View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk

brought to you by CORE

Research in Language, 2017, vol. 15:1 DOI: 10.1515/rela-2017-0004

THE TREATMENT OF GEOGRAPHICAL DIALECT IN LITERARY TRANSLATION FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF RELEVANCE THEORY

IZABELA SZYMAŃSKA
University of Warsaw, Poland
i.szymanska@uw.edu.pl

Abstract
This paper discusses problems involved in the translation of literary works that apply linguistic varieties, especially geographical dialects. It surveys selected approaches to the functions of dialects in literature and to the strategies of dealing with linguistic variation in translation, arguing that the understanding of the issue may be deepened and systematized by applying notions drawn from relevance theory. The use of dialect in literary texts is interpreted as a communicative clue and the translators' approach to its rendering is described with reference to the cognitive environment of the recipients and the balance of processing effort and communicative gain. Examples are drawn from the Polish translations of *The Secret Garden* by F.H. Burnett, the oldest coming from 1917 and the newest from 2012, which highlight the translators' changing assumptions on the recipients' cognitive environment reflected in the choice of the strategy of dialect rendition.

Keywords: cognitive environment, communicative clue, dialect translation, processing effort, *The Secret Garden*, translation strategy

Geographical dialects are among the most intriguing problems for translation theory, proving the inseparability of linguistic usage from the cultural context and knowledge. Language varieties, which, as is put by Bonaffini, used to be considered marginal and minor, or "even coarse and plebeian" (1997: 279), this prejudice limiting their representation in writing, are nowadays increasingly present in literary works. Thus, research on methods of translating language varieties, including geographical dialects, is also developing (e.g. Federici, 2011). This paper is going to refer to some research on this topic, especially concerning Polish translation practice, and to argue that the understanding of translators' approaches to geographical dialects can be deepened and systematized by applying the notions that are prominent in Gutt's (2000) relevance-theoretic account of translation, namely *communicative clues*, the target reader's *cognitive environment*, and the balance of *processing effort* and *communicative gain*.

For the sake of terminological clarity let us assume for the purpose of this paper that the label dialect covers user-related language varieties, including temporal varieties, sociolects, idiolects and geographical dialects (Hatim and

Mason, 1990: 39); the last category will be termed regionalects for short (after Balma, 2011: 9).

It is commonly assumed in translation studies that the treatment of non-standard language varieties, including regionalects, depends on the translator's interpretation of the functions they are ascribed and effects they are intended to serve in the original text. By way of illustrating the types of functions identified as well as the attitudes to the importance of dialect usage let us mention just several works touching the issue. For instance, Newmark (1988: 195) addresses dialectal variety in passim in connection with drama translation, concentrating on sociolects. In his view the major functions of dialects in literature are: showing a slang use of language, showing class contrasts and, rarely, indicating local cultural features, but he does not seem to consider them particularly important and suggests introducing just some features of sociolect in the target text, i.e. using a stylization1. Such an approach is perhaps conditioned by the attitude to dialects in the author's culture; he mentions that due to "the decline of dialects in present-day British English a translation into dialect runs the risk of being antiquated" (Newmark, 1988: 195) and treats the issue in a rather dismissive way. In contrast, scholars investigating the use of regionalects in Italian poetry attach a great cultural importance to the issue. Bonaffini, for example, asserts that "to contemporary men and women in danger of being swallowed up and obliterated by postindustrial society, dialect can offer the support of a culture which, while threatened with obliteration, is radically different from the dominant culture" (1998: 279). He sees regionalects in literature as "the linguistic testimony of a cultural heritage, of a collective patrimony and an anthropological condition condemned to extinction", which "as opposed to the language of the ruling class, can bear witness to the injustices of history and give voice to the excluded and the oppressed" (1998: 279). As is evident from his paper, and from Balma's description of the historical role and status of regionalects vs the standard language in Italy (2011: 1-3), in the Italian literary tradition regionalects are valued as a means of personalized and intimate expression, which is undoubtedly reflected in the above very emotional and involved statements concerning their functions. Such differences point to the key role of culture-specific attitudes and traditions in approaching the issue of dialect functions and their rendition in translation.

In works concerned with texts involving literary dialogue (drama, fiction and film) translation scholars focus on the role of dialects in distinguishing protagonists. For instance Hejwowski (2010: 45-47) compiles an extended list of the functions of language varieties (including regionalects, sociolects, idiolects and temporal dialects) on the basis of his own research and other scholars' works, mostly concerning literary prose. Those include: signalling differences in social status and education, manifesting ethnic and cultural identity, indicating a protagonist's foreign origin and poor knowledge of a language, characterizing

[1] The term *stylization* is adopted here after Hejwowski (2010).

protagonists, manifesting that a protagonist is a member of a certain subculture, signalling temporal distance, and introducing linguistic humour. Obviously, in a particular literary text many functions can be combined.

Ramos Pinto stresses that the creative use of linguistic varieties in literary dialogue

> becomes a textual resource that helps the reader to define the sociocultural profile of the character, as well as his/her position in the sociocultural fictional context. Knowing the social stereotypes and assumptions readers may share with the rest of the society they are part of, the author uses fictional varieties with the expectation that this will encourage certain reactions and assumptions that will aid characterisation. It leads to the stratification of the participants in the dialogue, since the speakers tend to associate higher prestige with a standard variety, and, consequently, to undervalue other varieties culturally associated with peripheral geographical spaces and with a lower sociocultural status. (2009: 291)

This diagnosis points to sociocultural stereotypes concerning status being vital in authors' and translators' usage of linguistic variation. It is important to note that even though for dialect speakers their variety is a natural, unmarked way of communicating, the effect of using dialects in literature crucially relies on the assumption that they *are* marked, standing "in opposition to another, more widespread and important" variety (Bonaffini, 1997: 283), i.e. on a tension created by contrasting language varieties, either overtly used in the text or assumed to be invoked on the basis of the recipient's cultural knowledge. Fawcett sums this effect up by the catchy phrase "giving the voice to the linguistic Other" (1997: 122). In translation then, the potential recreation of the functions depends on recreating the diversity. Therefore, I will follow those scholars who term the translation of dialects into the standard variety *neutralization*, highlighting the resultant loss of linguistic diversity.

The above outline of discussions on the functions of dialect usage in literature reveals the underlying intuition that its communicative effects are inferential in nature. What is linguistically encoded in a specific way, i.e. with the use of the non-standard, triggers an inferential process resulting in certain interpretations. Since such interpretations are intended by the author, inferences arising from the use of dialectal markers can be treated as implicatures. This leads us directly into the realm of relevance theory. Within the relevance-theoretic approach to communication this intuition can be accommodated by assuming that the very *fact* of using dialect is a very powerful communicative clue for the reader of the original and for the translator. I follow Gutt's assumptions that communicative clues "help the translator to identify […] features in the source and target language utterances that affect their interpretation" (2000: 172) and "reflect not only the information content […] but also the way in which it was expressed and the special effect that such stylistic features would achieve" (2000: 135).

What is not always clearly articulated in works on translation but clearly is an important practical consideration is that for many recipients a text involving

dialect, particularly regionalect, will require increased effort. Balma considers translations into target-language regionalects as potentially requiring a similar reading effort from the target reader as the original requires from many of the source readers (2011: 10), this effect being intended in the process of interpretation, but he also mentions the case of a film shot in the Bari regionalect and released with standard-Italian subtitles for non-Barese viewers to be able to follow the dialogue (2011: 1), which points to the comprehensibility of regionalects as an important practical factor in translators' decisions. Relevance theory highlights that non-standard language varieties, especially regionalects, require increased processing effort from many of the recipients (Gutt 2000: 109-110) and that this is a potential source of additional contextual effects in text interpretation.

Considering the intended functions of language varieties in literary discourse is the first step to, but no guarantee of, relaying those functions in the translated text. Let us now briefly survey some views on the possibility of rendering dialects, with special focus on regionalects. It should be underlined that in Polish translation studies this issue was noted and considered as important as early as in the 1950s. Klemensiewicz, who described the process of translating in functional terms, stressing the necessity of treating the original and the target text as organic wholes with every linguistic element performing a certain function, noted the different functions of language varieties (1955: 89-92) and concluded that while sociolects can often be rendered in a functionally adequate way, translating a regionalect involves a dilemma: substituting it with the standard variety does not relay its source-text functions while substituting it with a regionalect of the target language falsifies the cultural reality (1955: 95). Interestingly, Klemensiewicz assumed that neutralizing regionalects does not result in great losses in intercultural exchange, since there are not many valuable literary works that apply them. This points again to the important role of culture- and time-specific stereotypes and prejudices in translation theorists' approach to the issue.

A similar path of thinking as concerns the translatability of regionalects was followed by Wojtasiewicz (1957) in his pioneering attempt at formulating a fully-fledged translation theory. Wojtasiewicz interpreted the use of dialects in literature as "linguistic allusions" aimed at evoking culture-specific associations in the reader (1992: 89-91). Assuming that the default aim of translating is that the target text as a whole should evoke associations very similar to the source text (1992: 27), he pointed out that this is hardly achievable by substituting a target-language geographical dialect for a source-language one,[2] because this would lead to a cultural discrepancy or incoherence in the setting of the story and to associations different than those intended in the original. He concluded that the effect of regionalect usage in the original can usually be only partly

[2] The technique of translating a SL dialect by a TL dialect was considered a kind of "functional equivalent" by some theorists of that time (e.g. Catford 1965).

recreated in the target text by some sort of compensatory "retouching" (1992: 89-91), which in more modern terminology would be called *stylization* (Hejwowski 2010: 50). Wojtasiewicz's major achievement was highlighting that the main obstacle in regionalect translation is culturally-determined knowledge.

Let us note that this diagnosis of the problem of rendering regionalects can be directly accommodated within the relevance-theoretic account of translation, which relies on the idea of interpretive resemblance between two texts (sharing explicatures and implicatures) and communicating the originally intended interpretation to the receptors without putting them at unnecessary processing effort (Gutt 2000: 46, 107, 170-173). A crucial factor in the balance of processing effort and contextual effects is the context, that is the set of assumptions used to interpret utterances, drawn from the recipients' cognitive environment, i.e. widely understood knowledge (Gutt 2000: 26-35). Wojtasiewicz's account points to the fact that target recipients may not have a chance of arriving at the implicatures intended by using regionalect as a communicative clue in the source text, since their cognitive environment in this respect, that is culturally-determined associations connected with regionalects of their own language and their users, is different from that of the source-text recipients. Thus, communicating the originally intended interpretation in the translation of texts applying regionalect is predicted to be particularly difficult.

This prediction is confirmed by various descriptive studies (e.g. Berezowski, 1997, Dębska, 2009, Hejwowski, 2010), which show that in Polish literary translation until very recently it has been a fairly common practice to neutralize regionalects, i.e. translate them to standard Polish. This strategy filters out the impact of linguistic variation as a communicative clue; the main reason for its application is certainly the wish to avoid what can be termed "ungains", i.e. unwelcome side-effects introduced into the target text by some linguistic choices (Szymańska 2011: 127), in this case unintended negative associations possibly evoked by regionalects in the target culture (cf. Ramos Pinto on dialect functions above). In relevance-theoretic terms we could explain this strategy as the result of translators predicting that due to the difference in the cognitive environment and contextual assumptions, target recipients' increased effort involved in processing non-standard language will result in implicatures largely different than those intended by the original. Therefore, neutralization is used to prevent unintended interpretation for the price of lowering the overall communicative gain.

As is shown by Berezowski (1997: 53-87) and Hejwowski (2010: 48-54), a fairly common strategy attested in Polish practice is stylization, which only signals that a non-standard variety was applied in the original. Hejwowski (2010: 50) rightly notes that translators rarely apply real "full" dialects; they usually only choose certain signals of dialectal variety in lexis and/or pronunciation and/or inflection and/or syntax, as is also true of authors of originals. Ramos Pinto (2009: 292) calls this phenomenon "pseudo-variety". Therefore, it seems appropriate to refer to translation strategies in this area as to

various kinds of stylization: rural, colloquial, substandard, urban, slang or archaic, or combinations of those. Other strategies noted by those authors are: imitating foreign accent, pidginization, artificial language variety (invented by the translator), relativization (using non-standard forms of address only), and a translator's commentary in the text proper, footnotes or preface (usually combined with neutralization). Those strategies can be interpreted as introducing communicative clues requiring increased processing effort in the hope of achieving certain contextual effects, which, however, need not be very similar to those intended in the original. Stylizations are often compensatory in nature, i.e., it is not regionalect features but usually sociolect or register features that serve as communicative clues, which was predicted by Wojtasiewicz and can again be explained by differences in the assumed cognitive environment of the recipients.

The differences between the cognitive environments of audiences at different times can also account for the changes that can be traced by comparing older and newer translations. Berezowski (1997) and Hejwowski (2010) show that in older Polish translations of American and British literature it was quite a common practice to neutralize regionalects. Interestingly enough, research on recent translations (e.g. of novels by Scottish writers who use elements of regionalects and sociolects to make strong social and identity claims; cf. Korzeniowska 2004, 2013) indicates that it is increasingly common to apply *heavy* colloquial and slang stylization as a means of rendering the functions of dialects. This points to the growing acceptability of the non-standard in literary texts, which in turn suggests changes in the readers' cognitive environment: perhaps the weakening of the stereotypical assumption that the non-standard in general marks its user negatively.

Similar conclusions concerning the strategies of dealing with dialects can be found in the works of scholars investigating this issue in other European cultures. For example, Hatim and Mason (1990: 41, 45) state that geographical variation cannot be relayed by regionalect features because of the risk of unintended interpretations, implying that the most common strategy is neutralization, even though it erases the "alienating" effect of the non-standard. Fawcett (1997: 118-123), using examples of translations from several European languages to American English, concludes that sociolects are often neutralized, especially in film translation, while regionalects either neutralized (which may "neutralize" their speakers "out of existence" in the given text) or compensated with sociolects, usually with slang, which may lead to negative stereotyping and the audience feeling insulted.

Ramos Pinto (2009: 292-296), on the basis of English-Portuguese translation examples, attempts to systematize tendencies in dialect rendition in a hierarchical model, highlighting that the first choice faced by the translator is between the preservation and non-preservation of the linguistic variation. The latter choice may result in the use of the standard variety only or of a single non-standard variety. The preservation-of-variation path leads to four possibilities, defined by the decision to maintain or not to maintain "the space coordinates"

and “the time coordinates” of the source text; each of those four possibilities results in more detailed strategies of rendering linguistic variation, e.g. the use of oral discourse features, reducing it to forms of address, the use of lexical, morphosyntactic, graphic or phonetic features from different varieties. In spite of terminological differences, most of the strategies she identifies tally with Berezowski's and Hejwowski's findings mentioned above, which indicates that the repertoire of strategies in different cultures largely overlaps.

Ramos Pinto also links tendencies in translation practice with ideological changes; for instance she points to a correlation between a tendency to eliminate language varieties and use standard spelling before 1974 and a relaxation of norms to admit features of oral discourse or attempts at rendering language variation by non-standard spelling after 1974 in Portugal, the date marking the end of right-wing dictatorship and state censorship in the country (Ramos Pinto, 2009: 298-301). She also mentions studies suggesting that a preference for the strategy of “dialectalization” correlates with historic moments when power relations in cultures change to allow more autonomy and some expression of identity to various groups (2009: 293-294). Finally, she points to different norms of linguistic diversity rendition depending on the medium, and consequently the type of audience assumed, evidenced by differences in translations intended for print, for stage and for television (2009: 298-302). In connection with variation in medium and audience it is worth mentioning that Balma (2011: 9-12) argues for experimenting with a very unusual and complex strategy, namely quadrilingual editions of dialect poetry, including the original in a regionalect and its renditions into the standard source language, the standard target language and a regionalect of the target language. The author suggests that such a process of “filtering” the source text gradually through several linguistic systems may involve the target reader in discovering the significance of regionalect in literary discourse, but he points out that such an experiment (whose example is presented in his paper) requires a collaborative effort of several translators and can only be attempted in *scholarly* editions of poetry. This confirms a correlation between strategies of regionalect rendition and the type of text and audience. For obvious practical reasons such experiments are difficult to imagine in the translation of fiction and drama; for an interested reader a similar effect may perhaps arise from comparing various existing translations of a single original, which, however, is practiced by scholars rather than a wide readership. In DVD releases of films a similar effect could theoretically be attempted by providing several sets of subtitles between which the viewer can switch. All such considerations indicate once again that translators' *linguistic* decisions concerning linguistic diversity in particular translations have to be explained by factors related to the *cultural* conditioning of communication processes.

In the following part of this paper the issue of regionalect, which is clearly the most difficult type of dialect to translate, will be illustrated using *The Secret Garden* by Frances Hodgson Burnett (first published in the serial form in 1910). This novel is relevant to the topic for several reasons. Firstly, it applies the

Yorkshire dialect of English in large fragments of dialogue, which has considerable impact on its interpretation. Secondly, there are several Polish translations available, the oldest from 1917 and the newest from 2012, which provides ample material for tracing changes in translation strategies. Thirdly, many studies demonstrate that translating for children has long been guided, in addition to other factors, by translators' and editors' assumptions about the texts' comprehensibility for young readers (e.g. Shavit, 1986; Adamczyk-Garbowska, 1988; Tabbert, 2002; Oitinnen, 2006). Thus, translations of a children's book are particularly likely to be influenced by the assumed cognitive environment of their recipients.

The Secret Garden is a story of Mary Lennox, an English upper-class girl born in India, who is orphaned and sent to England to live as a ward of her uncle in his moor-surrounded manor in Yorkshire. A sulky and contrary child, neglected by her parents and then her guardian, Mary encounters a number of regionalect-speaking locals, who became catalysts of her change into a much more open, friendly, active and joyful person, enjoying work and contact with nature. The Yorkshire dialect contrasted with standard English is a crucial communicative clue in the novel, serving to signal the sociocultural profiles of the characters and the dynamic interpersonal relations between them. On the one hand, it implies that the speakers are of rural origin, low social status (usually servants), uneducated and poor, which are stereotypical negative associations. On the other hand, regionalect speakers are rooted in their culture and not ashamed to manifest this, they are close to nature (one could even say that they are presented as transmitting the magic healing powers of nature), they are open and unrestrained in expressing emotions, and they exhibit the common sense and natural wisdom of simple people. As the story progresses, Mary, a speaker of standard English who initially does not understand the Yorkshire dialect and looks at with contempt, starts to use it herself. This shift in her attitude, linked to the development of her relationships with other characters, is illustrated in (1). Fragment (1a) comes from an early chapter, when Mary encounters the servant Martha for the first time and asks whether Martha is going to dress her, as her servants in India did; in fragment (b), much later, she is proud to show her cousin Colin that she has picked some regionalect features from her new friends:

(1) a.

Martha sat on her heels again and stared. She spoke in broad Yorkshire in her amazement.

'Canna' tha' dress thysen!' she said.

'What do you mean? I don't understand your language,' said Mary.

'Eh! I forgot,' Martha said. 'Mrs Medlock told me I'd have to be careful or you wouldn't know what I was sayin'. I mean can't you put on your own clothes?' (Burnett 1993: 29)

b.

‘I’m givin’ thee a bit o’ Yorkshire,’ answered Mary triumphantly. `I canna talk as graidely as Dickon an’ Martha can but tha’ sees I can shape a bit. Doesn’t tha’ understand a bit o’ Yorkshire when tha’ hears it? An’ tha’ a Yorkshire lad thysel’ bred an’ born! Eh! I wonder tha’rt not ashamed o’ thy face.’ (Burnett 1993: 142)

The approach to language marks a change in Mary’s way of thinking and expressing emotions, her discovery of how it feels to belong, also pointing to the “covert prestige” of the non-standard. Thus, in this novel regionalect is also a means of evoking positive associations in readers. Let us now examine whether and how in such a situation interpretive resemblance is attempted by translators in Poland, a culture in which regionalects until very recently did not enjoy prestige or any sort of promotion.

The available Polish versions of the novel confirm the changing preferences as to regionalect translation strategies. In the oldest translation from 1917 (Burnett, 1996), whose slightly modernized editions are still being reprinted, the Yorkshire dialect is largely neutralized apart from some cases of rural vocabulary and forms of address. Sometimes the translator adds that a speaker switches to Yorkshire pronunciation, imitating comments provided in early fragments of narration by the author herself. Taking into consideration the time of publication, the translator probably assumed that any larger-scale rural stylization would not be communicatively effective, as the potential readership would probably be mainly from those social classes that used standard Polish and regionalect features might cause negative implicatures. Secondly, since the translation was contemporary to the original, the social differences signalled by the original regionalect must have been easily discernible for readers on the basis of their cognitive environment and it was enough to mark them with forms of address in the translation. Finally, at that time promoting standard Polish in literature for children was treated as a tool for the preservation of national identity, which was a heritage of the long period when Poland was partitioned (cf. Adamczyk-Garbowska, 1988: 148-149), so an ideological factor was probably at play.

In the extracts from the oldest translation quoted in (2), corresponding to the originals in (1), the difference between the Yorkshire dialect and standard English is fully neutralized, although the status difference is marked by forms of address.

(2) a.

Marta znów przysiadła na piętach i <u>przyglądała się Mary, jakby nie rozumiejąc o co jej chodzi,</u> wreszcie ze zdumieniem spytała:

– To panienka sama nie potrafi?

– Cóż to ma znaczyć? Nie rozumiem cię.

– Chciałam powiedzieć, że panienka chyba umie się sama ubrać.

(Bunett, 1996: 26)

b.
– Daję ci próbkę mowy Dicka – gwary jorkszyrskiej – odpowiedziała Mary triumfująco. – Nie umiem mówić tak ładnie jak Dick i Marta, ale zawsze się już trochę poduczyłam. Czy ty mnie rozumiesz? Właściwie to wstyd, gdybyś nie rozumiał, przecież tu jesteś urodzony i wychowany! (Burnett, 1996: 160)

Interestingly enough, in (2a) the translator adapted the underlined fragment, omitting the mention about Martha switching to the Yorkshire dialect, which changes the implicatures of the scene – in this version it implies a problem in communication caused by different customs not by the language.

Set apart from the first rendition by a significant temporal gap over which the original has become a classic and the approach to the child addressee has evolved, three translations from the 1990s and one from 2011 apply neutralization in some fragments, combined with various types and degrees of stylization in others, primarily achieved through lexis. Let us consider the fragments corresponding to (1), with elements that can be perceived as signals of the non-standard marked in bold italics:

(3) a.
Marta znów przysiadła na piętach i wpatrywała się w Mary,
zdumiona. W osłupieniu przemówiła rozlewną gwarą hrabstwa York :
– To ty sama ***nie zdolna odziać się***? spytała.
– Co to znaczy? Nie rozumiem co mówisz – oświadczyła Mary.
– Oj, zapomniałam – rzekła Marta. – Pani Medlock powiedziała, że będę musiała uważać, bo mnie nie zrozumiesz. Chcę powiedzieć: Czy nie potrafisz nałożyć na siebie swoich własnych rzeczy?
(Burnett, 2005: 22-23)

b.
– Pokazuję ci, jak brzmi gwara hrabstwa York – odpowiedziała triumfująco Mary. – Nie potrafię jeszcze mówić tak pięknie jak Dick i Marta. Nie znasz ani trochę tutejszej gwary? A ***przecie*** ty sam jesteś chłopakiem z Yorkshire, tu urodzonym i wychowanym! Ej! To naprawdę wstyd! (Burnett, 2000: 139)

(4) a.
Marta znów przysiadła na piętach i wlepiła wzrok w Mary. Była tak zdziwiona, że odezwała się, zaciągając w najczystszym dialekcie z Yorkshire.
– To panienka nie umie sama się ubierać? – zdumiała się.
– Co mówisz? Nic nie rozumiem z twojego języka – rzekła Mary.
– No, zapomniałam – mówiła Marta. – Pani Medlock ostrzegała mnie, żebym się starała, bo inaczej panienka nie będzie wiedziała co mówię. To znaczyło: czy panienka nie potrafi sama włożyć ubrania? (Burnett, 1997: 29)

b.

– Mówię do ciebie po jorkszajersku – triumfalnie oznajmiła Mary. – Nie potrafię mówić tak wspaniale jak Dick i Marta, ale sam widzisz, że wychodzi mi nieźle. Rozumiesz ten język troszeczkę, prawda? Przecież ty też jesteś ***chłopak*** z Yorkshire, tu się urodziłeś i wychowałeś, były wstyd, gdybyś nie rozumiał, ***no nie***? (Burnett, 1997: 174)

(5) a.

Martha znów przysiadła na piętach i przez chwilę przyglądała się uważnie dziewczynce.
– To panienka sama nie umie się ***oblec***? – rzekła zdumiona.
– Co mówisz? Nic nie rozumiem.
– Ach, całkiem zapomniałam. Pani Medlock mówiła, żebym uważała jak mówię, bo panienka nie zrozumie. Pytam, czy panienka nie potrafi się sama ubrać. (Burnett, 1998: 20-21)

b.

– Dałam ci próbkę tutejszej gwary – oznajmiła Mary z dumą. – Nie potrafię jeszcze ***gadać*** tak jak Dick czy Martha, ale jak widzisz, trochę już się nauczyłam. Nie rozumiesz yorkshirskiej mowy? Przecież jesteś ***chłopak*** z Yorkshire, tu urodzony i wychowany! Ech, powinieneś się wstydzić! (Burnett, 1998: 135)

(6) a.

Marta znów przysiadła na piętach i wbiła wzrok w dziewczynkę. Ze zdumienia zaczęła mówić z wyraźnym akcentem z Yorkshire.
– A to panienka sama się nie ***umi obdziać***?! – wykrzyknęła.
– Co to znaczy? Nie rozumiem, co do mnie mówisz – odparła Mary.
– Ech, zapominam się… – poprawiła się Marta. – Pani Medlock kazała mi uważać na słowa, żeby panienka mnie zrozumiała. Pytałam się, czy panienka sama nie umie włożyć sukienki. (Burnett, 2011: 29)

b.

– A ja mówię do ciebie językiem z Yorkshire – oświadczyła dumna z siebie Mary. – Nie potrafię zaciągać tak dobrze jak Dick czy Marta, ale już mi to mniej więcej wychodzi, prawda? Rozumiesz chociaż trochę co mówię? No bo ty też ***żeś jest chłopak*** z Yorkshire, tu urodzony i ***chowany***. Ej! ***Toć*** to byłby wstyd, jakbyś po swojemu nie rozumiał, ***no nie***? (Burnett, 2011: 182)

The above renditions include examples of rural pronounciation (*umi* in 6a), dated vocabulary (3a, 3b, 5a, 6a, 6b), dated inflection (*żeś jest* in 6b), colloquial words and expressions (*no nie* in 4b and 6b, *chłopak* in 5b and 6b, *gadać* in 5b), but the density of those markers is not high. (4a) exhibits full neutralization. The versions also differ in the use of address forms, with (4a), (5a) and (6a) applying the now dated honorific *panienka*, and (3a) using a non-distancing pattern, which may be an attempt at reducing the temporal distance for the young reader as well as levelling the social stratification. The translators' shared strategy is clearly to signal in some places that non-standard language was used in the

original without requiring young readers to invest much processing effort which, given their cognitive environment, might produce unintended implicatures, or even lead to a breakdown in communication, so in practical terms discourage them from reading, which is a factor often regarded as vital in translating for children (Oittinen 2006: 43). Additionally, it may have been induced by the traditional translation norms of the post-war period, when non-standard features, aside from archaic stylization, were definitely not promoted, even though not entirely banned, for educational and ideological reasons.

The most interesting case is the translation by Paweł Beręsewicz (Burnett 2012), which is the only one that signals regionalect *consistently* by non-standard *spelling*, reflecting regionalectal pronunciation (this method is sometimes called “eye-dialect”; cf. Ramos Pinto, 2009: 299). This is illustrated by the extracts in (7), corresponding to (1):

(7) a.

Marta wyprostowała się gwałtownie. Była tak osłupiała, że zawołała najczystsza gwarą:

– A sama***ś’ odziać*** nie ***ł***umi?

– Coś ty powiedziała? Ja w ogóle nie rozumiem, co ty do mnie mówisz! – mruknęła Mary.

– Oj! Zapomniałam – zreflektowała się Marta. – Pani Medlock ostrzegała, ***ż’*** mam ***ł***uważać, jak ***gadam***, bo mnie panienka nie zrozumie. Chodziło mi o to, czy sama ***ł***ubrania nie potrafisz włożyć. (Burnett, 2012: 32)

b.

– Tak***ś gada*** w Yorkshire – stwierdziła pękając z dumy. – Nie ***ł***umiem ***gadać*** tak dobrz***y*** jak Dickon i Marta, ale, jak widzisz, się ***ł***ucz***e***. Rozumiesz, co do cieb***i gadam***? ***Przeci*** ty w końcu ***chłopak*** z Yorkshire jesteś! ***Rodzony*** tutaj, wstydziłbyś się! (Burnett, 2012: 200)

The frequency of non-standard markers (bold italics) is much higher than in the previous renditions. The translator uses colloquial words (*gadać*, *chłopak*), archaic words (*odziać, przecie, rodzony*), and a dated syntactic pattern with the verb at the end of the sentence (*chłopak z Yorkshire jesteś*). In Martha’s lines, he mixes the honorific with the non-distancing form of address, making her speech spontaneous and thus believable in a simple country girl. Most conspicuously, however, throughout the novel he consistently introduces the following features of pronunciation marked by non-standard spelling:

1. the shortening and closing of open vowels in unstressed word-endings (e.g. *okropni* instead of *okropnie* ‘terribly’, *nieźli* instead of *nieźle* ‘fine’*,* *łaskawi* instead of *łaskawie* ‘kindly’, *dobrzy* instead of *dobrze* ‘well’, *przeci* instead of *przecie* ‘after all’),
2. the denasalization of nasal vowels (*cie* instead of *cię* ‘you-ACCUSATIVE’, *jo* instead of *ją* ‘her-ACCUSATIVE, *bedo* instead of *będą* ‘they will be’, *młodo*

dame instead of *młodą damę* young lady-ACCUSATIVE, *troszki* instead of *troszkę* 'a bit' [denasalization + closing]),

3. the labialisation of word-initial back vowels (*łuważasz* instead of *uważasz* 'you think', *łupatrzyłeś* instead of *upatrzyłeś* 'you have your eye on', *łucze* instead of *uczę* [labialisation + denasalization]),
4. apostrophes marking the shortened pronunciation of vowels (*ż'to* instead of *że to* 'that it', *trzab*' instead of *trzeba by* 'one should').

The following fragment (8a) exemplifies their frequency in a dialogue between two Yorkshire dialect speakers, which can be seen as more spontaneous than situations when Yorkshire speakers communicate with standard-English speakers. The frequency of non-standard spelling markers in (8a) is close to the frequency of non-standard features in (8b). All the previous Polish translations almost neutralize the regionalect in this fragment; for example in (8c), apart from the general impression of slightly old-fashioned diction, the only attempt at stylization is the colloquial word *ziółko* 'weirdo':

(8) a.

Dickon zachichotał.

– Że***b'ś'*** nie domyślili, co***ś'*** stało. Gdyby***ś'*** doktór dowiedział, ***ż'*** może sam stać, to***b'*** pewn***i*** zar***a*** do pana Cravena napisał. Panicz Colin trzyma to w sekrecie, że***b'*** samemu móc powiedzieć. Ma zamiar codzienn***i*** czarować swoje nogi, aż jego ojciec wróci i wtedy chce wejść do jego pokoju i pokazać, ***ż'***jest tak samo prosty jak wszystkie chłopaki. I wymyślili z panienk***o*** Mary, że dobrz***y*** b***e***dzie troszk***i*** pojęczeć i pomarudzić, że***b'*** ich wszystkich zmylić.

Kiedy mówił ostatnie zdanie, pani Sowerby zaśmiała się cichutko i serdecznie.

– Oj! – powiedziała. – Widz***e***, ***ż'***ta dwójka świetn***iś'*** bawi. Małe przedstawienie sob***i*** ***ł***urządzaj***o***, a nie znam ***dzieciaka***, co by nie lubił troszk***i*** poudawać. Opowiedz, synku, co tam wyprawiaj***o***. (Burnett, 2012: 265)

b.

Dickon chuckled.

'He does it to keep them from guessin' what's happened. If the doctor knew he'd found out he could stand on his feet he'd likely write and tell Mester Craven. Mester Colin's savin' th' secret to tell himself. He's goin' to practise his Magic on his legs every day till his father comes back an' then he's goin' to march into his room an' show him he's as straight as other lads. But him an' Miss Mary thinks it's best plan to do a bit o' groanin' an' frettin' now an' then to throw folk off th' scent.'

Mrs. Sowerby was laughing a low comfortable laugh long before he had finished his last sentence. 'Eh!' she said, 'that pair's enjoyin' theirselves, I'll warrant. They'll get a good bit o' play actin' out of it an' there's nothin' children likes as much as play actin'. Let's hear what they do, Dickon lad.' (Burnett, 1993: 186)

c.

Dick zaśmiał się cichutko.

– Specjalnie kaprysi, żeby nikt się niczego nie domyślił. Jakby doktor się dowiedział, że panicz stoi na własnych nogach, od razu zawiadomiłby o tym pana. A panicz chce, żeby to była tajemnica, bo chce sam o tym powiedzieć panu Cravenowi. Dlatego co dzień będzie tak zaklinał swoje nogi, dopóki nie wróci jego ojciec, bo wtedy sam wejdzie do jego pokoju i pokaże mu, jaki jest prosty i zgrabny. I dlatego razem z panną Mary wymyślili, że musi jednak trochę pogrymasić i pokaprysić, żeby ludzie się niczego nie domyślili.

Jej syn jeszcze nie przestał mówić, a pani Sowerby już zaczęła się po cichutku śmiać.

– Ojoj – powiedziała – coś mi się zdaje, że te dwa ***ziółka*** mają świetną zabawę. Urządzają sobie co dzień wesołe przedstawienie, a dzieci nic tak nie cieszy, jak zabawa w udawanie. No, mój chłopcze, opowiedz mi, co jeszcze wymyślili.

(Burnett, 2011: 244-245)

In the 2012 version the translator marks the first occurrence of non-standard spelling with a footnote: “Dear reader, please don’t be discouraged by the initial *problems* you might have with this strange language. This is part of the *adventure* that reading this novel is. Our heroine also had some *troubles* with *comprehending* this local dialect” (Burnett, 2012: 24, my translation and emphasis). This comment signals a very conscious communicative approach to rendering the regionalect, which goes against the conventional assumption underlying neutralization, namely that texts for children should not be too alien culturally and too difficult linguistically, since this may hamper understanding and discourage the reader. Let us note that the translator consciously calculates the increased effort involved in processing non-standard spelling into the act of communication, promising young readers an adventure; he counts on this challenge resulting in a rewarding cultural experience, i.e. a sort of communicative gain. Let us also note that the translator risks being “uneducational” for the sake of introducing a communicative clue intended at rendering the function of regionalect in the original, which suggests that the assumptions about the cognitive environment of readers may be changing.

This is also a rare example (not only in children’s literature) of a translation that attempts at consistent stylization that alludes to a *particular* regionalect of Polish. It seems that the translator tried to imitate the pronunciation of the south-eastern Polish borderland dialect (*polszczyzna kresów południowo-wschodnich*), used in the areas that had been part of Poland until the Second World War, but after the war were lost to the Soviet Union. All the above mentioned pronunciation features are listed by Kurzowa (1983: 73-83) as characteristic of the south-eastern borderland Polish dialect, which developed in close contact with the Ukrainian language and shared with it the shortening and closing of unstressed vowels and the lengthening and broadening of the stressed ones, properties which are absent from standard Polish.

The effect of this stylization can be ambivalent: if readers do not recognize the allusion to the borderland pronunciation, which may be the case with contemporary *child* readers, they are likely to treat it as a general rural or substandard form of stylization; the translator must have assumed that such stylization would not evoke unambiguously negative associations, which suggests that the values attached to the standard and non-standard in contemporary Polish culture are changing. For those contemporary adult readers who are able to recognize the allusion, the borderland pronunciation evokes *nostalgia* and *positive* associations with a part of Polish culture that was valued and lost. It is worth noting that borderland pronunciation was not associated exclusively with low-status rural communities, but to some extent also with the educated classes. The translator clearly decided to stress "the temporal coordinates" of the plot; a historical regionalect makes it easier to evoke past social differences that are explored in the novel. Interestingly enough, this particular choice tallies with Bonaffini's observation that one of the functions of using dialect in literature is to evoke cultural heritage that has almost vanished (1998: 279). "Giving the voice to the linguistic Other", this translation is a notable attempt to find communicative clues in the target language that could result in interpretive resemblance, i.e. regionalect features potentially evoking *positive* associations in the target culture. Particularly interesting and revealing is the translator's awareness of the role of the processing effort in text interpretation.

To conclude, the use of regionalect in literature can be considered a subtle stylistic clue, whose impact on inferential communication is deeply dependent on the cognitive environment of text recipients. If we assume that processing non-standard language involves increased effort, the use of regionalect potentially results in increasing the communicative gain of the text recipient. On the other hand, in translations, due to the different cognitive environment of the recipients, the use of regionalect is highly problematic, since introducing elements of target-language regionalects may lead to unintended implicatures and decrease interpretive resemblance. Thinking in terms of the balance of processing effort and communicative gain in the context of a *different* cognitive environment explains why translators often decide to neutralize geographical dialects in translation or compensate them with elements of sociolects or register, while attempts at regionalectal stylization, such as the 2012 translation of *The Secret Garden*, are uncommon.

References:

Adamczyk-Garbowska, Monika. 1988. *Polskie tłumaczenia angielskiej literatury dziecięcej: problemy krytyki przekładu*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Balma, Philip. 2011. From Standardization to Dialect Compilation: A Brief History of Italian Dialect Poetry in English Translation. *Translation Studies Journal* 3(1). 1-13. [Online] Available from http://escholarship.org/uc/item/5r18r9dx [Accessed 2 November 2016]

Berezowski, Leszek. 1997. *Dialect in Translation*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

Bonaffini, Luigi. 1997. Translating Dialect Literature. *World Literature Today* 71(2). 279-288.

Burnett, Frances H. 1993. *The Secret Garden.* Ware, Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Classics.

Burnett, Frances H. 1996 [1917]. *Tajemniczy ogród*. Translated by Jadwiga Włodarkiewicz. Warszawa: Pruszyński i S-ka.

Burnett, Frances H. 1997. *Tajemniczy ogród*. Translated by Bogumiła Kaniewska. Poznań: Podsiedlik-Raniowski i Spółka.

Burnett, Frances H. 1998. *Tajemniczy ogród*. Translated by Zbigniew Batko. Warszawa: Kama.

Burnett, Frances H. 2005 [1995]. *Tajemniczy ogród*. Translated by Anna Staniewska. Wrocław: Siedmioróg.

Burnett, Frances H. 2011. *Tajemniczy ogród*. Translated by Saskia Milaneau de Longchamp. Poznań: Vesper.

Burnett, Frances H. 2012. *Tajemniczy ogród*. Translated by Paweł Beręsewicz. Kraków: Skrzat.

Catford, John C. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.

Dębska, Karolina. 2009. Neutralizacja różnorodności językowej a usuwanie obcości z przekładu. In Jerzy Brzozowski and Maria Filipowicz-Rudek (eds.), *Między oryginałem a przekładem XV. Obcość kulturowa jako wyzwanie dla tłumacza*, 53-72. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.

Fawcett, Peter. 1997. *Translation and Language. Linguistic Theories Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Federici, Federico M. (ed.) 2011. *Translating Dialects and Languages of Minorities. Challenges and Solutions*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Gutt, Ernst-August. 2000. *Translation and Relevance. Cognition and Context. 2nd edn*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Hatim, Basil and Ian Mason. 1990. *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman.

Hejwowski, Krzysztof. 2010. O tłumaczeniu aluzji językowych. In Roman Lewicki (ed.), *Przekład – język – kultura. Tom II,* 41-56. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.

Klemensiewicz, Zenon. 1955. Przekład jako zagadnienie językoznawstwa. In Michał Rusinek (ed.), *O sztuce tłumaczenia*, 85-97. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Korzeniowska, Aniela. 2004. The Challenge of the Non-standard and the Notion of Untranslatability in Reference to Three Scottish Writers: Tom Leonard, James Kelman and William McIlvanney. In Olga Kubińska and Wojciech Kubiński (eds.), *Przekładając nieprzekładalne, volume II*, 93-100. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego.

Korzeniowska, Aniela. 2013. James Kelman's Polish 2011 Début with Jak późno było, jak późno (How late it was, how late) and its Position within the Polish Literary Polysystem. In Aniela Korzeniowska and Izabela Szymańska (eds.), *Scotland in Europe/Europe in Scotland. Links-Dialogues-Analogies*, 129-140. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Semper.

Kurzowa, Zofia. 1983. *Polszczyzna Lwowa i kresów południowo-wschodnich do roku 1939*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Newmark, Peter. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Oittinen, Riitta. 2006. No Innocent Act. On the Ethics of Translating for Children. In Jan Van Coillie and Walter P. Verschueren (eds.), *Children's Literature in Translation. Challenges and Strategies*, 35-45. Manchester and Kinderhook: St Jerome.

Ramos Pinto, Sara. 2009. How important is the way you put it? A discussion on the translation of linguistic varieties. *Target* 21(2). 289-307. doi: 10.1075/target.21.2.04pin
Shavit, Zohar. 1986. *Poetics of Children's Literature*. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press.
Szymańska, Izabela. 2011. *Mosaics. A Construction-Grammar-Based Approach to Translation*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Semper.
Tabbert, Reinbert. 2002. Approaches to the Translation of Children's Literature: A Review of Critical Studies since 1960. *Target* 14(2). 303-351. doi: 10.1075/target.14.2.06tab
Wojtasiewicz, Olgierd. 1992. *Wstęp do teorii tłumaczenia. 2nd edn*. Warszawa: TEPIS.