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ABSTRACT

On the grounds of the examination of the historical development of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis and theoretical interpretations and evaluations of the hypothesis, it is postulated that the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis can basically be reformulated as intimating that language influences and shapes worldview. Due to the fact that worldview in the work of Sapir and Whorf refers rather to the worldview of a specific cultural group – whose members share a language – than to the individual, the conclusion can be reached that the hypothesis implies that culture influences worldview and that language, as a reflection of culture, therefore indirectly influences worldview. The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis can be applied to translation in general, because translation entails transposition between languages as well as between cultures. As a literary text calls into existence a fictional textual world, the hypothesis that language influences worldview is especially applicable to literary translation. The writer of a literary text creates the world in the text through the medium of language and also represents views of this textual world (as held by the characters and the narrator) through language. The translator, as the producer of the target text, has the task of recreating the world in the source text into the target text through the medium of another language. Text-level equivalence between the source text and the target text is reached if a world that is equivalent to the source text world is created in the target text, and if the target language readers' experience of this world is similar to that of the source language readers' experience of the source text world. As this textual world is experienced through the medium of language, foregrounding based on linguistic deviation as well as culture-specific linguistic elements in the source text requires a certain amount of creativity on the part of the translator. The specific challenges involved in the rendition of instances of linguistic deviation and culture-specific linguistic elements are illustrated practically by way of a text-linguistic analysis of Carroll's Alice's Adventures in Wonderland and Through the Looking-Glass and an evaluative comparison between these texts and their Afrikaans translations by Brink. The conclusion is reached that literary translation requires a great deal of the translator due to the fact that a textual world and the readers' experience of this world must be recreated in the translation of a literary text.
OPSOMMING

Op grond van die onderzoek na die historiese ontwikkeling van die Sapir-Whorf-hipotese en teoretiese interpretaasies en evaluerings daarvan, word aan die hand gedoen dat die Sapir-Whorf-hipotese basies herformuleer kan word as "taal beïnvloed wereldbeskouing". Op grond van die feit dat wereldbeskouing in the werk van Sapir en Whorf eerder na die wereldbeskouing van 'n spesifieke kultuurgroep - waarvan die lede 'n taal deel - as na wereldbeskouing van die individu verwys, kan die gevolgtrekking gemaak word dat die hipotese impliseer dat kultuur wereldbeskouing beïnvloed en dat taal, as 'n weerspieëling van kultuur, daarom ook indirek wereldbeskouing beïnvloed. Die Sapir-Whorf-hipotese kan toegepas word op vertaling in die algemeen omdat vertaling die transponering tussen tale sowel as tussen kulture behels. Aangesien 'n literêre teks 'n fiksionele, tekstuele wereld daarstel, is die hipotese dat taal wereldbeskouing beïnvloed besonder toepaslik vir literêre vertaling. Die skrywer van 'n literêre teks skep die wereld in die teks deur middel van taal en representeer ook die beskouinge (soos deur die karakters en die verteller gehuldig) oor hierdie tekstuele wereld deur middel van taal. Die vertaler, as produseerder van die doeltekste, het die taak om die wereld in die bronteks in die doeltekste te herskep deur middel van 'n ander taal. Teksvlak-ekwivalensie tussen bronteks en doeltekste word bereik as 'n wereld wat ekwivalent is aan die brontekswêreld in die doeltekste geskep word, en as die doeltaallesers se ervaring van hierdie wereld ekwivalent is aan die brontaallesers se ervaring van die brontekswêreld. Aangesien hierdie wêreld ervaar word deur middel van taal, vereis die vertaling van vooropstelling gebaseer op linguistiese middele, soos linguistiese afwyking, en kultuurspesifieke linguistiese elemente in die bronteks 'n sekere mate van kreatiwiteit van die vertaler. Die spesifieke uitdaginge verbonden aan die weergawe van die voorbeeldige van linguistiese afwyking en kultuurspesifieke linguistiese elemente word prakties geïllustreer aan die hand van 'n tekslinguistiese analise van Carroll se Alice's Adventures in Wonderland en Through the Looking-Glass en 'n evaluerende vergelyking tussen hierdie tekste en hul Afrikaanse vertalings deur Brink. Die gevolgtrekking word gemaak dat literêre vertaling heelwat kreatiwiteit van die vertaler vereis weens die feit dat 'n tekstuele wêreld en die lesers se ervaring van hierdie wêreld in die vertaling van 'n literêre teks herskep moet word.
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Contextualisation and problem statement

The title of this dissertation indicates that the focus will fall on translation. It should be pointed out from the outset that translation does not only take place between languages, but between cultures, because language is imbedded in culture. As language and culture are two very important aspects of translation, it is apposite to first define these concepts. Mary Snell-Hornby (1988:39) points out that language is not "an isolated phenomenon suspended in a vacuum" but an integral part of culture. In this study it is accepted that language is an expression of the culture in which it is imbedded. For the purposes of this study, language refers to the code of communication used by a certain linguistic community in a certain time in history. Thus, modern-day South African English will be regarded as distinct from the English spoken in Victorian England, because these codes reflect different cultures. In this study culture will be understood in the same manner as Snell-Hornby (1988:39) uses the term, namely as "all socially conditioned aspects of human life". In this sense culture ties in with the way in which one is conditioned to view reality, that is, one's worldview.

The influence of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis on the cultural aspects of translation has been acknowledged by prominent translation theorists, such as Susan Bassnett (1996) and Mary Snell-Hornby (1988). Sapir's (1949:162) hypothesis reads as follows:

Human beings do not live in the objective world alone, ... but are very much at the mercy of the particular language which has become the medium of expression for their society ... the fact of the matter is that the real world is to a large extent unconsciously built upon the language habits of the group ... The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached to it.

However, this hypothesis addresses far more than just the cultural aspects of translation, as it refers primarily to the relation between language and worldview.

Whorf (1956:212) states the hypothesis more strongly than Sapir:
The background linguistic system (in other words, the grammar) of each language ... is itself the shaper of ideas, the program and guide for the individual's mental activity, for his analysis of impressions.

According to Penn (1972:13) the hypotheses concerning language and thought may be interpreted in two ways. The extreme interpretation would be that language determines thought, while the cautious interpretation would be that language influences thought. In the context of this study worldview should be seen as a mode of thought.

Greenberg (quoted in Penn, 1972:14) later follows up on this and reformulates the hypotheses of Sapir and Whorf in such a way that he takes neither the extreme nor the cautious stance. He states that "the grammatical categories of a language determine ... the general manner of conceiving the world of those who speak it".

The views outlined above clearly suggest that there is ample food for thought and speculation in the views expressed. Two notions emerge quite clearly from the various versions of the hypothesis:

- The language one speaks influences one's conception of the world; and
- the language one speaks guides or influences one's mental activity.

If the language you speak influences your mental activity, it would seem to follow logically that it will also influence creative activity, such as painting, writing, or even translating. In the light of the above two notions it becomes apparent that the hypotheses of Sapir and Whorf have some application to translating.

As it is the intention in this study to focus on the translation of literary texts, it would be appropriate to examine the concept of a literary text as well.

Lemon (1969:5) recognises that the literary text constitutes an alternative world when he describes literature as a "vicarious experience" and states that "the imaginative reader can live
in worlds attainable in no other way". Pavel (1986) also addresses the notion of textual worlds in his book *Fictional Worlds*.

Cloete (1984:16) regards literature's multivalence as an essential characteristic of literature. By multivalence is meant the fact that the literary text is composed of various linguistic and conceptual elements that are integrated with each other, and with the organisation of the text and the perspective according to which it is written. The linguistic elements (meaning, rhythm, sound, syntax, word quantity) and conceptual elements (events, figures, time, space), together with the organisation of the text and perspective, co-communicate with the reader.

De Beaugrande (1988:7) suggests that one should take the functional approach and refrain from asking "What is literature?". Instead one should ask what happens when people produce or respond to a literary text. According to De Beaugrande (1988:8), a dominant function of literature, hence a literary text, is that of *alternativity*, which entails that

[p]articipants in literary communication should be willing to use the text for constituting and contemplating other "worlds" (i.e., configurations of objects and events) besides the accepted "real world".

Cloete's definition of literature in terms of its **co-communicative constituents** (linguistic and conceptual elements, organisation and perspective) does not contradict De Beaugrande's definition in terms of the function of *alternativity*. The "world" in the text can only be called *into* being by these co-communicative constituents and it is simultaneously built by them and described by them.

I have formulated a working definition of a literary text, centring around the function of literature, as follows:

A literary text is a text in which, by means of linguistic and conceptual elements, an alternative ("other") world is created.

Thus, the literary text is not only an object in the world; it also constitutes an alternative world. If one accepts, as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis implies, that the language you speak
influences your perception of the world, one must necessarily accept that the reader’s language will also influence the perception of this textual world. This has important implications for literary translation where a more or less "equivalent" world must be called into being by means of different languages. Thus, the translator of literature has the special task of recreating the "world" postulated in the original text. The role of the literary translator can be explored in terms of his task of re-creating the other (textual) world.

To indicate why the translator of literature should take cognisance of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis in order to fully carry out his task of recreating, the following questions need to be answered:

1. How have the various hypotheses concerning the relation between language and thought developed through history?
2. What is the function of literature in terms of the principle of alternativity?
3. What are the possible implications of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis for literary translation, with due reference to the co-communicative constituents of the literary text and the process of translation and the mental aspects thereof?
4. How can these implications be illustrated practically in a translation-oriented text-linguistic analysis of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* and *Through the Looking-Glass* and an evaluative comparison of the linguistic elements of these source texts and their Afrikaans translations?
5. What are the tasks of the literary translator that can be derived from the practical illustration above, and to what extent can the literary translator be seen as being involved in the creation of the target text?
The aims of this study are to:

1. briefly examine the historical development of hypotheses concerning the relation between language and thought;
2. describe the function of literature in terms of the principle of alternativity;
3. determine the possible implications of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis for literary translation, with due reference to the co-communicative constituents of the literary text and the process of translation and the mental aspects thereof;
4. practically illustrate the implications of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis for literary translation by means of a translation-oriented text-linguistic analysis of Alice's Adventures in Wonderland and Through the Looking-Glass and an evaluative comparison of the linguistic elements of these source texts and their translations; and
5. reflect on the creative role of the literary translator by referring to the tasks of the literary translator as derived from the above practical illustration.

Thesis statement

The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis addresses the relation between language and world-perception, and has implications for literary translation, because a key characteristic of the literary text is its ability to postulate another world, the textual world. An important aspect of literary translation is the re-creation of this textual world. This means that the translator of literature must take cognisance of the hypothesis and its implications for the process of translation and his\(^1\) role as translator. I will argue that the role of the literary translator, in terms of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis and the principle of alternativity, is that of re-creator/co-creator of the textual world.

\(^1\) For the sake of expediency, the pronoun "he" will be used although full cognisance is taken of the female person.
Method

The historical development of the various hypotheses dealing with the relation between language and thought will be outlined briefly. It does not fall within the ambit of this study to evaluate the various versions of the so-called Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis philosophically. The various versions of the hypothesis through history, as well as the responses to these hypotheses in the fields of literary theory and linguistics, will only be mentioned to substantiate the argument. For the purposes of this study, it is sufficient to accept what Penn identifies as the "cautious interpretation" of the hypothesis, namely, that language influences thought, or more specifically, that language influences worldview.

The definition of literature, or even the function of literature, is too wide a subject to define within the constraints of a single dissertation. Only some defining aspects and functions of literature will be isolated for discussion, the most important being the principle of alternativity, which entails that the literary text constitutes a textual world as an alternative to the real world.

Chapter One will address the interpretation of the hypotheses of Sapir and Whorf and the defining aspects of a literary text. In Chapter One a brief working definition of translation will also be given to serve as a background for the discussion of the translation process in the following chapters. The possible implications of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis for literary translation, taking into consideration the working definition of literature developed for purposes of this study, will then be explored.

In Chapter Two, translation models illustrating the stages of the process of translation will be discussed. In other words, a profile of the processes that take place in the mind of a hypothetical translator will be given. The disciplines of text linguistics and stylistics will be explored as analytic tools that can shed light on the creative aspects of the translation process. Chapter Two will ultimately be an attempt to arrive at a method of illustrating the creative procedures involved in the process of translation in a practical manner.
The implications of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis for literary translation will be illustrated practically in the translation-oriented source text analysis in Chapter Three and the evaluative comparison of the ST and the TT in Chapter Four. In both these chapters the focus will fall on the linguistic elements of the text as the textual world is called into being by language. The TT will be evaluated in terms of the extent to which the translator succeeds in recreating the textual worlds of the original texts.

Although all literary texts subscribe to the notion of alternativity in that they contain a textual world that is an alternative to reality, the principle of alternativity cannot be illustrated with the same degree of ease in all texts. Textual worlds which are deeply imbedded in reality (De Beaugrande's "real world"), for example, the textual worlds in politically conscious texts, do not leave the reader with the same impression of fictionality as would be left by fantasy texts. Thus, the more fully imagined the textual world is, the easier it is to illustrate the principle of alternativity at work in that text. For this reason Alice's Adventures in Wonderland and Through the Looking-Glass and What Alice Found There by Lewis Carroll were chosen as literary texts by way of which the implications of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis for literary translation can be illustrated. These texts are structured in such a way that they lend themselves to analysis in terms of the co-communicative constituents of literature, i.e. the conceptual and linguistic elements of the text. The wordplay and instances of non-ordinary and non-expected language use in these texts also make them ideal objects of text-linguistic analysis.

Alice's Adventures in Wonderland will be abbreviated to Wonderland, and Through the Looking-Glass and What Alice Found There to Looking-Glass. Where both texts are meant, reference will be made to "the Alice texts". As source text, for purposes of the translation-oriented reading in Chapter Three, I used The Annotated Alice (1970, edited and annotated by Gardner), which includes both Alice texts. ST will be used as a general abbreviation of source text, and will also be used to refer to The Annotated Alice. Thus, for purposes of this study the two Alice texts will be considered as a single ST.
As target text, I will use *Die Avonture van Alice* (1987) which contains both *Alice se Avonture in Wonderland* (an Afrikaans translation of *Wonderland* by André P. Brink, 1965) and *Alice deur die Spieël* (an Afrikaans translation of *Looking-Glass*) by Brink, 1968). The translations of the two *Alice* texts will therefore also be treated as a single target text. *TT* will be used throughout to abbreviate *target text*.

*SL* and *TL* will be used to abbreviate *source language* and *target language* respectively.

The tasks of the translator in general, and then the special tasks of the literary translator, will be derived from the practical illustration. These will be discussed in an effort to reflect on the creative role of the literary translator.
CHAPTER 1
THEORETICAL BASE

It's a great huge game of chess that's being played – all over the world – if this is the world at all, you know.

—Alice

1 Introduction

In view of the aims outlined in the Preface, it would be apposite first of all to attempt an overview and evaluation of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis for purposes of justifying and qualifying the use of this hypothesis as the basis for this study. In Section 1.1 of this chapter the historical development of the hypotheses of Sapir and Whorf will be traced to arrive at a preliminary reformulation of the hypotheses. More recent theoretical comment on the hypotheses will then be discussed in an attempt to arrive at a plausible interpretation of the linguistic-relativity hypotheses for application in this study.

To examine the relation between the hypotheses of Sapir and Whorf and literary translation, it is necessary to first define literature and translation. In Section 1.2 a working definition of literature is established, and in section 1.3 of translation. The possibility of applying the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis to literary translation will be addressed in Section 1.4.

1.1 The hypotheses of Sapir and Whorf

Many theorists refer to the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, thereby implying that there is in fact one hypothesis "which maintains that thought does not 'precede' language, but on the contrary ... is conditioned by it" (Snell-Hornby, 1988:41). The premise that a single hypothesis exists, and that this hypothesis can be summarised in a few words has contributed to the controversy surrounding the so-called Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. This hypothesis is also referred to as linguistic relativism.

Based on the similarities in the work of Sapir and Whorf, a student of Whorf, Harry Hoijer, dubbed their postulations regarding the relation between language and thought the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis in 1956 (Blount, 1995:39).
In order to determine to what extent the hypotheses, as applied to the language-thought relationship specifically, are useful in the process of literary translation, it is necessary to examine the historical development of the hypotheses more closely. In her discussion of the statements on the relation of language to thought made by Von Humboldt, Sapir and Whorf respectively, Penn (1972:13) points out that there are two possible interpretations of these statements. The extreme interpretation would be that language determines thought, while the cautious interpretation would be that language influences thought.

The linguistic philosophy of Von Humboldt (1767-1835) is regarded as the basis of the "hypotheses" of Sapir and Whorf (Penn, 1972:23; Snell-Hornby, 1986:40) and will therefore be discussed in more detail. Von Humboldt maintains that the differences between cultures is a result of the differences between languages, but he also goes beyond the language-culture relationship when he states that "the worldview (Weltanschauung) of one people differs from that of another people" (Penn, 1972:19) as a result of language difference. One could interpret Von Humboldt's assertions cautiously and take them to mean that language influences worldview, i.e. thoughts about the world. However, in numerous places in Von Humboldt's Werke, VI, it is indicated how closely he identifies language with thought, so that, according to Penn (1972:20), one could say for him "language is thought, and thought, language". If one takes this into account, it is clear that Von Humboldt held the extreme belief, namely that language determines thought. His linguistic philosophy becomes fuzzy at this point, because if there can be no thought without language, language must have been created first. Von Humboldt asserts that language is created by the Geist of a nation and later that the Geist of a nation is its language (Penn, 1972:21). Due to the internal contradictions in Von Humboldt's assertions, one must conclude that he had no real hypothesis regarding the relation between language and thought, although it is clear that he saw a definite connection between language and worldview.

Penn (1972:23) summarises Von Humboldt's views as follows:

The worldview (Weltanschauung) of one people differs from that of another people ... due to the extreme difference in the "internal structure" (innere Sprachform) of their respective languages.
In the quotation above it is clear that Von Humboldt refers to the worldview of a cultural group who share a language, that is, a linguistic community.

Snell-Hornby (1986:40) states that it was Von Humboldt who made the vital connection between language and culture, language and behaviour and formulates his ideas as follows:

At the same time language is an expression both of the culture and the individuality of the speaker, who perceives the world through language.

The statement above suggests that it might be more plausible to say that the cultural group to which one belongs influences one's worldview and that language – as an expression of culture and a vital part of culture – therefore indirectly influences worldview.

About a century after Von Humboldt, Sapir (1884-1937) seems to echo Von Humboldt's views on language, culture and worldview. Sapir (1949:162) makes the following statement about the relation between language and worldview:

Language is a guide to 'social reality.' ... Human beings do not live in the objective world alone, nor alone in the world of social activity as ordinarily understood, but are very much at the mercy of the particular language which has become the medium of the expression for their society. It is quite an illusion to imagine that one adjusts to reality essentially without the use of language and that language is merely an incidental means of solving specific problems of communication or reflection. The fact of the matter is that the 'real world' is to a large extent unconsciously built up on the language habits of the group. No two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality. The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached.

Here Sapir also addresses the language-thought relationship as it is manifested in a group, referring to "the language habits of the group" and "societies". Penn (1972:23) interprets Sapir's hypothesis as saying "[t]he global system of cultural beliefs, the Weltanschauung, of a culture influences to a large extent the personal Weltanschauung of an individual". This appears to be a mild and careful rephrasing of Von Humboldt's statements about language and Weltanschauung. At this point one needs to ask what is meant by Weltanschauung. Penn seems to understand the Weltanschauung of the group as a set of
cultural beliefs. Accordingly, for the purposes of this study, the worldview of a cultural group is regarded as the set of beliefs (about the world) held by the group.

Although the cautious wording of the passage taken as Sapir's hypothesis (for example, "the 'real world' is to a large extent unconsciously built up on the language habits of the group") lends itself readily to the cautious interpretation, other passages from Sapir's work (1949) suggest that he, like Von Humboldt, does not believe that language and thought can be separated: "The writer, for one, is strongly of the opinion that the feeling entertained by so many that they can think, or even reason without language is an illusion" (Sapir, 1949:14-15) (cf. also Penn, 1972:24). Sapir sees language as originating from man's "spiritual" or "psychic" constitution (Sapir, 1949:9). Penn (1972:27) regards Sapir's philosophical position as inconsistent, because it vacillates between the cautious and the extreme view. Again, due to the inconsistencies, one can question the existence of a true hypothesis regarding the relation between language and thought in Sapir's work.

In the 1930s Whorf (1897-1941) started publishing articles in support of Sapir's assertions regarding the relation between worldview and language (Penn, 1972:9). Unlike the work of Von Humboldt and Sapir, Whorf's work regarding the relationship between language and thought are free from contradictions, mainly because he does not refer to a metaphysical level (compare Von Humboldt's Geist and Sapir's "psychic" constitution) in an attempt to explain the origin of language. In fact, Whorf "makes no serious statements about the origin of language" (Penn, 1972:28).

Although Whorf never explicitly asserts that he is hypothesising about the relationship between language and thought, the amount of "evidence" present in his work (as compiled in Language, Thought and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf) suggests that he felt the need to prove his assertions. Also, a lot of assertions were made after a collection of data, e.g. of the Hopi language system.

In his introduction to Whorf's Selected Writings, Chase (1956:vi) extracts two hypotheses from Whorf's work:

---

1 For an in-depth discussion of Sapir's work and his methods see Landar (1966:169-231).
First, that all higher levels of thinking are *dependent* on language.

Second, that the structure of the language one habitually uses *influences* the manner in which one understands his environment. The picture of the universe shifts from tongue to tongue (my emphasis).

Chase arrives at an interpretation of the "Whorfian hypothesis" after considering a large body of Whorf's work. He makes an important distinction in the hypotheses that he extracts from Whorf's work that Penn (1972) seems to have overlooked. Chase identifies a language-thought relationship in his first extracted hypothesis and a language-*Weltanschauung* relationship in his second hypothesis. By not equating *Weltanschauung* with thought, one comes to a clearer understanding of the hypotheses of Von Humboldt, Sapir and Whorf, and one may even see them in a more favourable light. *Weltanschauung* is only one mode of thinking, a way of thinking about, or perceiving, the world. Chase, by using the word "dependent", implies that Whorf takes the extreme position regarding the language-thought relationship. The word "influences" in the above quotation indicates a more cautious stance in terms of the language-*Weltanschauung* relationship. I will now proceed to examine Whorf's assertions regarding the language-*Weltanschauung* relationship.

Regarding his study of Hopi verbs, which do not indicate time or tense, Whorf (1956:55) makes the following remark:

> It is an illustration of how language produces an organisation of experience. We are inclined to think of language simply as a technique of expression, and not to realise that language first of all is a classification and arrangement of the stream of sensory experience which results in a certain world-order, a certain segment of the world that is easily expressible by the type of symbolic means that a language employs.

I interpret the above assertion as meaning that language acts as an instrument or tool in shaping our perception of the world, because it provides a means of *classifying* phenomena that can be perceived in this world. A language also provides a way of expressing the way in which we perceive the world. Each language constitutes a symbolic system that may differ to a small or large degree from another symbolic system. Whorf attempts to show that it is due to the different symbolic systems that the worldview of different language groups vary by referring to the fact that Hopi (a native American language) has no
references, either explicit or implicit, to time, a notion that has traditionally been regarded as universal. Whorf maintains that these "universal" notions (like the notion of time in Indo-European languages, or the notion of hope, or expectation, in Hopi) that exist in a language or a language group reveal something of a people's or a civilisation's philosophy.

Every language contains terms that have come to attain cosmic scope of reference, that crystallize in themselves the basic postulates of an unformulated philosophy, in which is couched the thought of a people, a culture, a civilisation, even of an era (Whorf, 1956:61).

When Whorf examines the Weltanschauung-language relationship he refers to the Weltanschauung of a group, or a people, and not to that of the individual.

The fact that the hypotheses as applied to the relationship between language and thought have two interpretations means that it is assessed in diverse ways in scientific and academic circles. It is possible for instance, to reject the extreme interpretation and to approve of the cautious interpretation: "Those who consider the hypothesis to be 'language determines thought' conclude with invalidating evidence; but those who set out to test the mild hypothesis conclude with possibly supportive evidence" (Penn, 1972:16). After reading the work of Sapir and Whorf, one is tempted to readily accept that language influences worldview, that is, the mild formulation of the linguistic relativity hypothesis. However, the references to the worldview (which should be understood in this context as a set of cultural beliefs) of a cultural group, or linguistic community, indicate that it would be more accurate to say that culture, of which language is an important aspect and a reflection, influences worldview.

Blount (1995:39) provides the following insightful summary of the development of what Harry Hoijer dubbed the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis in 1956:

An idea that dates back well into the nineteenth century, and which underlies the positions taken by Boas and Sapir, is that the patterns, and thus structure, of the language one speaks bears some influential, perhaps causal, relationship to the patterns of one's thoughts.

Blount (1995:39) believes that secondary interpretations of Whorf's work that distinguish a strong (extreme) and a weak (moderate) formulation of the hypothesis are false, and
maintains that "a careful reading of Whorf does not reveal any such distinction, nor does it reveal any claims to determinacy per se". Blount's view will be considered again after the historical development of the hypotheses pertaining to linguistic relativity has been discussed in more detail.

Penn (1972:33) points out that there are also those who maintain that the statements of Whorf and Sapir quoted above are not hypotheses at all, because one element of the relationship being described, namely thought, cannot be observed scientifically. More recent work in philosophy has, however, attempted definitions of thought. For example, Devitt and Sterelny (1987:115-116) regard thoughts as "inner representations", "propositions" or as "a certain attitude to a certain content". Although Devitt and Sterelny (1987:172-182) regard linguistic relativism in an unfavourable light, they acknowledge that thought is essentially "language-like" (i.e. linguistic) in character. A definition of thought in general falls outside the scope of this study. The acknowledgement that human thought (after the acquisition of language) has a linguistic character is sufficient for the purposes of this study.

It has already been mentioned that Blount (1995:39) does not agree with the distinction between the extreme and the cautious interpretation of Whorf's thesis about the relationship between language and worldview. He provides the following alternative interpretation:

Whorf argued that the ontological categories upon which important language distinctions are based, such as tenses and classifiers, are habitually used by speakers and that the habitual use itself predisposes them to see their physical and cultural world through the categories (Blount, 1995:39).

Greenberg (quoted in Penn (1972:14)) emphasises the language-Weltanschauung relationship in his summary of the hypotheses of Sapir and Whorf:

The general notion is that the grammatical categories of a language determine or at least influence strongly the general manner of conceiving the world of those who speak it.²
Two recent theorists, Snell-Hornby (1988) and Bassnett (1996), apply the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis to translation. Whereas Snell-Hornby's interpretation (see above) of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis focuses on the language-thought relationship, Bassnett's interpretation focuses on the language-culture relationship. Bassnett does not commit the fallacy of viewing it as one hypothesis, but still implies that the hypotheses of Whorf and Sapir are more or less the same when she asserts, "Lotman...declares as firmly as Sapir or Whorf that 'No language can exist unless it is steeped in the context of culture; and no culture can exist which does not have at its centre, the structure of natural language'" (1996:14).

It would be a fallacy to reduce the life work of Von Humboldt, Sapir and Whorf to a single hypothesis. Such a hypothesis would always show inconsistencies with other parts of their work, for it was never the intention of these linguists to postulate a single thesis regarding language and its relation to thought. For the purposes of this study the assertions pertaining to the relationship between language and worldview will be employed because it is these assertions that are of specific relevance to translation. It is my contention that a mild formulation of a hypothesis (or rather thesis) regarding the relation between language and worldview, such as the assertions of Von Humboldt, Sapir and Whorf, quoted above, cannot be readily disproved. Whorf's work on the differences between Hopi and Western European languages and worldviews provides some evidence that there is a relationship between language and worldview. This fact has been recognised in recent work in translation theory.3

Without ignoring the original assertions of Von Humboldt, Sapir and Whorf (and the contexts in which they were made) regarding the language-Weltanschauung relationship, the following preliminary reformulation of the various hypotheses can be made.

The **language that a person speaks influences his perception of the world, i.e. his Weltanschauung.**

This statement should be viewed against the background of recent work in the field of societal pragmatics. Mey (1993:300-301) explains the relation between language and

---

2 Bock (1992:248-259) also provides a comprehensive overview of the development of linguistic relativity.

8
worldview in terms of "wording", by which is meant "the process in which humans become aware of their environment, their world, and realise this awareness in the form of language". Mey (1993:301) points out that the process of "wording the world" is based on the interaction between language user and environment, because

... once language is created, once the world has been worded, it influences our ways of looking at the environment. The available wordings shape our perception of our environment: without words, the world remains an unread book, a black box. Wording the world is seeing it, not just looking at it to make sure it's there (my emphasis).

The quotation above is more or less a rewording of the preliminary hypothesis, namely that language influences worldview. However, this is only part of Mey's postulation. The point that Mey (1993:301) really wants to make is that the way in which people "word" the world (through language) and the way in which people perceive the world are interdependent:

... we should understand that the way we deal with the world is dependent on the way we metaphorically structure the world, and that, conversely, the way we see the world as a coherent, metaphorical structure helps us to deal with the world ...

There is, in other words, a dialectical movement from word to world and from world to word. Neither movement is prior to the other, logically; as their ontology both arise at the same time in the history of human development. In particular, as regards the ontogeny of the individual human, the child acquires its language, being exposed to 'wording' at the same time as it begins its 'wording' process; the world is not prior to the word, either ontologically or epistemologically.

Mey's observations have been quoted extensively above, because they illuminate the relation between word and world, and therefore, by implication, between language and worldview.

---

3 In this regard see Snell-Hornby (1988) and Bassnett (1996).
4 Mey's discussion of the "wording" process can be compared to Saeed's discussion of mental representations and concepts (1997:32-37).
5 This quotation also seems to clear up an issue that was characterised by "fuzziness" in early sociolinguistics, namely the question as to what comes first – language or thought. This issue, however, falls outside the scope of this study.
Mey (1993:301) recognises that wording depends on the environmental context in which it takes place and provides the following quotation from Teichler and Frank (1989) to support this view:

... language constructs as well as reflects culture. Language then no longer serves as the transparent vehicle of content or as the simple reflection of reality, but itself participates in how that content and reality are formed, apprehended, expressed and transformed.

The quotation above also supports the hypothesis that language influences worldview. The interdependence between wording and worldview has certain implications for the communication between people. In order to understand each other, interlocutors would have to have an understanding of the "word-and-world context" of the other interlocutors (Mey, 1993:303). Thus, where participants in the communication situation do not share a word-and-world context, for instance due to a significant time-lapse in the transmission and reception of the message (as in the case of many written texts), or the fact that the sender and the receiver belong to different language communities, the receiver needs to acquire an understanding of the "word-and-world" context of the sender in order to fully comprehend the meaning of the message. The application of this view for the translation of literary texts will be explored a little further in 1.4.

Recent theories that support the hypothesis that language influences worldview must be balanced by theories that reject linguistic relativism. Devitt and Sterelny's (1987) work is representative of the theories that reject linguistic relativism. We will consider their objections because they pertain to the relation between language and thought. Devitt and Sterelny (1987:172) summarise Whorf's thesis as "the conjunction of the following claims":

1. All thinking is "in a language -- in English, in Sanskrit, in Chinese" (Whorf, 1956).
2. Each language structures a view of reality.
3. The views of reality structured by languages, or at least by families of languages, differ.

The following comments on the above "claims" reveal Devitt and Sterelny's (1987:173) attitude towards Whorfianism:
There is certainly something to be said for these claims, but nothing to warrant the air of excitement and significance, even mystery, with which Whorf surrounds them. We have already discoursed at length the virtues of 1 [cf. Devitt and Sterelny, 1987:115-119], ... 2 and 3 are vague.

Devitt and Sterelny (1987:173-178) analyse Whorf's assertions regarding language and worldview in terms of the constraints that, on the one hand, vocabulary, and on the other hand, syntax (supposedly) place on the view of reality. Regarding vocabulary, Devitt and Sterelny point out that it is not impossible to think about something for which one does not have a word and that thoughts about concepts for which one does not have a word simply necessitate that a word be created for that concept, which, in turn, makes it easier for others to have thoughts about that concept. This means that language does not restrict thought. The following example illuminates this view:

The number of Eskimo words for snow is legendary; doubtless the contemporary Eskimo thinks thoughts about snow that the typical English speaker does not. This is certainly a sign of the influence of language but not of any prevention or constraint. Nor does there seem to be any incommensurability here. English speakers can catch up with the Eskimo because (we assume) all the Eskimo words for snow can be translated into English. Of course, each Eskimo word is likely to require a complex English phrase, thus discouraging thought. But discouraging is one thing, prevention another (Devitt & Sterelny, 1987:174) (my emphasis).

From the above quotation, it is clear that Devitt and Sterelny acknowledge that language can influence thought. Here thought refers specifically to thoughts about reality and the world (i.e. worldview). Thus, Devitt and Sterelny do not really oppose the hypothesis that language influences worldview. Their objections to Whorfian linguistic relativism is based on certain phrases in Whorf's work which suggest that he held more extreme views regarding the relation between language and thought so that it would appear as if it is possible for language to constrain a person's worldview (Devitt & Sterelny, 1987:173).

Devitt and Sterelny (1987:175-178) maintain that just as the vocabulary of a language cannot be said to constrain worldview, the syntax of a language also cannot be said to constrain worldview. They point out that widely different conceptions of reality can be described in one language, as can be seen in the historical development of philosophy. Devitt and Sterelny recognise that there is a relation between the syntax of a language and worldview, but rather than believing that the syntax of a language determines or constrains
the worldview of its mother-tongue speakers, they postulate that it is actually the speakers' conception of reality that determines the syntactical differences. They discuss this postulation in terms of Whorf's writings on the Hopi language and come to the following conclusion:

... the supposition that we differ from the Hopi in language and thought is quite compatible with the view that we have urged: that thought is ultimately prior to language. On this view the linguistic difference between Hopi and English has arisen from the conceptual difference, not vice versa. Of course once the linguistic difference exists, it will influence the thought of those that come after (Devitt & Sterelny, 1987:177).

So far we have three possibilities concerning the relation between worldview and language, namely

1. Language influences worldview (according to proponents of linguistic relativity, such as Sapir (1949) and Whorf (1956));
2. Language and worldview are interdependent (according to Mey (1993))
3. Worldview (the conception of reality) determines language structures (according to Devitt & Sterelny (1987)).

The diversity of the interpretations of the so-called Sapir-Whorf hypothesis and the magnitude of theoretical work that has been done in response to linguistic relativity indicate that the relation between language and worldview (or language and thought in general) is a controversial matter and that there is little likelihood of the last word being spoken on this subject in the near future. It would therefore be naïve to simply take the so-called Sapir-Whorf hypothesis and apply it "as is" to literary translation, or any area of literary theory or linguistics, for that matter.

This study is an attempt to illustrate some of the implications of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis on literary translation. It is important that these "implications" tie in with recent theoretical responses to the hypothesis and linguistic relativity. The aim of this study is not to doggedly apply the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis to literary translation, but to establish to what extent hypotheses concerning the relation between language and thought, as well as the theories that have emerged in reaction to linguistic relativism during the rest
of the twentieth century, can be employed to illuminate the nature and challenges of literary translation.

For the purposes of this study it will be accepted that language influences worldview, by reason of the role of language in the "wording" process, that is the process in which concepts are formed and named. It will also be accepted that once certain language structures are in place, it will influence further thinking in that language. The interaction between world (environment) and word (language) is also readily acknowledged. I do not agree with Devitt and Sterelny's (1987) premise that thought precedes language. However, the question as to whether language precedes thought or vice versa is not relevant to this study. Suffice it to say that language, as an aspect of culture influences worldview and the worldview, in turn, is manifested in language.

1.2 Defining literature

Before dealing with the notion of the translation of literature, it would be apposite to look briefly at the phenomenon of literature itself. Given the vastness of the field, I have decided to choose a number of prominent critics and to look at their definitional work closely in the process of finding and postulating a working definition of literature for the purpose of this study. I would like to start off with Gray (1975) to provide an outline, and use other critics to fill in and expand this outline, before attempting a definition of my own.

According to Gray (1975:20), the task of defining literature can be approached from two angles, namely a conception of literature as (a kind of) language and a conception of literature as fiction.

Gray (1975:21) quotes an assertion of Wellek and Warren as typical of the linguistic approach to literature: "Language is the material of literature as stone or bronze is of sculpture. ... Language is quite literally the material of the literary artist." However, language as a material does not correspond to stone as a material, because language depends on usage for its existence whereas stone can still exist even if it is not used (Gray, 1975:21). Gray (1975:21-22) asserts that "there is no language apart from the use made of it" and maintains that a literary work, like a poem, is just another instance of language in
use, of what De Saussure means by *la parole*. If one attempts to define literature in terms of language, one is obliged to view literature as a kind of language usage, namely the consciously creative use of language, which has to be distinguished from other uses of language:

A linguistic conception of literature ... logically requires that literary language be differentiated from other language, and this differentiation must obviously add up to a deviation in some way from the prosaic uses of language (Gray, 1975:26).

The Russian Formalists, for example, have long maintained that poetic or literary use of language differs from ordinary use of language.

Gray (1975:230) is strongly opposed to the linguistic definition of literature, because one may find other uses of language in a literary text, and the literary use of language in non-literary texts. Similarly, all instances of language that draw attention to the language itself, i.e. that deviate from ordinary language, do not necessarily constitute literature (Gray, 1975:26). According to Gray (1975:28-29), viewing literature as a special kind of language would excuse literature from being comprehensible or logical, because as long as it employs deviate language, it would be regarded as literature. The focus on the use of language in literature also means that literature is not studied as *literature*, but as language, which entails that literature is subordinate to linguistics, a non-literary discipline, which in turn means that pure literary study becomes impossible (Gray, 1975:36). Gray (1975:37) points out that a linguistic definition of literature implies that literature can be machine-produced:

... if literature is a unique kind of language, then computers can write literature.... If literature is a distortion of language that calls attention to itself and thrusts meaning into the background, a computer can handle that just as well as a person. It might even be that with effort a computer could be programmed to produce a poem possessing metrical regularity. But what a computer cannot be programmed to do is to tell a story.

Gray (1975:45) opts for a definition of literature as fiction, and advocates the study of literature, not as language, but as fiction, thereby criticising the practice of studying a literary work by way of a purely linguistic analysis. For the study of literature as fiction Gray (1975:46) recommends the following *modus operandi*:
... accept that literature is fiction, define it as "the moments of an imagined human activity", as "a world of ... imagination" in which "the statements ... are not literally true". Then show how these statements differ from those that are literally true, how these moments are presented, how they got to the reader or listener, what they mean, and how they function. This is what constitutes the study of literature qua literature ....

In order to arrive at a more specific definition of what literature is, and what it is not, Gray (1975:56) examines a number of works generally acknowledged as literature to derive certain general characteristics of literature. In this examination, Gray (1975:65) only considers works that are verbal and excludes works that are non-verbal, or "more than verbal", such as comic strips. Gray identifies four essential requirements of literature.

Firstly, a work of literature should be a statement (Gray, 1975:66). This entails that it should have a discernible meaning; it must make sense, by which it is assumed that it should be coherent and have structure. According to this criterion, Gray (1975:69-72) asserts that works like Eliot's *The Wasteland* and Joyce's *Finnegan's Wake* cannot be works of literature, because the former is not coherent and the latter is composed in an anti-language that counters "the entire structure of ordinary language". Works like these, according to Gray (ibid.), are the result of a conception of literature as *language*, because they are constructed solely on the principle that poetic language differs from ordinary language.

Secondly, a literary work must create an event by stating "something that has happened, is happening, or will happen", in other words, it must present "what is reputed to occur in some place at some time" (Gray, 1975:73). The event may be as simple as a person speaking, or as complex as an account of the entire life of a person (ibid.).

Thirdly, a literary work should be a moment-by-moment account of an event (Gray, 1975:98). This is what differentiates literary narration from historical narration:

... an event can be stated in two different ways. It can be presented moment-by-moment, with or without transitional summaries, and thus constitute a statement of an event. Or it can be narrated in summary, with little or no moment-by-moment presentation, and thus constitute a statement referring to an event. The first way is characteristic of literature. The second way is characteristic of history – as well as works that purport to be history but may not be (Gray, 1975:100).
Gray (1975:111) acknowledges that it may be difficult to decide when the presentation of an event can be regarded as moment-by-moment, but suggests that speech, more specifically dialogue, is "almost a sure sign" that it is a moment-by-moment account. Although moment-by-momentness is such a vague criterion, Gray (1975:115) regards "moment-by-moment presentation, particularly of utterance" as the *sine qua non* of literature.

One could question the prejudices underlying Gray's (1975) criteria, but he provides a useful distinction between a definition of literature based on fiction and one based on language usage. It is my contention that one could agree in general with a definition of literature as fiction.

Taking this as the point of departure, it is now apposite to investigate other views and definitions. In his explanation of what literature is, Cloete (1984:2,10) warns that one cannot isolate one characteristic that is unique to literature (i.e. an essential characteristic). So, for example, fictionality, a characteristic of literature, may also be applied in its broadest sense to a joke or a lie (Cloete, 1984:10).

Thus, instead of defining literature in terms of an essential characteristic, Cloete (1984) rather asks what literary communication entails. According to Cloete (1984:13), the literary text is a configuration of a multitude of communicative elements (linguistic and narratological), so that one can speak of the total communication system, or the multivalence of a literary text. The author communicates with his reader-public by way of the literary text. Like all communication, literary communication has a social foundation. Due to the creative factors which transcend social factors operative in the mind of the author, the reader-public may not understand the text, so that communication does not fully take place (Cloete, 1984:14). These creative factors give the text its inherent properties as literature (ibid.). Even if the reader does not fully understand the text, the text still has the potential to be understood as a total communication. Cloete (1984:15) warns that viewing literature as social communication may focus too much attention on the author or the reader, thus neglecting the text, the actual communication medium.
Literary communication can be explained in terms of the multivalence of the literary text. The literary text is polygraphic, in other words, composed of various linguistic and conceptual elements that symbolise and communicate simultaneously (Cloete, 1984:16). The linguistic elements include meaning, rhythm, sound, syntax and word quantity (Cloete, 1984:22), whereas the conceptual elements include events (or actions), figures (persons or entities), time, and place (Cloete, 1984:23). Cloete maintains that the different interpretations given to a text at different times need not be attributed to a shift in the taste of the readers, but can be understood in terms of a shift in the insight into the polygraphy of a text (ibid.).

It is important to note that the elements communicate simultaneously or in an integrated way, so that one can also refer to the type of communication found in literature as synthetic, integral or congruent communication (Cloete, 1984:22). The total communication of the literary text can also be regarded as its iconicity, meaning that what the literary text says semantically can also be communicated in one or more of its elements (ibid.). In other words, the communicative elements of the text also convey the semantic content of the text.

Focusing on the principle of total communication through linguistic and conceptual elements, Cloete (1984:25) arrives at the following definition of a literary text:

...it is the communication of events, with or by figures or entities (persons, animals, things), in a specific time and place, stated in various linguistic elements, seen and narrated from a certain perspective, and constructed within a specific tectonics (my translation).

Wellek (1978), in his attempt to explain what literature is, does not formulate a definition of literature, but traces the use of the term literature in its various forms from classical antiquity to the twentieth century. Up to the eighteenth century literature had a very inclusive reference that covered all kinds of writing, such as that on erudition, history, theology, philosophy and natural science (Wellek, 1978:19). The rise of the aesthetics in

---

6 Due to the fact that extensive work has already been done in the area of the conceptual elements and the ways in which these co-communicate in the literary text and due to the fact that these elements usually remain unchanged in translation, they will not be examined in depth in this study. Brink (1987) and Du Plooy (1986) both provide a comprehensive overview of the work done in the field of narratology.
the eighteenth century contributed to the gradual narrowing-down of the application of the term literature. Today literature refers to imaginative literature (Wellek, 1978:19), which would seem to imply that fictionality is a defining property of literature as we know it today.

Hirsch (1978:26) is sceptical of all definitions of literature, because he believes that our knowledge of literature is really too vague to allow us to demarcate the scope of literature: "To define is to mark off boundaries distinguishing what is literature from what is not, but our knowledge of literature has no such defining boundaries" (1978:26). Hirsch (1978:27) advocates that we only look at the "common usage" of the term literature "by educated men" in our attempts to say what literature is. This approach to literature would, according to Hirsch (1978:31), allow us to regard anything that is well-written and valuable as literature, for example, The Origin of the Species. However, if we accept Wellek's assertion that literature currently refers to "imaginative literature", one would have to believe that the "common usage" of the term refers to fiction, and not to all that is well-written and valuable. Indeed, the proponents of post-structuralism focus on fiction as an independent form of discourse. One of the main tasks of post-structuralist theory, according to Pavel (1986:10), is to "tackle again the problem of representation of reality in fiction" and to "respond again to the world-creating powers of imagination and to account for the properties of fictional existence and worlds" (my emphasis). In this study fictionality is also regarded as central in the definition of literature.

Pavel (1986) ponders the ontological status of the things that occur in a fictive world. The reader of a literary (fictional) text knows that the characters and events described therein do not exist outside of the text. Their "reality" (or realness) is only felt when the reader acknowledges their "fictionality" (Pavel, 1986:11). Pavel (1986:11) roughly distinguishes two views on the relation between fiction and reality. The segregationist view regards the content of fictional texts as purely imaginative and without truth value and sees fictional discourse as distinct from ordinary discourse, whereas the integrationist view does not acknowledge a difference between fictional and non-fictional descriptions of reality (Pavel, 1986:11).
Classical segregationism reveals a logocentric view of reality. There can be no existence, but in the actual world. Pavel (1986:16) explains that, according to Bertrand Russell's philosophy, sentences referring to imaginary objects or beings must be false on logical grounds because if one scans the actual universe one would not find the "one and only one entity" being referred to. Thus, Bertrand Russell's philosophy denies non-existent individuals (fictional beings or characters) any ontological status. When one compares fictional entities and statements about them with non-fictional entities and statements about them, one would necessarily conclude that, from a logical point of view, the fictional statements are false or spurious, because they lack denotation in the actual world. Pavel (1986:16) calls this kind of comparison between fiction and non-fiction the external approach and rejects it, because readers do not intuitively distinguish between references to actual beings and references to fictional beings in the fictional text. Pavel (1986:16) opts instead for the internal approach which examines the reader's understanding of fiction: "once they step inside it and more or less lose touch with the non-fictional realm". The internal approach does not distinguish between statements about fictional beings and statements about non-fictional beings:

During the reading of *The Pickwick Papers* does Mr Pickwick appear less real than the sun over Goswell Street? In *War and Peace* is Natasha less actual than Napoleon? Fictional texts enjoy a certain discursive unity, for their readers, the worlds they describe are not necessarily fractured along a fictive/actual line (Pavel, 1986:16).

Pavel rejects the classical segregationist notion that a text is a collection of sentences where the truth value of each sentence is judged separately (ibid.). Literary texts, as well as most other informal collections of sentences, like newspaper articles, possess the property of "global truth", which entails that "their truth as a whole is not recursively definable starting from the truth of the individual sentences that constitute them" (Pavel, 1986:17). He also points out that a text may have more than one level of meaning so that an allegory may contain several "false" sentences and still be experienced as "allegorically true as a whole" (Pavel, 1986:17). He then goes on to distinguish between the micro-truth value of individual sentences and the macro-truth value of large segments of the text or the whole text.
Proponents of the speech act theory of fiction can be regarded as segregationist, because they separate fictional discourse from ordinary discourse, asserting that a literary text "initiates a specific way of speaking or writing, as opposed to factual reporting" (Pavel, 1986:12). The linguistic attitude of the speaker is crucial in determining whether a piece of discourse is regarded as ordinary or fictional (Pavel, 1986:20).

Brown and Steinman (1978) adopt this discursive segregationist attitude in their attempt to define literature. They define imaginative literature simply as "fictional discourse" and then proceed to examine the distinction between fictional and non-fictional discourse in terms of Searle's four categories of speech acts and the rules that govern them. These are summarised as follows:

1. Utterance acts - uttering sentences.
2. Propositional acts - using utterances to refer to things and to predicate properties or relations of them.
3. Illocutionary acts - acts of asserting, questioning...
4. Perlocutionary acts - affecting hearers/readers by performing utterance, propositional or illocutionary acts (Brown & Steinman, 1978:143-144)

Brown and Steinman (1978:147) reject a distinction between fictional and non-fictional discourse in terms of the utterance act, which is governed by the ordinary constitutive rules of grammar, because "though it is easy to think of grammatical features that some fictional discourse, but no non-fictional possesses, no-one has thought of any that all fictional and no non-fictional possesses". Instead they define fictional discourse in terms of the propositional and illocutionary acts, or at least pretences of these. The speaker/writer's intention determines whether the discourse is fictional or not:

[T]o take discourse as fictional is ... to take it as an utterance act that pretends to be, but is not, a propositional act and an illocutionary act as well... the speaker or writer pretends to refer to things, to predicate properties or relations of them, and to perform an illocutionary act, but he does not really do so (Brown & Steinman, 1978:148).

Thus the fictionality of the literary text rests upon the writer's intention to pretend and the reader's recognition of this intention.
Unlike classical segregationism, discursive segregationism, as it is espoused by Brown and Steinman, does not label sentences in a fictional text as logically false, but judges the truth value of the sentences according to the context in which they occur. The speaker/writer (I) and hearer/reader (you) of fictional discourse differs from that of non-fictional discourse. Non-fictional discourse can be said to be situated, meaning that there is one speaker/writer (or a team), a hearer/listener (or a group) and a context providing a body of shared knowledge. Non-fictional discourse depends on this context for correct interpretation (Brown & Steinman, 1978:150). Fictional discourse is not intended or taken as situated discourse. If there is an I or you it refers to a fictive speaker/writer or hearer/reader.

The complex nature of this pretence is described as follows:

What the speaker or writer of a fictional discourse pretends to do is to perform the utterance-propositional-illocutionary act of reporting the speech acts of a fictive speaker or writer to a fictive hearer of reader. What the actual hearer or reader does is to overhear these reported speech acts (Brown & Steinman, 1978:150-151).

Fictional discourse has a layered structure similar to reported non-fictional discourse. Brown and Steinman (1978:151) contend that the distinction between fictional and non-fictional discourse does not mean that a separate set of rules is needed for each, because once the reader has accepted the pretence involved in fictional discourse and entered into the fictional world of discourse, the usual propositional act and illocutionary act rules come into play again. In this way narrators and characters who lie, or violate the rules in another way, can be exposed. Thus, the same speech act constitutive rules pertain to both fictional and non-fictional discourse. However, fictional discourse has the additional rule of pretence-of-reporting, also called the genre-rule (Brown & Steinman, 1978:152). According to Brown and Steinman (1978:153), a fictional world comes into being in a similar manner as a non-fictional world, namely "by inferences that the hearer or reader makes from the text by using relevant knowledge – knowledge of grammatical, propositional-act, and illocutionary-act rules, of genre-rules, of facts, and of empirical laws".

Pavel (1986:25) points out that not all utterances in fiction need be regarded as pretence. Expressions of the author’s wisdom are not pretence, but serious utterances. He uses Searle’s example from Anna Karenina: "Happy families are all happy in the same way,
unhappy families unhappy in their separate, various ways." (ibid.). This kind of utterance should be regarded as a genuine assertion of Tolstoy, and not as fictional.

Pavel (1986:28) claims that one of the most exemplary integrationist theories is that of Meinong which holds that, since every actual object consists of a list of properties, one could say that every list of properties constitutes a corresponding object, whether it exists in actuality or not. This theory does not eliminate fictional beings from the natural realm of being, because "[in] Meinongian systems, every kind of object is equally endowed with being, although not necessarily with existence" (Pavel, 1986:30).

However, in order to fully understand the nature of fictionality, one should not only concern oneself with the ontological status of the entities or objects described by fiction, but also with the realm, or world, in which these entities occur: "Fictionality cannot be understood as an individual feature: It encompasses entire realms of beings. The theory of fiction must thus turn to fictional worlds" (Pavel, 1986:42). This is an important consideration within the ambit of the present study, and is explored a little further below.

The "world" within the text is also what De Beaugrande (1988) focuses on in his attempt to explain what the literary text is. He briefly examines the various ways in which literature has been defined in the past and singles out four possible approaches:

1. Literature consists of language with "distinctive features", in other words, literary language differs from ordinary language.
2. Literature has "special content", in other words, certain texts contain certain ideas (or themes).
3. Literature is fictional.
4. Literature is rhetorical, in other words, composed by various stylistic devices (De Beaugrande, 1988. 7-8).

De Beaugrande (1988:8) suggests that one should take the functional approach and refrain from asking "What is literature?". Instead, one should ask, "What happens when people produce or respond to a literary text?" (ibid.). To a certain extent all of the above definitions of literature are true, but they fail to define literature satisfactorily. De Beaugrande (1988:8), in attempting to solve this dilemma, believes a dominant function of literature, hence a literary text, to be that of alternativity.
Participants in literary communication should be willing to use the text for constituting and contemplating other "worlds" (i.e., configurations of objects and events) besides the accepted "real world" (De Beaugrande, 1988:8).

However, literature's characteristic fictionality (the third approach to literature that De Beaugrande identifies) and its function of alternativity cannot be separated from one another, because the alternative worlds in literary texts are essentially fictional. In order to comprehend how a literary text calls into being a world within the text, one first has to understand the principles of fictionality.

Pavel (1986:44) makes use of Leibniz's notion of "possible world" and a Kripkean model structure to explain the principle of alternativity ("alternativeness") at work in the literary text. He asks that one imagine a set of possible worlds (K), the real world (G) as a member of this set, and a system of links or relations (R) between the worlds. To determine whether one member-world can be regarded as an alternative for another one needs a criterion, a defining property. If two worlds share this chosen criterion, though they may differ in other aspects, they can be regarded as possible alternatives of one another. It is easy to see how the worlds in so-called realist texts can be regarded as possible alternatives to the real world, e.g. the world of Sherlock Holmes is quite possible in terms of the probabilities of the real world:

Seen from this angle, realism is not merely a set of stylistic and narrative conventions, but a fundamental attitude toward the relationship between the actual world and the truth of literary texts. In a realist text the notion of truth and falsity of a literary text and of its details is based upon the notion of possibility (...) with respect to the actual world (Pavel, 1986:47).

The theory of possible worlds, however, leaves one with no explanation concerning literary worlds that do not pose an alternative to reality, for example the completely imaginative worlds of fantasy fiction texts. In this regard, Pavel (1986:51) refers to Plantinga's theory of books about worlds. This theory makes provision for worlds that have no obvious link to reality: "the book on W (any possible world) is the set B of propositions such that P is a member of B if W entails P" (Pavel, 1986:51). This means that each world corresponds

---

7 For a more comprehensive discussion of "possible world semantics" see Gocht (1995:419).
with one and only one book and that book is a complete list of the propositions true in that world. Pavel (1986:51) extends Plantinga's theory by grouping various worlds together in a "universe" and the books about them in a "magnum opus". For the purposes of this study it is not necessary to explore the intricate system of universes that Pavel derives from Plantinga's theory. It is sufficient to recognise that Plantinga's notion of possible worlds and books about them supports the notion that a literary text constitutes an alternative and independent world. The existence of all the entities in that world is derived from propositions made about them in the literary text.

According to Walton (quoted in Pavel, 1986:55) "the central metaphysical issue of the ontological status of fictional entities is the experience of being caught up in a story". Walton explains the nature of fictionality in terms of a game of make-belief that requires the reader's participation, which entails that the reader does not view the world of the text from some point outside of the text, but finds himself in the fictional world "that, for the duration of the game, is taken as real" (Pavel, 1986:55).

Lemon (1969:5), writing much earlier, also recognises the notion of fictional worlds and the participation of the reader when he describes literature as a "vicarious experience" and states that "the imaginative reader can live in worlds attainable in no other way" (my emphasis).

Pavel (1986:57) describes the relationship between a game of make-belief and reality as an isomorphic structure, for "no element in the secondary world of make-belief lacks a correspondent in the primary universe". For example, in a children's game every real-world mud-pie can correspond to a tasty pie in the world of make-belief. From this example it is clear that the relationship between the world in a fictional text and reality is not necessarily isomorphic. Pavel (1986:57) distinguishes between isomorphic and salient structures. In the case of salient structures, which are typically found in literary texts, the world of make-belief does not enter into a one-to-one relation with reality, but "includes entities and states of affairs that lack a correspondent" in reality.

A literary text may include more than one world, where one of the worlds in the text may represent reality more closely than another as "the worlds that mix together in texts may
represent the actual world, but they may be impossible or erratic worlds as well" (Pavel, 1986:62). In *Through the Looking-Glass*, for example, when Alice finds herself in the lounge, playing with the kittens, she is in the fictional world that is closest to reality, what Pavel (1986:61) calls the "actual in the novel". When she passes through the looking-glass, she enters into a fictional world alternative to the previous. The sharp distinction and continual interplay between the "actual" world and a fantastic world in the *Alice* novels indicates that Lewis Carroll, in fact, thematises the salient ontology of fiction.

Van Peer (1991:127) believes that a definition of literature "belongs to the most intricate epistemological problems of literary studies" and rejects the view that literature cannot be defined. In his attempt to provide a descriptive definition of literature, he characterises literature by way of three categories, namely *language*, *text* and *homiletic* forms of communication. Language is the medium of literature ("Without language there can be no literature") and this leads Van Peer (1991:128) to define literature as "a linguistic form of art ... a form of art, the functioning of which is primarily dependent on the use of natural human language as its medium". Van Peer (1991:129) goes on to distinguish between *discourse* (in the narrow sense of the word) where participants verbally interact in the same time/space configuration and *text* which transcends the time and space limits of ordinary discourse:

The most fundamental characteristic of all texts (in contrast to discourse) is their capability of becoming detached from the utterance situation, their transference through time and space, and their subsequent re-introduction into a new utterance situation.

Textuality pertains to both written texts and oral texts, such as folklore, with the main criterion of textuality being the utterance's ability to transcend time and space. However, all writing, not only literature, can be detached from the original utterance situation and introduced into a new situation, which begs the question as to the grounds on which a text can be regarded as literary. Van Peer (1991:132) argues that just as one can distinguish between institutional and homiletic forms of discourse, one can distinguish between institutional and homiletic texts. Schoolbooks belong to the educational institution, prayer books to the religious institution and newspapers to the institution of the press and are therefore institutional texts. Texts such as a love song, a fairy tale or a novel cannot be
categorised in terms of a particular social institution and are therefore homiletic texts. Van Peer (1991:133) postulates that "texts designated as 'literary' are basically homiletic in nature" and goes on to list the characteristics of homiletic texts:

Firstly, homiletical forms of communication refuse any direct contribution to labour. ... Second, homiletical texts are not produced or read in order to fulfil tasks directly linked to the functioning of a particular institution. Third, they are not read to promote the accumulation of material wealth, benefit, or profit. Nor are they used to wield or exert power (...).

Furthermore, homiletic texts make provision for the experience of delight, has the potential to create group solidarity and reveals a contemplative or reflective attitude towards reality. In order for homiletic texts to perform these functions, they must have certain formal qualities (Van Peer, 1991:134-135). The most prominent formal characteristic of homiletic texts, according to Van Peer (1991:136-137), is "the extra attention given to their linguistic structure ... the result is a general elaboration of linguistic form, unparalleled by other text types, except perhaps by those types which have their origin in religious institutions". Texts presented "as if" they were literature, such as a newspaper clipping in the form of a poem, present some problems to the definition of literature, but these problems are spurious when viewed from a pragmatic angle, for "readers will apply their knowledge of literature to non-literary texts when a situation compels them to do so" (Van Peer, 1991:137). This "as if" game is only possible against the background of the reader's existing knowledge of the characteristics of literature, which leads Van Peer (1991:138) to conclude that an objective description of literature is possible. He provides the following descriptive definition of literature:


Gray (1975:21-37) presents a strong and convincing case for rejecting a definition of literature as a unique kind of language that differs from ordinary language. It is also my submission that literary language, as such, does not exist, and that literature should not be defined in terms of a specific type of language or language usage. However, one has to

---

8 Van Peer (1991:132) recognises the role of publishing houses and other bodies promoting literature, but maintains that these "institutional anchorage points" cannot lead to the conclusion that literature is an institution in its own right.
agree with Van Peer (1991:128) that literature is a linguistic form of art, because language is the medium of literature. The language medium may be employed in non-ordinary and non-expected ways, i.e. as a foregrounding device, thereby contributing to the overall meaning-content of the text, or as Cloete (1984) would have it, the multivalence and iconicity of the text. The linguistic elements as communicative elements cannot be disregarded in the description of literature, nor in the interpretation of a specific literary text.

Although a definition of literature as fiction is favoured in this study, it is acknowledged that all that is fiction is not literature. From Wellek (1978) we learn that a definition of literature made today would not be complete without a reference to the fictionality of literature. Brown and Steinman (1978) also focus on the fictionality of literature by regarding literature as fictional discourse. This corresponds to Gray's (1975) view that a definition of literature as something other than fiction is impossible. Although fictionality may not be unique to literature, it is a factor central to the understanding of literature. The recognition and acceptance of the principle of fictionality is essential to the reader's participation in the process of literary communication. The reader enters into a game of make-belief, where he does not continually question the existence of the characters and the world that they inhabit, while he is at the same time aware of their fictionality. De Beaugrande (1988) and Pavel (1986) point out that the literary text constitutes an alternative and fictional world. Cloete's (1984:25) definition of literature is especially useful for the purposes of this study, because it refers to conceptual, or narratological, elements and linguistic elements. This definition of literature in terms of its communicative elements (linguistic and conceptual elements, organisation and perspective) does not contradict De Beaugrande's definition in terms of the function of alternativity. The "world" in the text can only be called into being by these communicative elements – it is simultaneously built by them and described by them. Thus, a comprehensive working definition of literature would have to address the principles of fictionality, alternativity and multivalence. For the purposes of this study, the following working definition of a literary text will be employed:

---

9 In this regard see the discussion of De Beaugrande's model of poetic translation in 2.1.2.
A literary text is a fictional text in which, by means of linguistic and conceptual elements, an alternative world is created.

In this study the focus will fall on the linguistic elements, on the role of language as the medium in which these alternative, fictional worlds are created. This will then be explored for purposes of proving the hypothesis of the study, viz. the fact that the influence of language on worldview has certain significant implications for literary translation.

1.3 Defining translation

The notion of equivalence has been central to the definition of translation for the last fifty years. Jakobson (1959, referred to in Bassnett (1996:14)) distinguishes three types of translation: (1) intralingual translation (rewording within the same language), (2) interlingual translation (translation proper), and (3) intersemiotic translation (transmutation of verbal signs for non-verbal signs). The problem in all three types of translation centres on the notion of equivalence: "while messages may serve as adequate interpretations of code units or messages, there is ordinarily no full equivalence through translation" (Bassnett, 1996:14). Jakobson recognises that full equivalence is impossible, that even synonyms do not entail complete equivalence and concludes that poetic art is therefore technically untranslatable and that "only creative transposition is possible" (Bassnett, 1996:15).

If equivalence is impossible, translation is only an adequate interpretation of an alien code (Bassnet, 1996:15). The fact that a dozen translators will produce a dozen different versions of the same text proves that equivalence in translation "should not be approached as a search for sameness, since sameness cannot even exist between two TL versions of the same text, let alone between the SL and the TL version" (Bassnett, 1996:29).

Snell-Hornby (1988:15) points out that all the linguistically-oriented schools of translation theory build their definitions of translation around the concept of equivalence and quotes the following definitions as examples:

Translation may be defined as follows:

28
The replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL) (Catford, 1965:20).

Translating consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style (Nida & Taber, 1974:12).

Although the concept of equivalence itself was never described, it emerged that what was supposed to be equivalent was the translation unit (Snell-Hornby, 1988:16). The translation unit was generally understood as "a cohesive segment lying between the level of the word and the sentence" (ibid.). According to this view, the source text is seen as a sequence of translation units. This, according to Snell-Hornby (1988:16), meant that translation was regarded as "merely a transcoding process involving the substitution of a sequence of equivalent units". Snell-Hornby's (1988:16) criticism of this approach is aimed at the fact that it is based on a fallacy, namely that there is a degree of symmetry between languages. Snell-Hornby (1988:22) goes on to illustrate that there is no symmetry between languages by comparing the German notion of Äquivalenz to the English notion of equivalence and comes to the conclusion that equivalence is "unsuitable as a basic concept in translation theory".

Bassnett's (1996:2) rendering of the general view of translation shows that assumptions about translation have until very recently been regarded in terms of equivalence on the sentence level:

What is generally understood as translation involves the rendering of the source language (SL) text into the target language (TL) text so as to ensure that (1) the surface meaning of the two will be approximately similar and (2) the structures of

---

10 Compare this to Gile's definition of a Translation Unit as a processing unit (1995:102) and as "a text segment which he or she [the translator] will deal with as a single unit" (1995:101). According to Gile, the Translation Unit may vary in length "from a single word to a whole sentence or more than one sentence..." (ibid.). In this regard also see Newmark's discussion of the unit of translation (1995:54-66).


12 Snell-Hornby summarises the difference between the two concepts as follows:

While Äquivalenz – as a narrow, purpose-specific and rigorously scientific constant – has become increasingly static and one-dimensional, equivalence (leaving aside the TG-influenced concepts of the 1960s) has become increasingly approximative and vague to the point of complete insignificance (1988:21).
the SL will be preserved as closely as possible but not so closely that the TL structures will be seriously distorted.

Bassnett sees this restricted view of translation as the cause of the low status of the translator in comparison to the status of the writer. Oversimplifying the translation process has the result that the creativity of the translator is not recognised:

Translation has been perceived as a secondary activity, as a mechanical rather than creative process, within the competence of anyone with a basic grounding in a language other than their own; in short as a low status occupation (Bassnett, 1996:2).

Translation is not merely a substitution of SL lexical items and sentence structures with TL lexical items and sentence structures:

A translation is not a monistic composition, but an interpenetration and conglomerate of two structures. On the one hand there are semantic content and the formal contour of the original, on the other hand the entire system of aesthetic features bound up with the language of the translation (Levy, quoted in Bassnett, 1996:5-6)

A translation is usually examined and evaluated in terms of the level of equivalence reached between the two structures that Levy mentions. Any attempt at the definition or demarcation of the field of translation studies must refer to the notion of equivalence.

According to Hermans (1991:157), translation has traditionally been defined in terms of equivalence, as "translation meant the replacement, or substitution, of an utterance in one language by a formally or semantically or pragmatically equivalent utterance in another language". Hermans (ibid) objects to the use of the term equivalence, because in a strictly mathematical sense it means "complete irreversibility and interchangeability of the source and target utterances". This is practically impossible in the field of translation and here the term equivalence has come to mean "similarity, or analogy, or correspondence, or 'matching', of a certain kind, to a certain degree and on certain levels only" (ibid.). The usage of the term equivalence in the field of translation leads Hermans to the following question: "If total or maximum equivalence was plainly unattainable, what was the minimum equivalence required for a given text to be regarded as a translation of another text?" (ibid.). Hermans (1991:157-158) finds his answer in Toury’s (1980) theory of
equivalence. According to Hermans (1991:157), Toury does not regard equivalence as a prerequisite of translation, but maintains that any text that is accepted as a translation by a certain cultural community is seen in relation to the original, and this relation is one of equivalence. In this sense equivalence is not used to determine whether a text is a translation or not, but to examine the relation between the source text and the target text. So although Hermans (1991) questions the use of the term equivalence, he cannot get around making use of the term. The notion of equivalence is so deeply imbedded in the field of translation that it has obtained its own frame of reference within the field.

Equivalence does not mean sameness in translation theory, and it is my contention that theorists using this term are well aware of this fact and do not necessarily base their assertions on the fallacy that symmetry between languages exists. The various categories of equivalence mentioned in the work of, for instance, Nida and Taber (1974), Popovic (1976, as discussed in Bassnett (1996:25)) and Newmark (1995) suggest that all these theorists use the term in a qualified manner.

Nida and Taber (1974:12-25) argue for the priority of dynamic equivalence over formal correspondence. Underlying Nida and Taber's (1974:12) theory of equivalence is the notion that the content is privileged over the form: "Translating must aim primarily at "reproducing the message". The goal of "equivalence rather than identity" emphasises the "reproduction of the message rather than the conservation of the form" (Nida & Taber, 1974:12). The reproduction of the message may entail drastic grammatical and lexical adjustments, even the omission of certain phrases to find the "closest natural equivalent" (Nida & Taber, 1974:12). Naturalness means that the translation should not sound like a translation and closeness entails accuracy rather than cultural reinterpretation (Nida & Taber, 1974:13). Formal correspondence places so much emphasis on the reproduction of the form of the message that something of the effect of the message may be lost. Nida and Taber (1974:22) go on to discuss the intelligibility of the translated text: "Such intelligibility is not, however, to be measured merely in terms of whether the words are understandable and the sentences grammatically constructed, but in terms of the total

---

13 It was not possible to obtain this source in the original. However Popovic's categorisation of the types of equivalence (as discussed in Bassnett (1996:25)) is mentioned in this study only to illustrate that the term "equivalence" is mostly used in a qualified manner by translation theorists.
impact the message has on the one who receives it". The impact of a literary text is especially important.

The original message is communicated by a source to the original receptor, or source language reader. The translator is both an original receptor and the source of the target language message. The translation is evaluated in terms of how the receptor of the translated message understands the translation in comparison to how the receptor of the original text understands the original message. Thus, one asks to which extent the impact of the translated message on the receptor of the translation be can regarded as equal to the impact of the original message on the original receiver. The translator of a literary text ultimately tries to reproduce the impact that the original message had on him/her as original receptor. This equivalence of response is what Nida & Taber (1974:24) mean by dynamic equivalence. The response of the target language reader is not only limited to the comprehension of the information conveyed in the message – one must also feel the same impact. Nida & Taber (1974:25) emphasise that one should take the expressive factor into account, "for people should also feel as well as understand what is said". This is especially true for expressive texts, such as literary texts. Nida & Taber (1974:14) offer a useful system of priorities in the translation process to achieve equivalent effect:

1. Contextual consistency has priority over verbal consistency (or word for word concordance).
2. Dynamic equivalence has priority over formal correspondence.
3. The aural (heard form) of language has priority over the written form.
4. Forms that are used by and acceptable to the audience for which a translation is intended have priority over forms that may be traditionally more prestigious.

These priorities clearly indicate that Nida & Taber’s extensive use of the notion of equivalence does not imply that translation is merely a process of substitution.

Neubert (referred to in Bassnett (1996:27)) also offers a system of priorities for translation, but from a semiotic perspective. According to Neubert, translation equivalence is to be regarded as a semiotic category, comprising syntactic, semantic and pragmatic components. Semantic equivalence has priority over syntactic equivalence, and pragmatic equivalence modifies both the other components (ibid.): "Equivalence overall results from the relationship between signs and what they stand for, and the relationship between signs,
what they stand for and those who use them" (ibid.). Again the priorities suggest that translation entails far more than sentence level substitution.

Popovic (quoted in Bassnett (1996:25)) distinguishes four types of equivalence:

1. **Linguistic equivalence**, where word for word translation is possible, because of homogeneity on linguistic level.
2. **Paradigmatic equivalence**, where elements of grammar are equivalent.
3. **Stylistic equivalence**, where the function or meaning is identical.
4. **Textual equivalence**, where the structures of the texts (form and shape) are equivalent.

From the above it is clear that Popovic does not assume that there is always symmetry between languages. Linguistic equivalence, for instance, is only possible where a word in one language refers to the same thing as a word in another language, e.g. *apple* (English) and *appel* (Afrikaans).

Newmark (1995) makes use of the notion of equivalence in his description of translation procedures. For instance, Newmark (1995:83) suggests that in the translation of a culture-specific term, one may make use of a cultural equivalent (e.g. *Abitur* (German) for 'A' Level (British English)), functional equivalent (e.g. *Sejm* rendered as Polish parliament) (ibid.), or the descriptive equivalent where the culture-specific term is explained (Newmark, 1995:83-84).

The notion of equivalence is also closely linked to the age-old debate of literal versus free translation. In Newmark's (1995:45-52) categorisation of translation methods it is shown that methods with a source language emphasis (word-for-word translation, faithful translation, semantic translation) lean towards the literal side, whereas methods with a target language emphasis (adaptation, free translation, idiomatic translation, communicative translation) lean towards the free side.

---

14 Chapter 8 of Newmark's (1995) *A Textbook of Translation* deals with a number of translation procedures, all of which are based to a certain degree on the notion of equivalence. Only the procedures which make explicit use of the notion of equivalence are mentioned here.

15 For a detailed discussion of the various translation methods, see Newmark (1995:45-48).
Equivalence-based definitions of translation are usually regarded as SL-oriented, whereas the more functional approaches and definitions are regarded as TL-oriented. Reiß and Vermeer's definition (translated from the German and quoted by Christiane Nord (1991:32)) of the target text as "an offer of information' about the information supplied by the source text" is central to the functional approach to translation. The function and the purpose (skopos) of the translation (target text) form the point of departure for the construction of the translation. The text, whether it is the source text or the target text, is viewed as a text-in-situation, i.e. the text is seen within the context of the communication between the writer and the reader. It is also the text, and not the word or the sentence that is seen as the unit of translation.

Recent definitions of translation also attempt to account for the mental processes involved in translating. Both Holmes (1988:83-84) and De Beaugrande (1978:28) refer to mental representations of the source text and the target text. Actual interlingual translating takes place when the translator's mental representation of the source text is converted to a mental representation of the target text. From the above description of translation, the following working definition of translation is derived:

Interlingual translation is the process of converting a source language text into a target language text by way of the following steps:

- the translator abstracts a mental representation of the SL text,
- transforms this representation into a mental representation of the target language text, and
- then constructs a concrete TL text.

1.4 The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis and literary translation

In 1.1 of this study it is indicated that the hypotheses of Sapir and Whorf will be loosely interpreted as the postulation that language influences worldview. At this stage it is necessary to point out that in arriving at a "working reformulation" of their hypotheses, it is

---

16 In this regard see the discussion of Nord's model of translation in Chapter Two.
17 See Sections 2.1.1 and 2.1.2.
not my intention to oversimplify the postulations of Sapir and Whorf regarding the relation between language and worldview, or to disregard the rest of their work in the field of linguistics. The thesis that the language one speaks influences one's worldview is accepted for purposes of this study for the following reasons:

1. It cannot be readily disproved, because it is not extreme.
2. A number of theorists writing on linguistic relativism seem to agree that it is possible for language to influence worldview, even if they disagree with extreme linguistic relativism.
3. It is applicable in the field of translation studies, as can be seen from the references thereto in the work of prominent translation theorists.

In 1.2 a literary text is defined as a fictional text in which an alternative world is created through conceptual and linguistic elements. The world in the text comes into being through the interaction between language and imagination. A view or perception of this world will be formed in the minds of the characters in the text (themselves an integral part of the fictional world) and this view will be represented in, *inter alia*, the focalisation in the narrative and the narrator's account of a character's worldview. It would not be unreasonable to say that this worldview will be influenced by the language "spoken" in the textual world, and moreover by the language which constitutes this textual world. It must be remembered that the reader of the literary text brings to the text his own worldview (influenced by his language).

When a literary text is translated the textual world is recreated in a different language. The view or perception of this new textual world will also be influenced by the languages of those who perceive it and by the language in which it is called into being.

1.5 Recapitulation

In this chapter the following was established:

- The language that a person speaks influences his perception of the world, i.e. his worldview and in turn, worldview is reflected in language structures.
• A literary text is a fictional text in which, by means of linguistic and conceptual elements, an alternative world is created.

• Interlingual translation is the process of converting a source language text into a target language text by way of the following steps:
  • the translator abstracts a mental representation of the SL text,
  • transforms this representation into a mental representation of the target language text, and
  • then constructs a concrete TL text

It is my contention that it is justified to apply the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis to literary translation in the light of the fact that a literary text constitutes a textual world. It is because a literary text constitutes a textual world through the medium of language that literary translation requires stronger creative input from the translator.

In the next Chapter I shall attempt to arrive at a method of illustrating what is involved in the creative process of translating. In other words, the process of recreating a textual world in order to ultimately show that the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis has certain implications for literary translation.
CHAPTER 2
METHODOLOGY

They've a temper, some of them—particularly verbs: they're the proudest—adjectives you can do anything with, but not verbs—however, I can manage the whole lot of them!—Humpty Dumpty.

2 Introduction

The main aim of this chapter is to arrive at a method of illustrating (a) that translating is a creative process and (b) that the understanding of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis arrived at in Chapter One has certain implications for literary translation. In this Chapter it will be shown that the translating process can be described by way of translation models.

A brief overview of the field of translation studies and the general types of translation models will be provided before the more extensive discussion of the translation models of De Beaugrande (1978) and Nord (1991) will be attempted. These translation models indicate that the translating process consists on the one hand of reading, and on the other of writing. The translator undertakes a translation-oriented reading of the text. Nord (1991) refers to this type of reading as translation-oriented source text analysis. The discussion of stylistics in 2.2 will show that Mick Short's (1996) brand of literary stylistics is a useful tool in the analysis of the linguistic elements of the source text.

2.1 Translation Studies: Translation models and theoretical approaches

Holmes (1988:70) elects to use translation studies to refer to the discipline that examines the act of translating and the theories surrounding it. An empirical discipline usually has two objectives, namely "to describe particular phenomena in the world of our experience and to establish general principles by means of which they can be explained and predicted" (Hempel, 1967:1, quoted in Holmes, (1988:71)). Holmes (1988:71) postulates two main objectives for translation studies as an empirical discipline:

(1) to describe the phenomena of translating and translation(s) as they manifest themselves in the world of our experience, and (2) to establish general principles by means of which these phenomena can be explained and predicted.
These objectives pertain to pure translation studies, i.e. empirical research, which is to be differentiated from practical application. Holmes (1988:67-80) provides a comprehensive overview of the scope of pure translation studies, which will be used to contextualise the theories and methods of description used in the analyses in Chapters Three and Four of this dissertation.

Pure translation studies can be divided into descriptive translation studies, or translation description, and theoretical translation studies, or translation theory (Holmes, 1988:71). The former corresponds to the first objective, and the latter corresponds to the second objective of translation studies as an empirical discipline.

Translation description may be product-oriented, function-oriented, or process-oriented. Product-oriented translation description concerns itself with describing and comparing existing translations. Function-oriented translation description focuses on the description of the function of the translation in the target language culture at a certain time and place. Process-oriented translation description aims to describe what takes place in the translator's mind "as he creates a new, more or less matching text in another language" (Holmes, 1988:72).

It is my contention that translation description rarely involves only the product, the function or the process. In Chapter Four of this study the translation products, Alice se avonture in Wonderland and Alice deur die spieël will be discussed in terms of solutions to the translation problems identified in the source text analysis in Chapter Three. The identification of translation problems on a linguistic level through source text analysis forms part of the translating process and is an indication of the creativity that will be required of the translator in the production of the target text. The solutions to translation problems and the choices that the translator makes during the translating process are largely determined by what the translator perceives the function of the translation to be. The translation description in this study will be mainly process-oriented, but due cognisance will be taken of the translation product under discussion and its function in the target language culture.
Translation theory aims to develop theories and models (based on the results of descriptive translation studies) to explain and predict "all phenomena falling within the terrain of translating and translation" (Holmes, 1988:73). The existing theories, however, do not cover such a wide scope, and Holmes (1988:73) refers to them as "partial theories" rather than "general theories". Holmes (1988:74-76) provides the following classification of partial translation theories:

(a) Medium-restricted theories  
(b) Area-restricted theories  
(c) Rank-restricted theories  
(d) Text-type-restricted theories  
(e) Time-restricted theories  
(f) Problem-restricted theories

Although the postulation of a translation theory falls outside the scope of this dissertation, Holmes's definition of rank-restricted theories and text-type-restricted theories will be useful as these, as well as more formalised theoretical models, will be employed in the description of the product, the function of the translation and the translation process.

Rank-restricted theories are "theories that deal with discourses or texts as wholes, but concern themselves with lower linguistic ranks or levels" (Holmes, 1988:75). Text linguistics, which will be used as a method of source text analysis, falls into this category. Text-type-restricted theories deal with "the problem of translating specific types or genres of lingual messages" (Holmes, 1988:75). Theories that look specifically at the translation of literary texts, or fictional texts, or narrative texts, fall into this category.

2.1.1 General overview of translation models

The aim of translation models is to describe the process of translation. An overview of the various models of translation that has been presented by translation theorists provides some insight into how views regarding the process of translation developed. Holmes (1988:81-91) provides a comprehensive overview of the historical development of translation models from the early lexical rank model to contemporary models that take the mental conception of the text ("map") into account.¹

¹ Nord (1991:30-35) also provides a discussion of the different types of translation models.
The models developed in the 1950s within the field of machine translation were based on "the notion that texts were strings of words which could, in the main, be translated item by item" (Holmes 1988:82). Nida's sentence-rank model later replaced the lexical-rank model. The sentence-rank model, however, also regarded the text as "a string of units, essentially serial in nature" (Holmes, 1988:82).

Holmes points out that texts are not only serial, but also structural, which entails that translation takes place on two planes: a serial plane, where one translates sentence by sentence, and a structural plane, "on which one abstracts a 'mental conception' of the original text, then uses that mental conception as a kind of general criterion against which to test each sentence during the formulation of the new, translated text" (Holmes, 1988:83). Holmes (1988:83-84) calls the "mental conception" of the text a map and points out that a translation model would have to contain more than one map to adequately represent what takes place during the process of translation. There will at least be a map of the source text and a map of the target text. Holmes (1988:84) introduces three sets of rules that relate to these maps:

1. derivation rules according to which the translator abstracts his map of the source text
2. correspondence (or equivalence) rules according to which the translator develops a map of the target text from the source text map
3. projection rules according to which the translator employs his target text map to formulate the actual target text

From the discussion below it will become clear that De Beaugrande's (1978) presentation of the translation process has much in common with Holmes's translation model.

2.1.2 De Beaugrande's model

De Beaugrande (1978:9) recognises that literary translating should be examined against the background of linguistic factors. However, early structural linguistics, with its focus on rules and predictability and its attempts to study the levels of sound, form and syntax

---

De Beaugrande makes use of the term translating to refer to the activity and translation to refer to the product (or target text). In the discussion of his model these terms will be followed for purposes of clarity.
separately from each other, is inadequate to describe literary translating (ibid.). Translating cannot be examined by way of a mere formal analysis of the constant aspects of language: firstly, because more than one language is concerned, and secondly, because meaning, which is variable, is central to translating (ibid.). Rather, what is needed is "a linguistic model capable of accounting for all the factors of communication through language" (De Beaugrande, 1978:12). Such a model "will not be based on a set of unexceptional rules, but rather on a system of mutually dependent strategies of expression" (ibid.). A pragmatic approach underlies this type of model, because the context of the communication is properly accounted for:

Instead of declaring what an abstract speaker must say under all conditions, we will have to account for what real speakers will probably say in real-life situations under the influence of variable factors such as socio-economic status, education and training, knowledge and beliefs drawn from experience, personal interests and priorities, and the constellation surrounding the act of using language (De Beaugrande, 1978:13).

The earlier pragmatics of Austin, Searle and Grice has expanded to the field of literature and developed into the disciplines of text linguistics and stylistics. De Beaugrande (1978:13) attempts to develop a theory of poetic (literary) translating based on text linguistics and begins by citing the following hypotheses:

a The relevant language unit for translating is not the individual word or the single sentence, but rather the text ...
b Translating should not be studied as a comparing and contrasting of two texts, but as a process of interaction between author, translator and the reader of the translation.
c The interesting factors are therefore not the text features themselves, but underlying strategies of language use as manifested in text features...
d The strategies must be seen in relation to the context of communicating: the use of poetic language in texts represents a special context.
e The act of translating is guided by several sets of strategies which respond to the directives within the text ...

Hypothesis a is in accordance with text linguists' proposition that one should look at the text as a whole. Hypotheses b and d address the notion of literary communication. Hypothesis d also recognises the unique nature of literary language and literary communication. A theory of poetic translating should acknowledge that poetic use of language differs from ordinary use of language (De Beaugrande, 1978:15). Hypotheses c
and e refer to the strategies employed by the participants in the communication process. Underlying these strategies are factors of human competence (De Beaugrande, 1978:7). De Beaugrande (1978:3) makes provision for the competence of the author, the reader and the translator, as well as the strategies that each employs. This theory of literary translating moves away from a comparison of the source text and the target text in isolation, and takes into account "how the texts were produced and how they affect readers" (De Beaugrande, 1978:13). From this model it is clear that the translator first acts as reader of the source text and then as writer of the target text. When reading, the translator forms a mental representation of the source text, which, in turn, gives rise to the translator's mental representation of the target text, which is eventually realised in the target text. De Beaugrande (1978:28) subscribes to the view that the conversion of the actual source text to a mental representation (i.e. reading) is in itself a type of translating and he compares this type of translating to Jakobson's concept of "intersemiotic translation".

De Beaugrande (1978:28-29) summarises the phases of poetic translating as follows:

1. Translating the written text into a mental representation.
2. Collating instances of non-expected usage with possible expected equivalents.
3. Re-arranging smaller or larger sequences according to their communicative content.
4. Collecting and transferring information contained in the context and co-text to the interpretation of problematic elements.
5. Finding goal-language exponents of the overall mental representation obtained in phases 1 through 4.
6. Collating the original text against both the translation under production and the multi-level mental representation.
7. Determining reader responses to the final translation, consulting informants if possible.

Phases 1 to 4 have bearing on the act of reading and phases 5 to 7 on the act of writing. The translator may not be consciously aware of these phases and they need not be "distinct from each other in real time" (De Beaugrande, 1978:29). However, in this study the phases will be examined separately in order to provide a comprehensive overview of the mental activities involved in the process of literary translation. The following discussion is an exposition of the translator's roles of ST reader (2.1.2.1) and TL writer (2.1.2.2) according to De Beaugrande's model.
2.1.2.1 The translator as reader

De Beaugrande (1978:25) dispels the myth that it is the original text written by the original author that is translated by suggesting that the translator as a reader forms a mental representation of the original text and then proceeds to translate, not the original text, but his mental representation of it:

The basis of the act of translating is not the original text, but rather the representation of the text that is eventually generated in the translator's mind.

This mental representation may differ from the original. For instance, the translator may have added components from his own experience, or may have given certain parts more prominence (De Beaugrande, 1978:26). Discrepancies between the original text and the mental representation of the text may explain why equivalence between an original text and its translation had not been achieved. The fact that it is the mental representation of the source text that is translated, is one reason for studying the translating process from the reader's standpoint. De Beaugrande (1978:24) asserts that "the standpoint of the reader opens up numerous insights into the processes of literary communication at large and of poetic translating in particular".

Another reason for examining the reading process is that it sheds lights on the writing process – as conducted by the original author and eventually by the translator-writer. An author first generates a piece of discourse in his mind and evaluates the mental representation thereof before writing it down. As the text grows, more data on which to base an evaluation become available to the author, so that the author may actually "read" and revise his mental representation before writing it down. Therefore, "[t]he ability needed to evaluate the text underway is surely a reading skill" (De Beaugrande, 1978:26).

According to De Beaugrande's (1978:3) model, the reader has reading competence, structuration competence and poetic competence. Each of these will be discussed as they pertain to the translator-reader.

Reading competence refers to the reader's expectations about language and text-types and his expectations within contexts. The notion of text-type should not be confused with the
notion of genre. Text-types are not determined according to conventional categories, such as fact/fiction, or prose/poetry, because most texts contain a mixture of fact and fiction, or a mixture of poetic and prose features. De Beaugrande (1978:16) maintains that texts should be classified on a more pragmatic basis, namely, "the use of language in interaction of writer and reader". Therefore, a text may be fictional if the reader accepts it as such (ibid.). Text-type as a mode of classification differs from the older generic forms of classification, because it does not typify a text on the basis of its formal properties, but on the basis of its communicative context.³

In literary texts language is used in a way that deviates from the ordinary use of language (ibid.). The reader's expectations about ordinary language, which he has formed as a result of his "language experience, knowledge of ordinary grammar and lexicon" and his "habits formed by dealing with these two language components" (De Beaugrande, 1978:17), will assist him in recognising language use that deviates from ordinary language. Such recognition of deviation activates a set of reading strategies.

Structuration is the first reading strategy identified by De Beaugrande (1978:17). Structures, in De Beaugrande's theory of poetic translating, refer to the potential interrelationships between elements (of the language message), and structuration refers to the activation of these structures:

There are very numerous possible structures in any text, but many of these are not "activated" for purposes of understanding the text. The structures which assist the reader in identifying the information to be communicated by the text are usually activated (De Beaugrande, 1978:17).

Structuration competence entails that the reader is able to recognise, by virtue of their similarity or difference, which elements belong together as a structure. De Beaugrande (1978:17) calls structures based on similarity, equivalences and structures based on difference, oppositions. Structuration competence also refers to the ability to recognise the various ways in which poetic language use differs from ordinary language use. De

³ The terms used in genre-based classification, such as fact/fiction, literary/non-literary, prose, poetry, drama and the names of the sub-genres, still prove very useful when discussing literary texts and readers' expectations are still strongly influenced by what they perceive the genre of the text to be. Although text-type will be used throughout this study, because it is less restrictive than genre, the intention is not to reject genre-based classification.
Beaugrande (1978:19) mentions the following four strategies of expression that may be used to overthrow the reader's expectations:

...the insertion of more items than are conventionally used (addition), or the removal of some expected items (reduction). One can employ altogether different items (substitution), or transform items (permutation).

Thus, structuration competence is "the ability to produce or to interpret non-expected use of language by reference to the structures of grammar and meaning in texts" and "the ability to activate language structures for producing and interpreting texts, together with an awareness of relative degrees of ordinariness and expectedness within these processes" (De Beaugrande, 1978:21,22).

Poetic competence is a prerequisite for the reader's ability to form expectations. Poetic competence is broadly defined as the ability to produce and interpret poetic language, and includes structuration competence, as well as factors related to poetic experience, such as knowledge of the language use of a particular author, awareness of the historical context in which the text was produced, and the reader's real-world experience, including his educational training and interests (De Beaugrande, 1978:22-23). Poetic competence is something that the reader acquires through his experience in the reading of poetic texts, and ties in with expectations about poetic texts, expectations about the author, and an awareness of the historical and cultural context of the text (De Beaugrande, 1978:3).

De Beaugrande (1978: Chapters 2-8), in his discussion of the reading process, devotes much space to the poetic use of language and expectations related to language use. The way in which the linguistic features of the text give rise to and/or flaunt expectations is of special importance for this study, because it informs the text-linguistic, translation-oriented source text analysis in Chapter 3 and is central to any text-linguistic reading of a text. It should be noted that De Beaugrande (1978:23) does not speak of poetic language as language for its own sake, but regards poetic language within the context of communication.

It is the non-expected elements in a text that create reading obstacles. When the text fails to fulfil the reader's expectations, the automatic processing of the text is interrupted or
slowed down and more effort and conscious concentration is required of the reader, so that
the unexpected elements are foregrounded (De Beaugrande, 1978:18-19). According to De
Beaugrande (1978:19), "[i]t is this unexpectedness which has been defined as the
prerequisite for literary language by Michael Riffaterre (1959,1960) and Jan Mukarovsky
(1964)". Non-ordinary use of language is one way of creating unexpected elements and as
such it "creates the proper circumstances for slower processing and heightened awareness"
(De Beaugrande, 1978:18).4

Unexpectedness should be understood in the light of context and co-text. Co-text refers to
the combination of items within the text and readers expect to find certain words and
expressions in typical co-texts (De Beaugrande, 1978:19). Context consists of the co-text
plus "the factors relevant to the use of the text by writer and reader" (ibid.). Non-ordinary
use of language may manifest itself in deviation from ordinary grammar and from the
ordinary lexicon of a language (De Beaugrande, 1978:18). In other words, non-ordinary
use of language may entail the use of unexpected linguistic items. However, non-ordinary
use of language may also manifest itself in the use of expected elements, but in unexpected
combinations, i.e. co-texts (De Beaugrande, 1978:19).

It is important to note that non-expectedness does not depend on non-ordinariness in
language use. De Beaugrande (1978:20) explains it as follows:

It is the function of non-expectedness that is significant in the interaction of writer
and reader, and that function may be suited by ordinary and well as non-ordinary
language. For example, a writer may create a context of ordinary language only to
break out of it with sudden non-ordinary usage; the reverse can occur just as well.
In such instances it is the expectations generated by the text itself that are taken as a
basis for non-fulfillment, rather than expectations derived from ordinary language.

When his expectations are disappointed, the reader usually responds by referring to the
ordinary, expected items and by applying the information derived from the expected items
to the unexpected items (De Beaugrande, 1978:20). In other words, the reader gathers
information from the context and co-text and evaluates the unexpected items in the light of
his expectations (De Beaugrande, 1978:21).

4 De Geest (1995:335) points out that the notion of "expectation" is also prominent in "reception
De Beaugrande (1978:34) likens the task of the translator-reader to that of the literary critic who has to try "to investigate whether his or her own responses can claim general validity". This entails that the translator-reader should systematically search for linguistic structures to verify his interpretation. Structuration as a reading strategy is closely linked to what the reader perceives the theme of the text to be and De Beaugrande (1978:74) argues that the discovery of the theme or topic of the text is the strategy of highest priority. The establishment of a theme is essential to a valid interpretation, because an awareness of the theme allows for reliable reader expectations and reduces the number of possible alternative meanings.5

The validity of the translator-reader's responses should also be seen against the background of the distinction between "a reading based predominantly on reader-supplied information" and "a reading based predominantly on text-supplied information" (De Beaugrande, 1978:87). De Beaugrande (1978:87) sees these as two ends of a scale. A single reader would tend to begin in the region of the first end and move toward the latter, because as he progresses into the text, he should gain more text-based information and thus come to depend less on information supplied by himself (ibid.). Varying interpretations of the same text can therefore be ascribed to the extent to which the various readers have progressed on the scale and the extent to which their interpretations are based on text-supplied information. The translator-reader should strive towards a reading based on text-supplied information.

One way of gathering information from the text itself, is an examination of the linguistic features of the text. De Beaugrande (1978:37) advises that the translator-reader should systematically investigate "the way in which an author consistently modifies the ordinary grammar of a language". Instead of trying to derive a set of rules according to which the author makes use of non-ordinary language, the translator-reader should rather try to identify "typical modification procedures" (De Beaugrande, 1978:37,47), that is, typical ways in which the author modifies the grammar of the source language or the morphology of the lexical items.

---

5 The reader should also be aware of the fact that unexpected shifts in the theme may be used as a foregrounding device.
An investigation of the linguistic features of a text will necessarily include a consideration of their significance or their effect on the reader. De Beaugrande (1978:38) distinguishes between the potential meaning of a word and the actual meaning of a word within a particular context. A number of possible meanings may be assigned to an isolated word, but as soon as that word occurs within a given context (which subsumes topic, or theme, and co-text), its meaning potential is reduced and "this reduction controls the expectation of both the sender and the receiver" (De Beaugrande, 1978:39). The meaning potential of a word may also be expanded (e.g. in the case of puns) or altered (as in the case of metaphor) (ibid.).

In general, when an author makes use of non-ordinary or non-expected linguistic features, these features are taken to be significant. The reader perceives that they carry "extra" meaning relevant to the interpretation of the text. When a linguistic item acquires significance within the context in which it occurs, the item is semanticised. However, De Beaugrande (1978:58) warns against over-zealous semanticising of linguistic structures on behalf of the reader when he points out that "not every grammatical structure in a poetic text must itself have a poetic effect on the reader", because that would over-emphasise the formal aspects of the text at the cost of the communicative aspects of the text. De Beaugrande (1978:59) suggests that the reader should limit semanticisation to items that are non-expected or non-ordinary and items that can assume an additional non-banal meaning that is appropriate to the context.

De Beaugrande bases his discussion of the reduction, expansion or alteration of meaning on the notion of semantic "markers" in the sense used by Katz and Fodor (1963). The meaning may be reduced because not all markers are activated, expanded because extra markers are activated, or altered, because markers are replaced. In Chapters Three and Four of this study the reduction of the meaning potential of words will be considered mainly in terms of the interpretation restrictions brought about by the topic and co-text. The focus will fall on the expansion of meaning due to the many instances of word-play that will be examined in the Alice texts.

De Beaugrande's translation of an excerpt from S.J. Schmidt (1968) (quoted in De Beaugrande (1978:58)) sheds some light on the semanticising of grammatical structures as a part of the reading process:

The semantic content of words in poetic language does not stem only from their arrangement in the context, but rather, language devices that are normally not significant or not noticeably so are semanticized, i.e., they can assume a defined or undefined information value that is intentional or accidental.
De Beaugrande's approach to the reading phase is typically text linguistic in that it advocates the construction of a mental representation of the text based on text-supplied information. This type of information is to be found in the linguistic elements of the text.  

2.1.2.2 The translator as writer

It has already been pointed out that the translator as a reader formulates a mental representation of the source text. For the translator-writer, the writing process consists of transposing the source text mental representation to a continuously evolving target text mental representation, which is eventually concretised in the actual translation.

According to De Beaugrande's (1978:27) definition of equivalence as "the property of being able to represent the original text to a foreign reader", the translator will not be able to produce an equivalent text unless he can gauge the response of the potential readers of the translation. It is important to note that De Beaugrande refers to equivalence in terms of the whole text, and not only in terms of minute formal aspects of the text. It is "the text in communication" (De Beaugrande, 1978:91) that is the unit of translation and not the word. "Should the translator be motivated to strive for maximal correspondence between texts, such a plan cannot be realised by proceeding word for word" (ibid.). It is clear that De Beaugrande (1978:91) is an advocate of the top-down (whole text to smaller linguistic units) approach favoured by text-linguists and functionalists, because he suggests that after the translator-writer has established maximum correspondence between the texts, he can "then work backwards toward obtaining some small-scale correspondences after the entire context is established" (my emphasis). According to De Beaugrande (1978:91), such an approach would mean that "non-correspondence of single words" is only a "spurious problem". However, this does not imply that one can simply ignore smaller linguistic units, but that they should be considered within the context of the whole text. Maximum correspondence also entails that linguistic peculiarities in the source text are accounted for in the target text.

Non-ordinary language use in the source text probably justifies the use of non-ordinary language in the target text. However, De Beaugrande (1978:27) cautions that

---

8 For a concise description of text linguistics see De Beaugrande (1995:536-543).
it still does not follow that this non-ordinariness must consist in some artificial
reconstruction of the forms of the original, especially since the foreign reader (who
presumably consulted the translation because of not knowing the source language)
is not likely to appreciate what is being done.

Instead of forcing the grammatical forms of the source language onto the target text, the
translator should rather search for "some interpretable expansion of the goal language" (De
Beaugrande, 1978:27) so that the reader is able to appreciate the non-ordinariness with
reference to his own language experience. The translator-writer should be aware of the
possibilities of the target language to enable him to make decisions about the linguistic
features of the target text. In this regard De Beaugrande (1978:92) refers to Mimic's
(1971) description of style as the result of "the selection of options offered by the
language". The source text sets the parameters within which the translator-writer can make
his choices. As significant qualities, non-expectedness and non-ordinariness, should guide
the translator-writer to make the appropriate linguistic choices in order to satisfactorily
reflect the style of the original.

The fact that the text creates "its own world...an alternate version of reality" which only
corresponds to a certain degree to the reader's "conventional version of reality" has the
implication that the reader attempts to reduce some of the unfamiliar qualities
("undefinedness") of the text, that is, those elements that have no direct basis in the real
world, by supplying "some of the perceptions not presented in the text" (De Beaugrande,
1978:29). To be able to do this, the reader "must actualise the potential of language
elements to refer to things in the real world" (De Beaugrande, 1978:30). It goes without
saying that different readers will process texts differently, because their perceptions of
reality may differ (which would entail that they may perceive the world in the text in
different ways) and because the ways in which they actualise language elements may
differ. However, it is necessary in the discussion of the role of the translator-writer to
mention this obvious point, because it sheds light on a possible pitfall in the translation-
writing process. In his mental representation of the source text, the translator-writer may
already have reduced the undefinedness of the source text by mentally supplying
information based on his experience of his conventional reality and his knowledge of
language structures. De Beaugrande (1978:30) asserts that it is essential to preserve the
meaning potential of a text when translating and extends the following warning to the translator-writer:

As a reader the translator naturally tends to complete the text, filling in gaps or supplying details and responses at appropriate points. There will be a constant danger that the translator will render into the goal language not just the meaning potential of the text, but the translator's own additions and responses. The result is a text deprived of its dynamic aspect, since the reader's role has been filled by the translator.

The "undefinedness" of the text ties in with the author's intention to withhold certain information in his communication with his readers. The author of the text intended that the reader supply this information himself, and although it is appropriate for the translator-reader to supply this information as a reader, the translator-writer must respect the author's intention by "leaving the text undefined and producing a translation with which a foreign reader can interact in a corresponding way" (De Beaugrande, 1978:37).

As I understand it, the "undefinedness" that De Beaugrande refers to is situated mainly in non-ordinary or non'-expected language use, which explains why a thorough analysis of the linguistic elements in the source text is a crucial step in the translating process. Such an analysis will reveal where the author intended more conscious reader participation. The linguistic elements also reflect the SL culture, and therefore an analysis of the linguistic elements also serves to highlight the culture-specific items in the ST.

In order to retain the communicative value, or effect of the text intended by the author, the translator-writer must take the readership into account. The readership does not refer to all target language speakers, but to the "communicative community" who is likely to read the text (De Beaugrande, 1978:100). The translator writer must take into account the poetic competence of this communicative community (ibid.).

---

9 In a narratological text (whether it is fiction or not), the author may manipulate the plot, or other narratological elements, to create this effect of "undefinedness." However, in this dissertation the focus falls on linguistic elements and the preservation of their meaning potential in the target text. I am also of the opinion that the translator-writer is in greater danger of filling in linguistic "gaps" rather than narratological "gaps" (thereby diminishing their effect on the target language readers), because the former is more subtle, whereas the latter is more consciously processed.
It was mentioned earlier that the translator-writer should strive for equivalence on text level, and that the preservation of the gaps intended by the author, the text's "undefinedness", is an important aspect of text-level equivalence. Other aspects to take into account when aiming for text-level equivalence between literary texts are style and the aesthetic properties of the text (De Beaugrande 1978:92) which in turn, are inseparable from the language usage of the text. De Beaugrande (1978:93) also mentions the historicity of the text. The source text and the target text are mostly produced at different stages in history,¹⁰ and may sometimes be historically remote. If this is the case, De Beaugrande (1978:93) advises that the translation be written in the language of the contemporary readers, and that the chief criteria for decisions pertaining to language usage should be "interpretability and presumed response". These criteria are indicative of the importance of the cultural context of the reader in the process of literary communication.

De Beaugrande (1978:101) lists a number of factors that contribute to non-equivalence in order to demonstrate the challenges faced by the translator-writer striving for text-level equivalence. Among the factors pertaining to language systems, the incompatibilities between grammatical systems and the differences in the "segmentation of the accepted reality into language" (De Beaugrande, 1978:101) are mentioned. The polyvalence and polyfunctionality of certain linguistic items, the expansion of the ordinary grammar and lexicon and the non-fulfilment of reader expectations are factors that pertain to the poetic use of language (ibid.). As mentioned earlier, non-equivalence may also be the result of a predominance of reader-based information over text-based information or the addition of omitted information in the transposition from the mental representation to the written mode (De Beaugrande, 1978:101). To overcome problems of equivalence, the translator needs to employ compensatory strategies (De Beaugrande, 1978:101). These strategies will be determined by the specific source and target language systems in which the translator works and the language usage within the specific text.

It goes without saying that the translator should be aware of the differences in the manner of expression, grammatical features and other peculiarities of the source and target

¹⁰ A literary translation is usually initiated once the source text has gained some popularity or has manifested some literary value, although, there is a tendency among Afrikaans writers, such as André P. Brink and Elsa Joubert, to release translations of their texts at the same time or very shortly after the original in order to attain international exposure.
language systems and that he should have a sensitivity for rendering grammatical peculiarities of the source language into the target language.\textsuperscript{11}

The poetic and structuration competence of the translator-writer comes into play when he is faced with problems of equivalence due to the language usage (non-ordinary or non-expected) in the source text. An awareness of the modification procedures typically employed by the original author would guide the translator-writer when making decisions about the style and language usage of the target text.

From the discussion of De Beaugrande's model it is clear that the writing phase of the translating process is based on and determined by the reading phase. This point is also stressed by Nord (1991) as can be seen in the discussion below.

\subsection*{2.1.3 Nord's Model}

Nord's (1991:4) translating model applies to all types of translating and not only to the translating of literary texts. Nord adheres to the functional approach to translating, and thus for her model, the notion of function is "the overriding criterion". The function is derived from the purpose (\textit{skopos}) of the translation:

The function of the target text is not arrived at automatically from an analysis of the source text, but is pragmatically defined by the purpose of the intercultural communication (Nord, 1991:9).

Nord's (1991:32) point of departure is Reiß and Vermeer's (1984) definition of the target text as "an offer of information" about the information supplied by the source text.

\textsuperscript{11} The following serves as an example of a compensatory strategy pertaining to the linguistic peculiarities of the source and target languages: 

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{He was here} would be a mistranslation of the Afrikaans \textit{Hy was mos hier}, because the implication of the word \textit{mos} would be omitted. Instead one could translate it with \textit{He was here, wasn't he?}, or \textit{But he was here} which would be a more adequate rendering of the implication of the Afrikaans sentence. Similarly, the English \textit{He was here, wasn't he?} would be better rendered with \textit{Was hy nie hier nie?} or \textit{Hy was mos hier} than with \textit{Hy was hier, was hy nie?}
  
\end{itemize}

An analysis of the Afrikaans renditions of all the grammatical peculiarities occurring in the texts under discussion is beyond the scope of this study. Grammatical peculiarities of the kind illustrated above will only be mentioned in this study where they are closely linked to instances of non-ordinary or non-expected language usage.
According to Nord (1991:32), "the translator offers information on certain aspects of the ST-in-situation, according to the TT skopos fixed by the initiator".

Nord (1991:7) views the source text and the target text as culture-bound linguistic signs which are determined by the "communicative situation in which they serve to convey a message". In the process of intercultural communication (translating) the following participant roles are identified by Nord (1991:37):

1. Source text producer: the one who actually produces the text.
2. Sender: the one who transmits a text with an intended message.
3. Source text recipients.
4. Initiator of the translation.
5. Translator (target text producer).
6. Target text recipients.

One person may fulfil more than one of the above communicative roles. For example, if the sender writes the text himself without any assistance, he is also the text producer. Similarly the translator or the sender may also be the initiator of the translation. The translator's role is unique in that "he takes part in both the ST situation and the TT situation," because he is both ST recipient and TT producer.

Nord (1991:4) works within the theoretical framework of skopos theory which postulates a concept of translating that is basically functional. Nord (1991:1) emphasises the importance of source text analysis in the translation process, firstly, because it is the only way that the translator can be sure that he has "wholly and correctly" understood the source text, and, secondly, because it will shed light on extra-textual factors (such as the intention of the source text sender and the effect of the source text on its recipients) which the translator needs to take into account. Nord (1991:14) points out that the communicative elements of the text do not only consist of verbal elements, but also of non-verbal elements, such as illustrations.\textsuperscript{12}

As the text is usually not produced within the same situation in which it is received, written communication allows for analysis of the text-function from either the producer's or the

\textsuperscript{12} In this regard also see Nord, C. 1993. Alice Abroad: Translating Descriptions of Non-verbal Communication in Fictional Texts. Paper read at 1993 AILA World Congress.
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recipient's point of view (Nord, 1991:15). From the producer's point of view, one could examine the author's intention. Nord (1991:15) claims that this intention is significant because it "determines the strategies of text production (such as elaboration of the subject matter, choice of stylistic devices or non-verbal elements, etc.)." From the recipient's point of view, the recipient's expectations are taken into account:

The reception of the text depends on the individual expectations of the recipient, which are determined by the situation in which he receives the text, as well as by his social background, his world knowledge, and/or his communicative needs (Nord, 1991:16).

Nord emphasises the importance of the communicative function of the text by asserting that the communicative function determines the strategies of text production:

For the translator this view has two consequences. From a retrospective angle, he tries in his ST analysis to verify this expectation regarding text function, which has been built up by situational clues, or (if there is no extra-textual information about the setting of the text) to correlate the structural features of the ST with possible text functions and thus make inferences about the communicative situation. From a prospective angle, on the other hand, he has to check each ST element as to whether it can fulfil the intended TT function as it stands or whether it has to be adapted, since the structural properties of any target text have to be adjusted to the function it is intended to have for the target-culture recipient (1991:17).

According to Nord (1991:30), models of the translation process are usually two-phased or three-phased. The two-phase model consists of two sequential phases, namely analysis (decoding/comprehension of the source language message) and synthesis (encoding/reconstruction/reformulation of the source language message in the target language). In the three-phase model, transfer operations are inserted between the comprehension and reformulation phases (Nord 1991:31). These transfer operations may be based on "an equivalence relationship between lexical items" or the function of the target text (ibid.). Nord (1991:31) criticises the two-phase model for wrongly suggesting that, because translation is a code-switching operation, a translator only needs source and target language proficiency to fulfil his task. Both the two-phase model and the three-phase model can be regarded as too source-text oriented, because they are based on the assumption that "since the ST has a certain function attached to it which must be transferred to the target situation, it is source text analysis alone that provides the transfer criteria", entailing that a source text will carry its own text-immanent "translating
instructions" (Nord, 1991:32). However, the text function is not contained in the text only, but determined by the communicative situation (ibid.), that is, the extra-textual factors. Therefore, the two-phase and the three-phase models do not adequately account for the function of the source and target texts.

In her model, Nord (1991:32) represents the translating process as four steps, which can be summarised as follows:

1. Analysis of the TT skopos ("those factors that are relevant for the realization of a certain purpose by the TT in a given situation" (ibid.).)
2. Analysis of the source text which consists of analysis of the extra-textual and intra-textual aspects of the text.
3. Identification of the translation-relevant ST elements and decision-making regarding potentially appropriate TL elements in accordance with the intended TT function.
4. Final structuring (synthesis) of a target text that is congruent with the TT skopos.

From Nord's model above it emerges that the determination of the skopos of the target text and an analysis of the source text are crucial to the translating process. It is through source text analysis that the translator is able to identify "those text elements that according to the TT skopos are of particular importance for the production of the target text", in other words, "the translation-relevant ST elements" (Nord, 1991:33). The skopos will determine which elements are translation-relevant and how these elements will be rendered in the target text. In other words, the skopos will influence the final structuring of the target text.

The translator as reader (source text recipient, in Nord's terms) is concerned with source text analysis, which is the second step in the translating process represented above, whereas the translator as writer (target text producer in Nord's terms) is concerned with decision-making regarding the appropriate target language elements and the final structuring of the target text. In both the reading (receiving) and writing (producing) phases of the translating process, the skopos of the target text has to be taken into account.

According to Nord (1991:10), the translator is a special kind of receiver, because he does not read the text for his own purposes, as an ordinary reader would, but "instead of the initiator, or some other recipient who belongs to a target culture". The fact that the translator-reader knows that he will afterwards provide the target culture recipients with "a certain piece of information from or about the source text" by way of a translation,
influences the way in which he will read (ibid.). He will aim for a critical, comprehensive, translation-oriented analysis, and his previous experiences of translation-oriented reading will come into play in each new reading of each new source text:

The professional translator reads every new ST in the light of his experience as a critical recipient and translator. This experience forms a framework into which he integrates the findings of each new ST reception (Nord, 1991:11).

The translator-reader's particular competence will also influence his reading. A critical prerequisite of the translator-reader is a command of the source culture, which would enable him to reconstruct the possible reactions of the ST recipients, which, in turn, is relevant for the production of a functionally adequate TT (Nord, 1991:11).

Nord (1991:36-140) provides a comprehensive method of source text analysis and distinguishes between "extra-textual" ("external") and "intra-textual" ("internal") factors. These factors may be represented as follows:

Who transmits (sender)
to whom (recipient)
what for (sender’s intention)
by which medium
where (place)
when (time)
why (motive)
with what function? (text function)
on what subject matter
what (and what not)
in what order (structuration)
using which non-verbal elements
in which words
in what kind of sentences
in which tone (suprasegmental factors)

The first set of questions refers to the external factors and the second set of questions to the internal factors of source text analysis. The external and internal factors are related. The external factors are analysed before the reading of the text by means of observing the
communicative situation in which the text occurs (Nord, 1991:37). The situation will create certain expectations about the internal factors, which may or may not be fulfilled during the actual reading process. The fulfilment/non-fulfilment of the reader's expectations will have a certain effect on him, so that the question to what effect? entails "a global or holistic concept, which comprises the interdependence or interplay of extra-textual and intra-textual factors" (Nord, 1991:37). The translator may also make conjectures about the situation in which the source text was used (if this information is not available in the text environment) (ibid.). The recognition of the interrelationships between the external and internal source text analysis factors is in keeping with the recursive nature of Nord's "looping model" of the translating process.

2.1.3.1 The extra-textual factors of ST analysis

Although the extra-textual factors are discussed separately, it is important to note that they are interrelated and co-communicative, and that they should not be analysed in isolation. Analysis of the extra-textual factors, which may yield information concurrently, takes place before the source text is read. For example, the time and place of text production may provide information about the author, or the author's intention, and the time of text production may provide information about the motive. However, this does not mean that the extra-textual factors can be examined in a random manner, as Nord (1991:75) explains:

Data and clues about a single factor can be derived from the data and clues obtained about the other factors. This is why the order in which the analytical steps are carried out should not be regarded as being entirely arbitrary... The most important principle, however, is that of recursiveness. This type of analysis is no one-way process, but contains any number of loops, in which expectations are built up, confirmed, or rejected, and where knowledge is gained and extended and understanding constantly modified.

The following extra-textual factors should be taken into account in source text analysis:

---

13 The "answers" to questions are provided here in brackets, because these are the headings under which they are discussed by Nord. The discussion of the external and internal factors of ST analysis in this study will follow a similar pattern.

14 The interdependence of the extra-textual factors can be seen in the checklists which Nord (1991) provides and which are quoted here in footnotes.
(a) Sender

Nord (1991:43) defines the sender as "the person who uses the text in order to convey a certain message to somebody else and/or to produce a certain effect". In the case of a literary text, the author is the sender of the text. The name of the author already carries some information and may invoke some reader expectations about the language usage and themes in his work.

Nord (1991:46) points out that knowledge about the sender is usually culture-specific, and therefore not necessarily shared by the target recipient. She (ibid.) goes on to suggest that whenever a lack of such information may interfere with the target recipient's comprehension of the text, it should be compensated for by additional information in the target text or its environment.\(^\text{15}\)

(b) The sender's intention

The sender's intention refers to what he aims to achieve with the text (Nord, 1991:47), and consists of the function he intends the text to fulfil and the effect he intends to have on the recipients. The actual function the recipients assign to the text and the effect that the text has on the recipients may or may not correspond to the function and effect intended by the author. Where there is a significant difference in the sender's intention and the actual

---

\(^{15}\) Nord (1991:46-47) provides the following checklist of questions for obtaining and confirming information about the sender:

1. Who is the sender of the text?
2. Has the sender written the text himself? (If not who is the text producer?...)
3. What information about the sender (e.g. age, geographical and social origin, education, status, relationship to the subject matter, etc.) can be obtained from the text environment? Is there any other information that is presupposed to be part of the recipient's general background knowledge? Can the sender or any person related to him be asked for more details?
4. What clues as to the characteristics of the sender can be inferred from other situational factors (medium, place, time, motive, function)?
5. What conclusions can be drawn from the data and clues obtained about the sender with regard to
   (a) other extra-textual dimensions (intention, recipient, medium, place, time, occasion, function) and
   (b) the intra-textual features?
function and effect of the text, the translator will have to decide which to preserve. Nord (1991:48) seems to advocate the preservation of the sender's intention by stating that

> [t]he intention of the sender is of special importance to the translator because it determines the structuring of the text with regard to content (subject matter, choice of informative details) and form (e.g. composition, stylistic-rhetorical characteristics, quotations, use of non-verbal elements, etc) ... Even if text function is changed in translation, the translator must not act contrary to the sender's intention (if it can be elicited).

The various types of intention that can be distinguished correspond to the various functions of communication and can be summarised as follows:

1. Referential intention: the sender wants to inform the recipient about something.
2. Expressive intention: the sender wants to tell the recipient something about himself and his attitude towards things.
3. Operative intention: the sender wants to persuade the recipient.
4. Phatic intention: the sender wants only to maintain or establish contact with the recipient (Nord, 1991:49).

The sender of a literary text has an expressive intention.16

(c) Recipient

As the way in which the message is structured is largely determined by assumptions about the recipient's linguistic and world knowledge, the recipient is probably the most important factor in communication:

According to his assessment of the recipients' communicative background, a text producer not only selects the particular elements of the code he is going to use in

---

16 Nord provides the following questions as a means of finding information regarding the sender's intention:

1. Are there any extra-textual or intra-textual statements by the sender as to his intention(s) concerning the text?
2. What intentions are by convention associated with the text-type to which the analysed text can be assigned?
3. What clues as to the sender's intention can be inferred from other situational factors (sender – especially his communicative role - recipient, medium, place, time, and motive)?
4. What conclusions can be drawn from the data and clues obtained about the sender's intention with regard to
   (a) other extra-textual dimensions (recipient, medium, and function) and
   (b) the intra-textual features?
the text, but also cuts or omits altogether any details which he "presupposes" to be known to the recipient, whilst stressing others ... (Nord, 1991:53).

Each text is oriented towards or addresses the "recipients-in-situation" (Nord, 1991:52). The TT recipients differ from the ST recipients because their situations are different and they belong to different cultural and linguistic communities (Nord, 1991:52). The translator must identify the textual elements "which he considers to be determined by the particular recipient-orientation of the source text" and adopt these elements for the TT recipients (Nord, 1991:52).

Information about the recipients may be inferred from the text environment, probable reader expectations, and intra-textual references (Nord, 1991:55).17

(d) Medium

Medium is defined as "the means or vehicle which conveys the text to the reader" (Nord, 1991:56), broadly speaking, speech or writing. The medium of writing normally has the implication that there will be a difference in the time and/or place of text production and text reception. This is certainly the case with a written literary text.18

(e) Time and place

In the case of written texts, the place and time in which the text is produced do not correspond to the place and time of reception. The culture and politics of the country or

17 Nord (1991:56) lists the following questions to help find information about the recipient and his expectations:
1. What information about the recipient can be inferred from the text environment?
2. What can be learned about the recipient from the available information about the sender and his intention?
3. What clues to the ST addressee's expectations, background knowledge etc. can be inferred from other situational factors (medium, place, time, motive, and function)?
4. Is there any information about the reactions of the ST recipient(s) which may influence translation strategies?
5. What conclusions can be drawn from the data and clues obtained about the recipient regarding
(a) other extra-textual dimensions (intention, place, time, and function), and
(b) the intra-textual features?

18 Recent advances in technology have broadened the scope of written media considerably to include electronic texts such as e-mail messages and internet-relayed conversations. The texts discussed in
region in which the text was published at the time of publication need to be taken into account (Nord, 1991:61). The larger the gap in time between text production and text reception, the more likely the comprehension difficulties. Amongst other things, this is due to the fact that language is continually changing:

Every language is subject to constant change in its use and its norms. So the time of text production is, first and foremost, an important pre-signal for the historical state of linguistic development the text presents. This applies not only to language use as such (from the sender's point of view) but also to the historical comprehension of linguistic units (from the recipients' point of view), which is itself bound to a certain period or epoch, since linguistic changes are usually determined by socio-cultural changes (Nord, 1991:63).

(f) Motive

Motive refers to the reason why the text was written and also to the occasion for which a text was produced (Nord, 1991:67). The question of motive is relevant to translation because the translator "has to contrast the motive for ST production with the motive for TT production and find out the impact this contrast has on the transfer decisions" (Nord, 1991:67).

---

Nord (1991:63) provides the following checklist with regard to information about the place of communication:

1. Where was the text produced or transmitted? Is any information on the dimension of space to be found in the text environment? Is any information on space presupposed to be part of the recipient's general background knowledge?
2. What clues as to the dimension of space can be inferred from other situational factors (sender, recipient, medium, motive)?
3. What conclusions can be drawn from the data and clues obtained about the dimension of space as regards
   (a) other extra-textual factors (sender, recipient, medium, motive) and
   (b) intra-textual features?

Nord (1991:67) provides the following checklist with regard to information about the time of communication:

1. When was the text written/published/transmitted? Does the text environment yield any information on the dimension of time? Is any information on the dimension of time presupposed to be part of the recipient's general background knowledge?
2. What clues to the dimension of time can be inferred from the other situational factors (sender, medium, recipient, motive, and text function)?
3. What conclusions can be drawn from the data and clues obtained about the dimension of time as regards
   (a) other extra-textual factors (sender and intention, communicative background of the recipient, possible media, the motive for text production, function), and
   (b) the intra-textual factors?
4. What fundamental problems arise from a possible time lag between ST and TT situation?
1991:69). For the purposes of this study it is not necessary to go into a lengthier discussion of motive in general.20

(g) Text function

Nord (1991:70) defines text function as "the communicative function, or the combination of communicative functions, which a text fulfils in its concrete situation of production/reception" and explains that text function is derived from "the specific configuration of extra-textual factors". Text function, as a certain configuration of extra-textual factors, ties in with the notion of text-type. When certain configurations occur frequently, they acquire conventional forms that constitute text-types. However, the notion of text function and the notion of text-type should not be confused. Nord (1991:70) makes the following distinction:

... a text-type is the textual result of a certain type of communicative action ... the notion of text function is related to the situational aspect of communication, whereas the notion of text-type is related to the structural aspect of the text-in-function.

Nord (1991:71) regards literariness as a text function and goes on to use the special text function of literary texts to illustrate how text function is a result of the particular configuration of situational factors. The author of the literary text is the sender and text producer. As the sender, he has a "special literary intention" which is "not to describe 'reality', but to motivate personal insights about reality by describing an (alternative) fictitious world" (Nord, 1991:71). The recipients of the literary text have certain

---

20 The following questions provided by Nord (1991:69-70) have bearing on motive as a situational factor:

1. Why was the text written or transmitted? Is there any information on the motive of communication to be found in the text environment? Is the recipient expected to be familiar with the motive?
2. Was the text written for a special occasion? Is the text intended to be read or heard more than once or regularly?
3. What clues as to the motive for communication can be inferred from other extra-textual dimensions (sender, intention, recipient, medium, place, time, function)?
4. What conclusions can be drawn from the data and clues obtained about the motive for communication as regards (a) other extra-textual factors (expectations of the recipient, sender and intention), and (b) intra-textual features?
5. What problems can arise from the difference between the motive for ST production and the motive for translation?
expectations based on previous experiences with literary texts (ibid.). As mentioned earlier, the medium of the literary text is usually a written text, which entails that production and reception probably took place at different times and places. According to Nord (1991:71), time, place and motive may not be significant if the communication is intra-cultural, but when the text is translated, these situational factors become significant, because "they convey culture-specific characteristics of both the source and the target situation". It is this configuration of extra-textual factors that causes the text to be regarded as "literary" and the intra-textual features to be interpreted as "literary", and therefore one can say that literariness is a text function, "a pragmatic quality which is assigned to certain texts by the sender and the recipient in a particular communicative situation" (Nord, 1991:71).

Although the functional approach to translating focuses on the prospective function of the target text, and although the target text function will probably differ from the source text function, it is necessary to analyse the function of the source text. Such an analysis would help the translator to decide which target text functions will be compatible with the source text function in order to remain loyal to the intention of the source text sender.21

2.1.3.2 The intra-textual factors of ST analysis

In a sender-oriented analysis there are eight intra-textual features to be considered, namely, subject matter, content, presuppositions, composition (the outward appearance of the text), non-verbal elements (such as the lay-out and illustrations), lexic, sentence structure, and suprasegmental features, such as "tone" (Nord, 1991:80-81). Subject matter, content and presuppositions are categories pertaining to the semantic information in the text, whereas

---

21 Nord (1991:74-75) provides the following checklist of questions relevant to text function:

1. What is the text function intended by the sender? Are there any hints as to the intended function in the text environment, such as text-type designations?
2. What clues as to the function of the text can be inferred from other extra-textual dimensions (motive, medium, recipient, intention)?
3. Are there any indications that the recipient may use the text in a function other than that intended by the sender?
4. What conclusions can be drawn from the data and clues obtained about text function as regards
   (a) other extra-textual dimensions (sender, intention, recipient, medium, time, place, and motive), and
   (b) intra-textual features?
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composition, non-verbal elements, lexic, sentence structure, and suprasegmental features are categories which refer to the style, or gestalt of the text (Nord, 1991:83). Nord (1991:83-84) uses the concept of style in a purely descriptive manner to refer to "the way in which information is presented to the recipient" and "the formal characteristics of a text".

Nord (1991:81) points out that the intra-textual features are interdependent and that their separation is merely a methodological device. The intra-textual features should also be seen in the light of the expectations created by the extra-textual factors. The internal factors of source text analysis will now be discussed separately at the hand of Nord's discussion of these factors.

(a) Subject matter

One reason for analysing the subject matter of the text is to determine whether the subject matter is embedded in a particular cultural context (Nord, 1991:85). This cultural context may be real or fictitious (ranging from realistic to utopian) (ibid.). Titles and headings are one way of eliciting information about the subject matter and these often represent "a kind of thematic programme", especially in scientific texts (Nord, 1991:86). However, in literary texts, titles and chapter headings may be deliberately obscure or misleading in order to foreground them or to manipulate the reader's expectations. Identifying the isotopic levels in the text is another way of eliciting information about the subject matter and this method may be better suited to literary texts. Isotopic features, according to Nord (1991:87), "are semes shared by various lexical items in a text, thus interconnecting the lexical items and forming a kind of chain or line of isotopies throughout the text". Similarly, thematic concepts can be identified in the text and information about the subject matter can be obtained by analysing their density and distribution in the text (Nord, 1991:87). The identification of isotopic levels and patterns of thematic concepts ties in with the coherence of the text. Nord (1991:88) points out that coherence explains the relationships between the elements of the text, but that it does not explain the relationship between the text and the extra-linguistic reality to which it refers. For the recipient to understand the text, he must be able to connect the information verbalised in the text to "some form or manifestation of either reality in general, or of a particular reality", i.e. the
reader must be able to connect new information to his existing knowledge of the world (Nord, 1991:88). Nord (1991:88-89) explains the role of the reader's linguistic competence and world knowledge in understanding the text as follows:

The reader "understands" the content of an utterance by associating the information he has gained from the lexical and syntactical text elements, by means of his linguistic competence, with the knowledge of the world stored in his "horizon" and amalgamating these into a new "whole". He establishes analogies between the new information of the text and the information that is part of his empirical knowledge. Similes and metaphors can facilitate this process. Thus, the principle of combining new information with existing knowledge also applies to fictional texts, even to science fiction.

(b) Content

Content refers to the meaning of the text and deals with how the verbal elements of the text (mainly the lexical items) refer to an extra-linguistic reality – whether it is the real world or a fictitious world (Nord, 1991:90). The verbal elements carry denotative as well as connotative meaning. Connotative meaning can only be analysed in detail on the micro-structure level (lexic, sentence structure and suprasegmental features) and Nord (1991:92) suggests that the reader should only "mark" certain items as "probably connotative" at this stage of content analysis.

During the content analysis the internal situation of the text is also examined. If the internal situation of the text is not identical to the external situation in which the communicative action takes place, the internal situation should be analysed in the same manner as the external situation. A text may also include further embedded situations, which would have to be analysed separately (Nord, 1991:94).

(c) Presupposition

In Nord's (1991:96) model, presupposition means "all the information that the sender expects (= presupposes) to be part of the recipient's 'horizon'". Presuppositions are difficult to detect, because they represent information that is not verbalised. However, the translator-reader should try to identify those pieces of unverbalised information that may be unknown to the target language reader and which may have to be verbalised in the
target text. The first step in the identification of presuppositions is determining to which
culture or "world" the text refers, and here the distinction between factual and fictional
texts is important:

Factual texts claim to make a proposition about reality (as generally accepted in the
culture in question) whereas fictional texts make no such claim – or at least not in
the same way. The difference lies in the relationship between the text and the
(assumed) reality. Fictional texts are, of course, as real as factual texts, and
fictitious information can be contained both in fictional and factual texts (Nord,

The reader classifies the text as fictional or factual according to the concept of reality
prevailing in his culture (Nord, 1991:98). In fictional texts the "world" or situation is
usually described more explicitly than in factual texts, because the sender and receiver of
factual texts share one model of reality (ibid.). A fictional text builds up its own model,
which can refer explicitly to a realistic model, be fictitious but related to some degree to a
realistic model, or be "contrary to the normal truth values of non-fictional utterances"
(ibid.). If the world of the fictional text is linked to, or anchored in, the world of the source
culture, some information about this world will be presupposed and therefore not
verbalised. In this case the translator may need to expand the explicitness of the target
text, to include information not verbalised in the source text. On the other hand, the source
text may be linked to the world of the target language recipient (or a culture with which the
target recipients are familiar) and contain verbalised information for the benefit of the
source recipients which may seem trivial to the target recipients. In this case the translator
may choose to reduce the verbalised information. Both the procedures of "expansion" and
"reduction" (Nord, 1991:98) contain the risk of ruining the "literary charm" (Nord,
1991:99) of the text. Translation problems are less likely if the text refers to a world that is
equally 'distant' to both the ST and the TT recipients (ibid.).

(d) Text composition

For an analysis of the text composition, it is important to consider whether the text is
independent or forms part of a higher rank, such as a trilogy, series, collection, etc.,
whether the macro-structure of the text contains imbedded texts (which may contain
further imbedded texts and have their own macro-structures), whether the macro-structure
is typical of a certain text-type, and how information is presented in the micro-structure of
the text (Nord, 1991:100-107).

(e) Non-verbal elements

According to Nord (1991:108), non-verbal elements are "signs taken from other, non-
linguistic codes" and employed to "supplement, illustrate, disambiguate, or intensify the
message of the text" and to complement verbal communication. Illustrations and font size
and type are examples of non-verbal elements in written texts. Nord (1991:110) points out
that non-verbal elements are culture-specific, and that the translator must establish which
non-verbal elements can be preserved and which non-verbal elements have to be adapted
to suit the target text recipients.

(f) Lexic

Both the external and the internal factors determine the lexic of the text. The subject
matter of the text determines the choice of lexical items in order to form isotopic chains
(Nord, 1991:112). The sender's intention ties in with the style of the text. The choice of
lexical items, in turn, depends largely on the style of the text (Nord, 1991:114). The
external factors of space and time influence the choice of lexic in terms of the deictic
references to the internal situation and references to the situation in which the text was

(g) Sentence structure

Nord (1991:119) points out that "the analysis of sentence structure is not an aim in itself
but must lead to functional interpretation". The translator should be on the look-out for
deviations from syntactic norms and conventions, because these produce stylistic effect.
Nord (1991:119) describes the translator's *modus operandi* as follows:

...the translator has first to find out what kind of deviation is used and how it works
before he can decide, whether or how to "translate" it (in the widest sense of the
word) in the light of the translating instructions.
Suprasegmental features

Nord (1991:120) defines the suprasegmental features of the text as

all those features of text organization which overlap boundaries of any lexical or syntactical segments, sentences, and paragraphs, framing the phonological "gestalt" or specific "tone" of the text.

Spoken texts acquire phonological gestalt by means of tonicity, modulation, variations in pitch and loudness, etc. (Nord, 1991:120). According to Nord (1991:120), written texts that are read silently can also be assumed to have phonological "gestalt". The suprasegmental features conventionally pertaining to spoken texts illuminate the suprasegmental features of written texts. Intonation in spoken texts is used to divide the text into information units, mark the semantic nucleus of the sentence and "disambiguate the various possible meanings of a sentence" (Nord, 1991:121). The suprasegmental features of a written text fulfil the same functions. Nord (1991:124) lists the following ways in which suprasegmental features can be represented in writing:

... the selection of particular words, word order, onomatopoeia, certain features of type face such as italics or spaced words, orthographic deviations (...), quotation marks, underlining, or even – at least where the rules allow a certain latitude – by punctuation.

2.1.4 Snell-Hornby's integrated approach to translation

Snell-Hornby (1988:1) declares her work Translation Studies; An Integrated Approach to be

an attempt to present recently developed concepts and methods, both from translation theory and linguistics, in such a way that they could be usefully employed in the theory, practice and analysis of literary translation.

The text (whether it is the source text or the target text) is not viewed in isolation, but as part of a communicative situation, which, in turn, has certain implications for the analysis of the text:
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... in our concept translation begins with the text-in-situation as an integral part of the cultural background, whereby text-analysis proceeds from the macro-structure of the text to the micro-unit of the word, this being seen, not as an isolatable item, but in its relevance and function within the text. Furthermore, the text cannot be considered as a static specimen of language (...), but essentially as the verbalised expression of an author's intention as understood by the translator as reader, who then recreates this whole for another readership in another culture (Snell-Hornby, 1988:2).

Snell-Hornby (1988:2) presents a stratificational model of translation studies which clearly illustrates her integrationist approach to the discipline. The first stratum represents the conventional areas of translation that, according to Snell-Hornby (ibid.), "have been kept all too separate". The second stratum gives a prototypology of the basic text-types, of which children's literature is one. The third stratum is an exposition of the non-linguistic disciplines which are linked to translation, for instance, knowledge of the socio-cultural background of both the source and target culture, which is essential for all translation, and a background in literary studies and cultural history which is necessary for the translation of literature. The fourth and fifth strata of the models are of particular importance for this study and will therefore be dealt with in more detail.

The fourth level presents "the important aspects and criteria governing the translation process itself" and is divided into three parts (Snell-Hornby, 1988:34). The first part deals with the understanding of the source text, which, apart from knowledge of the source language words and structures, entails "the ability to penetrate the sense of the text, both as a complex multi-dimensional whole and at the same time in its relationship to the cultural background" (ibid.). The second part pertains to the criteria for the envisaged translation, and here the recreation of language dimensions (with texts involving "the creative extension of the language norm") and, in certain cases, the notion of equivalence comes into play. The third part refers to the communicative function of the translation and the shifts of perspective resulting from the recreation of language dimensions (ibid.).

The fifth stratum names those areas of linguistics relevant to translation. These include text linguistics and psycholinguistics ("as regards the interdependence of language, experience and thought" (Snell-Hornby, 1988:35)). The latter ties in with the hypotheses of Sapir and Whorf as in Chapter One of this study. Text linguistics as a tool of source text analysis is discussed from a theoretical point of view in this chapter and practically applied
in Chapter Three of this study. Snell-Hornby (1988: 35, 69) asserts that a text linguistic analysis, as the name implies, should be top-down from the level of the text to the level of the smaller linguistic signs.

The sixth stratum deals with the phonological aspects of the text relevant for translation.

Snell-Hornby (1988:42) points out that the role of the reader is "an essentially active and creative one", which means that the reader does not merely passively "receive" the text, but interacts with it on the grounds of his previous experience and world knowledge and the expectations he harbours as a result of his experience (Snell-Hornby, 1988:42-43).

The concepts of dimension and perspective\(^{22}\) play a role in the reader's understanding of a text. Snell-Hornby (1988:52) uses the term perspective to mean "the viewpoint of the speaker, narrator or reader in terms of culture, attitude, time and place" and maintains that a shift of perspective is inevitable in translation. Dimension refers to the "internal aspects of language" (Snell-Hornby, 1988:52) and concerns "the relationships observable between linguistic structures and devices in the text" (Snell-Hornby, 1988: 54). Wordplay presents a particular challenge to the translator in terms of dimension and perspective:

> The translation strategy lies in identifying and recreating multiple relationships in both cultural association (perspective) and language (dimension), both at the semantic and the phonological level (Snell-Hornby, 1988:53).\(^{23}\)

Perspective becomes a translation problem if the reader is addressed as a member of a specific culture and/or knowledge of a specific culture is presupposed, whereas perspective is not so problematic if the culture referred to in the text is "distant and exotic" for both source and target readers (Snell-Hornby, 1988:54).

The wordplay in the Alice texts will also be analysed in terms of dimension and perspective in Chapter Three of this study.

---

\(^{22}\) See the discussion of the fourth and fifth strata of Snell-Hornby's stratificational model of translation studies.

\(^{23}\) Snell-Hornby, illuminates her explanation of the role of dimension and perspective in translation by way of Enzenberger's German rendering of the Mock Turtle's list of school subjects in *Wonderland*. 71
It has already been pointed out that the translator as reader has the task of analysing the source text. Snell-Hornby (1988:69) argues for a text-linguistic source text analysis, that is to say, a text analysis proceeding from macro- to micro-level, because the text is not "a chain of separate sentences, these themselves a string of grammatical and lexical items", but "a complex, multi-dimensional structure consisting of more than the mere sum of its parts". The following is the *modus operandi* for source text analysis suggested by Snell-Hornby (1988:69):

... the translator's text analysis should begin by *identifying* the text in terms of culture and situation.... The next step is the analysis of the *structure* of the text, proceeding down from the macro-structure to the level of lexical cohesion and including the relationship between the *title* and the main body of the text, and finally *strategies* should be developed for translating the text, based on conclusions reached from the analysis. It is important to stress again that the analysis is not concerned with isolating phenomena or items to study them in depth, but with tracing a web of relationships, the importance of individual items being their relevance and function in the text.

A source text analysis such as the one described above serves not to solve translation problems, but to make the translator aware of possible problems and to guide him in his decisions in the actual translation process (Snell-Hornby, 1988:77).

### 2.2 Stylistics/text linguistics as an analytic tool

It should be pointed out at the outset of this discussion that due cognisance is taken of the fact that literary stylistics and text linguistics are not exactly the same thing. However, a detailed contrasting of the two disciplines falls outside the scope of this study. Instead, the focus will fall on the common ground between the two disciplines, more particularly, that which stylistics have in common with text linguistics.

One of the most important points of departure in text linguistics is that "[t]he text can only be understood and analysed within and in relation to the framework of the communicative act-in-situation" (Nord, 1991:12). Another characteristic of a text-linguistic analysis is that it starts on the level of the text, or macro-structural level, and moves down to the micro-structural level of the linguistic elements, because
the macro-structural meaning of a literary text as a whole, rather than deriving from the micro-structural meanings of sentences and words, defines these partial meanings; and consequently that micro-structural differences in translations, rather than leading to macro-structural differences depend on them (Van der Voort, 1991:66).

Lefevere (1992:8-9) explains why text linguistics is particularly useful for translation theory:

... a sentence is always "somewhat more" than a string of equivalent words, and a text is always "somewhat more" than a string of equivalent sentences.

The unit of translation for text linguistics is no longer the ideal contextless sentence, but the text as such. Text linguistics also sees the text not as an isolated verbal construct, but as an attempt at communication that functions in a certain way in a certain situation or culture and may not work with the same degree of success in another situation or culture. ...

Text linguistics therefore adds a much-needed functional dimension to the analysis of the translation process and the analysis of translated texts. This dimension is of the utmost value for literary translation.

Short's (1996) brand of stylistics shares the basic tenets of text linguistics and will be employed as a framework for the text-linguistic analysis in Chapter Three of this study. Short (1996:1) begins to define stylistics as "an approach to the analysis of (literary) texts using linguistic description". Thus, stylistics covers both the fields of literature and linguistics, so that the stylistician may regard himself as both a critic and a linguist. As a critic, his core task comprises three parts: (1) description (mainly linguistic), (2) interpretation, and (3) evaluation (Short, 1996:3). These three parts logically follow on each other. No evaluation is possible if one has not fully understood the text, and no interpretation is possible if the linguistic information has not been analysed (or described).

The ordinary reader intuitively analyses linguistic structures (Short, 1996:5). For example, the ordinary reader may note, without actually explicitly acknowledging this to himself, that figurative language instead of literal language is used, or that certain sounds are repeated. The critic, on the other hand, should describe the linguistic structures in a text in an explicit and systematic way. Such a detailed linguistic description would guide one in

---

24 In this regard see Roger Sell's (1991) Literary Pragmatics.
deciding on a valid interpretation of the text (Short, 1996:5). Linguistic description is not all that is involved in understanding a text. In a prose text, for example, one should also take into account certain narratological phenomena, such as the development of plot and character. However, according to Short (1996:6), stylisticians do not usually attempt to include the latter in their analyses. They rather concentrate on textual evidence to support their interpretations. In this respect stylistics is an extension of practical criticism (Short, 1996:6). Stylisticians see partiality as a danger in interpretation and attempt to avoid it by making their analyses "as detailed, as systematic and as thorough as possible" (Short, 1996:6). Stylistics differs from more recent approaches to criticism, such as feminism, in that it does not attempt to produce new interpretations of a text:

...stylistic analysis is just as interested, if not more so, in established interpretations as in new ones. This is because we are also profoundly interested in the rules and procedures which we, as readers, intuitively know and apply in order to understand what we read. Thus, stylisticians try to discover, not just what a text means, but also how it comes to mean what it does. And in order to investigate the how it is usually best to start with established, agreed interpretations for a text (Short, 1996:6).

Although readers differ from one another, they arrive at remarkably similar, although not exactly the same, interpretations of a text. The extent of agreement in interpretation is due to the fact that readers have a language in common. They therefore have a shared knowledge of the structure of the language, and also the procedures of inference used to interpret utterances (Short, 1996:7). Whenever the reader comes across an utterance that deviates from the normal paradigm, he infers an appropriate interpretation by making use of linguistic, contextual and general world knowledge (Short, 1996:8). Like narratological phenomena that need to be taken into account, inference indicates that the meaning of a text cannot be derived from a purely linguistic analysis: "The linguistic features in the text do not constitute meaning in themselves; rather they constrain readers from inferring unreasonable meanings and prompt them towards reasonable ones" (Short, 1996:8). Thus, an analysis of the linguistic features may help the reader to arrive at an appropriate interpretation. Short (1996:9) maintains that stylistic analysis is a valuable interpretative tool because

Besides helping you to acquire an explicit and rational basis for deciding between interpretations, [it] should also help you to become more consciously aware of the processes of interpretations which you use in order to get to grips with the texts you read.

Foregrounded parts of a text are usually those parts that do not conform to norms and expectations. Deviation from linguistic (and non-linguistic) norms causes the part of the text in which the deviation occurs to become perceptually prominent (Short, 1996:11-12). The foregrounding of a part of the text may also be due to linguistic parallelism, usually manifested in the repetition of grammatical structures or sounds. Parallel structures are not only perceptually prominent, they also "invite the reader to search for connections between the parallel structures" (Short, 1996:14). Deviation and parallelism may occur on any of the following linguistic levels: phonetic, graphological, metrical, morphological, syntactic, lexical, discoursal, semantic, and pragmatic (Short, 1996:34).

Short (1996:257) identifies three levels of discourse in the novel, namely, the author-reader level, the narrator-narratee level and the character-character level. Discoursal deviation occurs when the rules governing a certain discourse level are broken or bent, or where the rules pertaining to one communication situation are imposed on another.

Short (1996:43) defines semantic deviation as "meaning relations which are logically inconsistent or paradoxical in some way". For the purposes of the analysis of the Alice texts in Chapter Three, semantic deviation will include all instances where a word or expression means something different to what it usually means. Any deviation from the grammatical rules of the language constitutes grammatical deviation. In English, grammatical deviation is most commonly manifested in word-order changes (Short, 1996:47). Grammatical deviation and parallelism are often linked to the meaning of a sentence which allows one to speak of semantico-syntactic deviation.

Short (1996:45) mentions neologisms and functional conversion (where a word is converted from one grammatical class to another) as the most obvious examples of lexical deviation. Carroll's nonsense words and portmanteau words may be regarded as neologisms.
Riffaterre (1983:62) distinguishes between literary neologisms and neologisms in everyday language:

The latter are coined to express a new referent or signified, and their use depends, therefore on a relation between words and things – which is to say, on linguistic factors. They are first and foremost the bearers of a new meaning, and are not necessarily perceived to be unusual forms. A literary neologism, by contrast, is always perceived as an anomaly, and is employed precisely because of that anomaly.

Riffaterre (ibid.) goes on to argue that this anomalous word interrupts the "automatism of perception" and focuses the reader's attention on the form of the message.

According to Short (1996:51), deviation at morphological level occurs when a morpheme is used in a way that it is not usually used, for example, if one adds a morpheme to a word that it is not normally added to. Because the irregular use of a morpheme will constitute a new (albeit anomalous) word, morphological deviation is regarded as a form of neologism, so that one can speak of lexico-morphological deviation. Lexical distortion as a parodying device will also be regarded as lexico-morphological deviation.

Graphological deviation occurs where part of the written text deviates in appearance from the rest of the text.

Short's (1996) categories of linguistic deviation will form the framework of the analysis of the instances of linguistic deviation and parallelism in the Alice texts in Chapter Three. The following categories of linguistic deviation will be used in Chapter Three:

- Discoursal deviation
- Semantico-syntactic deviation
- Lexico-morphological deviation
- Grammatical deviation
- Graphological deviation
2.3 By way of recapitulation: a methodology for ST analysis and TT evaluation derived from translation studies and text linguistics

In Chapters Three and Four the mental activities involved in translating will be discussed and illustrated in practical terms by way of an analysis of "Alice's Adventures in Wonderland" and "Through the Looking-Glass and What Alice Found There" by Lewis Carroll, as well as an evaluative comparison of these texts and their Afrikaans translations by André Brink.

"Wonderland" and "Looking-Glass" are accepted as literary texts, and therefore the working definition of a literary text established in Chapter One applies to these texts. In both "Wonderland" and "Looking-Glass" a textual world is called into being through the medium of language. These textual worlds, in turn, contain imbedded narratives, each constituting its own textual world through the medium of language.

Broadly speaking, the object of Chapter Three is to show how language and linguistic devices can be employed to construct a textual world, and the objective of Chapter Four is to show how this textual world is reconstructed in another language. It has already been suggested that Chapters Three and Four cannot be an exhaustive account of how each textual world is constructed through the medium of language. In the first place, it was decided not to include a discussion of the conceptual elements of the text, i.e. narratological elements, such as events, time, place, and figure (character), as these will remain more or less the same in a translation (unless a radical TL culture-oriented adaptation is attempted). Instead the focus will fall on the linguistic elements of the text.

The format of the discussion of the linguistic elements in Chapters Three and Four is based on De Beaugrande and Nord's models of translation and Short's stylistics (2.1 and 2.2 above). The discussion of theoretical approaches to translation in 2.1 clearly indicates that the text cannot be viewed in isolation. The text should always be viewed within the context of the communicative situation in which it functions. In other words, certain extratextual factors need to be taken into account in the interpretation of the text.
In De Beaugrande's model, the translator first acts as reader of the ST and then as writer of the TT. Chapter Three will address the role of the translator as reader and Chapter Four will address the role of the translator as writer.

The reading process involves translation-oriented ST analysis. Nord's model of source text analysis will be applied in Chapter Three to shed light on what is involved in a translation-oriented reading. Nord (1991) distinguishes between extra-textual and intra-textual factors of ST analysis. A discussion of the extra-textual factors according to Nord's model (cf. 2.1.3.1) is sufficient to cover the communicative context of the ST. In the discussion of the intra-textual factors of ST analysis a distinction is made between factors pertaining to the semantic information in the text and factors pertaining to the style of the text. The factors pertaining to semantic information will be discussed in terms of Nord's (1991) model (cf. 2.1.3.2). However, in the discussion of the factors pertaining to style, I will deviate from Nord's (ibid.) division and make use of Short's (1996) categories of linguistic deviation (cf. 2.2), not because of any shortcomings in Nord's model, but because Short's categorisation of the types of linguistic deviation proves a more effective way of systematically presenting the translation-relevant aspects of style in the Alice texts, because linguistic deviation is such a prominent aspect of the style of these texts.

Snell-Hornby's (1988:69) modus operandi for source text analysis as quoted above under 2.1.4 will serve as a general guideline in the next two Chapters.