for poetic codes, as the data show attempts at compensation. For example, assonance might have been used in the target poem to compensate for the lack of full end rhyme (see chapter 5.2.3. for a discussion of the findings). Thus, the following poetic categories were also listed under a):

- ◆ Line break difference;
- ◆ Line overflow;
- ◆ Rhyme kept/not kept;
- ◆ Rhyme: local;
- ◆ Sound-various.

All the features listed under these headings were filtered for distribution and frequency. The distinction between linguistic and poetic codes was maintained in the analysis, however.

It is clear, of course, that no absolute distinction can be maintained between ‘changed’ and ‘kept/not kept’, but the distinction was not unwarranted and did provide some leverage and leeway in this investigation. For example, the terms, ‘yard’ and ‘meter’ both belong to systems of measurement but they also index the cultures in which they are used; their being kept or not was significant in this respect. The same reasoning held for all the items listed temporarily under a)-type linguistic features (see chapter 5.3. for a discussion of findings from the data).

Many items listed under b) are more illustrative, though not only and not entirely, of Catford’s shifts in formal correspondence, as class shifts like **‘verb: verb to noun’** or **‘verb: verb**

**to preposition**’ for example, illustrate. In the main, all these items are more obviously illustrative of ‘change’ or ‘shift’. In this respect, the many instances of shift listed under ‘**explicitation**’ and ‘**implication**’ could be re-transposed into shifts of Catfordian formal correspondence. As a result, the following Level 2 categories were regrouped along with the Level 1 categories under b)-type shifts:

- ◆ Explicitation;
- ◆ Implication;
- ◆ Elision;
- ◆ Possible Mismatch;
- ◆ Word choice;
- ◆ Word order;
- ◆ Level 1 categories.

All instances of shift listed under these headings were also filtered for distribution and frequency and filed together for discussion.

#### 4.2.4.2. Categories and Codes: b)-type shifts – an outline of their distribution

All the (linguistic) categories and codes listed under b)-type headings were tested for distribution and frequency of occurrence in the Meulenhoff and Poetry International sections of the corpus. Distribution and frequency of occurrence was also tested in relation to the number of lines in each section of the corpus. The Meulenhoff section subjected to this analysis comprises 1463 lines and the Poetry International section 4049 lines or 26.54% and 73.46% of the 5512 lines under analysis, respectively. The resulting ratio between the two sections of the corpus was 1:0.3613, which was rounded off at 1:0.36. This provided a means of testing the relative frequency of all the codes per line in each section of the corpus.

1. The overall distribution of linguistic shifts listed as b)-type was:
  - ◆ Meulenhoff: 1463 lines / 257 shifts (33.73%) = an average of 1 shift per 5.69 lines;
  - ◆ Poetry International: 4049 lines / 505 shifts (66.27%) = an average of 1 shift per 8.02 lines;
  - ◆ Total: 5512 lines / 762 shifts = an average of 1 shift per 7.23 lines.
2. Out of a total of 762 shifts, 259 (33.98%) occurrences of the same shift types (codes) were distributed in the following way:
  - ◆ Poetry International = 209 (27.43%) / Meulenhoff = 50 (6.56%) (M < 0.36 of PI or a ratio of 1: 0.172);
  - ◆ Meulenhoff: 1463 lines / 50 shifts = 1 shift per 29.26 lines;
  - ◆ Poetry International: 4049 lines / 209 shifts = 1 shift per 19.37 lines;
  - ◆ 52 (6.82%) of these shifts occurred in **Poetry International only**, 25 of which occurred **only once**;
  - ◆ Total: 5512 lines / 259 shifts = an average of 1 shift per 21.28 lines.

It was considered important to show which types of shift were involved but for reasons of space only 20<sup>267</sup> of these shift types have been listed in the following table:

codes	all	M	PI
noun: complex shift	34	8	26
cl: cl to ph	27	5	22
verb: other (collocation)	25	5	20
noun: other (register or length)	22	2	20
noun: specified (same field)	17	4	13
cl: adverbial	11	2	9
elision: adjective dropped	10	2	8
adj.: specified (same field)	9	2	7
word choice: same (register or length)	9	2	7
cl: + adverbial	8	1	7
possible mismatch: noun	6	1	5
adj.: other (metaphor)	5	0	5
explicit: + adjective (phrase)	5	0	5
possible mismatch: verb	5	0	5
w-o: inversion - assonance	5	1	4
w-o: inversion - meter	5	1	4
w-o: inversion - rhyme	5	1	4
word choice: other (collocation)	5	1	4
cl: + object	4	1	3
verb: specified (same field)	4	0	4
subtotal	221	39	182
%	100	17.65	82.35

**Table 4-xi: M < 0.36 of PI: 20 most frequent shifts – 221 (85.33%) of the 259 tokens**

The 38 remaining shifts had a frequency of 2 or less.

Out of a total of 762 shifts, 503 (occurrences of the same shift types (codes) were distributed in the following way:

- ◆ Poetry International = 296 / Meulenhoff = 207 (M > 0.36 of PI or a ratio of 1:0.7).
- ◆ Meulenhoff: 1463 lines / 207 shifts = 1 shift per 7.07 lines.
- ◆ 27 (3.54%) shifts occurred in **Meulenhoff only**, 14 of which occurred **only once**.
- ◆ Poetry International: 4049 lines / 296 shifts = 1 shift per 13.68 lines.
- ◆ Total: 5512 lines / 503 shifts = an average of 1 shift per 10.96 lines.



The following table lists the first 20 of these shift types:

codes	all	M	PI
cl: non-finite to finite	61	21	40
noun: generalised (same field)	60	23	37
cl: complex shift	54	17	37
implicit: clause	32	10	22
noun: same (register or length)	32	15	17
explicit: noun (phrase)	17	8	9
cl: ph to cl	16	6	10
implicit: noun	16	9	7
verb: generalised (same field)	15	4	11
adj.: generalised (same field)	12	5	7
elision: noun dropped	12	4	8
implicit: verb	11	7	4
verb: other (metaphor)	11	4	7
implicit: phrase	10	3	7
verb: verb to verb + adverbial	10	6	4
adj.: other (collocation)	9	5	4
explicit: + noun (phrase)	9	3	6
elision: verb dropped	8	3	5
noun: other (collocation)	8	3	5
explicit: + adverbial	7	3	4
subtotal	410	159	251
%	100	38.78	61.22

**Table 4-xii: M > 0.36 of PI: 20 most frequent shifts – 410 (81.51%) of the 503 tokens**

The remaining 93 tokens of code had a frequency of 6 or less, 23 of which had a frequency of 2 or less.

3. Out of a total of 762 shifts listed as b)-type
  - ♦ 52 (6.82% of all b)-type codes) occurred in Poetry International only, 25 (3.28%) of which occurred once only;
  - ♦ 27 (3.54% of all b)-type codes) occurred in Meulenhoff only, 14 (1.84%) of which occurred once only;

So, a total 39 shifts (5.12% of all b)-type codes) occurred **only once** in the part of the corpus analysed<sup>268</sup>.

As can be seen from the tables above, there is a wide variety both in type and frequency of shifts in both sections of the corpus. This raised the question as to which shifts should be treated in the discussions in the next chapter. It can be safely argued that shifts of higher

frequency form valid indications of certain translations patterns and hence deserve comment. As mentioned earlier however, those shifts that occur only once still form unique solutions to individual translation problems and should not be treated as insignificant. On the whole, the concern here is to maintain the appropriate degree of generalisation in order not to lose sight of how these shifts relate to the text and context in which they were made. In this respect, a degree of generalisation could probably be found for those codes that only occurred once. Only a further analysis of text and context would indicate which, as it is not the intention to posit levels of logical belonging without first examining the textual situations in relation to which these choices were made. It was decided to focus on higher frequency codes in the analysis below, as the emergent regularity of shifts contradicted the common belief that translation solutions increase in proportion to the number of translators involved. An explanation had to be found for this regularity. The most obvious explanation was that the regularity was dictated by constraints of Dutch syntax. It remained to be seen whether this was the case or not.

In more general terms however, given the relatively higher frequency of b)-type shifts in the Meulenhoff section of the corpus, it can be asserted that the factor time played an important role in this respect. Poetry International translations were often carried out on an ad hoc basis in the past, even though this is no longer the case today. Given the findings, the hypothesis in this case is: the more time given to translate, the higher the potential frequency of b)-level shifts. This seems to be in keeping with the findings from the interview data (see the discussion in chapter 2.4.3. on translation as a material process). All those interviewed pointed to the importance of the source poem becoming a poem in its own right in the target language/culture. This requires time for revision, in order to filter out 'translationese' for example, which is not at all the same as obliterating the 'foreignness' of the source poem. As the interview data shows, the original still forms the yardstick against which the new poem is measured. It is not only a matter of seeking equivalence but also of providing a matching performance (Chesterman & Arrojo 2000) in the target text, i.e. a new poem. By that stage in the translation process (see in particular the discussion in chapter 2.4.3.1.) the text has already become grounded in the genre expectations the target text it belongs to. It seems plausible, therefore, to expect more shifts, given the evidence issuing from this analysis and given the relatively longer time span given to those who translated for Meulenhoff.

It was discovered, however, that this did not hold for four poems in the Meulenhoff section: four translations of poems by Paul Durcan proved practically identical to those found in the Poetry International section, except for two words and line break differences. Nevertheless, those who worked for Poetry International years ago (the same translators in both cases) pointed to the shorter time span given for translation as being a drawback, which is not to say that it lessened their effort in any way. It is simply accepted as given among those interviewed that time is needed to translate poetry. The assertion made here with regard to time is not based on the complete picture, of course, as the other categories of shift have to be

examined before reaching a more rounded conclusion on the matter (see the opening discussion of chapter 6 for a conclusion on the matter).

#### **4.2.4.3. Categories and Codes: a)-type linguistic and poetic features**<sup>269</sup>

All the linguistic and poetic codes listed as a)-type were also tested for distribution and frequency of occurrence in the Meulenhoff and Poetry International sections of the corpus. The ratio of 1:0.36 was also used in this case to discover their relative frequencies<sup>270</sup> with respect to the number of lines in each section of the corpus<sup>271</sup>. In contrast to b)-type features, the findings with regard to a)-type linguistic and poetic features will be discussed separately for each feature at the beginning of the next chapter, along with extracts from the corpus data relating to these features.

On the whole, the corpus set out above will be analysed and discussed in detail in the next chapter. In discussing each of the points concerned, the following overall approach will be used. Firstly, statistical findings will be provided for each key translational feature. Secondly, examples of the most frequent key features will be discussed at length. This involves examining and contrasting fragments of source and target poems, with a view to discovering the contextual constraints at play in the translational decisions involved. Thirdly, the implications of these decisions will be examined against the backdrop of key quotes from the interview data. Fourthly, certain conclusions will be drawn following on the findings from the data. These conclusions will be examined in the light of types of translational decision set out in the translations studies literature, particularly traditional binary models of translational decision, like 'obligatory' and 'optional' shift, for example.



## 5. ANALYSING THE CORPUS DATA

As was mentioned at the end of the previous section, this chapter comprises the actual analysis of the salient poetic and linguistic features found in the corpus. The ensuing discussion proceeds systematically from a)-type linguistic to a)-type poetic and finally to b)-type linguistic features. The reader will notice that the disparateness of the codes and categories has been largely maintained throughout the discussion that follows. Only when the discussion has been completed will the categories and codes be re-examined for their appropriateness, etc. It must be remembered that these codes and categories were posited not only in response to existing terms and concepts in the literature but also in relation to the phenomena observed in the data. The issues arising from this will be discussed in chapter 5.4, but also in chapter 6.2, the final chapter of this study.

### 5.1. Analysing the Data: a)-type linguistic features

A number of findings from the data listed under a)-type linguistic features (see table below) will be discussed in sections 5.1 to 5 and some general conclusions on these features will be reached in 5.1.6. The categories grouped together under a)-type linguistic features were found to be more closely related to each other than initially thought when drawing the tentative line of demarcation between a) and b)-type features above. Though the distinction ‘kept/not kept’ could be maintained in most cases for a)-type features, an examination of what exactly was being kept or not kept revealed some interesting choices made by the translators and some clear sites of culture in the process.

code	frequency	PI - kept	PI - not kept	M - kept	M - not kept	ratio
Ling-Code	33	21	7	1	4	M < 0.36 of PI
Idiomatic choice	120	93		27		M < 0.36 of PI
Index	26	12	10	3	1	M < 0.36 of PI
Pragmatic choice	14	9		5		M > 0.36 of PI
Names & Places, etc.	38	7	8	18	5	M > 0.36 of PI
total	233	142	25	56	10	M > 0.36 of PI

**Table 5-i: frequency and distribution of a)-type linguistic features in Meulenhoff & Poetry International**

The figures in this table cannot be dealt with in the same way as those in the b)-type shift table. The table here is designed to provide information on the frequency of salient a)-type linguistic items. However, it would be difficult to assert that the translators used less idiomatic language in Meulenhoff than in Poetry International for example, as this is directly dependant on the idiomatic language found in the source texts. In designing the corpus, no attempt was made at balancing the number of poems in each section that might contain idiomatic usage. The same goes for the other items in the table above. What the table does indicate is that these items were largely maintained in the target texts. Without exception, the features in the table are all linked to the local or broader cultural context of both source and target texts in some way, the most obvious being (place) names and units of measure.

### 5.1.1. Names and Places

As the names of persons mentioned in the poems in this corpus were invariably kept in translation, they were not coded or included in this list<sup>272</sup>. Biblical names, where encountered, were rendered in the Dutch spelling. On the whole, names of places were kept whereas units of measure (and one or two food items) were transposed to those of the target culture. Nonetheless, as far as place names were concerned some interesting combinations of source and target orthography emerged, as the following examples indicate:

- ◆ (poems - meulenhoff) - 1 (mpaul durcan) - 4  
 In the **Holy Faith Convent** I stab a girl in the back;      In het **Holy Faith-klooster** steek ik een meisje in de rug;  
 In the **Christian Brothers School** I slap a boy in the face;      In de **Christian Brothers School** mep ik een jongen op de wang;
  
- ◆ (poems - meulenhoff) - 2 (mseamus heaney) - 4  
 Lazarus, the Pharaoh, Solomon      Lazarus, de Farao, Salomo  
 and David and Goliath rolled      en David en Goliath rolden
  
- ◆ (poems - meulenhoff) - 4 (mjohn montague) – 1  
 'To hell with **King Billy**'      We dansten om hem heen en schreeuwden 'Naar de hel met **koning Billy**',
  
- ◆ (poems - meulenhoff) - 5 (mpaul muldoon) – 1  
**Mrs de Groot**      Negen uur. Ik kan **Mrs de Groot** nog steeds horen
  
- ◆ (poems - meulenhoff) - 5 (mpaul muldoon) - 3  
 to **Crewe junction**,      Naar **Wigan**, naar **Crewe Junction**,
  
- ◆ (poems - meulenhoff) - 5 (mpaul muldoon) - 5  
**Andrews Liver Salts**,      spek en eieren verkocht,  
 and, until now, clove-rock.      **Andrews' zuiveringszout**



- ◆ 2 (poetry international) - 4 (desmond o'grady) - 4  
When all's said and done, Als je het goed bekijkt,
- ◆ 2 (poetry international) - 5 (richard murphy) - 3  
"If words were bank-notes, he would filch a wad;" "Als woorden bankbiljetten waren, gapte hij een rol;"
- ◆ 2 (poetry international) - 10 (paul durcan) - 2  
But though the land is going to pieces Maar al gaat het land naar de donder
- ◆ 2 (poetry international) - 12 (paul muldoon) - 2  
Come Into My Parlour KNIBBEL, KNABBEL, KNUISJE
- ◆ 2 (poetry international) - 15 (ciaran carson) - 2  
I know this place like the back of my En ik begin te kalmeren: Ik ken deze buurt op mijn duimpje,  
hand, except alleen is mijn hand

**Extract 5-2: selection of data fragments from idiomatic choice**

Many of the extracts listed here belong within a frame of imagined conversation or form representations of interaction in some way or other (ranging from narrative as in Paul Durcan's poem 'The Kilfenora Teaboy' to long conversational exchanges, as in Seamus Heaney's 'Station Island'). These passages form ideal sites for idiomatic language<sup>274</sup> use and as can be seen from the few translated excerpts above, the translators supplied register and genre-specific expressions to fit these situational exchanges. Register is understood here as:

[A] linguistic repertoire that is associated, culture internally, with particular social practices.

The use of register conveys to a member of the culture that some typifiable social practice is linked indexically to the current occasion of language use, as part of its context. (Agha in Duranti 2001<sup>275</sup>: 212)

Though imagined, the idiomatic language within the narratives and conversations represented in these poems was recognised as such by the translators, as the translations above indicate. Idiomaticity<sup>276</sup> also arose as a topic in the interview data:

Reply B2 (sub1)

RW.

Je kunt eens dus wel een equivalent brengen, maar zelfs als je iets, een equivalent brengt dan is dat iets anders dan wat de oorspronkelijke dichter heeft gezegd (ja) en sommige zaken kon je dus gewoon niet letterlijk vertalen moet je dus ofwel bepaalde beelden of zo of bepaalde uitdrukkingen moet in je eigen taal en andere uitdrukkingen zien te vinden die dezelfde gevoelswaarde heeft. (1.2/b2 (sub1))

Reply B2

VDK: Ja, ja neen neen dat mag je nooit zien dat het om een vertaling gaat dus em.

Men moet proberen van Nederlands te schrijven maar ...als je soms idiomatisch Engels moet je gewoon door idiomatisch Nederlands vertalen. (1.6/b2)

**Extract 5-3: selection from interview data on idiomaticity**



Some of the translation extracts above are less obviously idiomatic, however. The title of Paul Muldoon's poem, 'Come into my parlour' was translated as 'Knibbel, Knabbel, Knuisje,' for example. At first sight, the choice seemed obtuse, but in terms of genre perceptions it is not at all wide of the mark. Broadly speaking, both titles belong within the framework of story telling: the former from 'The Spider and the Fly' (a story in poetic form) and the latter 'Hansel and Gretel' (tale). The Dutch idiom in the title may well trigger a similar reaction to the English title; both poem titles index threat or the imminent danger of being eaten alive (they also index the storyteller's accompanying high-pitched cackle and cringing gestures, all expected by the listeners during the telling). This could be termed functional, denotative or dynamic equivalence depending on the framework (Kenny in Baker 2000: 77), but it is, nevertheless, through the idiomatic that the functional, etc. is achieved. The point here is not that the idiomatic expression 'originated' in the source poem – in this case it certainly did not – and was rendered dynamically in the target text, but

1. that it was recognised by the translator in the first place and
2. that in translating, he demonstrated an awareness that touches on idiom, genre, register and intertextuality all at the same time (see also the discussion of Index in 5.1.5 below).

The result, therefore, is 'nicely out of tune' but certainly still in key with the original<sup>277</sup>. As the example above illustrates, the choice made is not immediately obvious and probably also involved the reflection that the target audience may not have known Mary Howitt's<sup>278</sup> poem, 'The Spider and the Fly'. Nonetheless, on investigation the translator's choice does prove plausible and quite insightful. Consequently, it is argued that the choices listed as idiomatic and those made elsewhere are not informed by contextual clause or phrase level items alone but by the relevant register required and the genre within which these items are perceived to belong. This is in keeping with Bauman's view on genre:

More specifically, a genre is a speech style oriented to the production and reception of a particular kind of text. When an utterance is assimilated to a given genre, the process by which it is produced and interpreted is mediated through its intertextual relationship with prior texts. The invocation of a generic (i.e. genre-specific) framing device such as 'Once upon a time' carries with it a set of expectations concerning the further unfolding of the discourse, indexing other texts initiated by this opening formula. (Bauman in Duranti 2001: 79)

However, as the example examined above demonstrates, the translational result is asymmetrical in that it is hard to retrace if one follows the logical development found in functional models of analysis (proceeding from microlevel changes to macrolevel effects as suggested by Van Leuven-Zwart, for example) and can perhaps best be understood as a particular type of translational performance within a given generic framework. If indeed genre forms a point of departure in practice for translational decisions, then distinctions made between formal and dynamic equivalence would no longer hold, as Tymoczko points out (Tymoczko 1999: 57) nor can they be considered as (diametrically opposite) independent categories of approach or translation strategy. At best they can be seen as related stages in a

translation process – as has been argued in chapter 2.4.3.1. In this respect, the basic distinction made by Tymoczko in analysing translations of the old Irish epic, *Táin Bó Cúailnge*, can also be understood in terms of varying translational practices related to or within a given genre:

... This is why the initial translations of unfamiliar texts are so often either popular or scholarly: the former are usually severely limited in their transfer intent and minimally representative of the metonymic aspects of the source text, while the latter allow a good deal of metatranslation to proceed, presenting quantities of information through such vehicles as instructions, footnotes, appendices, parallel texts, and so forth. In a scholarly translation the text is embedded in a shell of paratextual devices that serve to explain many of the metonymies of the source text ... In the case of popular translation, by contrast, the translator typically focuses on selected salient aspects of the literary text which are made accessible to a broad segment of the target audience. (Tymoczko 1999: 48-49)

It is not the intention here to mitigate scholarly translation in any way, but simply to point to how it has its own set of generic conventions and perceptions of what translation consists in. Similarly, it is the intention to continue to see and to understand the work of translators as part of a general theory of translation as practice. The analysis of the translational corpus has so far identified patterns of regularity in translational action. Such regularity lifts the work of translators out of the domain of anecdote and away from such sweeping generalisations as “all translators translate differently”. The interview data revealed how translators work with perceptions of genre and their language use appropriate to that genre. The corpus data provides textual evidence of these perceptions, the items listed under idiomatic choice being instances in which perceptions of genre and register are salient.

### 5.1.3. Pragmatic Choice

Pragmatic choice was selected as a category to cover smaller salient aspects of represented interaction discovered in the poems and their translations. The selection below illustrates some of the choices made by the translators (items in bold face):

- ♦ 1 (poems - meulenhoff) - 1 (mpaul durcan) - 3

Would you like a whiskey? **Good:**

Wil je een whiskey? **Prima:**

- ♦ 1 (poems - meulenhoff) - 1 (mpaul durcan) – 3

**Well** - may that propeller I left in Bilbao -

**Nou** – m

- ♦ 1 (poems - meulenhoff) - 1 (mpaul durcan) – 6

I said to her: Would you like to go to a film?

Ik zag dat ze een vreemde was met groene ogen.

She said: I would love to go to a film.

Ik zei tegen haar: Heb je zin om naar een film te gaan?

In the back seats of the cinema,

Ze zei: **En of ik zin heb in een film.**

- ♦ 1 (poems - meulenhoff) - 6 (mrichard murphy) – 4

- 'Let us in!' - and half-naked

takken van mijn hoofd - 'Doe open! Doe open!' –

- ♦ 2 (poetry international) - 4 (desmond o'grady) – 6  
**Good night,** **Welterusten**  
 darling ..." lieveling ...'
  
- ♦ 2 (poetry international) - 5 (richard murphy) – 2  
**"Give me that!"** "What for?" **'Geef hier!' 'Waarvoor?'**
  
- ♦ 2 (poetry international) - 8 (aseamus heaney) – 1  
 All the time they were shouting. **"Shop!"** Heel de tijd schreeuwden ze: **"Volk!"**  
**Shop!"** so I pulled on my shoes and a sportscoat **Volk!"** dus trok ik mijn schoenen en een jasje aan
  
- ♦ 2 (poetry international) - 10 (paul durcan) – 1  
**"But, blast it,** I won't; let's have a row:" **"Maar barst,** ik doe het niet; ik wil liever mot:"
  
- ♦ 2 (poetry international) - 14 (dseamus heaney) – 1  
**'Hold on,'** she said, 'I'll just run out and get him. **'Momentje',** zei ze,
  
- ♦ 2 (poetry international) - 17 (brendan kennelly) – 9  
**Well,** nearly always, anyway. **Nou ja,**

#### Extract 5-4: selection of data fragments from pragmatic choice

It is clear from the data extracts provided that the choices made by the translators were informed by corresponding pragmatic<sup>279</sup> forms in imagined repertoires of interaction in the target language and that the translators made ample use of such repertoires at their disposal in doing so. The instances require little comment as they mainly speak for themselves in showing how the translators evaluated the pragmatic weight of the items concerned and rendered them accordingly in the target poems.

#### 5.1.4. Ling-codes

The two remaining a)-type linguistic categories in the list are closely related to idiomatic choice to the extent that they ground the poems to a large extent in the culture of their origin. In this respect, 'ling-code' lists items related to code-switching and mixing that draw on Irish and Scottish Gaelic, Hiberno-English, Ulster Scots and (local) non-standard English, as the items underlined in following extracts illustrate:

- ♦ (poems - meulenhoff) - 2 (mseamus heaney) - 4  
'I was dandering by kon hij dan zeggen, 'ik kwam toevallig voorbij  
 and says I, I might as well call.' en zeg ik, waarom wip ik niet eens aan?' (**Ulster Scots**)
  
- ♦ (poems - meulenhoff) - 7 (mmatthew sweeney) – 7  
 braked on the brae to ask me remde op de steile oever een vrachtwagen (**Scottish Gaelic**)

- ♦ (poetry international) - 1 (john montague) – 2  
A Special Force of  
Angels we'd need  
to put manners on us. We missen een Speciale  
Engelenbrigade  
om ons fatsoen te lere (**Hiberno English**)
  
- ♦ (poetry international) - 1 (john montague) – 2  
anocht is uaigneach droef is Ierland (**Irish Gaelic**)
  
- ♦ (poetry international) - 8 (aseamus heaney) – 1  
and the shock  
  
is still in me at what I saw. His brow  
keerde ik mij om naar zijn gelaat en de schok  
om wat ik zag ben ik nog niet te boven. (**Hiberno-English**)
  
- ♦ 2 (poetry international) - 12 (paul muldoon) – 2  
Them, and the best of good timber  
Are come into the kingdom.' Die, en het beste van het beste hout  
Bennen in het koninkrijk gekomen.' (**Non-standard English**)
  
- ♦ (poetry international) - 17 (brendan kennelly) – 5  
Is all the  
dirt what's left of flowers and  
people, all the dirt there in a  
gebeurt er met al het stof? Is al het  
stof wat overblijft van bloemen en  
mensen (**Non-standard English**)

**Extract 5-5: selection of data fragments from ling-code**

It is hard in fact to avoid seeing indications of culture in such items, including the positions adopted by the poets with respect to that culture. For example, John Montague and Tom Paulin use German words to index and hence criticise perceived 'Nazi' practices by sectarian groups involved in the conflict in Northern Ireland:

- (poetry international) - 1 (john montague) – 2  
spiked clubs  
Law und Order's  
middeleeuws gepantser  
Recht en Orde
  
- (poetry international) - 7 (tom paulin) – 1  
That fremd evening  
Die vreemde avond

**Extract 5-6: selection of data fragments from ling-code**

It must be stated here that all the examples shown above have in fact been translated into Dutch, which means that they were understood by the translators. But these examples also show the difficulty involved in rendering such code-switching or mixing in translation, precisely because of the situated nature of such items and the indexical meanings that go along with them. In the case of 'fremd' and 'und' for example, translating the words means losing their indexical meaning as 'German' words in an English text. Should these words have not been left as they were? This is a paradox with which the translator must sometimes grapple, a

point where to translate is not to translate. In another instance for example, we noted an attempt at eye dialect in the Dutch “Die, en het beste van het beste hout / Bennen in het koninkrijk gekomen”, which indicates that the translators were aware of the non-standard use in the source line. Transposing such phenomena in the target text involves making informed choices that are based on knowledge of the sociolinguistic politics of both language communities – a difficult task at the best of times. The issue discussed here arose on a number of occasions during the interviews, as the following extract indicates<sup>280</sup>:

Reply A3 (sub1)

NP: ... omdat er uitdrukkingen bestaan die teruggaan tot ja tot eh het misschien wel letterlijke vertalingen uit het Gaelic zelfs zoals "I'm after doing this" (Ja, "I'm after doing" ja dat is letterlijk uit het Iers) dat is letterlijk uit het Iers (ja, ja ja, ja inderdaad) (laughs) en dat soort dingen moet je wel herkennen, en moet je proberen door, door niet door iets te veel gek van te maken maar door een bepaalde toon of, of, of, of volgorde van woorden toch, toch neer te zetten waardoor het net iets anders wordt (ah ha) maar het gaat mij te ver zoals sommige vertalers gedaan hebben om daar een soort Vlaams van te maken om zo aan te geven eh ja ... (I.3/a3 (sub1))

#### Extract 5-7: interview data on code switching and mixing

There is no easy solution to the problem of how to translate (evidence of) code-switching and mixing in a source text and more often than not the translator has no choice but to translate as can be seen from the data fragments above and, to repeat what was said above, the fact that they translated them means that they noticed them.

### 5.1.5. Index

The data coded under Index was also perceived as grounding the poems in their broader social, historical and cultural context. The term was used to cover items of a more indexical or intertextual order (Silverstein 1992). It can be argued that the other categories of a)-type linguistic feature are also strongly indexical. Names and places, idiomatic and pragmatic choice and ling codes all trigger or point at context in some way. Names and places index culture and orders of social relations. Ling codes, idiomatic and pragmatic choices also function as intertextual cues. The items brought together under index could be listed safely under the other four headings, hence the separate category Index. The list of items it contains is not exhaustive however, as only those items that were considered potentially problematic were included in the list<sup>281</sup>. Following coding and on closer examination and reflection, the problems perceived were not translation problems in the strict sense of the term. The initial question in setting up this code category was whether the translators would manage to tackle the intertextual referencing and indexical meaning involved. But in retrospect, the reasoning informing the category seemed more a demonstration of this writer's vanity and his willingness to display knowledge of local readings of these poems. As can be seen from the selection of fragments below, the translators did not elide any of the items involved (in fact, elision proved to be infrequent in the corpus: see the discussion of Elision in 5.3.3.3. below).



Shakespeare's *King Lear*, perhaps wonder about the strange spelling and leave the matter at that. A target reader might see some allusion to the trope of 'peasant ignorance' in Desmond O'Grady's line "imagining me stuck with pikes / ik iets met hooivorken van doen had" and not discover that 'pikes' are emblematic of a rebellion that took place in Ireland in 1798. But he or she would certainly be able to conclude that the poem has something to do with rebellion, nonetheless. An English-speaking reader, on perusing Paul Durcan's line, "They come no more for to be with me / Komen ze niet langer om bij mij te zijn", may see in it an instance of non-standard English or an allusion to the older language of the ballad form visible in "for to be". Ostensibly, the line has been correctly translated (a literal back translation "om te zijn" would produce "for to be") but the Dutch line does not trigger the same sociolinguistic or intertextual cue as "for to be" does. It is difficult, however, to speak of 'failure' on the part of the translator in this instance. A perusal of the few samples listed above shows a clear attempt on the part of the translators to maintain these 'foreign' items in the target text. But the instances investigated throw up another interesting paradox: though the onus is on the translator to maintain the foreign and cultural 'other' (Venuti in Baker 2000: 242) as much as possible in the target text (an opinion expressed by all those interviewed and also enjoying a long tradition of adhesion in translation literature since Schleiermacher), it can be wondered how comprehensive native readings of the source poems really are.

This opens the door to a discussion on 'intentionality' (Hatim & Mason 1990). This is a complex matter which in this case includes, among other things:

- ◆ the intention of the author/poet;
- ◆ the intention of the translator/commissioner;
- ◆ expert/scholarly views on the intention of the source text and its cultural groundings;
- ◆ along with the richness of cultural referencing in source poems ranging from
  1. the 'authorial fallacy' of the New Critics to;
  2. situated readings of cultural artefacts found in Silverstein & Urban (1996);
- ◆ readers' opinions and reading practices.

All of this can be considered to belong to the domain of ethnographic inquiry into reading (translations). If the fixed meaning of texts has been challenged in the broader literature of language study, surely approaches to textual analysis must be expressed in terms of plausible readings in given contexts rather than a given reading against which other readings would be weighed. This also holds for translation. As translation involves reading, we can only study reading(s) in context and not an ultimate reading against which the other readings might be contrasted and found lacking. The ethnographic study discussed in chapters 2 and 3 provides some insight into reading practices among translators (see in particular chapter 3.3.1.4. *Skin to Skin: Orders of Readership*), but that is only part of the picture. However, this should prove sufficient for the purposes of this study. On the whole the translators remained pertinently aware of the 'foreign' in these poems and kept these items where possible. Recommendations for the use of foreignising strategies found in the translation literature, no matter how laudable, need to be more fully attested, therefore, as the evidence found in this corpus seems

to corroborate a concern for the foreign. This is at variance with the deplorable state of affairs set out by Venuti in his *Scandals of Translation*<sup>284</sup> (Venuti 1998), though it is not the intention here to gainsay his findings.

The items listed under Index in this study, despite their indexical and intertextual referencing, also belong to the texts they are part of and thus cannot be considered as wholly independent categories of meaning. In the final analysis they must be related to the other categories of salience found in the corpus.

### 5.1.6. a)-type Linguistic Features: some tentative conclusions

As far as a)-type linguistic features are concerned, it can be stated here that their identification has allowed us to test and attest aspects of re-contextualisation and hence focus on broader socio-cultural issues. The data shows that the translators in both sections of the corpus have largely maintained a)-type linguistic items in the target texts. This allows us to conclude the following:

1. The keeping of names, indexes and source codeswitches demonstrates an overall concern among the translators to foreground the source culture of the poems;
2. Matching idiomatic and conversational usage demonstrates a concern among the translators to ground their translations in the target culture.

Hence the strategies thrown up by this analysis of the data are both foreignising and domesticating at the same time.

## 5.2. Analysing the Data: a)-type poetic features

In what follows, an outline will be given of findings gleaned from the data listed under a)-type poetic features, i.e. **'line overflow'**, **'line break difference'**, **'rhyme'**, **'rhyme: local'** and **'sound: various'**. The table below indicates the frequency of each feature and the ratio of occurrence per line in Meulenhoff and Poetry International. Given the ratios, it can be stated that **'line break differences'** are slightly more frequent in Poetry International and that **'rhyme'** was either kept or dropped to an equal extent in both sections of the corpus. No comment can be made on the other three items as their frequency directly depended on corresponding occurrences in the source poems. **'Line overflow'** belongs within **'line break difference'** but was kept as a separate category because it allowed us to group target poems that were clearly longer or shorter on the page than the source poems.



code	frequency	PI - kept	PI - not kept	M - kept	M - not kept	ratio
Line break difference	124	95		29		M < 0.36 of PI
Line overflow	13	9		4		M > 0.36 of PI
Rhyme	42	22	11	6	3	M = 0.36 of PI
Rhyme: local	23	15		8		M > 0.36 of PI
Sound: various	28	19		9		M > 0.36 of PI
Total	230	160	11	56	3	M < 0.36 of PI

**Table 5-ii: frequency and distribution of a)-type poetic codes in Meulenhoff and Poetry International**

### 5.2.1. Line Overflow

The first instance of line overflow provided here stems ostensibly from limitations imposed by page space. The poems in the monolingual edition, *Het Dwingende Verleden*<sup>285</sup>, were placed two by two on a page, which meant that some target lines had to be made shorter than the source lines as the following excerpt from Paul Durcan's 'At the Funeral of the Wedding' and its translation illustrates:

1. Location: 1 (poems - meulenhoff) - 1 (mpaul durcan) - 6

Its beetroot quality.

As I gazed at my wife

I wondered who on earth she was -

I said to her: Would you like to go to a film?

She said: I would love to go to a film.

In the back seats of the cinema,

As we slid up and down in our seats

In a frenzy of hooks and clasps,

The manager courteously asked us not to take off our clothes. In een razernij van haakjes en gespjes,

We walked off urgently through the rain-strewn streets  
Into a leaf-sodden cul-de-sac

And as, from the tropic isle of our bed,

Chock-a-block with sighs & cries,

We threw our funeral garments on the floor,

We could hear laughter outside the door.

There is no noise children love more to hear

Than the noise of their parents making love:

O my darling, who on earth are you?

ondernemer,

Hoe bietroot die niet was.

Terwijl ik mijn vrouw aanstaarde

Ik zag dat ze een vreemde was met groene ogen.

Ik zei tegen haar: Heb je zin om naar een film te gaan?

Ze zei: En of ik zin heb in een film.

Op de achterste rij van de bioscoop,

Terwijl we op en neer gleden in onze stoelen

Vroeg de bedrijfsleider ons beleefd ons niet uit te kleden.

Ongeduldig liepen we weg door de verregende straten

Een doodlopende steeg in bezaaid met natte bladeren

En terwijl wij van het tropische eiland van ons bed

Tjokvol zuchten en giljetjes,

Onze rouwkleren op de grond gooiden,

Hoorden we gelach vanachter de deur.

Er is geen geluid dat kinderen liever horen  
Dan het geluid van hun ouders in bed:  
O mijn lieveling, wie ben je in godsnaam?

**Extract 5-9: data fragment from line overflow**

It must be noted that the layout of the translations on the page was always kept in the electronic corpus. In this instance the ‘eye rhyme’ is achieved by placing the words “kleden”, “straten” and “bladeren” under each other in line initial position. This is considered salient as there is no rhyme scheme in the original, even though the odd line does rhyme. My suggestion is that such observable phenomena form part of a repertoire of generic and translational practices (see in particular Rhyme and Rhyme: local in chapter 5.2.3. and 4. below but also chapter 5.3.1.1. and 5.3.3.6., among other sections for illustrations of such practices). The following two extracts provide illustrations of the translator’s concern with rhyme and meter resulting in the ‘**line overflow**’ in these instances:

1. Location: 1 (poems - meulenhoff) - 2 (mseamus heaney) - 2

But pass through, though always skirting landfall.  
At dusk, horizons drink down sea and hill,  
The ploughed field swallows the whitewashed gable  
And you're in the dark again. Now recall

Maar blijf je op doorreis, steeds op de rand  
Van in zicht komend land. De horizonnen  
In de schemer drinken heuvels, zee en strand,  
Het witsel van de gevel wordt verslonden

The glazed foreshore and silhouetted log,  
That rock where breakers shredded into rags,  
The leggy birds stilted on their own legs,  
Islands riding themselves out into the fog

Door het geploegde veld, zodat de nacht  
Je weer heeft ingehaald. Herinner je nu  
Het glazig wad, het silhouet van een stronk,  
Die rots waarop de golven van de branding

And drive back home, still with nothing to say  
Except that now you will uncode all landscapes  
By this: things founded clean on their own shapes,  
Water and ground in their extremity.

Zich keer op keer aan flarden scheurden,  
Vogels hoog boven de stelten van hun poten,  
Eilanden die de mist trotseerden-  
En rijd dan terug naar huis, nog steeds met niets

Te zeggen, al daagt van nu af het besef  
Dat je elk landschap kunt ontcijferen:  
Dingen puur door hun eigen vorm  
gegrondvest,]  
Water en grond in hun uitersten

2. location: 2 (poetry international) - 16 (matthew sweeney) - 11

And I want my favourite Thai chef  
flown there, a day before,  
and brought to the local fishermen  
so he can serve a chilli feast  
before we head off up the hill.

En ik wil dat mijn favoriete Thaise kok  
naar de vissers daar wordt gevlogen,  
een dag ervoor, zodat hij een feestmaal  
kan serveren voor we de heuvel beklimmen.

**Extract 5-10: data fragments from line overflow**

In the translation of Heaney's poem 'Peninsula', the translator has allowed the lines to run on and form an extra stanza in an attempt to maintain a rhyme scheme and also maintain the meter set up in the translation as it emerged. The scheme in the original is approximately *abba* whereas in the translation *abab* has been attempted in places (stanzas 1 and 4 in this excerpt). Note too the chiming of *f*'s and *s*'s in "besef" "ontcijferen", "gegrondvest" and "uitersten", which compensates for the lack of full rhyme in the last stanza. Seen in this context, the word "besef" (realisation/awareness) makes sense, even though the word itself is nowhere to be found in the original. The addition of "besef" could be considered an example of explicitation-by-addition but one can ask whether this was done only because the translator feared that the reader might not understand the reference. The explicitation here was bound up with the 'internal logic' of rhyme and meter in the emerging translation and cannot be explained only in terms of fear of a loss of meaning.

The translation of the extract from Matthew Sweeney's 'An End' is a line shorter than the original for reasons of target text meter, it is argued here. In the translation, the chef is flown straight to the fishermen, which tightens up the cadence in the Dutch poem. In terms of shift, we have an instance of a coordinated verb phrase in the passive subclause being reduced to a single verb phrase, with the elision of "and brought to the local". The translator could have included "brought" and hence been complete. But one can observe the translator's concern to remain close to the ellipted syntax and succinctness of the original "(to be) flown .../...so (that) he can..." **without** burdening the meter. Moreover, "local" is still visible in the adverb in "de vissers daar" and it is also quite plausible in Dutch to have the Thai chef flown straight to the fishermen. One wonders about the absence of "chilli" in the translation, however. Was it dropped for reasons of meter too? Though "chillifeest" is perfectly possible in Dutch, "chillifeestmaal" might have sounded laborious perhaps.

However, it is not the intention to offer a definitive opinion on the whys and wherefores of the decision to drop "chilli" or "and brought to the local", but to state instead that the choices were informed and that plausible explanations can be offered for the changes observed, in these cases a desire to set up and maintain target rhyme or meter (along with succinctness of expression). The latter two extracts were intended as initial illustrations of the translator's concern with meter and rhyme but at the same time they also show how such concerns are inextricable from decisions regarding word choice and syntax in the translation. This echoes Jakobson's observation on the projection of the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection into the axis of combination: "Equivalence is promoted to the constitutive device of the sequence," (Jakobson 1981: 27).

Consequently, it can be observed in some respects and at some remove that the work facing the translator of poetry is very similar to that of the poet:

Translation is a matter of choice, but choice is always motivated: omissions, additions and alterations may indeed be justified but only in relation to intended meaning. Even within the eighteenth-century canon of translation-as-imitation, departures from the original text were not indiscriminate. (Hatim & Mason 1990: 12)

At this point the following question can be asked: what falls under the heading of intended meaning in a poem? In the three fragments of translation discussed here, it would seem that the intended meaning of the target texts is not that far removed from that of the source texts and the omissions (“and brought to the local”, “chilli”), additions (“het besef”) and alterations (“kleden”, “straten” and “bladeren”, each on a new line) seem explainable in the context. But in these few extracts there is also evidence to suggest that form and meaning coalesce and that decisions regarding style cannot be disassociated from those taken on syntax and word choice, that sound patterning has ‘meaning’ too. This does nothing other than state the obvious and the assumptions versed here can be found in much more refined forms in numerous models of linguistic and literary analysis, translational or otherwise. But it seemed advisable to hold theory at bay for a brief moment, to resist the temptation of proposing an existing model of literary or linguistic analysis just yet. It is not the purpose to hasten to assert that after a full formal and stylistic analysis that source and target texts do not match. It was a matter, therefore, of first trying to map such practices, of understanding how these translators bring perceptions of language use, register and genre into play at one and the same time in creating the target text. Perhaps then these practices can be examined in further research in the light of models of analysis extant in the literature but not before the practices have been outlined as such, which is the purpose of this study.

### 5.2.2. Line Break Difference

The category ‘**line overflow**’ stemmed initially from the observation that some poems were longer or shorter on the page in translation. ‘**Line break difference**’ on the other hand, was used to cover such cases where lines were allowed to run on into each other, or where the sense contained in a given line in the source text was divided over two lines or more in the target text or vice versa. In the final analysis line overflow was considered a subset of line break difference. ‘**Line break difference**’ itself proved the most frequent of poetic features observable in this corpus. Initially, it was believed to have been caused by the constraints of Dutch syntax but this proved to be just one of the reasons. Further analysis of the differences lead to the following paradigm of possible explanations:

Codes		occ.
lbd: assonance	+	22
lbd: eye rhyme	+	9
lbd: line length	+	26
lbd: meter	+	30
lbd: other	+	5
lbd: rhyme	+	20
lbd: syntax	+	10
lbd: whole poem	+	2
tot:		124

Table 5-iii: n° of occurrences of line break difference in analysed corpus

The rationale in proposing these explanations stemmed from the dominance of a given feature in the environment of a line break, as no line break could be explained in terms of one feature alone. It can be rightly asked why a distinction was made between line length and meter. For example, the code **'lbd: line length'** (**'line break difference: line length'**) covered observable differences caused by longer words or phrases in the target texts. Word length is a topic that arose in the interviews, particularly in discussions on rhyme and meter, as the following extracts illustrate:

Reply A3 (sub1)

VDK: Het grote probleem van het Nederlands zijn alle doffe klanken die de woorden dan heel lang maken en daar zit je dan.

Engels is zo een heel korte taal heel bondig, kan heel gebalde dingen zeggen dus en dat is ook niet eenvoudig hoor om dat in het Nederlands mooi te laten klinken.

Dylan Thomas bijvoorbeeld dat is muziek dat hij schrijft het, ie is zeer moeilijk (ja, ja) (I.6/a3 (sub1))

Reply C2

CJ: (KH: ja eh) In het Frans is dat ook eh met le passé simple et l'imparfait en weet ik niet allemaal waar in je werkwoordsvorm al een betekenis of, of neen wordt aangegeven dat iets nog bezig is of gedaan is en wat weet ik niet allemaal in het Nederlands moet je dat allemaal met hulpwerkwoorden daar gaan aan toevoegen (PF: ja) (I.8/c2)

Reply A1 (sub3)

CP: Tja em ja dat intrigeert mij inderdaad wel waarom ik het niet gedaan heb is enfin ik heb vrij weinig uit het Engels literatuur eh poëzie vertaald zeker niet metrische poëzie omdat ik vind dat, daar is een technische moeilijkheid waar je bijna niet eigenlijk niet uitkon en dat is het feit dat het Engels allemaal veel kortere woordjes heeft en ja hebt jij een pentameter je ja in dat Nederlands lukt dat gewoon niet.

Ja wij hebben al die uitgangen je zit onmiddellijk twee lettergrepen verder dus (ah ja) alles wat zo compact is (ja) jaa je moet je woorden gaan schrappen op wat dan ook dus je slaagt er dus niet in om dat goed te krijgen. (I.10/a1 (sub3))

#### Extract 5-11: selection of interview data on word length

It was for this reason that the distinction was made in the first place. In retrospect, the interview data serves here as another indication of how the translator's perceptions of language use and stylistics interlock. The code **'lbd: meter'** was used where the length of translated words was not the main issue. The following data fragments serve as examples of each type of line break difference:

1. location: 1 (poems - meulenhoff) - 5 (mpaul muldoon) – 5: assonance

We kept a shop in Eglisch  
that sold bread, milk, butter, cheese,  
bacon and eggs, Andrews Liver Salts,  
and, until now, clove-rock.

We hadden een winkel in Eglisch  
die brood, melk, boter, kaas,  
spek en eieren verkocht,  
Andrews' zuiveringszout,  
en, tot nu toe, kaneelstok

By breaking off line 3 and replacing clove (sweets) by cinnamon (sticks), the translator managed to create assonance between “verkocht” and “kaneelstok”, both of which curiously echo the sound of “clove-rock”. Next to this, the line break makes the translated lines look more symmetrical, the last three lines in the translation containing the same number of syllables.

1. location: 1 (poems - meulenhoff) - 1 (mpaul durcan) – 5 : eye rhyme

Putting everything I have got into Raymond  
of the Rooftops?]

Me uit de naad werk om Raymond van  
de daken af te  
krijgen,

Isn't it well for him? Everything he has got!

Tegen de klok race om Raymond van de daken af te  
krijgen,  
Dat ik mij met hart en ziel aan Raymond van de daken  
wijd?

Is dat niet fijn voor hem? Met hart en ziel!

Here again we can see how the translators took advantage of restrictions of page space in creating some eye rhyme: “krijgen/ krijgen/ wijd”.

1. location: 2 (poetry international) - 17 (brendan kennelly)

– 1: Line length

And in the fields,  
In men's eyes and children's voices,

En in de velden, in de ogen  
Van mensen en de stemmen van kinderen,

Here we can see how the translator balanced the two Dutch genitives (van) in the second line and reduced overall length by placing “in the eyes” on the first line.

1. location : 2 (poetry international) - 5 (richard murphy) – 9: Meter

Alone I love  
To think of us together:  
Together I think  
I'd love to be alone.

Als ik alleen ben  
Is het mij lief te denken aan ons samen:  
Als we samen zijn  
Denk ik dat ik het liefst alleen ben.

In these four lines the translators managed to create parallel meter in lines 1 and 3 and 2 and 4 respectively. They reinforce the parallel structure in the target lines by using the conjunction “when/if” in lines 1 and 3 and by placing “love” (“lief”) in line 2. The resulting lines, though longer, are more symmetrical and hence the contrast achieved is arguably more striking than in the original.

1. location : 2 (poetry international) - 14 (dseamus heaney) – 1: Other

Then found myself listening to  
The amplified grave ticking of hall clocks

Toen trof ik mezelf aan  
luisterend naar het versterkte, sombere tikken van de klokken in de gang



Stanza type	n° of occ.	Code:	Translator/corpus
			section/poet (initials)
k-3 & 4-line stanzas: end rhyme kept	+	1	pnpicc <sup>cs87</sup>
k-3-line stanzas: aba - partly kept	+	1	rhavdwpirm
k-4 line stanzas: aabb - kept	+	1	jemrm
k-4 line stanzas: abba - kept	+	1	rhavdwpirm
k-4-line stanzas: abcb - mainly kept	+	1	pnmjm
k-4-line stanzas: abxb - mainly kept	+	1	ggpijm
.	+	4	pnpicc
.	+	1	pnpibk
.	+	1	pnpish
k-rhyme kept: abcdec	+	1	ggpijm
k-rhyme partly kept: abba to abab		1	pnpish
k-rhyme: mainly kept	+	1	rhavdwpirm
k-rhyming couplets: rhyme kept		1	jemrm
.		1	bdupidog
k-sonnet: rhyme kept	+	2	jepirm
k-sonnet: rhyme partly kept	+	2	jepirm

**Table 5-iv: rhyme kept in Meulenhoff and Poetry International**

In what follows, a general overview will be given of findings from the data on rhyme. It is not the intention here to discuss the rhyme scheme of each poem in detail and for reasons of space the analysis will be limited to a stanza in each case. The purpose here is to point to general trends in tackling rhyme that have emerged in the data:

1. location : 2 (poetry international) - 5 (richard murphy) – 7

You were standing on the quay	Jij stond op de kade
Wondering who was the stranger on the mailboat	En vroeg je af wie de vreemde op de veerboot was
While I was on the mailboat	Terwijl ik op de veerboot stond
Wondering who was the stranger on the quay	En me afvroeg wie de vreemde op de kade was

The *abba* pattern in the original was shifted to a single rhyme between the second and the fourth line because of syntax constraints in the Dutch. This in turn would indicate that the translators were in fact led by the source text syntax or tried to keep as close to the English wording as possible. The syntax in lines 2 and 4 of the translation requires the verb “was” to be placed in end position, which made the rhyme possible. The very same ‘rule’ made it impossible to rhyme target lines 2 and 3 as in the original. The problem could have been



resolved perhaps by switching to direct speech in the questions, e.g. “who is the stranger on the mailboat?”, and by replacing the subordinating conjunction “terwijl” by a coordinating conjunction “en”. This would mean starting three lines with “En”, and changing the tense, which would have obscured the alternation visible in the source lines. It can be argued, therefore, that there was a clear effort to maintain the rhyme in spite of the constraints of syntax. However, as can be observed, the syntax constraints were not only dictated by the target ‘system’ but also by source text word order. More generally, we have a similar instance to the one discussed in the example of ‘**lbd: rhyme**’ (see chapter 5.2.2. above), which seems to indicate that rhyme schemes form an operational framework for the translators, together with syntax and word choice, rather than constituting a separate phase in the translational process. The translation results shown above are asymmetrical to the source texts they stem from, yet they still belong within a set of translational expectations. It would seem more productive empirically to speak of translation in terms of the asymmetry visible in this corpus. Once accepted, patterns of asymmetry could be traced and understood in terms of (the translator’s) responses to a source poem. This echoes the idea of translation as refraction found in the work of Lefevre and Toury and goes back to Vološinov’s (1973:10) idea on the nature of signs:

A sign does not exist as part of reality – it reflects and refracts another reality. ... Every sign is subject to the criteria of ideological evaluation ... The domain of ideology coincides with the domain of signs. They equate with one another. Whenever a sign is present, ideology is present, too. Everything ideological possesses semiotic value.

If this is held to be **so** within one language, why is it not the case when it comes to evaluating translations, where only the ideology of translation as a spotless mirror will suffice, no matter how untenable this model may be. Adopting the notion of dissymmetry or degrees of symmetry might help curtail the eternal jeremiad over injuries to source poems, which in fact prevents us from seeing what is going on.

Location: 2 (poetry international) - 6 (arichard murphy) – 1

Now my fish-ponds hold no water. Doors and aisles  
Are stacked with donors' tombs, badly invested,

Mijn visvijvers staan nu droog. Portalen, gangpaden]  
liggen vol graven van donors die 't slecht hebben  
gedaan:]

A gift for peeping toms: my lecherous gargoyles  
Hacked off by thieves, the bones unresurrected.

geschenk voor gluurders, mijn geile gargouilles  
door dieven afgehakt, de beenderen niet opgestaan.

Here, too, buried in rhyme, lovers lie dead,  
Engraved in words that live each time they're read.

Hier liggen ook minnaars, dood, begraven in rijm,  
gehakt in woorden die leven, steeds als ze gelezen  
zijn.]

In the final quatrain and couplet of this Shakespearean sonnet, the translator changed a number of items in an attempt to keep the rhyme in the target poem. “Badly invested” in line 2 was generalised to “fared badly” (slecht hebben gedaan), thereby making the rhyme possible with “niet opgestaan” in the last line of the quatrain. The Dutch words for aisles (zijbeuken,

gangpaden) rendered the rhyme with “gargouilles” impossible. Nonetheless, the translator’s choice of words brought about some interesting forms of assonance. In line 1 of the quatrain “Doors and aisles” were translated as “Portalen en gangpaden” – the translator could have chosen the more obvious “deuren en zijbeuken”. These choices are not only correct in register but also chime better with other words in the line like “staan droog” (literally “are dry”, rather than “hold no water”) along with the long vowels in the rhyme “gedaan” and “opgestaan”.

In the final couplet, the auxiliary of the final verb is made to rhyme with a word that is in the middle of the line in the source text. This required a change of word order, “buried in rhyme” being moved to the end of the line. In changing the word order the translator created some interesting cadence in the couplet with each line dividing nicely into two halves. There is a natural pause after “minnaars” and “leven” in each line, the vowels in “ook” and “dood” (line 1) and “leven” and “gelezen” (line 2) echoing each other in each half line --/--. In more general terms, we can see how three instances of linguistic shift, i.e. a word order shift and generalisations at clause level, have been brought into play in order to match the rhyme scheme in the source poem.

1. location: 2 (poetry international) - 1 (john montague) - 3

Bith was buried in a stone heap,  
Collapse of mind, all passion spent.  
Fintan fled from the ferocious women  
Lest he, too, by love be rent.

Bith werd begraven onder een hoop stenen,  
geestelijk ingestort, alle hartstocht verbeurd.  
Fintan ontvluchtte de bloeddorstige vrouwen  
eer ook hij door de liefde werd verscheurd.

In this extract we can see how the choice of verb at the end of the second line was dictated by the translation of rent: “verscheurd” in the fourth. In terms of linguistic shift, “verbeurd” (forfeited, seized, confiscated) would be categorised as ‘**verb: other (register or length)**’, the idea being that the verb in translation, though it has a different meaning, still belongs to the same register of use as the source item. Similarly, in line 3 the adjective “ferocious” was translated as the more intense “bloeddorstig” (bloodthirsty), whereas the first entry in the dictionary<sup>288</sup> is “woest” – “bloeddorstig” is not mentioned. In terms of linguistic shift, this would be listed as ‘**adj: specified (same field)**’. This shift could be explained in terms of the translator’s perception of the women’s behaviour or as a type of intensification or hyperbole. However, a perusal of the source line offers us another possible explanation. The translator most probably noted the alliterative effect of the “*f*’s” in the source line and already had a match in the target line between Fintan and the devoiced *v*’s in “ontvluchtte” and “vrouwen” (the translator is from the Netherlands). Had he used “woeste”, the alliterative effect would have been weakened, whereas “bloeddorstige” offered him an echo of the *l* and final *e* in “ontvluchtte”. Once again the two linguistic shifts – choice of verb and adjective – can be plausibly explained by the translator’s concern for maintaining rhyme in the stanza and sound in the line.

1. location: 2 (poetry international) - 9 (bseamus heaney) - 3

I keep but feel little in common with -  
a kind of stone age circumcising knife,  
a Calvin edge in my complaisant pith.  
Granite is jaggy, salty, punitive

die ik bewaar al voel ik weinig met hem gemeen -  
een soort besnijdenismes uit de steentijd,  
een Calvijn-kant aan mijn gediensig merg.  
Graniet is puntig, zoutig, streng

In this extract the translator relied on assonance (gemeen/steentijd) in an attempt to match the rhyme in the source stanza. In lines 1 and 2 we notice a shift in word order that is more dictated by rules of syntax than choice, but not entirely. The first line could have mirrored the source syntax, though the result would have proved inelegant, whereas placing “gemeen” in end position, next to creating a natural pause, made the assonance with “steentijd” below it possible. The pre-modifier “stone age” in line two was shifted to a postmodifying prepositional phrase in the target text “uit de steentijd” (from the Stone Age) in keeping with Dutch syntax. The noun “punitive” in the last line was generalised in the Dutch to “streng” (severe), hence fitting in with the other words ending in *g* in the line and echoing those ending in *g* in line 3. In this example, decisions with regard to word order and lexical choice helped in bringing about assonance in the target stanza which compensated for the lack of full rhyme.

#### 5.2.4. Rhyme: local

The category ‘**rhyme: local**’ was introduced to cover instances of rhyme in poems with no strict rhyme scheme. Here too the translators were confronted with the decision of keeping the rhyme or not. In most instances the rhyme was either kept or compensated for in some way, as the two examples below illustrate:

1. location : 1 (poems - meulenhoff) - 1 (mpaul durcan) – 4

Of what they did die - we do not agree:

Waaraan zij stierven-daar zijn we 't nog niet over eens:

'Of romantic love' - the politicians lie:

'Aan romantische liefde' - liegen de politici:

'Of nuclear fall-out' - the doctors testify:

'Aan nucleaire neerslag' - getuigen de medici:

2. location: 2 (poetry international) - 17 (brendan kennelly) - 10

The Holy Family loved his voice.

De Heilige Familie vond zijn stem prachtig.

It was pure and clear and strong,

Zij was zuiver en helder en krachtig,

The perfect voice of the perfect sinner

De volmaakte stem van de volmaakte zondaar

And the perfect end to the dinner.

En het volmaakte eind van het diner.

In the first example, the translator made handy use of the constraints of Dutch syntax in maintaining the rhyme. The inversion of subject and predicator required in lines 2 and 3 allowed the translator to shift the rhyme from the verb to the noun, for which he used the Latin plural. In the second example the rhyme was moved up two lines, where an alternative expression “found his voice beautiful” was used to replace “loved his voice”. So we

can conclude here that the presence of rhyme cues a response from the translator, though not necessarily in the same place or way, even in poems with no fixed rhyme scheme. Such examples and others show clear evidence of perceptions of genre (see chapter 3.5. for a discussion of the interview data on genre). Not only that they give credence to the scholarly approach to genre discussed in chapter 3 like the following definition for example:

“Genres are how things get done, when language is used to accomplish them” (Martin 1984: 25 & 1985: 248 in Eggins 1994).

### 5.2.5. Sound: various

This category covers instances of alliteration and other relations of sound within lines along with the translators’ responses to such instances. The data examined here further confirms tendencies already visible in the extracts examined under a)-type poetic codes. These extracts show that the translators picked up cues relating to sound patterns of various types in the source texts and tried to respond to these patterns in corresponding ways in the target texts.

1. location: 1 (poems - meulenhoff) - 1 (mpaul durcan) – 3

I am a pink place in which a pink pig plashes:	Ik ben een roze ruimte waar een roze big rotzooit:
You are a pink peach in which a pink babe perishes -	Jij bent een roze perzik waarin een roze kindeke sterft –]

Here the series of *p*’s in the first line of the source text have been matched almost completely by a series of *r*’s in the target line. In the second target line there is no Dutch verb ending in *r* to match “perish” and hence echo the other *r*’s in the target line and there is no match for the sibilant endings of “peach”, “which” and “perish”. But there is sonority in the target line next to the repetition of the *r* in “roze”: the *z*, *k* and short *i* in “perzik”, “waarin” and “kindeke”. The translators had no real alternative as far as the first two of these three words were concerned but “kindeke” was not the only choice available.

1. location: 1 (poems - meulenhoff) - 2 (mseamus heaney) – 1

Under my window, a clean rasping sound	Onder mijn <u>raam</u> klinkt het helder zuiver schrapen
When the spade sinks into gravelly ground:	Van een <u>spa</u> die doordringt in een grond vol grind:
My father, digging. I look down	Mijn <u>vader</u> , <u>gravend</u> . Ik kijk omlaag

In these three lines we have a typical example of Heaney’s much praised and sometimes mocked<sup>289</sup> sonority, but next to it we can also find a clear attempt to match his music in the translation. The three target lines contain a series of long *a* vowels (underlined) which help strengthen the assonance between the final words in lines 1 and 3. To do so, “sound” has been turned into a verb in the Dutch and “rasping” has been replaced by “scraping”, whose *a* is relatively longer in Dutch. Moreover, the translator matched the alliterative effect of the *gr*’s in line 2, the sound of which is carried on to “gravend” in the last line and he also chimed “klinkt” in line 1 with “doordringt” (de-voiced *g*), “doordringt” not being the obvious choice here, according to the dictionary.

1. location : 1 (poems - meulenhoff) - 6 (mrichard murphy) – 2

The boom above my knees lifts, and the boat	De giek boven mijn knieën rijst en de boot
Drops, and the surge departs, departs, my cheek	Daalt en de zee splijt, splijt, mijn wang wordt
Kissed and rejected, kissed, as the gaff sways	Gekust en verworpen, gekust terwijl de gaffel
A tangent, cuts the infinite sky to red	Een raaklijn beschrijft, de wijde lucht tot
Maps, and the mast draws eight and eight across	Rode vakken versnijdt en de mast achten tekent]
Measureless blue, the boatmen sing or sleep.	Op peilloos blauw en de bemanning zingt of slaapt

The source lines in this extract contain a series of one-syllable verbs all in the simple present, “lifts/drops/sways/cuts/draws/sing ... sleep”, one two-syllable verb repeated (“departs”) and three past participles in reduced passive constructions (“kissed, rejected, kissed”) – a considerable number of verbs for six lines of poetry. All work together to strengthen the physical sensation of sailing and the thump of the waves the boat is struggling through. These opening lines and verbs prepare the reader for what is to follow in the poem: a failed attempt to reach an island. As the simple present is used more frequently in Dutch, matching these verbs in the target lines would ostensibly have proved to be a matter of course, the final *t* of the third person singular creating a similar chopping effect in the translation. But the translator achieved more in these six lines through his choice of words. The verb “departs” was translated as “splijt” (splits), which would be categorised as ‘**verb: other (register or length)**’. The image in the source line of the waves rolling away from the boat was replaced by the image of the boat cutting through the waves – a different verb but clearly within the same register. The choice of “splijt” helped foreground a series of similar sounds in the lines: “rijst/splijt, splijt/mijn/terwijl/raaklijn/beschrijft/wijde/peilloos/versnijdt”. Furthermore, “beschrijft” and “wijde” are certainly not the immediate choices presented in the dictionary for “waves” and “infinite”. It is suggested here that the long vowel in these words reinforces the meter in the target lines while creating a sense of suspense, a sense of the boat rising from a trough before being hit by the next wave enacted by the final *t* of each verb.

location: 2 (poetry international) - 2 (micheal o huanachain) – 5

flickering fingers freckling my back	vluchtige vingers voorzien mijn rug
with warmth.	
van warmte.	

location: 2 (poetry international) - 13 (cseamus heaney) – 3

But the slop of the actual job	Maar het gekluts van de eigenlijke klus,
--------------------------------	--

In the first extract the alliterative effect of the *f*'s is replicated by the *v*'s in the target line. To maintain the alliteration, the translator changed the verb to “voorzien” (provide) rather than “freckle”. In the second extract, the *l* and *o* in “slop” is echoed in “actual job” in the source line. In the target line a similar effect is noticeable in the repetition of *klu* in “gekluts” and “klus”. In these two short instances, we can see once again how considerations of sound determined word choice within the target line.

### 5.2.6. a)-type Poetic Features: some tentative conclusions

At this stage of the discussion, a number of tentative conclusions can be drawn regarding the findings from the data listed under a)-type poetic features. In discussing the data from each category of poetic feature, it has been demonstrated that translators respond in various ways to the cues triggered by these features. It has been shown that these responses are asymmetric to the cues visible in the source texts but that in each case some form of response is visible in the target text. As has already been demonstrated, the asymmetry or degrees of symmetry is/are framed within a set of genre expectations involving, rhyme, language use etc. It has also been shown that decisions with regard to line (rhyme, etc.) interlocked with those taken with regard to syntax and lexical choice. It can be asserted, therefore, that the translator brings responses to all these factors into play simultaneously. This assertion is based on the relative ease with which linguistic shifts observed in the data can be explained in terms of poetic decisions and vice versa. There is nothing new in this assertion, save the fact that it is clearly observable in the corpus. In this respect it corroborates Jakobson's observation on the nature of poetic language quoted above, albeit in the context of literary translation. It also confirms statements regarding the creativity attributed to translators of literary works:

The literary translator creates a new pattern in a different language, based on personal readings, research and creativity. This new creation in turn becomes the basis for multiple readings and interpretations which will go beyond any intentions of either original author or translator. Nevertheless it is the fruit of thousands of decisions, large and small, and of a creative activity on the part of the translator. (Bush in Baker 2000: 129)

The shifts observed in the data can be considered as issuing from the creativity expected from a translator working within the genre but as was demonstrated in chapter 2, such creativity is never allowed totally free reign. As the interview data shows, two constraints remain paramount:

- ♦ The work must be a translation (and not an adaptation);
- ♦ It must be a poem in the new language/culture.

More specifically, the translators stressed the importance of getting "the first impression" "down on paper" in translation and of using time to further fashion the new poem, which involves various rewritings and adjustments – a very material process, as was shown in chapter II. It is logical, therefore, to take such forms of engagement as the basis for an emergent model of translation process (not unlike think-aloud protocols in this instance, with one difference: that the decisions involved are not considered as purely 'mental'). If creativity is expected or considered as a given among translators, it still remains to be seen how the entextualisation happens within the framework of constraints held by the translator, which means that creativity cannot be considered as something which is located only in the source text. It also stems from the translator's engagement with the source and with target text as it gradually emerges. In this respect it proves interesting to reflect on how the various 'features'

were deployed in the extracts discussed above, were it only to discuss one point: ‘target system’ constraints and their resulting ‘obligatory shifts’ (Bakker, Koster & Van Leuven-Zwart in Baker 2000: 228):

- ♦ It emerges from the above analysis that ‘obligatory’ cannot be laid at the door of the target system alone. It has been shown in the discussion of **rhyme** in the extract (location: 2 (poetry international) - 5 (richard murphy) - 7) that a desire to remain close to the source text has consequences for the target text syntax as well;
- ♦ It has also been shown that language system ‘rules’ are made to be broken or circumvented. In the discussion of **rhyme** in the extract (location: 2 (poetry international) - 9 (bseamus heaney) - 3) the translator did not match the source syntax in the target text even though he could have done so;
- ♦ Furthermore, it has been demonstrated that target system rules actually help the translator to achieve certain effects, rather than constrain him/her: see the discussion of (location: 1 (poems - meulenhoff) - 1 (mpaul durcan) - 4) in **rhyme: local**;
- ♦ Fourthly, the data extracts suggest that the line between obligatory and optional shifts is a very fuzzy one indeed. It follows from this that system-governed shifts are not system-governed only: see the discussion of the extract (location: 1 (poems - meulenhoff) - 1 (mpaul durcan) - 3) in **sound: various** and (location: 2 (poetry international) - 9 (bseamus heaney) - 3) in **rhyme**.

These conclusions beg a re-examination of distinctions such as ‘obligatory’ and ‘optional’ shifts. An analysis of the data in the next section will show just how obligatory these shifts are or, conversely, that there is more regularity in ‘optional’ shifts than one would expect.

### 5.3. Analysing the Data: b)-type features

In this section, the data fragments listed under b)-type features will be examined in order to determine which translational tendencies can be found in them. These features include items listed under the categories of **clause** and **phrase level shift, explication, implicitation, elision, possible mismatch, word choice** and **word order**. The main point of inquiry here is to see to which extent the choices found in the data can be considered system driven (obligatory shifts) or mainly the result of a translator’s choices (optional shifts). Of all the categories listed under b)-type shifts - i.e. explication, implicitation, elision, possible mismatch, word choice, word order and level 1 clause and phrase shifts – clause and phrase level shifts seemed the most obvious environment to find obligatory changes in, as the other categories, like explication for example, imply forms of ‘optional’ change or decision-making by the translators. Nonetheless, it seemed more prudent not to take this assumption for granted and examine data from each category. It seemed safe, however, to limit the discussion to the more frequent shifts found in the corpus<sup>290</sup> as far as level 1 clause and phrase shifts were concerned. The table provides details of the 20 most frequent b)-type shifts:

Pos	freq	PI	M	Code	ratio
3.	61	37	23	cl: non-finite to finite	M > 0.36 of PI
4.	60	40	20	noun: generalised (same field)	M > 0.36 of PI
5.	54	33	18	cl: complex shift	M > 0.36 of PI
6.	34	26	8	noun: complex shift	M < 0.36 of PI
7.	32	15	15	noun: same (register or length)	M > 0.36 of PI
8.	32	22	8	implicit: clause	M < 0.36 of PI
9.	27	18	10	cl: cl to ph	M > 0.36 of PI
10.	25	15	10	verb: other (collocation)	M > 0.36 of PI
12.	22	21	2	noun: other (register or length)	M < 0.36 of PI
13.	17	18	4	noun: specified (same field)	M < 0.36 of PI
14.	17	14	6	explicit: noun (phrase)	M > 0.36 of PI
16.	16	13	4	implicit: noun	M < 0.36 of PI
18.	16	8	8	cl: ph to cl	M > 0.36 of PI
19.	15	6	9	verb: generalised (same field)	M > 0.36 of PI
20.	12	10	4	elision: noun dropped	M > 0.36 of PI
	440	296	149	Subtotal	M > 0.36 of PI
	57.7	38.8	19.5	% of 762 b)-type features	

**Table 5-v: 20 most frequent b)-type shifts: tokens and distribution**

### 5.3.1. Clause Level Shifts

In what follows the three most frequent clause level shifts will be discussed in brief and contrasted with observations in the translation studies literature. The most frequent clause shift found in the corpus was '**cl: non-finite to finite**' (clause shift from non-finite to finite clause) with 61 occurrences noted, followed by '**cl: complex shift**' (clause shift involving more than one important change in the clause) with 54 occurrences. The third most frequent clause shift was '**cl: cl to ph**' (clause shift from clause to phrase) in which the source clause was reduced to a phrase in the target text – 27 occurrences. The first two were relatively more frequent in the Meulenhoff section of the corpus:

codes	all	M	PI	
cl: non-finite to finite	61	21	40	M > 0.36 of PI
cl: complex shift	54	17	37	M > 0.36 of PI
cl: cl to ph	27	5	22	M < 0.36 of PI
cl: ph to cl	16	6	10	M > 0.36 of PI
subtotal	158	49	109	M > 0.36 of PI
% of 762 b)-type features	20.7	6.4	14.3	

**Table 5-vi: most frequent clause-level shifts: tokens and distribution**



### 5.3.1.1. Clause: non-finite to finite

The data fragments discussed here were taken from both sections of the corpus and are representative of the other segments listed under this code in the corpus. It must be noted that three of the four shift types were more frequent in the Poetry International section of the corpus. Of the 61 ‘**cl: non-finite to finite**’ tokens, some were infinitive and past participle clauses but the rest (53) were present participle<sup>291</sup> clauses (Vandenberghe 1995<sup>292</sup>: 216; Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, & Svartvik 1985<sup>293</sup>: 993) of the type shown in the following two extracts:

1. location: 1 (poems - meulenhoff) - 2 (mseamus heaney) - 3

The ground itself is kind, black butter

Melting and opening underfoot,

Missing its last definition

By millions of years.

De grond zelf is zachte zwarte boter

Die zich onder onze voeten opent

En smelt, zijn laatste definitie

Al miljoenen jaren misloopt.

2. location: 2 (poetry international) - 1 (john montague) - 5

she says, holding a wet blossom

for a second, in a hand knotted

as the knob of her stick.

zeft ze, en houdt heel even

de natte bloesem in haar hand, knoestig

als de knop van haar stok.

In such instances, the non-finite subclause was invariably changed to a finite (relative) clause. This does not mean that the constructions found in the source lines are not structurally possible in Dutch. Consider the following example and explanation taken from the ANS, the Dutch On-line Grammar<sup>294</sup>:

In geschreven (vooral literair) taalgebruik kan men op de eerste zinsplaats combinaties van diverse types aantreffen, zoals de volgende voorbeelden:

(Maar) ’s anderendaags, weer nuchter, weer op kantoor, lopend in de tredmolen van het dagelijks werk, |waren| ze weer vijanden.

Though this example is used to illustrate possible sentence initial constructions, it does contain a present participle subclause (underlined) and more examples of this are to be found in the section on the present participle itself. Why then did the translators not use a present participle construction in Dutch? The following answer was found in Devos, De Mynck & Martens (1992<sup>295</sup>: 87):

In het Frans en in het Engels komen deelwoordzinnen die niet worden ingeleid door een voegwoord, frequent voor. In het Nederlands behoren dergelijke constructies overwegend tot de (archaische) schrijftaal.

So it can be concluded that these shifts are not based on system alone or rather on systemic (im)possibility but were mainly dictated by register (Bassnett 2002<sup>296</sup>: 24-26), to the extent that such things can be separated in language use. Present participle constructions of this type are considered as belonging to a formal or even old-fashioned written register in Dutch, in

contrast to the finite clauses found in the data, which are considered more immediate in reflecting the source lines. The frequency of shift from non-finite to finite, including the fact that all the translators used this particular shift, confirms the observation in Devos, De Muynck & Martens (1992). This finding alone calls for a re-examination of ‘obligatory shift’, as it is usually explained in terms of formal and structural<sup>297</sup> differences between language pairs:

Of course, some of the decisions translators make are hardly decisions at all, let alone their own. Already McFarlane urged consideration of “what things are essentially within and what necessarily beyond the control of the translator” (1953<sup>298</sup>: 93). The translator’s decision-making only concerns us here only to the extent that it lies within his or her control. If a language does not possess a passive, then that option is not open to the translator. If the source text uses a plural with reference to two items because it only has a singular and a plural, and the receptor language has a dual to refer to a twosome, the translation must use the dual if it wants to be grammatical. (Hermans 1999: 73)

**Obligatory shifts** are dictated by differences between linguistic systems, for example a lack of correspondence between related lexical items in the source and target languages (Kade 1968: 79ff.).

**Optional shifts** are those opted for by the translator for stylistic, ideological or cultural reasons. (Bakker, Koster & Van Leuven-Zwart in Baker 2000: 228) (bold in the original)

Judging from the extracts listed under ‘**cl: non-finite to finite**’, ‘obligatory’ shifts are not necessarily or not only based on formal or structural differences between language systems nor are ‘optional’ shifts as optional as they would seem, as can be judged from the reliance on register constraints visible in the above extracts. But next to these considerations one can also observe evidence of other phenomena at work in the above extracts. In the first extract, the unmarked word order in the relative subclause with the verbs in end position along with the reversal of the verbs (“opens and melts” rather than “melting and opening”) made assonance possible between line-final “boter”, “opent” and “misloopt”, thereby matching and even going beyond the sonority of “butter/underfoot”. Here again, we have an instance of the ‘obligatory’ and the ‘optional’ working together, as it were.

In the second extract, the subclause in the source lines became a full clause in a coordinated structure. Functionally speaking, the contemporaneous action indexed by the present participle “holding” is matched in the target line by the conjunction “en” (and). Next to this, or perhaps more precisely in conjunction with this, the translator rendered “for a second<sup>299</sup>” as “heel even” (very briefly), thereby bringing the other *b*’s in the two lines into play.

However, it must be stated that there is evidence in the corpus of the opposite shift, i.e. ‘**cl: finite to non-finite**’, though they are far fewer in number with only 6 occurrences noted. Two examples are provided here for the sake of illustration:

locatie: 1 (data fragmentsm) - 3 (clausem) - 2

I could risk blasphemy,

Godslastering riskeerend zou ik

Consecrate the cauldron bog  
locatie: 2 (data fragmentspi) - 3 (piclauses) - 5  
The flower, if you turned it upside down,  
Looked like a dagoba with an onion dome.

Het ketelmoeras kunnen wijden  
De bloem leek, ondersteboven gedraaid,  
Op een dagoba met een koepel als een ui.

#### Extract 5-12: selection of data fragments from cl: finite to non-finite

In both instances, it can be argued that economy of line played a role in the decision to reduce the clause to the phrase, as there is no real information loss in either case.

#### 5.3.1.2. Clause: complex shift

The code ‘cl: complex shift’ was used to cover formal changes in relation to the source clause that were too complex to describe in a single term like ‘cl: non-finite to finite’, for example. Basically the code was used to list (structurally) alternate ways of expressing the source text clause. The 54 instances were of the types found in the following extracts:

1. location: 1 (poems - meulenhoff) - 1 (mpaul durcan) - 1  
Had to be helped away as they wept copiously in their cups: Moesten worden weggeholpen terwijl hun gemoed  
overvloedig volschoot:
2. location: 1 (poems - meulenhoff) - 6 (mrichard murphy) - 3  
He took your widow Honor for his wife  
Hij nam je weduwe Honor tot echtgenote  
When serving the Sun King you lost your life. Toen je in dienst van de Zonnekoning was  
neergeschoten.]
3. location: 2 (poetry international) - 10 (paul durcan) - 2  
she has a fire lighting in each eye, Zij heeft in ieder oog een lichtje branden,
4. location: 2 (poetry international) - 12 (paul muldoon) - 9  
They're kindly here, to let us linger so late, Aardig van ze dat wij zo laat nog mogen blijven zitten,
5. location: 2 (poetry international) - 15 (ciaran carson) - 7  
I see you now, Miranda,  
Through the glassed-in cloudy steam of yesteryear. Do Schweppes. Nu zie ik je, Miranda,  
Door de mistige stoom van vorig jaar achter glas gevangen.
6. locatie : 2 (poetry international) - 17 (brendan kennelly) - 7  
She became dumb fear. Zo hard tegen mijn hals dat het pijn deed.  
De angst sloeg haar met stomheid.

#### Extract 5-13: a selection of data fragments from cl: complex shift

In general terms, one can notice a tendency emerging in the translations of the above lines. In all of the extracts, the translators used expressions within the clauses that either verge on the idiomatic or are even fully metaphoric, which is the case in the first extract “terwijl hun gemoed overvloedig volschoot”, the source text expression being much more literal, “as they

wept copiously in their cups”, and quite comical it must be added. In 3, 4 and 6, i.e. “zij heeft ... een lichtje branden” (she has ... a little light burning), “blijven zitten” (stay sitting) and “De angst sloeg haar met stomheid” (fear/angst dumbfounded her), the translators drew on fixed expressions or recognised collocates to render the source expressions “a fire lighting”, “linger” and “she became dumb fear”, all of which are not immediately idiomatic. In the second extract we can see how dictates of rhyme played a role in the process: the muted final *n* in “neergeschoten” making rhyme possible with “echtgenote”. Back-translated, the line reads “while in the service of the Sun King you were shot (dead)”. The shift was considered complex because of the combination of verb switch and change of voice. In the remaining extract (5), the translator had to tackle the difficult “glasses-in” and “yesteryear”, both items belonging to the same noun phrase. This translation was considered complex because it comprised both a change in word order and an instance of explicitation, “yesteryear” being translated as “last year”, which of course is correct but lacks the more general connotation of recent past and reminiscence.

It can be noted from the point of view of classification that many of the clauses listed under ‘**cl: complex shift**’ could be regrouped as a subcategory of idiomatic choice. One main difference must be kept in mind, however: in contrast to those in idiomatic choice, the source items in these extracts are not specifically idiomatic. As a result, the notion kept/not kept would not apply to such items. The tendency towards the idiomatic observed in the target text is understood as another aspect of more general entextualisation strategies visible in the data, all of which are clearly target-oriented (see the discussion of idiomatic and pragmatic choice in 5.1.2 and 3 above). Regarding the extracts listed under ‘**cl: complex shift**’ we can conclude here too that repertoires of familiar expression or collocation like that between the verb “slaan” (strike) and the noun “stomheid” (speechlessness, dumbfoundedness) which is visible in the last extract were brought into play by the translator to tackle these particular translation problems. The evidence revealed by the data is, therefore, in keeping with Vinay and Darbelnet’s observation on what they call ‘oblique’ translation methods and more particularly on modulation, which the code **cl: complex shift** was considered to include (Vinay & Darbelnet in Venuti 2000: 87-89). Indeed the data does contain many of these ‘oblique’<sup>300</sup> shifts. But next to this, considerations of line also played a part in the process. To return once again to the last extract, the expression “met stomheid geslagen” was rendered in active voice and given a subject, “angst”, the result being a little unusual, in fact. Nevertheless, “stomheid” at the end of the line also echoes “deed” in the line above but only in the finality of its *d*.

### 5.3.1.3. Clause: clause to phrase

The reduction of clause to phrase – shown in the examples in the extracts below – was also attributed to considerations of line length or meter. This is particularly the case in extract three below where the long subclause “when all my papers are heaped on the desk in a three month mess” was reduced to the noun phrase, “de papieren chaos van drie maanden op mijn bureau” (lit: “the paper chaos of three months on my desk”). In extract 1 below, the present

continuous form “flecking” is used as an adjectival present participle in the noun phrase, “bevekkende huid en tanden van vier jonge broers”. This solution avoided the use of a longer relative subclause which would have been at variance with the compact syntax in the source lines. In extracts 3 and 5 the verb in the clause was replaced by a preposition (“tegen”) and an adjective (“onrustig”), respectively, both solutions again resulting in more compact modes of expression in the target lines. For example, had the translator used the infinitive “to heal” instead of the preposition “against”, which would have been perfectly possible – “om stomheid te genezen” – the line would have become unnecessarily long. In the fourth extract, the verbs “smirking” and “saying” were replaced by a prepositional phrase and a colon, respectively. The former “with a smirk on their kisser/gob” is quite long given the circumstances but fits the register perfectly. Its length is compensated by an interesting form of speech representation, namely the colon at the end of the line.

1. location: 1 (poems - meulenhoff) - 2 (mseamus heaney) - 5

Tell-tale skin and teeth

De verklikkende, bielsen

Flecking the sleepers

Of four young brothers, trailed

For miles along the lines.

Bevekkende huid en tanden

Van vier jonge broers, mijlver

Langs de spoorlijn gesleept.

2. location: 1 (poems - meulenhoff) - 6 (mrichard murphy) - 5

How much it hurts me to tidy up when all my papers are  
heaped on the desk in a three-month mess,

Wat doet het pijn om de papieren chaos van drie maanden  
op mijn bureau nu op te ruimen,

3. location: 2 (poetry international) - 9 (bseamus heaney) - 5

The woman in customs asked me to declare  
the words of our traditional cures and charms  
stomheid]

to heal dumbness and avert the evil eye.

Bij de douane vroeg de vrouw me aan te geven  
de woorden van onze traditionele remedies tegen

en toverspreuken om het boze oog af te weren.

4. location: 2 (poetry international) - 16 (matthew sweeney) - 2

They don't stand there, smirking. saying

I'm broke, I'm going to wet myself,

Ze staan daar niet met een grijns op hun smoel:

Ik heb geen cent, ik doe het in mijn broek.

5. location: 2 (poetry international) - 17 (brendan kennelly) - 3

The sun fussed over it.

De zon onrustig erboven.

#### Extract 5-14: a selection of data fragments from cl: cl to ph

All the solutions shown above involved the replacement or transformation of a verb form either in the main or subclause. As a result the target items are rendered slightly more implicit. It is argued, however, that these shifts were invariably motivated by considerations of line and did not result in any major loss of meaning.

In order to put the discussion above into perspective, it must be stated that in contrast to the 27 instances of clause to phrase, there were 16 instances of the opposite strategy, i.e. ‘**cl: ph to cl**’, found in the corpus. In these instances, the phrase in the source text became a clause as the following selection illustrates:

1. “at odds” became “ruziënd”;
2. “a clean rasping sound” became “klinkt het helder zuiver schrapen”;
3. “insatiable” became “niet te verzadigen”;
4. “a night-long fight to save a calf” became “een hele nacht vochten we om een kalf”;
5. “but none of my removals” became “maar niets van wat ik wegdeed”;
6. “bows to his own absence” became “buigt naar waar hij zelf afwezig is”.

The following explanations are suggested for these changes. The translation offered by the dictionary for “at odds (with)” in 1 is “in onenigheid leven met” for which the translator used a more concise verb form to fit the line. In 2, the verb “klinken” (to sound or ring) replaced the noun, “sound”, which allowed “schrapen” to be placed at the end of the line for purposes of assonance (see the discussion of these lines in Sound: various above). In 3, the translator could have chosen the adjective “onverzadigbaar”, but this would have disturbed the overall sound pattern and meter in the target lines:

location: 2 (poetry international) - 1 (john montague) – 4

In dank November

When the two worlds near each other,  
he glittered among his subjects,  
blood-crustcd, insatiable.

In de gure maand november,

wanneer de twee werelden elkaar naderen,  
glinsterde hij temidden van zijn onderdanen,  
vol korsten bloed, niet te verzadigen.

In 5, the noun “fight” was turned into a verb as an equivalent noun phrase in the target line would have made it excessively long. In fact, the translator moved the infinitive “te redden” (to save) to the next line most probably for the same reason:

Location: 1 (meulenhoff) – 4 (richard murphy) – 6

I assisted at such failure once;

A night-long fight to save a calf

Born finally, with broken neck.

Eénmaal assisteerde ik bij zo'n mislukking;

Een hele nacht vochten we om een kalf

Te redden, dat ten slotte met gebroken nek

In 6, the translator strengthens the rather comical effect in the line by rendering “bows to his own absence” as “bows to where he himself is absent”. The translator could have used the equivalent for “absence” in Dutch, i.e. “afwezigheid” and perhaps have translated the phrase as “naar zijn (eigen) afwezigheid”. It is surmised that this four syllable word would have interrupted the meter in the final line, which also matches that of the line above it:

Location: 2 (poetry international) – 12 (paul muldoon) - 9

The table itself, the chair he's simply borrowed,

And smiles, and bows to his own absence.

De tafel zelf, de stoel die hij slechts heeft geleend,

En glimlacht, en buigt naar waar hij zelf afwezig is.

As a whole, the clause shifts found in the corpus account for 30% of all b)-type linguistic shifts. Those discussed above comprise roughly two thirds of those shifts or 20% of all b)-type shifts. These shifts were slightly more frequent in the Meulenhoff section of the corpus. Their analysis has revealed two items of note. Firstly, it has been shown in the discussion of ‘**cl: finite to non-finite**’ that considerations of register are as equally constraining as those traditionally listed as ‘obligatory’ or system-based shifts. Secondly, it has been shown that the translators used idiomatic forms and collocates in places where such forms were not immediately visible in the source lines (see ‘**cl: complex shift**’). Next to this it must be noted in the analysis of the data in this section that once again linguistic and poetic choices have had a mutual influence on each other.

### 5.3.2. Phrase Level Shifts

Only the most frequent forms of phrase level shift will be dealt with in what follows. Out of a total of 344 phrase level shifts, 197 (roughly 25% of all b)-type shifts) involved some form of change to noun(s)-phrases, 90 (12.5%) to verb(s)-phrases and 43 (5.4%) to adjectives. 30 of the adjectives that were changed functioned as modifiers in noun phrases and hence can be listed as a subcategory of noun phrase shifts. The remaining adjectives mainly functioned as complements and have to be treated separately. In total, phrase level shifts accounted for roughly 43% of all b)-type linguistic shifts. As adverb shifts were mainly found to belong to adjective phrases or to more general clause level shifts<sup>301</sup> they will not be dealt with here.

#### 5.3.2.1. Noun Phrase Shifts

The second most frequent shift attested in the corpus was ‘**noun: generalised (same field)**’ – 60 occurrences. In these instances the translators provided close approximates to the source text item which belong to the same field of use.

codes	all	M	PI	
noun: generalised (same field)	60	23	37	M>0.36 of PI
noun: complex shift	34	8	26	M<0.36 of PI
noun: same (register or length)	32	15	17	M>0.36 of PI
noun: other (register or length)	22	2	20	M<0.36 of PI
noun: specified (same field)	17	4	13	M<0.36 of PI
subtotal	165	52	113	M>0.36 of PI
% of 762 b-type features	21.6	6.8	14.8	

**Table 5-vii: the most frequent noun phrase shifts – tokens and distribution**

A selection from the data will illustrate what is meant by this:

Atlantic seepage.

The wet centre is bottomless.

the gable

or taps a little tune with the blackthorn

a longship, a buoyant

on her naked front.

where sleep begins its shunting. You adopt

Seeking the fair island, without serpent or claw;

Guiding image of their disgrace.

For if a man should have been content

To his childhood settle.

What will the islanders think of our folly?

fall among stones and nettles,

the tasteless trunk of a seventy year old virgin,

Those million tons of light

Misschien zijn de veenplassen lekwater

Van de Oceaan.

**(Atlantic to ocean)**

hoorden we zijn voetstappen langs de buitenmuur

**(gable to outside wall)**

of tikt een deuntje met de stok,

**(blackthorn to stick)**

een langwerpig schip,

**(a longship or Viking ship to a long ship)**

op haar naakte romp

**(front to torso)**

Waar slaap zijn afleidingen begint.

**(shunting to diversions)**

Op zoek naar het mooie eiland zonder slangen of demonen;

**(claw to demons)**

Het leidende beeld van hun zondige zeden.

**(disgrace to sinful morals/practices)**

Want als iemand tevreden had moeten zijn,

**(a man to anyone)**

naar de alkoof van zijn jeugd.

**(bed to alcove where the bed is)**

Wat zullen ze op het eiland denken van ons gedoe?

**(folly to carry-on)**

Ik glij buiten uit, val tussen stenen en onkruid,

**(nettles to weeds)**

stronk van zeventig jaar maagdelijkheid,

**(virgin to virginity)**

Die enorme lichtmassa waarneembaar

**(tons of light to enormous mass of light)**

#### Extract 5-15: selection of data from noun: generalised (same field)

The items coded as ‘**noun: generalised (same field)**’ are considered different to those listed under ‘**noun: same (register or length)**’, which mainly comprises near synonyms of the source items. It can be seen from the above examples that there is no serious loss of information in the choices made by the translators. The items chosen have a more general meaning than the source texts noun phrases, as the first shift “Atlantic to ocean” illustrates. It can be argued, in the case of “ocean” being used rather than “Atlantic”, that there is enough information in the poem to allow the reader to understand which ocean is referred to. Next to this, it can be argued that the translator might have been considered the full phrase to be too long for the line, as the Dutch does not allow the shorthand form “Atlantic”. The fact that “van de Oceaan” (capital letter in the original) was moved to the last line seems to confirm this reasoning:



Location: 1 (meulenhoff) 2 (seamus heaney) - 3

Every layer they strip  
Seems camped on before.  
The bogholes might be Atlantic seepage.  
The wet centre is bottomless.

Iedere laag die wordt blootgelegd  
Schijnt eertijds al bewoond geweest.  
Misschien zijn de veenplassen lekwater  
Van de Oceaan. De natte kern is bodemloos.

In the case of “blackthorn”, perhaps target readers might not have known that the word is synonymous with walking stick, hence the translator’s use of “stok”, rather than “sleedoorn/meidoornstok” – “sleedoorn” or “meidoorn” on its own not being sufficient to convey the source message.

In other cases we can see considerations of meter and rhyme influencing the decisions made. For example, “demonen” was used to replace “klauwen” (claws), because the long *o* in its second syllable echoes the long *o* in “komen” in the last line of the stanza:

Location: 1 (meulenhoff) 4 (john montague) - 2

Fleeing from threatened flood, they sailed,  
Seeking the fair island, without serpent or claw;  
From the deck of their hasty barque watched  
The soft edge of Ireland nearward draw.

Vluchtend voor de dreigende vloed voeren ze uit,  
Op zoek naar het mooie eiland zonder slangen of demonen;  
Vanaf het dek van hun haastig vlot zagen ze  
De zachte rand van Ierland nader komen.

And is not it a well known fact that demons sometimes have claws? Equally, “zondige zeden” in the same poem was chosen to rhyme with “stede” two lines above it:

Location: 1 (meulenhoff)

A sweet confluence of waters, a trinity of rivers,  
Was their first resting place:  
They unloaded the women and the sensual idol,  
Guiding image of their disgrace.

4 (john montague) - 2

Een zoet samenvloeien van de wateren, een drieëenheid  
Van rivieren was hun eerste stede:  
Ze losten de vrouwen en de zinnelijke afgod,  
Het leidende beeld van hun zondige zeden.

With regard to the shift “nettles to weeds” in Richard Murphy’s poem, *Sailing to an Island*, it can be shown that assonance in and across the line played a part in the decision:

He has lost his watch, an American gold  
From Boston gas-works. He treats the company  
To the secretive surge, the sea of his sadness.  
I slip outside, fall among stones and nettles,  
Crackling dry twigs on an elder tree,  
While an accordion drones above the hill.

Hij heeft zijn horloge verloren, een Amerikaans,  
Van goud, van de gasfabriek in Boston. Hij onthaalt  
Het gezelschap op zijn geheimzinnige zee van verdriet.  
Ik glij buiten uit, val tussen stenen en onkruid,  
Krackende droge takjes van een vlierstruik,  
Terwijl een accordeon dreunt op de heuvel.

The diphthong *ui* in “onkruid” echoes that of “buiten” and “uit” in the same line and more importantly “vlierstruik” at the end of the next line. It must be noted that the source poem does not contain end rhyme.

Though the translators could have easily used the Dutch equivalent for source words or phrases like "claw" (klauw) and "nettle" (brandnetel), for example, it is clear from the above examples that other considerations made them opt for an item of more general meaning. Rhyme and meter do not explain everything, however. The shift from "a man" to "anyone" in the translation of Paul Muldoon's poem, 'Why Brownlee left', was probably occasioned by the hypothetical nature of the construction in the line. The fact that the man in the poem was Brownlee emerges sequentially in the course of the reading. It is suggested here that in keeping with the hypothetical statement in the line, the translator read "a man" as "een mens" (a human being). As a result, the step taken to generic "iemand" (someone/anyone) was an obvious one<sup>302</sup>:

For if a man should have been content  
It was him; two acres of barley,

Want als iemand tevreden had moeten zijn  
Was hij het; één bunder gerst,

The reason for the generalisation seems to lie in the hypothetical expression involved<sup>303</sup>. It is asserted, therefore, that an ease of expression indexing the conversational is what mattered here. This fits the overall language of the poem which tells the story of a local farmer who leaves everything behind, even though he was prosperous. It could be argued from a psychological or biographical point of view that Muldoon was referring to his own father, who did in fact vanish from the poet's life when he was a boy. However, this belongs to a second order of reading and is not immediately visible in the source text either.

Again, it can be stated on the whole that the words visible in these generalising shifts still relate to the contexts respresented in the source poems. A note of caution should be sounded, however. In the Muelenhoff translation of 'The Wild Dog Rose', a poem by John Montague, "virgin" was translated as expected as "maagd", rather than as "maagdelijkheid", which was found in the Poetry International translation of the same poem. A contrast of the two translations may shed some light on why these translations differ:

1 (meulenhoff) - 4 (john montague) - 3

In the darkness  
They wrestle, two creatures crazed  
With loneliness, the smell of the  
decaying cottage in his nostrils  
like a drug, his body heavy on hers,  
the tasteless trunk of a seventy year  
old virgin, which he rummages while  
she battles for life  
zij vecht voor haar leven

Ze worstelen  
in het donker, twee wezens krankzinnig  
van eenzaamheid, de bedwelvende geur  
van het rottende huisje in zijn neusgaten,  
zijn lichaam zwaar drukkend op het hare,  
de smaakloze romp van een zeventig jaar  
oude maagd, waarin hij wroet terwijl

2 (poetry international) – 1 (john montague) - 5

In the darkness  
They wrestle, two creatures crazed

In het donker  
worstelen ze, twee wezens gek

With loneliness, the smell of the  
decaying cottage in his nostrils  
like a drug, his body heavy on hers,  
the tasteless trunk of a seventy year  
old virgin, which he rummages while  
she battles for life

van eenzaamheid, de verdoovende geur  
van het rottende huis in zijn neusgaten,  
zijn lichaam op het hare, een smaakloze  
stronk van zeventig jaar maagdelijkheid,  
waarin hij wroet terwijl zij  
voor haar leven vecht

Firstly, The Meulenhoff translation follows the line final words and the word order in the lines of the original more closely. But, a comparison of the two noun phrases in question shows them to be of equal length:

een smaakloze stronk van zeventig jaar maagdelijkheid /  
de smaakloze romp van een zeventig jaar oude maagd]

The relatively longer “maagdelijkheid” is balanced in the other phrase by “een” and “oude”, which are missing in the Poetry International translation. It is argued that “maagdelijkheid” took its cue from “eenzaamheid” in the third line. Both words form natural pauses in the lines, the former pause strengthened by the short syllable “gek” (crazed) at the end of the previous line. Moreover, the lines in between are shorter in Poetry International, thereby bringing the two three-syllable words closer together. In contrast, “crazed” was rendered in Meulenhoff as the longer “krankzinnig”, which weakens the pause after “eenzaamheid”. “His body heavy on hers” is also longer in Meulenhoff: “zijn lichaam zwaar drukkend op de hare” – a full line compared to a half line in the other translation. All this sets off other chains of relation or demonstrates other forms of focus: viz. the chiming of the vowels in line-final “neusgaten”, “hare”, and “jaar”, phrase-final “maagd”, followed by “waarin” and then “haar” on the next line, for example.

It seems, therefore, that each choice made by the translator must not only be consistent with the task of translating the source item but also consistent with itself in fitting into and relating to the other choices made by the translator in the target lines. From a research point of view this seems to form a paradox. Setting up codes of shift and searching for these shifts across source and target texts leads one to complex forms of textual interrelatedness which somewhat lessen the importance of the shifts as such. Nonetheless, it is precisely through identifying shifts that we can discover these more complex forms of interrelatedness between and within source and target texts (see the concluding discussion on shifts in the first section of chapter 6).

Two other issues of a more general order emerge from the discussion of the data listed under ‘**noun: generalised (same field)**’ in this section. Firstly, it is indeed obvious that more textual context is needed to provide a plausible explanation for the choices listed, which is why larger extracts from the poems had to be used to support the arguments made. Secondly, the fact that translators differ must also be factored into the equation. But, as can be judged from the results above, it is mainly the outcomes that differ. A considerable degree of regularity was found in the types of shift used by the translators, as well as in the way they link up specific linguistic choices in the target text.

It has been shown here how translational tendencies not only emerge from the constraints set up by the source text but also by the translators' attention to how various items relate to each other in the target lines. Up until now we have only discussed the general tendencies observable in the corpus. However, as the instance of "virgin" discussed above illustrates, it is also important to know to which extent these tendencies apply to translators individually and in which ways. The extracts shown above were taken from the whole corpus, which means that all the translators used this 'noun generalisation' strategy, but not always in the same places and not always in the same ways. This issue will be discussed in the next and final chapter, where shifts will be examined once again to see whether **there is** any unequivocal evidence of individual translational preferences in the corpus data.

The second most frequent noun phrase shift found was '**noun: complex shift**' with 34 occurrences. Here too the notion complex shift was used to designate shifts that could not be described by using a single term, as the following selection illustrates:

1. location: 1 (data fragmentsm) - 4 (nouns) - 4 Cutting through the shrouding mist	En door de sluier van mist snijden
2. location: 1 (data fragmentsm) - 4 (nouns) - 6 ... the sea's iodine odour	zilde zeelucht,
3. location: 1 (data fragmentsm) - 4 (nouns) - 7 in the queued-up station?	in de rijen op het station?
4. location: 2 (data fragmentspi) - 4 (pinouns) - 1 the great sunroom het glazen huis vol zon	
5. location: 2 (data fragmentspi) - 4 (pinouns) - 1 Its retinue of dogs	de honden, haar gevolg,
6. location: 2 (data fragmentspi) - 4 (pinouns) - 4 anxious joy Grootzeil vol, blijde spanning	
7. location: 2 (data fragmentspi) - 4 (pinouns) - 5 A blank mind,	Een leegte in mijn hoofd,
8. location: 2 (data fragmentspi) - 4 (pinouns) - 16 the sheep-encrusted headland	naar de landtong met die korst van schapen

**Extract 5-16: selection of data fragments from noun: complex shift**

In all the fragments above, the items in the noun phrase underwent shifts in grammatical function in the target phrase. For example, the present participle modifier "shrouding" in the first example becomes the noun "sluier" (veil/shroud), the head of the target noun phrase. In the second example "sea's" switches from being a determiner to being part of the compound noun "zeelucht" (sea odour/air), which is the head of the target phrase. In fact in all but two of

the above examples, a source modifier became the head of the target phrase; in the remaining two, a determiner became a head (2) and a head became a modifier (4). Generally speaking, the phrase remained a noun phrase but its components relate to each other differently in the target phrase. The question of course is why the components shifted function. Was this due to target word order constraints or were there other reasons to be found for the changes. At a glance, it would seem that the complexity of the source phrases had much to do with it. Again larger sections of text will have to be examined to see whether other factors outside these phrases influenced decisions with regard to their internal structure.

In 1, it can be argued that the noun “sluier” proved an appropriate solution as the Dutch verb “sluieren” in the sense of “to become foggy/fogged” is intransitive and hence cannot be used in the same way as in the source text. In 2, the repetition of the *o*’s in iodine odour is mirrored in the repetition of the *z*’s in “zilte zeelucht” (salty/briny sea air/odour). It can also be argued that register played a role here as the Dutch word “jodium” may have been considered too “scientific” in the context, “zilt” being more common a collocate in this respect. An examination of the lines involved offers another possible reason:

Lovely as seals wet from fishing, hauled out on a rock	als zehonden nat van 't vissen, gehezen op een rots
To dry their dark brown fur glinting with scales of salmon	om hun diepbruine vacht te drogen, glinsterend van zalm-
When the spring tide ebbs. This is their everlasting day	schubben als de vloed wegtrekt. Dit is hun altijdurende dag
Of being young. They bring to my room the sea's iodine	van jong te zijn. Ze brengen naar mijn kamer zilte zeelucht,
odour	
On a breeze of voices ruffling with calm as they comb	een bries van stemmen die mij raakt terwijl ze haren kammen
their long	
Hair tangled as weed in a rockpool beginning to settle	verward als zeewier in een plas waar water helder wordt.
clear.	
Give me the sea-breath from your mouths to breath a	Geef mij de adem van je zeemond om te ademen, voor even.
while!	

It can be observed from these lines that the translator tried to maintain the pattern of line final words apparent in the target text. This would have posed a problem of length in the line under discussion, had the phrase been translated as it stands: “de jodiumlucht van de zee”, next to it being out of rhythm with the rest of the lines. “Zilte zeelucht” also echoes the chiming audible in “iodine odour”.

In 3, the translator had to find a replacement for the verb “to queue”. As queue is not a verb in Dutch – the dictionary translates queue as “een rij vormen/in de rij (gaan) staan”, (to form a line/queue; to (go) stand in line) – this clearly made the source construction difficult to render in Dutch. A similar case is visible in 8, where the modifier “sheep encrusted<sup>304</sup>” was rendered as a post-modifying prepositional phrase “with that crust of sheep”. The verb “korsten” is intransitive in Dutch, which means that the verb “encrust” would have to be translated as “bedekken/bezetten” (cover or plaster). Had the translator chosen this solution, he would have lost the image of “crust”. In 4, a related problem occurred with “sunroom”, which is used metaphorically in the line to refer to the Inis Eoghain peninsula to the west and

north of Derry city. But it also can be read quite literally within the metaphor as “a sunny or sun room”. It is obvious from the translation that this was spotted by the translator:

Rearing westward  
the great sunroom  
of Inis Eoghain

Naar het westen oprijzend  
het glazen huis vol zon  
van Inis Eoghain

But the translator was stuck with the word “sunroom” itself: how should it be rendered in Dutch? The dictionary entry offers “serre”, which is understood in the first place in Dutch as glasshouse or greenhouse and only in second place as a glass veranda or conservatory. In this case “serre” would have been too specific or let us say it would not have carried the metaphor. Hence, the translator opted for a ‘literal’ translation of sunroom as “house of glass or glass house” (and not glasshouse) and somehow compensated for the loss of the adjective “great” in the noun phrase by using “full” in “full of sun”. In 6, the translator inverted the functions in the phrase: “anxious joy” became “joyous tension/suspense”. This does not mean that the construction is impossible in Dutch, as it could have been rendered as “angstige vreugde.” It is suggested here that the translator took his cue for this inversion from the common Dutch collocation<sup>305</sup> “blijde” + “verwachting” (happy expectation/happily pregnant/expectant). The same can be argued in 7: the adjective “blank/empty” collocates with head in Dutch, hence the translation “an emptiness in my head”, rather than “leeg van geest”, which would have been understood as “vacuous<sup>306</sup>” or “stupid”.

The third most frequent noun phrase shift was ‘**noun: same (register or length)**’, which covers the use of near synonyms in the target text. It is argued that these synonyms were chosen for the purposes of register or meter in the line. As this requires little discussion, I will limit myself to only a few examples to illustrate the point:

1. location: 1 (data fragmentsm) - 4 (nounsm) - 1  
A three-storey house with half a roof;

Met drie etages en een half dak;

2. location: 2 (data fragmentspi) - 4 (pinouns) - 7  
new reasons for a secular  
Mode of voicing the word nation

nieuwe redenen voor een seculiere  
zegswijze van het woord natie

3. location: 1 (data fragmentsm) - 4 (nounsm) - 2  
As he rode the tumbriel

Toen hij op de mestkar reed,

**Extract 5-17: selection of data fragments from noun: same (register or length)**

In 1, the shorter word “etages” was used instead of “verdiepingen” and in 2 “mode of voicing” was translated very concisely as “zegswijze”, thereby avoiding a change in word order in the line in the latter case. In 3, “tumbriel” was translated as “mestkar” (manure cart) instead of “stortkar/kipkar” (dumper/tipper): all three are listed in the dictionary. The translator’s choice not only fits the agrarian register, as the other two words are more modern, it also catches the

desolate image of the prisoner being led away to execution in Heaney's poem, 'Tollund Man'. On reflection, it proves difficult to call these items "shifts", particularly those identified as pertaining to register. It was considered important to note them nonetheless as the translators could easily have chosen other words in their stead.

The fourth noun shift category identified was **noun: other (register or length)** – 22 occurrences. Here too it is argued that the alternative words were chosen for the purposes of register or meter in the line:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. location: 2 (data fragmentspi) - 4 (pinouns) – 1<br>a hygienic honeycomb   | in hygiënische muizenhokken  |
| 2. location: 2 (data fragmentspi) - 4 (pinouns) – 13<br>Black leatherette and bier-like gauntness of it<br>Made it seem the sofa had achieved | uiteinden, zwart kunstleer en de lijkbaar-achtige<br>hoekigheid,       |
| 3. location: 2 (data fragmentspi) - 4 (pinouns) - 16<br>he'd gatecrashed a bagpipers' convention<br>in his own home, that was no home now.    | dat was duidelijk - alsof hij verdwaald was<br>op een doelzakkfestival |

**Extract 5-18: selection of data fragments from noun: other (register or length)**

In 1, honeycomb was translated as "muizenhokken" (mouseholes/boxes/cages), which has a much more pejorative ring to it than the Dutch "honingraat" (honeycomb). This was perhaps inspired by 'Little Boxes'<sup>307</sup>, a song sung by Pete Seeger on the absurdity of middle-class American lifestyles in the early nineteen sixties, which does not quite match the tenor of the lines but does reflect the mental and social rigidity expressed in them:

a humming factory	een zoemende fabriek
a housing estate	een woningproject
hatreds sealed into	haat wordt vacuüm verpakt
a hygienic honeycomb	in hygiënische muizenhokken

In 2, gauntness was translated as "hoekigheid" (angularity – and by extension awkwardness), rather than the more immediately recognisable "schraalheid" or "magerte".

Ghost-train? Death-gondola? The carved, curved ends, Black leatherette and bier-like gauntness of it Made it seem the sofa had achieved floatation	Spooktrein? Doodsgondel? Door de bewerkte, gebogen uiteinden, zwart kunstleer en de lijkbaar-achtige] hoekigheid, leek het of de sofa was gaan drijven
---	---

The choice was probably cued by the sound of the preceding suffix "-achtig", even though an equivalent for "gauntness" was available.

In 3, the word "festival" was used instead of "conventie", most probably to echo a similar sound in "verdwaald" in the line above it. It can be wondered whether "a bagpipers' festival"

might not sound just as incongruous to a Dutch reader as “a bagpipers’ convention” might to an English or Irish reader.

It is argued that these examples mainly manifest a concern among the translators for relations between items in the target texts, as target equivalents of the source words were clearly available and could have been used instead.

### 5.3.2.2. Verb Phrase Shifts

On the whole, verb shifts were found to be less frequent in the corpus than noun or clause shifts. Out of the 20 most frequent b-type shifts, the number of tokens for these three categories was as follows: clause: 158, noun: 165 and verb: 61, respectively. An analysis of clause and noun shifts has revealed how a number of factors informed these shifts. It remains to be seen whether these factors played a similar role in verb shifts.

The most frequent verb phrase shifts were ‘**verb: other (collocation)**’ with 25 tokens and ‘**verb: generalised (same field)**’ with 15. In the former, it can be seen that another verb was used mainly because it collocated with items in the target lines. In the latter, a more general verb was used, in a similar way to ‘**noun: generalised (same field)**’. It must be noted that the first shift of the four listed in the table was much more frequent in the Poetry International section of the corpus:

codes	all	M	PI	
verb: other (collocation)	25	5	20	M<0.36 of PI
verb: generalised (same field)	15	4	11	M>0.36 of PI
verb: other (metaphor)	11	4	7	M>0.36 of PI
verb: verb to verb + adverbial	10	6	4	M>0.36 of PI
subtotal	61	19	42	M>0.36 of PI
% of 762 b)-type features	8	2.5	5.5	

**Table 5-viii: most frequent verb phrase shifts – tokens and distribution**

In the five examples of ‘**verb: other (collocation)**’ below, the verbs collocate with the noun in the clause and fit the general context of the target utterance in some way:

1. location: 1 (data fragmentsm) - 5 (verbsm) - 2

Thigh-deep in sedge and marigolds  
a neighbour laid his shadow  
on the stream, vouching

Tot aan zijn dijen in zegge en goudsbloem  
wierp een buurman zijn schaduw  
over de beek, getuigend:

2. location: 2 (data fragmentspi) - 5 (piverbs) - 7

Your voices brimmed here, but now,

Jullie stemmen klonken hoog hier

3. location: 2 (data fragmentspi) - 5 (piverbs) - 13

Said the absolute speaker. Between him and us  
A great gulf was fixed where pronunciation

zei de absolute spreker. Tussen hem en ons  
gaapte een wijde kloof waar de uitspraak



Reigned tyrannically. The aerial wire

tiranniek regeerde. De antenne dook van

4. location: 2 (data fragmentspi) - 5 (piverbs) - 16

Teeth moving on the bit.

Tanden bijtend op het bit.

**Extract 5-19: selection of data fragments from verb: other (collocation)**

In 1 the verb used was “wierp” (cast) which definitely collocates with shadow. In 2 “brimmed” was rendered as “klonken” (sounded) and the notion of full to overflowing in brim was compensated for in the target line by the adverb “hoog” (high), the relation between sound and voices being an obvious one. The verb “gapen” (to gape) was used in 3 instead of “vastleggen”, the collocation in Dutch being very similar to the English “a gaping abyss”. In 4, the use of “bijtend” (biting) rather than the Dutch verb for “move” is easy to grasp. In all these instances we can note a clear tendency to ground the emerging text in the target language and culture through the use of recognisable collocations.

In the following examples of ‘**verb: generalised (same field)**’ other tendencies are visible that were also discovered in ‘**noun: generalised (same field)**’:

location: 1 (data fragmentsm) - 5 (verbsm) - 1

As I clambered upstairs I had not much time:

Terwijl ik de trap opklom had ik niet veel tijd:

**Clamber (beklauteren) became climb (opklimmen) – the second option in the dictionary**

location: 1 (data fragmentsm) - 5 (verbsm) - 4

When they trooped down to breakfast that morning.

Wanneer ze die ochtend beneden kwamen voor het ontbijt]

**Trooped (marcheren) became came (komen)**

location: 2 (data fragmentspi) - 5 (piverbs) - 2

do oracles

onze verbitteide stam, bewaken orakels

Police men's minds?

's mensen geest?

**Police became guard (bewaken) – to police is rendered as “onder politiebewaking stellen” in the dictionary**

location: 2 (data fragmentspi) - 5 (piverbs) - 2

Opnieuw bouwde ik mijn droom Again I sounded my dream

**Sounded (peilen) became built (bouwen)**

location: 2 (data fragmentspi) - 5 (piverbs) - 5

How far their feelings are from mine marooned.

Hoe ver verwijderd hun gevoelens van de mijne liggen.]

**Marooned (afgesneden) became “verwijderd liggen” (separated)**

**Extract 5-20: selection of data fragments from verb: generalised (same field)**

In these instances verbs of a more general meaning were chosen, even though translations for all of the source verbs could be found in the dictionary. All of the alternatives chosen belong to the same field of use, though there is a lack of nuance in the target verbs, especially in examples 1, 2 and 5. The choice of the shorter “bewaken” (guard) is obvious in 3, as the use of the dictionary entry would have made the line far too long. In 2 this is perhaps less the case but “kwamen” is still shorter than “marcheerden”, which would have also required the use of the preposition “naar” thereby making the line too long. Again in 1 “opklom” was shorter than

“beklouterde” and to some extent still implies the difficulty visible in “clamber”. In 5 too the use of the Dutch equivalent for “marooned” would have made the line awkward, despite the slight loss of meaning in the line as a result. So once again we can see how systemic or in these instances lexical possibility was constrained by considerations of meter, which again demonstrates just how important perceptions of the right contextual use of register are and as a result how important genre is in such matters.

This ends the discussion of level 1 clause and phrase shifts. To recapitulate, it has been demonstrated, through the analysis of these shifts, that:

1. There is a considerable amount of regularity in ‘optional’ shifts despite the variety of textual outcomes noted;
2. Considerations of genre and register, which in this case includes meter, rhyme etc., are just as constraining, if not more so, than language system per se.
3. Hence, the changes carried out in translation cannot be reduced to the dichotomy of a) requirements of language system (obligatory shifts) and b) ‘optional’ or arbitrary translational preferences.

All this points to notions of contextual consequentality in the decisions taken by the translators in the instances analysed.

### 5.3.3. Other b)-type Features

We now turn to the remaining b)-type features identified in the corpus, namely level 2 shifts that were grouped in the following categories:

- ◆ Explicitation;
- ◆ Implication;
- ◆ Elision;
- ◆ Possible mismatch;
- ◆ Word choice and
- ◆ Word order.

These categories were chosen in the main because of their existence in the literature and particularly because instances of them were fairly easy to spot in the data. As was stated already, b)-type level 1 shifts were maintained because they did not fit into these 6 categories straight away. Following the analysis, some level 1 shifts could be included under level 2 b)-type categories (see table 5-xvii in 5.4. below). However, the corollary of this is that the level 2 shifts have to be reviewed in the light of the evidence found while analysing the level 1 data (see also 5.4. below). As was stated above, ‘**explicitation**’ for example is not a translational absolute or an end in itself, but a manifestation of the translator’s interaction with source and target texts within a given set of language and genre expectations or perceptions. As is visible from the tables below (see also **Tree n° 3: overview of categories and deeper codes** in chapter 4.1.5.2. above), these categories were further subdivided. In two of the categories – ‘**word order**’ and ‘**word choice**’ – explanatory tags were appended to the codes. In the other categories, the lexical item where the particular shift took place was indicated, as in ‘**elision:**

**adjective dropped'** for example. Each of these categories and their subdivisions will be discussed briefly in turn. In each case a table will be provided indicating position and distribution in the two sections of the corpus, along with examples from the data of the most frequent codes.

### 5.3.3.1. Explicitation

As is indicated in the table, explicitation comprises changes or additions<sup>308</sup> of items in the target texts that were either implicitly stated or not (immediately) retrievable in the source texts:

Codes	all	M	PI	
explicit: noun (phrase)	17	8	9	M>0.36 of PI
explicit: + noun (phrase)	9	3	6	M>0.36 of PI
explicit: + adverbial	7	3	4	M>0.36 of PI
explicit: + adjective (phrase)	5	0	5	M<0.36 of PI
explicit: + verb form	5	2	3	M>0.36 of PI
explicit: adjective (phrase)	1	1	0	M<0.36 of PI
explicit: adverbial	1	1	0	M<0.36 of PI
explicit: verb (phrase)	1	0	1	M<0.36 of PI
Subtotal	46	18	28	M>0.36 of PI
% of 762 b-type features	6	2.3	3.7	

**Table 5-ix: explicitation – level and distribution**

A random sample of instances from the data revealed the following:

- location: 1 (data fragmentsm) - 7 (explicitm) – 2 (“loads” became “balen” (bales))  
and David and Goliath rolled en David en Goliath rolden  
magnificently, like loads of hay overdadig, als balen hooi  
too big for our small lanes, te groot voor onze smalle wegen,
- location: 2 (data fragmentspi) - 7 (piexplicit) – 3 (+ noun : “wolk”)  
On shelves at school, and wait and watch until Op de planken op school, en af te wachten tot  
The fattening dots burst into nimble - De opzwellende stipjes openbarstten in een wolk  
Swimming tadpoles. Miss Walls would tell us how Van kwieke kikkervisjes. Miss Walls legde ons uit
- location: 2 (data fragmentspi) - 7 (piexplicit) – 3 (+ adverbial: “uit nieuwsgierigheid”)  
Some day I will go to Aarhus Eens zal ik, uit nieuwsgierigheid, in  
To see his peat-brown head, Aarhus zijn veenbruine hoofd gaan bekijken,
- location: 2 (data fragmentspi) - 7 (piexplicit) – 2 (+ adjective: “warm”)  
Ta réimse Je hebt de ruimte,  
iomlan neamhtheoranta d'aighe agat volledig, onbegrensd, voor die geest van je  
le spaisteoireacht om in rond te dolen  
faoi ghrian te idéil, leoithne onder de warme zon van een ideaal, een bries

5. location: 1 (data fragments) - 7 (explicit) – 6 (+ verb form : “geheven”)

Hotly you duelled for our name abroad  
In Restoration wig, with German sword,  
Wanting a vicious murder thrust to prove  
Your Celtic passion and our Lady's love.

Je duelleerde fel voor ons prestige in den vreemde  
Met Restauratie-pruik, het Duitse zwaard geheven.  
Je wilde een dodelijke stoot om ons te doen aanschouwen  
Je Keltisch vuur en 't hart voor onze Vrouwe.

#### Extract 5-21: selection of data fragments from explicitation

An analysis of the broader co-text of the fragments in which these items of ‘**explicitation**’ were discovered allowed the following conclusions to be reached. It is asserted that sound patterns determined the choice of “balen” in 1 (see especially line-final “rolden” in the first line of the fragment). In 2, the monosyllabic “wolk” fits in with the line-final monosyllables above and below it. “Wolk” also partly compensates for the absent present participle “swimming”. It is argued that the addition of “wolk” stems from the difficulty of rendering “burst into” in the same way in Dutch, even though “openbarsten tot” may have proved a close translation. The addition of the adverbial in 3 is somewhat of an anomaly. It does not seem to have been determined by meter as a close translation of the original would have caused no imbalance in length between the first and second line in the target poem. Indeed, a translation of the same poem by the same translator in Meulenhoff 10 years later remains very close to the original and contains no explicitation:

1 (meulenhoff) 2 (seamus Heaney) -5

Some day I will go to Aarhus  
To see his peat-brown head,  
The mild pods of his eye-lids,  
His pointed skin cap.

Eens zal ik naar Aarhus gaan  
Om zijn turfbruine hoofd te zien,  
De zachte schillen van zijn oogleden,  
Zijn spitse kap van huid.

Another explanation is needed, therefore, and it is asserted that the explicitation shows evidence of (arrested) drafting, which given the ad-hoc nature of the translations at Poetry International at the time seems plausible. In 4 “warm” collocates with “sun” of course, but perhaps it can be put down to an attempt at hyperbole on the part of the translator. The verb form “geheven” in 5 was clearly added for the sake of assonance with the final word in each of the other lines of the stanza.

Most of the changes and additions shown above would be classified as ‘**optional explicitations**’ (Klaudy in Baker 2000: 80-84), as opposed to ‘**obligatory explicitations**’, to the extent that they may have been

dictated by differences in text-building strategies (cf. Blum-Kulka’s cohesive patterns) and stylistic preferences between languages. They are optional in the sense that grammatically correct sentences can be constructed without their application in the target language, although the text as a whole will be clumsy and unnatural. (Klaudy in Baker 2000: 83)

The final sentence in the quote raises the following question: why would a translator want to sound clumsy and unnatural? Perhaps the following situation might be a case in point: the

translator is conducting a study of the said text and wants to render the source syntax in target terms for the purposes of illustration and comment. The skopos is clear and accepted by all involved and students and scholars alike know that one would not put the given line or sentence that way in the target language. So, to use the old adage, such situations require and in fact demand ‘a suspension of disbelief’ regarding language use. How else would one lay bare the source text intricacies involved? None of those interviewed had that purpose in mind, however. In their situation, clumsiness or unnaturalness would be tantamount to incompetence in the target language itself, never mind its stylistic preferences. Such considerations extend outwards and embrace each translator’s professional situation as well as inwards to cover their skills in engaging with the texts involved. In this respect, ‘stylistic’ preferences are not the properties of languages but are held by the people who are seen to use them and who are consequently judged for doing so. They are hence not as optional as they are posited to be. A ‘bad’ translation may mean loss of work or a lambasting by critics, or both. Moreover, it has been shown throughout the analysis of the data in the corpus that decisions involving the language ‘system’ and its ‘stylistics’ occurred in conjunction with one other and that the ‘optional’ has proved much more systematic than previously thought.

As was the case with ‘obligatory shifts’, ‘obligatory explicitation’ is understood as stemming from formal incompatibilities between languages or ‘categories’ that are missing in one language as compared to another, e.g. the absence of the definite article in Russian:

So translation from Russian into English, which uses its definite article prolifically, will involve numerous additions, as will translation from the preposition-free Hungarian into languages such as Russian and English, which use prepositions. (Klaudy in Baker 2000:83)

Catford’s little contrastive study (1965) of the article in translation (French-English) shows that such predictions provide little leverage in theory or practice, once again demonstrating that the dichotomy ‘obligatory/optional’ needs to be rethought. Perhaps the modal ‘will’ in the above quotes could be replaced by another modal like ‘should’ or ‘might’ along with the tentative “as far as can be judged from observing differences between the two languages”.

From a methodological point of view, one can ask at this stage whether a number of Level 1 codes should not be brought together under the broader term, ‘**explicitation**’. The codes ‘**noun: specified (same field)**’ – 17 tokens and ‘**verb: specified (same field)**’ – 4 tokens are obvious cases in point to mind. The same question can (and will) be asked for implicitation below. It seems only fair to say, if this were done, that a proviso should be added. Despite their validity as recognised categories in the translation literature, it seems from this analysis that they should be viewed as functions of the situated (textual) practices revealed thus far, which would cancel out Klaudy’s tripartite typology of ‘obligatory, optional and translation-inherent explicitations’ (Klaudy in Baker 2000: 80-84). As much can emerge in the process of analysis, it seemed advisable, therefore, to forestall a complete regrouping of codes and categories for the time being. It still also remains to be seen whether ‘**explicitation**’ is more frequent in the corpus than its opposite ‘**implicitation**’, which, judging from the number of

implicitation features, does not seem to be the case (see following table). If ‘**elision**’ were included in the equation, this would definitely not be the case.

### 5.3.3.2. Implicitation

The category ‘**implicitation**’ is understood as comprising items of expression found in the target texts that are considered less specific than those in the source texts. **Elision** (omission or deletion) is included by some under ‘**implicitation**’ (see Klaudy 2000: 8-84 for further references) but will be dealt with separately below.

codes	all	M	PI	
Implicit: clause	32	10	22	M > 0.36 of PI
implicit: noun	16	9	7	M > 0.36 of PI
implicit: verb	11	7	4	M > 0.36 of PI
implicit: phrase	10	3	7	M > 0.36 of PI
subtotal	69	29	40	M > 0.36 of PI
% of 762 b)-type features	9	3.8	5.2	

**Table 5-x: implicitation – place and distribution**

1. location: 1 (data fragmentsm) - 9 (implicitm) – 4 (clause)

There was not so much as the smell of whiskey on him.  
 People still hold he had died of fright,  
 That the house was haunted by an elder brother  
 Who was murdered for his birthright.  
 People will always put two and two together.

Er was geen spoor van whiskey in zijn adem. De mensen  
 Beweren nu nog dat hij van angst gestorven is,  
 Dat in het huis de geest van een oudere broer rondwaarde  
 Die om zijn geboorterecht vermoord was.  
 De mensen zullen altijd hun conclusies trekken.

location: 1 (data fragmentsm) - 9 (implicitm) – 3 (noun)  
 but no longer harsh, a human being  
 merely, hurt by event.

maar nu niet langer weerzinwekkend is, gewoon  
 een menselijk wezen, gekweld door het leven.

location: 1 (data fragmentsm) - 9 (implicitm) – 3 (verb)  
 We danced round him shouting 'To hell with King Billy'

We dansten om hem heen en schreeuwden  
 'Naar de hel met koning Billy',]

And dodged from the arc of his flailing blackthorn.

En ontweken de boog van zijn zwaaiende stok.

location: 2 (data fragmentspi) - 9 (piimplicit) – 8  
 I came back from that frugal republic  
 with my two arms the one length, the customs woman  
 having insisted my allowance was myself.

Ik kwam met lege handen terug uit die schrale Republiek  
 de douanebeambte had erop aangedrongen  
 dat de mij toegestane uitvoer gelijk was aan mijzelf.

#### **Extract 5-22: selection of data fragments from implicitation**

In 1 the idiomatic expression “to put two and two together” is rendered more prosaically and implicitly in the target line as “to draw their conclusions”, as the expression is not common in Dutch usage. It still manages to strike the same note of incongruous matter-of-factness as the

source line: of course a person would die of fright if he saw a ghost and big mansions are always haunted by ghosts, ergo! The example of ‘**implication**’ in 2 could also have been coded as ‘**noun: generalised (same field)**’. The translator could have easily chosen the Dutch word for event (gebeurtenis) but did not, perhaps because of the seriousness of the event involved. It is noted that the words “gekweld” and “leven” collocate in Dutch, as in “door het leven gekweld (gaan)”. In 3, the verb form “flailing” is rendered implicitly as “swinging”. Here too the translator could have used the Dutch verb “dorsen” (to flail seed or grain) but chose not to, probably because it was considered too specific in the context. Indeed “dorsen” means hitting the mark, which is not the case in the poem. In 4 the gender of the customs official is not clear in the target form “douanebeampte” (customs official). The translator would have to have used “vrouwelijk” to specify the gender of the official thereby further lengthening the line. The implicit form did not cause any major loss of meaning in the lines as a whole.

As can be seen from these examples, implicitness covers a variety of things ranging from the idiomatic as opposed to the prosaic (modes of expression) to the absence of a gender marker in a phrase that is ostensibly quite close to the source phrase (a shift from gender specific to gender neutral lexical items). Some plausible explanations have been put forward for these implications and it has been shown that though equivalents do exist in the target language (except in 1), other more implicite alternatives were chosen in conjunction with and as a result of other factors of influence in the context.

### 5.3.3.3. Elision

It is a commonly held view that translators omit or fail to translate parts of a source text, so it was of particular interest to me to discover whether there was any substance to this view or, more particularly, whether the findings from the corpus would bear the view out. A search in the literature for entries on this topic proved quixotic, however, so I decided for the time being that the windmill of elision was of my own creation. Nevertheless, it seemed like an issue worth tackling and trying to understand. What in fact did elision constitute in the corpus and what forms did it take? An initial examination of the data showed that very little had been left out. In fact, only 33 instances of ‘**elision**’ were noted for a total of 5512 lines analysed, which meant that on average only 1 item was left out every 167 lines. As the table indicates, elision was more frequent in the Meulenhoff section of the corpus: 1 item per 122 lines as opposed to 1 item per 176 lines in the Poetry International section. The most frequent lexical items to be omitted were nouns (11), adjectives (9) and verbs (8):

codes	all	M	PI	
elision: noun dropped	11	4	7	M>0.36 of PI
elision: adjective dropped	9	2	7	M<0.36 of PI
elision: verb dropped	8	3	5	M>0.36 of PI
elision: adverb dropped	2	2	0	M>0.36 of PI
elision: clause dropped	1	0	1	M<0.36 of PI
elision: complex shift	1	1	0	M<0.36 of PI

elision: phrase dropped	1	0	1	M<0.36 of PI
subtotal	33	12	21	M>0.36 of PI
% of 762 b)-type features	4.3%	1.6%	2.7%	
Elision per line	1/157	1/122	1/193	

**Table 5-xi: elision – place and distribution**

As elision evidently resulted in information loss, it remained to be discovered how great the loss of information was. This meant examining the environments from which these items had been omitted and also attempting to discover possible reasons for their omission. Were the items in question of major or minor importance in the overall context of each poem? Did they stand alone or function independently in the clauses they were part of or were they embedded in verb or noun phrases, etc. within those clauses? It was felt that these factors were important in determining the extent of the information loss in each case. It was also considered important to discuss all 11 instances of noun elision in order to see whether any pattern could be discerned. A perusal of the data revealed the following: of the 11 nouns omitted, 10 were elements of larger phrases, the other stood alone and functioned as the object of a clause (example 10), as the examples illustrate:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>that child's grandchild's</b><br/><u>speech</u> stumbles over lost<br/>syllables of an old order.</li> <li>2. Washed over rails <b>our Clare</b> <u>Island</u> dreams,</li> <li>3. You chose <u>rapparee</u> mountain routes to try</li> <li>4. You stood, while <u>brother</u> officers betrayed</li> <li>5. with <b>beehive</b> <u>huts</u></li> <li>6. Look though,<br/>in the wink of an eye there's <u>a fall</u><br/>an end to joy a sad last curtain</li> <li>7. curved <b>for miles</b><br/><b>East and miles</b> west beyond us, sagging</li> <li>8. <b>for miles</b><br/><b>East and miles</b> west beyond us, sagging</li> <li>9. <b>With his spade and</b> <u>navvy's</u> shovel.</li> <li>10. Than you started to dance <u>a step</u></li> <li>11. Sunday afternoon <b>in Croke Park</b> or <u>Dalyer</u>,</li> </ol> | <p>struikelt <b>dat kinds kleinkind</b><br/>over verloren syllaben<br/>van een oude orde.</p> <p>Onze droom van Clare weggespoeld over de railing</p> <p>Je koos bergpaden om het vijandelijk moreel</p> <p>Jij hield stand, andere, verraderlijke officieren<br/>met bijenkorven.</p> <p>in een oogwenk valt<br/>het eind van de vreugd<br/>een bedroefd laatste doek</p> <p>Als een prachtig vloeiend handschrift golfden ze mijlen<br/>Naar oost en west van ons vandaan,</p> <p>Als sierlijk schoonschrift kromden zij zich mijlenver<br/>Naar Oost en west van ons vandaan,</p> <p>Met zijn spa en zijn schop.</p> <p>Of je begon gelijk te dansen</p> <p>Uw zondagmiddagen niet bij een wedstrijd <b>in Croke Park</b>,</p> |
|---|---|

**Extract 5-23: all data fragments from elision: noun dropped**

The elided nouns have been underlined in the source lines. Three of the ten nouns omitted function as the head of the noun phrase they belong to: (1, 5 and 11). It is argued that omitting these three nouns would constitute the more serious loss of information. However, information gleaned by the reader from the broader context of the poems would reduce the information loss to some extent in these cases. This is clearly the case in 2 where it is obvious from the rest of the poem and even its title, 'Sailing to an Island', that the poem refers to Clare Island off the Mayo coast and not County Clare further south on the west coast of



Ireland. In 1, the word “speech” is used as a metonym for the person in question, which in fact is how the translator read and translated the lines. In 5 there definitely is information loss, as there is a marked difference between “beehives” and “beehive huts”:

from ‘A New Seige’ – John Montague (PI)

the bright candle	de heldere toorts
of the O’Neills	van de O’Neills
burns from Iona	brandt vanaf Iona
lightens Scotland	verlicht Schotland
with beehive huts	met bijenkorven
glittering manuscripts	glinsterende manuskripten

The image of medieval monastic life indexed by “beehive huts” is missing though not entirely lost in the translation as it is compensated for in the following line. Given that “huts” was the only word missing in a poem that is 274 lines long, one wonders whether this was not the result of a misreading or oversight. Dalyer, the word dropped in 11 is short in Dublin speech for Dalymount Park soccer stadium. Croke Park is where Gaelic football is played. The poet creates an ironic contrast in the line between these two popular sports. This was probably unknown to the translator, who nonetheless did not fail to miss the reference to football which is not mentioned at all in the source line:

location: 2 (poetry international) - 17 (brendan kennelly) - 10

Why can't you be an honest-to-God	Waarom kunt u geen godvrezende doorsnee Dubliner
Dubliner, go for a swim in Sandymount, spend	Zijn, gaat u niet zwemmen in Sandymount, slijt u
Sunday afternoon in Croke Park or Dalyer,	Uw zondagmiddagen niet bij een wedstrijd in Croke Park,]
Boast of things you've never done,	Pocht u niet over dingen die u nooit gedaan heeft,
Places you've never been,	Plaatsen waar u nooit geweest bent,

Thought the contrast was lost in the target line, the reference to football was made explicit. In the era of global television and Sky Channel one can sometimes catch a game of Gaelic football or even hurling on television but back in 1999 this was not quite the case.

There are two other cultural references of a similar type that were dropped by the translators: the Gaelic word “rapparee” in 3 and “navvy” (short for navigator) in 9. These three words could equally have been treated under ‘**Index**’ in 5.1.5 above. They were the only words of this type to be dropped, as all similar items that were indexical of culture were kept in the translations. “Rapparee” and “navvy” were perhaps hard to find in an ordinary dictionary and are certainly not listed in the translation dictionary. Both words would be recognised immediately by an Irish reader. A “rapparee” was a type of Irish (read: anti-English) renegade romanticised in popular story as someone who robbed the rich and gave to the poor: a kind of celtic Robin Hood, if you like. “Navy” is short for navigator, originally a road or railway worker but now synonymous with a hard-working builder’s labourer. It is associated with the thousands of Irish people employed in the rebuilding of England after World War Two and the dire conditions they worked in. The two words could easily have been kept as they were in

translation and may have aroused the Dutch-speaking reader's curiosity. On the other hand, perhaps the relative obscurity of the words dissuaded the translators from using them. The question then was: should the translators have kept the words as they were or should they have tried to translate them and if so, how would they have translated them? "Rapparee" could be rendered as "vrijbouter" perhaps, which would have kept some of the romanticism of the term but none of its associations with Irish history. "Navy" could be translated as "stukwerker" and evoke similar associations in the Dutch, not those of an Irish builder's labourer on an English building site, but perhaps those of a Portuguese or Polish labourer on a Belgian building site. This leads us back to the discussion on domesticating and foreignising strategies. In these two instances it is very hard to say what the best strategy would have been: to evoke scenes the reader recognises and can relate to, or to oblige the reader to go in search of terms he or she does not recognise, something not every reader will do. Much emerges in the reading both before and after translation and it is difficult to tell in advance what a reader might make of a poem (see the discussion in 'Index' in 5.1.5 above). Whatever the case may be, our main concern here was to observe and offer plausible comment on what the translators actually did. In this instance they clearly elided two culturally important items. How should this be evaluated? Ultimately only two such instances were noted in the corpus, which means that they can hardly be accused of obscuring the source culture in the poems, quite to the contrary, as has been demonstrated in 'Index' 5.1.5 and 'Names and Places' 5.1.1 above. In terms of frequency, these two elisions are negligible, as are the number of elisions in the corpus as a whole.

In 4 the missing word "brother" is partly compensated for by the addition of "anderen" (other) in the target line. In 7 and 8 (taken from two different translations of the same poem) miles is used twice in the same phrase and hence can be considered redundant in terms of actual information load. The second "miles" was dropped by both translators. Its purpose in the source text is metrical more than anything else. Similarly in 10, one can ask whether there is a great difference between "to dance a step" and "to dance". In 6, "fall" is not really omitted but rendered as a verb. On further investigation the **elision** looks more like a **mismatch** as the original poem speaks of a fall (of the trapeze artist) and the translation "of the end of the fun happening" ("valt" in Dutch).

To return to the notion of frequency, one can ask whether it alone is a relevant criterion in discussing elision. It is argued here that it is, were it only to dispel the common belief that translators "leave things out all the time". Viewed narrowly however, elision has to be evaluated on a case by case basis in order to establish the extent or nature of the information loss in any given piece of translation. Nevertheless, there is no hard and fast rule for evaluating such cases as **elision** sometimes fades into **implication** (examples 7, 8 and 10) or **possible mismatch** (example 6) or is compensated for in some way in the target text (**explicitation** in example 11). Regarding any emergent pattern in the elision of nouns, the following can be suggested:

1. Perceptions of redundancy played a role in elision (examples 7, 8 and 10);
2. 'Obscure' words were dropped but the information loss was more of an indexical order rather than a denotational one (examples 3, 9 and 11);
3. Elision (and the examples used to illustrate it) cannot be considered total or absolute as other mechanisms of 'compensation' are visible in the co-text (examples 4 and 11).

The adjectives omitted in the target texts were of course used to provide extra information but also to intensify or add to the emotional colouring of the phrases they function within. Again, all instances will be shown in order to see whether any pattern emerges from these elisions:

1. Red-clawed choughs perched on it saw	De alpenkraai, op het dak gezeten,
2. as they comb their long  Hair tangled as weed in a rockpool beginning to settle clear.	een bries van stemmen die mij raakt terwijl ze haren kammen  verward als zeewier in een plas
3. his body heavy on hers,	zijn lichaam op het hare,
4. And leprous sores my towers like beggars show.	en de zweren,
5. kept faith with doughty bullfinches,	hield mijn woord jegens goudvinken,
6. Till there's nothing left of our black horse	Tot er van ons paard niets over is
7. Or the abstract, lonely curve of distant trains	of de abstracte, eenzame curve van treinen
8. the tucked Neat head and claws and, finding himself linked	Kevin voelt de warme eitjes, de kleine borst, het gedoken kopje en de klauwtjes,
9. Nothing elaborate, just something simple and quick -	Niets bijzonders, gewoon iets eenvoudigs -

**Extract 5-24: all data fragments from elision: adjective dropped**

The elided adjectives were underlined in the source line. Considerations of meter and line length played a part in the decision to drop most of these adjectives, which an examination of the broader co-text demonstrates:

1. Location: 1 (meulenhoff) 6 (mrichard murphy) 1  
Red-clawed choughs perched on it saw  
Guards throw priests to the sea's jaw.

De alpenkraai, op het dak gezeten,  
Zag hoe ze priesters in 't water smeten.

This is also argued for fragment 4:

2. Location: 2 (poetry international) 6 (arichard murphy) 1

Here the rain harps on ruins, plucking lost  
Tunes from my structure, which the wind pours through  
In jackdaw desecration, carping at the dust

And leprous sores my towers like beggars show.

Hier hamert regen op ruïnes, verloren wijzen  
ontlokkend aan mijn bouw, waar de wind door Stroomt]  
in ontwijding met kraaien vittend op het  
Stofgrijze]  
en de zweren, door mijn torens als bedelaars getoond.]

Both extracts of translation show that the translator was eager to keep meter and rhyme in the target lines and as a result took some liberty with their sense. Nonetheless, it is argued that “alpenkraai” in 1 retains something of the gruesomeness of the original, which is not achieved in fragment 4. The same reasoning is considered to hold for fragments 2, 5, 7 and 9. Fragment 3 is a similarly interesting case which has already been discussed in part under ‘**noun: generalised (same field)**’ in chapter 5.3.2.1. Noun Phrase Shifts above. There too it was argued that considerations of rhyme and meter played a part in the decision-making. It is noted here that for the very same reasons there was no elision in another translation of this poem by another translator, in which the line was rendered as:

like a drug, his body heavy on hers,

zijn lichaam zwaar drukkend op het hare,

The missing adjective, “black” in fragment 6 was probably considered redundant by the translator as it was already stated in stanza 1 of the poem that the horse was black. Finally, the absence of “neat” in fragment 8 was compensated for in some way by the translator’s use of the diminutive suffixes ‘-je’ and ‘-tje’ in “kopje” and “klauwtjes”. It can be concluded that these elisions were mainly informed by decisions with regard to rhyme and meter and that they were not absolute for in most cases some form of plausible explanation or compensation was found in the co-text.

The elision of verb forms seems harder to explain than those of nouns and adjectives. Nonetheless, it can be argued that considerations of redundancy played a role in some of the elisions visible in the data below. Fragments 2, 7 and 8 are considered cases in point: the ship had to be struck by a wave in the first place to shudder; birds cannot fly without feathers and rivers usually flow, no matter how slowly:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Encased in a mirage, steam on the water,   | In een luchtspiegeling, stoom op het water,  |
| 2. he hoves to a squall; is struck; and shudders.   | Ze buigt voor een windstoot en siddert.  |
| 3. Or a pit of night kept warm by a peat fire   | of een schacht van de nacht, warm door een<br>Turfvuur]  |
| 4. Petals beaten wide by rain, it   | De blaadjes uiteen van de regen, hij   |
| 5. I am neither interneer nor informer;<br>An inner émigré, grown long-haired<br>And thoughtful; a wood-kerne | Ik, geïnterneerde noch verklikker,<br>Van binnen émigré, langharig<br>En bedachtzaam; een voetknecht |

- |    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
| 6. | much as any<br>picked or paid accomplice.                         | door te getuigen of te verzwijgen, net zoals<br>een betaalde medeplichtige. |
| 7. | Until the young are hatched and fledged and flown.                | tot de jongen<br>uit het ei komen en hebben leren vliegen.                  |
| 8. | as I stood peeing into the river<br>that flowed beneath the house | naar binnen, terwijl ik stond te turen<br>naar de rivier beneden het huis   |

**Extract 5-25: all data fragments from elision: verb dropped**

The absence of the verb “kept” in 3 is compensated for by the weight of the preposition “door” in Dutch, which assumes some of the properties of the verb. There seems to be a tendency in Dutch for prepositions like “door” or “toe<sup>309</sup>” to assume part of the agency normally carried by verbs or longer expressions, though I have come across no study that corroborates this intuition. The same can be argued for 4 where the use of the adverb (particle) “uiteen” in combination with the preposition “van” renders the verb form “driven” more than implicitly in the target line. This cannot be said of the preposition in 1, however, as it merely proposes a state of affairs and lacks the intensity and sense of entrapment visible in the past participle “encased”. The verbs “be” and “grow” in 5 would be treated as a copula and a resulting copula in English (Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech & Svartvik 1997: 1172), which means that there is identity or complementation between the persona (I) in the poem and the state or result evoked i.e. “neither internee nor informer/an inner émigré, long-haired/ and thoughtful, a wood-kerne.” The translator achieved identity and an elliptical style by dropping both copulas and hence juxtaposing the series of noun phrases, but lost the sense of process visible in “grow”, even though he could easily have used Dutch copulas to match the ones in the source lines. It can be argued that once the first copula was dropped the second had to be as well; otherwise the construction would have sounded like ‘foreign speech’. Why “picked” was dropped in 6 is not at all clear, however, as an equivalent verb was easily available in Dutch. Neither can line length or meter be put forward as an argument for the elision, though the full line may have been considered awkward by the translator:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 2 (poetry international) 4 (pidesmond o grady) 4<br>innocent triumph. We grownups murder too<br>through witness, omission, much as any<br>picked or paid accomplice. | onschuldige triomf. Wij volwassenen moorden ook<br>door te getuigen of te verzwijgen, net zoals<br>een (gekozen of) betaalde medeplichtige. |
|--|---|

There are five other instances of elision of various types noted in the corpus which will not be dealt with here, as the main tendencies observable with respect to these elisions have been covered in the discussion so far. Suffice it to say by way of conclusion that the absence of a lexical item in the target text is no hard and fast proof of elision as the information load carried by that item in the source text may have been attributed to another item in the target

text or even redistributed over several. Furthermore, it has been shown that elision (omission or deletion) is hardly ever the result of forgetfulness, as the word omission might imply.

#### 5.3.3.4. Possible Mismatch

The term ‘**possible mismatch**’ was chosen out of a concern not to exclude certain readings of items and lines in the poems that were not immediately apparant to me. It became more than obvious when conducting the interviews that reading<sup>310</sup> is of capital importance to those interviewed (see the data excerpts and discussion in chapter 2.4.3.1. (b1). How do you go about it?). All the translators pointed to the layeredness of literary texts in general and of poetry in particular and of the difficulties involved in achieving a corresponding degree of layeredness in the target text. It seemed important, therefore, not to dismiss any mismatches found in the corpus out of hand but to scrutinise them and the immediate environment in which they were found, in search of plausible explanations. This would allow me to put into perspective the items that were coded as ‘**possible mismatch**’ in the corpus. It must firstly be stressed that these mismatches were relatively few in number, as the table below illustrates:

codes	all	M	PI	
possible mismatch: noun	6	1	5	M<0.36 of PI
possible mismatch: verb	5	0	5	M<0.36 of PI
possible mismatch: adjective	2	0	2	M<0.36 of PI
possible mismatch: preposition	2	1	1	M>0.36 of PI
possible mismatch: clause	1	1	0	M<0.36 of PI
possible mismatch: adverb	1	1	0	M<0.36 of PI
subtotal	17	4	13	M<0.36 of PI
% of 762 b)-type features	2.2%	0.5%	1.7%	
Mismatch per line	1/324	1/366	1/311	

**Table 5-xii: possible mismatch – level and distribution**

The evidence dispelled another commonly held view that translators often misunderstood the texts they translated, though it was hard to find any categorical statements of this nature in the literature. As a result, the view was put down to hearsay, even though I encountered it quite often myself in my own work as a professional translator. The view is even echoed in part by the eminent scholar Robert De Beaugrande (1978<sup>311</sup>: 25) though only as an opening gambit and it must be stated that he stresses the importance of understanding a translator’s readings as they become manifest in his or her translations:

Most contributions on translation of poetry do not focus specifically on the processes whereby the original text is read and understood. Yet the fact that a text must be read before it can be translated is by no means nugatory. Although translators are not, as a rule, inarticulate people, one would be hard put to discover a translation of poetry that is entirely free from what appear to be errors. It is more probable that the errors derive from inaccurate reading than from inaccurate writing (although the latter cannot be ruled out).

Note also that De Beaugrande hedges his assertion by speaking of “what appear to be errors” and not of errors as such, which in fact provides a point of ingress into possible mismatches.

It must be stated categorically that these mismatches are in no way considered as evidence of a lack of knowledge of or competence in the source language. It was merely the purpose to examine the contextual plausibility of mismatches. Given the sensitivity of the issue, it was neither the purpose to air the translators’ ‘dirty linen’ in public as it were, which is why no instances from the data will be shown here<sup>312</sup>. None of those interviewed ever claimed infallibility of judgement and admitted openly that misreadings could slip into their work. In the normal course of events such items would be spotted by proofreaders and editors or by the translators themselves given the right amount of time and distance from the work. The reader is asked, therefore, to take it on trust that 10 of the 17 instances noted were simple misreadings and the other 7 were plausible interpretations in the context. It was also observed that the plausible interpretations were informed by considerations of rhyme and meter in the line. Given that the majority of mismatches occurred in the Poetry International section of the corpus, it can be argued that they were mainly the result of a lack of time for proofreading. Again, all this needs to be put into perspective. It cannot be stressed enough, that no matter how regrettable such mismatches or infelicities may be, they are not particular to translations alone.

### 5.3.3.5. Word Choice

Word choice was chosen as an obvious initial category before beginning the coding. As such it was meant to comprise all the phrase level items discussed in 5.2 above. When the complexity and variety of phrase level changes began to emerge during coding, it was decided to classify these changes under the various subsections of phrase level shift. The intention was ultimately to bring all these categories, subsections and codes together under one general heading namely, ‘**word choice**’. The table below contains details of two remaining items and their distribution in the corpus. These items contain instances that could be redistributed across the various phrase level codes analysed in 5.2. In this respect they have already been discussed in detail with regard to their substance and the translation decisions they manifest. Hence it would prove redundant to examine fragments of data listed under the two remaining codes in the table.

codes	all	M	PI	
word choice: same (reg. or length)	8	1	7	M<0.36 of PI
word choice: other (collocation)	5	1	4	M<0.36 of PI
subtotal	13	2	11	M<0.36 of PI
% of 762 b)-type features	1.7%	0.3%	1.4%	M<0.36 of PI

**Table 5-xiii: word choice – type and distribution**

Nonetheless, it was considered important to keep this category in order to show how the research method developed and how the categories were rethought and regrouped during coding as certain patterns of frequency began to emerge in the data. In retrospect, it can be stated that ‘**word choice**’ proved too broad and somewhat unwieldy a category, mainly because

it would have contained – and does contain – too many disparate items. Had the data not been recoded at a ‘deeper’ level, the patterns of frequency that emerged may have remained invisible. Furthermore, the disparity of the items listed under **‘word choice’** would have necessitated further coding and regrouping anyway. Ultimately, **‘word choice’** can be considered as an overarching category that includes all phrase level features but which, in itself, is too general to offer any real leverage when coding the data. It is pertinently obvious, of course, that only lexical items were listed as codes at phrase and clause level, with the exception of prepositions and the odd auxiliary verb, which was always examined within the verb phrase anyway. It was considered futile to match prepositions for example as they collocate with lexical items differently in the languages under scrutiny. It was noted, however, that prepositions have a tendency to share the weight usually carried by verbs in Dutch (**verb: verb to preposition**, 3 instances and **verb: verb to prepositional phrase**, 1 instance). All this belongs to the broader debate on grammaticalisation which will not be entered into here. Next to this, only two instances of preposition mismatch were found in the whole analysis. Terms like adjective, noun and verb may be considered ideologically neutral but the tags attached to them in the codes cannot be considered so, at least not entirely, (e.g. **‘word choice: other (collocation)’** or **‘word order: narrative strategy’**). However, these tags were conceived following observation of certain phenomena in the data and did not rely entirely on the terminology found in translation studies. This is to say that there was no well-structured pre-conceived taxonomical grid placed over the data from the outset but that the data helped form the grid as the analysis progressed. **‘Word choice’** can be considered a general descriptive category which, nonetheless, comprises codes with (semi)evaluative tags like **‘noun: generalised (same field)’** for example. These tags were derived from a comparison of the source and target items in the corpus but at the same time the whole approach relies on the terminological apparatus and methods developed by translation scholars like Vinay, Darbelnet, Catford, and Van Leuven-Zwart, to name but a few. Viewed in this setting, the category **‘word choice’** means something particular, i.e. the choice of a particular target lexical item in relation to a given source item. This seems simple enough, mainly because it only shows part of the picture. The analysis of the various types of **‘word choice’** in the corpus has shown that we cannot understand the processes involved if we simply compare the two items concerned outside of their textual and contextual relations. In other words, it can be stated that the choices concerned are situated. In this respect, **‘word choice’** would be a misleading category, if only understood in the narrow sense of simply comparing and choosing lexical items.

### 5.3.3.6. Word Order

A similar line of reasoning as that followed for **‘word choice’** is also followed in relation to the discussion of the data in this section. As a general category, **‘word order’** covers phenomena relating to how the translators dealt with the source clauses and sentences they translated. Hence, **‘word order’** also includes everything dealt with in chapter 5.3.1-3 above, i.e. clause level shifts. It has been demonstrated in 5.3.1-3 that clause level changes (and other changes)



were carried out in conjunction with those involving meter and rhyme as each new translation emerged. **Word order** is also understood as including observable changes to word order as such, e.g. when a translator inverted the word order in the target sentences though it was not required, ostensibly to achieve a particular effect or goal. Initially, it was thought that this was due to the constraints of Dutch syntax but as the table below suggests, this was only partly the case. Though syntax obviously did play a role it was not the only reason found for changes to word order. Other phenomena were visible, like considerations of rhyme or overall line length in a stanza, for example:

codes	all	M	PI	
w-o: inversion - narrative strategy	6	2	4	M>0.36 of PI
w-o: inversion - assonance	5	1	4	M<0.36 of PI
w-o: inversion - meter	5	1	4	M<0.36 of PI
w-o: inversion - rhyme	3	0	3	M<0.36 of PI
w-o: inversion - dutch syntax	1	0	1	M<0.36 of PI
w-o: inversion - line length	1	1	0	M<0.36 of PI
subtotal	21	5	16	M<0.36 of PI
% of 762 b)-type features	2.75	0.65	2.10	

**Table 5-xiv: word order – type and distribution**

These cases of inversion were considered salient because, in all cases but one, normal or unmarked syntax could have been used in the target lines. Once again, possible explanations for the inversion were tagged to the code, e.g. **w-o (word order): inversion – narrative strategy**, in which case the plausible reason found was that the translator wished to achieve a particular narrative effect in the target poem. Five of the six tags propose literary or poetic explanations for linguistic phenomena or at least point to their co-occurrence. The rationale in proposing these explanations stemmed from the dominance of the given feature in the clause and its immediate environment, as each instance of inversion could not be explained in terms of the feature alone (the same reasoning was followed for **line break difference** in chapter 5.2.2 above). A number of data fragments relating to these codes will be discussed in what follows. Examples of assonance, meter and rhyme will be discussed in brief before turning to narrative strategy, which we will examine at more length as it is the only code of this type in the analysis.

1. location: 2 (data fragmentspi) - 17 (piword order) – 1 - assonance

How did I end up like this?  
Often think of my friends'  
beautiful prismatic counselling  
And the anvil brains of some who hate me

Hoe ben ik zo geworden? Vaak,  
Als ik de verantwoordelijke tristia  
Zit af te wegen, denk ik  
Aan de fraaie, prismatische

As I sit weighing and weighing  
My responsible tristia.  
For what? For the ear? For the people?  
For what is said behind-backs?

Raadgevingen van mijn vrienden  
En de halsstarrigheid van die mij haten.  
Waarom? Om gehoord te worden? Om de mensen?  
Om wat achter de rug om gezegd wordt?

2. location: 2 (data fragmentspi) - 17 (piword order) – 3 - rhyme

Here, too, buried in rhyme, lovers lie dead,  
Engraved in words that live each time they're read.

Hier liggen ook minnaars, dood, begraven in rijm,  
gehakt in woorden die leven, steeds als ze gelezen  
zijn.]

3. location: 2 (data fragmentspi) - 17 (piword order) – 4 - meter

Now and again I started up  
miles away and saw in my absence  
The sloped cursive of each back and felt them  
perfect themselves against me page by page.

Nu en dan schrok ik, mijlen verwijderd,  
op en zag in mijn afwezigheid  
het gebogen cursief van hun ruggen en voelde  
hoe zij zich, bladzij na bladzij, tegen mij bekwaamden.

**Extract 5-26: selection of data fragments from w-o: inversion – assonance, meter and rhyme**

The inversion in the second fragment above was already discussed in passing in chapter 5.2.3. **Rhyme** above. It is clear how the inverted word order made the pararhyme possible between line-final “rijm” and “zijn” in the target lines.

In the first fragment the translator made considerable changes to the word order in the lines. The grouping of the long *a*'s in the first stanza would not have come about had the translator followed the source word order.

The inversion in the last line of fragment 3 allows the line to fit in with the meter of the other lines. Placing “bladzij na bladzij” (page by/after page) in the middle of the line heightened the dramatic effect of the full verb which resonates with the other verbs in line final position in the stanza.

All the data fragments shown below contain some form of fronting or clefting in the target text. In the first extract, for example, the translated line is rendered as “It was of an embrace that he perished”. All the other target lines contain similar constructions.

location : 1 (data fragmentsm) - 3 (claussem) - 4

He perished of an embrace.

Het was aan een omhelzing dat hij bezweek.

location : 2 (data fragmentspi) - 3 (piclauses) - 12

I last met Joseph Mary Plunkett Ward  
In a pub just over the Irish border.

De laatste keer dat ik Joseph Mary Plunkett Ward ontmoette  
Was in een pub net over de Ierse grens.

location : 2 (data fragmentspi) - 17 (piword order) - 1

You could tell the weather by frogs too  
For they were yellow in the sun and brown  
In rain.

Ook kon je aan kikkers zien wat voor weer het was,  
Want ze waren geel in de zon en in de regen  
Bruin.

location : 2 (data fragmentspi) - 17 (piword order) - 8

Though, had they known it,  
Nellie was more timid by far  
Than the timidest there.

Al was Nellie veel bedeesder -  
Zonder dat een van hen het wist -  
Dan zelfs de bedeesde onder hen.

**Extract 5-27: selection of data fragments from w-o: inversion – narrative strategy**

Fronting is considered to be more common in Dutch than clefting<sup>313</sup> (Devos, De Muynck & Martens 1992: 169-180), both devices fulfilling a similar function in Dutch as in English:

Tot de middelen die de taalgebruiker ter beschikking heeft om een bepaald zinsdeel te doen uitkomen in het zinsgeheel en daarmee aan te geven dat het zinsdeel een grote informatieve waarde heeft, behoren ook de constructies met gekloofde en pseudo-gekloofde zinnen.

Gekloofde zinnen komen in het Nederlands, en dit in tegenstelling tot het Frans en het Engels, niet zo frequent voor. Het Nederlands geeft de voorkeur aan vooropplaatsing ... en aan het contrastief accent ... om bepaalde zinsdelen te focaliseren. (Devos, De Muynck & Martens 1992: 169)

Fronting or clefting heightens the focus on the fronted or clefted item. Next to that, these devices can be considered part of a narrative ploy or strategy as they also index certain moments of importance in the thematic development of the overall text. As fronting or clefting was not present in the source text, the translators' use of these devices is salient. Initially these items were coded as '**w-o: inversion – fronting/clefting**'. The more evaluative tag, '**narrative strategy**', was opted for as the fronting and clefts do in fact heighten the narrative importance of the lines concerned. They also heighten the visibility of the translators in a way, though it would be erroneous to overstress this as the translators have long since become visible in these poems. It could be argued that such devices are forms of explicitation as they do indeed render some of the information in the lines more explicit. It was decided not to pursue this line of thought for the following reason: explicitation – and its corollary, implicitation – seems to have acquired its own teleology, viz. the explicitation hypothesis (Klaudy in Baker 2000: 84). Once a particular translation item has been listed as a form of explicitation, the other functions that particular item may fulfil in the translated text will become obscured. If anything, '**narrative strategy**' points to or provides evidence of an aspect of entextualisation that can be clearly recognised as pertaining to the genre expectations and practices the translators work within.

#### 5.4. **Regrouping a)-type and b)-type Features: evidence and justification of a theory of practice**

As '**word order**' formed the last item in the list of b)-type features, it proved important as this juncture to re-examine the categories as a whole, particularly those labelled as b)-type features with a view to regrouping them in a way that reflects the relative importance of each category in the overall framework of the analysis. The results of this regrouping will be discussed briefly in this section.

The following table outlines the distribution of all a)-type and b)-type features in both sections of the corpus.

	a)-type ling.	a)-type poetic	b)-type ling.	Total	%
Meulenhoff	66	59	257	382	31.29%
Poetry International	163	171	505	839	68.71%
Total	229	230	762	1221	100%
ratio	M > 0.36 of PI	M < 0.36 of PI	M > 0.36 of PI	M > 0.36 of P	

**Table 5-xv: n° and ratio of a)-type and b)-type features in Meulenhoff and Poetry International**

As was stated already (chapter 4.1.6.1), the number of a)-type linguistic features in translation was directly related to their occurrence in the source poems, hence all that can be concluded is that more of such features were present in the source poems translated for the Meulenhoff section of the corpus. The higher frequency of a)-type poetic features stemmed from **'line overflow'** that resulted from a different page layout and more instances of **'rhyme: local'** and **'sound: various'**, as **'line break difference'** was more frequent in the Poetry International section of the corpus. Again, the instances of **'rhyme: local'** and **'sound: various'** were directly proportional to those found in the source poems, whereas the higher number of line break differences in Poetry International points to a higher degree of manipulation for the purposes of rhyme and meter. The relative frequencies of b)-type linguistic shift in each section of the corpus were discussed already in chap. 4 1.6.2. On the whole, 6.82% of all linguistic codes/shifts were found in Poetry International only, less than half of which occurred only once. 3.54% of linguistic codes/shifts were found in Meulenhoff only, roughly half of which occurred only once. So, 5.12% of all codes occurred only once in the analysis. This means that 89.64% of all b)-type codes occurred in both sections of the corpus, in varying degrees of proportionate frequency. This alone indicates a regularity of translational behaviour across both sections of the corpus, which in turn has been demonstrated in the discussion of the various code types in the analysis above. It was shown that this regularity could not be reduced to obligatory target-system constraints alone, i.e. that there was a lot more regularity on the 'optional' side of the equation than expected.

Those codes that only occurred once were not dealt with in the analysis and hence require some basic comment as they form 10.36% of all b)-type codes. There are considerable grounds for assuming that these codes represent instances of translational decision that are tied to the texts and contexts in a similar way as the more frequent codes that were analysed. A discussion of all 79 instances – 39 of which occurred only once – would take up too much space but the writer is confident that, taken as a whole, these instances would also display the generalities and regularities discovered in the more frequently occurring codes, generalities and regularities, it must be added, that emerged from a situated engagement with the text. Only a thorough investigation can verify this stance. However, to repeat what was said in chapter 2, it is not the intention to posit levels of logical belonging without first examining the textual situations in relation to which these choices were made. This should form the object of further research following the completion of the present work.

Following the findings from the data analysis discussed in this chapter, the categories and codes were regrouped in the following way:

- Tree n° 5: regrouped categories and codes -----
- (1) regrouped
  - (2) - Poetic codes
    - (3) . - Rhyme (kept/not kept)
      - (4) . . - rhyme: local
      - (4) . . - sound: various
    - (3) . - line break difference
      - (4) . . - line overflow
  - (2) - Linguistic codes
    - (3) . - discourse (and culture-related) features
      - (4) . . - idiomatic choice
      - (4) . . - index
      - (4) . . - ling code
      - (4) . . - pragmatic choice
      - (4) . . - names places, etc.
    - (3) . - sentence features
      - (4) . . - Word Choice
        - (5) . . . - adjective (phrase)
        - (5) . . . - noun (phrase)
        - (5) . . . - verb (phrase)
      - (4) . . - Word order
        - (5) . . . - clause
          - (6) . . . . - adverbials
          - (6) . . . . - marked word order
      - (4) . . - Explicitation
      - (4) . . - Implication
        - (5) . . . - elision
        - (5) . . . - possible mismatch

**Table 5-xvi: final regrouping of categories and codes**

The rationale informing the tree diagram remains consistent with that followed in the coding process and the data analysis. The (re)grouping hence emerged from what was visible in terms of salience in the data. The 'line of demarcation' between a)-type 'kept/not kept' and b)-type 'changed' is still reflected in the diagram: poetic codes and discourse and culture-related features are a)-type and sentence features are b)-type. The heading, discourse (and culture-related) features is perhaps infelicitous as it might create the false impression that evidence of culture is not to be found in sentences and words. A perusal of the data in '**Index**' and '**Ling-code**' for example shows that this is not the case. Along with '**names, places, etc.**' these two categories contain items that encompass ways of speaking and naming observable in Ireland in general and Northern Ireland in particular. In this way they are also discursive and culturally contextualised. As the data shows, the translators took pains to maintain the foreign in the

poems where possible. In a similar way **'idiomatic'** and **'pragmatic choice'** fall under discourse as they provide evidence of the translators' awareness of modes of (imagined) interaction and how they should be deployed in the target poems. From the data listed under these two categories, it emerged that the translators used these modes of interaction to ground the new poems in the target culture. So, the data shows evidence of care for or attention to both the foreign and the domestic cultural context at one and the same time, including modes of interaction or ways of speaking as they became visible in the source poems and hence emerged in the translated poems.

The sentence level features were grouped at Word Choice (phrase) and Word Order (clause level) as stated above. To avoid confusion, the specific word order code discussed in the previous section was renamed **'marked word order'**, which is more in keeping with the findings of the data. **'Elision'** and **'possible mismatch'** were included under **'implication'** as the findings showed that it was better to view these two categories as belonging on a scale of **'implication'** rather than as absolute independent categories. This stems from the fact that elision was sometimes compensated for in some way and that some mismatches were not entirely misplaced.

On the whole, it was never the intention to make a completely watertight set of well-defined codes and categories. The work of other scholars has taught us that this is impossible (see Van Leuven-Zwart's comments on categorising shifts in chapter 4.1.5.1 above). The above table does attempt to be consistent with the findings from the data, however. In this respect, **'explicitation'** and **'implication'** were not ranked as overarching categories because the data did not show them to be so. However, they were kept as categories as they did encapsulate certain tendencies observed at clause and phrase level. Indeed, certain clause and phrase level codes could certainly be listed under **'explicitation'** or **'implication'**. It was decided not to do so as it was not the purpose of this study to prove or disprove the explicitation hypothesis. Nonetheless, it was shown in passing that **'explicitation'** was not a major salient feature in this corpus. There was also an element of caution involved in not reclassifying certain codes under either heading. The following instance is a case in point. The code **'clause: non-finite to finite'** (61 tokens) could be considered on formal grounds as constituting instances of **'explicitation'**. Generally speaking, under this code present participle clauses were rendered as finite clauses in Dutch but in some of these clauses the personal pronoun "je" was used generically, thereby maintaining the indefiniteness of the source clause in the target text. In a similar way, pinning **'implication'** on a given target lexical item vis-à-vis a source item might mask a redistribution of meaning over a number of target lexical items. Neither category can be determined on formal grounds alone; hence it is safer not to assume that formal shifts of the type illustrated above automatically imply **'explicitation'** or **'implication'** before examining the items in questions in the contexts in which they are found. In contrast, the items listed under **'explicitation'** and **'explicitation'** could easily be reclassified under clause and phrase level shifts. Furthermore, **'explicitation'** and **'implication'** were found to co-occur with other changes and not inform or cause those changes. Despite what has been

argued above, '**explicitation**' may be the major salient feature of other corpora: only an analysis of the data can tell.

The items classified at sentence level and below provide evidence of the more minute or local business of translation. In this respect they fulfil at least three functions:

- ♦ Firstly, they manifest the translators' sense of register or how they used appropriate lexical items to fit the imagined situations and events represented in the poems as they emerged in translation;
- ♦ Secondly, they provide evidence through the word order in the sentences of how the translators reconstructed the events and situations visible in the poems;
- ♦ Thirdly, they provide evidence of how the translators fulfilled all the above within the genre of poetry, including the other speech genres represented in the poems. This also became visible among other things in their handling of rhyme and meter and their choice of the appropriate word and word order to fit the rhyme and meter as it emerged in the target poems, even in places where it was not expected or demanded.

It was stated at the beginning of this chapter that findings from the linguistic and poetic data would have to be laid across each other in the final analysis but this has proved to be unnecessary. In the analysis of the data gathered under each code, it proved impossible to separate translational decisions relating to line and meter from their linguistic counterparts, the result being that counterpart decisions mainly ended up being explained in relation to each other. In fact the analysis constituted a simultaneous weighing of the data from both perspectives. The apparent circularity of this statement stems in part from the coding, i.e. from making a distinction between poetic and linguistic codes, the distinction being informed by tradition but also by phenomena observable in the corpus. The same conclusion can be drawn here as the one related to shifts above (see chapter 5.3.2.I.). In the same way as the identification of shifts led us into the complex interrelatedness between shifts and the texts they were found in, the coding process as a whole and the resulting analysis of the separate data fragments listed under each code has laid bare the translators' complex yet pointed engagement with the poems and their emerging translations. It would be blatantly beside the point to classify such engagement as either 'obligatory' or 'optional', as something they had no choice but to do on the one hand and every choice in doing, on the other. This sounds as if they had already been dictated the linguistic plans by some august body and were asked to decorate the edifice by way of compensation for their forced labour during its construction. Nothing of this was found in the corpus analysis. Moreover, the interview data shows that the translators are extremely wary of extraneous decorations or additional garnitures of any type.

Having finalised the framework of categories and codes, the broader consequences of the findings thrown up by the analysis need to be discussed.

- ♦ In the main, the coding and subsequent analysis of the coded data laid bare certain regularities of translation practice that were shared by the translators found in the corpus. Despite the diversity of textual outcomes, these regularities were visible at all levels and ranged from how the translators dealt with cultural items to their ways of

handling rhyme and meter in conjunction with the complex linguistic material involved;

- ♦ It was shown that the decisions made were situated in that each translational decision involved minute engagement with the text and its perceived context at a number of levels simultaneously;
- ♦ It was also shown that the decisions involved could not be reduced to the dual constraints, or rather the dualistic model of constraints consisting in ‘obligatory’ language system-driven changes and ‘optional’ (stylistic) changes decided on by the translator;
- ♦ What the translators’ decisions did show was an awareness of language system, not merely as a set of constraints but also as a set of possibilities to be used in conjunction with other aspects of language use relevant to the genre and context they work within. Though system constraints were clearly visible, language system does not have a mortgage on constraint nor does it function as a *main morte* on translational creativity.

This unsettles the duality of obligatory and optional even further and begs the question: if their work cannot be reduced to a duality is there another formation that might fit the picture better? The question will be broached in the last chapter.

This brings us to an issue that has remained unbroached throughout this whole chapter: what about the poems as such, both source poems and their translations? What can be said of them? The reputation of many of the source poems and their poets precede them and not without a certain amount of trepidation for the translator, as might be the case with Seamus Heaney’s poems for example. But Heaney is a translator himself and, according to those who have translated his work, highly approachable in the process. What then of the translations? In this respect, the descriptive component of Van Leuven-Zwart’s model of shift analysis

focuses on the effects of microstructural shifts on the macrostructural level, i.e. on the level of the characters, events, time, place and the other meaningful components of the text. (Van Leuven-Zwart 1989: 155)

The macrostructure in question is literary prose but it emerged in the analysis that, much like works of literary prose, many of the poems in the corpus could easily have been analysed, as suggested by Van Leuven-Zwart, in terms of characters, events, time, place etc., next to the more traditional categories used in analysing poetry. Take John Montague’s ‘The Wild Dog Rose’ or Seamus Heaney’s ‘Station Island’, for example. Both poems depict encounters with persons during which the story of an event in each person’s life is retold. The former relates the terrible tale of a rape, the latter that of a cruel sectarian killing. Indeed, a simple glance at the poems in this corpus shows that a considerable number of them could be subjected to prose analyses of this type also. Yet, at no stage during the analysis has there been any mention of the distinction between a micro and macrostructural level in the poems gathered for this corpus. Nor has it been the purpose to judge the overall value and meaning of the translated poems in relation to the source poems or as poems in their own right in the Dutch language but rather to study and to offer plausible explanations for how the translated poems



came about. What can be commended is the resourcefulness the translators displayed in tackling the source poems and creating new ones in Dutch, all of which I believe has become amply visible in the course of this study.

Van Leuven-Zwart's approach reflects the structuralist view on a literary work as a set of interlocking systems that ranges from sentence level ploys to the larger cultural system in which the work was created (see Hermans 1999: 120-117 for a discussion (of the structuralist roots) of polysystem theory). Hence if changes were carried out in translation at the microlevel, it was assumed that this would upset a work's macrostructure in some way or the balance of the work as a whole. This view on literary works and their meaning was placed in its historical perspective by Bassnett (2002, 3rd edition: 81-82):

Much time and ink has been wasted attempting to differentiate between translations, versions, adaptations and the establishment of a hierarchy of 'correctness' between these categories. Yet the differentiation between them derives from a concept of the reader as the passive receiver of the text in which its Truth is enshrined. In other words, if the text is perceived as an object that should only produce a single invariant reading, any 'deviation' on the part of the reader/translator will be judged as a transgression.

Bassnett then indicates how scholars have moved away from this view:

One of the greatest advances in twentieth-century literary study has been the re-evaluation of the reader. So Barthes sees the place of the literary work as that of making the reader not so much a consumer as a producer of the text, while Julia Kristeva sees the reader as realizing the expansion of the work's process of semiosis. The reader, then, translates or decodes the text according to a different set of systems and the idea of the one 'correct' reading is dissolved. At the same time, Kristeva's notion of intertextuality, that sees all texts linked to all other texts because no text can ever be completely free of those texts that precede and surround it, is also profoundly significant for the student of translation.

Bassnett's point is put even more strongly by Tymoczko:

Thus, a literary work, like a translation, depends on previous texts: neither is an "original semantic unity", both are "derivative and heterogeneous".' Every writing is a rewriting. (Tymoczko 1999: 41)

All this proves interesting with regard to a point raised by a translator during the interviews:

I.J: t is eigenlijk nu, enfin nu zijn wij zo een beetje in het heden (ja).

Ik ben eigenlijk nogal ontevreden met het soort eh poëzie dat hier enfin in Vlaanderen en Nederland wordt geschreven en ja die ontevredenheid, ik kan die best als volgt zo omschrijven.

Ik vind de traditie in Vlaanderen en in Nederland erg geïnspireerd op de Duitstalige tradities en dat resulteert in een vrij gesloten hermetische poëzie . . . dat kan ik enfin, ik wil een andere, wil ik instaan voor een ander soort poëzie, ook in mijn eigen schrijven (ja), en wat mij aanspreekt, laat ons zeggen in de Angelsaksische traditie en meer bepaald ook in de Ierse is toch eh daar is er nog een kern aanwezig van eh het verhalen vertellen.

Daar is toch nog een, poëzie is geen medium om een verhaal te vertellen, maar het kan narratief gebruikt worden en ik eh ik vind dat er narratieve elementen sterker aanwezig zijn bijvoorbeeld in de Ierse poëzie en in

de Angelsaksische poëzie misschien wel in het algemeen die ik wil bekend maken of die ik wil promoten ook binnen ons literair landschap. Dat is eigenlijk de reden waarom dat ik met Ierse poëzie bezig ben. (I.4/a3)

**Extract 5-28: of storytellers and philosophers**

This quote from the interview data can be discussed in a number of ways, one being the translator's literary agenda or view on poetics or how he embraces the modern view that poetry is not the medium of storytelling as such, hence the historical decline of epic poetry. Next to this, it can be stated with some irony that the corpus data actually confirms the translator's intuition about narrative in Irish poetry. This is an unexpected turn of events<sup>314</sup> though not the point of focus. What is stressed here is the importance of reading(s) for our understanding of translations, or as De Beaugrande (1978: 25-37) points out in his chapter, 'The Role of Reading in Poetic Translating':

All the same it cannot be the function of theory to eliminate from the considerations troublesome aspects of common practice: theory must rather account for the sources of troubles in a systematic way. ... [T]hat means investigating typical obstacles to reading comprehension in poetic texts and demonstrating how such obstacles can be regularly overcome. (De Beaugrande 1978: 26)

De Beaugrande goes a long way towards accommodating common practice but the idea of a unitary or total reading in the structuralist vein still underlies his statement. In the quote from the interview data we can see how something that the translator noticed in Irish poetry became something he consciously sought and wished to translate and finally something he incorporated into his own poetic practice and hoped other poets in his community might adapt. It is within such 'intertextual' frameworks, among other things, that much translation has been shown to take place, (see chapters 2 and 3). So if I might dare to suggest a slight rephrasing of De Beaugrande's statement, while thanking him for all the initial insight, I would propose the following:

Theory must account in a systematic way for observable practice and hence lay bare how translators dealt with the (sources of) troubles they encountered.

For it has been shown in the analysis that the translators were well aware of the troubles they faced. In this regard no independent reading of the source text can ever entirely account for the reading process visible in a translation, particularly if the purpose of an independent reading is solely to be judge and jury over that translation in the circuit courts of source and target meaning and aesthetic values – courts at which translators are seldom if ever present, let alone allowed to defend themselves. Nor can the value judgements which are concomitant with such readings account empirically for what has been observed in the corpus analysis. The decisions taken there were also value driven to the extent that they were informed by perceptions of language, language use, culture, professional practice (including aesthetics), as has been demonstrated in the chapters 2 and 3. In this respect, an independent reading should at best function as a framework or matrix for understanding other (possible) readings, as a

means of identifying value and concomitant (translational) action and not as the yardstick against which other readings will be measured and found lacking.

The findings from the data have driven a proverbial wedge between obligatory and optional translations shifts and choices. This became manifest in how the translators engaged materially with the source and emerging target texts (poems). This engagement further manifests both an awareness of language use and system (including its possibilities) on the one hand, but also an awareness of the values informing language use in given contexts on the other. It goes without saying that, without engagement, the whole exercise would prove dilettante, superfluous and devoid of concrete meaning as it would remain entirely in the realm of the speculative and the possible. In this respect, translation is very much a matter of 'alea jacta est'. It has to be done before it can be judged. Judgement is needed for a translator to grow professionally and so on.

All this leads us back to the tripartite relation proposed by Hanks (1996: 11) in defining practice as the point at which three things converge: "the law of system, the quick of activity and the reflexive gaze of value". If the corpus analysis has shown us one thing it is certainly convergence:

- ◆ How translational decisions were taken in conjunction with others;  
or conversely
- ◆ How a number of (linguistic and poetic) phenomena were visibly at play in any given decision;  
or to put it another way,
- ◆ How no translational decision could be reduced either to systemic constraint or aesthetic/stylistic preference or arbitrary (one-off) textual whim alone.

The findings from the corpus analysis still have to be juxtaposed with the findings from the interview data in order to reach a more rounded view on the translational practice under study and the theoretical framework used and further proposed for the study of that practice. This will also involve deciding whether the corpus data shows unequivocal evidence of particular translational preferences among the translators and if so to which extent these preferences are connected to the work being translated and/or manifest clearly individual translational 'styles'. This will be dealt with in the sixth and final chapter of this work.



## 6. QUALITATIVE DATA AND AN ELECTRONIC CORPUS: A CONTRAST OF THE FINDINGS

At a seminal moment, it was decided that translation studies were concerned with translated texts and their source texts, along with the socio-cultural and historical contexts in which the translations were carried out, rather than the languages as such in which these texts were written or spoken (Chesterman 1998)<sup>315</sup>. The further shift within translation studies from text-based to socially-situated analyses was traced in chapter 1 of this study. It was stated in chapter 2 that, although approaches like Skopos theory see translators as social actors, they offer little means of attesting their social action. The ethnographic approach used for this study attempted to do just that, and the results of the attempt were discussed in detail in chapters 2 and 3. Next to that, an electronic corpus of translations and originals was built and coded and findings from the corpus were discussed in chapters 4 and 5. The tables below provides a final breakdown in frequencies, percentages and ratios per line of linguistic and poetic features noted and coded in the corpus for each translator concerned:

Distribution of features per translator							
	RH & AV/DW	P N	JE	RL	B DEN U	CB & JE	GG
Meulenhoff = 1463 lines							
Lines per translator	234	1012	217				
a)-type features ling. (66)	18	40	8				
a)-type features poetic (59)	18	33	8				
b)-type features ling. (257)	31	168	58				
n° of features = 382	67	241	74				
% of Meulenhoff	17,54%	63,09%	19,37%				
features/lines (1/3,77L)	1/3,49 L	1/4,20 L	1/2,93L				

(continued on the next page)

Poetry Int. = 4049 lines							
Lines per translator	849	1396	433	319	401	177	477
a)-type features ling.: 167	55	62	19	5	6	9	11
a)-type features poetic: 171	30	82	29	9	9	3	9
b)-type features ling.: (505)	103	182	49	22	54	34	61
n° of features = 843	188	326	97	36	69	46	81
% of Poetry International	22.30%	38.67%	11.50%	4.27%	8.18%	5.46%	9.61%
features/lines (1/4.80L)	1/4.51L	1/4.28L	1/4.46L	1/8.86L	1/5.81L	1/3.85L	1/5.88L
Total n° of features = 1225	255	567	171	36	69	46	81
Overall % of analysis	20.82%	46.29%	13.96%	2.94%	5.63%	3.75%	6.61%
Total n° of lines = 5512	1083	2408	650	319	401	177	477
Overall average n° of features/lines (1/4.5L)	1/4.25L	1/4.25L	1/3.80L	1/8.86L	1/5.81L	1/3.85L	1/5.88L

**Table 6-i: n° and distribution of features identified in the corpus per translator**

Three factors must be borne in mind when reading the tables in this section:

- ♦ 55.5% of all the poems in the analysis (82.5% in Meulenhoff and 45.5% in Poetry International) were translated by two of the interviewees<sup>316</sup> in the ethnography.
- ♦ 89.64% of all b)-type features occurred in both sections of the corpus and the work of the two interviewees in question featured significantly in each section.
- ♦ The data represented in the analysis in the previous 2 chapters forms 87.5% of all the data coded as a)-type and b)-type features in the corpus.

The obvious question stemming from these factors is whether the features found in the work of the two interviewees provide indications of their own approach to translation or are they more generally distributed throughout the work of the other translators in the corpus. To find out, we have to examine the ratio of features per line in the analysis. The ratio of features per line for each translator lies within 1.38 digits above or 0.45 digits below the average of 1 shift every 4.5 lines of the analysis, except for one translator only who translated 2.94% of the corpus. This is considered significant as the ratio also holds for 6 out of seven of the translators including those who translated 5.63%, 3.75% and 6.61% of the corpus, respectively.

In relation to the Meulenhoff section, it can also be seen from the above table that one of the interviewees, J.E. has the highest ratio of features per line (**1 every 2.93 lines of poetry**) in the Meulenhoff section of the corpus. The next in line is not the second interviewee P.N. but R.H. & A. v/d W. with **1 feature every 3.49 lines**. When we examined the ratio per line for b)-type linguistic features only we found the following:

R.H. & A. v/d W.: **1 per 7.55 lines**; P.N.: **1 per 6.03 lines** and J.E.: **3.49 lines**.

The rationale in examining the ratio of b)-type features is that they are quite indicative of translator ‘intervention’ and hence shift in the target text. The term engagement is probably better in the activity involved (see below), as intervention suggests that the text somehow leads

a life of its own during translation. The following conclusions can be drawn for the Meulenhoff section of the corpus:

- ◆ Despite the higher ratio of features per line in J.E.'s work, that of R.H. & A. v/d W. does not differ significantly from P.N.'s, notwithstanding the fact that P.N. translated 63.09% of the section. This would imply that the features as such are quite evenly distributed among the three (teams of) translators in the Meulenhoff section.
- ◆ The higher frequency of b)-type linguistic features per line and hence shift in J.E.'s work is closely related to the stricter rhyme schemes found in the poems he translated.
- ◆ The higher frequency of features in the Meulenhoff section of the corpus as opposed to the Poetry International section (**1 per 3.77 lines** as opposed **1 per 4.51 lines**) indicates that more time was spent in translating the former (as was suggested in chapter 4). It must be remembered in this respect that the same poets are found in both sections of the corpus.

As far as the Poetry International section of the corpus is concerned, we can state that there is a wider degree of variation in ratio among the translators: from R.L. at **1 feature per 8.86 lines** to J.E. & C.B. at **1 feature per 3.85 lines**. Nonetheless, these ratios must be weighed against the fact that both translators translated only 4.27% and 5.46% of the Poetry International section, respectively. Note that the latter ratio is close to that of J.E.'s in Meulenhoff. As can be seen from the initials, J.E. was a member of the team but the poet **he** translated was different (Seamus Heaney in Poetry International and Richard Murphy in Meulenhoff). The ratios of the translators who translated the main part i.e. 72.77% of the Poetry International section are within half a digit of each other:

RH & AVDW	PN	JE
22.30%	38.67%	11.80%
1/4.51L	1/4.28L	1/4.46L

**Table 6-ii: main translators of Poetry International section**

In fact these three (teams of) translators translated 75.11% of the poems analysed in this study – a percentage that comes close to yet is less than that of b)-type features found in both sections of the corpus (89.64%). As was mentioned above, the two translators who took part in the ethnography translated 55.5% of the poems in the analysis. Interestingly, the ratio of features per line for J.E.'s work is significantly lower in this section (1/4.46L compared to 1/2.93 in Meulenhoff). This is also related to the fact that the poets he translated for Poetry International do not always use end rhyme in their work. An examination of the ratio per line for b)-type features in the Poetry International section revealed the following:

5512 lines	RH & AV/DW	PN	JE	RL	B DEN U	CB & JE	GG
<b>Lines per translator</b>	<b>849</b>	<b>1396</b>	<b>433</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>477</b>
b)-type features ling.: (505)	103	182	49	22	54	34	61
Overall ratio / line: 1/10.91L	1/8.24	1/7.67	1/8.83	1/14.5	1/7.43	1/5.21	1/7.82

**Table 6-iii: ratio of b)-type features per line per translator in Poetry International**

We can conclude that the features are evenly distributed among more than just the three main (teams of) translators in this section of the corpus. Further analysis has proved indeed that high frequency features were distributed fairly evenly among all the translators, relative to the number of lines they translated in the corpus. Given that this represented roughly 75% of all b)-type features in the analysis they can be considered as accruing to all translators and hence as underscoring regularities in translational approach in the corpus. These high frequency features were discussed in detail in the previous chapter and allowed us to speak in terms of general translational tendencies among the translators in the corpus. A condensed form of the considerably long table<sup>37</sup> (8 landscaped A4 pages) listing the findings of the analysis is used below in discussing some points from an article by Mona Baker on a preliminary analysis of the Translational English Corpus (TEC) (Baker 2000).

However, it also seemed necessary to examine the other end of the spectrum of frequency. This involved conducting an inquiry into the hypothetical distribution of b)-type and '**line break difference codes**' in the corpus that were not used by (some) translators. We refer the reader to the CDROM for the full list of figures involved and provide a short overview of the details in the three tables below. This inquiry is hypothetical because the absence in a translator's work of a code indicating a particular shift does not mean he would not have used it if given the opportunity. All we can say is that it did not occur in his part of the corpus. Going on the evidence found in the corpus, we cannot say that the absence of given code and hence shift would be indicative of a difference in translational approach.

Nonetheless, it was thought interesting to see to how many codes were missing per translator, i.e. to look for zero tokens of **b-type** and '**line break difference**' codes (shifts) and even see how frequently the codes were absent per line per translator. It went without saying that the higher the number of lines a translator translated in the corpus the fewer the number of codes (shifts) that would be missing in his work. The assumption was that the absence of codes – in relation to the number of lines – would be inversely proportional to the degree of change (n° of shifts) in a translator's work. Hence, the lower the ratio of absence was per line the higher the frequency of change in a given translator's work.



Translator	All	RH & AVDW	PN	JE	RL	B DEN U	CB & JE	G.G.
Lines per translator	5512	849	1396	677	319	401	177	477
all tokens of b-type code and lbd	885	145	421	124	27	66	35	67
% of all tokens of b-type codes and lbd	100%	16.38%	47.6%	14.00%	3.05%	7.43%	3.95%	7.6%
Ratio of code to line	1/6.23L	1/5.86L	1/3.32L	1/5.46L	1/11.81L	1/6.08L	1/5.06L	1/7.12L
b-type and lbd: zero freq. per translator		63	32	62	94	81	91	77
Ratio of code<1 to line	1/12.07L	1/13.48L	1/43.63L	1/10.91L	1/3.39L	1/4.95L	1/1.95L	1/6.19L
tokens of same codes in corpus	885	219	38	181	524	336	426	306

**Table 6-iv: distribution of code-types <1 per translator for b)-type and lbd**

The table above provides a reverse and complementary image of the information contained in the first table in this chapter in that it provides information on absences rather than on attested tokens and percentages of code types. An examination of the details in the R.L. column in Table 6-i, ii and iii confirms this. If we look at absences as such, however, we can see that even the three (teams of) translators who translated the largest section of the corpus did not use 32, 55, and 62 types of code, respectively:

Translator	Missing code types	ratio
average	71.43	1/10.9L
RL	94	1/3.39L
B DEN U	81	1/4.95L
CB & JE	91	1/1.95L
GG	77	1/6.19L
RH & A v/d W	63	1/13.48L
JE	62	1/10.91L
P N	32	1/43.63L

**Table 6-v: ratio of code-types <1**

Relatively speaking, this seems like a high number of absences given the amount of work they translated. Without examining which codes were involved we can assume a certain amount of overlap or similarity in the codes not used. But we can also assume that the 32 codes not used by P.N. were shared by some or all the other translators in the corpus<sup>318</sup>. We also note the number of codes missing in J.E. and R.H & A. v/d W.'s work is relatively close to the overall average of 71.43. Though it is logical to assume that certain codes would be absent from smaller quantities of work, their absence from larger quantities of work seems more striking.

This puts the higher number of absences in the work of the first four translators in the above list into perspective. Up until now the occurrence or absence of a code has always been related to the number of lines translated by (each team of) translators. The figures in the above tables suggest that another parameter of evaluation is required, next to ratio of feature to line. The parameter would be probabilistic: given the number of occurrences and absences of codes per line in a given corpus, how many such occurrences and absences can we expect to find on average in a single translator's work in the corpus. We could then measure the actual codes against these averages and then draw some basic working conclusions. These conclusions would always have contrasted with the specific translation 'problems' each translator faced in the source text(s) he/she translated.

In terms of percentages of codes missing per category we can also make assumptions regarding preferences among translators for certain codes and hence for the use of certain shifts, as the following table illustrates:

Translator	All	RH & AVDW	PN	JE	RL	B DEN U	CB & JE	GG
Lines per translator	5512	1083	2408	650	319	401	177	477
Tokens of codes in category	% of codes missing in category							
adjective	43	85.7%	14.3%	57%	85.7%	42.9%	42.9%	85.7%
clause adv.	9	80%	40%	40%	100%	100%	100%	100%
clause	219	64.3%	50%	65.5%	82.1%	75.8%	85.7%	53.6%
elision	39	71.4%	42.9%	16.6%	85.7%	50%	71.4%	57.1%
explicit	46	62.5%	12.5%	42.8%	62.5%	42.9%	87.5%	75%
implicit	70	0%	0%	25%	75%	75%	25%	25%
lbd	124	37.5%	0%	25%	50%	62.5%	87.5%	37.5%
noun	197	47%	23.5%	66.6%	82.3%	100	82.3%	58.8%
mismatch	12	80%	20%	58.8%	100%	52.9%	100%	80%
verb	90	50%	37.5%	85.7%	93.7%	85.7%	68.7%	87.5%
marked w-o	21	33.3%	16.6%	50%	100%	81.2%	83.3%	100%
word choice	14	50%	100%	50%	50%	50%	0%	100%

**Table 6-vi: % per translator of codes missing from main b)-type categories and lbd**

Proceeding negatively we note low percentages of absence as indicators of more instances of code types within a category and hence the use of more shifts in that category. Certain tentative conclusions can be drawn from the above table. The table can be read horizontally in comparing the relative frequency of use of shifts within a category. For example, we can note P.N.'s relative preference for adjectival shifts in comparison to the other translators. It can also be read vertically in discerning a translator's preference for particular categories of shift. In this respect, we note P.N.'s preference for noun shifts over verb or clause shifts, for example. The question is: what do such comparative preferences tell us? Are they indicative of personal

linguistic preferences in themselves or not? How marked are the differences visible in the table from one translator to the next? Again it seems obvious that the “problems” posed by the source poems have to be brought into the equation before any pronouncements can be made on the matter. The tables give us indications and open up avenues of exploration and possibilities for further research, which in the end will also need to be contrasted with the data to see whether the emerging hypotheses might hold. Though they help provide an overview of phenomena visible in the data, the tables were never meant to be an end in themselves or to replace the data.

On the whole, the exercise does remain hypothetical because we can only guess which shifts translators might have used had each been asked to do all the work in the corpus. Ideally speaking, they would have to be asked to translate the same poems under the same circumstances but this may create other constraints and pressures than those otherwise found in the working conditions explored in the research. However, following the analyses in chapter 4 and 5, our guess would be quite well-informed or at least within a framework of probable expectation. Though the linguistic material in the poems differed, the underlying patterns of change manifest in the shifts were shown to be quite regular. Moreover, though only the most frequent b)-type features were analysed in this study, which in fact represents 75% of all tokens of b)-type features, we have every reason to believe that the tendencies of approach they revealed also obtain for the less frequent shifts coded in the corpus. As was stated in chapter 5, shift analyses of all types led us, on each occasion, into a complexity of textual relations that dwarfed the importance of a particular shift as such. On the other hand, without the points of ingress that these shifts provided, we would not have gained an understanding of the complexity of the translational work involved. Hence it proves more fruitful to consider shifts as points of departure in exploring the (textual) complexity of translations, rather than regard them as reified or verifiable textual or translational categories. Shifts index change more so than being the changes themselves, i.e. they have to be taken at more than their face value. Therefore, it can be stated here that the approach used in the corpus analysis will have to be refined before we can make clear-cut statements on individual translational practice. Nonetheless, the analysis has succeeded in showing broader translational tendencies related to the language area and genre in question. It is against the backdrop of such tendencies that individual practice can and probably should be understood.

In relation to the above discussion, two broad methodological conclusions can be drawn regarding the shift types coded in the corpus. Firstly, the codes were named after shifts immediately visible in the data like ‘**clause: finite to non-finite**’, whereby a non-finite clause in the source text became a finite clause in the target text. Though categories of code were regrouped at the end of the analysis in chapter 5, the codes within clause and phrase level categories were not regrouped as such. This will probably prove necessary, for a closer examination of clause level shifts might throw up logical orders of belonging confirmed by the data that tie the various codes together in more general subgroups within the category. This in turn would reduce the disparity of codes, particularly those that occurred only once in the

corpus. Unfortunately, this examination was not carried out thus far but does form one of the goals of further research into the corpus.

Secondly, because defining categories of shift has proved notoriously difficult (viz. Van Leuven-Zwart's comments quoted in chapter 4) a willingness to seek other or sharper parameters of precision would probably be counterproductive. The second point forms a corrective to the first. It seems advisable to keep definitions within the realm of family resemblances (Chesterman & Wagner 2002<sup>319</sup>), the rationale being that a particular study is bound up with the material it studies and hence can only generalise to a degree. As a result caution has to be exercised in examining shifts for indications of particular translational styles, which is not say that these examinations must not be carried out. For the reasons outlined above, this particular study hesitated on the brink of such examinations as it was considered more important at this stage to outline the field in detail and point to the collective before making pronouncements about the individual.

In this respect, the distribution of translational features listed in the above tables are thought relevant enough to be able to speak of overall tendencies in translational practice when contrasting the findings from the qualitative data with those from the corpus in the discussion that follows. It is believed that enough caution has been taken in conducting the inquiry to allow us to do so. With regard to the ethnography, more translators were asked to participate than those found in the corpus. This allowed us to gain a broader picture of and various perspectives on the field of literary translation in the Netherlands and Belgium. Likewise, with respect to the corpus, the work of other translators was analysed alongside those who had participated in the ethnography. This allowed us to acquire a general view of translational or textual practice with regard to the poems in question, a necessary step on the path to making generalisations about individual translational strategies. Next to this the corpus was divided into two sections, which also provided us with a further control. It was known that poems in the Poetry International section had been mainly translated in a shorter period of time than those in the Meulenhoff section. Would the same translators function in different ways in the two environments and time spans? The analysis provided indications of these differences. On the whole, the study set up a broad scope of inquiry within which textual and contextual factors intersected and could be related. As was stated above, it was considered important to show how individual preferences should be seen within the framework of shared situated translation practice.

Next to all this there is one 'non-dite' that has to be underlined before going any further, (see the discussion in chapter 4.1.2.2.). Shifts emerge in translation not only in contrast to phenomena observable in the source text but also against the backdrop of items that are not considered salient by the researcher, in this case perfectly acceptable translations of given lines and verses that seem to deserve no further comment. These items form the ground against which the figures of shift emerge. However, these lines and verses are also part of the translators' work and mainly go unnoticed, or in the worst of cases escape comment by critic and scholar alike. Such lines and verses have also been ignored in this study, not because they

are unimportant but because shifts can be more fruitfully commented on as sites of translational activity and hence as evidence of negotiated language use, expressions of evaluation, etc. This does not mean that the lines in question fall outside negotiation or value. On the contrary, the negotiation and evaluation grounded there is only less obviously visible and hence harder to detect. Shifts must be understood in this context and not as phenomena that are perfectly indicative of translational activity within a translated text. Nonetheless, shifts provide more obvious evidence or heightened instances of merging (contrasting) views on language use and value and hence form valuable sites of inquiry in translation.

To return to the ethnographic study, in chapters 2 and 3, it was shown that translators work within and maintain a network of social and professional relations, all of which has a bearing on (the products of) their translational activities. In this respect, their actions were shown to fulfil a number of functions simultaneously. Next to providing translated texts on commission or after proposing commissions themselves, translators build and maintain standards of textual and professional practice that are informed by ethos, ideologies of language, and perceptions of genre and culture. As was demonstrated, their actions were shown to have both a textual and a social orientation<sup>320</sup> (see particularly the findings listed in **Table 3-i ethic orientations** and **Table 3-vi genre related utterances** and the discussion of these tables in chapter 3). It is within this framework that (translated) texts and their meanings are contested and negotiated. In chapter 5 a significant number of target texts were analysed in contrast with their source texts in order to see whether they might manifest emergent patterns of translational behaviour. The patterning found in the translations could not be neatly separated out in terms of the dictates of language system (*langue*) and/or optional translational preferences alone. The analysis of the translations has shown that perceptions of genre (and register) were just as compelling in the decision-making process as the dictates of language ‘system’ per se. In fact judging from the data, it was difficult to disassociate considerations of language system from those of genre (or register), all of which underscores the situated nature of the language use involved. It is important to re-quote one of Hank’s statements on genre in relation to this:

Genres are not sets of discourse features but “orienting frameworks, interpretive procedures, and sets of expectations.” (Hanks 1987: 670)

It has been shown on numerous occasions in chapter 5 how the translators tackled the problems they encountered in translating poetry. This involved not only recognising particular discourse features including those of prosody in the source poems but also recreating ‘them’ in the target poems. Such recreation is an aspect of engagement with genre, i.e. translators act within genre and do not approach it from the outside or consider it merely as a set of discourse features. It was shown that the recreation also revealed an amount of regularity in interpretative procedures but that the overall result was asymmetrical with regard to each source text but still within a set of textual and aesthetic/evaluative expectations. All this in itself indicates the complexity of the activity involved – a point that requires further reflection and discussion (see below). Moreover, the ways in which the translators approached the source

poems, how they read them and how they recast them in Dutch bears further witness to Hank's notion of genre as activity type, an activity type, it must be stressed, which requires considerable verbal skill and language awareness all of which also became apparent in the ethnography.

Therefore, it is argued that the findings from the corpus corroborate those from the interview data in consolidating the view of translation as situated practice. In chapters 2 and 3, it was shown how translators orient themselves both textually and socially at the same time when tackling translations. In chapter 5 it was shown how these orientations became manifest in the way the translators engaged with the poems at various levels – linguistic, poetic, socio-cultural, etc. – all at the same time. Their decisions were informed both textually, by perceptions of correct language use and other forms of verbal expertise within the genres they work in, and socio-culturally, by codes of professional and cultural/aesthetic behaviour that are negotiated and constructed in the community of practices (Wenger & Lave 1998<sup>321</sup>) they belong to (see below). This is the first time the term 'community of practices' is mentioned specifically in this study but I believe, at this stage of the inquiry, that the data as a whole provides sufficient grounds for using the term. Caution was expressed from the outset regarding terms like 'language community' or 'community' as such because of the difficulty of encapsulating or localising such formations, particularly in this era of globalisation and corporate capitalism and the breakdown of more traditional community patterns<sup>322</sup>. Next to that there was also a fear that community might also be understood as 'monolingual', which is seldom the case. The same fears hold for 'community of practices', though it would be absurd to view a community of practices involving translators as monolingual. Moreover, none of those interviewed ever gave their consent or otherwise expressed a desire to be included in such an exotic entity; nor were they asked to do so. Nonetheless, the interviewer was struck by the way those interviewed were enthused by or otherwise (emotionally) involved with their work and professional relations and friendships within the field of translation. A tentative 'community' was also visible in the commonality of their views and ethos and in the regular patterns of approach found in their translations. Curiously, it can be asserted that this community of practices was cast into sharper relief through study, through an attempt to sharpen etic tools by honing them on an emic whetstone, as it were. Therefore in this case, community of practices is used with caution as shorthand for a complex set of interactions both textual and other involving translators and others working in the field.

On the whole, the analysis in this study was conducted on two sets of 'givens': in-depth qualitative data and an electronic corpus of translations and source texts. A complex picture emerged from each set of data, the key factors of which have been discussed in detail in the preceding chapters. Our understanding of this picture has been primed up until now by the tri-partite model of practice involving system/form, activity and value proposed by Hanks (1996). It is important to reiterate the distinction between what Hanks understands by system or form and the more traditional notion of language system or *langue* (de Saussure). Though Hanks in no way rejects the 'grammar' of any given language (quite to the contrary), for a

number of reasons he considers it as falling short in attempting to explain language use in human interaction<sup>323</sup>:

Language and the world of human experience are everywhere interpenetrated, so that even the inner logic of a linguistic system bears the trace of the routine practices to which it is adapted. (Hanks 1996: 236)

It is in such terms that Hanks understands system. The analysis of the ethnographic data and the corpus data has revealed considerable evidence of language patterning or systematic language use, activity and value at work. Each of these aspects is equally important for our overall understanding of the field under study as well as **for** the texts produced in that field.

Hanks argues for a separate mode of analysis for each aspect even though he sees the three as overlapping in instances of interaction (Hanks 1996: 230-231). In contrast to a practice approach, many of the sources quoted in chapters 4 and 5 on the nature of or distinctions in translational or textual decision-making or processes are binary in nature: viz. obligatory/optional shift for example. Such binary models stem in the main from de Saussure's 'primeval' distinction of *langue* and *parole* within language, although St. Jerome's translational distinction between word-for-word and sense-for-sense is much, much older, but of a different order. Unfortunately, the elements of binary models have a tendency to become irreconcilable. The unity from which they are considered to stem recedes exponentially the more each element is examined in isolation or the more one is neglected or prioritised in favour of the other. For example, optional translational decisions are a poor cousin in comparison to those dictated by a whole language system. In the same vein, the relative concreteness of a target text can never match the meaning potential of the language it was made in. A concrete translation issuing from a given reading can never match the multiple readings of a potential total translation. Translational performance can never match the potential richness of translational competence. All this has a bearing on how translations are evaluated at various levels in society, including the pedagogical, for surely there is more involved in evaluating a translation than marshalling the discourse features visible in that translation alone.

In the same way, adequate/acceptable (Toury), overt/covert (House), foreignising/domesticating (Venuti) etc., next to being posited categories of translation, are first and foremost socio-cultural positionings and textual orientations, all of which require verification through analysis. It always remains to be seen whether a given translation is (exclusively) the one or the other. In fact, the analysis of the translations in our corpus study has shown them to be both. It would seem safer, therefore, to consider the binary translation types (and other dichotomies) found in the literature as polar opposites along a cline of translational typology because a cline could account for all the positions in between.

Quite obviously, upholding the foreign or cultural other while striving for (target) literary prowess in a translated text is clearly a more difficult agenda than a foreignising or domesticating strategy alone. And this is what the translators in the corpus aimed for, as the analysis has shown. Such translations would occupy the middle ground on the cline and this is

the crux of the matter or more pertinently, the danger, notwithstanding the cline. Because of the conceptual pull of the poles in a binary model, the middle ground could just as well be considered a kind of bland half-way house, as a state of affairs that is neither fish nor flesh, which clearly is not the case. As such, the middle ground manifests perhaps the most complex relation that translators can adopt with regard to source and target texts. In this respect, all those interviewed strive to give each of their translations a literary merit of its own. It emerges from the qualitative data that the cultural and aesthetic merit of the source poems begged or even demanded an equal literary effort by the translator. In this respect, translation is never the recognition and transfer of sets of discourse features. Here we see how the conduit metaphor of translation falls short: for example the idea of the 'safe' carriage of literary meaning across language and cultural borders in no way does justice to the complexity of the effort involved. Next to this, the findings from the corpus also show a clear respect for the cultural other in the translations.

However, in building a corpus one creates a new unity of texts for the purposes of study and this shows the precariousness of drawing up a corpus of any type or its constructed nature, if you wish. All the tendencies laid bare in chapter 5 circumvent the unity of each text and the singular engagement each translator had with each individual poem as such. At no time was the general result or merit of each translated poem ever tested or commented on in this study. Deciding on the literary merit of each individual translation has never been the purpose here. Such things can only be considered within the framework of a larger scale inquiry into (literary) reception and reading practices in the Netherlands and Belgium (minimally) over the last forty years, along with other evaluative studies of the work in the corpus – a considerable enterprise on the face of it and something that could form the object of future research. What the corpus study has shown is patterning or regularity in translational decision along with the considerable resourcefulness that the translators demonstrated in dealing with the complexity of the material involved. And it would have been hard to discover regularity, and hence various aspects of (textual) practice, without compiling an electronic corpus, which, after all, was one of the main purposes of the study. Suffice it to say here that the resourcefulness discovered at various levels in the translated poems is deserving of merit in itself.

An adjacent purpose of this study was to factor translators back into translation both theoretically and in real terms (Hermans 1996<sup>324</sup>: 26). As was stated from the outset, this involved both making an in-depth qualitative study of their world and a textual analysis of their work. It meant exploring and attempting to understand their relations both to texts and the contexts in which these texts were compiled. It is to this complex relation that I now wish to turn in bringing together a number of key findings from the ethnography and the electronic corpus and discussing them in the light of sources from the translation literature.



## 6.1. The Common Ground of Habitus and Textual Practice

Descriptive Translation Studies is understood as concerning texts and their translations (among many other things – Chesterman & Arrojo 2000: 151-160) and not the languages as such that the texts were written or translated in. In this sense, they were seen to be concerned with the *parole* side of the language equation (Koller 1971). But surely it is so that anyone studying these texts will draw on a set of repertoires in both languages in order to understand and comment on the texts in question. In the case of literary translations, the considerable hoard of literary wealth manifest in similar texts in the two languages will also be brought into play in evaluating the texts under scrutiny. In fact, whatever the genre a translator works within, a similar amount of experience, expertise and perceptions of appropriate language use will be marshalled by others in evaluating his or her work. And such perceptions of language use will also draw on language system in the classical de Saussurian sense. As a result the subsequent judgments of translations will always be contestational in some way even when one is acting with the best intentions in proposing ‘better’ or alternative solutions. Functional approaches to translation do not merely conduct textual analyses for the sake of it but to make pronouncements on how texts should or do relate to or function in the socio-cultural contexts they were shaped for. Shift analyses in all their guises do the same. Cultural approaches to translation (Gentzler 1993) proceed inversely in critiquing linguistic approaches to translation from the vantage point of broader socio-cultural concerns. Next to this, our desire to understand how someone translated something is intersected by notions of how we might have done it ourselves and how it should reflect or respond to perceived socio-cultural concerns. Next to being the results of translational practice, translations (and their source texts) are sites of further consumption, comment and evaluation. They form a point of entry for various forms of practice related to the genre they entextualise.

On the other hand, translation studies are also understood to be specifically concerned with translators, and the contexts in which translations are generated. It seems only fair, therefore, that these factors also be analysed along with the texts before casting judgement on a translated text or attempting to make remarks as to its quality. In this respect a contrastive analysis of source and target texts alone will not suffice – hopefully something that has become sufficiently clear in this work. Yet, it is also only fair to state that an ethnography which does not examine instances of interaction or language use in situ will also fall short – here this includes source texts, translations, etc.

It is, therefore, only partly the case to say that translation studies are concerned with texts and not languages. Language use is ever present throughout the various stages of translation, both in the translator’s everyday work and the scholar’s or anyone else’s study or reading of the texts (see chapter 3). This is not to say that translation studies should be involved with languages per se but rather with examining the broader language use related to translation and this cannot be reduced to a comparison of source and target texts alone or to the assumptions of context they might entail. Likewise, translational norms have been traditionally cast as

belonging somewhere above the bedrock of intransigent grammatical law and the airiness or even fickleness of one-off individual translational choice. The findings from the corpus demonstrate how translators use system to their advantage; hence the language systems they draw on are neither intransigent nor constitute a legal bedrock but are more in keeping with Hanks's view re-quoted here:

Although linguistic systems are governed in part by principles unique to language, grammar is neither self-contained nor entirely independent from the social worlds in which individual languages exist. Modes of speaking have an impact on and are influenced by linguistic structure. (Hanks 1998: 229)

In this way norms are not set off by or floating somewhere above language systems but feed into them and help shape them. Similarly poetics cannot be disassociated from perceptions of related appropriate language use. In this respect, it was shown how the regularity or patterns of language use found in the corpus could not be reduced to language system constraints alone but rather bore witness to the interplay of system and genre constraints, to the extent that such things can be disassociated. Perceptions of language system form a basic part of a translator's decision-making even in the case of shifts that occurred only once in the corpus. A one-off translational whim still functions within what is linguistically plausible or recognisable.

Traditionally speaking too, translations are considered as belonging within product-oriented DTS (Holmes in Venuti 2000: 176) but as was argued in chapter 1.6., a considerable degree of delicacy would be required to separate such texts from the contexts they were generated in or made for (*viz.* the intricacy of many models of analysis in the literature that approach translation from a functional perspective). A translation still remains a product, however, as it consists in the result of translational activity. But though the result is 'textual' it cannot be understood solely in terms of the source text the translator drew on. As was shown in chapter 5, the target texts bear evidence of complex situated practices that were based on source texts but not only so. It was shown that these texts also manifest a commendable amount of linguistic skill and resourcefulness that was used to shape poems for a new language and context. These findings echo earlier remarks by translation scholars. Commenting on Levý's views on the matter, Hermans states the following:

For Levý the value of a given rendering depends on its relation to a historically determined norm. He perceives two norms at work: a reproductive norm which shapes translation as a derived product, and an aesthetic norm which applies to a translation as a text in its own right. A translation is then a hybrid product, a conglomerate, part of which refers back to the original text while other parts reveal the translator's input. (Hermans 1999: 21)

Hence a translation is and always will be a textual two-headed Janus. Further complicating the issue, the translator's 'input' is informed by the socio-cultural context of his or her action: see all the factors laid bare in the ethnography (chapters 2 and 3). Like culture, context is extremely difficult to tie down yet still relatively easy to sketch. Likewise, the contrastive characteristics of source and target texts are relatively easy to outline. Yet, these characteristics

can only manifest unacceptable difference if the source text forms the sole yardstick of evaluation (Popovic 1970<sub>325</sub>: 78-87). Throughout this study, it has been argued that language use cannot be separated from the user, i.e. that translators drew up texts according to visible principles and values that also helped construct a context and not just that a particular text was drawn up in a given context *in abstracto*. Text and context are united in and through the user, which also frees us from another looming dichotomy. Nonetheless, establishing the link between the various factors of text generation and their context through the user remains a precarious matter. To reiterate a point made in chapter 2, we firstly had to gain an understanding of translation practice as a whole, while remaining wary of setting up one-to-one falsifiable correspondences between actors and actions or the assertions of translators and their translations. That there is a relationship is beyond doubt; that the relationship is actualised in text is also beyond doubt. The precise nature of the relationship still remains unclear, however. The analysis in chapters 2 (a description of translation as an activity) and 3 (a detailed outline and analysis of the values informing that activity) has laid bare clear indications of what could be called a translatorial habitus and hence also a clear outline of the 'context' of translation. The data analysis in chapter 5 has thrown up patterns of translational and textual practice within poetry translation. From the very outset (see the discussion of functional approaches to translation in chapter 1) we have moved beyond notions of text and context that do not include the translator explicitly and have worked with the idea of the translator as actor or as text and context maker or, following Silverstein and Urban (1996), as 'entextualiser' and 're-contextualiser'.

The discussion so far could lead us to conclude, therefore, that the relation between the patterning revealed in the corpus and the salient factors involving ethos, etc. revealed in the ethnography, is embodied in and by the translator, that his or her practice is an extension of his or her ethos, etc. and vice versa. This would conflate translational practice and translatorial habitus and nicely round off the argument without requiring further proof that this is entirely the case. It would avoid having to carry out the rather prickly task of seeing whether translatorial habitus is consistent with textual practice in a case by case falsifiable sense. It would free us from regarding the interviewees' utterances as possible rationalisations that may only have an indirect bearing on what they actually do in real life – see in particular the debate on language ideologies in chapter 3. Yet embodiment is not necessarily conclusive in tying together the two strands of argument in this work. Certainly, embodiment is an aspect of habitus and has been demonstrated in this study (see the analysis of the data in chapter 3.3.1.2.; 3.1.6.; 3.1.8.; 5.1.8.) but it is not the 'be all and the end all' of it. In this respect, I feel that there is more to be gained from leaving the relationship between action and utterance 'fuzzy' for the moment or as Simeoni (1998: 34) puts it:

On the assumption that higher-level cognitive tasks tend to be loosely structured, the mediating models designed to illuminate translatorial performance should take this inherent looseness (or fuzziness?) seriously. This is an arduous path – for it is far more habitual for the theoretical mind to look for degrees of explicitness exceeding those in the reality of practice.

The study of habitus-mediated relations of norms to agents will be best served if we keep in mind that only the weaker form of determinism can apply, in practice as well as in our competing comprehensions of such practices in the act of research.

The data provides grounds for adopting such a stance but it is not the intention to remain non-committal or elusive on the matter. Functional approaches to translation take the relation between text and context for granted and factor it into their models of analysis. Other sources in translation literature approach the relation between text and the translator in various ways, a few of which will be examined in brief here before going on to decide on the findings from the data. As the following quotes illustrate, there has been a long tradition in translation studies that herald notions such as entextualisation and re-contextualisation, like Jakobson's concept of interlingual translation, for example (see the brief discussion in chapter 4.1.2.2.). Here again a shift can be traced in the broader context of language study from textual approaches that explicate action and context through text (text as language use in different social situations – Crystal & Davy 1969) to socially-situated views on the matter (text as frozen or decontextualised instances of on-going speech or discourse – Baumann & Briggs 1990; Hanks 1996; Silverstein & Urban 1996).

### **6.1.1. From Metatext to Metonymics: translated texts as evidence of cultural change**

In tracing various views on the relation between text and context in translation it is important to examine firstly Popovič's older notion of translation as metatext:

Of particular concern to Popovič was the attempt to capture the specificity of translation by setting it among and against similar 'metatexts', as he called them. Translation in his view constitutes a form of 'metacommunication'. The term refers to "all types of processing (manipulation) of the original literary text, whether it is done by other authors, readers, critics, translators, etc." (1976a: 226). James Holmes shared Popovič's concern; André Lefevere would later speak of 'refracted texts' and then of 'rewriting'. (Hermans 1999: 25)

Popovič's metatext is relational in that it is preceded by and stems from a prototext; it hence recognises and builds on textual interrelatedness. This perhaps attributes too much importance to the original but it does point to the complexity of the interaction involved between both texts, while allowing the various actors in through the backdoor. Lefevere's notion of 'refracted texts' echoes Bakhtin's stance on (literary) text which he considered as being basically dialogic, as constituting a response to prior utterances on the theme while at the same time refracting and reflecting the socio-cultural reality it attempts to represent. For Lefevere translations refracted varying language practices and cultures or constitute 'rewritings' of earlier texts (in different languages) for different cultures and societies. Lefevere saw literary translations as being constrained by 'poetics, patronage and ideology' more so than by 'linguistic differences' (Lefevere 1992: 87 quoted in Hermans 1999: 43), all of which must have an effect on or somehow become visible in a translated text. Tymoczko (1999) took Lefevere's

notion of 'rewriting' further by positing the notion of metonymics<sup>326</sup> in order to ground translational action in a larger socio-cultural context.

At the same time, the metonymies of translation are a key to the construction of the representations that translations project – whether they are representations of history, culture, values, or literary form. The metonymics of a translation are, thus, not simply of abstract interest. They cast an image of the source text and the source culture; they have political and ideological presuppositions and impact; they function in the world. For the receiving audience the translation metonymically constructs a source text, a literary tradition, a culture, and a people, by picking parts, aspects, and attributes that will stand for wholes. Such metonyms of translation play a part in establishing a symbolic order within which a people is construed or even construes itself. (Tymoczko 1999: 57)

This fruitful approach allowed Tymoczko to reconstruct widely held visions on an emerging independent Ireland in the 19th and early 20th century through an analysis of numerous contemporary translations of the Old Irish epic, 'Táin Bó Cúailnge.'

Regarding translation as metatext, refraction, rewriting or metonymics, if we pursue Bakhtin's reasoning and view each utterance as both a refraction of and response to previous utterances then we cannot exclude utterances that were made in other languages. I am not only referring here to instances of what is normally regarded as codeswitching, mixing or slippage. Nor does this necessarily mean translations<sup>327</sup> or interpretation events only but it definitely does include them. More importantly, if response and refraction are basic to any utterance and hence to the original (source text) then why should they be considered as something to be avoided in or even banned from the target text? In this respect, the ideal model of a target text mirroring a source text, next to being fundamentally erroneous, is naïve. Its 'all or nothing' stance can only lead to frustration. Moreover, the data has shown that translators take it for granted that no such match or mirror is possible even though they strive to achieve it (see particularly the discussion in chapter 3.4.2.1).

What then can we reasonably expect to find in translations next to evidence of a source text? If they are seen as metatexts, rewritings or metonymically charged texts then they can hardly be expected to only repeat what was said in the source text. Indeed the corpus study has shown the translations to be asymmetrical to their target texts. The dual goal emergent in the ethnographic data, i.e. to stay as close as possible to the source poem while making a new target poem, can only but result in a hybrid product (Levý in Hermans 1999: 21). Otherwise there would be no 'meta,' no refraction or no response or in the case of the target texts in the corpus, nothing would have been either versed or conversed. Fortunately, hybridity<sup>328</sup> has lost the stigma it might have had in Levý's day and has long since become a darling term among post modernists. In its new guise, hybridity indexes a form of cultural and linguistic practice that typifies the post-colonial being and is celebrated as such. Nor is hybridity new to translators or to translation. Nevertheless, neither translators nor translation scholars were ever really invited to the party, despite the recognition of the vital role of translation in cultural transfer and the body of work written on the matter. Translations are still legitimately studied

in order to sift out or identify a translator's 'input.' The danger in this is **that** one might end up believing that a source text can somehow miraculously translate itself with a little help from a translator, whose contribution could then be gummed out or safely quarantined during some imaginary tidying-up process afterwards. The translator's 'input' is not and never has been a layer of text that can be peeled off to reveal the pristine purity of the original. Without the translator's 'input' there would have been no translation in the first place. The corpus data showed how the translators paid close attention to the modes of expression and cultural other in the source poems and an equal amount of care to the emerging target poems. Next to this the qualitative data revealed how their input is also situated in the community of practices they work within; neither is their input solely theirs, at least not totally, despite the responsibility (textual and legal) they bear for the finished target text. This brings us back full circle to our initial question on the relationship between text and context, though not entirely. It has been shown that translated texts are always (re-)contextualised and multi-voiced, notwithstanding an economy of practices that obfuscates itself by upholding disinterested and disassociated individuality as the *summum* of performance (Bourdieu 1979<sup>329</sup>).

### 6.1.2. A Corpus as Evidence of a Translator's Style

A more recent approach to the relation between translator, text and context builds on insights gained from translational corpora. In an initial investigation of the Translational English Corpus<sup>330</sup> (TEC) Mona Baker (2000<sup>331</sup>) proposed a methodology for investigating a literary translator's style. Baker sees style as "a kind of thumb-print that is expressed in a range of linguistic as well as non-linguistic features" or "as a matter of patterning: it involves describing preferred or recurring patterns of linguistic behaviour, rather than individual or one-off instances of intervention," (Baker 2000: 245). In seeking evidence of a given translator's preference for specific lexical items, syntactic patterns, etc., she poses three important questions:

The questions might include the following: (a) Is a translator's preference for specific linguistic options independent of the style of the original author?; (b) Is it independent of general preferences of the source language, and possibly the norms or poetics of a given sociolect?; (c) If the answer is yes in both cases, is it possible to explain those preferences in terms of the social, cultural or ideological positioning of the individual translator? (Baker 2000: 248)

Our analysis of the qualitative data has thrown up an array of professional, linguistic and cultural/aesthetic stances (see particularly the overviews in Tables 3-i-iv, 3-vi and 3-vii in chapter 3), that largely answer question (c) above, though not in relation to or as emergent from specific textual choices. The analysis of the corpus data revealed a considerable amount of translational patterning but whether this allows us to answer questions (a) and (b) is another matter. In fact, regarding question (b), I find it difficult to see how such independence could be possible, for no matter how 'original' or 'eccentric' or 'iconoclastic' a translator's linguistic preferences, norms or poetics are, they will still belong within the economy of practices of the field in question or relate to them in some way, no matter how obliquely<sup>332</sup>. It

has been amply shown in the ethnography how translators make distinctions between their own forms or views of practice and those of others (not necessarily translators) within the field. These distinctions were often expressed in terms of selfless dedication to the art of translation or, more pertinently, in terms of the loss of economic capital ensuing from such dedication. To borrow one of Lefevere's terms, these distinctions must somehow be traceable in the 'poetics' of literary translators. The question then is how individual are a single translator's poetics.

Question (a) still remains a hard nut to crack, however. The corpus analysis has shown how the translators engaged with the problems, linguistic and otherwise, posed by the source poems. The solutions they found were shown to be situated to the extent that they cannot be totally separated from the 'problems' they attempted to solve. It was shown that the solutions found belonged within plausible linguistic and generic expectations of the target culture, which is not to say that they were conform with orthodox views on how literary texts should be in Dutch. It would also be going too far to say that the solutions were solely specific to the two translators who translated almost two thirds of the corpus (see the discussion of the tables at the beginning of this chapter). As was mentioned above, the table below contains a condensed selection of details on frequency and percentage for codes that could be considered as bearing indications of translational style. As the table illustrates, all the translators carried out shifts at all the levels listed except for '**marked word order: – inversion**', which was not found in the translations of B. den U., G.G. or R.L. As this is just one indicator of style it hardly allows us to draw any solid conclusions. It is important to remind the reader that the inversion coded in these instances was not solely due to syntactic constraints in the target language (see chapter 5.3.3.6.):

Translator	ALL	RH& AVDW	PN	JE	RL	B DEN U	CB & JE	GG
N° of lines	5512	1083	2408		319		177	477
Tokens	freq	freq	freq	freq	freq	freq	freq	Freq
adjectives	43	1	30	3	1	4	2	2
%	100%	2,3	69,8	6,98	2,3	9,3	4,7	4,7
clause	219	42	100	25	6	13	8	25
%	100%	19	45,7	11,41	2,7	5,94	3,7	11
elision	35	2	8	15	1	3	3	3
%	100%	5,7	22,9	42,86	2,9	8,57	8,6	8,6
explicit	46	8	24	4	4	3	1	2
%	100%	17	52,2	8,7	8,7	6,52	2,2	4,3
implicit	70	19	21	18	2	4	4	2
%	100%	27	30	25,71	2,9	5,7	5,7	2,9
Lbd	124	11	73	24	5	4	1	6
%	100%	8,9	58,9	19,35	4	3,2	0,8	4,8
nouns	197	27	96	24	3	17	9	21
%	100%	14	48,7	12,18	1,5	8,62	4,6	11
mismatch	17	3	7	1	1	1	1	3
%	100%	18	41,2	5,9	5,9	5,9	5,9	18
verbs	90	16	42	16	4	4	5	3
%	100%	18	46,7	17,77	4,4	4,44	5,6	3,3
marked w-o: -	21	6	12	2	0	0	1	0
%	100%	29	57,1	9,52	0	0	4,8	0

**Table 6-vii: a selection of codes from the corpus: frequency and % per translator**

The table also lists the poetic feature **lbd** ('**line break difference**') for example, which definitely can be considered as constituting a form of 'stylistic' or aesthetic 'intervention'. The large differences in frequencies and percentages must be seen in proportion to the number of lines each translator translated but it can be tentatively concluded from the table that possible indicators of style are quite well distributed among all the translators, as was also argued at the beginning of the chapter. Individual differences are visible in the table, however. Note for example the relatively few instances of '**line break difference**' under C.B. & J.E. and R.H. & A. v/d W.: **1 every 177 and 98 lines**, respectively compared to the average of **1 every 44.5 lines**. Note also the relatively low number of noun and verb shifts under R.L.: **1 every 106 and 80 lines**, compared to the averages of **1 every 28 and 1 every 61 lines**, respectively. Next to this deeper levels of difference have to be – and were – examined within clause or phrase level, etc. Again, differences in frequency and percentage would have to be weighed against the number



of lines translated. The related source texts would also have to be examined on each occasion to see whether they formed the cause of the differences or not. In the above instances line length and strictness of rhyme scheme would certainly have to be taken into consideration, particularly in relation to **'elision'** in J.E.'s work for example. An examination of the table shows both similarity and difference among translators. Therefore, it can be concluded, given the broad distribution of high frequency 'style indicators' among the translators, that personal translational style is more a matter of degree than of absolute or clear-cut difference.

The above discussion throws up an interesting paradox. Literary translators are expected to demonstrate creativity in their work, albeit within certain limits. All those interviewed agree on staying as close as possible to the source text, which means that they cannot take too much leeway with it. There is a point in leeway beyond which a translation is understood to be an adaptation, a reworking, etc. At the same time, translators are also required to perform well in terms of target aesthetic expectations: the source poem has to become a poem in the target language/culture. Given these constraints, we can ask what translational creativity consists in. According to the translators, it does not mean taking too many liberties with the source text but rather engaging with it intensely in order to get the most out of or put the most into the target text. All this has a bearing on the patterning sought in any effort to discover a translator's style. What does patterning manifest: a translator's creative engagement or his/her routine use of set linguistic ploys, notwithstanding the source text? This is an important issue for the translators, all of whom were categorical in rejecting routine: see in particular the column on **'textual orientation'** in **Table 3-i: ethic orientations**, the column on **'focus/approach'** in **Table 3-vi: genre related utterances** and the discussion of these tables in chapter 3. A rejection of routine or 'hack' work is also found in **Interview 8: ensuing conversation**, where it is equated with 'platitudes'. In **Interview 9: ar**, the interviewee stresses the importance of beginning each translation afresh and of not relying on the same approach to a work, even or especially when it is by the same author. A similar stance also emerges in **Interview 6: a3(sub2)**, where the interviewee refuses to consider a writer as a typical representative of a given culture, which means paying close attention to individual – contestational – aspects of voice rather than cultural and linguistic stereotypes. In **Interview 10: b1(sub5)**, a distinction is made between the routine work of a 'professional' translator and a translator's dedication to a single work, which costs more in time and effort than the actual fee for the work. As we can gather from these instances, the exigency is not to fall into a translational rut. For all intents and purposes, if such stances were adhered to, this would make linguistic patterning much more difficult to trace.

Patterning and what it manifests also has a bearing on the discussion about translator 'invisibility' (Simeoni 1998). If it is so that the more closely a translator engages with a source text, the less visible his or her patterning might become, would this be tantamount to the translator's voluntary self-effacement? I believe not. A translator's reputation is seldom equated with or judged on his or her 'visibility' in the target text over and above a successful engagement with the source text. As was pointed out in chapters 2 and 3 however, translators

are visible and audible in the economy of practices they work within. Yet, one of the demands of that economy of practices does amount in a way to textual self-effacement. This in turn is related to notions of equivalence at various levels (see the discussion in chapter 2.4.3.1. and 2.5.5.3. and elsewhere). No matter how difficult it is to define textual equivalence and no matter how varied the types of equivalence distinguished in the literature – ranging from formal to pragmatic – equivalence is also as an aspect of practice, something expected and negotiated by the actors in the field when approaching text. Thus, a translator’s visibility in terms of reputation may indeed stem from or be concomitant with his or her perceived ‘textual’ invisibility.

At the same time, it cannot be denied that translations do entextualise a translator’s ethos etc. in some way. Indeed, a close examination of the corpus data has thrown up plausible genre-based explanations for the translational decisions found there and evaluation is always involved in generic activity. As was stated already, only a judicious weighing of frequencies and percentages and comparison with the source text will allow us to make more precise conjectures regarding ethos, etc. Deciding just how closely such findings can be paired with a particular translator would require much more detailed analysis than was made available in this study. The purpose here was to sketch general translational practice rather than paint portraits of particular individuals. It can be asserted, however, that the work delivered here will help make these portraits more detailed and heighten their perspective.

The main difficulty, however, is that we cannot glean all the information we need from source and target texts alone, no matter how vast the corpus is, even if the data were filtered later for each single translator. An understanding of the various aspects of the practices that generated these texts is needed in order to get a more focused picture, which first involves gaining an overview of the commonality of certain translational decisions within a given community of practice. Nevertheless, textual analyses do provide an essential part of the answer to the question regarding the relation between text and context in translational practice.

### 6.1.3. **Habitus and a Translator’s Style**

Simeoni (1998: 15) relates a translator’s ‘style’ or textual practice to the broader socialisation processes through which a translator’s habitus takes form. In outlining the genealogy of habitus he points to its origin in Aristotle’s notion of

*hexis*, i.e. a quality of being or “disposition” characterised by stability and permanence....

He cites two such “qualities” of *hexis*: the sciences, and virtue (the latter specifically defined as *hexis proairètikè*, i.e., as “habitus dependent on and creator of, choices” – thus clearly anticipating Bourdieu’s conceptualization). When conceived of as an attribute of human beings, *hexis* is associated with age, character, social standing, distinction and birth (*Rhetorica* II, 8, 1386a, 26). Most relevantly for students of language in context, Aristotle establishes a strong association between (i) *hexis* as “those dispositions only which determine the character of a man’s life” and (ii) stylistic variation. A person’s *hexis* is said to be “reproduced” in his or her style of speaking (*Rhetorica* III, 7, 1408a: 27–31).

Whether we use the term *hexis*<sup>333</sup> or *habitus*, it is not the purpose to reduce the scope of the term to a translator's mental or articulatory make-up or solely to individual behaviour. As Hanks points out:

Finally, whereas the unit of speech production in both formalist and pure relational approaches is typically taken to be the individual speaker, in a practice approach it is the socially defined relation between agents and the field that "produces" speech forms. This is not to deny the agency of individual speakers but to recognize that speech production is a social fact. (Hanks 1996: 230)

Likewise, as the data listed in the tables in this chapter suggest, a translator's individual style is only distinct to a degree and only in relation to others within the field. It is never absolutely so, not even for the most renowned or the most individual. It is through our understanding of the field that such distinctions within it become visible or that individual stances make sense. Conversely, the distinctions set up by the translators which emerged in the qualitative data do not merely illustrate various professional and ideological positionings and approaches to language and text within the field, they also structure and construct that field and have a bearing on textual practice at the same time. Their distinctions allowed us to gain a perspective from which to examine textual practices. Such practices are considered to belong to a translator's *habitus*. How they relate specifically in this study will be further outlined below. Before doing so some final remarks have to be added to the discussion of the literature. In his provisional conclusions on translatorial *habitus*, Simeoni states:

To talk of a *habitus* is to imagine a theoretical stenograph for the integration and – in the best of cases – the resolution of those conflicting forces. A highly personalized construct, it retains all the characteristic imperiousness of norms. Indeed, norms without a *habitus* to instantiate them make no more sense than a *habitus* without norms. Incorporating conflict in one single construct attached to the person of the translator should also help us better understand the tension behind the individual choices during the decision process. (Simeoni 1998: 33)

This study has shown that a translator's *habitus* is not only a highly personalised construct but a socially distributed set of practices as well. This means that the relation between text and context is never exclusively individual or entirely embodied in the translator alone. In this respect, the study has certainly laid bare the conflicting forces pointed at above. Following Voloshinov, it can be argued that the 'psychological' dilemmas translators face in making both professional and textual decisions are grounded in the field they work in and are hence also socio-cultural. The conflicts pointed to by Simeoni were shown to be salient both in the translators' professional interaction and in their textual decision-making. In this respect, *habitus* forms a potent tool because, in its attempt to lay bare the various aspects of human interaction in and through language use, it

1. Allows people to exist and participate from a theoretical point of view;
2. Provides us with a framework for studying people's life worlds, beliefs, language use and actions all at the same time.

Is there a degree of circularity in all this, a setting out merely to repeat in the end what has initially been posited? I believe not. The framework of practice (or habitus) has proved itself elsewhere and needs no defence as such. On the other hand, the data for this study still had to be gathered and analysed and it was not clear from the outset whether a practice approach would help us gain an insight into the field of translation. The tri-partite distinctions of (1) system, (2) activity and (3) value in a theory of practice did help us recognise and separate out a number of salient factors in the data that could be tacitly grouped under these headings. More importantly, the theory taught us to be wary of attempting to reduce related factors to functions of a single overarching factor. A case in point was the importance of symbolic and cultural capital as means of exchange in negotiating meaning and reputation in translation (chapters 2 and 3). Its most obvious third component, financial capital could not explain all perceived relations of importance, either textual or professional, in the field. This applies to the other salient features in the data, which also overlapped in many ways. In this respect, I believe it has also become sufficiently clear from the evidence so far that:

1. Translated texts cannot be reduced to the contexts of their production;
2. Translated texts cannot fully explicate the contexts of their production;
3. Translations cannot be fully explicated by source texts;
4. Translations do entextualise ethos, etc., but do not (cannot) embody individual ethos only;
5. Individual translational ethos and textual practice both belong to the field of translation and help structure that field;
6. Language use in translational practice needs to be understood in broader terms, not merely as (translated) texts, no matter how functional the approaches to these texts are.

Therefore, text and context intersect in many ways in the field of translation, some of the approaches to which have been sketched in the discussion above. Much of what has been said confirms Hanks's view on speech production as social fact, to which we can add one of Vološinov's views on language: "the domain of ideology coincides with the domain of signs," (Vološinov 1973: 10). Both of their views encapsulate and answer our question on the relation between text and context albeit in principle or as a point of departure. But their views (and those of others) have not only informed the stance adopted from the outset in this work, they have also helped us understand the phenomena found in the data. If this is circularity then so be it.

Ultimately, the discussion still had to be conducted with regard to translators and more particularly in relation to the data gathered for this study for it is only through the data that we can reach any form of conclusion on the matter, no matter how tentative the conclusion is. Furthermore, for a theory of practice or habitus to be worth its salt it has to do more than just propagate itself theoretically. It has to show something specific about the field it was used to analyse. Therefore, it was not the relation between text and context as such that mattered but rather how the relation was specifically constituted by those working in the field under study. In contrasting the findings from two sets of data, it has never been the purpose to subject them to a 'view from nowhere' (Hanks 1996) in order to reach a plausibly disinterested or

objective conclusion. The few tentative conclusions that issue from the findings must be understood in relation to those who were willing to take part in this study and to the field they work and live within. Notwithstanding the worth of a practice approach, the perspective gained from this study is far from complete, neither methodologically nor in terms of evidence – hence the suggestions for further research mentioned throughout this chapter. What the study did achieve was to lay bare patterns in language use, approach to activity and values among a number of literary translators working in the Netherlands and Belgium. Though incomplete, this forms an initial but necessary step in understanding translation practices in the field. Moreover, in commenting on the relation between text and context in translation it is also important to go beyond the hedged nature of the six points made above. It still has to state what the relationship specifically is, at least from the perspective of this study. In what follows a number of overall conclusions will be drawn from the findings from both sets of data. These conclusions will be expressed with a measure of caution. In his exploration of what a translatorial habitus might consist in, Simeoni (1998:17) warns us against:

adopting the all-to-simple image of Russian dolls or embedded influences, for the simple reason that the facts appear far more complex. In particular, given the interplay of influences to which we-as-social-agents are all subjected, it is far from clear which kind(s) can be said to be most active, which most tenuous, or which comes first or last, in general terms.

This will be borne in mind when setting out the conclusions below.

## **6.2. Tying the Two Strands of Inquiry Together: conclusions of the study**

The main issues to emerge from the analysis of the ethnographic data can be grouped under four headings: ethos, language ideologies, perceptions of genre, and versions of culture. In the data analysed under each of these headings a set of distinctions were set up by the translators that both described and structured aspects of the field under scrutiny. Their distinctions were both contestational and contrastive and reflected the agreement and potential conflict present in all forms of human interaction, in this case in relation to translation. They showed that it was through contestation and agreement that meaning came about not only among the parties involved but in the texts (translations) they were involved with. When the interviewees spoke of translation, their utterances were found to have immediate textual relevance, i.e., they related to translating texts as such and hence to textual practice. At the same time, they related to the field in which their work was carried out, to all the actors they dealt with in the course of their work, etc. The following two tables, which were condensed from those drawn up in chapter 3, provide an overview of the key ways in which these orientations were characterised per heading and hence how the translators viewed and structured their field. The first table groups the findings on ethos, perceptions of genre and versions of culture and the second brings together stances on the Dutch language and on language(s) in general:

Ethos		Perceptions of Genre		Versions of culture	
Textual	Social	Expectation	Approach	Version	Instance
Raw Beauty vs. blandness; adventure vs. routine	Prospective readers vs. prescriptive 'scientists'	Respect for the original in every sense	Creative immediacy, formal care in translation	Poetic practice shows common cultural tradition, aesthetic codes	Common source of poetic theme from Yeats to Heaney
Sensitivity vs. heavy-handedness	Consultation vs. unilateral action	Improving poetic, translation practice	Understanding through translation	Artistic practices show common aesthetics	Common theme across the arts
Committed distance vs. untested awareness	Collaboration vs. unilateral action	Difference in language(s) forms basis for leeway in a genre	Shifting dynamic functions forms framework of translation	Culture-specific use of English lexicon	Irish or Hiberno-English variety
Responsible non-committal reading	Translators vs. others inc. writers, readers, etc.	A poet's breath determines his/her poetry	Breath as a means of analysis and actual translation	Politics of poetics, generic traditions	Narrative vs. philosophical tradition in poetry
Quality vs. Expedience	Consultation vs. unilateral action	Contestation of (a poet's) generic shortcomings	Empathy as a basis for translational action	Contrastive cultural / literary practices	Degrees of access to literary field across cultures
Creativity vs. language rules	Translators vs. proofreaders, clients	Anxiety regarding poetic/ translational competence	Orders of competence in translation activity	Orders of legitimacy / cultural competence	Formation in English literatures
Human variation vs. mechanical reproduction	Translators vs. others, clients	Eye for individual or changing literary styles	Engaging with differences within known generic frameworks	Real / imagined landscapes index embodied / imagined cultural traits	Wild landscape as ground for 'wild' Irish characters
Quality vs. hack work	'Real' vs. 'professional' translator	Specific historical expressions within genres	Understanding Pre and High Modernism	Asymmetric developments in cultural / artistic movement(s)	Historical use of blank verse vs. rhyme across languages, cultures

**Table 6-viii: the main factors in ethos, perceptions of genre and versions of culture**

All the characterisations outlined above were situated in and directly related to the activity of translation. They also ground translation in various ways in the broader socio-cultural context in which it takes place. The characterisations are also interpenetrated by stances on language use.

The Dutch Language Debate		The General Language Debate	
Perceptions of Dutch	Perceptions of “Flemish”	Perceptions of (other) language(s)	Professional / Social Stance
‘Internal’ contestation, attacked by pedants	Flemish turn of phrase is ‘beautiful’ / ‘wonderful’	Collective nature of language determines lexical variation in and across languages	Translating involves using lexical variation and hence containing possible meaning.
fashion-conscious / intolerant of difference	Timeless / storehouse of language use	Language is alive: poetry (must) reflect(s) that life	Translated poetry must take on the being (form and substance) of the new language.
Dominates through market share in media	Not allowed in publications	Distance from language community causes (vertical) disassociation of aspects of language	In contrast to the colloquial, a ‘higher’ language level is needed for writing and translating
Standard language hence carelessness among its native speakers when translating	Dialect as handicap Hence more care among ‘non-standard’ users when translating	Similar language structures implies similar poetic practices	Relatedness of language structure and hence poetics facilitates translation
Only valid variety central dominance hence threat of impoverishment	Old-fashioned / inaccurate peripheral resistance hence preservation of variety	Conjugation systems determine line length so longer lines in Dutch translations prove problematic	Dutch translations of Afrikaans are more melodious: a positive, unexpected result of longer lines
Correct / knowledgeable / exclusive intolerance of difference	Negative / unknowledgable / A variety / preservation of variety	French rhymes, Dutch resists rhyme	Rhyme may have to be abandoned to achieve good Dutch translations
Fashionable / racy hence liable to age quickly in translation	More conservative hence longer lasting / more secure in translation		

**Table 6-ix: the main factors in language ideologies**

The characterisations of language found in the table on language ideologies ground language in translational activity as well as in its broader sociocultural settings. The characteristics attributed to languages are expressed in terms of genre and socio-cultural perceptions.

As can be observed from the two tables, the characterisations are often cast in terms of contrasting pairs of attributes. Such contrasts are especially visible in the sections on ‘ethos’

and **language ideologies.**' These contrasts create fields of tension within which their attributes are seen to belong and to function. They index the relational nature of the positions that the translators adopt in the field in question, along with their recognition of the various voices and views to be found there. In this way, they also point to power relations within the field, power relations that are played out in terms of related language competence and orders of poetic or aesthetic competence. The translators are visible and audible as actors and expressers of value throughout these fields of tension.

A number of issues also emerged from the analysis of the electronic corpus. The data grouped under the various categories of code provided textual evidence of various aspects of translational practice. The following lists outline the key aspects related to each code category which encompasses source and target texts in the corpus:

*1. Linguistic codes*

a) Discourse features:

**Ling. Code:** awareness/difficulty of translating source codeswitching and mixing;

**Idiomatic choice:** awareness of / appropriate language use in (imagined) generic instances;

**Index:** translation problems related to the local indexed by certain source text items; how total are native / foreign readings of a poem?

**Pragmatic choice:** awareness / appropriate use of pragmatic forms in (imagined) interaction;

**Names, places, etc.:** mostly kept, important aspects of source culture kept in target poems.

b) Sentence features:

**Word choice - phrase level: source to target** lexical equivalence set off by considerations and interrelations between target text lexical items, rhyme and meter;

**Word order - clause level:** genre constraints override 'system' constraints; decisions on syntax and those on rhyme and meter interlock.

*2. Poetic codes:*

**Line overflow and line break difference:** decisions regarding word order and those regarding line length and meter are interlocked;

**Rhyme:** result is asymmetric to source rhyme but within a set of genre expectations;

**Rhyme (local):** target rhyme cued by the odd source rhyme seen as a path of action though there is no fixed source rhyme;

**Sound (various):** similar path of action to rhyme local in which **perceptions** of assonance, alliteration, etc. forms part of the translation's repertoire.

The most obvious conclusion that can be drawn from these lists concerns the interrelatedness of linguistic and poetic decision-making. This interrelatedness has been so obvious to all and sundry that it hardly even needed mentioning. It is basic to poetry translation 'out there' in the world. The difference is that the corpus has thrown up so many instances of it among the various translators that it constitutes a considerable empirical given. This empirical given cannot be ignored and needs to be examined more closely for its own sake to see how it functions. What I mean is that it should not only be examined in contrast



to how poems might have been translated given ideal circumstances. Likewise, it was shown in the analysis of rhyme that the results were asymmetrical to the rhyme in the source poems yet still within a set of expectations. This too needs to be examined more profoundly, for rather than being one of its 'regrettable' side effects, it is also basic to poetry translation 'out there'. Rivers of ink have flown over the 'impossibility' of translating poetry. Translators know that it is 'impossible' and have said as much; many argue that this is why they do it. The 'impossibility' argument also needs to be examined from the point of view of obfuscation. Cultural and symbolic capital is often jealously guarded – a 'national' poet is sometimes seen as minding the inner sanctum of a shared cultural experience and aesthetic. The reasoning is **that** this does not belong to those outside the nation, at least not immediately and never entirely. Very often the debate is cast in terms of language difference and the resulting difficulty of 'transfer'. Here Boaz's notion of language relativity is often used with incisive though unfair effect. The difficulty of transfer is the translator's daily bread; he or she is well placed to comment on the work involved. National literatures are often examined with 'a view from nowhere', as Hanks puts it. Hence translations cannot be evaluated entirely from within a single language or culture. To use the language of conflict, a certain 'rapprochement' is needed here between the empirical and the speculative.

In relating the findings condensed in the tables to those in the lists the following general conclusions can be reached:

Firstly, the various aspects of language use are understood by translators to be both embodied and socially distributed.

- ♦ In this respect competence in 'grammar' or care for 'rules' for example, is often projected outwards, both positively and negatively, onto others in the field (proofreaders, editors, (pedant) critics, etc.).
- ♦ In the work-a-day world of translation, the various aspects of language competence are also understood as embodied in various ways and to varying degrees by the actors in the field<sup>334</sup>. In such projections, creativity often remains on the side of the translator.
- ♦ Orders of creative competence are further distinguished among translators themselves. These orders intersect with those of (source/target language) poets and writers.
- ♦ Translators also embody 'grammatical' competence. This becomes manifest firstly in the conflicting loyalties they express between 'correctness' and perceived obligations regarding the standard and the leeway needed for creative language use. It is also visible in their defence of (creative) choices in negotiations with proofreaders and editors. This tension between creativity and grammatical rule has also been amply evidenced in the corpus.

Secondly, creative language use is a basic expectation of the genre these translators work within.

- ♦ To say that it entirely overrides considerations of correctness would be going too far, however. What the corpus does show is that systemic possibility is constrained by appropriate genre-related use. This too is fraught with tension.

- ♦ Genre expectations are both embodied by the translator and shared by the community, but more immediately by the others working in the field.

Thirdly, appropriate language use in poetry (translation) feeds into shared notions of aesthetics and poetics and hence forms a site of local discussion and negotiation. In addition to the corpus findings, the qualitative data showed how translators cultivate expertise on and practice in the genre(s) they work in often in cooperation with other translators, which further underlines the shared nature of genre expectations.

Fourthly, by shared I do not necessarily mean agreement or uniformity.

- ♦ Agreement is never given. In fact throughout this study contestation has been the emergent yardstick against which agreement can be measured. In all this the translator is a gatekeeper, but certainly not the only one.
- ♦ It would seem inappropriate, therefore, to assume the existence of a blanket synchronous aesthetic or linguistic norm for any given community for any given time.

Fifthly, as the ethnographic data shows, translators also cultivate and often have lived experience of the cultures they are involved with from the point of view of translation.

- ♦ Recognising cultural differences, whether they are indexed by lexical items such as names, themes or turns of phrase, forms part of their own perceived competence and is also largely evidenced in the corpus.
- ♦ Nonetheless, translators refuse to equate the writings of a single member of a given culture with that culture. Here too contestation is recognised along with the multi-voicedness involved in the construction of any culture.

In retrospect, the conclusions drawn here seem more than obvious and may have been taken for granted by some for a long time already. Nonetheless, they had to be stated with the facts and figures in hand. Perhaps the two strands of reasoning could have been tied together more tightly, the findings from the two sets of data could have been allowed to overlap more closely but in my defence, I ask you to consider the words of the poet, Leonard Cohen<sup>335</sup>:

*There is a crack in everything,  
That's how the light gets in.*

More can and will be said and with more precision.





---

## NOTES

### CHAPTER 1 - EMIC JOURNEYS & ETIC SHIFTS: TOWARDS AN ETHNOGRAPHY OF TRANSLATION

<sup>1</sup> Malmkjaer, Kirsten (1991) *The Linguistics Encyclopedia*, London: Routledge.

The following quote was taken from the entry on tegememics in the encyclopedia:

“The **etic** view has to do with universals, with observation from outside a system, as well as with the nature of the initial field data, and with various forms of an emic units”. Such a view, he [Pike] thinks, “can provide no more than a point of departure for an **emic** view consisting in interpreting events according to their particular function in the particular cultural world in which they belong.” (Waterhouse 1974: 6)

“The **emic** view is concerned with the contrastive, patterned system of a specific language or culture or universe of discourse, with the way a participant in a system sees that system, as well as with the distinctions between contrastive units.” (Ducrot & Todorov 1981: 36; Waterhouse 1974: 6)

<sup>2</sup> Pike, Kenneth L. (1954-56) *Language, in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior, parts I, II, III*, Glendale, CA, Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Pike, Kenneth L. (1966) “Etic and Emic Standpoints for the Description of Behavior” in Smith A.G. (ed.) *Communication and Culture: Readings in the Codes of Human Interaction (152-163)*, New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

<sup>3</sup> For a full discussion of the use of the terms see Headland, N. Thomas, Kenneth L. Pike & M. Harris (eds.) (1990) *Emics and Etics: The Insider/Outsider Debate*, Newbury Park, Ca: Sage Publications Inc.

<sup>4</sup> Baker, Mona (1998) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London: Routledge.

<sup>5</sup> 7. A Stereoscopic Window on the World, Characteristics of the Two Views, <http://www.sil.org/klp/eticemic.htm>

<sup>6</sup> Bassnett, Susan (2002) *Translation Studies, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition*, London: Routledge.

<sup>7</sup> For a detailed discussion of these developments see the entry, “Translator-training institutions” by Monique Caminade & Anthony Pym (Baker 1998: 280-285).

<sup>8</sup> Snell-Hornby, Mary (1998) *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

<sup>9</sup> Vološinov, V.N. (1973) *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, Translated by Ladislav Matejka and I.R. Titunik (Studies in Language, ed. M. Silverstein), New York, London: Seminar Press.

For a detailed discussion of contextual aspects of meaning see also Duranti, A. & Goodwin, C. (eds.) (1992) *Rethinking Context, Language as an interactive phenomenon* (Studies in the Social and Cultural Foundations of Language, N° 11), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

<sup>10</sup> Venuti’s Translation Studies Reader (2002) and Hermans’ Translation in Systems (1999) trace various aspects of developments that increasingly take situation into account.

<sup>11</sup> Robinson, Douglas (1998) “Literal Translation” in Baker *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London: Routledge.

- 
- <sup>12</sup> Bourdieu, Pierre (1992) *Language & Symbolic Power*, Edited and Introduced by John B. Thompson, Translated by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- <sup>13</sup> Robinson, Douglas (1997) *The Best Kind of Translator*, Letter to Pammachius (395) translated by Paul Carroll in *Western Translation Theory, from Herodotus to Nietzsche*, Manchester: St. Jerome: 23-30.
- <sup>14</sup> For a detailed discussion of equivalence within contrastive linguistics and Translation Studies see Chesterman, Andrew (1998) *Contrastive Functional Analysis*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- <sup>15</sup> Venuti, Lawrence (1998) *The Scandals of Translation, towards an ethics of difference*, London: Routledge.
- <sup>16</sup> Bassnett, Susan & Trivedi, Harish (eds.) (2002) *Post-Colonial Translation. Theory and Practice (3<sup>rd</sup> edition)*, London: Routledge.
- <sup>17</sup> Thibault, Paul J. (1997) *Re-reading Saussure, The dynamics of signs in social life*, London: Routledge.
- <sup>18</sup> Harris, Roy (2001) *Saussure and his Interpreters*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- <sup>19</sup> de Saussure, Ferdinand (1974), *Cours de linguistique générale*, (édition critique préparé par Tullio de Mauro) Paris: Payot.
- <sup>20</sup> Baker, Mona (1992) *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*, London, New York: Routledge.
- <sup>21</sup> Pym, Anthony (1992) *Translation and Text Transfer*, Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- <sup>22</sup> Pym, Anthony (1998) *Method in Translation History*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- <sup>23</sup> Vermeer, H. (1998) "Starting to Unask What Translatology Is About" in *Target International Journal of Translation Studies* 10/1, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- <sup>24</sup> Holmes, James S. (1998) "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies" [1972] in R. van den Broeck (ed.): *Translated!* (67-80), Amsterdam: Rodopi.  
Also ('with a few stylistic revisions') in L. Venuti (ed.) (2000) *The Translation Studies Reader*, London: Routledge. All citations are taken from Venuti (2000).
- <sup>25</sup> Koller, Werner (1971) "Übersetzen, Übersetzung und Übersetzer. Zu schwedischen Syposien über Probleme der Übersetzung" in *Babel* 17, Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- <sup>26</sup> Levý, Jíří (1967) "Translation as a Decision Process" in *To Honour Roman Jakobson 11 (1171-1182)*, The Hague.  
Also in Venuti, L. (ed.) (2000) *The Translation Studies Reader*, London: Routledge.
- <sup>27</sup> Hermans, Theo (1999) *Translation in Systems*, Manchester: St. Jerome
- <sup>28</sup> Hatim, Basil & Mason, Ian (1990) *Discourse and the Translator*, London: Longman.
- <sup>29</sup> Koller, Werner (1976) "Äquivalenz in kontrastiver Linguistik und Übersetzungswissenschaft" in Grähs L., Korlén G. & Malmberg, B. (eds.) *Theory and Practice of Translation*, Nobel Symposium 39, Bern: Lang.
- <sup>30</sup> Sampson, Geoffrey (1985) *Schools of Linguistics, Competition and evolution*, London: Hutchinson.
- <sup>31</sup> House, Juliane (1977) *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*, Tübingen: TBL Verlag Gunter Narr.
- <sup>32</sup> Venuti, Lawrence (1998) *The Scandals of Translation, Towards an ethics of difference*, London: Routledge.
- <sup>33</sup> Kenny, Dorothy (2001) *Lexis and Creativity in Translation, A Corpus-based Study*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- <sup>34</sup> Crystal, D. & Davy, D. (1969) *Investigating English Style*, London: Longman.
- <sup>35</sup> See also Appiah's notion of 'thick translation' for example and the various calls for respecting the foreign or cultural other in translation in the work of Berman, Reiss, Tymoczko, and Venuti inter alia).
- <sup>36</sup> Jacquemond, Richard (1992) "Translation and cultural hegemony" in Venuti, Lawrence (ed.) *Rethinking Translation Discourse Subjectivity Ideology*, London: Routledge.
- <sup>37</sup> Vermeer, H.J. (1978) "Ein Rahmen für eine allgemeine Translationstheorie" in *Lebende Sprachen* 23: 99-102.
- <sup>38</sup> Reiss, K. & Vermeer, H.J. (1984) *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.

- <sup>39</sup> Vermeer, H.J. (1986) *Voraussetzung für eine Translationstheorie: Einige Kapitel Kultur- und Sprachtheorie*, Heidelberg: Groos.
- <sup>40</sup> Gardt, A. (1989) "Möglichkeiten und Grenzen einer pragmatischen Übersetzungstheorie" in *TEXTcomTEXT 4*: 1-59.
- <sup>41</sup> Holtz-Mänttari, J. (1984) *Translatorisches Handeln: Theorie und Methode*, Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.
- <sup>42</sup> Wilss, W. (1988) *Kognition und Übersetzen: Zu Theorie und Praxis der menschlichen und der maschineller Übersetzung*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- <sup>43</sup> Nord, C. (1988) *Textanalyse und Übersetzung. Theoretische Grundlagen, Methode und didactische Anwendung einer übersetzungsrelevanten Textanalyse*, Heidelberg: Groos.
- <sup>44</sup> Gutt, E. -A. (1991) *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- <sup>45</sup> Duranti, Alessandro (1997) *Linguistic Anthropology*, Cambridge, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- <sup>46</sup> Ruggie, John (1975) "International Responses to Technology: Concepts ad Trends", in *International Organization* 29/3: 557-584.
- <sup>47</sup> Krasner, Stephen D. (ed.) (1983) *International Regimes*, Ithica: Cornell University Press.
- <sup>48</sup> Arrojo, Rosemary (1998) "The revision of the traditional gap between theory & practice & the empowerment of translation in postmodern times" in *The translator* 4/1: 25-48.
- <sup>49</sup> Venuti, Lawrence (1996) *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*, London, New York: Routledge.
- <sup>50</sup> Lehr, Andrea (1996) *Kollotationen und maschinelesbare korpora: Ein operationeles analysemodell zum Aufbau lexikalischer Netze*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- <sup>51</sup> Firth, J.R (1957) *Papers in Linguistics 1934-1951*, London, New York and Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- <sup>52</sup> Baker, Mona (2001) "The Pragmatics of Cross Cultural Contact and Some False Dichotomies in Translation Studies", in Olohan, Maeve (ed.) *CTIS Occasional Papers, Vol. 1* (7-20), Manchester: Centre for Translation and Intercultural Studies, UMIST.
- <sup>53</sup> Reiss, Katarina (1988) "Der Text und der Übersetzer" in Arntz, Reiner (ed.) *Textlinguistik und Fachsprache* (67-75), Hildesheim: Olms.
- <sup>54</sup> Nord, Christiane (1991) *Text Analysis in Translation*, Amsterdam & Atlanta: GA Rodopi.
- <sup>55</sup> Hymes, D.H. (1971) "On Communicative Competence" in Pride J.B. & Holmes J. (eds.) (1972) *Sociolinguistics*, London: Penguin.
- <sup>56</sup> Bell, R.T. (1991) *Translation and Translating Theory and Practice*, London & New York: Longman.
- <sup>57</sup> Canale M. (1983) "From Communicative Competence to Communicative Language Pedagogy" in Richards J. and Schmidt R. (eds.) *Language and Communication*, London: Longman.
- <sup>58</sup> Schepher-Hughes, Nancy (2000) "Ire in Ireland" in *Ethnography* Vol. 1 (1): 117-140, London, Seven Oaks, CA and Delhi: Sage Publications.
- <sup>59</sup> Hymes, Dell and Robinson, Douglas (1980) "What is ethnography?" in *Language and education: ethnolinguistic essays*, Washington Center for Applied Linguistics: Washington.
- <sup>60</sup> Translators work and will continue to work with a whole range of resources that stem in the main from on-going scholarly inquiry within and across a plethora of academic disciplines – dictionaries, comparative grammars, specialised lexicons, corpora, to name but a few.
- <sup>61</sup> Harris, Marvin (1976) "History and Significance of the Emic/Etic Distinction" in *Annual review of Anthropology*, 5: 329-50.

---

## CHAPTER 2 - AN ETHNOGRAPHY OF TRANSLATION: SOME INITIAL STEPS

- <sup>62</sup> Bakhtin, M.M. (1990) *Speech Genres and other Late Essays*, (99) Emerson, Caryl & Holquist, Michael (eds.) translated by Vern W. McGee, Austin: University of Texas Press.
- <sup>63</sup> Medvedev, P. N. & Bakhtin, M. M. (1978) *The Formalist Method in Literary Scholarship*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- <sup>64</sup> Hanks, William F. (1996) *Language and Communicative Practices*, Boulder Colorado: Westview Press.
- <sup>65</sup> Hymes, Dell H. (1968) "The Ethnography of Speaking" in Fishman, Joshua (ed.) *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, (32-33), The Hague: Mouton.
- <sup>66</sup> Hymes, Dell H. (1972) "Models of the Interaction of language and Social Life" in Gumperz, John & Hymes, Dell (1972) *Directions in Sociolinguistics - The Ethnography of Communication*, London: Basil Blackwell [1972 ed., NY: Holt, Rhinehart & Winston].
- <sup>67</sup> Hymes, Dell H. (1974) "Ways of Speaking" in Bauman, Richard & Sherzer, Joel (eds.) *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking* (433-51), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- <sup>68</sup> Crystal, David (1997) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language, Second Edition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- <sup>69</sup> Venuti, Lawrence (1995) *The Translator's Invisibility, a History of Translation*, London, New York: Routledge.
- <sup>70</sup> Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1993) "The Politics of Translation" in *Outside the Teaching Machine*, New York: Routledge.
- <sup>71</sup> Venuti, Lawrence (ed.) (1992) *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*, London: Routledge.
- <sup>72</sup> Many of the earlier calls for heightened translator visibility stem from studies in literary translation. Within skopos and other more recent theories, the translator is not necessarily a literary translator. It would be interesting, therefore, to compare notions of visibility (desired or otherwise) across genres: among those who translate technical manuals and those who translate legal documents for example. It is argued that invisibility does not necessarily imply subservience but this would have to be examined within each genre separately before reaching any conclusion.
- <sup>73</sup> de Jong, Engelen (1998) "De Beroepspraktijk van literaire vertalers" in *Filter, Tijdschrift over vertalen en vertaalwetenschap* 5/1.
- <sup>74</sup> Hermans Johan & Lambert José (1998) "From Translation Markets to Language Management: The Implications of Translation Services" (113-132) in *TARGET International Journal of Translation Studies* 10/1, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- <sup>75</sup> Jaffe, A. (1999) *Ideologies in Action: Language Politics on Corsica*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- <sup>76</sup> Tusting, T. (2000) *Written Intertextuality and the Construction of Catholic Identity in a Parish Community: An Ethnographic Study*, University of Lancaster: Unpublished Ph.D.
- <sup>77</sup> Briggs, C.L. (1986) *Learning How To Ask: a Sociolinguistic Appraisal of the Role of the Interview in Social Science Research*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- <sup>78</sup> Holstein, J.A. & Gubrium, J.F. (1995) *The Active Interview*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- <sup>79</sup> Fontana, Andrea (2002) "Postmodern Trends in Interviewing" in Gubrium J. F & Holstein J.A. (eds.) *Handbook of Interview Research Context and Method*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- <sup>80</sup> Bernstein, B. (1990) *The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse*, London: Routledge.
- <sup>81</sup> Chouliarki, L. & Fairclough, N. (1997) *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.



---

<sup>82</sup> Wetherell, M.; Taylor, S. & Yates, S.J. (2001) *Discourse as Data a Guide for Analysis*, Milton Keynes: The Open University.

<sup>83</sup> **Interview Questions**

**A. General Questions**

1. What brought you to translation?
2. Have you translated many poets?
4. Do you have a special affinity with Ireland?

**B. Translating as such**

1. How do you go about it?
2. What do you do when you are stuck for a word/reference, whatever?  
Can you consult people on such matters?
3. Do you work closely with the poets you translate (when possible)?
4. Do publishers put you under a lot of pressure?

**C. When the work is done!? I don't know if this is the right way of putting it.**

1. How do things go after you have submitted drafts of translated poems?
2. What do the publishers do?
3. Is there a lot of work for you during this part of the process?

**D. After your work has been published?**

1. How do you feel?
2. What about the critics?
3. Are their comments useful in any way?

<sup>84</sup> Many of the points touched on regarding interviews in the section have been dealt with in considerable detail by others. They range from more general issues like the relevance of access to the field under study and how the interviews are framed to interview-specific aspects like what to do with topic breaks and digressions and the evolving order and refocusing of questioning in a series of related interviews. All these issues have implications for overall interview design and also for how the data is coded and processed. For detailed analyses of these issues see Cicourel (1973: 187-222; 1974: 1563-1605; 1982: 48-78) for example.

Cicourel, Aaron (1973) "Cross-modal communication: the representational context of sociolinguistic information processing" in Shuy, Roger W. (ed.) *Sociolinguistics: Current Trends and Perspectives N° 2*, Washington: Georgetown University Press.

(1974) "Ethnomethodology" in Sebeok, Thomas, A. (ed.) *Current Trends in Linguistics (vol. 12)*, The Hague, Paris: Mouton.

(1982) "Language and Belief in a Medical Setting" in Byrnes, Heidi (ed.) *Contemporary perceptions of language: Interdisciplinary Dimensions*, Washington: Georgetown University Press.

<sup>85</sup> Bucholtz, Mary (2000) "The politics of transcription" in *Journal of Pragmatics* 32 (1439-1465), Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.

<sup>86</sup> See CDROM for full transcripts of the interviews.

<sup>87</sup> See the poetry anthology Stassijns, K. & Van Strijtem, I. (eds.) (1998) *De mooiste van de hele wereld. 300 gedichten van de 20e eeuw (samen gebracht door)*, Tiel: Lannoo/Atlas.

<sup>88</sup> See CDROM for a full list of transcription codes.

<sup>89</sup> Warren, Carol A.B. (2002) "Qualitative Interviewing", in Gubrium, J.F. & Holstein, J.A. (eds.) *Handbook of Interview Research Context and Method*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

---

Rubin and Rubin (1995: 145-146) note that the qualitative interview uses three kinds of questions: main questions that begin and guide the conversation, probes to clarify answers or request further information and follow-up questions that pursue the implications of answers to main questions.

<sup>90</sup> For more information on these programs visit:

[www.kwalitan.net](http://www.kwalitan.net)

[www.qualisresearch.com](http://www.qualisresearch.com)

<http://caqdas.soc.surrey.ac.uk>

<http://www.qsrinternational.com>

<sup>91</sup> Briggs, Charles L. (2002) "Interviewing, Power/Knowledge, and Social Inequality", in F. Jaber, J. Gubrium & A. Holstein (eds.), *Handbook of Interview Research Context & Method*, Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.

<sup>92</sup> Kussmaul, Paul (1993) *Empirische Grundlagen einer Übersetzungsdidaktik: Kreativität im Übersetzungsprozeß* in Holtz-Mänttari & Nord (eds.)

<sup>93</sup> Kussmaul, Paul (1995) *Training the Translator*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

<sup>94</sup> Bakhtin, M.M. (1990) *Speech Genres and other Late Essays*, in Emerson, Caryl, Holquist & Michael (eds.) translated by Vern W. McGee, Austin: University of Texas Press.

<sup>95</sup> See specifically interview responses WR d6, NP b1, IJ b1(sub2), HJ b1, CJ a3(sub1) for explicit statements to this effect.

<sup>96</sup> Medvedev, P.N. & Bakhtin, M.M. ([1928] 1978) *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship A Critical Introduction to Sociological Poetics* (translated by Albert J. Wehrle), Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press.

<sup>97</sup> Van Gorp, H. et al. (eds.) (1986) *Lexicon van literaire termen*, Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.

"In hun hoedanigheid van 'secundaire' tekst, nl. als tekst die op herkenbare wijze aan één of meer andere tekst refereert, worden ook vertalingen, parodieën, travestieën, plagiaat, adaptaties, enz. als metateksten beschouwd". Calling a translation a metatext remains problematic, however. The above definition speaks of a recognisable reference to one or more other texts in the metatext. But how should we understand reference in this respect? Is it something that is framed by the new text and found within it as quotation, paraphrase, etc? The word meta also implies some form of comment. Bakhtin (1990) would say that all utterances are responses to other utterances, which also begs the question: what is the difference between a comment and a response? The authors of the entry recognise that in many cases: "de afstand tussen tekst en metatekst wordt kleiner of zelfs opgeheven". One can perhaps best regard translation as meta-practice as it also involves some degree of reading, discussion and interpretation and hence comment or response but is this not true of all instances of communication? I fear therefore that if translations are to be considered metateksts they can never be so in an absolute sense but always in relation to their prototexts (see discussion on Popovič: in chapter 6) . Certainly those who read them do not immediately consider them as such; in fact they more often consider them as primary texts.

<sup>98</sup> See notions such as interlanguage and interculture discussed by Pym (1998).

<sup>99</sup> This puts the notion of native speaker into question. Apparently in such situations some speakers are 'more' native than others within the same 'language community'. Perceived regional origin is projected onto a plane of correctness, therefore. Here, embodied editorial practices and norms of printed language are conflated with competence in 'the' Dutch language.

<sup>100</sup> See the section on Language Ideologies in the chapter 3 for a fuller discussion.

<sup>101</sup> See <http://www.taalunie.org>

- <sup>102</sup> Simeoni, Daniel (1998) "The Pivotal Status of the Translator's Habitus" in *TARGET International Journal of Translation Studies* 10/1: 1-39, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- <sup>103</sup> As was mentioned already, assertions regarding a translator's invisibility have to be placed within the framework of the particular translation activity involved. Such assertions can also be seen as a function of readership. In terms of inter-professional relationships visibility is important. Whether a translator should or wishes to be visible to the broader public still remains to be seen.
- <sup>104</sup> Goodwin Charles (1994) "Professional Vision" in *American Anthropologist* 96(3): 606-633, American Anthropological Association.
- <sup>105</sup> The process described can be encapsulated by Goffman's notion of 'footing' (Goffman 1981: 325-326), which in fact also bears a resemblance to the factors of Skopos theory (see 2.5.5. for a discussion of Skopos theory). Goffman used 'footing' to describe a speaker's roles in a given situation. He identified three basic roles: animator or 'talking machine', 'author' or the selector of the sentiments and words expressed and the 'principal' or the person committed to what the words say. Distributed socially these roles could be fulfilled variously by the actors in the field of translation.
- Goffman, Erving (1981) *Forms of Talk*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- <sup>106</sup> See Inghelleri, Moira (2004) "Habitus, field and discourse: interpreting as a socially-situated activity" in *Target* Feb. 2004 for a discussion of situated practice among interpreters.
- <sup>107</sup> Sometimes originals and translations are published in the same edition, which adds to the complexity of the responses.
- <sup>108</sup> Venuti, Lawrence (1998) *The Scandals of Translation Towards an ethics of difference*, London: Routledge.
- <sup>109</sup> Bassnett, Susan & Trivedi, Harish (1999) *Post-Colonial Translation Theory and Practice*, London: Routledge.
- <sup>110</sup> Simon, Sherry (1996) *Gender in Translation*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- <sup>111</sup> von Flotow, Luise (1997) *Translating and Gender Translating in the 'Era of Feminism'*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- <sup>112</sup> *Filter, tijdschrift over vertalen* is a Dutch language journal that publishes all manner of articles and comments on translation in the broadest sense: <http://www.literairvertalen.org/filter>
- <sup>113</sup> For a full account of what the translators said see the complete interview transcripts on the CDROM.
- <sup>114</sup> Nord, Christiane (1997) *Translating as a Purposeful Activity, Functionalist Approaches Explained*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- <sup>115</sup> For a revealing study of relationships between clients and translators see also Hermans, Johan & Lambert, José (1998) "From Translation Markets to Language Management: The Implications of Translation Services" in *TARGET International Journal of Translation Studies* 10/1: 113-132, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- <sup>116</sup> See <http://www.viperrecords.com/murphy/history.shtml>
- <sup>117</sup> This formed the subject of a paper presented at the BAAHE annual conference in November 2003: "The Relevant Factors of Skopos".
- <sup>118</sup> Bourdieu, Pierre (1980) *Le sens pratique*, Paris: Les éditions de minuit.

### CHAPTER 3 - AN ETHNOGRAPHY OF TRANSLATION: INDICATIONS OF HABITUS

- <sup>119</sup> Nord, Christiane (1997) *Translating as a Purposeful Activity, Functionalist Approaches Explained* Manchester: St. Jerome.
- <sup>120</sup> Hawkins, Joyce M. & Allen, Robert (eds.) (1991) *The Oxford Encyclopedic English Dictionary*, Oxford: OUP.
- <sup>121</sup> Goodwin, Charles (1994) "Professional Vision" in *American Anthropologist* 96 (3): 606-633, American Anthropological Association.

- 
- <sup>122</sup> Lakoff, George & Johnson, Mark (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- <sup>123</sup> “For instance, conversation analysts often state their reluctance to allow categories to enter the analysis other than those entertained by the participants or revealed in an analysis of the sequential flow of interaction. This point is often captured through the ironicising image of rejecting a “bucket”-theory of context which is contrasted with the preferred view of context as a project and a product of interaction...” See “The Sociology of Order in Interaction”(8) at STEF SLEMBROUCK (1998-2003) - WHAT IS MEANT BY DISCOURSE ANALYSIS?
- <sup>124</sup> See Drew & Holt for a treatment of figurative language in conversation. Their data allowed them to point to the use of figurative language in the collaborative achievement of topic ending/summary and shift, which is not far removed for the assertion being made regarding the data under examination in this section
- <sup>125</sup> This formed the topic of my first discussion of the interview data at a colloquium organised by Moira Inghilleri (Goldsmiths College, London) and Peter Flynn (Ghent University) called *Quality and Inequality of Access in Translation and Interpreting Contexts: Ethnographies of Translational Practices*, during Sociolinguistics Symposium 14 (Ghent, 4-6 April, 2002). The title of the paper was “Metaphor as a Resource in the Construction of Translation Practice (the case of K)”. See <http://allserv.rug.ac.be/~sslembro/colloquialist.html>
- <sup>126</sup> Hymes, Dell (1972) “Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life” in Gumperz, J. & Hymes, D. *Directions in Sociolinguistics: the Ethnography of Speaking* (35-71), New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- <sup>127</sup> Here we have an awareness that ‘textual features’ – in this case what makes poetry, poetry – can be common to two genres or more or jump genre, as it were (see discussion of genre).
- <sup>128</sup> Mertz, Elizabeth and Yovel, Jonathan (2000) “Metalinguistic Awareness” in J. Verschueren, J. Östman, J. Blommaert & C. Bulcaen (eds.) *Handbook of Pragmatics 2000*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- <sup>129</sup> It is interesting to note, regarding entries in bi-lingual dictionaries, that the lexicalisation of a metaphor in one language may not run parallel with its lexicalisation in another, if at all. Hence a seemingly straightforward entry in one language may contain numerous items listed under the corresponding entry in the other language i.e. a number “equivalents”, which in turn provide ample evidence of pragmatic and other non-‘word-for-word’ strategies of translation. Two remarks can be made here: firstly, that these entries manifest a basic recognition among lexicographers of the metaphorical origin of certain lexicalised items and secondly, that their translations – unwittingly or not – banish the age-old discussion on word-for-word and sense-for-sense to the outer regions.
- <sup>130</sup> Schieffelin, B, Woolard K.A. & Kroskrity, P.V. (1998) *Language Ideologies, Practice and Theory*, Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- <sup>131</sup> Hanks, William (1987) “Discourse Genres in a Theory of Practice” in *American Ethnologist* 14: 668-692.
- <sup>132</sup> For an illuminating discussion of the indivisibility of translators and their tools see: Cronin, Anthony (2003) *Translation and Globalisation*, New York, London: Routledge.
- <sup>133</sup> The Collins Cobuild English Dictionary (1995) London: Harper Collins.
- <sup>134</sup> The New Oxford Dictionary of English, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- <sup>135</sup> This metaphor calls to mind a whole set of critical writings on translation which the interviewee was unaware of at the time of the interviews:  
Bassnett, Susan & Trivedi, Harish (eds.) (1999) *Postcolonial Translation: Theory and Practice*, London, New York: Routledge.  
Vieira, Else & Ribeiro, Pires (1994) “A Postmodern Translation Aesthetics in Brazil”, in M. Snell-Hornby, F. Pöhhacker, and K. Kaindl (eds.) *Translation Studies: An Interdiscipline* (65-72), Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- 
- <sup>136</sup> Lévi-Strauss, Claude (1975) *The Raw and the Cooked*, New York: Harper & Row Publishers.  
 One cannot help but associate the above extract with Claude Lévi-Strauss's *The Raw and the Cooked*, either. If cooking is an act of culture that holds the mean between the natural orders of the raw and the rotten, as Lévi-Strauss postulates, in this particular extract overcooking or overspicing leads to cultural blandness and textual insipidity. The task of the translator/cannibal then is to maintain the excitement of creating cultural meaning by embracing the raw, the incipient, the newness of discovery when reading a work, no matter how well known that work might be and hence culturally established for others. Here again we have another indication of the sequential nature of the translation process but also of a state of translation evoked that is neither raw nor cooked but both.
- <sup>137</sup> It is interesting to note that the notion of craft provides us with another perspective on individual translated texts, i.e. they can also be read as marking the various stages of a translator's development within the craft, particularly reflexively by translators themselves.
- <sup>138</sup> Including Woolard, Kathryn A. "Introduction: Language Ideology as a Field of Inquiry" in B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, P. Kroskrity (1998) *Language Ideologies, Practice and Theory*, Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- <sup>139</sup> Silverstein, Michael, (1998) "The Uses and Utility of Ideology: A Commentary" in B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard; P. Kroskrity (1998) *Language Ideologies, Practice and Theory*, Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- <sup>140</sup> Kroskrity, Paul V. (2004) "Language Ideologies", in Duranti, Alessandro (2004) *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, Malden, Oxford, Victoria: Blackwell.
- <sup>141</sup> Silverstein, Michael (1979) "Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology" in P. Clyne; W. Hanks & C. Hofbauer (eds.) *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels (193-247)*, Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- <sup>142</sup> See also Kroskrity, P. in Duranti (2001) *Linguistic Anthropology A Reader (403)*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- <sup>143</sup> Irvine, Judith T. (1998) "Ideologies of Honorific Language" in B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, P. Kroskrity (eds.) (1998) *Language Ideologies, Practice and Theory*, Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- <sup>144</sup> Hill, Jane H. (1998) "'Today There Is No Respect': Nostalgia, 'Respect' and Oppositional Discourse in Mexicano (Nahuatl) Language Ideology" in B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, P. Kroskrity (eds.) (1998) *Language Ideologies, Practice and Theory*, Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- <sup>145</sup> Kroskrity, Paul V. (1998) "Arizona Tewa Kiva Speech as a Manifestation of a Dominant Language Ideology" in B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, P. Kroskrity (eds.) (1998) *Language Ideologies, Practice and Theory*, Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- <sup>146</sup> In his discussion of what he calls "behavioural speech genres", Vološinov ([1930]1973: 20-21) sets out a number of methodological prerequisites for establishing a typology of such genres:  
 Ideology may not be divorced from the material reality of the sign (i.e. by locating it in the "consciousness" or other vague elusive regions);  
 The sign may not be divorced from the concrete forms of social intercourse (seeing that the sign is part of organized social intercourse and cannot exist, as such, outside it, reverting to a mere physical artefact);  
 Communication and the forms of communication may not be divorced from the material basis. (italics in the original)

- <sup>147</sup> Mertz, Elizabeth (1998) "Linguistic Ideology and Praxis in U.S. Law School Classrooms" in B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, P. Kroskrity (eds.) (1998) *Language Ideologies, Practice and Theory*, Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- <sup>148</sup> Irvine, Judith T. (1989) "When Talk Isn't Cheap: Language and Political Economy" in *American Ethnologist* 16: 345-367.
- <sup>149</sup> Spitulnik, Debra (1998) "Mediating Unity and Diversity: The Production of Language Ideologies in Zambian Broadcasting" in B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, P. Kroskrity (eds.) (1998) *Language Ideologies, Practice and Theory*, Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- <sup>150</sup> Briggs, Charles (1998) "'You're a Liar -You're Just Like a Woman!' Constructing Dominant Ideologies of Languages in Warao Men's Gossip" in B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, P. Kroskrity (eds.) (1998) *Language Ideologies, Practice and Theory*, Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- <sup>151</sup> Collins, James (1998) "Our Ideologies and Theirs" in B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, P. Kroskrity (eds.) (1998) *Language Ideologies, Practice and Theory*, Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- <sup>152</sup> In this respect, Vološinov makes a distinction between behavioral and established ideology, which he defines as follows: To distinguish it from the established systems of ideology – the systems of art, ethics, law etc. – we shall use the term behavioral ideology for the whole aggregate of life experiences and the outward expressions directly connected with it. Behavioral ideology is that atmosphere of unsystematized and unfixed inner and outer speech which endows our every instance of behavior and action and our every "conscious" state with meaning. ... The established ideological systems of social ethics, science, art, and religion are crystallizations of behavioral ideology, and these crystallizations, in turn, exert a powerful influence back upon behavioral ideology, normally setting its tone. (Vološinov [1930] 1973:91)
- Note too the striking resemblance between the dichotomous interplay of behavioural and established ideology visible in the above quote and the notions of centre and periphery as understood in sociolinguistics (Bell 1976; Kachru 1982, Stewart in Fishman 1968), literary theory and translation theory (Even-Zohar, Toury, et al.). See also Hermans (1999: 102-117) on the structuralist foundations of polysystem theory and DTS.
- <sup>153</sup> The results of a search for Vlaams (Flemish) and other language-related words in the interview transcripts are shown below. These words mainly came up in discussions about translation as such but also appeared in relation to perceptions of language.

Nederlands (Dutch) + cognates:	416
Taal (language) + cognates:	233
Vlaams (Flemish) + cognates:	177
Engels (English) + cognates:	186
Total:	1,212
Total number of words =	94,128

**Table I-f: salient language-related words**

<sup>154</sup> Collins and Slembrouck, (eds.) 2005.

<sup>155</sup> "I think the point was that urban Turks from Istanbul will tend to see the Turkish used in Flanders by immigrants as "archaic" and as detached from present-day usage (esp. to the extent that the immigrant group in Flanders is perceived as having a rural and poor background). The very same population will tend to be

---

perceived in Flanders as fully competent in Turkish and as more competent in Turkish than in Flemish. Both readings are the result of centre/periphery-logic. They also involve the effects of "denied displacement" (collapse of Turks in Europe with Turks in rural Anatolia; collapse of Turks in Flanders with Turks in Turkey). The point is not so much: what are the real characteristics of the language use? Indeed, Turkish in Flanders may well display aspects of older, rural uses, but it may equally at the same time bear traces of contact with, say, Turkish satellite media, Turkish newspapers. The point is rather: which characteristics will tend to get singled out/remain unmentioned and will be subsequently projected to define the group?" (Personal communication from Prof. Dr. Stef Slembrouck)

<sup>156</sup> This is also enshrined in the Belgian Constitution: telephone conversation with Jacques Van Keymeulen, Vakgroep Nederlandse Taalkunde, Universiteit Gent. See [http://www.senate.be/doc/const\\_nl.html](http://www.senate.be/doc/const_nl.html)

<sup>157</sup> See <http://www.vrt.be/doc/taalcharter.doc>

<sup>158</sup> See Blommaert & Verschueren in B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, P. Kroskrity (eds.) (1998) *Language Ideologies, Practice and Theory*, Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

<sup>159</sup> In the main, Dutch people would not recognise their manner of speaking as being a "variety" of Standard Dutch and would simply call it Dutch in contrast to Flemish, – what Flemish people speak – or Friesian, a separate language spoken in Friesland, a province of the Netherlands. This is interesting from an ideological point of view as it corroborates a point made in Woolard et al., namely how a dominant ideology is naturalised to the point of becoming invisible.

<sup>160</sup> The Hague accent is to Standard Dutch what RP is to British English.

<sup>161</sup> The majority of Dutch-language publishing houses are located in the Netherlands.

<sup>162</sup> The evidence referred to comprises a weekly language quiz shown on Dutch and Belgian TV channels called Tien Voor Taal (Ten for Language) and Het Grote Dictee Der Nederlandse Taal, a yearly dictation competition. Flemish competitors have been known to do well at both these events.

<sup>163</sup> *Woordenlijst Nederlandse Taal* (1995) Instituut voor Nederlandse Lexicologie in opdracht van de Nederlandse Taalunie, Den Haag. The 'little green book' is a lexicon of the Dutch language that provides basic information on morphology, gender, etc.

<sup>164</sup> I will return to this in more detail in the section on Perceptions of Culture below where I will draw in particular on Joep Leersen's studies on the construction of (national) identity in literature.

<sup>165</sup> See the distinction Woolard (1998: 7) makes between neutral and negative definitions of ideology.

<sup>166</sup> The basic conclusions that are drawn above merely scratch the surface of a highly complex sociolinguistic situation and its attendant – often heated – discussions on the precise nature and cause of observable language variation among users in the Netherlands and Belgium, particularly in recent years. See the discussion forum at <http://taalschrift.org/> a Taalunie site. See also "Het Vlaamse stigma. Over tussentaal en normativiteit." Jürgen Jaspers (Universiteit Antwerpen – UfsiA) for a discussion of attitudes towards 'tussentaal' ("in-between language"): the term indexes a variety or collection of varieties of use that is/are perceived to lie somewhere between standard Dutch and dialects. It is not the purpose here to enter this debate fully. As has been pointed out already, there are others in a better position and more suited to do so. What is important to note however, as Jaspers points out in his article, is that such attitudes reflect positions within a linguistic market. The characterisations found in the data can be seen as intersecting this broader social debate and likewise as reflecting such positions to some extent. It is not the purpose however to subsume these characterisations within the broader debate but to keep their origins visible both in terms of profession and of professional trajectory, especially a person's reputation within that profession – in this case, translation. I insist with respect to language

---

ideologies that profession/social position forms a parameter alongside the discursive parameters of characterisations mentioned above – in other words not only what is being said about language use and how but also who is saying it and to whom. In this respect it could be argued that the characterisations gleaned from the data are outdated and no longer reflect more recent social reality, more particularly the commonly held view that Flemish people care little nowadays for the ‘linguistic superiority’ of their northern neighbours and are quite content to go about their daily language business without them. But how can one be sure without inquiring first? If anything uncorroborated constructions of this type and the reifying power they bring with them to the public debate do much to underscore the validity of the notion, language ideologies.

<sup>167</sup> This reasoning echoes the following definition of an utterance:

If we tear an utterance out of social intercourse and materialise it, we lose the organic unity of all its elements. The word, grammatical form, sentence, and all linguistic definiteness in general taken in abstraction from the concrete historical utterance turn into technical signs of a meaning that is as yet only possible and still not individualised historically. The organic connection of meaning and sign cannot become lexical, grammatically stable, and fixed in identical and reproducible forms, i.e. cannot in itself become a sign or constant element of a sign, cannot become grammaticalized. This connection is created only to be destroyed, to be reformed again, but in new forms under the conditions of a new utterance. (Medvedev, P.N. & Bakhtin, M.M., [1928] 1978: 121)  
Medvedev, P.N. & Bakhtin, M.M. ([1928] 1978) *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship A Critical Introduction to Sociological Poetics* (translated by Albert J. Wehrle), Baltimore, London: John Hopkins University Press.

<sup>168</sup> One cannot help but notice the romantic overtures evoked by the word being used in conjunction with language, but it would be a misrepresentation to classify the above utterance under belated Romanticism, as the rest of the quote indicates.

<sup>169</sup> Even-Zohar, Itamar (1997) “The Making of Culture Repertoire and the Role of Transfer” in *Target International Journal of Translation Studies* 9/2: 355-363, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

<sup>170</sup> See 3. 6 for a fuller discussion of culture.

<sup>171</sup> In stylistics and sociolinguistics the term refers to a variety of language defined according to its use in social situations, e.g. a register of scientific, religious, formal English. In Hallidayan linguistics, the term is seen as specifically opposed to varieties of language defined according to the characteristics of the user (*viz.* his regional or class dialect), and is given a sub-classification into field, mode and manner of discourse.

Crystal, David (1980) *A First Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, London: André Deutch: 301.

<sup>172</sup> This echoes the distinction between stress-timed and syllable-timed languages.

**Stressed-timed:** A very general term used in phonetics to characterise the pronunciation of languages displaying a particular type of rhythm; it is opposed to syllable-timed languages. In stressed-timed languages, it is claimed that the stressed syllables recur at regular intervals of time, regardless of the number of intervening unstressed syllables, as in English. ... However, it is plain that this regularity is the case only under certain conditions, and the extent to which the tendency towards regularity in English is similar to that in, say, other Germanic languages is unclear (Crystal 1980: 333).

For a discussion of stress-timing in Dutch and English see Collins, Beverly & Mees (1996) *The Phonetics of English and Dutch*, Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill.

<sup>173</sup> This opinion is held by other translators, though they formulate it in different terms, e.g. that a line of poetry tends to be longer in Dutch translation than the original line is in English. See, in particular, interviews with KH & CJ (**br**), BM (**t1 & t2**) and CP (**br**).



<sup>174</sup> One of the examples given is the suffix –en, which is needed to form the infinitive of verbs in Dutch or the adjectival suffix –(e)lijk, both of which ‘unavoidably’ lengthen a line.

<sup>175</sup> Problem is rather a one-sided way of putting it. The things translators encounter are not always problematic; they can also be routine or surprising and not necessarily difficult, but it is often the case that the phenomena they encounter and have to deal with are understood in terms of the languages they are working with.

<sup>176</sup> See Goodwin’s description of how fieldwork is conducted and the learning relationship between professor and students in Goodwin Charles (1994) “Professional Vision” in *American Anthropologist* 96/3: 606-633, American Anthropological Association.

<sup>177</sup> Jaffe, Alexandra (1999) “Locating Power: Corsican translators and their critics” in Blommaert, Jan (ed.) *Language Ideological Debates*, Berlin, New York: Mouton De Gruyter.

<sup>178</sup> A random search in the transcripts for genre-related words yielded the following:

Dichter (poet) + cognates :	262
Gedicht (poem) + cognates:	302
Genre:	3
Poëzie (poetry) + cognates:	212
Literatuur (literature) + cognates:	131
Roman (novel) + cognates:	21
Tekst (text) + cognates:	116
Total:	1047
Total number of words (transcripts) =	94,128

**Table 2-f Salient genre-related words**

<sup>179</sup> Consider the following quote from Aristotle’s *Poetics*:

“Epic and tragic composition, and indeed comedy, dithyrambic composition, and most sorts of music for wind and stringed instruments are all, [considered] as a whole, representations. They differ from one another in three ways, by using for the representation (i) different media (ii) different objects, or (3) a manner that is different and not the same” (p.1).

Aristotle, *Poetics* (translated by Richard Janko) (1987), Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company Indianapolis. Here too the focus is on (the various) aspects of performance including text along with its broader social relevance and perceived reception and hence not merely text as such.

<sup>180</sup> The first outline of these findings was presented in a paper called *Negotiating Genre: Translators at Work*, delivered during the colloquium: *WOG Systemic Functional Linguistics in Ghent* (27-29 November 2003).

<sup>181</sup> Martin’s work belongs in the framework of (Hallidayan) Systemic Functional Linguistics which can be traced back further to Firth (and Malinowski) who lay at the origin of an “enduring and distinctive vision of language study” in twentieth-century Britain’ (Stubbs, 1996: 22 quoted in Kenny 2001 – Firthian Linguistics) – a tradition that has always taken the social dimensions of language use into account in its paradigms. In a similar vein, Wetherell et al.’s work belongs within discourse analysis, “a hybrid field of inquiry” (STEF SLEMBROUCK (1998-2003) - WHAT IS MEANT BY DISCOURSE ANALYSIS?), which studies language in use/language in social situations and stems from a number of disciplines within the social sciences. More specifically, Wetherell’s work belongs within Discursive Psychology and draws in the work of Sacks and Goffman. Hanks work belongs squarely within linguistic anthropology which according to Duranti (2001: 5) “...is the understanding of the crucial role played by language (and other semiotic resources) in the constitution of society

---

and its cultural representations”.

Duranti, Alessandro (2001) “Linguistic Anthropology: history, ideas, and issues” in: Duranti, A. (ed.), *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Vološinov and Bakhtin continually stressed the social nature of language, though their work may seem overly philosophical to the modern reader. We must remember that they did not benefit from the advanced techniques available and taken for granted by researchers today (e.g. a simple tape recorder), which would have allowed them to record the language of a variety of genres in situ (Slembrouck 2003). All the definitions provided above are oriented, therefore, in varying degrees towards the social.

<sup>182</sup> See also reference to behavioural and established ideology in Vološinov in footnote 1 above.

<sup>183</sup> Not necessarily the vision of those in power in the country he lived in.

<sup>184</sup> Kristeva, Julia (1974) *La Revolution du Langage Poetique*, Paris: Seuil. Translated by Margaret Waller (1984), *Revolution in Poetic Language*, Introduction by Leon S. Roudiez, New York: Columbia University Press.

<sup>185</sup> This approach to genre is epitomised in Crystal, D. and Davy, D. (1969) *Investigating English Style*, London: Longmans, some of the chapters of which are entitled, The Language of Conversation, The Language of Religion etc. The authors remarked back in 1969 that: “we must remember here that the term ‘genre’ has never been given a precise, generally agreed definition, and is regularly used to refer simultaneously to varieties operating at different degrees of theoretical abstraction – for example, ‘poetry’ v ‘prose’ as well as ‘essay’ v ‘short story’, which are subcategories of prose” (75). Despite the refinement of analysis in the book, genre can be equated more or less with varieties of ‘text’ (spoken or written).

For a more general discussion of text and text-types see also:

Dressler, Wolfgang U. (ed.) (1978) *Current Trends in Textlinguistics*, Berlin, New York: Walter De Gruyter.

Enkvist, Nils Erik “Contrastive Text Linguistics and Translation” in L.Grähs, G. Korlén, & B. Malmberg (eds.) *Theory and Practice of Translation*, Bern, Frankfurt & Las Vegas: Lang.

Note the following entry on genre in the index: “Another word for text type.”

The reference itself is highly revealing and runs as follows:

“Space, defining the shape of the text, is also one powerful way of recognising different types of writing (also called genres). This activity will test out how far it is possible to identify different written genres without being able to read any of the actual words the texts contain” (p.29)

in Carter, Ronald et al, (eds.) (1997) *Working with Texts, A core book for language analysis*, London, New York: Routledge.

<sup>186</sup> Though genre does not have a separate entry in their standard work on text linguistics, De Beaugrande and Dressler’s notion of text type – which they treat as a set of expectations, albeit formal ones, along with the accompanying notion of intertextuality – forms a bridge from “sets of discourse features” to the more recent views on genre outlined above:

“The question of TEXT TYPES offers a severe challenge to LINGUISTIC TYPOLOGY, i.e. systematization and classification of language samples. In older linguistics, typologies were set up from the sounds and forms of a language (cf. II.19). More recently, linguistics has been preoccupied with typologies of sentences. Another approach is the construction of cross-cultural typologies for languages of similar construction (cf. Romportl et al. 1977). All of these typologies are devoted to VIRTUAL SYSTEMS, being the abstract potential of languages; a text typology must deal with ACTUAL SYSTEMS in which selections and decisions have already been made (cf. 3.12). The major difficulty in this new domain is that *many actualised instances do not manifest complete or exact characteristics of an ideal type*. The demands or expectations associated with a text type can be modified or even

---

overridden by the requirements of the context of occurrence (cf. VII.18.7: 182-183)

De Beaugrande, Robert & Dressler, Wolfgang (1981) *Introduction to Text Linguistics*, London, New York: Longman.

It can be remarked that the notion of text type outlined in the quote still seems to be hesitating on the brink of virtual systems before taking a step into “context of occurrence” and relinquishing the ideal sets of formal features it still somehow must comply with.

<sup>187</sup> Take Systemic Functional Linguistics for example, which nowadays is also considered to comprise various schools or ‘dialects’.

<sup>188</sup> See Part II, Chapter I. Two Trends of Thought in Philosophy of Language pp. 45-63 in Vološinov ([1930]1973) and The Problem of Genre in Chapter 7, The Elements of the Artistic Construction in Medvedev & Bakhtin ([1928] 1978: 129-130)

<sup>189</sup> See also Richardson, Kay (1987) “Critical linguistics and textual discourse” in Van Dijk, T. (ed.) *Text, an interdisciplinary journal for the study of discourse* Vol. 7-2 (145-163), Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton De Gruyter.

<sup>190</sup> Silverstein, Michael and Urban, Greg (1996) *Natural Histories of Discourse*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

<sup>191</sup> This brings us back once again to the notion of translation as metatext (see also discussions in chapter 2 and 6). Viewed from the perspective on genre outlined above, upon examination, a particular translation should reflect (or refract, as Vološinov ([1930] 1973: 23) puts it) the meta-work of the translator, including among other things his or her perceptions of genre, which may differ in various ways from the generic stance and ideology of the writer of the source text. This still does not allow us to call a translation a metatext, as the relation/difference between any text and its translation is neither one of distanciation nor reflection alone.

“Existence reflected in sign is not merely reflected but *refracted*. How is this refraction of existence in the ideological sign determined? By an intersecting of differently oriented social interests within one and the same sign community ...”. Vološinov ([1930] 1973: 23)

<sup>192</sup> Lowell, Robert (1990) *Imitations*, New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

<sup>193</sup> Otherwise translation would prove superfluous and redundant.

<sup>194</sup> Yeats, W.B. (1990) “The Fascination for what’s Difficult” in *Collected Poems* (104), London: Picador.

<sup>195</sup> Van Gorp H. et al. (eds.) (1986) *Lexicon Van Literaire Termen, Stromingen en Genres Theoretische Begrippen, Retorische Procedes en Stijlfiguren*, Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.

Note the similarity between this outline and the definitions of genre given by Bakhtin, Bauman, Hanks and Voloshinov cited in this chapter.

<sup>196</sup> These words are considered synonymous though they might allow for a degree of differentiation. The distinction I wish to make here also applies in the case of those poets who have published a collection of poems and those who have not: in the Bourdieuan sense competence might not necessarily imply competency i.e. being allowed or possessing the authority to do something.

<sup>197</sup> Burke, L., Crowley, T. & Girvin, A. (eds.) (2000), *The Routledge Language and Cultural Studies Reader*, London, New York: Routledge.

<sup>198</sup> Katan, David (1999) *Translating Cultures an Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators*, Manchester: St. Jerome.

<sup>199</sup> Petrelli, Susan (ed.) (2003) *Translation, Translation*, Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.

<sup>200</sup> Layder, D. (1997), *Modern Social Theory: Key Debates and New Directions*, London: UCL Press.

<sup>201</sup> Sealey, Alison & Carter, Bob (2004) *Applied Linguistics as Social Science*, in Candlin, Chris & Sarangi, Srikant (eds.) *Advances in Applied Linguistics Series*, London, New York: Continuum.

<sup>202</sup> Cf. Nigel Hall, *Interpreting as action: young children's behaviour in language brokering events* (SS14, April 4 2004). In his paper, Hall posits the notion of language brokering to encompass the interpreting activities of young children in the company of their parents/grandparents in third party exchanges (shops, local administration, etc.) in English in Great Britain.

<sup>203</sup> A random search in the transcripts for the word culture and other related words yielded the following:

Cultuur (culture) + cognates:	59
Land (country) + cognates:	31
Total:	90
Total number of words (interviews) =	94,128

**Table 3-f: Salient culture-related words**

Speakers of Dutch use the word culture both in the narrow sense of the arts and in the broader sense of national or ethnic culture. In this sense literature is culture as it indexes particular cultural traits, customs and mindsets.

<sup>204</sup> Kroeber, A.L. & Kluckhohn, C. (1952) *Cultures; A critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*, Peabody Museum Papers Vol. 47: 1, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University.

<sup>205</sup> Linton, Ralph (1936) *The Study of Man*, New York: Appleton-Century Co.

<sup>206</sup> Saville-Troike, Muriel (1982) *The Ethnography of Communication, An Introduction*, in Trudgill P. (ed.) *Language in Society Series*, Oxford: Blackwell.

<sup>207</sup> Geertz, Clifford (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures*, New York: Basic Books.

<sup>208</sup> Douglas, Mary (1970) *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology*, New York: Random House.

<sup>209</sup> Robinson, Gail (1988) *Crosscultural Understanding*, Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall International.

<sup>210</sup> Paulin, Tom (1983) "A New Look at the Language Question" in L. Burke, T. Crowley & A. Girvin (eds.) (2000), *The Routledge Language and Cultural Studies Reader*, London, New York: Routledge.

<sup>211</sup> Blommaert, Jan & Verschueren, Jef (1991) "The Pragmatics of Minority Politics in Belgium" in *Language and Society* 20, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

<sup>212</sup> The critic Edna Longley considers MacNiece to be the next Irish poet in line after Yeats in terms of literary stature but MacNiece is also closely associated with W.H. Auden and other British poets who came into their own in the period between the two World Wars.

Longley, Edna (1988) *Louis MacNiece*, London: Faber & Faber.

Longley, Edna (1994) "Poetry in Ireland, Scotland and Wales, 1920-1990" in Woodring, Carl (ed.) *The Columbian History of British Poetry* (605-641), New York: Columbia University Press.

<sup>213</sup> Kiberd, Declan (1996) *Inventing Ireland the Literature of the Modern Nation*, London: Vintage.

<sup>214</sup> The staging of J.M. Synge's "The Playboy of the Western World" resulted in public outcry. There was strong popular objection to the way Irish people were represented in the play, as it was seen as propagating deeply engrained misconceptions of Irishness held by the British.

<sup>215</sup> Foucault, Michel (1971) *L'ordre du discours*, Paris : Gallimard.

<sup>216</sup> Conflicting not merely in the symbolic sense but also very much in the literal sense.

- <sup>217</sup> O'Toole, Fintan (1996) *The Ex-Isle of Erin, Images of a Global Ireland*, Dublin: New Island.  
(1994) *Black Hole Green Card: the Disappearance of Ireland*, Dublin: New Island.
- <sup>218</sup> Kinsella, Thomas (ed.) (1986) *The New Oxford Book of Irish Verse*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- <sup>219</sup> Venuti, Lawrence (1998) (ed.) *Translation and Minority, Special issue of the Translator*, Volume 4/2 Manchester: St-Jerome.
- <sup>220</sup> Spivak, Gayatri Charavorty (2000) in Venuti, Lawrence (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*, London: Routledge.
- <sup>221</sup> One of the cornerstones of polysystem theory is seen in action here.
- <sup>222</sup> See the work of Irish poets like Mathew Sweeney and Michael Hartnett, to name but two.
- <sup>223</sup> See <http://www.intercelt.com> for a list of annual storytelling festivals in Ireland (consulted 26-08-2004).
- <sup>224</sup> Viz. the numerous scandals involving institutionalised abuse by church and state revealed in the media during the late 1980's and 1990's.
- <sup>225</sup> Burke, Edmund, *Correspondence* in Thomas, W. Copeland (ed.) (1958-78) 10 Vols., Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- <sup>226</sup> Toury, Gideon (1995) *Descriptive Translation studies and Beyond*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- <sup>227</sup> Nord, Christiane (1991) "Scopos, Loyalty, and Translation Conventions", in *Target* 3/1: 91-110.
- <sup>228</sup> This is clearly in keeping with the paradigm of structuralism. Consider the following quote from Lévi-Strauss in Duranti (1997: 36): "... That is, my work gets thought in me unbeknownst to me. I never had, and still do not have, the perception of feeling my personal identity; I appear to myself as the place where something is going on, but there is no "I", no "me". Each of us is a kind of crossroads where things happen. The crossroads is purely passive; something happens there. A different thing, equally valid, happens elsewhere. There is no choice; it is just a matter of chance. (Lévi-Strauss 1978: 3-4)"  
Lévi-Strauss, Claude (1978), *Myth and Meaning*, New York: Schocken Books.  
Elsewhere in his discussion of Lévi-Strauss's semiotic theory of culture, Duranti points to how Lévi-Strauss sees culture as something that "communicates itself through social actors" Duranti (1997: 35). Agency is rendered invisible in both quotes along with the responsibilities implied, though the second quote may not be Lévi-Strauss's exact words. See also Hermans (1999) for a critique of structuralism in translation theory.
- <sup>229</sup> De Geest (1992) "The Notion of 'System': Its Theoretical Importance and Its Methodological Implications for a Functionalist Translation Theory" in Kittel, H. (ed.) *Geschichte, System, Literarische Übersetzung/Histories, Systems Literary Translation* (32-45), Berlin: Schmidt.
- <sup>230</sup> Baker, Mona (2000) "Towards a Methodology for Investigating the Style of a Literary Translator" in *Target* 12/2: 241-266, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

#### CHAPTER 4 -

##### AN ELECTRONIC TRANSLATION CORPUS: IN SEARCH OF SITUATED PRACTICE IN TEXTS

- <sup>231</sup> The result of the collaboration can be found in 'De lier van Eirean', an issue of the literary magazine *Deus Ex Machina*, published in 2001. For more details see <http://www.deusexmachina.be> (05-10-2005).
- <sup>232</sup> Chesterman, Andrew (1998) *Contrastive Functional Analysis*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- <sup>233</sup> Kreszowski, Tomasz R. (1990) *Contrasting Languages, The scope of contrastive linguistics*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- <sup>234</sup> Dik, Simon C. (1978) *Functional Grammar*, Amsterdam, New York, Oxford: North Holland.
- <sup>235</sup> Bal, Mieke (1980) *De theorie van vertellen en verhalen. Inleiding in de Narratologie*, Muiderburg: Coutinho.

- <sup>236</sup> Leech, Geoffrey N. & Short, Michael (1981) *Style in Fiction, A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*, London, New York: Longman.
- <sup>237</sup> For a Systemic Functionalist approach to translation including comments and debates by translation scholars see also Schäffner, Christina (ed.) (2002) *The role of discourse analysis for translation and in translator training*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- <sup>238</sup> Halliday, M.A.K. (1973) *Explorations in the Functions of Language*, London: Edward Arnold.
- <sup>239</sup> For debates on translation terms and their various meanings go to <http://www.uwasa.w/comm/termino/> (25-04-2005).
- <sup>240</sup> For a discussion of the goals and theories of translation studies see Chesterman, Andrew & Arrojo, Rosemary (2000) "Forum: Shared Ground in Translation Studies", *Target* 12/1: 151-160 and 12/2: 333-362.
- <sup>241</sup> See Chesterman (1998: 5-59) for comprehensive discussion of similarity and equivalence.
- <sup>242</sup> But neither is this without its problems. As Santos (1995: 217) points out, a number of factors or potential problem areas still have to be taken into account in this respect: "translation quality, translationese and the logical diversity of translation correspondences."  
Santos, Diana (1995) "On the use of parallel texts in the comparison of languages", in *Actas do XI Encontro da Associação Portuguesa de Linguística* (217-239), Lisboa, 2-4 de Outubro de 1995.
- <sup>243</sup> Stig Johansson: email correspondence 20/04/2005.
- <sup>244</sup> See also the discussion on equivalence in chapter 1 and more particularly in Baker 1992: 5-6.
- <sup>245</sup> Toolan, Michael (2004) "Values are Descriptions; or, from Literature to Linguistics and back again by way of keywords" in *the Belgian Journal of English Language and Literatures*, New Series 2 Thematic Issue The Linguistic/Literature Interface (11-30), Ghent: Academia Press.
- <sup>246</sup> Chesterman, Andrew & Arrojo, Rosemary (2000) "Shared Ground in Translation Studies", *Target* 12/1: 151-160, John Benjamins: Amsterdam.
- <sup>247</sup> Heaney, Seamus (1975) *North*, London: Faber & Faber.
- FOSTERAGE  
For Michael McLaverty  
'Description is revelation!' Royal  
Avenue, Belfast, 1962,  
A Saturday afternoon, glad to meet  
Me, newly cubbed in language, he gripped  
My elbow. 'Listen. Go your own way.  
Do your own work. Remember  
Katherine Mansfield—*I will tell*  
*How the laundry basket squeaked . . . that note of exile.*'  
But to hell with overstating it:  
'Don't have the veins bulging in your biro.'  
And then, 'Poor Hopkins!' I have the journals  
He gave me, underlined, his buckled self  
Obeisant to their pain. He discerned  
The lineaments of patience everywhere  
And fostered me and sent me out, with words  
Imposing on my tongue like obols.

- 
- <sup>248</sup> e.g. Dutch boom, masc. / French arbre, fem. / English tree, neutral? (natural) gender – all nouns but of different gender. Do they correspond formally?
- <sup>249</sup> Silverstein, Michael & Urban, Greg (1996) *Natural Histories of Discourse*, Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.
- <sup>250</sup> van den Broeck, Raymond & Lefevere, André (1979) *Uitnodiging tot de vertaalwetenschap*, Muiderberg: Coutinho.
- <sup>251</sup> It is clear from Silverstein and Urban (1996) that there is more involved than ‘rewording’ hence the (terms) entextualisation and recontextualisation involved in each instance.
- <sup>252</sup> Baker, Mona (2000) “Towards a Methodology for Investigating the style of a Literary Translator” in *Target* 12/2: 241-266, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- <sup>253</sup> Kenny, Dorothy (2001) *Lexis and Creativity in Translation. A Corpus-based Study*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- <sup>254</sup> Jakobson, Roman (1981) *Selected Writings Vol. III: Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry*, The Hague Paris, New York: Mouton.
- <sup>255</sup> For more information on Poetry International and its activities see <http://www.poetry.nl>
- <sup>256</sup> Anonymised as N.P. in the interviews.
- <sup>257</sup> Anonymised as E.J. in the interviews.
- <sup>258</sup> This collection of Dutch translations mainly drew on the work of poets who had read at Poetry International but also includes the work of other Irish poets. The collection was edited by Peter Nijmeijer, one of the main translators of Irish poetry in the Low Countries, and contains a short biography and bibliography of each poet in the collection along with explanatory notes on the poems involved.
- <sup>259</sup> Poetry International holds an international poetry festival in June each year in Rotterdam in the Netherlands. According to Poetry International and those interviewed, a lot of translations were initially carried out in situ during the festival and only with time were poets asked to send on their work in advance for translation. It hence seemed plausible to contrast these translations with those that – at least in principle – had been given more time before publication. For more information on Poetry International, visit their excellent website at <http://www.poetry.nl> where you can also view archive footage of major poets reading their work.
- <sup>260</sup> By align I do not mean subjecting the texts to some form of restructuring by corpus software, as the program I was working in would carry out that task itself. The real threshold at this stage was text format i.e. of finding a way of keeping source and target poems and lines parallel to each other in a running text in a format that was accepted by Kwalitan.
- <sup>261</sup> In this case, a line constitutes any line of text, no matter how short: this amounted to one word in some cases. Stanza breaks or other blank lines used for the purposes of layout between blocks of text were not counted.
- <sup>262</sup> Sinclair, John (1991) *Corpus Concordance Collocation*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- <sup>263</sup> The following poems were not included in the analysis:
- 1 poem by Matthew Sweeney – Meulenhoff (original not found) – left out of all calculations from the beginning
  - 9 poems by Nuala Ni Dhomhnaill – Poetry International (no English glosses)
  - 3 poems by Seamus Heaney – Poetry International (! = same as previous year)
  - 2 poems by Richard Murphy – Poetry International (! = same as previous year)
- <sup>264</sup> For all ‘code distribution and frequency’ tables, see the section on Code Tables on CD-ROM.
- <sup>265</sup> System is understood here in the sense attributed to it in translation studies, which stems from the distinction *langue/ parole* in de Saussure. System = *langue*, whereas traditionally speaking practice would fall under *parole*. Practice is not used in this sense however: see the discussion of practice in chapter 1 and 2.

- <sup>266</sup> Kwalitan allows you to filter data by setting particular search parameters, e.g. all occurrences of code x in Meulenhoff or all occurrences of codes x, y and z for poet/translator 12, 13, 16, etc.
- <sup>267</sup> For a full list of these shifts see tables section on CDROM.
- <sup>268</sup> See tables section on the CDROM for the tables relating to these findings.
- <sup>269</sup> The term feature has been opted for here, as shift could be considered as too narrow a distinction. Generally speaking ‘feature’ means any salient item in the corpus and hence includes ‘shift’.
- <sup>270</sup> For an overview of relative frequencies of codes in each (sub)project per section of the corpus see tables on CDROM.
- <sup>271</sup> For a full overview of the distribution of a)-type linguistic and poetic categories per translator see the tables on CDROM.

#### CHAPTER 5 - ANALYSING THE CORPUS DATA

- <sup>272</sup> For a list of names see CDROM. Following Hymes (in Duranti 2001: 158-161), “proper names and their meanings” are recognised as “inseparable from social and historical context”. Therefore, they are important indexes of culture and identity, which, as has been stated above, remain visible in the translations in this corpus. In this respect, Paul Muldoon’s poem “Come into my parlour” can be read as the construction of community through naming members of that community, despite the eerie undertone of its graveyard setting. The same can be said of John Montague’s “Like dolmens round my childhood, the old people”.
- <sup>273</sup> Fernando, Chitra (1996) *Idioms and Idiomaticity*, Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- <sup>274</sup> A further distinction was made in this respect i.e. pragmatic choice, to cover more specific aspects of these imagined exchanges and their translations (see below).
- <sup>275</sup> Duranti, Alessandro (ed.) (2001) *Key Terms in Language and Culture*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- <sup>276</sup> The word “uitdrukking(en)” (idiomatic) expressions occurred 16 times in the interviews and “idiomatisch” 6.
- <sup>277</sup> Within systemic functionalism register is related to context of situation whereas genre is related to context of culture: for a detailed discussion of the differences between genre and register viewed within this framework see Leckie-Tarry (1995: 5-16).  
Leckie-Tarry, Helen (1995) *Language and Context A Functional Linguistic Theory of Register*, London, New York: Pinter.  
For a detailed study and discussion of register (and genre) see also:  
Biber, Douglas & Finnegan, Edward (eds.) (1994) *Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Register*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.  
Biber, Douglas (1995) *Dimensions of register Variation A cross-Linguistic Comparison*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
Biber, Douglas & Conrad, Susan (eds.) (2001) *Variation in English: Multi-Dimensional Studies*, Harlow: Longman.
- <sup>278</sup> Mary Howitt, English poetess (1799-1888), who, interestingly, translated Hans Christian Anderson’s fairy tales into English: <http://www.maryhowitt.co.uk/profile.htm>
- <sup>279</sup> For a detailed study of pragmatic markers in translational corpora see: Aijmer, Karin and Simon-Vandenbergen, Anne-Marie (2003) “The discourse particle well and its equivalents in Swedish and Dutch” *Linguistics* 41. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.



- 
- <sup>280</sup> The word dialect was mentioned 25 times in the interview data. For more details see the following extracts in the interview data on the CDROM: NP a<sub>3</sub>(sub<sub>1</sub>); VDK c<sub>1</sub>(sub<sub>1</sub>) and ensuing conversation; CP d<sub>1</sub>(sub<sub>2</sub>), d<sub>2</sub>, d<sub>2</sub>(sub<sub>2</sub>) and ensuing conversation; KH & EJ ensuing conversation.
- <sup>281</sup> For a full list of culture-specific items see Culture-specific data fragments on CDROM.
- <sup>282</sup> ‘Oranje Boven!’ might be rendered as ‘Victory to the House of Orange’.
- <sup>283</sup> Lir 1. Father of the children changed into swans in Oidheadh Chláinne Lir (The Tragic Story of the Children of Lir). (Mackillop 1998: 299)  
MacKillop, James (1998) *Oxford Dictionary of Celtic Mythology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- <sup>284</sup> See particularly Venuti’s chapter on the Bestseller (Venuti 1998: 124-157) for clear evidence of how foreignness is elided in English-language translations.
- <sup>285</sup> Nijmeijer, Peter (ed.) (1988) *Het Dwingende Verleden*, Amsterdam: Meulenhoff.
- <sup>286</sup> Devos, F., de Muynck, R. & Van Herreweghe, M. (1991) *Nederlands Frans en Engels in Contrast 1. De nominale constituent*, Leuven: Peeters.
- <sup>287</sup> pnpicc = Peter Neijmeijer Poetry International Ciaran Carson. The rest of these codes contain similar information: translator/corpus section/poet.
- <sup>288</sup> The dictionary referred to throughout this study is Martin, W. and Tops, G.A.J. (eds.) *Van Dale Groot Woordenboek Engels-Nederlands en Nederlands-Engels*, Utrecht, Antwerpen: Van Dale Lexicografie.
- <sup>289</sup> See James, Clive (1976) *Peregrine Prykke’s Pilgrimage*, London, for a parody of Heaney’s poetry.
- <sup>290</sup> For a full list of shifts, their distribution and frequency see the table on the CDROM.
- <sup>291</sup> There were also a few gerund clauses.
- <sup>292</sup> Vandenberg, Anne-Marie (1995) *Exploring English Grammar*, Leuven/Appeldorn: Garant.
- <sup>293</sup> Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, Harlow: Longman.
- <sup>294</sup> See [ 2:3:6.4 ] “Andere combinaties” and [ 2:4:5 ] “Het tegenwoordig deelwoord” at <http://oase.uci.kun.nl/~ans/>
- <sup>295</sup> Devos, F., De Muynck R., Martens, L. (1992) *Nederlands Frans Engels in Contrast 2. De zin*, Leuven: Peeters.
- <sup>296</sup> Bassnett, S. (2002) *Translation Studies* (Third Edition), London, New York: Routledge.
- <sup>297</sup> See also p. 75 in Theo Hermans (1999) *Translation in Systems*: “If we disregard regularities attributable to structural differences between the languages involved and focus on non-obligatory choices, we can look for external, socio-cultural constraints to explain the recurrent preferences which translators show”. It would seem that language structure is also embedded in socio-cultural constraints too.
- <sup>298</sup> McFarlane, J. (1953) “Modes of Translation” in the Durhan University Journal.
- <sup>299</sup> It must be noted here that Dutch allows adverbials between predicate and direct object.
- <sup>300</sup> Obliqueness seems to the rule rather than the exception.
- <sup>301</sup> For a list of adverb-related changes see the full list of clause shifts on the CDROM.
- <sup>302</sup> Personal e-mail communication from Albert Oosterhoff, Vakgroep Nederlandse Taalkunde, Universiteit Gent: “In principe kunnen onbepaalde enkelvoud en zoals ‘een man’ in het Nederlands generiek geïnterpreteerd worden. Ik denk dat ‘een man’ hetzelfde betekent als ‘man’ in het Engels. Dat kan ‘het probleem’ niet zijn. Het lijkt me dan waarschijnlijker dat ‘a man’ in het Engels niet zozeer betekent ‘een man’ maar eerder ‘een mens’. Om die betekenis weer te geven zou je in het Nederlands misschien inderdaad eerder ‘iemand’ gebruiken.”

- <sup>303</sup> Moreover, the indefinite pronoun is commonly found in such constructions in English. A random phrase query in the British National Corpus on the constructions ‘if anyone’ and ‘if a man’ threw up the following: 134 occurrences in 116 texts for the former as opposed to 917 occurrences in 615 texts for the latter.
- <sup>304</sup> It is noted here that the verb ‘to encrust’ is seldom used actively whereas its past participle form is much more frequent: 8 occurrences of ‘encrust’ in the BNC as opposed to 87 for ‘encrusted’.
- <sup>305</sup> See also ‘Blijde Inkomst’ and ‘Blijde Boodschap’.
- <sup>306</sup> The adjective ‘leeg’ is also rendered as vacuous in English. See also ‘lege muur’: blank wall.
- <sup>307</sup> ‘Little Boxes’ (1962), a song written by Malvina Reynolds and sung by Pete Seeger.
- <sup>308</sup> See Klaudy in Baker (2000) for a full discussion of explicitation and impication.
- <sup>309</sup> In Flemish political discourse, the phrase “naar de burger toe” is a case in point. This shorthand form could be glossed as ‘with regard to the citizen(s)’ ‘as far as the citizens are concerned’ ‘bearing the citizens in mind’, etc..
- <sup>310</sup> The word ‘lezen’ including its past participle form ‘gelezen’ occurred 170 times in the interview transcripts.
- <sup>311</sup> De Beaugrande, Robert (1978) *Factors in a Theory of Poetic Translation*, Assen (the Netherlands): Van Gorchem.
- <sup>312</sup> The reader is referred to the list of possible mismatches in the appendix.
- <sup>313</sup> For a similar opinion see also Gekloofde zinnen 21.1.2.2 at <http://oase.uci.kun.nl/~ans/>
- <sup>314</sup> The role of translators in bringing about change in the literary canon of a given culture has been discussed at length in the literature, the pre-eminent example be Even-Zohar’s work. What is interesting in this instance is that the translator points to something that source culture scholars may not have studied from a contrastive perspective: perceived differences in poetic form and theme across cultures, how a trait only becomes apparent in contrast or how difference only emerges in comparison, how self becomes visible in the mirror of other. I make this assertion with the greatest of precaution as I must confess ignorance regarding studies on this topic.

## CHAPTER 6 -

### QUALITATIVE DATA AND AN ELECTRONIC CORPUS: A CONTRAST OF THE FINDINGS

- <sup>315</sup> See the detailed discussion of historical contrastive linguistics and translation studies in Chesterman (1998).
- <sup>316</sup> For a full list of all the codes used by each translator along with their respective text fragments see under coded corpus data on CDROM.
- <sup>317</sup> For all the details of this analysis including frequency, percentage and ratio per line of each feature in the corpus see the section on the corpus on the CDROM.
- <sup>318</sup> See CDROM for details.
- <sup>319</sup> Chesterman, Andrew & Wagner, Emma (2002) *Can Theory Help Translators? A Dialogue Between the Ivory Tower and the Word face*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- <sup>320</sup> This echoes Gumpertz’s observation on how interlocutors attend to the ‘global’ and the ‘local’ at the same time in conversational exchanges. Similarly, Gumpertz states that: “The verbal system can ... be made to refer to a wide variety of objects and concepts. At the same time, verbal interaction is a social process in which utterances are selected in accordance with socially recognisable norms and expectations. It follows that linguistic phenomena are analysable both within the contexts of language itself and within the broader context of social behaviour,” (Gumpertz 1972: 219 - Quoted in Hanks (1996: 119)).  
Gumpertz, J. (1972) [1968] “The Speech Community” in Giglioli, P.P. (ed.), *Language and Social Context*, Harmondsworth (Eng.): Penguin.
- <sup>321</sup> Wenger, E. & Lave, J. (1998) *Communities of Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- 
- <sup>322</sup> Pym prefers to see translators as forming a nomadic interculture with respect the more sedentary societies they work within and between: see Pym, Anthony “Alternatives to Borders in Translation Theory” in Petrelli, Susan (2003) *Translation, Translation* (451-463), Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.
- <sup>323</sup> See Chapter 2.2. Translation as Practice? for a detailed discussion of this topic.
- <sup>324</sup> As Theo Hermans so succinctly put it “translation used to be translators” or similarly that “Translation used to be regarded primarily in terms of relations between texts, or between language systems. Today it is increasingly seen as a complex transaction taking place in a communicative socio-cultural context. This requires that we bring the translator as a social being fully into the picture”.  
Hermans, Theo (1996) “Norms and the Determination of Translation: A Theoretical Framework”, in R. Alvarez & M. Vidal (eds.) *Translation Power Subversion* (26), Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- <sup>325</sup> Popovič, Anton (1970) “The Concept ‘Shift of Expression’ in Translation Analysis” in Holmes, James S. (1970) *The Nature of Translation Essays on the Theory and Practice of Literary Translation*, The Hague, Paris: Mouton.
- <sup>326</sup> A basic feature of rewritings and retellings is that they are metonymic. Metonymy is a figure of speech in which an attribute or an aspect of an entity substitutes for the entity or in which a part substitutes for the whole. (Tymoczko 1999: 42)
- <sup>327</sup> Take the many writers ‘influenced’ by Joyce for example.
- <sup>328</sup> This formed the topic of a paper (Translators and Hybridity: a new historical given or an aspect of practice?) given by the writer at the 2004 BAAHE conference on Hybridity in Antwerp (Nov. 20).  
For a discussion of hybridity see Bhabha, Homi K. (1994) *The Location of Culture*, London, New York: Routledge Press.
- <sup>329</sup> Bourdieu, Pierre (1979) *La distinction : critique sociale du jugement*, Paris : les éditions de minuit.
- <sup>330</sup> For more details see <http://www.monabaker.com/tsresources/translationalenglishcorpus.htm> (13/09/2005).
- <sup>331</sup> Baker, Mona (2000) “Towards a Methodology for Investigating the Style of a Literary Translator” in *Target* 12/2: 241-266, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- <sup>332</sup> On the face of it, such a ‘style’ would probably be easy to detect, however. I am reminded here of personalised adaptations of poems by other poets or writers, like Tom Lannoye’s renditions in Dutch of the war poets in his collection *Niemand’s land*. Such work is often contested by professional translators, whereas writers and poets feel better placed to decide what constitutes a poem. In this regard, what serves as an acceptable definition is very much a matter of practice: see the discussion on contestation with genre in chapter 3 (3.5.1.1.-8.).  
Lannoye, Tom (2002) *Niemand’s Land (Gedichten uit de Grootte Oorlog)*, Amsterdam: Prometheus.
- <sup>333</sup> Without wishing to sound anachronistic, we can find a similar idea curiously echoed in the interview data. One of the translators speaks of ‘catching the poet’s breath’ as vital to translating his or her poetry. ‘Breath’ is further considered to be linguistically traceable in his or her poems (Interview 4: b1(sub1) / b3(sub1) / b4(sub1)). Hence the translator sets up a category of analysis that runs deeper than and determines formal aspects of a poem like its syntax, rhyme or cadence. Breath is synonymous with a poet’s way of speaking and it that way of speaking that has to become audible in the target poem. The notion of breath also grounds poetry in the spoken and further echoes broader concerns within language study regarding how spoken language should/can be written down or rendered on the page, viz. *Del Hymes work within ethnomethodology and Bauman and Briggs work in performance studies*.
- <sup>334</sup> Here we have very real evidence of language as a collective entity (de Saussure).
- <sup>335</sup> Taken from the song “Anthem”, track 5 on *The Future*, a record by Leonard Cohen, Columbia Records, 1992.

# bibliography

## Poetry Sources: Meulenhoff and Poetry International

### Carson, Ciaran

- (1988) *The Irish for No*, Oldcastle, Co. Meath: The Gallery Press.
- (1989) *Belfast Confetti*, Oldcastle, Co. Meath: The Gallery Press.
- (1994) *Opera Et Cetera*, Newcastle upon Tyne: Bloodaxe Books.

### Durcan, Paul

- (1967) *Endsville*, Dublin: New Writers' Press.
- (1975) *O Westport in the Light of Asia Minor*, Dublin: Anna Livia Press.
- (1978) *Sam's Cross*, Dublin: Profile Press.
- (1976) *Teresa's Bar*, Loughcrew, Co. Meath: The Gallery Press.
- (1986) *Teresa's Bar*, Revised edition, Loughcrew, Co. Meath: The Gallery Press.
- (1980) *Jesus, Break his Fall*, Dublin: The Raven Arts Press.
- (1982) *Ark of the North*, Dublin: Raven Arts Press.
- (1982) *The Selected Paul Durcan* (Edna Longley ed.), Belfast: The Blackstaff Press.
- (1983) *Jumping the Train Tracks with Angela*, Dublin, Manchester: Raven Arts Press / Carcanet New Press.
- (1985) *The Berlin Wall Café*, Belfast: The Blackstaff Press.

### Heaney, Seamus

- (1965) *Eleven Poems*, Belfast: Festival Publications.
- (1966) *Death of a Naturalist*, London: Faber & Faber.
- (1969) *Door Into the Dark*, London: Faber & Faber.
- (1969) *A Lough Neagh Sequence*, Didsbury, Manchester: Phoenix Pamphlet Poets.
- (1970) *Night Drive*, Crediton, Devon: Richard Gilbertson.
- (1970) *Boy Driving His Father to Confession*, Farnham, Surrey: The Sceptre Press.
- (1971) *Land*, London: Poem-of-the-Month Club.
- (1972) *Wintering Out*, London: Faber & Faber.
- (1975) *North*, London: Faber & Faber.
- (1979) *Field Work*, London & Boston: Faber & Faber.
- (1980) *Selected Poems 1965-1975*, London, Boston: Faber & Faber.
- (1984) *Station Island*, London, Boston: Faber & Faber.
- (1987) *The Haw Lantern*, New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

- (1990) *New Selected Poems 1966-1987*, London: Faber & Faber.  
(1991) *Seeing Things*, New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.  
(1996) *The Spirit Level*, London, Boston: Faber & Faber.

### Kennelly, Brendan

- (1990) *A Time for Voices, Selected Poems 1960-1990*, Newcastle upon Tyne: Bloodaxe Books.  
(1991) *The Book of Judas*, Newcastle upon Tyne: Bloodaxe Books.  
(1996) *Poetry My Arse*, Newcastle upon Tyne: Bloodaxe Books.

### McGuckian, Medbh

- (1982) *The Flower Master*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
(1984) *Venus and the Rain*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
(1988) *On Ballycastle Beach*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

### Montague, John

- (1958) *Forms of Exile*, Dublin: Dolmen Press.  
(1961 and 1971) *Poisoned lands*, Dublin: Dolmen Press.  
(1966) *Patriotic Suite*, Dublin: Dolmen Press.  
(1967) *A Chosen Light*, Dublin: Dolmen Press.  
(1971) *Tides*, Dublin: Dolmen Press.  
(1972) *The Rough Field*, Dublin: Dolmen Press.  
(1978) *The Great Cloak*, Dublin: Dolmen Press.  
(1984) *The Dead Kingdom*, Dublin: Dolmen Press.

### Muldoon, Paul

- (1973) *New Weather*, London: Faber & Faber.  
(1977) *Mules*, London: Faber & Faber.  
(1980) *Immram*, Dublin: Gallery Press.  
(1982) *Out of Siberia*, Dublin: Gallery Press.  
(1983) *Quoof*, London: Faber & Faber.  
(1983) *Why Brownlee Left*, London: Faber & Faber.  
(1984) *The Wishbone*, Dublin: Gallery Books.  
(1987) *Meeting the British*, London: Faber & Faber.  
(1996 & 1987) *Selected Poems 1968-1983*, London: Faber & Faber and New York: Ecco Press.  
(1990) *Madoc: A Mystery*, London: Faber & Faber.

### Murphy, Richard

- (1955) *The Archaeology of Love*, Dublin: Dolmen Press.

- (1963) *Sailing to an Island*, London: Faber & Faber.  
 (1968) *The Battle of Aughrim*, London: Knopf and Faber, 1968; LP recording 1969.  
 (1974) *High Island*, London: Faber & Faber.  
 (1979) *Selected Poems*, London: Faber & Faber.  
 (1983) *Care/Zorgzaamheid* (translation by Eijkelboom), Galway: Cornomona Press.  
 (1985) *The Price of Stone*, Winston-Salem: Wake Forest University Press.

### Ni Dhomhnaill, Nuala

- (1981) *An Dealg Droighin*, Baile Átha Cliath: Cló Mercier.  
 (1984) *Féar Suaithinseach*, Dublin: Gallery Books.  
 (1986, 1988, 1990) *Rogha Dánta/Selected Poems*, Dublin: New Island Books.  
 (1990) *Pharaoh's Daughter*, Dublin: Gallery Books.  
 (1991) *Feis*, Dublin: Gallery Books.  
 (1992) *The Astrakhan Cloak* (English and Irish), Dublin: Gallery Books.  
 (1993) *Selected Poems* (English and Irish), Dublin: New Island Books.  
 (1998) *Cead Aighnis*, Dublin: Gallery Books.  
 (1999) *The Water Horse* (English and Irish), Dublin: Gallery Books.

Poems translated from Gaelic into English:

- ‘The Language Issue’, ‘The Fairy Boat’, ‘Deep-Freeze’, ‘Nude’ and ‘My Dark Master’  
 translated by Paul Muldoon;  
 ‘Aubade’ translated by Michael Longley;  
 ‘Island’ translated by John Montague;  
 ‘You Are’ translated by Eiléan Ní Chuilleanáin;  
 ‘The Mermaid in the Labour Ward’ translated by Medbh McGuckian.

### O’Grady, Desmond

- (1956) *Chords and Orchestrations*, Dublin: The Gallery Press.  
 (1961) *Reilly and Other Poems*, London: MacGibbon & Kee.  
 (1964) *Professor Kelleher and the Charles River*, Cambridge.  
 (1965) *Separazioni* (inc. translations from the Italian), Rome.  
 (1967) *The Dark Edge of Europe*, London: MacGibbon & Kee.  
 (1968) *Off Licence* (translations from Irish, Italian and Armenian).  
 (1968) *The Dying Gaul*, London: MacGibbon & Kee.  
 (1971) *Hellas*, Dublin: The Gallery Press.  
 (1976) *Stations*, Cairo.  
 (1977) *The Gododdin*, Dublin: Dolmen Press.  
 (1977) *Sing Me Creation*, Dublin: The Gallery Press.  
 (1978) *A Limerick Rake* (translations from Irish), Dublin: The Gallery Press.  
 (1979) *The Head Gear of the Tribe*, Dublin: The Gallery Press.  
 (1979) *His Skaldcrane’s Nest*, Dublin: The Gallery Press.

## O hUanachain, Micheal

(1979) *Crann Tógála*, Baile Atha Cliath: An Clóchomhar Tta.

## Paulin, Tom

(1977) *A State of Justice*, London: Faber & Faber.

(1980) *The Strange Museum*, London: Faber & Faber .

## Sweeney, Matthew

(1981) *A Dream of Maps*, Dublin: Raven Arts Press.

(1983) *A Round House*, Dublin, London: Allison & Busby/Raven Arts Press.

(1985) *The Lame Waltzer*, Dublin, London: Allison & Busby/Raven Arts Press.

(1989) *Blue Shoes*, London: Secker & Warburg.

(1989) *Cacti*, London: Secker & Warburg.

(1997) *The Bridal Suite*, London: Cape Poetry.

## Other Poetry References

Heaney, Seamus (1975) *North*, London: Faber & Faber.

James, Clive (1976) *Peregrine Prykke's Pilgrimage*, London, for a parody of Heaney's poetry.

Kinsella, Thomas (ed.) (1986) *The New Oxford Book of Irish Verse*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lanoye, Tom (2002) *Niemand's Land (Gedichten uit de Grootte Oorlog)*, Amsterdam: Prometheus.

Longley, Edna (1988) *Louis MacNiece*, London: Faber & Faber.

Longley, Edna (1994) "Poetry in Ireland, Scotland and Wales, 1920-1990" in Woodring, Carl (ed.) *The Columbian History of British Poetry (605-641)*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Lowell, Robert (1990) *Imitations*, New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

Nijmeijer, Peter (1987) *Mistroostig en thuis*, Amsterdam: Kwadraat.

Nijmeijer, Peter (ed.) (1988) *Het Dwingende Verleden*, Amsterdam: Meulenhoff.

Stassijns, K. & Van Strijtem, I. (eds.) (1998) *De mooiste van de hele wereld. 300 gedichten van de 20e eeuw* (samen gebracht door), Tiel: Lannoo/Atlas.

Yeats, W.B. (1990) *Collected Poems*, London: Picador.

## Works Consulted

- Aijmer, Karin & Simon-Vandenberghe, Anne-Marie (2003) "The discourse particle *well* and its equivalents in Swedish and Dutch" in *Linguistics* 4/1, Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Aristotle *Poetics* (translated by Richard Janko 1987), Cambridge: Hackett Publishing.
- Arrojo, Rosemary (1998) "The revision of the traditional gap between theory & practice & the empowerment of translation in postmodern times" in *The Translator* 4/1: 25–48, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Baker, Mona (1992) *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*, London, New York: Routledge.
- Baker, Mona (1998) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London: Routledge.
- Baker, Mona (2000) "Towards a Methodology for Investigating the style of a Literary Translator" in *Target* 12/2: 241-266, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Baker, Mona (2001) "The Pragmatics of Cross Cultural Contact and Some False Dichotomies in Translation Studies", in Olohan, Maeve (ed.): *CTIS Occasional Papers, Vol. 1 (7-20)*, Manchester: Centre for Translation and Intercultural Studies, UMIST.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1990) *Speech Genres and other Late Essays*, in Emerson; Caryl; Holquist & Michael (eds.) translated by Vern W. McGee, Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bal, Mieke (1980) *De theorie van vertellen en verhalen. Inleiding in de Narratologie*, Muiderburg: Coutinho.
- Bassnett, S. (2002) *Translation Studies* (Third Edition), London, New York: Routledge.
- Bassnett, Susan & Trivedi, Harish (1999) *Post-Colonial Translation Theory and Practice*, London: Routledge.
- Bell, R. (1976) *Sociolinguistics*, London: Basil Blackwell.
- Bell, R.T. (1991) *Translation and Translating Theory and Practice*, London, New York: Longman.
- Bernstein, B. (1990) *The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse*, London: Routledge.
- Bhabha, Homi K. (1994) *The Location of Culture*, London, New York: Routledge Press.
- Biber, Douglas & Conrad, Susan (eds.) (2001) *Variation in English: Multi-Dimensional Studies*, Harlow: Longman.
- Biber, Douglas & Finnegan, Edward (eds.) (1994) *Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Register*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Biber, Douglas (1995) *Dimensions of Register Variation A Cross-Linguistic Comparison*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, Jan & Verschueren, Jef (1991) "The Pragmatics of Minority Politics in Belgium" in *Language and Society* 20, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, Jan & Verschueren, Jef (1998) in B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard & P. Kroskrity (eds.) *Language Ideologies, Practice and Theory*, Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.



- Bourdieu, Pierre (1979) *La distinction : critique sociale du jugement*, Paris : les éditions de minuit.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1980) *Le sens pratique*, Paris: Les éditions de minuit.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1992) *Language & Symbolic Power*, edited and introduced by John B. Thompson, translated by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Briggs, Charles L. (1986) *Learning How To Ask: a Sociolinguistic Appraisal of the Role of the Interview in Social Science Research*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Briggs, Charles L. (1998) “ ‘You're a Liar -You're Just Like a Woman!’ Constructing Dominant Ideologies of Languages in Warao Men’s Gossip” in B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard & P. Kroskrity (eds.) (1998) *Language Ideologies, Practice and Theory, Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Briggs, Charles L. (2002) “Interviewing, Power/Knowledge, and Social Inequality” in F. Jaber, J. Gubrium & A. Holstein (eds.) *Handbook of Interview Research Context & Method*, Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications.
- Bucholtz, Mary (2000) “The politics of transcription” in *Journal of Pragmatics* 32 (1439-1465), Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.
- Burke, Edmund *Correspondence*, edited by Thomas, W. Copeland (1958-78) 10 Vols., Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Burke, L., Crowley, T. & Girvin, A. (eds.) (2000) *The Routledge Language and Cultural Studies Reader*, London, New York: Routledge.
- Caminade, Monique & Pym, Anthony (1998) “Translator-training institutions” in Baker (ed.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (280-285), London: Routledge.
- Canale M. (1983) “From Communicative Competence to Communicative Language Pedagogy” in Richards J. & Schmidt R. (eds.) *Language and Communication*, London: Longman.
- Carter, Ronald et al., (eds.) (1997) *Working with Texts, A core book for language analysis*, London, New York: Routledge.
- Chesterman, Andrew & Arrojo, Rosemary (2000) “Forum: Shared Ground in Translation Studies” in *Target* 12/1: 151-160 and 12/2: 333-362, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chesterman, Andrew (1998) *Contrastive Functional Analysis*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Chouliarki, L. & Fairclough, N. (1997) *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Cicourel, Aaron (1973) “Cross-modal communication: the representational context of sociolinguistic information processing” in Shuy, Roger W. (ed.) *Sociolinguistics: Current Trends and Perspectives N° 2*, Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Cicourel, Aaron (1974) “Ethnomethodology” in Sebeok, Thomas, A. (ed.) *Current Trends in Linguistics (vol. 12)*, The Hague, Paris: Mouton.

- Cicourel, Aaron (1982) "Language and Belief in a Medical Setting" in Byrnes, Heidi (ed.) *Contemporary perceptions of language: Interdisciplinary Dimensions*, Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Collins, Beverly & Mees, Inger M. (1996) *The Phonetics of English and Dutch*, Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill.
- Collins, James (1998) "Our Ideologies and Theirs" in B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard & P. Kroskrity (eds.) (1998) *Language Ideologies, Practice and Theory*, Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Collins, James & Slembrouck, Stef (eds.) (2005) *MultiLingualism and Diasporic Populations: Spatializing Practices, Institutional Processes, and Social Hierarchies Language & Communication Special Issue*, Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Cronin, Michael (2003) *Translation and Globalisation*, New York, London: Routledge.
- Crystal, David & Davy, D. (1969) *Investigating English Style*, London: Longman.
- Crystal, David (1980) *A First Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, London: André Deutch: 301.
- Crystal, David (1997) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language, Second Edition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- De Beaugrande, Robert & Dressler, Wolfgang (1981) *Introduction to Text Linguistics*, London, New York: Longman.
- De Beaugrande, Robert (1978) *Factors in a Theory of Poetic Translation*, Assen (the Netherlands): Van Gorchem.
- De Geest, D. (1992) "The Notion of 'System': Its Theoretical Importance and Its Methodological Implications for a Functionalist Translation Theory" in Kittel, H. (ed.) *Geschichte, System, Literarische Übersetzung/Histories, Systems Literary Translation* (32-45), Berlin: Schmidt.
- de Jong, Engeliën (1998) "De Beroepspraktijk van literaire vertalers" in *Filter, Tijdschrift over vertalen en vertaalwetenschap* 5/1.
- de Saussure, Ferdinand (1974), *Cours de linguistique générale* (édition critique préparé par Tullio de Mauro), Paris: Payot.
- Devos, F., De Muynck R., Martens, L. (1992) *Nederlands Frans Engels in Contrast 2. De zin*, Leuven: Peeters.
- Devos, F., de Muynck, R. & Van Herreweghe, M. (1991) *Nederlands Frans en Engels in Contrast 1. De nominale constituent*, Leuven: Peeters.
- Dik, Simon C. (1978) *Functional Grammar*, Amsterdam, New York, Oxford: North Holland.
- Douglas, Mary (1970) *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology*, New York: Random House.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. (ed.) (1978) *Current Trends in Textlinguistics*, Berlin, New York: Walter De Gruyter.
- Ducrot, Oswald & Todorov, Tzvetan (1981) in Malmkjaer, Kirsten (1991) *The Linguistics Encyclopedia*, London: Routledge.

- Duranti, A. & Goodwin, C. (eds.) (1992) *Rethinking Context, Language as an interactive phenomenon* (Studies in the Social and Cultural Foundations of Language, N° 11), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duranti, Alessandro (1997) *Linguistic Anthropology*, Cambridge, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Duranti, Alessandro (2001) "Linguistic Anthropology: history, ideas, and issues" in Duranti, A. (ed.), *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Duranti, Alessandro (ed.) (2001) *Key Terms in Language and Culture*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Enkvist, Nils Erik (1988) "Contrastive Text Linguistics and Translation" in L. Grähs, G. Korlén, & B. Malmberg (eds.) *Theory and Practice of Translation*, Bern, Frankfurt, Las Vegas: Lang.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (1997) "The Making of Culture Repertoire and the Role of Transfer" in *Target International Journal Of Translation Studies* 9/2: 355-363, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fernando, Chitra (1996) *Idioms and Idiomaticity*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Firth, J.R (1957) *Papers in Linguistics 1934-1951*, London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Fontana, Andrea (2002) "Postmodern Trends in Interviewing" in Gubrium J. F. & Holstein J.A. (eds.) *Handbook of Interview Research Context and Method*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Foucault, Michel (1971) *L'ordre du discours*, Paris : Gallimard.
- Gardt, A. (1989) "Möglichkeiten und Grenzen einer pragmatischen Übersetzungstheorie" in *TEXTcomTEXT* 4: 1-59.
- Geertz, Clifford (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures*, New York: Basic Books.
- Girvin (eds.) (2000), *The Routledge Language and Cultural Studies Reader*, London, New York: Routledge.
- Goffman, Erving (1981) *Forms of Talk*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Goodwin Charles (1994) "Professional Vision" in *American Anthropologist* 96(3): 606-633, American Anthropological Association.
- Gumpertz, J. (1972 [1968]) "The Speech Community" in Giglioli, P.P. (ed.) *Language and Social Context*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Gutt, E. -A. (1991) *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hall, Nigel (2004) "Paper: Interpreting as action: young children's behaviour in language brokering events", Ghent SS14, 4 April 2004.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1973) *Explorations in the Functions of Language*, London: Edward Arnold.
- Hanks, William (1987) "Discourse Genres in a Theory of Practice" in *American Ethnologist* 14: 668-692.

- Hanks, William F. (1996) *Language and Communicative Practices*, Boulder Colorado: Westview Press.
- Harris, Marvin (1976) "History and Significance of the Emic/Etic Distinction" in *Annual review of Anthropology*, 5: 329-50.
- Harris, Roy (2001) *Saussure and his Interpreters*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Hatim, Basil & Mason, Ian (1990) *Discourse and the Translator*, London: Longman.
- Hawkins, Joyce M. & Allen, Robert (eds.) (1991) *The Oxford Encyclopedic English Dictionary*, Oxford: OUP.
- Headland, N. Thomas, Kenneth L. Pike & M. Harris (eds.) (1990) *Emics and Etics: The Insider/Outsider Debate*, Newbury Park CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Hermans, Johan & Lambert, José (1998) "From Translation Markets to Language Management: The Implications of Translation Services" in *TARGET International Journal of Translation Studies* 10/1: 113-132, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hermans, Theo (1996) "Norms and the Determination of Translation: A Theoretical Framework" in R. Alvarez & M. Vidal (eds.) *Translation Power Subversion* (26), Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Hermans, Theo (1999) *Translation in Systems*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Hill, Jane H. (1998) "'Today There Is No Respect': Nostalgia, 'Respect' and Oppositional Discourse in Mexicano (Nahuatl) Language Ideology" in B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard & P. Kroskrity (eds.) (1998) *Language Ideologies, Practice and Theory*, Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Holmes, James S. (1998) "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies" [1972] in R. van den Broeck (ed.): *Translated!* (67-80), Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Holmes, James S. in Venuti, L. (ed.) (2000) *The Translation Studies Reader*, London: Routledge.
- Holstein, J.A. & Gubrium, J.F. (1995) *The Active Interview*, Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Holtz-Mänttari, J. (1984) *Translatorisches Handeln: Theorie und Methode*, Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.
- House, Juliane (1977) *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*, Tübingen: TBL Verlag Gunter Narr.
- Hymes, Dell.H. (1971) "On Communicative Competence" in Pride J.B. & Holmes J. (eds.) p. 269-293. London: Penguin.
- Hymes, Dell H. (1972) "Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life" in Gumperz, J. & Hymes, D. *Directions in Sociolinguistics: the Ethnography of Speaking* (35-71), New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Hymes, Dell H. (1980) "What is ethnography?" in *Language and education: ethnolinguistic essays*, Washington Center for Applied Linguistics: Washington.
- Hymes, Dell H. (1968) "The Ethnography of Speaking" in Fishman, Joshua (ed.) *Readings in the Sociology of Language* (32-33), The Hague: Mouton.

- Hymes, Dell H. (1974) "Ways of Speaking" in Bauman, Richard & Sherzer, Joel (eds.) *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking* (433-51), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Inghelleri, Moira (2004) "Habitus, field and discourse: interpreting as a socially-situated activity" in *Target* 15:2, 243–268, Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Irvine, Judith T. (1989) "When Talk Isn't Cheap: Language and Political Economy" in *American Ethnologist* 16: 345-367.
- Irvine, Judith T. (1998) "Ideologies of Honorific Language" in B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard & P. Kroskrity (eds.) (1998) *Language Ideologies, Practice and Theory*, Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jacquemond, Richard (1992) "Translation and cultural hegemony" in Venuti, Lawrence (ed.) *Rethinking Translation Discourse Subjectivity Ideology*, London: Routledge.
- Jaffe, Alexandra (1999) *Ideologies in Action: Language Politics on Corsica*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jaffe, Alexandra (1999) "Locating Power: Corsican translators and their critics" in Blommaert, Jan (ed.) *Language Ideological Debates*, Berlin, New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Jakobson, Roman (1981) *Selected Writings Vol. III: Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry*, The Hague Paris, New York: Mouton.
- Jaspers, J. (2001) "Het Vlaamse stigma. Over tussentaal en normativiteit" in *Taal en Tongval, Tijdschrift voor Taalvariatie* (129-153), Gent: Vakgroep Nederlandse Taalkunde.
- Kachru, B. B. ed. (1982) *The other tongue: English across cultures*, Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Katan, David (1999) *Translating Cultures An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Kenny, Dorothy (2001) *Lexis and Creativity in Translation, A Corpus-based Study*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Kiberd, Declan (1996) *Inventing Ireland, the Literature of the Modern Nation*, London: Vintage.
- Koller, Werner (1971) "Übersetzen, Übersetzung und Übersetzer. Zu schwedischen Syposien über Probleme der Übersetzung" in *Babel* 17, Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- Koller, Werner (1976) "Äquivalenz in kontrastiver Linguistik und Übersetzungswissenschaft" in Grähs L., Korlén G. & Malmberg, B. (eds.) *Theory and Practice of Translation*, Nobel Symposium 39, Bern: Lang.
- Krasner, Stephen D. (ed.) (1983) *International Regimes*, Ithica: Cornell University Press.
- Kreszowski, Tomasz R. (1990) *Contrasting Languages, The scope of contrastive linguistics*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kristeva, Julia (1974) *La Revolution du Langage Poetique*, Paris: Seuil. Translated by Waller, Margaret (1984), *Revolution in Poetic Language*, introduction by Roudiez, Leon S., New York: Columbia University Press.

- Kroeber, A.L. & Kluckhohn, C. (1952) *Cultures; A critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*, Peabody Museum Papers Vol. 47/1, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University.
- Kroskrity, P. V. in Duranti (2001) *Linguistic Anthropology, a Reader* (403), Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kroskrity, Paul V. (1998) "Arizona Tewa Kiva Speech as a Manifestation of a Dominant Language Ideology" in B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard & P. Kroskrity (eds.) (1998) *Language Ideologies, Practice and Theory*, Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kroskrity, Paul V. (2004) "Language Ideologies" in Duranti, Alessandro (2004) *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, Malden, Oxford, Victoria: Blackwell.
- Kussmaul, Paul (1993) "Empirische Grundlagen einer Übersetzungsdidaktik: Kreativität im Übersetzungsprozeß" in Holz-Mänttari, Justa & Nord, Christiane (eds.) *Traducere navem: Festschrift für Katharina Reiss zum 70. Geburtstag*, Tampere: Univ.-Bibl.
- Kussmaul, Paul (1995) *Training the Translator*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Lakoff, George & Johnson, Mark (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Layder, D. (1997), *Modern Social Theory: Key Debates and New Directions*, London: UCL Press.
- Leckie-Tarry, Helen (1995) *Language and Context A Functional Linguistic Theory of Register*, London, New York: Pinter.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. & Short, Michael (1981) *Style in Fiction, A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*, London, New York: Longman.
- Lehr, Andrea (1996) *Kollokationen und maschinelesbare korpora: Ein operationelles analysemodell zum Aufbau lexikalischer Netze*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude (1975) *The Raw and the Cooked*, New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude (1978), *Myth and Meaning*, New York: Schocken Books.
- Levý, Jifí (1967) "Translation as a Decision Process" in *To Honour Roman Jakobson 11 (1171-1182)*, The Hague, Paris: Mouton.
- Levý, Jifí in Venuti, L. (ed.) (2000) *The Translation Studies Reader*, London: Routledge.
- Linton, Ralph (1936) *The Study of Man*, New York: Appleton-Century Co.
- MacKillop, James (1998) *Oxford Dictionary of Celtic Mythology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Malmkjaer, Kirsten (1991) *The Linguistics Encyclopedia*, London: Routledge.
- Martin, W. and Tops, G.A.J. (eds.) *Van Dale Groot Woordenboek Engels-Nederlands en Nederlands-Engels*, Utrecht, Antwerpen: Van Dale Lexicografie.
- McFarlane, J. (1953) "Modes of Translation" in the *Durban University Journal*.
- Medvedev, P.N. & Bakhtin, M.M. ([1928] 1978) *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship A Critical Introduction to Sociological Poetics* (translated by Albert J. Wehrle), Baltimore, London: John Hopkins University Press.

- Mertz, Elizabeth (1998) "Linguistic Ideology and Praxis in U.S. Law School Classrooms" in B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard & P. Kroskrity (eds.) (1998) *Language Ideologies, Practice and Theory*, Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mertz, Elizabeth and Yovel, Jonathan (2000) "Metalinguistic Awareness" in J. Verschueren, J. Östman, J. Blommaert & C. Bulcaen (eds.) *Handbook of Pragmatics 2000*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Nord, C. (1988) *Textanalyse und Übersetzung. Theoretische Grundlagen, Methode und didactische Anwendung einer übersetzungsrelevanten Textanalyse*, Heidelberg: Groos.
- Nord, Christiane (1991) "Scopos, Loyalty, and Translation Conventions", in *Target 3/1*: 91-110. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nord, Christiane (1991) *Text Analysis in Translation*, Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Nord, Christiane (1997) *Translating as a Purposeful Activity, Functionalist Approaches Explained*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- O'Toole, Fintan (1994) *Black Hole Green Card: the Disappearance of Ireland*, Dublin: New Island Books.
- O'Toole, Fintan (1996) *The Ex-Isle of Erin, Images of a Global Ireland*, Dublin: New Island Books.
- Paulin, Tom (1983) "A New Look at the Language Question" in L. Burke, T. Crowley & A. Girvin *The Routledge Language and Cultural Theory Reader*, London: Routledge.
- Petrelli, Susan (ed.) (2003) *Translation, Translation*, Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.
- Pike, Kenneth L. (1954-56) *Language, in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior, parts I, II, III*, Glendale CA: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Pike, Kenneth L. (1966) "Etic and Emic Standpoints for the Description of Behavior" in Smith A.G. (ed.) *Communication and Culture: Readings in the Codes of Human Interaction (152-163)*, New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Popovič, Anton (1970) "The Concept 'Shift of Expression' in Translation Analysis" in Holmes, James S. (1970) *The Nature of Translation Essays on the Theory and Practice of Literary Translation*, The Hague, Paris: Mouton.
- Pym, Anthony (1992) *Translation and Text Transfer*, Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Pym, Anthony (1998) *Method in Translation History*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Pym, Anthony "Alternatives to Borders in Translation Theory" in Petrelli, Susan (2003) *Translation, Translation (451-463)*, Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, Harlow: Longman.
- Reiss, K. & Vermeer, H.J. (1984) *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Reiss, Katarina (1988) "Der Text und der Übersetzer" in Arntz, Reiner (ed.) *Textlinguistik und Fachsprache (67-75)*, Hildesheim: Olms.

- Richardson, Kay (1987) "Critical linguistics and textual discourse" in Van Dijk, T. (ed.) *Text, an interdisciplinary journal for the study of discourse* Vol. 7-2 (145-163), Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Robinson, Douglas (1997) "The Best Kind of Translator, Letter to Pammachius" translated by Paul Carroll in *Western Translation Theory, from Herodotus to Nietzsche* (23-30), Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Robinson, Douglas (1998) "Literal Translation" in Baker *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London: Routledge.
- Robinson, Gail (1988) *Crosscultural Understanding*, Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall International.
- Rubin & Rubin (1995) in Warren, Carol A.B. (2002) "Qualitative Interviewing" in Gubrium, J. F. & Holstein, J.A. (eds.) *Handbook of Interview Research Context and Method* (145-146), Thousand Oaks CA.: Sage Publications.
- Ruggie, John (1975) "International Responses to Technology: Concepts and Trends" in *International Organization* 29/3: 557-584.
- Sampson, Geoffrey (1985) *Schools of Linguistics, Competition and evolution*, London: Hutchinson.
- Santos, Diana (1995) "On the use of parallel texts in the comparison of languages" in *Actas do XI Encontro da Associação Portuguesa de Linguística* (217-239), Lisboa, 2-4 de Outubro de 1995.
- Saville-Troike, Muriel (1982) *The Ethnography of Communication*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schäffner, Christina (ed.) (2002) *The role of discourse analysis for translation and in translator training*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Scheper-Hughes, Nancy (2000) "Ire in Ireland" in *Ethnography* Vol. 1 (1): 117-140, London, Seven Oaks CA and Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Schieffelin, B., Woolard K.A. & Kroskrity, P.V. (1998) *Language Ideologies, Practice and Theory*, Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sealey, Alison & Carter, Bob (2004) *Applied Linguistics as Social Science* in Candlin, Chris & Sarangi, Srikant (eds.) *Advances in Applied Linguistics Series*, London, New York: Continuum.
- Silverstein, Michael & Urban, Greg (1996) *Natural Histories of Discourse*, Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.
- Silverstein, Michael (1979) "Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology" in P. Clyne, W. Hanks & C. Hofbauer (eds.) *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels* (193-247), Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Silverstein, Michael and Urban, Greg (1996) *Natural Histories of Discourse*, Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.
- Silverstein, Michael (1998) "The Uses and Utility of Ideology: A Commentary" in B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard & P. Kroskrity (1998) *Language Ideologies, Practice and*



- Theory*, Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Simeoni, Daniel (1998) "The Pivotal Status of the Translator's Habitus" in *TARGET International Journal of Translation Studies* 10/1: 1-39, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Simon, Sherry (1996) *Gender in Translation*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Sinclair, John (1991) *Corpus Concordance Collocation*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Snell-Hornby, Mary (1998) *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Spitulnik, Debra (1998) "Mediating Unity and Diversity: The Production of Language Ideologies in Zambian Broadcasting" in B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard & P. Kroskrity (eds.) (1998) *Language Ideologies, Practice and Theory*, Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1993) "The Politics of Translation" in *Outside the Teaching Machine*, New York: Routledge.
- Spivak, Gayatri Charavorty (2000) in Venuti, Lawrence *The Translation Studies Reader*, London: Routledge.
- Stewart, W. A. (1968) "A sociolinguistic typology for describing national multilingualism" in Fishman et al. (eds.) (1968) *Readings in the Sociology of Language* (531-545), The Hague: Mouton.
- The Collins Cobuild English Dictionary* (1995), London: Harper Collins.
- The New Oxford Dictionary of English*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thibault, Paul J. (1997) *Re-reading Saussure, The dynamics of signs in social life*, London: Routledge.
- Toolan, Michael (2004) "Values are Descriptions; or, from Literature to Linguistics and back again by way of keywords" in *The Belgian Journal of English Language and Literatures*, New Series 2 Thematic Issue The Linguistic/Literature Interface (11-30), Ghent: Academia Press.
- Toury, Gideon (1995) *Descriptive Translation studies and Beyond*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Trudgill P. (ed.) *Language in Society Series*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tusting, K. (2000) *Written Intertextuality and the Construction of Catholic Identity in a Parish Community: An Ethnographic Study*, University of Lancaster: unpublished Ph.D.
- Van den Broeck, Raymond & Lefevere, André (1979) *Uitnodiging tot de vertaalwetenschap*, Muiderberg: Coutinho.
- Van Gorp H. et al. (eds.) (1986) *Lexicon Van Literaire Termen, Stromingen en Genres Theoretische Begrippen, Retorische Procedes en Stijlfiguren*, Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.
- Vandenbergen, Anne-Marie (1995) *Exploring English Grammar*, Leuven, Appeldorn: Garant.

- Venuti, Lawrence (1995) *The Translator's Invisibility, a History of Translation*, London, New York: Routledge.
- Venuti, Lawrence (1996) *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*, London, New York: Routledge.
- Venuti, Lawrence (1998) (ed.) *Translation and Minority, Special issue of the Translator*, Volume 4/2, Manchester: St-Jerome.
- Venuti, Lawrence (ed.) (1992) *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*, London: Routledge.
- Vermeer, H. (1998) "Starting to Unask What Translatology Is About" in *Target International Journal of Translation Studies* 10/1, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Vermeer, H.J. (1978) "Ein Rahmen für eine allgemeine Translationstheorie" in *Lebende Sprachen* 23: 99-102.
- Vermeer, H.J. (1986) *Voraussetzung für eine Translationstheorie: Einige Kapitel Kultur- und Sprachtheorie*, Heidelberg: Groos.
- Vieira, Else & Ribeiro, Pires (1994) "A Postmodern Translation Aesthetics in Brazil" in M. Snell-Hornby, F. Pöchhacker & K. Kaindl (eds.) *Translation Studies: An Interdiscipline* (65-72), Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Vološinov, V.N. (1973) *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, translated by Ladislav Matejka and I.R. Titunik (Studies in Language, ed. M. Silverstein), New York & London: Seminar Press.
- von Flotow, Luise (1997) *Translating and Gender Translating in the 'Era of Feminism'*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Warren, Carol A.B. (2002) "Qualitative Interviewing" in Gubrium, J. F & Holstein, J.A. (eds.) *Handbook of Interview Research Context and Method*, Thousand Oaks CA.: Sage Publications.
- Waterhouse, Viola (1974) in Malmkjaer, Kirsten (1991) *The Linguistics Encyclopedia*, London: Routledge.
- Wenger, E. & Lave, J. (1998) *Communities of Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wetherell, M.; Taylor, S. & Yates, S.J. (2001) *Discourse as Data a Guide for Analysis*, Milton Keynes: The Open University.
- Wilss, W. (1988) *Kognition und Übersetzen: Zu Theorie und Praxis der menschlichen und der maschineller Übersetzung*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Woolard, Kathryn A. "Introduction: Language Ideology as a Field of Inquiry" in B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard & P. Kroskrity (1998) *Language Ideologies, Practice and Theory*, Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Woordenlijst Nederlandse Taal (1995) Instituut voor Nederlandse Lexicologie in opdracht van de Nederlandse Taalunie, Den Haag.

## Electronic Sources

<http://taalunieversum.org/>  
<http://www.sil.org/klp/>  
<http://www.kwalitan.net>  
<http://www.qualisresearch.com>  
<http://caqdas.soc.surrey.ac.uk>  
<http://www.qsrinternational.com>  
<http://www.taalunie.org>  
<http://www.tijdschrift-filter.nl/>  
<http://www.viperrecords.com/murphy/history.shtml>  
<http://allserv.rug.ac.be/~sslembro/colloquialist.htm>  
[http://www.senate.be/doc/const\\_nl.html](http://www.senate.be/doc/const_nl.html)  
[http://www.vrt.be/extra/vrtaal\\_net.pdf](http://www.vrt.be/extra/vrtaal_net.pdf)  
<http://taalschrift.org/>  
<http://www.intercelt.com>  
<http://www.deusexmachina.be/>  
<http://www.uwasa.w/comm/termino/>  
<http://www.poetry.nl>  
<http://www.maryhowitt.co.uk/profile.htm>  
<http://oase.uci.kun.nl/~ans/>  
<http://www.monabaker.com>