Abstract

This thesis explores one L1 and one L2 translation of Erlend Loe's two novels *Naiv. Super.* and *Doppler*, with particular attention to style. The purpose of this is to illustrate how the retention of style and the degree of foreignization and domestication varies according to whether the translators are translating into their L1 or their L2. Due to factors like the translator's integrated bias towards their native culture, L2 translation can be expected to be more foreignizing and more faithful to style. Research was carried out in the form of identifying stylistic traits, procedures used to translate these, as formulated in 1958 by Vinay and Darbelnet (31-40), and finally determining to what degree these procedures were foreignizing or domesticating. It was concluded that the L2 translation was more foreignizing and that the L1 translation was more domesticating. Furthermore, it was discovered that the L2 translator tended to preserve style to a greater extent, whereas the L1 translators tended to standardise certain stylistic elements. The new light thus shed on L2 translation suggests that this practice might be an adequate resistance towards the Anglo-American cultural and linguistic hegemony.

Acknowledgements

First of all, I am very grateful to my supervisor Annjo Klungervik Greenall, who has taught me so much about translation and academic writing. I would like to thank her for creative and academic input, commitment, patience and constructive comments.

I am also much appreciative towards Tor Ketil Solberg, the translator of *Naiv. Super.* and Don Bartlett and Don Shaw, the translators of *Doppler*, who kindly shared their thoughts on their respective translations.

 I would also like to thank John Brumo and Anne Berit Lyngstad for guiding me towards useful sources regarding Loe's style.

For painstaking proofreading of my thesis, a big thank you is due to my sister Lone Sunnset-Taule. All remaining errors are my own.

Last, but not at all least, my family and friends deserve a big thank you for supporting me through the process, for providing much needed time off, but also for giving me space when I needed it. Not least, they deserve a medal for putting up with my one-sided conversations about my project.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Theme and background

This study explores and compares the translation of style in Erlend Loe's two novels *Naiv. Super.* (ST1)[1] (1996) and *Doppler* (ST2) (2004). The translation of the former is carried out by Tor Ketil Solberg, whose first language is Norwegian; while the latter is jointly translated by Don Bartlett and Don Shaw, who have English as their first language.[2]

These two novels, particularly ST1, demonstrate a highly individual style that might be difficult for a translator to recreate. ST1 describes the main character's existential crisis in which he leaves university and moves into his brothers flat where he spends his time trying to comprehend the complexities of life, time and the universe by engaging in conversely uncomplicated activities like repeatedly knocking down the pegs of a children's pound-a-peg. Complex thoughts are described in a highly laconic and simple language and are supplemented by unconventional layout and text elements like lists, e-mails and postcards. On a surface level, therefore, translating ST1 might seem an easy task, but the novel still includes complexities, like allusions, that could cramp a translatorial process. ST2, for its part, tells the story of Doppler, who leaves his family to live in the woods. On his quest to escape the constraints of conformity, he befriends the elk cub Bongo. ST2 is more conventional regarding style, but has many interesting idiosyncrasies not apparent at first glance, like personification.

Even though commentators often draw attention to Loe's simple language (Andrine Pollen 15), particularly the short sentences (Eirik Vassenden 80), and his (in)famous lists (Wera Birgitte Holst 76), no scholar has, to my knowledge, set out to identify and categorise the stylistic traits in Loe's novels in a systematic way. Studies on stylistics are, according to Paul Simpson, "flourishing" and useful in "language learning" (2), which makes a study analysing Loe's style in an of itself an undertaking worth pursuing. In addition, nothing has been said about the *translation* of Loe's style. Jean Boase-Beier notes a shortage on the study of the translation of style (1), but points out that the study of style is expanding to include

---

[1] The term 'ST1' (source text one) stands for *Naiv. Super.*, while 'ST2' stands for *Doppler*.
[2] The translator of *Naiv. Super.* will be labelled the ST1 translator, while the two translators of *Doppler* will be labelled the ST2 translators.

subjects like "voice, otherness [and] foreignization" (2). Exploring the stylistic divergences between two translations of Loe and their respective originals with particular focus on foreignization and domestication[3] could reflect something about how Loe's style is rendered in a translation and contribute to the study of style in translation. Furthermore, it can lead to new discoveries about the source texts, because, as Tim Parks points out, "much can be learnt about a work of literature by considering the problems involved in its translation" (vii).

The intention of this study is, however, threefold: 1) it has the purpose of identifying the most prominent stylistic traits in ST1 and ST2, 2) it seeks to establish whether style is preserved and/or whether foreignization or domestication is the overall translation strategy, and 3) whether there are differences between the L1 and L2 translators in respect to the choices made. This will, in turn, indicate if either of the translators is more prone to either foreignize or domesticate. The differences and similarities in procedural trends in TT1 and TT2 will be explored by utilising Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet's 1958's framework, originally meant for stylistic comparison between English and French. It will later be discussed which of Vinay and Darbelnet's procedures lean more towards foreignization or domestication (as discussed by Venuti) and which procedures are used by which of the translators.

1.2   Research question and hypothesis

Whether a translation turns out foreignizing or domesticating can, according to theorists like Kinga Klaudy, vary depending on the status of the languages translated from or into (43) (see also Toury 271; Even-Zohar 200, 201). A translation from a minor to a major language is allegedly more domesticating than vice versa and can, according to Klaudy, be attributed to "the limited knowledge of the target audience about the source culture, [which prompts] the translator … to make an extra effort to be understood" (43). This effort to clarify what might be obscure to the target reader can erase source culture-specific elements and possibly features of style from the source text. As Norwegian is a minor language, compared to

---

[3] Lawrence Venuti's definition of fluency in a domesticating translation, reads as follows: "[a] fluent translation is immediately recognizable and intelligible, "familiarised," domesticated, not "disconcerting[ly]" foreign, capable of giving the reader unobstructed "access to great thoughts," to what is present in the original" (*Invisibility* 5). A foreignizing translation, on the other hand, is neither fluent nor "transparent" (ibid., 28), and is Venuti's preferred approach in "[resisting] ethnocentrism and racism, cultural narcissism and imperialism, in the interest of democratic geopolitical relations" (ibid., 16).

English, one can expect both TT1 and TT2 to have a domesticating effect, thus reinforcing what Venuti describes as "a complacency in British and American relations with cultural others … that can be described – without too much exaggeration – as imperialistic abroad and xenophobic at home" (*Invisibility* 13). I want to see if this trend is upheld or changed if one takes the translator's language backgrounds into consideration and to see if L2 translators are more prone to resisting such values. The main research question in this study is therefore as follows: does the retention of style and the degree of foreignization and domestication differ between TT1 and TT2 and does this relate to the translator's differing language backgrounds?[4]

Scholars confirm that L1 translation is the preferred norm (Newmark 26; Campbell 57; Barslund 148). Some call for a re-evaluation of this trend and underline the growing importance of L2 translation in an increasingly monolingual English-speaking world (Campbell 57; Pokorn 27). Shedding some much needed light on L2 translation will hopefully add to this discussion. Based on this, one can expect both TT1 and TT2 to lean more towards domestication. However, when the dimension of translator's language background is added to the equation, we might be lead to expect certain irregularities in this pattern. An L2 translator, who is integrated in the source culture, is arguably more invested in displaying his or her own source culture in a translation, which could lead to a more foreignizing translation. L2 translation could therefore be a tool with which to resist the English cultural hegemony. On the other hand, an L1 translator might not have such an integrated bias and objective and is perhaps more interested in merely explaining or adapting the source text to the target readers, which in turn could lead to domestication. At this point, therefore, I suspect that TT1, which is an L2 translation, will preserve style to a greater extent and be more foreignizing, while TT2, which is an L1 translation, will give less precedence to style and be more domesticating.

1.3   Outline of thesis

As this study investigates translation of style, it begins with a brief summary of the field of stylistics to create a backdrop for the analysis and discussion. Chapter 2 therefore serves to describe the study of stylistics as seen in connection with translation. Additionally, research

---

[4] When I discuss translation into one's first language in a general sense, I will use the term 'L1 translation', while 'L2 translation' denotes the opposite, namely translation into ones second language.

on L1 versus L2 translation will be presented. This chapter outlines the theoretical background of my research question and hypothesis.

Chapter 3 deals with the methodological choices and characteristics of this study. It discusses such things as my comparative approach and the process of interviewing translators. Furthermore, it offers a description of Vinay and Darbelnet's framework, seen in relation to domestication and foreignization, which will be used to categorise observed stylistic traits in the source and target texts in the subsequent analysis.

The analysis in chapter 4 is an account of the data I have collected, which comprises of observed stylistic traits from the source and target texts. The analysis provides a structured overview of examples as well as the most prominent trends regarding the preservation of style, translation procedures and the degree of foreignization or domestication resulting from the use of these.

Chapter 5 contains my discussion of the main findings from my analysis. Examples of the more important findings are the greatly foreignizing handwritten explanations of borrowed Norwegian swear words in TT1 and, what I have chosen to call, Loe-esque expressions that are are translated with more standard English expressions in TT2.

In Chapter 6 I sum up my thesis, evaluate my hypothesis and offer suggestions for further research. I conclude that my hypothesis can be partly confirmed, but that TT1 is more often than not merely exoticizing, rather than foreignizing (see Venuti 160).

Chapter 2

Theoretical background: Style and translation

This chapter will deal with literary style, and its relation to translation. Firstly, attention will be given to the general field of stylistics. Following this, a selection of stylistic elements in Erlend Loe's novels *Naiv. Super.* and *Doppler*, noted by various commentators and myself will be presented. Lastly, I will focus on challenges and advice connected to L2 translation of such stylistic traits.

2.1   What is stylistics?

Although there have been conversations about style since the time of classical rhetoric (Jeffries and McIntyre 1), it was not recognised as an important part of the interdisciplinary study of linguistics and literature until the 1960s, with Russian formalism and Roman Jakobson in the vanguard (Beier 7). In his 1958 paper "Linguistics and poetics," Jakobson argues for the "poetic function of language", and that the poetic and linguistic fields of study should therefore not be separated (54). Since then, the study of stylistics has gained ground (Simpson 2) and, as of 2014, stylistics is defined as

> a method of textual interpretation in which primacy of place is assigned to language. The reason why language is so important to stylisticians is because the various forms, patterns and levels that constitute linguistic structure are an important index of the function of the text. The text's functional significance as discourse acts in turn to its interpretation (Simpson 3).

On the basis of this, one can assert that stylistics is the study of linguistic signs through which interpretation is sought. Accordingly, stylistic elements illuminate the subject matter of a text. A similar view is advocated by translation scholar Joan Boase-Beier who argues that stylistic analysis uncovers "how texts have the effects they have and why they are understood in the way they are, by uncovering views, stances and states of mind not immediately obvious without such analysis" (29).

2.2   Defamiliarization

One way to uncover such perspectives is to look for "defamiliarization," a term of interest to the formalist school, which is defined as the necessary "strange[ness]" that makes art visibly different from reality (Morson 216). Defamiliarization is a common ingredient in many

stylistic features, especially regarding Loe, which is why I will be returning to this term frequently. Developed by Viktor Shklovsky (1925), the term points to the operation where new defamiliarizing textual elements continually substitute those that have grown "familiar"; this enables the audience to "treat [things] as if we were seeing them for he first time" (ibid., 216- 218). Exemplifying defamiliarization in Loe's novels is his repeated use of 'ugjerne' an uncommon word whose more familiar version would be 'motvillig'. Defamiliarization also happens through "foregrounding", which, in turn, "is achieved by either linguistic **deviation** or linguistic **parallelism** [emphasis in the original]" (Jeffries and McIntyre 31). 'Deviation' denotes textual features that represent "*irregularity* in language", like Loe's manipulation of familiar expressions, while 'parallelism' is an "*unexpected* regularity" in the language of a text, like the uncomplicated syntax in ST1 [emphasis in the original] (ibid., 32).

Based on Venuti's claim that the intention of translation is to "bring back a cultural other as the recognizable, the familiar, even the same" (*Invisibility* 14), one can suppose that many translations are less defamiliarizing than their originals, since many are "familiari[sed]" (Morson 216), that is, they are less deviating from normal prose than their originals. Thus, it seems that the terms 'defamiliarization' and 'foreignization' have some affinity. A foreignizing translation would, within the former dichotomy, prompt the target reader to "see things, not just recognize them" (ibid.), which means that foreignizing translations could also be described as defamiliarizing.

2.3   Style in Erlend Loe's novels

Loe's novels are presumably easy to identify as "loesk" 'Loe-esque' (Rødset 16; my translation). Features like simple language paired with complex subject matters is one of Loe's hallmarks. The subject matters in ST1 are fear of complexity and time and longing for the simplicity of childhood, while those in ST2 revolve around self-reliance, fatherhood and escaping conformity. This section will demonstrate that style and subject matter are intricately interweaved and guide the reader to understanding (Simpson 3). Stylistic traits that belong to naïvism, the label most frequently put on Loe's style, will be given precedence; but first, a brief explanation of the term 'naïvism' is in order.

2.3.1   Naïvism

The style in Erlend Loe's novels has been called both "naivisme" 'naïvism' (Øystein Rottem; my translation) and "ny-naivisme" 'neo-naïvism' (Andersen 650; my translation). In his

laudatory review of *Naiv. Super.* Rottem comments that naïvism is a hard style to master, but that Loe does so brilliantly (*Dagbladet*). Andersen calls 'neo-naïvism' "en tilbakevending til det barnslige og førproblematiske" (650). The term 'Naïvism' otherwise brings to mind naïve art made famous by Henri Rousseau (Rødset 14), which evokes "naturalness, innocence, unaffectedness, inexperience, trustfulness, artlessness and ingeniousness" (Brodskaia 11). Inger Rødset points out that both naïve art and the naïvism in Loe's novels share the same fascination with concrete items (14), which in *Naiv. Super.* takes the form of a red plastic ball (ST1 19). Wera Birgitte Holst argues that the childish mentality of the narrator is a coping mechanism in *Naiv. Super.* (25), while the naïve notion of happy endings is questioned in *Doppler* (47). Thus the two novels differ in how they treat naïvism as technique and subject matter. In ST1, it is sought after by the main character, while in ST2, it is dismissed. As a literary device, however, naïvism is arguably used in both ST1 and ST2, which will be illustrated in the following section.

2.3.2 'Loe-esque' expressions and idioms

Something that has, to my knowledge, not been taken due note of, is Loe's inclination to alter familiar Norwegian expressions in both source texts. For instance, the Norwegian saying 'å sage over grenen man sitter på' is represented in *Doppler* as "[m]an må våge seg ut på grenen man sitter på og av og til må man også sage den av" (151). These instances make readers see the expressions from a different perspective and are thus, defamiliarizing. What looks like intentional malapropisms could represent the main character's attempt to recall the feeling of misunderstanding language as a child.

2.3.3 Repetition

Repetition creates rhythm and focuses attention on particular motifs, and when giving the impression of a limited vocabulary, it might appear child-like, humorous and in some cases create a sense of immediacy. Holst directs our attention to the repetition of the word 'now' in ST1 (171), which she argues puts emphasis on the moment (41, 42):

> Nå kaster jeg.
> Nå tar min bror imot.
> Nå kaster min bror.
> Nå tar jeg imot.

Exemplifying a different kind of repetition is the following sentence in *Doppler*: "[j]eg hadde skapt en mistenksom og hatefull stemning på settet og filmen ville blitt en mistenksom og hatefull film" (ST2 69). This kind of repetition creates intrasentential redundancy and is arguably not present for poetic purposes, but rather humorous ones (see also Rødset 38). Intrasentential redundancies means that there is repetition of the same word in the same sentence and can also be detected in Loe's non-fictional language: "én tanke som jeg kan forstå, eller to tanker som jeg kan forstå" (NRK).

Use of repetition can be interpreted as a lack of variation in vocabulary. Andersen points out that "mangelen på variasjon gir leseren assosiasjoner i retning av en barnslig språkbruker" (650). This lack of variation is exemplified by the repetitive use of the word "sympatisk" in ST1 (e.g. 7) and "flink" in ST2 (e.g. 39). Pollen tellingly compares the simple language in *Naiv. Super.* to that present in Loe's children's books about Kurt (15). This indicates an agreement among theorists that repetition or lack of variation in Loe's language is reminiscent to child-like language, or indeed naïve language and elicits humour.

2.3.4   Amounts

Both source texts have uncommon descriptions of amounts, a stylistic trait that has not been commented on by theorists. One example is "et stykke arbeid" (ST2 150), and "en håndfull grader over frysepunktet" (ST1 10). These surprising turns of phrases have a defamiliarizing effect and are not how one would normally describe amounts.

2.3.5   Swearing

Swearing is more prevalent in ST2 than in ST1. As far as I know, few have commented on the swearing in either of Loe's novels, except Andersen who suggests that the copies of swearing in the ST1 chapter "Biblioteket" is a way of poking fun at conventional intertextuality (651). Apart from the occasional 'faen' or 'pokker' elsewhere in the novel, most of the swearing in ST1 is compiled into this one chapter. It consists of 16 pages of copies of library searches, in which the main character and his brother go to the New York Public Library and start searching for authors with Norwegian swear words in their names (ST1 146-162). The use of swear words in this chapter reminds one of children exploring and experimenting with bad language and hiding it from their parents. The main character himself admits that "[j]eg føler at vi lurer noen" (ST1 145). Regarding the rebellion in ST2, Holst claims that it is attributed to a "forsinket pubertet" 'delayed puberty' (154; my translation), which could possibly extend

to include Doppler's excessive swearing. Hence, it could be argued that the use of swearing in ST1 is innocently experimental, while in ST2 it is a way to express delayed teenage rebellion.

2.3.6 Litotes

Litotes is defined as an "ironical understatement in which an affirmative is expressed by the negative of its contrary" ("Litotes"a). A commonly used litotes in many languages, including English and Norwegian, is 'not bad' or 'ikke dårlig' when referring to something that is actually quite good. This is common in daily usage, but litotes can also be used to create defamiliarization or to characterise temperance in a literary text. Litotes was widely used in Old English poetry and The Icelandic Sagas, contributing to "stoical restraint" ("Litotes"b). 'Stoical restraint' is arguably something that could also describe the modesty in Loe's characters and his naïve style. Andersen states that Loe's crude language "er formulert av noen som har peiling på litotens humoristiske potensial" (650). Holst points out that litotes in ST2, like "[i]ngenting gjør meg så lite misfornøyd som snø [*sic*]" is a form of defamiliarization (65). An example of litotes in ST1 is "[d]et er ikke få ting som skal klaffe" (134).

2.3.7 Allusion

Allusion is defined by William Irwin as "an intended indirect reference that calls for associations that go beyond mere substitution of a referent" (227). Simpson lists intertextuality as one of six "stylistic elements, which make up narrative discourse" and adds that "[t]he term intertextuality … is reserved for the technique of 'allusion'" (Simpson 20, 22). With this in mind, I choose to render allusion as a technique that results in intertextuality, and therefore, the term 'allusion' will be used from now on.

ST1 includes allusions to popular culture like celebrities and famous labels like "Levis" (ST1 179), but also a few references to high culture, like "Olav H. Hauge" (ST1 37). Allusion is more prevalent and complex in ST2. One example of this is the inclination towards mixing high and low elements, where songs, poetry and biblical quotes are intermixed with the main character's everyday dialogue (Holst 77, 84, 85). This could illustrate the main character's hubris and inability to see his own inferiority. An example of this is one of Doppler's conversations with his adopted elk cub that turns into an ornamental poetic allusion to the Norwegian poet Sigbjørn Obstfelder (139). Elsewhere, ST1 alludes to the bible in a way that combines his own flawed values with the high moral values of

Christianity, like in the following example: "[f]linkhet og faenskap og tro, håp og kjærlighet i verden. Men størst av alt er skogen" (96).

In an NRK interview about *Naiv. Super.*, Loe states that he seeks "én tanke som jeg kan forstå, eller to tanker som jeg kan forstå og ikke et virvarr av komplisert intertekstualitet og alt det der som du har lært om på universitetet" (Loe, *naivisme*). In this context, alluding to other texts, necessarily arousing more than one thought, would be against his objective. Andersen, however, points out that ST1 does include less complex "intertekster" (651). Here he refers to the 16 pages in *Naiv. Super.* with copies of library searches (see above) (Andersen 651). This use of allusion can hardly be called complex and Andersen suggests that this is a mockery of conventional, more complex intertextuality (651). The same could perhaps be said about the catalogue of overt allusions to pop-culture, which are not always complex.

In light of this, we can infer that Loe's use of allusion could be a way to trivialise this literary tradition, thus characterising the main characters as naïve.

2.3.8   Binary oppositions

In ST1 – and to a lesser extent – ST2 the main characters sort the world into binary oppositions, rather than complex ones, which is reflected in the language. Rødset connects this to a childish way of categorising the world: "[d]en første måten barn lærer å skille mellom ting, når de begynner å snakke, er gjennom binære opposisjoner" (15; see also Andersen 651). Tønnessen points out that even the title, *Naiv. Super.*, is a binary opposition (136). Using binary oppositions characterises the narrator as someone who cannot, or will not see the complexities of life and wants to regain the naïvety of childhood by utilising a childlike register.

2.3.9   Simple sentences

In the same NRK interview mentioned earlier, Loe says that he wanted to "skrive noe som var med på å legalisere det enkle" (Loe *naivisme*). This objective is apparent by the structure of the sentences in ST1, of which a majority are simple. One example is "[n]å har jeg lest videre. Det blir verre og verre" (ST1 27). This is in keeping with Andersen's comment on the language in ST1: "[f]or det første finner vi en syntaktisk enkelhet, frembrakt ved at periodene gjennomgående er svært korte og grammatisk ukompliserte, for det meste hovedsetninger, samt at hver setning stort sett inneholder én ny informasjon" (650; see also Pollen 15). This

uncomplicated sentence structure makes for an easy read and furthers Loe's ideal of simplicity.

2.3.10 Sentence fragments

What contribute further to the economy of language in ST1 are sentence fragments, or incomplete sentetces, like "[h]att en formkurve. Og penger" (ST1 8), which can signify introspection (Hasselgård, Johansson, and Lysvåg 248). Although a certain amount of sentence fragments is common in literary prose, their presence in ST1 is arguably more conspicuous than the norm. Tønnessen comments that fragmentation is particularly manifested in the tendency to start off a new line after full stops (134). This characterises all of ST1, by starting a new line even after one or two-word sentences, leaving many blank spaces on the page. This feature gives connotations to how children do not care to complete a line in the early process of learning to write.

2.3.11 Use of the present tense

 Tense has the power to render "certain events … as remote or distant, others as immediate or imminent" (Simpson 81). Most of ST1 is written in the present tense, often accompanied by the word 'nå', and events are therefore presented as immediate, exemplified in the following sentence: "[n]å legger jeg boken fra meg. Jeg kjenner at jeg er matt. Jeg er i opprør" (28). There are, however, a few instances of analepsis, like when childhood memories are narrated (ST1 28, 32).

The narration in ST1 is, by literary theorist Gérard Genette called "simultaneous" which means that events are recounted as they are happening (217). This can have the effect of backgrounding the plot "if the emphasis rests on the narrating itself, as in narratives of "interior monologue,"" (Genette 219). As internal monologue is a big part of ST1, one can say that simultaneous narration reduces the narrative distance and puts focus on the narrator's instantaneous state of mind. This coupled with the inclusion of realistic documents, like e-mails, focalises the moment further (Tønnessen 127). Holst claims that the present tense narration in ST1 emulates the way children are oblivious to time passing during playtime (41). The present tense in ST1 can therefore be said to describe events as immediate, thus emphasising the moment as seen through the eyes of a child, instead of fearing the passing of time, like the narrator often does.

2.3.12 Animation and personification

Animation is defined as "giving human characteristics to nature" ("Animation"), while personification is "the attribution of a personal nature or human characteristics to something non-human" ("Personification"). These stylistic traits mostly pertain to ST2. Animation is exemplified by Doppler assigning human qualities to the elk cub Bongo and their resulting 'conversations', something Rødset points out as having a humorous effect (53). Having a strong connection to animals can be associated to naïvism and childishness, as most adults understand that animals cannot talk. One example of personification is the sentence "[t]anken må krype til korset og melde pass (ST2 28), which is a defamiliarizing combination of two fixed expressions that personify 'tanken'. This mash-up of elements could represent linguistic misapplications made by the main character and thus pertain to inexperience and naïvism.

2.3.13 Thematisation

Thematisation means "plac[ing] (a word or phrase) at the start of a sentence in order to focus attention on it" ("Thematising"). Many of the sentences in ST1 start with conjunctions and this is also very prevalent with the adverb "nå" and the personal pronoun "jeg". What is more, placing the thematised words at the beginning of a new line often highlights thematisation. This focuses attention on these words and form perpendicular patterns on the printed text. The repetition of these words, especially 'nå', is noted and discussed by Holst (42), but as far as I am aware, commentators have not duly noted the frequent thematisation of them. According to Jean Boase-Beier, "a literary text … gives stylistic signals, such as layout on the page … that in turn can have profound effects on the way the reader sees the world" (72), which means that unconventional layout, such as the thematisation in ST1, is, indeed, an important stylistic device.

2.3.14 Lists

Another feature that can give rise to a deviating layout is the multitude of lists in ST1. Holst calls these lists defamiliarizing (76). For instance, the list of qualities and objects in the main character's possession is according to Holst "absurd", because in the main character's reasoning these add up to 17, a number he is pleased with (75, 76). In all there are 24 lists in ST1 and none in ST2.

2.4   Translating Loe's Style

Now that we have established the most prominent stylistic features in the source texts, we will now focus on how these elements might be translated. This section will first present how various commentators view the translation of style, after which the stylistic traits covered in the previous section will be explored in terms of how they might pose challenges to the translator, and how commentators have suggested they be translated as far as there are available recommendations.

Several literary scolars have commented on the retention of style in translation. Jean Boase-Beier defines translation of style as "whenever translation is concerned with how something is said as well as what is said" (71). As far as Schleiermacher is concerned, the translator has a responsibility to retain the style that contributed to the acclaim of the author in the source culture so that the author garners similar acclaim in the target culture (56; see also Nida 161). In a similar vein, Vladimir Nabokov argues that "render[ing] the "spirit" – and not the textual sense" could lead to misrepresenting, or defaming of the author and he furthermore states that: [t]he clumsiest literal translation is a thousand times more useful than the prestiest paraphrase" (115).

2.4.1   Translating fixed expressions

Regarding expressions, form and content are tightly knit together and not easily separated. Mona Baker describes idioms and fixed expressions as "frozen patterns of language" (63), and insists that they "often carry meanings which cannot be deduced from their individual components" (63) (also discussed by Rodriguez 113). Simply put, an expression only conveys its intended meaning when the words are collocated in the familiar and expected manner in a given language. As the same meaning is often made up of different collocations in different languages, translation might involve changing their form and separating the 'individual components'. That is not to say that no source and target culture expressions converge in both form and content and in these cases, literal translation is possible. Sometimes, however, formally similar expressions can have different meanings in different languages and these instances can "lay easy traps for the unwary translator who is not familiar with the source-language idiom and who may be tempted simply to impose a target-language interpretation of it" (Baker 67), which can cause semantic loss.

Antoine Berman and Nida express two conflicting views on the translation of fixed expressions, with Berman leaning towards foreignizing expressions and Nida recommending domesticating them in favour of the target reader. Berman states that "[r]eplacing an idiom with its "equivalent" is an ethnocentrism" and would rather have idioms translated literally, because one would avoid "[attacking] the discourse of the foreign work" (Berman 287). Nida, on the other hand, argues that literal translation of expressions "would require numerous footnotes in order to make the text fully comprehensible" (156). Furthermore, Nida asserts that "an idiom may not be merely meaningless, but may even convey quite the wrong meaning, in which case it must also be modified" (166). Literal translation of all expressions, favoured by Berman, is necessarily confusing for target readers, while modifying them, as Nida recommends, could increase target reader comprehension. Such modifications, especially of non-standard figures of speech, necessitate "a very considerable act of creativity" according to Parks (33).

2.4.2 Translating repetition and rhythm

On translating rhythm, Antione Berman comments that "the novel is not less rhythmic than poetry" and that sacrificing rhythm in the translation of a novel by, for instance, using more commas than the original, can have a negative effect (284). In Loe, however, it is, above all, certain repeated words that create the rhythm. Peter Newmark recommends that such words "must be correspondingly repeated in the target text" (147). Berman confirms the stylistic importance of such repeated words: "[a]fter long intervals certain words may recur, certain kind of substantives that constitute a particular network" (284). He emphasises that the author's choice of words is intentional: "an author might employ certain verbs, adjectives and substantives, and *not others* [emphasis in original]." (Berman 285) Hence, Loe's continual use of 'sympatisk' and not, say, 'vennlig'.

2.4.3 Translating swearing

Nida comments that "swear words in one language may be based upon the perverted use of divine names, but in another language may be primarily excremental and anatomical" (164). This is the case in Norwegian and English, where the former mostly uses religious swearing, and the latter anatomical swearing. Andrea Millwood-Hargrave conducted a study in 2000 to perceive British people's attitudes towards swearing (1). According to this study, the top three expletives were 'cunt', 'motherfucker' and 'fuck', whereas 'crap', 'bloody' and 'God' were

hardly considered swearing (9). According to Ruth Fjeld's 2004 article on *Språkrådet.no*, the opposite is true of Norwegian swearing, which is most commonly connected to good and evil powers in Christianity (see also Hasund 2006). She argues, however, that "[i] og med at stadig færre tror på disse overnaturlige kreftene, kommer andre uttrykk inn i vårt bannevokabular" (ibid.). In a 2011 interview in *Aftenposten*, Fjeld stated that swearing has become more sexualised in Norway due to immigration, which has intensified the use of words like "fuck" and "morapuler" in the younger generation (Fjeld). A survey in Sondre Lie's 2013 Master's Thesis found that both religious and anatomical expletives were considered severe by Norwegians (Lie 1-15). The religious word 'faen' was ranked "sterkt" by 36 per cent of the participants, "veldig sterkt" being the highest degree (Lie 2). The anatomical word 'fitte' was considered "sterkt" by 46 per cent and thus seen as worse than 'faen' (ibid.). Fjeld, Hasund and Lie's findings span from 2004 to 2013 and prove that religious swearing in the time when ST1 and ST2 were published (1996-2004), was still considered severe, but that the use of anatomical swear words were increasing. The translator's challenge will thus be to either make sure that the target culture will not be offended, which would be domesticating or use swear words with similar severity and usage, regardless of the target culture's reaction, which would be foreignizing.

2.4.4   Translating litotes

Lee M. Hollander argues that the English translations of the many litotes present in Old Norse are "stylistically inferior to those into German and the modern Scandinavian languages" (5). Although this probably is not directly relevant to Loe's use of litotes, it is still an indication that litotes in his novels might have been difficult to translate.

2.4.5   Translating allusion

Translating allusions can be challenging due to the linguistic, cultural, literary and religious disparities that may exist between two different languages and André Lefevre argues that such an undertaking "require from translators a more than superficial familiarity with the culture of which the source language is both the repository and the expression" (25). Schleiermacher describes the challenges that can arise when a translator encounters allusions clearly:

> if we consider a master's power to shape the language in a larger context, his use of related words and their roots in great quantities of works that make references to one another, how is the translator to find his way, given that the system of ideas and the signs for them in his language are completely different than in the original …? (52)

Scleiermacher postulates that when it takes hard work for an author to write a book, let alone incorporate complex allusions, translating it must be twice as challenging. Firstly, s/he would have to locate them within the source text, which would require an expert's knowledge of a given source culture's literary history. Then, s/he is left with the choice of explaining the reference, or finding a similar reference to fit the target culture.

Venuti suggests using footnotes, or adding extra information to explain elements that might be obscure to the target culture (*Scandals* 22; see also Lefevre 25). However, Venuti also points to the disadvantage of using footnotes: "[it] can narrow the domestic audience to a cultural elite since footnotes are an academic convention" (*Scandals* 22). Newmark, on the other hand, argues that the translator should leave allusions in peace: "a translator should not reproduce allusions, in particular if they are peculiar to the source language culture, which his readers are unlikely to understand" (147). Understanding of this point depends on what Newmark means with 'not reproduce'; should one omit the allusion, avoid literal translation, or find an allusion that has the same function in the target culture? In any event, his stance seems to be that allusions, and specifically cultural allusions in the source culture are hard to grasp for target cultures, and therefore not ideally translated literally.

In his study of the Italian translation of James Joyce's *The Dead*, Parks argues that references to local places or songs "evoke" the sense of Dublin city life (63). The "mood" these references inspire in source culture-members with real-life experiences of these places is challenging, if not impossible, to replicate in a target text (ibid., 64). The difficulty lies in the fact that the "names may mean very little to the foreign audience, may carry no connotations whatsoever, and second that they probably will not fit in with the rhythms of the target language prose" (ibid., 63). Reading a translation with such source culture-specific allusions often involve "a loss of cultural density in local cultural reference" or "exoticism", for a target reader (ibid., 64).

2.4.6 Translating Tense and aspect

Preserving a particular use of tense and aspect is not always a straightforward task for translators, as the systems of tense vary from language to language (Baker 98, 99). The tense systems in Norwegian and English differ somewhat in that Norwegian expresses aspect, not in terms of a grammatical category, but through context and adverbs (Hasselgård, Johansson, and Lysvåg 184). Parks discusses the challenge of retaining the tense in the Italian translation of James Joyce's *A Portrait of an Artist*, in which unusual variations in grammar are utilised

to reflect the mindset of a child (71). Where English can be vague as to whether an action is habitual or unique, Italian must specify (ibid.). Thus, in Italian, "it is impossible to evoke the same naïvety through grammar" (ibid.). Consequently the target text inevitably fails to convey "the [vagueness of the] child's mind", as the child is "unaware of what would be needed to explain things precisely to his reader/audience" (ibid.). Not so much naïvety, as urgency, is engendered by means of tense, combined with adverbial 'now', in ST1 and the differences between Norwegian and English could be problematic for the translator.

In her discussion about the English translation of H.C. Andersen's short story *Den lille Pigen med Svovelstikkene*, Kristen Malmkjær found that the on-going action in the original was described using the simple past in the English translation, which, according to her, "conveys less of a sense of currency than the continuous aspect might have" (18). This is of interest regarding the translation of the tense in ST1, due to the similarity between Danish and Norwegian.

2.5   Translating and transmitting style into an L2: Who should translate?

In this study, it is argued that foreignization is hypothetically more frequent with L2 translators, while L1 translators domesticate more. This presumption is made based on the assumed integrated bias that might prompt an L2 translator to want to display his/her own culture and language in a translation, through foreignizing methods. The reverse is assumed about L1 translators. L2 translation is considerably less common in literary translation than L1 translation and as Campbell puts it, "[t]he benefits of one or the other can be argued, although it must be said that expert (and no doubt public) opinion favours translation into the first language" (57). Literary translator and theorist Charlotte Barslund, confirms that L1 translation is, indeed, the norm (148). To ensure translation into an L1 or language proficiency that is approximate to an L1, The Code of Professional Conduct, was issued in 2013 and states:

> members shall translate only into a language that is either (i) their mother tongue or language of habitual use, or (ii) one in which they have satisfied the Institute that they have equal competence. They shall translate only from those languages in which they can demonstrate they have the requisite skills (Institute of Translation and Interpreting 5; cf. Baker 65).

One argument in favour of L2 translation is that the translator has an internalised insight to his or her native culture and language, while a counter-argument is that they lack similar insight

to their L2. The opposite could, however, be said about L1 translators. Barslund argues that "[p]rose translators need to be widely read in the literature of at least two languages" (149). The language dominance of English and the proliferation of English literature arguably make it more likely that the L2 translator is widely read in English literature. The opposite could be assumed about the L1 translators when it comes to Norwegian literature, which is not heavily canonised.

Schleiermacher prefers a translator that "has mastered this art of understanding by studying the language with diligence, acquiring precise knowledge of the entire historical life of a people … *he*, to be sure, and he alone is justified in desiring to bring to his countrymen and contemporaries just this same understanding of these masterworks of art and science" (47). Though not explicitly favouring either L1 or L2 translation, Schleiermacher seems to prefer translators to study a culture's language and literature from the outside and in turn bring it home to his "countrymen and contemporaries" (ibid.). This, however, depends on what he means with 'language' but the context suggests that he means 'source language'. The translator is bringing "precise knowledge … of a people" (ibid.), i.e. knowledge of the source culture to "his countrymen" (ibid.), i.e. the target culture of which he is a part. Therefore, it seems that Schleiermacher argues that only L1 translators who have a deep comprehension of the source culture is fit to translate it.

Campbell explains that the challenge of L2 translation is "in producing a target text in a language in which composition does not come naturally" (57). According to his study of L2 translators' competence and style, some of the participants "showed almost native ability to write in the required style" (Campbell 104). An L2 translator can seemingly acquire almost the same proficiency as a native speaker. Similarly, Nike Pokorn argues that: "[i]n some cases, although rare, foreign speakers come close to the group of native speakers of a particular language" (1). She claims that the idea of an "ideal native speaker" is "ethnocentric" and, by extension, discriminatory against immigrant translators and team translators (ibid., 27). The notion that only native speakers can translate into their mother tongue is thus seen as untrue, unnecessary and unfair.

Parks points out that "it is extremely difficult to judge, in one's second language, the appropriateness or otherwise of a deviation from standard discourse" (5). In an experiment conducted by Parks, Italian English literature teachers saw "extravagance of diction" and "unusual and vague collocation[s]" in an English-language original text as signs that the text was a bad translation, rather than D. H. Lawrence's original text with a highly idiosyncratic

style (ibid., 9, 10). An L1 translator might interpret a "[d]eviation from standard discourse" as an error, in need of correcting (ibid.). Thus, Parks seems to argue that L1 translation involves a correction of style. This enables L1 translators to inadvertently spot stylistic features, while it simultaneously poses the risk of these features being corrected or eliminated, as was the case with the translation of Lawrence's *Women in Love*: "[c]ertainly the [L1] translator Vittorini frequently chose to 'improve on' what he felt was Lawrence's inelegance" (Parks 15). This makes it interesting to ask the question as to whether the L1 translators of ST2, have similarly "improved on" Loe's style and left "the translation … better than the original to the extent that it eliminates certain individual tics and returns the text to a publicly approved style" (ibid.).

        As we can gather from this, there are valid arguments for translation in both directions, but the preferred norm of L1 translation still prevails. Consequently, a source text is more frequently translated by translators whose frames of mind are governed by different linguistic and cultural norms and values than those in the source culture. The next subheadings will explore how L2 translation relates to some of the stylistic elements that are present in ST1 and ST2 where the skills of an L2 versus an L1 translator can affect a translation process in different ways.

2.5.1   L1 versus L2 translation of fixed expressions and idioms

When translating idioms, Baker mentions a certain "sensitivity" innate in native speakers that justifies favouring translation into one's native language: "[t]he majority of translators working into a foreign language cannot hope to achieve the same sensitivity that native speakers seem to have for judging when and how an idiom can be manipulated" (64). Furthermore, Baker points out that "[g]enerally speaking, the more difficult an expression is to understand and the less sense it makes in a given context, the more likely a translator will recognize it as an idiom" (65). This poses the idea that L1 translators can with greater ease identify idioms, simply because they seem obscure. The Loe-esque expressions are probably even more obscure and a challenge both to identify and translate. Where Baker talks of the "sensitivity" of L1 translators (64), Peter Newmark discusses their "intuition" (180); he claims that an L1 translator "will also make mistakes in collocation … but he will correct himself intuitively" (ibid.). This intuition is, conversely, not inherent in L2 translators (ibid.).

2.5.2 L1 versus L2 translation of swearing

A 2003 psychophysiological study carried out by Harris, Aycicegi and Gleason and
concluded that reading or hearing "[t]aboo words and reprimands elicited stronger
physiological responses, as measured by skin conductance, in speaker's L1 than did
equivalent words in their L2, which was learned after the age of 12" (566, 574). In other
words hearing and reading swearing in one's L2 is more comfortable than in one's L1. If this
were true of translators as well, they could presumably be more comfortable with translating
severe swear words into their L2 than into their L1. This might colour an L2 translator's
intuition of what is the appropriate swearing to use in an L2 translation and, furthermore,
produce a foreignizing translation. L1 translators could, by the same token, minimise the use
of swear words deemed inappropriate and produce a domesticating translation.

2.5.3 Summing up: restatement of hypothesis

L2 and L1 translators might affect style in different ways. As a result of not having insight
into what is acceptable in the target culture when it comes to, for instance, swearing, L2
translators might produce translations that sound offensive as far as swearing goes. On the
other hand, L2 translators are integrated in the source culture, and therefore have a greater
ability to spot stylistic nuances, like allusions and expressions, in the source text. These
translators could, in turn, choose to make these culture specific elements visible and
consequently disrupt fluency. According to Venuti, a fluent and domesticating translation,
which is preferred in Anglo-American cultures, is one "[absent of] stylistic peculiarities"
(*Invisibility* 1). This norm might, in turn, prompt English L1 translators to eliminate elements
of style, thus making them less marked. For these reasons I expect the TT1 translator, who
works into his L2, to have produced a more defamiliarizing text, whose style is more
idiosyncratic and marked than the TT2 translators, who work into their L1. Furthermore,
expect that TT1 will be more foreignizing than TT2.

Chapter 3

Method

This chapter will discuss my choice of material and the criteria by which I chose examples to illustrate my points. Then I account for the choice of method, after which, a description of Vinay and Darbelnet's framework will be given. Lastly I describe the process of interviewing the translators.

3.1 Choice of material

I chose Loe because he has been said to have an unusual style (Rottem) and it would be interesting to see how this style is dealt with in an English translation. Also of interest is exploring how Norwegian culture is presented to English target cultures and how it might be depicted differently by L1 and L2 translators. I hypothesise that the L2 translator is more invested in preserving Loe's style and his references to culture specific elements and that, conversely, the L1 translators are more concerned with adapting and explaining, rather than preserving the source text's style.

Naiv. Super. was chosen because it is the novel that most famously embodies Loe's idiosyncratic style, which includes realistic documents, such as copies of library searches, e-mails, and lists. *Doppler* was chosen because I needed one more novel in order to compare style and it resembles the style in *Naiv. Super.* in many ways, more so than Loe's other novels, even if encompassing a less marked style. Thus, I would have more or less homogenous source material, which makes comparison more fruitful. Additionally, both novels were good candidates for studying translation due to their easily available translations. *Naiv. Super.* has been translated into "over 20 languages" ("Naiv. Super."), while *Doppler* has also been translated into many languages, the exact number of which is unavailable.

3.2 The selection of stylistic traits and examples

Stylistic elements that scholars and reviewers in concurrence praise as typical of Loe's style have been given prominence in my study. In addition, certain stylistic traits have been included based on my own reaction to given linguistic elements while being a 'pretend reader'. This method was inspired by Malmkjær's comment that "reader-oriented stylistic analysis" involves that "the analyst masquerades as reader and it is the analyst's reactions to the text that are being charted" (14). This is what I have endeavoured to emulate; stylistic

importance was assigned to a given stylistic feature based on my reaction as a 'pretend reader', whether it be surprise, enjoyment, or my stopping and thinking about a given sentence or word.

I have placed all observed occurrences of prioritised stylistic elements from ST1, ST2 and their respective target texts in tables, many of which will be presented in the analysis chapter. After collecting these occurrences, I chose to analyse and discuss them in separate chapters. I needed at least two examples for every stylistic trait and wanted to include additional ones if I found any that somehow stood out. The examples that demonstrated a marked divergence from the source text would have to be included and explained. I also saw it as interesting to include examples where the target text and the source text had a marked similarity to the point where it could have a foreignizing effect on the target audience.

The examples chosen exemplify trends and regularities. An example is included if it demonstrates the retention of stylistic traits or has a clear domesticating or foreignizing effect. Sometimes examples will illustrate deviations from trends to show that translators sometimes depart from tendencies and ask why this happens.

3.3   A comparative approach

My comparative approach is threefold; there are comparisons between source texts, between source texts and target texts and between the two target texts. These comparisons are made to "[look] for differences and … similarities (patterns)" (Williams and Chesterman 94). This will be further discussed in the present section, in addition to the pros and cons of counting stylistic traits.

3.3.1   Comparison of source texts

A comparison between ST1 and ST2 was carried out in order to spot similarities and differences between the two texts so I could later see how the translators have dealt with a textual feature common in both texts. Furthermore, I wanted to see if there were differences between the source texts to later decide if and how Loe's style has evolved.

In my stylistic analysis, in which I compare the two source texts, I have again followed Malmkjær's advice about "masquerad[ing] as reader" (14). Having read the books as an ordinary reader many times before, I found that mixing the 'pretend reader' role with the analytic role gave the text a new dimension to the point where I was able to discover

stylistic features that had previously escaped my attention. Examples of this are the covert allusions in *Doppler* and the Loe-esque expressions in both source texts.

3.3.2 Comparison of source texts and target texts

The purpose of comparing source and target text was basically to identify translation shifts. Such comparison is, according to Malmkjær, necessary in an analysis of a target text because "it is not possible through stylistic analysis of a translation alone to provide a satisfactory answer to the question why the translation has been made to mean as it does" (16). Malmkjær therefore proposes the term "translational stylistics" as a tool in which a close comparison between source and target text sentences make it easier to identify "textual features of potential interest" (16). Such an approach would be effective in spotting stylistic traits in both the source and target text. As Malmkjær demonstrates in her article, examining source and target text sentence pairs side by side, assists the analytical process and makes it easier to identify when stylistic traits have been adjusted in the target text (17-21). If something in the translation seems unidiomatic or awkward, I have taken this to be an indication that the problem might stem from a deliberate stylistic choice in the source text (see Parks 13). Thus, at an early stage, I read each source and target text simultaneously, going back and forth to recognise stylistic shifts. Later I categorised the located examples in tables so that I could compare them side-by-side, thus facilitating the analytical process.

3.3.3 Comparison of target texts

Comparison of target texts was done to identify characteristic procedural trends regarding the translation of stylistic traits. In turn, this would indicate if the translations lean more towards foreignization or domestication. To assess which is more fluent, one has to compare the two target texts. If one translator uses a great deal of adaptation, for instance (see below), it suggests that the translation leans towards domestication. Eventually, this comparison will serve as evidence for my discussion and my hypothesis that the L2 translation will be more foreignizing than the L1 translation.

3.3.4 Counting stylistic traits

Some of the data I have collected in this study have been analysed quantitatively. This means that stylistic traits that are easily countable have been manually counted and entered into tables. Being able to count how many times a word is used in the source text, compared to the

target text, could help draw conclusions as to what degree a given stylistic trait is preserved and if one target text preserves stylistic features more often than the other. Furthermore, if a textual element in the source text proves frequent, this also constitutes further evidence that the element is indeed a stylistic trait. This approach is loosely based on Williams and Chesterman's description of quantitative analysis (98-100).

Naiv. Super. and *Doppler* being 213 and 159 pages and their translations 197 and 169 pages respectively, makes manual counting very time consuming. Thus, I settled for manually counting only a selection of traits in parts of the source and target text. As a consequence, the results have an informal quantitative aspect. The stylistic traits counted in its entirety in both source and target texts are swearing and some repeated content words, like 'sympatisk'. Stylistic traits that have been counted in parts of the source and target texts in ST1 are: lists, simple sentences, sentence fragments, present tense verb forms and thematisation. ST1 was the easiest to count due to bigger fonts and bold letters and the fact that many repeated words were placed perpendicularly and thus easy to spot. ST2, on the other hand, has a small font and smaller line spacing, which made counting more challenging. As a result, more stylistic traits in ST1 have been counted. Naturally, the same type of stylistic traits as those counted in the source texts have been counted in the target texts.

3.4   Terminology used: Vinay and Darbelnet

I have chosen to use Vinay and Darbelnet's 1995 terminology to describe translation shifts in my analysis because they offer a helpful system when comparing stylistic shifts between source and target texts (see Williams and Chesterman 49).

Vinay and Darbelnet's theory includes two main categories for translation methods, namely oblique and direct translation, under which seven different translation procedures are categorised (Vinay and Darbelnet 31). Borrowing and literal translation belong to direct translation, while transposition, modulation, équivalence and adaptation belong to oblique translation (ibid.). The procedures described below are the ones that are relevant to this study. Generalisation and explicitation will also be discussed, even if they are not a part of the seven main procedures, due to their use in both TT1 and TT2.

Oblique and direct translations are superficially relatable to domestication and foreignization, respectively, in that some procedures would be categorised similarly. The main difference between these two frameworks is that foreignization and domestication are not "binary oppositions", like Vinay and Darbelnet's categories, but types of cultural effects

(Venuti, *Invisibility* 19). Vinay and Darbelnet's procedures can still be placed somewhere on an imagined foreignization – domestication scale. In the following, a collocation of these two frameworks will give an indication as to which procedures have mainly foreignizing or domesticating effects. Most of the procedures tend towards a domesticating effect.

3.4.1 Procedures that have a foreignizing or neutral effect

At one end of the spectrum we find the foreignizing procedures that represent higher degrees of foreignization in the target text.

The first, and perhaps most foreignizing procedure, is borrowing, in which "[a] word or expression [is] borrowed directly from another language, in its form and meaning" (Vinay and Darbelnet 340). This procedure is used to "create a stylistic effect" and sometimes "to introduce the flavour of the SL culture into a translation" (ibid., 32). This procedure is, to some measures, deliberately foreignizing. Some borrowings are integrated into the target language (ibid.). The relationship between the Norwegian and English language can attest to words like 'fjord' and 'lutefisk', not just being borrowed, but adopted into English. Thus, borrowing of source culture specific words may have a long-term effect on the target language.

Explicitation is not a part of Vinay and Darbelnet's direct or oblique translation procedures, but is nevertheless an important technique within their framework. It is explained as "a stylistic translation technique, which consists of making explicit in the **target language** what remains implicit in the **source language** because it is apparent from either the context or the **situation**. Excessive use leads to **overtranslation**" (Vinay and Darbelnet 342) (emphasis in original). Explicitation is often applied to make explicit to the target culture the meaning of pronouns (ibid., 116) or the meaning of the message (ibid., 166). Explicitation is arguably foreignizing in that it calls attention to, and explains a foreign reference, thus "sending the reader abroad" (Venuti, *Invisibility* 15). Not using explicitation is less invasive on the target reader situation: s/he is not 'sent abroad', but remains "in peace" (Schleiermacher 49). Thus, I would argue that explicitation is more foreignizing than it is domesticating.

3.4.2 Procedures that have a domesticating or neutral effect

Some of Vinay and Darbelnet's procedures tend towards domestication at the other end of the spectrum. These procedures represent shifts that eventually may contribute to "a wholesale domestication of the foreign text" (*The Translators Invisibility* 14).

25

One of these procedures is équivalence, which is defined as "[a] translation procedure, the result of which replicates the same situation as in the original, whilst using completely different wording" (Vinay and Darbelnet 342). The French, and original version of this term, 'équivalence' is the one I will be using to distinguish between Vinay and Darbelnet's procedure and the English word 'equivalence', simply meaning "the condition of being equal or equivalent in value, worth, function, etc" ("equivalence"). Équivalence is specifically relevant when it comes to the translation of fixed expressions: "most equivalences are fixed, and belong to a phraseological repertoire of idioms, clichés, proverbs, nominal or adjectival phrases, etc" (Vinay and Darbelnet 38).[5] Équivalence is domesticating because it alters the source text words, while retaining the meaning. The words that form expressions, allusions and swearing in a given language, are culturally and linguistically bound and by changing their form, one risks erasing culture specific connotations. As an example, an équivalent translation of the expression 'rosinen i pølsa', which is arguably connected to the Norwegian tradition of eating sausages, into 'the heart of the matter', would be domesticating as it changes the culture specific words.

Another clearly domesticating procedure is adaptation, which "is used in those cases where the type of situation being referred to by the SL message is unknown to the target culture. In such cases translators have to create a new situation that can be considered as being equivalent" (Vinay and Darbelnet 39). Put differently, it is the *context* surrounding a word or a phrase that is altered into a équivalent and not merely the word or phrase itself. One such situation could be if a reference to the song "Vi ere en Nation vi med", which describes Norwegian patriotism "unknown to the target culture" (ibid.), is adapted into a song with equal value in the target text, like "God Save the Queen". Adaptation is particularly domesticating because it uproots words from their original context and inserts them into target culture moulds. If used excessively, the procedure could veil much of the source culture. Refraining from adaptation, on the other hand, could lead to locutions "that [do] not sound quite right" (ibid.). In other words, avoiding adaptation can lead to foreignizing phrases, while adapting unfamiliar source text elements to the target audience's knowledge is domesticating.

A procedure that can be considered mainly domesticating is transposition, which "involves replacing one word class with another without changing the meaning of the message" (Vinay and Darbelnet 36). There are "obligatory transpositions" and "optional

---

[5] The English translation of Vinay and Darbelnet uses the word equivalence without an accent, which can be confusing. I have chosen not to change it here.

transpositions" (ibid.). Optional transpositions are arguably more domesticating, especially in cases where a change in word class could serve to enhance coherence in the target text. As noted by Parks, the source text's "breaking of the barriers of normal syntax and semantics", which could involve atypical use of grammar, could be intentional (33) and changing it to adhere to target language grammatical norms is domesticating, not to mention a possible erasure of stylistic features. Consider the slightly domesticating transposition in the translation of "[d]et var et kick hver gang" (ST1 95) into "[w]e got a kick every time" (TT1 85). Here, the slightly ungrammatical pairing of the intransitive verb 'var' with the object 'et kick' has been replaced with the more grammatical transitive verb 'got'.

Modulation is defined as "a variation of the form of the message, obtained by a change in point of view" (Vinay and Darbelnet 36). This procedure is used when a "translation results in a grammatically correct utterance, [but] it is [still] considered unsuitable, unidiomatic or awkward in the TL" (ibid., 36). As with transposition, modulation can be "optional" or "obligatory" (ibid., 37). Modulating a locution to make it more idiomatic, consequently altering it more than what is strictly necessary for the target reader's understanding, is arguably domesticating, albeit to a lesser degree than many of the other procedures. There are many types of modulations, for instance "[turning] a negative SL expression into a positive TL expression" (ibid., 37). An example of this could be if 'jeg er ikke hjemme' was translated into 'I am out'.

Lastly, the secondary procedure generalisation is "[a] translation technique in which a specific (or concrete) term is translated by a more general (or abstract) term" (Vinay and Darbelnet 343). Some languages use more abstract terms than others (ibid., 52), while some are more descriptive, like English (ibid., 53) and thus a translation into English should not involve much use of generalisation. There may, additionally, be other reasons for the use of generalisation, like the tendency to standardize (Toury 267-274; also discussed in Munday 90). Generalisation can be domesticating if it reduces a concrete or culture specific source text element to its most general or abstract form, like if 'fårikål' was translated into 'dinner', but it could also be neutral if the element being generalised is not culture specific, like if 'fløyte' was translated into 'instrument'.

3.4.3   Literal translation: foreignizing, domesticating or neutral

Literal translation is "the direct transfer of a [*sic*] SL text into a grammatically and idiomatically apropriate [*sic*] TL text in which the translators' task is limited to observing the

adherence to the linguistic servitudes of the TL" (Vinay and Darbelnet 33, 34). Simply put, if a source word or sentence has been translated using directly translated words in the target text, it is a literal translation. For instance, if the English word 'door' is translated into the Norwegian word 'dør' one uses literal translation. This procedure is regularly used "when translating between two languages of the same family" (ibid., 34) and as Norwegian and English are both a part of the Indo-European language family, one can expect much use of this procedure in the translations studied here. This procedure is foreignizing if the translator sticks to it so that 'false friends' might occur, neutral if used where appropriate or domesticating if it results in erasing covert relations present in the source text.

3.5   Interviewing the translators

Initially I contacted Tor Ketil Solberg, merely to determine his language background. This was done to find out whether Norwegian was his L1 or whether he had had experience with English that would potentially render him a balanced bilingual, such as native English-speaking parents or living for a longer period of time in an English speaking country. This would eventually give validity to my research question, which asks whether stylistic differences between TT1 and TT2 could be attributed to the translator's differing language backgrounds. If one of the translators considered English to be their L2, it would be possible to compare L2 versus L1 translation of style.

He told me that both his parents are Norwegian, but that his family had frequent visits by English speaking people when he was growing up. Furthermore, he mentioned living in England for one year at the age of five and one year at the age of 11 and another six months when he was 15 and a stay in South Africa. Still, he considers English as his L2. The language background of Don Shaw and Don Bartlett was later confirmed by e-mail, and they both consider English to be their first language.

In early 2015, two e-mail interviews were conducted with Tor Ketil Solberg (*Naiv. Super.*), Don Bartlett and Don Shaw (*Doppler*). Both interviews were conducted in English. Quotes from their answers will give the translators a chance to voice their opinion on their own work and it will add another dimension to my analysis. I have their written permissions made via e-mail to quote their e-mail answers.

The interviews have given interesting insight into what the translators think, how they work, and it will make them more visible as translators (see Williams and Chesterman 24, 25). As will be shown, some insight has been gained as far as their intentions and their stances

on preservation of style and L1 versus L2 translation. Their replies have been viewed in relation to my findings and used as a supplement in the discussion chapter. However, their answers will only be an indication into how they retrospectively view the process of translating style. Tor Ketil Solberg's translation of *Naiv. Super.* was first published in 2001 and the period of time that has gone by since then might have obscured the memory of the process. Bartlett and Shaw, on the other hand got their translation published in 2012, which increases the chance that they will remember more.

Chapter 4

Analysis of ST1, ST2 and their respective target texts

This chapter will analyse patterns in the data I have collected for my research, i.e. sentences and words in the source text that exemplify prominent, naïve stylistic elements and how these have been translated in the target texts. First I present the source text examples, then a description of how these stylistic traits are represented in their respective target texts will follow. The categories in the following sections sometimes converge on each other so that a given stylistic trait can qualify for more than one category.

4.1.1   Loe-esque expressions

As mentioned in the theory chapter, Erlend Loe often creates his own version of familiar Norwegian expressions. *Naiv. Super.* contains some of these expressions, but they are more prominent in *Doppler*.

4.1.1.1   Loe-esque expressions in ST1 and TT1

No	ST1 example	TT1 example
1	noen burde skyte dem i foten (someone ought to shoot them in the foot)[6]	someone ought to shoot them in the foot
2	selv om leken er god, ser jeg ingen grunn til å slutte (even if the game is good, I see no reason to quit)	I can't see any reason to stop even though the going is good
3	man får mer moro enn man lager selv (you get more fun than you create yourself)	you can have fun even when you don't try

The **first example** represents the Loe-esque version of the Norwegian saying 'å skyte seg selv i foten' (to shoot oneself in the foot). 'Dem' refers to advertisers, who the main character dislikes. Originally, the expression means 'getting oneself into a bad situation', and has the same meaning and equivalent wording in English. Including 'burde' (ought), as Loe does, suggests that the main character would encourage and is hoping for someone to come and shoot advertisers, rather than it being just a description of a bad situation. Changing the perspective of this familiar expression, namely from an objective description to an encouragement, generates humour. The English equivalent of expression 1 is to 'shoot oneself in the foot' and literal translation is therefore possible. Aside from two obligatory added words, example 1 is a literal translation and, as such, it uses equivalent words and conveys the

---

[6] All of the following parenthetical glosses are my own more or less literal translations.

same meaning. The element of encouragement is what is unusual about the ST1 expression and this has been preserved in TT1 by adding 'ought to'. By doing so, the stylistic technique might have the effect of adding something new to the already familiar expression in the target culture, which could have a foreignizing effect.

Example 2 is another fusion of an established saying and Loe's leaps of creativity. It is a play on the saying 'å slutte mens leken er god' (to quit while the game is good), whose closest English equivalent is 'to quit while you are ahead', which is only slightly different from the Norwegian version. In the source text, this is put in the context of an actual game, namely the main character throwing a ball against a wall, which means that he wants to keep throwing. Playing solitary and monotonous games like this gives the main character control and the ability to think clearly. In example 2, it seems that the translator has attempted to preserve the expression in the source sentence by latching on an equivalent English expression to the end of the sentence, namely 'the going is good'. The procedure used in this case is therefore équivalence, which has a slightly domesticating effect. In order to preserve the alteration in ST1, the translator has, like Loe, negated the expression.

Example 3 is the main character's description of New York. This sentence refutes the Norwegian expression 'man har ikke mer moro enn man lager selv' (one does not have more fun than one creates oneself), of which the English equivalent is 'if you want to have fun, you've got to make it yourself'. This equivalent expression is not used in the translation, nor has a similar expression been used, which means that this Loe-esque expression is not preserved. The verb 'får' (get) is changed to 'have', while, the verb 'lager' (make) is substituted with 'don't try'. The literal translation 'you get more fun than you make yourself,' would be grammatically acceptable, but not completely idiomatic, which makes this shift a case of modulation, with a domesticating effect.

4.1.1.2 Loe-esque expressions in ST2 and TT2

No.	ST2 example	TT2 example
1	min datter hadde satt fingeren rett på såret (my daughter had put her finger directly on the wound)	my daughter had put her finger on my affliction
2	du er ikke akkurat den skarpeste i klassen (you are not the sharpest in the class)	you may not be the sharpest knife in the drawer
3	ræva mi ler (my ass is laughing)	I laugh my arse off
4	man må våge seg ut på grenen man sitter på og av og til må man også sage den av (one has to dare oneself out on the branch one is sitting on	you have to venture out farther on the branch on which you're sitting, and once in a while you also have to

	and once in a while one also has to saw it off)	saw it off
5	tanken må krype til korset og melde pass (the thought has to crawl to the cross and bid pass)	the mind has to acknowledge its limitations and pass

All the Loe-esque expressions have been detected by the TT2 translators, which confirms Baker's claim that translators will identify expressions if they appear more obscure (65).

The **first example** means something like 'putting something painful into words'. Here, Loe has mixed two Norwegian sayings: 'å gni salt i såret' (to rub salt in the wound) and 'å sette fingen på noe' (to put the finger on something). Both expressions have existing English literal translations and retaining Loe's untraditional combination of them is feasible. However, only one part of the combination is retained in the translation. The phrase 'satte fingeren på' (put the finger on) has been literally translated, but the adverb 'rett' (directly) has been omitted, which reduces the force of the verb 'put'. On the same note, 'putting a finger onto a wound' is more evocative of pain than 'putting a finger onto an affliction', which is not as concrete as 'sår' (wound). Thus, the word 'sår' has undergone generalisation. The English equivalent to the expression 'gni salt i såret' (rub salt in the wound) has not been retained, but substituted with 'on my affliction'. Thus, we have literal translation of the first part of the expression, "had put her finger on", and a modulation of the last part "on my affliction" (TT2 27). The translation has therefore not preserved the stylistic feature and neither does it have a perceivable domesticating or foreignizing effect.

The **second** expression is a comment Doppler makes to Bongo, the baby-elk he has befriended. It derives from 'den skarpeste kniven i skuffen' (the sharpest knife in the drawer), whose English equivalent is 'the sharpest knife in the drawer'. The expression refers to the smartness of an individual compared to 'skuffen' (the drawer), a metaphor for the general population. Loe, however, transfers this to a context in which the separation of individuals based on smartness would make most sense, namely a school environment, or 'klassen' (the class). This alteration has not been preserved in the translation. Instead, the TT2 sentence is merely translated into a standard, unaltered English expression, using the expected metaphorical images 'knife' and 'drawer'. As a result, the sentence is less surprising and unmarked. The translation procedure used in this case is modulation of "you may not be the sharpest", while the last part "knife in the drawer" (TT2 34) is translated with équivalence. These shifts do not affect domestication or foreignization.

Example 3 is a slightly altered version of the Norwegian expression 'jeg ler ræva av meg' (I laugh my ass off), which translates literally into the English expression 'I laugh my ass off'. In Doppler's case, however, the ass is doing the laughing, which means that a defamiliarizing reversal of agency has taken place. The translation of this is yet another example where an altered expression has been replaced by a standard expression. The ST2 expression has merely been translated with the closest target language expression without retaining the source text alteration and does not take into account Loe's reversal of agency. Therefore, this exemplifies the use of modulation, but is neither particularly foreignizing nor domesticating. It is, however, another example of turning a marked source text element into an unmarked one.

The **fourth** expression is based on 'sage over den grenen man sitter på' and is used about situations where someone is responsible for an action that affects them negatively. The English equivalent is 'sawing off the branch you're sitting on'. The purpose of Loe's expression is reversed; rather than working as an example of what not to do, the expression seems to encourage such behaviour. The procedure used in this case is literal translation, which also preserves the stylistic trait. However, stranding the pronoun 'on', instead of using an empty pronoun, like in ST2, gives it a slightly more formal tone (Hasselgård, Johansson and Lysvåg 23). The latter is possible and would have looked like this: 'on the branch that you're sitting on'. This slight alteration aside, it is still a literal translation, but neutral regarding the degree of foreignization or domestication.

The expression used in **example 5** is a combination of two expressions. The first is 'å krype til korset' (crawling to the cross), whose closest English equivalent is 'eat humble pie' meaning 'to deeply regret something'. The second expression is 'å melde pass' (to bid pass), which is equivalent to 'throwing in the towel'. The combined meaning of these is that the personified thought has to regret something and give up. The translation demonstrates the use of modulation, and to a certain degree, generalization. The lack of an English equivalent to 'krype til korset' might explain its translation into 'acknowledge its limitation', which means something like 'admitting one's flaws'. 'Tanken' has been replaced by 'the mind', which is a generalization. This example is domesticating in that it alters the culture specific words that form the expression in Norwegian.

4.1.1.3 Summary

Loe-esque expressions occur in both ST1 and ST2, but are more frequent in the latter. More often than not, TT1 preserves both the sense and the altered form of Loe's expressions, while there is a tendency to leave out the alteration in TT2. On that account, the stylistic trait has been more normalised in TT2 than in TT1, and the defamiliarization they provided has thereby been diminished. Thus, the TT2 expressions are more fluent insofar that they will appear more natural to a target reader than they might have done to a source reader, but they are not necessarily domesticating. Many of the expressions, from which the alternative expressions derive, are nevertheless translated with the closest equivalent target culture expression when possible. The most frequent translation procedure used in both source texts is modulation and literal translation, even though équivalence is the procedure normally used when translating expressions (see above).

4.1.2 Repetition

Repetition is in itself a way to discover the prominence of stylistic elements and might therefore, in many cases, only be an auxiliary feature of a given stylistic element. Still, treating it like its own category is fruitful when repetition highlights the subject matter. To transmit this style to a target text, Newmark suggests that one follows the same pattern of repetition (147).

4.1.2.1 Repetition of content words in ST1 and TT1

No.	ST1 example	TT1 example
1	**a)** sympatisk (sympathetic)	friendly, good
	b) usympatisk (unsympathetic)	not so friendly, unpleasant

The main character in *Naiv. Super.* is stuck in his life and finds repetitive acts therapeutic; like repeatedly riding the elevator up and down. Repetition often constitutes the embodiment of these coping mechanisms.

    The content word most frequently repeated is different versions of 'sympatisk', which is used 13 times; 'usympatisk' (not sympathetic) is used twice, and 'sympathetic' is used once in an English language e-mail. The repetition of these words exemplifies self-reference (Thomas 182, 183), as they are repeated in ST2 as well. The narrator's fixation on this word might indicate his concern with people's degree of friendliness and his limited vocabulary to

describe this quality. **Example 1a** illustrates that "Sympatisk" (sympathetic) (e.g. ST1 94) is translated into the equivalent and arguably more standard words "friendly" (e.g. TT1 85) seven times and "good" (TT1 11) once, while **example 1b** shows that "usympatisk" (e.g. ST1 94) is tanslated into "not so friendly" (TT1 85) or "unpleasant" (TT1 168). 'Friendly' means 'being nice' while 'sympatisk' denotes likeability or charisma. 'Sympatisk' is an adjective on all pages except 16, where it has been translated into an adverb: "that's good of him" (TT1 11). This has probably been done to account for the change in the word from adjective to adverb in ST1. 'Friendly' could also work as an adverb, but would be less idiomatic, which means that this is an optional modulation, making it more domesticating. Despite this one divergence, the repetition is preserved in TT1 and does not affect domestication or foreignization any further.

4.1.2.2 Repetition creating intrasentential redundancies in ST1 and TT1

No.	ST1 example	TT1 example
1	den og den filmen er en viktig film (such and such film is an important film)	such and such a film is an important film
2	og han har fått seg en kjæreste som er penere enn hun som var penest i klassen (and he has gotten a girlfriend who is prettier than the girl who was the prettiest the class)	and he has a girlfriend who is prettier than the prettiest girl in the class used to be

In ST1, there is repetition that leads to intrasentential redundancies, where ellipsis is perhaps the expected choice. Ellipsis normally happens when a word "is left out because it can be filled in from the surrounding text" (Hasselgård, Johansson and Lysvåg 404). In the **first example** 'film' is repeated, where Loe could have conformed to the norm and used ellipsis, in a more familiarised way: 'den og den filmen er viktig'. Literal translation is used in this example and the same word is repeated in the translation. This shift is neutral regarding foreignization and domestication. The procedure used in **example 2** is predominantly literal translation, while the latter part of the sentence demonstrates the use of modulation, where 'used to be' indicates that the girl in question is no longer pretty, something the source text does not convey. Furthermore, the variation in word order in the translation means that the intrasentential repetition of sentence structure in ST1 is not retained, namely subject (kjæreste, hun) – relative pronoun (som, som) – verb (er, var) – adjective (penere, penest). Nevertheless, example 2 preserves intrasentential redundancy by repeating different forms of the word 'pretty' twice. Example 2 could be slightly foreignizing, in that the modulation has

not left the sentence more fluent, but rather slightly unidiomatic. This stylistic trait has nonetheless been preserved in both examples.

4.1.2.3   Repetition of content words in ST2 and TT2

No.	ST2 example	TT2 example
1	vi har skaffet oss hus og pusset det flinkt opp (we have obtained a house and refurbished it cleverly)	we have acquired a house, which we decorated to look nice
2	a) derfor gjør jeg det ugjerne (that's why I do it reluctantly) b) du omgås mennesker gjerne …mens jeg gjør det ugjerne (you socialise gladly …while I do it ungladly)	a) that's why I'm reluctant to go b) you like mixing with people … but I don't like to do that
3	usympatisk (unsympathetic)	unfriendly

In *Doppler*, the repetition takes different forms and is connected to the subject matter, but some examples are included here to also shed light on the self-reference created by the repetition of some words in both ST1 and ST2.

Doppler seeks to escape 'flinkheten' (cleverness) by moving into the woods. The repeated focus on the word 'flink' reaches its culmination during Doppler's epiphany (ST2 39-41) where various forms of the word 'flink' is repeated no less than 36 times, but 'flink' is used elsewhere in the novel as well. It is applied in numerous ways, the most surprising of which is the adverb versions in **example 1**. The repetition of 'flink' is generally not preserved in TT2, as it has been substituted by various equivalent words. Thus the stylistic trait has become unmarked by introducing a comfortable variety of words where monotonous focus on one word dominates the source text. The translation of Doppler's epiphany, however, consistently translates 'flink' into 'nice', except when it comes to example 1, where a more standard description is used. The procedure used in example 1 is transposition, which has turned the unconventional adverb 'flinkt' into an adjective that describes the house, rather than the house-building process. This is a shift that leaves the TT2 sentence more coherent and by that account, it is domesticating. Repetition is generally not preserved in TT2 and the words chosen in the translation attest to a more varied vocabulary and do not call attention to themselves, therefore they do not disrupt fluency.

The unconventional word 'ugjerne' (ungladly) is repeated twice in ST2. A word closer to the norm, like 'motvillig' (reluctantly), would sufficiently express reluctance, but not as tellingly as 'ugjerne'. Adding the 'u', thus negating an otherwise positive word, illustrates Doppler's reluctance to conforming to societal expectations, but also to using normal semantics, which gives the word stylistic importance. 'Ugjerne' has been translated using

transposition, turning a source text adverb into adjective "reluctant" (TT2 5) **example 2a** and the verb "don't like" (TT2 35) in **example 2b**. Consequently, repetition is not preserved and the significance of the word is lost. These transpositions are optional and therefore domesticating.

      Example 3 illustrates another similarly deviating word starting with 'u', namely "usympatisk" (unsympathetic) (ST2 122), which represents repetition across ST1 and ST2 (see above). This word is translated into "unfriendly" (TT2 128), a perhaps more frequently used word than the literal translation 'unsympathetic'. The procedure used in this case, is équivalence and does not affect foreignization or domestication. The reference to ST1 is preserved as 'friendly' is frequently repeated there as well.

4.1.2.4   *Repetition creating intrasentential redundancy in ST2 and TT2*

No.	ST2 example	TT2 example
1	store, øde landskaper slutter å være store, øde landskaper (vast desolate landscapes stop being vast desolate landscapes)	large, desolate landscapes stop being large, desolate landscapes
2	jeg hadde skapt en mistenksom og hatefull stemning på settet og filmen ville blitt en mistenksom og hatefull film (I would have created a suspicious and hateful atmosphere on the set and the film would have become a suspicious and hateful film)	I would have created an apprehensive and spiteful atmosphere on the set, and the film would have become an apprehensive and spiteful film

A more familiarised version of **example 1**, could be 'store øde landskaper slutter å eksistere' (vast desolate landscapes cease to exist), but would not have had the same defamiliarizing effect. Alternatively, ellipsis could have been used in place of the word 'landskaper', which is already mentioned. The redundancy this creates is even clearer in **example 2**. Three words are repeated here, namely 'film', 'mistenksom' and 'hatefull'. Instead of using the pro-form 'det', saying 'og *det* ville blitt en mistenksom og hatefull film', Loe repeats the subject at the beginning and end of the clause. Additionally, the narrator's description of a film and an atmosphere as 'mistenksom' is arguably idiosyncratic in that suspicion is normally a characteristic assigned to humans, making this is an example of personification. Both ST2 examples of intrasentential redundant repetition are preserved in TT2. Example 1 is translated literally. The same is true of example 2, despite the altered semantic meaning of he word 'mistenksom' (suspicious); 'apprehensive' does not convey the same sense of scepticism.

Still, the ST2 stylistic effect of intrasentential redundancies is maintained in TT2. The procedures used here do not affect foreignization or domestication in any evident way.

4.1.2.5 Summary

The repeated content word 'sympatisk' is preserved in TT1, save for one divergence. TT2, however, varies the repeated source text words frequently. These findings illustrate that the repetition of content words is less defamiliarizing in TT2 and that TT1 is more true to Loe's repetition. Intrasentential redundancies are, however, repeated to the same extent in TT1 and TT2. None of the above examples affect foreignization or domestication, except for the change from 'sympatisk' to 'good' in TT1, which is slightly domesticating.

4.1.3 Unusual representations of amounts

The main character in *Naiv. Super.* admits that he has a problem with estimating amounts (ST1 27) and this is confirmed many times by his unusual descriptions of quantities in both ST1 and ST2, which more often than not denote approximations. These descriptions are repetitive and, as such, linked to the above category.

4.1.3.1 Amounts in ST1 and TT1

No.	ST1 example	TT1 example
1	en håndfull grader over frysepunktet (a handful of degrees above the freezing point)	handful, a few
2	jeg skulle dunke han på pinnen i mange kilometer i timen (I was going to knock him on/to the stick at many kilometres per hour)	I would smack him against the peg at many kilometres an hour
3	hva som skal skje om en million milliarder år angår meg strengt tatt ikke (what is going to happen in one million billion years doesn't strictly speaking concern me)	what's going to happen in a billion billion years really just doesn't concern me
4	helt sikkert mer enn fem (definitely more than five)	at least five

Of all the unusual ways to describe amounts, 'en håndfull' (a handful), is the most frequent and is used four times, one of which is demonstrated in **example 1**. The context of this sentence is the narrator estimating how cold it is inside a bush, namely "en håndfull grader over frysepunktet" (a handful of degrees above the freezing point) (ST1 10). The repetition of

'en håndfull' is a self-reference since it also occurs in *Doppler*. 'En håndfull' is translated literally in two out of three instances. There is one divergence, however; "en håndfull grader" (ST1 10), is translated into "a few degrees" (TT1 4), which is a modulation and arguably a more conventional term to describe degrees. These shifts mostly preserve the stylistic trait, but do not affect foreignization or domestication.

The second example contains an unusual description of speed. The context is a game of croquet the main character is eager to win. It is unusual to describe the strike from a mallet in kilometres per hour. **Example 2** shows that the unusual representation of speed has been preserved. 'På' (on), however has been changed to "against" and specifies direction. The procedure used here is modulation that leaves the sentence a bit more fluent.

Another example of anomalous descriptions of amounts is apparent by the application of numbers in **example 3**, which is evocative of a child's unawareness of numbers. "En million milliarder" (ST1 171) has been translated to "a billion billion" (TT1 158), which uses different words, but not so that it changes the semantic meaning of the phrase, which is most likely 'a really long time ago'. The procedure used here is therefore équivalence. Saying 'billion' twice, like in this example, carries the stylistic effect over to the target text. The change from 'million' into 'billion' might intensify the dimensions further and make the stylistic trait more prominent. This shift does not affect foreignization or domestication.

The unusual descriptions of quantities often produce slightly contradictory sentences, like the one in **example 4**. The sentence contradicts itself by first using the phrase 'helt sikkert' (definitely) which denotes an absolute certainty followed by the vague number 'mer enn fem' (more than five). This conveys the main character's certainty about uncertainty, which ties in with one of the novel's themes, namely that the only definite knowledge in the universe is that all knowledge indefinite. The contradictory sentences in example 4 are less pronounced in TT1 than in ST1. The absoluteness produced by the phrase 'helt sikkert' (definitely) lacks in 'at least'. The procedure applied in this case is modulation, the use of which eliminates the stylistic trait and creates fluency.

4.1.3.2   Use of amounts in ST2 and TT2

No.	ST2 example	TT2 example
1	en håndfull ganger (a handful of times)	a handful of times
2	et stykke arbeid (a piece of work)	a work of art
3	et stykke tid (a piece of time)	for a while

As previously mentioned, 'en håndfull' reappears in ST2. The first instance of this is the following sentence: "jeg har kun sett min kone en håndfull ganger siden da" (I have only seen my wife a handful of times since then) (ST2 33). Another example is the phrase "enda en håndfull penger" (another handful of money) (ST2 37). It is easier to imagine a handful of money than a handful of times. **Example 1** shows how 'en håndfull' has been translated literally and this is true of all translations of the expression in TT2. This means that this stylistic element is as prominent in TT2 as in ST2. This shift does not affect fluency.

The phrase 'et stykke' (a piece) is used in the contexts of work and time. The Norwegian word 'arbeid' is normally translated into 'work' but in this case 'work' could mean either 'physical labour' or the outcome of physical labour, such as a work of art. A literal translation of **example 2** could be confusing to the target culture, as 'a piece of work' also is a derogatory expression for someone who is difficult to deal with. This has been avoided in TT2 and rather translated into "a work of art" (TT2 158). The procedure used here is therefore optional modulation and has a domesticating effect and the unusual description in ST2 is not preserved, but substituted for a more expected expression.

The **third example** is also unconventional; in Norwegian, 'et stykke' pertains to either a distance or a piece of a given physical mass, not an abstract measurement like time. The translation of the third example, does not retain Loe's idiosyncratic use of 'et stykke', but opts for a more conventional time measurement. This is also an example of modulation, which is domesticating and represents a move towards unmarkedness.

4.1.3.3   *Summary*

The procedure used most frequently with the translation of amounts in TT1 is modulation. Despite slight divergences from ST1, this stylistic trait has been preserved in TT1. These shifts have either neutral or domesticating effects in TT1. TT2 translates 'en håndfull' literally in all instances, thus preserving the defamiliarizing desction. The TT2 examples in this section lean towards domestication.

4.1.4   Swearing

Both novels contain swearing, but the swear words in ST2 have a stronger emotional force than those in ST1. Swearing is stylistically important in ST1 and ST2 because it characterises the two main character's different registers, where the former is more childlike and the latter more like that of a teenager. Comparing the severity of swearing across cultures and

languages is challenging, if not impossible, but one can still make some suggestions based on the available research and one's own intuition if one is well familiar with both languages.

4.1.4.1 Swearing in ST1 and TT1

No.	ST1 example	TT1 example
1	pikk	pikk =dick
2	**a)** jævlig (devilish) **b)** min bror den jævelen (my brother the devil) **c)** for jævlig (for devilish)	**a)** fucking, bloody **b)** the bastard **c)** really stinks
3	**a)** nå skal det faen meg bygges hus (now shall it devil me be built houses) **b)** jeg gir stort sett faen i rom (I usually don't give a devil about space)	**a)** let's build some goddamn houses **b)** I generally don't give a toss about space
4	**a)** vil det ikke skje en skit (will it not happen a shit) **b)** skal bæsje (is going to poop) **c)** begynner å bæsje (starting to poop) **d)** hundebæsj (dog poop)	**a)** nothing will happen, not a turd **b)** take a shit **c)** starts to crap **d)** dog turd
5	en sort mann som kalte sykkelen sin for bitch (a black man who called his bike bitch)	a black man calling his bike *bitch*

ST1 contains 31 instances of swear words, 19 of which could be considered severe, like 'faen' (the devil), while 12 could be considered mild, like 'skit' (shit). TT1 has 30 swear words, of which 15 are mild and 15 are severe, which marks a 21 per cent decrease from ST1. The one missing from ST1 is 'for jævlig', which has been translated into the expression 'really stinks'. The swearing in TT1 seems to be mostly of the same degree of severity as that in the source text.

The total number of swearing in ST1 rises significantly by including all the swear words from the chapter "Biblioteket". These are Norwegian expletives typed into a library search engine at the New York Public Library for the purpose of finding matching authors, and as such, their function is not to express anger or excitement but to explore language and rebel against appropriate 'grown up' behaviour. Most of these swear words in this chapter are anatomical, unlike other severe expletives, and pertain more to immature humour. The pages containing these words look like actual printed copies of the search results. In all, 12 severe swear words are searched for and have 72 matching authors. They search for words like 'pikk' (cock) and 'rompe' (ass), the last of which, has the name of the author Rompe, Robert as result (ST1 162). In TT1 the translator has included handwritten explanations next to the Norwegian words. **Example 1** illustrates this; next to the Norwegian word "pikk" there is a

handwritten "= dick" (TT1 138). Other than that, the pages of Internet searches are exactly the same as in ST1. These handwritten explanations are visible signs of the translator and thereby generate a clear foreignizing effect. The exact copies of the Norwegian search results are also foreignizing in that all the Norwegian swear words are borrowed in TT1.

The fact that the most severe swear words in ST1 derive from Christian terms is something that Fjeld (2004) and Hasund (2006) can attest to being the most common in Norway. The severity of these, as we shall see, varies by context. One such word is 'jævlig' (devilish), in **example 2a**, which is used five times and was considered neutral in Lies survey (10). This is translated into 'fucking' twice, which was considered the third most severe swear word in Milwood-Hargrave's survey (9) and does not match the severity of 'jævlig'. It is translated into 'bloody' once which was considered mild in the same survey (ibid.,14) and therefore matches the severity of 'jævlig'(Lie 10). The fixed expression in **example 2b** is not driven by hate, but rather mild brotherly annoyance and the translation of this, exemplifies a shift in context from religion to social stigma, which reveals that the procedure used is adaptation. Historically, the word 'bastard' was a derogatory term for illegitimate children, but is now used as a general insult or have a more friendly tone (Hughes 18, 19). **Example 2c** is a fixed expression that denotes an awful situation, but is not very strong. This has not been translated as swearing in TT1 but the context of the word has still been altered from religious to anatomical, which makes this instance an adaptation. All of these examples involve the procedure adaptation, which is used to change the cultural context of the swear words and has a domesticating effect.

The religious expletive 'faen' (the devil), which is used twice in ST1, is common and considered severe in Norway (Lie 2). It derives from the Norwegian word 'fanden', which means 'devil'. The word is used in the fixed expression 'gi faen', which means 'to not give a damn'. In **example 3a**, 'faen meg' (devil me) functions as an adverb which modifies the verb 'bygges' (be built) and practically has the same meaning as 'really'. The religious context of 'faen' is, in this example, retained in the translation by the use of 'goddamn' but there has been a shift to a benign rather than malign Christian power. In this case we are dealing with a modulation that creates a certain domesticating effect. The word 'God' was considered "[n]ot swearing" in Millwood Hargrave's study (18), while 'faen' was considered severe in Lies survey (2), which means that 'goddamn' does not preserve the degree of severity of in the translation. Example **3b** demonstrates the use of adaptation, and is domesticating.

Terms describing defecation are considered mild in Norway (Lie 8, 9). 'Skit' is used figuratively, to denote 'nothing', like in **example 4a**. In the corresponding TT1 sentence, 'turd' compensates for the swear word 'skit'. 'Turd', however, denotes "a lump of excrement" or "obnoxious and contemptible" ("turd"), instead of 'nothing' and is less offensive than 'shit'. (Hughes 467). The word 'shit', however *has* the potential to mean 'nothing' and would have fit target culture expectations (see Millwood-Hargrave 13). The procedure used here is équivalence and this has a foreignizing effect. **Examples 4b-d**, are expletives that are not used as swear words but describe the act of defecation. The use of the word 'bæsje' (poop) as opposed to 'drite' (shit), in the source text, is in line with the naïve and childlike tone of the novel: "[n]å sitter Obi og skal bæsje. På gresset. Jeg syns det er ekkelt" (Now Obi is sitting and pooping. On the grass. I think it's nasty) (ST1 133). **Example 4b** has been translated into "take a shit" (TT1 121). While the literary use of 'shit' has lost some of its taboo connotations, it still is "offensive in public, professional, or political discourse" (Hughes 434) and in the context of TT1 connotes a more adult register than the word 'poop' would have. Using 'shit' for 'bæsje' takes away from the naïvety in the source text.

Example 3 demonstrates an expletive that is also a loanword, namely "bitch" (ST1 174). The word is included in the main character's list of every day observations in New York. As this is merely an observation of someone else's swearing written in the main character's L2, a certain distance is created (see Harris, Aycicegi and Gleason 574). This loanword has been borrowed; the only difference being that it is set in italics. This technique is generally used in TT1 to signalise English words in the source text. Using italics like this could be a form of explicitation in that they highlight something in the target text that is implicit in the source text. The italicised words might seem random and foreignizing to the target culture, as they probably have no knowledge of the Englishness in ST1.

4.1.4.2 Swearing in ST2 and TT2

No.	ST2 example	TT2 example
1	**a)** faen (devil) **b)** sette inn hele faenskapet med … olje og beis (paint the whole devilry with … oil and stain) **c)** flinkhet og faenskap og tro og håp og kjærlighet i verden (cleverness and devilry and faith and hope and love in the world) **d)** som faen (like devil)	**a)** shit, bloody, buggery **b)** give it the works **c)** niceness and devilry and belief and hope and love in the world **d)** like crazy, hell of a
2	**a)** satans (satan's) **b)** å satan, er det jul (oh satan, is it Christmas)	**a)** bloody **b)** oh, sod it it's Christmas

3	**a)** helvetes (hellish) **b)** helvete (hell) **c)** for helvete (for hell)	**a)** bloody, sodding, damned **b)** hell **c)** for Christ's sake
4	**a)** jævlig (devilish) **b)** jævlene (those devils)	**a)** bloody **b)** buggers
5	**a)** som pokker (like damn) **b)** forsyne meg (provide me) **c)** himmel og hav (heaven and sea)	**a)** like crazy **b)** crickey, bugger me, goodness me, damn well **c)** Christ

Where ST1 has 36 swear words, ST2 contains 49 in total, 34 of which could be considered severe, while 15 could be considered mild. Thus, one can say that ST2 contains more expressive swearing than ST1. TT2 contains 45 swear words, as opposed to 49 in the original. 18 of these have a severe expressive force, while and 27 are more or less mild. This demonstrates a 47 per cent decrease in the use of severe swear words in TT2. Many of the religious swear words in TT2 are translations of non-religious ST2 words, like "damn well" (TT2 108) for "forsyne meg" (ST2 104). What is more, four swear words that are mild or severe in ST2 are made into non-swearing in TT2.

Different versions of 'faen' are used 14 times in ST2, compared to two times in ST1. It expresses Doppler's anger, which, at its peak, sounds like this: "jeg …roper til slutt bare faen, faen, faen helt til jeg mister stemmen" (I … yell in the end just the devil, the devil, the devil until I lose my voice) (ST2 95). 'Faen' was considered severe in Lie's survey (2). In **example 1a** 'faen' has become 'shit' four times, which is a shift from a religious context to an anatomical context, which makes this a case of adaptation, creating a domesticating effect. **Example 1c** is translated into "devilry" (TT2 98) and the religious context of the ST2 swear word has thus been preserved. **Example 1b** and **1d** are both translated into non-swearing. The former is a modulation and a reduction in which 'hele faenskapet' has been reduced to 'it'. Again, there is a shift of context, as well as a reduction in severity and has a domesticating effect. Additionally, the repetitive effect of 'faen' is not replicated in TT2.

Another religious swear word in ST2 is 'satan', an international term for the devil, which is used six times. It mostly functions as an adjective, for example in the sentence "det satans bordet" (that devilish table) (ST2 125), but could also be used as an interjection, like in **example 2a**, which is translated into 'bloody' five out of six times. "Sod it" (TT2 94), in **example 2b**, derives from sexual terminology, and is an abridgement of the word "sodomy", meaning "homosexuality" (Hughes 236). According to Millwood-Hargrave's survey, "sodding" was considered "mild" (14). Without available research, one could infer that

'satan' is stronger than both 'bloody' and 'sodding', due to its religious origin. Both 2a and 2b are adaptations and have a domesticating effect.

Different versions of 'helvete' (hell) are used eight times and are considered severe (Lie 10). Three of these are adjectival, as seen in **example 3a**, four are nominal, like that in **example 3b**, while **example 3c** is an interjection. In 3a, it is translated into various words like "bloody" (TT2 7) and "sodding" (TT2 97) which are both considered mild in the target culture (Millwood-Hargrave 14). These are examples of adaptation and have a domesticating effect. Example 3b is translated literally, like in "[m]ay the Teletubbies burn in hell" (TT2 97). "Hell" has, according to Hughes, lost its severity due to "the secularization of society" (116). The interjection in example 3c has retained its religious context in the translation but is altered from evil to good powers. This is a modulation, where the place 'helvete' is changed into the person 'Christ', which was considered "[n]ot swearing" by the majority of the participants in Millwod-Hargrave's survey (17). One can therefore assert that the translations of 'helvete' have a milder effect than those in the original. Example 3b and 3c do not have a foreignizing or domesticating effect.

'Jævlig' was the most recurrent swear word in ST1 but is only used twice in ST2. It is adjectival, like in **example 4a**, and nominal, like in **example 4b**. The severity of the word is considered neutral (Lie 10). The translation of both of these examples demonstrates a shift from religious swearing to sexual and anatomical. 'Jævlige' is rendered as "bloody" (TT2 20), while 'jævlene' has become "buggers" (TT2 43), stemming from the word "a Bulgarian", which historically denotes "a sodomite" (Hughes 31). Both 'buggers' and 'bloody' are considered "mild" in the target culture (Millwood-Hargrave 13,14). Adaptation is used in both 4a and 4b, the severity of which seem equivalent to that of 'jævlig', generating a more domesticating effect.

In addition to the severe swear words, there are also quite a few occurrences of mild swearing in ST2. One instance is the expression in **example 5a**, "som pokker" (damn) (ST2 27), which was considered "veldig mildt" (very mild) by the majority in Lie's survey (9). 5a has been translated into "like crazy" (TT2 20), which is not an expletive and could be said to have a slightly milder effect than 'pokker'. The procedure used here is adaptation, this time changing the context from religious to mental. This has a slightly domesticating effect. Neither **example 5b** nor **example 5c** was considered in Lie's survey, but one can safely surmise that they are fairly mild to the extent that they border on non-swearing. Example 5b has three different translations, reducing its repetitive effect in ST2. The mildest of these are

arguably "goodness me" (TT2 143) and "damn well" (TT2 108), the latter of which has lost most of its taboo status (Hughes 116). 'Goodness me' is translated using équivalence, while 'damn well' is translated by means of modulation. Example 5c is translated into "Christ" (TT2 162), using modulation, and is, as previously mentioned, hardly considered swearing and is therefore similar to'himmel og hav' (Millwood-Hargrave 17). Consequently, one can gather that these examples are generally translated with correspondingly mild terms and that they therefore do not affect domestication or foreignization, with the exception of example 5a.

4.1.4.3   Summary

When it comes to swearing, the procedure most frequently used in both target text is adaptation. In this case, this means that the cultural context surrounding the swearwords is changed from religious to anatomical. Adaptation generally has a domesticating effect (see above). The most clearly foreignizing example, when it comes to swearing, occurs with the borrowed swear words and handwritten explanations in TT1. The swearing in TT1 is considered slightly more severe than that in ST1, which changes the naïvety of the ST1 character. The opposite is true of TT2, which conversely tends to moderate many severe expletives. Both target texts vary swear words where they remain the same in the source text, but this happens more frequently in TT2.

4.1.5   Litotes

Litotes, is an "ironical understatement in which an affirmative is expressed by the negative of its contrary" ("Litotes").

4.1.5.1   Litotes in ST1 and TT1

No.	ST1 example	TT1 example
1	det er ikke få ting som skal klaffe (there aren't few things that have to work out)	quite a few things have to gel
2	jeg er ikke dummere enn at jeg ser nytten av en viss kunnskap (I'm not more stupid that I don't see the use of a certain amount of knowledge)	I am not so stupid that I don't see the use of a certain amount of knowledge

Even though there is much use of understatement in ST1, there is not an abundance of litotes, in its strictest sense. In **example 1** the negative 'ikke' (not), expresses the contrary of 'få' (few), namely 'many'. This creates the affirmative sentence 'many things need to work out'.

The first example of litotes is translated into 'quite a few' and can be back-translated into 'ganske så få', which is the contrary of 'mange' (many). However, 'quite a few' is not negated in this example and consequently, example 1 cannot be called litotes. To preserve the litotes, the TT1 expression would have to read 'not quite a few', which might nevertheless sound unidiomatic and foreignizing. This is therefore a modulation that upholds fluency by which the negative 'ikke få' is turned into the positive 'quite a few', thus not preserving the litotes.

The affirmative, underlying meaning of **example 2** is 'I see the use of a certain amount of knowledge.' The litotes has been preserved in the translation. TT1 includes an additional negative, namely 'don't see', which gives the sentence three negative elements, namely 'not', 'stupid' and 'don't'. The TT1 has thus preserved the litotes and left the sentence amplified. This translation shift is a case of literal translation and modulation, which does not affect domestication of foreignization.

4.1.5.2   Litotes in ST2 and TT2

No.	ST2 example	TT2 example
1	ingenting gjør meg så lite misfornøyd som at det snør (nothing makes me so little displeased as the fact that it's snowing)	nothing gets me less grumpy than snow
2	jeg kunne omtrent ikke huske sist gang jeg ikke tenkte på badet (I almost couldn't remember the last time I thought about the bath room)	I could hardly remember the last time I wasn't thinking about the bathroom
3	intet påskudd er for lite til at han gjør seg en tur over til meg (no excuse is too small for him to visit me)	any old excuse will do to come over and visit me

The **first example** is negated once, by 'ingenting' (nothing) and described by the negative words 'lite' (little) and 'misfornøyd' (displeased). Combined, they express the contrary, which is that 'snow makes me very satisfied'. In this example, the litotes is preserved in the translation. There are three negative words here, like in the corresponding ST2 example, namely 'nothing', 'less' and 'grumpy', therefore, the litotes is retained. This sentence is translated using modulation. The phrase 'så lite misfornøyd' is changed to 'less grumpy', which is an optional modulation. The word 'misfornøyd' is in itself a negation of a frequently used positive word, namely 'fornøyd' (pleased), while the same cannot be said about 'grumpy'. Words like 'displeased' or 'unhappy', which are negations of positive words, might have emphasised the litotes in the translation. This shift therefore has a slightly domesticating

effect. 'Som at det snør' has become 'than snow', which is probably an obligatory modulation without a domesticating effect.

The two negatives 'ikke huske' and 'ikke tenkte', in **example 2**, are used to express a positive statement: 'I often think about the bathroom.' These two negations have been translated into the negative adverbs 'hardly' and the negation 'wasn't'. Thus, there is double negation in TT2 as well, and the litotes is preserved. Example 2 demonstrates the use of équivalence in the phrase 'I could hardly remember' and literal translation in the remaining part of the sentence. This shift leans sligtly towards domestication, due to the use of équivalence.

The **third example** expresses the idea 'every excuse is big enough to visit'. This statement is negated once, by 'intet' and the example has not been represented as litotes in the translation. The sentence has no negation of its contrary and is simply an affirmation. 'Intet' has been substituted with 'any old', while 'for lite' has become 'will do'. This example somewhat unmasks the litotes by only conveying its affirmative meaning. Thus, we once again have a modulation where terms have been reversed and, consequently, a stylistic effect in the source text is lost. These optional modulations lead to domestication.

4.1.5.3 *Summary*

ST2 has more litotes than ST1. TT1 has preserved one of the two litotes that were present in ST1, the first of which has been domesticated. The procedure used in the TT1 examples was modulation. In TT2, two of the three studied litotes were preserved and two examples lean towards domestication, while one is slightly foreignizing. The TT2 examples were mostly translated using modulation.

4.1.6 Allusions

Allusion is a part of both books, but is more prevalent in ST2. In ST1, the allusions are easy to spot because the narrator often identifies them. In ST2, however, the allusions are embedded into the dialogue and thus harder to spot. Therefore, we can differentiate between overt and covert allusions. Furthermore, we can draw a distinction between allusions to popular and high culture.

No.	ST1 example	TT1 example
1	**a)** å synge inn Lille Kattepus på band (to record Little Pussycat on tape) **b)** jeg kan synge Fola Fola Blakken (I can sing Fola Fola Blakken)	**a)** to sing The owl and the Pussycat on tape **b)** I can sing 'Fola Fola Blakken' (footnote)
2	**a)** sportsrevyen **b)** det var ikke TV2 (It wasn't TV2) **c)** rema 1000 **d)** Lars-Lillo Stenberg	**a)** *Sports Review* **b)** this was not *Sesame Street* **d)** rema 1000 **e)** Lars-Lillo Stenberg (footnote)
3	**a)** Svensk ZTV **b)** Karlsson på taket (huset hans, som jeg bygde under bordet) (Karlsson on the roof (his house, which I build under the table)	**a)** some programme or other on TV **b)** Karlsson på taket (footnote)

The Norwegian children's song "Lille Kattepus"(Little Pussycat) in **example 1a** is a covert allusion, which has a defamiliarizing effect in that the reader might initially mistake the song lyrics for dialogue. Similarly, **example 1b** demonstrates that the lyrics of "Fola Fola Blakken" are combined with the narrator's thoughts like so: "at Blakken skal få hvile, da henger det sammen" (that Blakken is going to rest, it all falls into place) (ST1 80). The strategy for translating allusions to children's songs is inconsistent in TT1, where the first is translated using adaptation, and the other is explained in a footnote. "Lille Kattepus" is adapted into "The Owl and the Pussycat", a British nonsense poem by Edward Lear, which is equally familiar to target readers. This passage leads to domestication, and would read fluently to an English speaking reader. "Fola Fola Blakken" is explained by way of a footnote stating "a melancholy song about an ageing horse who is ready for 'retirement'" (TT1 72), which preserves the allusion and highlights a foreign song. This explicitation therefore leads to foreignization. Consequently, there is a mix of foreignization and domestication when it comes to children's songs.

Allusions to Norwegian TV shows, branded products and household names are distributed either in one of the main character's lists or elsewhere in the text. **Examples 2a-e** are only briefly mentioned in ST1 and not explained. These have been translated using four different procedures. **Example 2a** is a literal translation, bordering on borrowing and 'sports review' could easily be a TV programme in the target culture and by the same token, it is domesticating. **Example 2b** illustrates an adaptation from 'TV2', a Norwegian TV channel directed towards a more adult audience, to '*Sesame Street*,' a children's programme familiar

to the target culture, which gives it a domesticating effect. In **example 2c** 'Rema 1000' is left unexplained and borrowed in TT1, which has a foreignizing effect. **Example 2d** has been explained in a footnote, which is foreignizing and compromises transparency.

As well as alluding to Norwegian popular culture, Loe overtly alludes to Swedish popular culture. One notable **example** is **3a**, where the main character suspects his good friend, Kim, of watching "Svensk ZTV" (Swedish ZTV) (ST1 16), since he receives a fax from him in Swedish. This example is translated using generalization and is domesticating in that it erases all the Swedish connotations. The opposite happens in **example 3b**, which is borrowed and explained in a footnote, generating a foreignizing effect. 3b, however, demonstrates reduction in which the whole parenthesis following 'Karlsson på taket' is omitted. Thus, the allusions to Swedish popular culture are sometimes domesticating and at other times foreignizing.

4.1.6.2 Allusions to high culture in ST1 and TT1

No.	ST1 example	TT1 example
1	Olav H. Hauge	Olav H Hauge (footnote)
2	jeg tenker på Ferdinand Finne. Kunstneren	I am thinking about Ferdinand Finne. The artist

Among the multitude of allusions to popular culture, there are also allusions to high culture. **Example 1** shows the mention of the Norwegian poet "Olav H Hauge" (ST1 37) in the main character's list of people he admires. Hauge is also covertly alluded to in ST2 and is thereby a self-reference. The name "Olav H. Hauge" is borrowed and explained by way of a footnote in TT1, which has a foreignizig effect (TT1 32). The **second** allusion to high culture is the reference to the Norwegian painter Ferdinand Finne, whose life philosophy is the object of wonder for the main character (ST1 54). The reference to Ferdinand Finne is borrowed in TT1 and is foreignizing in that the name is probably unfamiliar to the representative target reader. However, Finne's occupation is clearly stated, both in the source text and the target text, so the allusion to Finne is preserved.

4.1.6.3 Allusions to popular culture in ST2 and TT2

No.	ST2 example	TT2 example
1	du har en lang vei å gå, du, Bongo … men jeg skal gå den med deg (you have a long way to	you've got a long way to go, you have, Bongo … but I'll be with you

	go, you, Bongo … but I will walk it with you)	every step
2	**a)** svart senker natten seg, synger jeg stille, i stall og stue (black the night descends, I sing quietly, in stable and cottage) **b)** saantaaluuciia. Santa Lucia	**a)** night goes with silent steps, I sing quietly, Round house and cottage **b)** saaaaantaalucia, Santa Lucia!
3	du och jag, Bongo, sier jeg (you and me, Bongo, I say)	you and me, kiddo, I say

As illustrated by **example 1**, a snippet from the song "Eg ser" by Norwegian songwriter Bjørn Eidsvåg has been included in the dialogue covertly. This allusion is in every respect invisible in TT2; it is translated literally, with no explanation and is thus domesticating.

Example 2a is an overt allusion to the advent song "Santa Lucia". The lyrics are interrupted by narrative comments, like in the following: "[s]vart senker natten seg, synger jeg stille, i stall og stue" (81). Équivalence is used with the translation of the song with some regard to rhythm and rhyme. Instead of "senker natten seg" (descends the night) (ST2 81), the night is personified and instead "goes with silent steps" (TT2 82), which has the same amount of syllables. Additionally, the TT2 translators have chosen 'house' instead of 'stall' (stable) and added an exclamation mark at the end. The translation of the last line of the song, which can be seen in **example 2b**, seems like an effort to emulate the rhythm in the corresponding line in ST2, which, is demonstrated by matching the number of vowels to the number of syllables. This is not replicated in TT2, as the translators seem to have merely inserted a random number of vowels. The translation of "Santa Lucia" is therefore a modulation that has a foreignizing effect.

An allusion to Swedish popular culture occurs in ST2 as well, but covertly so. The Swedish line in **example 3** is an allusion to the children's books and films about *Emil fra Lønneberget* by Swedish writer Astrid Lindgren. In the film version, the little boy Emil lovingly exclaims to his best friend and father figure: 'du och jag, Alfred!' which has become something of a catchphrase of the series, one that many Scandinavians can easily identify. In ST2, the catchphrase is reversed so that the father figure Doppler utters the phrase to the 'child' Bongo. In TT2, the allusion is translated literally, but 'Bongo' has been changed into 'kiddo', which is an adaptation that changes the cultural context from Swedish to American ("Kiddo") and makes this shift domesticating. Thus, the allusion to Swedish culture is substituted with a target culture reference, which nevertheless has a somewhat similar effect.

No.	ST2 example	TT2 example
1	det er den draumen, sier jeg. At me ein morgonstund skal glida inn på ein våg me ikkje har visst um (it is that dream, I say. That we one early morning will glide into a bay we have not known of)	as a Norwegian poet once said: It's the dream. Slipping into an unfamiliar bay in the early morning
2	vi må være kommet til feil skog, sier jeg til Bongo. Her er så underlig (we must have come to the wrong forest, I say to Bongo. Here is so strange)	we must have come to the wrong forest, I say to Bongo. It's so strange here
3	jeg er en folkefiende (I am an enemy of the people)	I'm an enemy of the people
4	skogen gir og tar. Og den former dem som oppsøker den i sitt bilde (the forest gives and takes. And it moulds those who seek it in its image)	the forest gives and it takes. And it shapes those who take refuge there in its own image

The allusion to Olav H. Hauge in **example 1** corresponds to verse 10 and 11 in his poem "Det er den draumen": "at me ei morgonstund skal glida inn på ein våg me ikkje har visst um" (10-11). The change from Bokmål to Nynorsk in example 1 makes the allusion clearer as Hauge also uses Nynorsk. Alluding to Hauge is another example of Loe's self-reference as Hauge is mentioned in ST1 as well. The allusion to Hauge is translated using équivalence, and has a preceding comment pointing out that the following sentence is a poetic reference, which changes the allusion from covert to overt. The translation makes the allusion and its connotation to Norwegian literature visible and is thereby foreignizing.

The allusion in **example 2**, refers to two verses of Sigbjørn Obstfelder's modernist poem "Jeg ser", which reads "Jeg er visst kommet på en feil klode! / Her er så underligt …" (I have apparently come to the wrong planet! / Here is so strange) (17-18). Unlike the Hauge allusion, this instance is not explained in the translation and looks like any other sentence. It is a literal translation, which does not explain the allusion and has the effect of erasing cultural connotations. The loss might be owing to the translators failing to notice the allusion or giving up trying to find a better solution preserve it due to its obscurity.

Another obscure allusion is the reference to the Ibsen play "En folkefiende" (An enemy of the people) in **example 3**. The allusion has been translated using équivalence, which has a domesticating effect. TT2 looks like the official English title of the play, *An Enemy of the People*, except that it is not italicised, and the allusion is therefore preserved. The allusion

is, however, invisible to the target culture, unless they happen to know the play, which makes the shift domesticating.

There are many religious allusions in ST2, consisting of snippets and combinations of familiar biblical quotes. **Example 4** is an allusion to parts of Job. 1.21: "Herren gav, og Herren tok" and Gen. 1. 27: "Og gud skapte mennesket i sitt bilde" (*Skoleutgave*). The translation of example 4 is similar to the corresponding English bible quotes alluded to: "The LORD gave and the LORD has taken away" (*English Standard Version*, Job. 1. 21) and "So God created man in his own image" (Gen. 1. 27). Literal translation is used in this example, but the words 'oppsøke' and 'bilde' are translated with équivalence into 'take refuge', and 'image', respectively, which are both common in biblical language (see 2 Sam. 22. 3). This biblical allusion is therefore detectable to target readers. Converting words into the target culture's biblical usage is arguably domesticating.

4.1.6.5 Summary

As we have established, the TT1 translator, alternates between adaptation, footnotes and borrowing when dealing with allusions. This leads to a mix of foreignization and domestication; six of ten TT1 examples discussed are foreignizing. TT2 consistently uses in-text explicitation the few times an allusion has been elaborated on but never in the form of footnotes. The sentences containing allusions in TT2 are, however, mostly translated literally and without explicitation, which render many of the allusions lost. Five out of nine translations of allusions in TT2 are domesticating.

4.1.7 Binary oppositions

Binary oppositions are common in *Naiv. Super.* and is the main character's coping mechanism in what he perceives to be a confusing world. Furthermore, it resembles the way a child might categorise experiences (Rødset 15). They also occur in Doppler, but to such a small scale that they do not appear to be characteristic.

4.1.7.1 Binary oppositions in ST1 and TT1

No.	ST1 example	TT1 example
1	jeg har to venner. En god og en dårlig (I have two friends. One good and one bad)	I have two friends. A good one and a bad one

2	og noen ganger var de bedre enn ting er nå, og andre ganger var de dårlige (and sometimes things were better than they are now, and sometimes they were worse)	and sometimes things were better than they are now, and other times they were worse
3	jeg … svarte ja på det første spørsmålet og nei på det andre (I … answered yes to the first question and no to the other)	I … answered yes to the first question and no to the other

Experiences, feelings and people are divided into neat binary boxes, which keep things simple and leave nothing in between. In the binary opposition in **example 1**, the sense has been translated, but with slight amplification, namely two mentions of 'one'. This shift could be obligatory, if 'en' is an indefinite article, which necessitates adding the propword 'one' in English. However, 'en' could refer to the numeral 'én' (one), without an accent signalising the narrator's naïve, careless language, in which case, the shift would be optional. These shifts make the sentence less stoic and more fluent.

In **example 2**, the narrator's state of mind is described as either better or worse, not in-between. The translation of this sentence has some reduction. 'Noen ganger' has become 'sometimes'. Furthermore, 'things' has been moved and takes the place of 'de' perhaps to make it more idiomatic. Otherwise it is similar and conveys the same binary meaning, making this a literal translation.

The narrator's replies are often either affirmative or negative, not supplementary, like in **example 3**. This example has similarly been made binary in TT1. Again, this is a literal translation of the corresponding ST1 sentence, which leaves the stylistic trait intact. Neither foreignization nor domestication is apparent in this case.

4.1.7.2   *Binary oppositions in ST2 and TT2*

No.	ST2 example	TT2 example
1	og du fungerer alltid så bra og jeg så dårlig, og du omgås mennesker gjerne og med letthet mens jeg gjør det ugjerne og med vanskelighet (and you always function so well and I so badly, and you socialise with people gladly and with ease, whereas I do it ungladly and with difficulty)	and you always function so well and I function so badly, and you like mixing with people and it's easy for you, but I don't like to do that and it's difficult for me

In **example 1**, Doppler is explaining the main differences between him and his wife, illustrating their conflicting personalities. Except for the transposition of 'ugjerne', the binary opposition is preserved in TT2.

4.1.7.3   Summary

The binary oppositions in these examples show that TT1 has translated them literally, despite some obligatory shifts. TT2 has preserved the one binary opposition that was detected in ST2. For the most part, the changes made in TT1 and TT2 do not break target culture conventions, generating a slightly domesticating effect in some cases.

4.1.8   Lists

Something that also contributes to the main character's naïvism is the considerable use of lists to categorise events and objects and perhaps to keep him busy.

4.1.8.1   Lists in ST1 and TT1

No.	ST1 example	TT1 example

1	Kim har sett på svensk ZTV. Han siterer:
	   1. Säg upp dej
	   2. Res bort
	   3. Skaffa nya vänner
	(Kim has been watching Swedish ZTV. He quotes: 1. quit your job 2. travel. 3. get new friends)
		Kim has been watching some programme or other on TV. He quotes: 1. Quit your job. 2. Go travelling. 3. Make new friends

In total there are 23 lists in *Naiv. Super* and none in *Doppler.* One example includes a long list of items and activities that used to fill the narrator with enthusiasm (ST1 30-32). Another example is the narrator's and his four-year-old friend Børre's lists over what kind of animals they have seen. Holst calls these lists defamiliarizing in that they seldom make logical sense (75, 76). The lists are amusing, unconventional and a hallmark of Loe's style, and can also be found in his novel *Volvo Lastvagnar*. There are 23 lists in the translation, which means that this stylistic trait has been preserved. However, one is missing and an extra is added, which might have been done to compensate for the one missing. This is neither domesticating nor foreignizing.

     Example 1 demonstrates that the TT1 version of Kim's list is not bulleted, which means that the stylistic element is not always retained. Furthermore, the list does not express the use of Swedish. This is an obligatory transposition, since it would be near impossible to

account for the Swedish in TT1. This obligatory grammatical shift tends towards domestication.

4.1.8.2 *Summary*

The lists are, in themselves, defamiliarizing, but the translation of most of them is not foreignizing, except for the cultural loss in example 1, which is domesticating.

4.1.9 Short and simple sentences in ST1

Naiv. Super. often incorporates short and simple sentences.

4.1.9.1 *Short and simple sentences ST1 and TT1*

No.	ST1 example	TT1 example
1	sangen er kjempefin (the song is really nice)	the song is great
2	verset er stille men refrenget er ganske rått (the verse is quiet, while the chorus is pretty cool)	the verse is quiet, but the chorus rocks

There is a significant amount of short and simple sentences in *Naiv. Super.* A simple sentence is "a single clause which occurs on its own" (Hasselgård, Johansson and Lysvåg 28). This means that it only has a main clause, which means that it "must contain a subject (apart from imperatives) and a finite verb" (ibid., 248). A finite verb is one that expresses tense (ibid., 21). In the chapter "Fire", 27 out of 54 sentences are simple, which amounts to 50 per cent. In the corresponding TT1 chapter, 27 of 46 sentences are simple. This means that in the translation of this chapter, 59 per cent of the sentences are simple, as opposed to 50 per cent in the source chapter, which suggests an intensification of the simple style that is created through the use of simple sentences in ST1.

Example 1 is simple because it has a subject and a finite verb that expresses present tense. This example has been translated into a simple sentence, and is a literal translation. ST1 does have some compound sentences too, as illustrated in **example 2**. This has been translated into a similarly compound sentence, and is a literal translation. Both of these examples retain the brevity of the sentence structure in ST1; however, neither of them affects domestication or foreignization.

4.1.9.2 Summary

There is a higher amount of simple sentences in the TT1 chapter studied, than in the corresponding ST1 chapter, which suggests an intensification of style.

4.1.10 Sentence fragments

Naiv. Super. includes many sentence fragments, an important stylistic trait, as the book mostly describes the main character's thoughts and inner life, which seldom manifest in whole sentences.

4.1.10.1 Sentence fragments in ST1 and TT1

No.	ST1 example	TT1 example
1	bære noe riktig tungt (carry something really heavy)	carry something really heavy
2	til null (to zero)	to zero
3	det er noen uker siden (it is a few weeks ago)	a few weeks ago
4	dette var ikke tull (this wasn't nonsense)	no nonsense here
5	jeg … sa at jeg ikke kom til å skrive på en stund, og kanskje aldri (I … said that I wouldn't be writing for a while and maybe never)	I …told them I wouldn't be writing any more for a while. Maybe never

A complete sentence must include a main clause, which means that it needs at least a subject and a finite verb (Hasselgård, Johansson and Lysvåg 248). In ST1 there are many sentences that do not satisfy this rule, and these are called "sentence fragments", or incomplete sentences, and "are often used to express the stream of thought" (ibid., 395). As the bulk of the narrative style in ST1 is simultaneous interior monologue (see Genette 219), fragments of sentences often occur, like that in **example 1**, which lacks a subject and is therefore incomplete. The same goes for **example 2**, which only consists of a preposition and a numeral and lacks both subject and verb. Of the 200 sentences in the chapter "Veggen" (7-12), there are 19 sentence fragments, which makes up 10 per cent. Sentence fragments make up a relatively small portion of the chapter, but their presence is still an important manifestation of the narrative style in ST1, which expresses the main character's incoherent inner monologue.

There are sentence fragments in TT1 as well. Apart from example 1 and 2, TT1 includes additional sentence fragments in the chapter "The Wall" (TT1 1-7). Of the 195 sentences in this chapter, there are 22 sentence fragments, which make up 11 per cent, as opposed to 10 per cent in ST1. The translation of **example 3** lacks a subject, unlike the ST1 version. **Example 4** has also lost its subject and thus become a sentence fragment. **Example 5**

demonstrates how the latter part of a long sentence in ST1 has become a sentence fragment in TT1. Example 1 and 2 are literal translations and neutral regarding foreignization and domestication, while example 3, 4 and 5 are examples of transpositions that make the text read more idiomatically, therefore, they are domesticating. The added sentence fragments in TT1 makes this stylistic element stronger and increases fragmentariness and the stream of thought.

4.1.10.2 Summary

The chapter "The Wall" has a higher ratio of sentence fragments in TT1 than in ST1, which makes it look more fragmented than the source text.

4.1.11 Use of the present tense

The majority of ST1 is written in the present tense, conveying situations happening here and now. A translation of this includes grammatical shifts, most of which are shifts into the present progressive in TT1. In English, the present progressive is used to describe the incomplete nature of an ongoing situation happening here and now (Hasselgård, Johansson, and Lysvåg 184). In Norwegian, however, there is no such grammatical category to distinguish between the degree of completion of an action and must be read from the context or preceding words (ibid.). Translating from a language that has no grammatical category for aspect into one that does, anticipates use of obligatory transposition, leading to domestication.

4.1.11.1 Present tense in ST1 and TT1

No.	ST1 example	TT1
1	jeg spør Lise (I am asking Lise)	I am asking Lise
2	nå skriver Paul at jorden er at atypisk sted i universet (now Paul is writing that the earth is an atypical place in the universe)	now Paul writes that the earth is an atypical place in the universe
3	vi spiser pannekaker som Lise har laget (we are eating pancakes that Lise has made)	we're eating pancakes that Lise has made
4	nå spør den tyske damen (now the German lady is asking)	now the German lady is asking

Most of the action in ST1 takes place in the simple present, like in examples 1-4. This is often accompanied by the repetitive use of the time adverbial 'now', which, combined describe ongoing situations. In the translation, the original simple present tense is often expanded to include aspect and therefore changed to the present progressive, like in **examples 1, 3** and **4**.

These are obligatory transpositions. The chapter "N" (ST1 123-127) describes the main character's flight to New York and launches us into the action with the starting sentence: "[j]eg sitter på flyet nå" (I am sitting on the plane now) (ST1 123). This chapter has 39 verb forms that would qualify for the present progressive in a translation. The corresponding TT1 chapter, however, contains 19 present progressive verb forms, which is a decrease of 51 per cent.

Example 2 refers to the thoughts the main character has while reading a book that Paul has written. The action takes place in the present, and it is a process, which means that he is in the middle of reading Paul's book. With this example, literal translation is used and, consequently, the tense stays in the simple present. In example 2, the act of reading is described indirectly by reiterating what is written in the book. Thus, 'he is writing' means 'I am reading'. By not using the present progressive here, the activity seems habitual and could be interpreted as 'nowadays, Paul writes', instead of the continuous 'now, Paul is writing', which is the intended meaning. The literal translation of tense in example 2 could be part of a foreignizing strategy, while using obligatory transposition, and thus changing the tense to present progressive, like in example 1, 3 and 4 above, is domesticating. This domesticating strategy leads to retention of style because it conveys the action as continuous; however, the occasional divergent use of literal translation gives rise foreignization.

4.1.11.2 Summary

TT1 uses other verb inflections when the present progressive is expected. The translation of chapter "N" has 19 instances of the present progressive when 39 verb forms in ST1 would qualify for the use of the continuous aspect in TT1, which signifies a decrease of 51 per cent. This could affect the here and now depiction in ST1. Where the present progressive is used in TT1, it is the result of transposition, while literal translation is used where the progressive is not opted for. Transposition, in this case, leads to domestication, and preserves immeciady, while literal translation leads to foreignization and conversely reduces some of the immediacy.

4.1.12 Thematisation

As noted, words like the adverb 'nå' (now), the first person pronoun 'jeg' (I) and the coordinating conjunction 'og' (and) are frequently thematised in ST1. Another characteristic

of these words is that they often start off the sentence (see Tønnessen 134). The combination of this results in perpendicular lines of the said thematised elements on the page.

4.1.12.1 Thematising of the adverb 'nå' in ST1 and TT1

The time reference 'nå' is thematised 50 times in the pages 101-210[7] and no less than 46 times does 'nå' start off a new line on the page. This means that the instances where 'now' is initial in the sentence, 92 per cent starts a new line. In the TT1 pages corresponding to those counted in ST1, 'now' is initial 42 times[8], which is a decrease of 16 per cent. Of these, 28 start a new line, which is a decrease of 39 per cent from ST1. Of the instances where 'now' was initial in ST1, only 67 per cent start off a new line in TT1.

The thematisation of 'nå' puts focus on the word and what it represents; the moment, which is a recurring subject matter in the novel. Sometimes, the perpendicular lines of 'nå' are clustered together on one page, which creates an atypical appearance of the printed page (see above example in section **2.3.3**). This is defamiliarizing to the reader and also establishes a repetitive rhythm. In TT1 'now' is more often put in mid, or final position. This shows that there is a bigger variety in the placement of this time adverb in TT1, which engenders less prominent perpendicular lines formed by 'now'. In turn, this gives the printed page a more standard appearance, which is less surprising to the target culture, and contributes to fluency.

4.1.12.2 Thematising of the coordinating conjunction "og" in ST1 and TT1

The sentences where 'og' is thematised have the impression of being afterthoughts or asides, and their repetition and positioning make them significant. 'Og' (and) is thematised 69 times in the pages 101-210. In the same stretch of text 'og' starts off a new line 24 times, which make up 35 per cent. In the corresponding TT1 pages 'and' is initial 67 times, which is a decrease of only 3 per cent. Thus, the thematising of 'and' is very similar in ST1 and TT1. 'And', however, starts off a new line only eight times in TT1, which make up 12 per cent, a decrease of 67 per cent from ST1. Like the previous example, this decrease signifies a more unmarked textual appearance in TT1.

---

[7] The pages counted were arbitrarily chosen on my part and is the latter half of both ST1 and TT1. All the counting done in relation to thematisation is done within these pages.
[8] The pages 95-195 correspond to the pages counted in ST1, namely 101-210.

4.1.12.3 Thematising of the personal pronoun 'jeg' in ST1 and TT1

Thematising the first person personal pronoun is frequent in ST1 and probably to be expected as the novel describes a great deal of personal observations. On page 123, for example 'jeg' is thematised and starts off the line eight times. In the pages 101-210, 'jeg' is thematised no less than 282 times. Of these, 230 start a new line, which make up 82 per cent. In the corresponding TT1 pages, 'I' is thematised 316 times, which is an increase of 12 per cent from ST1. 105 of these start off the line, which make up 33 per cent, a decrease of 54 per cent from ST1. This demonstrates that the thematisation of 'jeg' has been intensified in TT1 but that the ST1 inclination to start a new line with 'jeg' has, however, not been as persistent in TT1. Again, this makes the textual pattern in ST1 less apparent in TT1.

4.1.12.4 Summary

Thematisation has been preserved for the most part, but mild divergences were found between ST1 and TT1 with the thematisation of 'now' and 'and', which had a decrease of 16 per cent and 3 per cent, respectively. Bigger divergences were found between ST1 and TT1 regarding the elements starting off a new line: 'nå' has a decrease of 39 per cent, 'og' has a decrease of 67 per cent and 'jeg' has a decrease of 54 per cent. This suggests a more unmarked typography, which could increase fluency.

4.1.13 Personification and animation

ST2 has, as seen, less characteristic stylistic traits than ST1. One that could be said to belong to ST2, however, is personification and animation. This tendency could be a ploy for the main character to humanise his surroundings and suggests that he has a closer relationship to non-human things.

4.1.13.1 Personification and animation in ST2 and TT2

No.	ST2 example	TT2 example
1	jeg liker ikke folk, mens Afrika liker dem godt (I don't like people, while Africa likes them well)	I don't like people, whereas Africa likes them a lot
2	den spiser fra hånden min (it eats from my hand)	it eats from my hand
3	den spiser oss til frokost (it eats us for breakfast)	it laughs at people like me

The **first example** is a personification of a synecdoche. The synecdoche is the continent of Africa, which stands for 'Africans in general' and by saying 'Afrika' instead of 'Afrikanere'

(Africans) Loe personifies a continent. In addition to being a personification, this is a binary opposition and attests to the narrow-mindedness of the main character. Example 1 is a literal translation, and as such, it has preserved the personification. This does not affect foreignization or domestication.

The **second example** is Doppler's comment on mass production: "[d]en spiser oss til frokost" (it eats us for breakfast) (94). Mass production, and not the people behind it, is made the villain here, by giving it selfish human characteristics. This is translated using literal translation and preserves the personification, and does not affect foreignization or domestication.

The last non-human element to be personified is the city. **Example 3** arguably has dual citizenship in that it can also be characterised as a Loe-esque expression, but is also a good example of ST2's use of personification. In the translation, the metaphoric referent is altered, but the personification remains. It seems, however more unmarked; 'laughs at' is arguably less evocative than 'spiser oss til frokost' (eats us for breakfast), which makes 'masseproduksjonen' (massproduction) seem more vicious and greedy. The procedure used in this case, is équivalence, which has a domesticating effect.

4.1.13.2 Summary

Two of the personifications presented here are translated with literal translation, in which case they do not affect domestication or foreignization, while one is translated using équivalence, generating a domesticating effect. These examples illustrate that personification is preserved in TT2.

Chapter 5

Discussion

My aim in this study has been to identify prominent stylistic elements in *Naiv. Super.*, *Doppler* and their respective target texts in order to spot stylistic similarities and differences. Furthermore, I wanted to look for signs that any stylistic differences in the two target texts could be attributed to the translators' differing language background. Hypothetically TT1, which is translated into an L2, will be more foreignizing than TT2, which is translated into an L1. This is based on the L1 translator's alleged instinct for what is appropriate in their native language and the L2 translator's relative lack thereof (Baker 64; Newmark 180). In the light of Parks' claim that the L1 translations in his study had more standard language and style (41), one could additionally assume that TT1 might be more true to the source text style than TT2.

5.1   Summary of main findings

This section will briefly summarise my main findings, including the most prominent stylistic traits and the overall trends regarding translation procedures, markedness and foreignization or domestication.

5.1.1   Style in ST1 and TT1

The idiosyncrasies in ST1 are distinct and thus very noticeable, the translation of which, predominantly tends towards foreignization, but not so that it never demonstrates the use of domesticating procedures. Hence TT1's foreignizing tendency to borrow allusions, while also using the domesticating procedure adaptation. TT1 is generally faithful to the style and in some cases displays even more marked idiosyncracies, which is particularly apparent in the increased number of simple sentences and sentence fragments. All in all, this supports my hypothesis that the TT1 translator will foreignize more and be more faithful to the style of the source text.

5.1.2   Style in ST2 and TT2

ST2 is more typographically conventional, that is, the appearance of the printed text is more typical, evident by its absence of authentic documents and lists. The translation of style in TT2 leans more towards a domesticating translation. Exemplifying this is TT2's adaptation of swear words and literal translation of allusions. The many instances where marked elements

in ST2 become unmarked in TT2 is in line with Parks' research, which suggests that less marked elements in the translation is to be expected in L1 translations (15). This is particularly true regarding the less marked translation of the Loe-esque expressions, which disproves the claim that L1 translators can more easily rely on "intuition" (Newmark 180) or "sensitivity" (Baker 64) when translating expressions. The native intuition of L1 translators might well aid in identifying what expressions to use in the target language, but not necessarily in determining how a source language expression is altered in a literary text. This supports my hypothesis that the TT2 translators domesticate more and normalise style to a greater extent.

5.2 Specific findings regarding mainly foreignizing translatorial choices

This section will discuss issues of specific interest regarding similarities and divergences that illustrate whether the translators incline to retain markedness and how translation procedures have a foreignizing or domesticating effect.

5.2.1 Interchanging techniques of translating allusions in TT1

Venuti differentiates between foreignization and exoticizing translation approaches, claiming that the latter

> produc[es] a translation effect that signifies a superficial cultural difference, usually with reference to specific features of the foreign culture ranging from geography, customs and cuisine to historical figures and events, along with the retention of foreign place names and proper names as well as the odd foreign word (*Invisibility* 160).

Exoticizing translations are consequently not fully foreignizing because they merely scratch the surface of a foreign culture and do not reveal unsettling differences between the source and target culture so that it disrupts the target reader (ibid.). Parks notes the challenge of replicating in a translation the same feelings or "moods" some allusions can "evoke" in the target reader (64). The missing out of such connotations leads target readers to "[accept] a loss of density in local cultural references (and hence 'meaning' in its fullest sense) in return, perhaps, for a corresponding exoticism arising from reading about foreign places" (ibid.).

      The plethora of culture specific references in ST1 gives the translator many an opportunity to decide between translation procedures. Borrowing culture specific allusions in TT1, like 'Rema 1000' could exemplify "a loss of density" (ibid.) on the part of the target reader. The opposite is true of the translation of children's songs where both adaptation and

footnotes are applied. Similar to the evocations explored in Parks' research, ST1 has many allusions that inspire particular "moods" in the source reader (Parks 63, 64). 'Lille Kattepus' can, for example, evoke childhood nostalgia, while the Swedish brand 'Fjällräven' can evoke memories of past trips to 'påskefjellet'. The domesticating adaptation of 'Lille Kattepus' into a nonsense poem directed towards children in TT1, could evoke some of the same childhood nostalgia which a literal translation or borrowing would not have sufficed at. On the other hand, borrowing 'Rema 1000' and 'Fjellräven' is foreignizing or perhaps merely exoticizing. According to Venuti, borrowings like these could be exoticizing rather than foreignizing to the target culture so long as they only reveal "superficial differences" (*Invisibility* 160). The name of a grocery chain like 'Rema 1000' does not represent a deep-rooted cultural difference, and borrowings like these are therefore merely exoticizing. Contributing further to exoticism could, according to Venuti, be the mention of historical figures like "Ferdinand Finne" (TT1 49) and the retention of source culture place names like "Hamar" (TT1 61) (*Invisibility* 160).

The translator himself notes that "I actually wanted to teach the reader something about Norwegian/Scandinavian popular-culture references" (Solberg). His intention was to bring the reader to the source culture, so to speak, which necessarily involves foreignization or exoticism. The varying techniques used are explained by the TT1 translator in the following: "[i]n quite a few instances I chose to explain these references in footnotes, while elsewhere I decided it was more appropriate to leave the reader to look things up if desired, or simply leave hanging what the reference could mean" (Solberg). From this it seems that the select footnotes were intended to spark interest or to inspire the reader to explore the foreign culture further. If this is the case, it illustrates that the translator uses foreignizing procedures that occasionally only lead to exoticism, but sporadically opts for domesticating procedures, which "leaves the [target] reader in peace and moves the writer towards him" (Schleiermacher 49). As mentioned earlier, explaining allusions in footnotes, like the TT1 translator sometimes does, is welcomed by Venuti but can as has been mentioned, ostracise some target readers (*Scandals* 22). This is arguably not the case in TT1, as the footnotes merely describe pop culture references and the footnotes therefore do not perplex the reader.

Based on this, one can claim that the translation of allusions in TT1 varies between domesticating and foreignizing procedures, which consequently moves the target reader to and fro between the target and source culture, giving him or her insight into come aspects of Norwegian culture, while leaving other things obscure or adjusted to his or her target culture.

Thus, the interview with the translator and the assembled data demonstrate that the TT1 translator *does* intentionally foreignize, as was suspected, but that he also domesticates occasionally when it comes to allusions. This could be explained by the translator accepting that some cultural loss is inevitable in a translation and that all allusions cannot be recreated to inspire the same feelings in the target culture as they do in the source culture.

5.2.2 Handwritten explanations of borrowed Norwegian swear words in TT1

As mentioned above, in English language translations, fluency is valorised and "the more fluent the translation, the more invisible the translator" (Venuti, *Invisibility* 11; 1-2).

The handwritten explanatory notes for the Norwegian swear words compromises the invisibility of the translator and disrupts fluency. Borrowing Norwegian swear words in itself is foreignizing and definitely sends the target reader abroad. One example of an explanatory note in the chapter "Biblioteket" is the explanation of the search word "basj", which has a handwritten "= crap" next to it (TT1 141). 16 pages of this and similar examples give the target readers a quick lesson in Norwegian swearing, which tie in well with the translator's pedagogical intention. Adding English handwritten translations to the already borrowed Norwegian swear words is a very visible trace of the translator (Venuti, *Invisibility* 1). It could of course be that the borrowing of swear words and their explanations are exoticizing, rather than foreignizing. The value that could possibly be interfered with, is the target culture's tendency to swear within the anatomical context, but it so happens that most of the swear words in the source text chapter of "Biblioteket" are anatomical, so the direct transfer of these do not disrupt values, but it nevertheless highlights the foreign. Venuti offers no black and white distinction between exoticizing and foreignizing, so this is a matter of interpretation. The direct transfer of profanities could be more serious than that of convenience store chains, like Rema 1000. The profanities in "Biblioteket" are not necessarily upsetting, but the surface of cultural values is still scratched, therefore, this could be a case of foreignization bordering on exoticism.

According to the TT1 translator, the "forward-leaning" publisher Canongate allowed for such "unorthodox features, such as the hand-annotated photo-copies of the searches the boys did on the N.Y. library computer" (Solberg). Canongate thus seems to accept foreignizing methods and is, by that, an exception to the rule that publishers always seek domesticating translations (Venuti*, Invisibility* 1). One wonders how the swearing in "Biblioteket" could otherwise have been dealt with. The translator would have had to go to

the New York Public Library, typed in the corresponding English swear words and printed out the copies. This would be domesticating, but at the cost of creating a marked distance from the author; Loe would have been morphed into an American. As popular belief deems Loe and the main character in ST1 to be the same person, the realistic documents in ST1 have an authenticity that is hardly transferable by any other means than copying them as the TT1 translator has done.

In sum, one can infer that handwritten traces of the translator disrupt transparency and consequently have a foreignizing effect in TT1 that borders on exoticism, which confirms my initial assumption that the L2 translator would foreignize to a greater extent. By including his own handwritten comments, the translator indeed makes himself very visible and the translation, accordingly so.

5.2.3   Naïve swearing made severe in TT1

Assessing the severity of swearing is a challenge, since trends continually evolve and usage is determined by a myriad of factors, like religion and social belonging. Nonetheless, studies conducted by Hargrave (2000), Harris, Aycicegi and Gleason (2003) and Lie (2013) attempt to map people's reactions to swearing. The former two were published around the same time as TT1, thus, the informant's opinions on swearing could be a representation of swearing trends existing within the target audience at the time of TT1's publication. Sondre Lie's 2013 survey gives a more contemporary perspective on Norwegian people's view of various swear words.

As Hughes points out, "*shit* continues to thrive as a personal insult, and in contemporary usage it has greatly generalised to express exasperation, anger, surprise, frustration, disgust and astonishment" (434). It is still regarded as insulting, but not taboo and is widely used (ibid.). Harris, Aycicegi and Gleason (2003) established that being exposed to swearing in one's L1 creates more physical discomfort than in one's L2 (574). For example, a Norwegian might not have any qualms about saying the word 'shit' in a public context, while an American or a British person knows s/he will be censored, and might therefore be more careful. This could also be true of the translators in this study where the TT1 translator might comfortably translate more severe swear words, while the TT2 translators might moderate.

Though ST1 also contains swearing from an adult register, which is translated accordingly, there are instances where mild swearing is intensified in TT1. A description of defecation is arguably not swearing unless certain words are used or if they are used to

express anger or annoyance. The word 'bæsje' is used in ST1 to describe the main character's objective and naïve observance of a dog defecating. This is translated into 'shit', a more laden word, which changes the source text scene slightly. The TT1 translator comments that

> Norwegian swear words are often more Bible-rooted than their closest English counterparts. So, a peak word such as "jævla" (lit. *bedevilled, devilish* but meaning something far more profane than those) became "fucking", which is the most frequent translation in TV subtitling etc. In order to achieve a close (in intensity) and relevant, up-to-date use of swear words I drew on my everyday surroundings in South Africa, where I was studying at the time of translating the book, and the UK for some of the more juvenile or childish instances of profanities, anatomicals etc" (Solberg).

Although probably not aware of Venuti's terminology, the TT1 translator evidently intended to domesticate swear words to match the values of the target audience. This is true in most cases, notably in the shift from religious to anatomical words, by wich the TT1 translator has avoided archaisms, and by extension foreignization. The translation of 'bæsje' into 'shit', also demonstrates domestication, but slightly changes the naïve tone of the original.

Based on this discussion, one can assert that the translation of a mild swear word into a more offensive one has altered the sense of naïvety in that it employs a more adult register, which questions my hypothesis that the L2 translator would preserve naïvism to a greater extent. This shift cannot be counted as evidence of a foreignizing or domesticating approach, since 'shit' is a wildely used expletive in the target culture.

5.2.4   Intensification of style: Sentence fragments in TT1

Vassenden expresses annoyance regarding "det forknytte og avkortede" 'the timid and truncated' in ST1 (74; my translation), which is a testament to these stylistic traits being very noticeable. My findings suggest that there is a strengthening of these elements, which might, create even more annoyance and a sense of defamiliarization to the target culture. This could disrupt fluency, which according to Venuti "depends on syntax that … unfolds continuously and easily" (*Invisibility* 4). The syntax of ST1, which is interrupted by sentence fragments, does not adhere to this notion of fluency, nor does that of TT1. The added sentence fragments in TT1 could increase the sense of the fragmented internal monologue and demonstrates that the retention of style, in this case, is foreignizing and defamiliarizing. While TT1's increase of sentence fragments attests to an even more marked style in TT1, some of the sentence fragments actually bring more coherence to TT1 and could be seen as domesticating. The added sentence fragment "[m]aybe never" (TT1 6) exemplifies this.

This example furthermore attests to the affinity between the terms foreignization and defamiliarization and illustrates that the former sometimes is a reflection of the defamiliarization that is present in the source text. In the case of the sentence fragments, the foreignization it can give rise to, can simultaneously be simply defamiliarizing, in that is foregrounds certain textual elements (Jeffries and McIntyre 31) and enables the reader to see things differently (Morson 216). This defamiliarization could conversely be seen as foreignizing, in that is could be interpreted as disrupting fluency by target readers, who might not be able to separate between textual elements that are the result of a stylistic effects and ones that are the results of a bad translation process. This can be tied in with Parks' research, in which idiosyncracies in an English-language source text was interpreded, by non-English teachers, as the results of a bad translation process: "they find it difficult to distinguish between a poetic use of the language and a poor translation" (Parks 10).

To sum up, the act of intensifying, in the translation, the already defamiliarizing sentence fragments in ST1, contributes to an even more defamiliarizing experience for the target reader. This intensification of style is predominantly foreignizing and supports my suspicion that the TT1 translator has produced a more foreignizing translation.

5.2.5 Foreignizing italicisations in TT1

A domesticating translation is, as has already been established, "transparent" (Venuti, *Invisibility* 1). The use of italics in a target text can arguably disrupt transparency if they serve different purposes than singalising titles of books and movies. When italics draws attention to foreign words, however, they are be foreignizing. The italication of English source text loanwords and sentences in TT1 could compromise transparency in that it calls attention to something unavailable to the target reader. One example of this is the translation of the source word 'bitch', which is italicised in the target text. Translating a word like this, without italicising it would make the translation of the word invisible and domesticating. This way of employing explicitation, by way of italics, could be an effort to make the loanwords intelligible to the target reader, but I suspect that it rather leads to confusion. The target reader cannot instinctively know that 'bitch' is a loanword in the source text, which renders this explicitation futile. It could be argued that the italicisation of 'bitch' has been an attempt to focus attention on the language dominance of English that put the loanwords in the Norwegian text in the first place. The italicised loanword would, in this case, accentuate the ways in which the source language is influenced by the English language, which is partly a

result of the historical tradition of domestication (ibid., 12). However, only readers interested enough to read both the source and the target text would be made aware of this, so the explicitation is in most events not very effective in illustrating the influence of English in the source text.

In consideration of these points, one can assert that explicitly pointing out the loanword in the translation produces markedness and is furthermore a visible sign of the translation process that disturbs transparency. One can therefore assert that italicising source text English loanwords gives rise to confusion, compromises transparency to some extent, and is a foreignizing procedure, which supports my hypothesis that the TT1 translator will gravitate more towards foreignization.

5.2.6 Foreignizing deviation in swearing trends in TT2: The archaism in 'devilry'

According to Venuti, the use of archaic words can interrupt fluency: "[a] fluent translation is written in an English that is current ("modern") instead of archaic, that is widely used instead of specialized ("jargonisation")" (*Invisibility* 4). Furthermore, Venuti states that "inconsistency of word choice … exposes the translation process" (ibid., 22), which means that the sudden use of a word that stands out might make the translation visible, which in turn can disrupt fluency (ibid., 1). Words connected to 'the devil' has, according to Hughes, had a "loss of intensity" in English, even though there still is "lingering respect for the linguistic power" of devil related words (120).

In my hypothesis, I assume the TT2 translators to produce a domesticating translation, which in turn necessitates the modernisation of archaic words (*Invisibility* 4). Therefore, the foreignization arising from the TT2 translators' use of an archaism like "devilry" is a deviation from what was expected. The word gives the impression of a swearing register that does not reflect Doppler's teenage-like rebellion (see Holst 154). According to Toury, inconsistencies like these occur: "a translator's behaviour cannot be expected to be fully systematic. Not only can his/her decision-making be differently motivated in different problem areas, but it can also be unevenly distributed throughout an assignment within a single problem area" (Toury 67). In their translation of swear words the TT2 translators do occasionally diverge from their typical use of translation shifts. In the case of 'devilry', there is a shift in the translators' trend of utilising adaptation when translating swear words, namely from a religious to an anatomical context. The TT2 translators' inclination to use modern swear words is also broken by the use of an archaic word.

A reason for this deviation might be due to the source text sentence being a biblical allusion, in which parts of 1 Cor. 13.13 is mixed with Doppler's values: "[f]linkhet og faenskap og tro og håp og kjærlighet i verden. Men størst av alt er skogen" (ST2 96). 'Devilry' is the literal translation of 'faenskap' and is not obscure in the sense that it is incomprehensible to the target culture, but it is nevertheless not widely used. The effort to preserve the allusion, or at least give it a sense of belonging to the religious sphere, has affected the trend of using modern swear words and thus made it less fluent. It seems like a give or take situation in which the translators sacrifice one part to give primacy to another.

From this, one can gather that the archaism in 'devilry' is foreignizing and affects style by interrupting the teenage register. Hence, TT2 deviates from my hypothesis and proves that translators do not consistently follow systematically prescribed methods at all times, if any to begin with.

5.3 Specific findings regarding domesticating translational choices

5.3.1 Reduction of immediacy in TT1

As we have established, the different tense systems between languages might manifest in translations as less complex, or even unobtainable ways of portraying childish mentalities (Parks 71). This could also pertain to the differences between Norwegian and English tense systems where Norwegian expresses aspect, not in terms of a grammatical category, like in English, but through context and adverbs (Hasselgård, Johansson, and Lysvåg 184). The naïve mentality is epitomised by extensive emphasis on the moment (Holst 41), simultaneous narration, and the Norwegian present tense. This continuous narration of events arguably qualifies as "cases where there is a clear need to focus on the temporary and incomplete nature of the situation" (Hasselgård, Johansson, and Lysvåg 184), which is also the case with the present progressive. The preservation of immediacy would thus involve a pronounced present progressive in the translation, which could possibly be foreignizing, especially if used with stative verbs (ibid,. 181). This however, does not always happen in TT1.

Translating all the 'here and now' situations into present progressive would perhaps be foreignizing to the target culture, but would nevertheless be true to the style of the original. As was discovered in the analysis, the expected use of present progressive verb forms in TT1 was 51 per cent lower than in ST1 in the chapter analysed. This is domesticating to the target culture, but it also puts focus on the Norwegian way to express tense, and could possibly be a

deliberate effort to preserve style. The lack of a fixed description to describe continuous situations in Norwegian might complicate the translator's decision of whether or not to use the progressive. Norwegians tend to use too much progressive verb forms when writing English (ibid., 184). A deliberate effort to moderate the present progressive, as the TT1 translator seem to be doing, would be domesticating and reduces some of the immediacy that so much permeates the source text.

Malmkjær's comment on the tendency to translate Danish ongoing situations, like "det snedde", into the simple past tense in an English language translation (18) could apply to the same tendency in TT1, due to the close similarity between Norwegian and Danish. I would suggest that the translator in Malmkjær's text has merely emulated the syntactic structure of the Danish 'det snedde', which superficially looks like the English simple past of 'it snowed', but conveys a more ongoing situation, calling for the past progressive 'it was snowing'. This could also apply to Norwegian since 'det snødde' superficially looks like the English simple past tense. Comparably, the ST1 sentence "[n]å skriver Paul" (ST1 125) looks like the formally equivalent simple present tense and has been translated accordingly. "Now Paul writes" (TT1 114) gives the action the impression of being habitual, as opposed to ongoing. The preceding adverb 'nå,' indicates that the progressive aspect, or at least an element creating immediacy, is in order in a translation, which would ensure semantic equivalence. 'Nå' has been retained in the translation, thus conveying some sense of immediacy. However, adding the progressive to this could possibly make the event even more urgent and involve the reader more. Thus, it would seem that the TT1 translator has interpreted the tense superficially at times and conveyed formal rather than semantic equivalence. Another example is "[j]eg reiser meg for å gå på do" (ST1 124), which describes a continuous movement, but lacks the explicit marker of immediacy 'nå'. The tense in this example is translated into the simple present like so: "I get up to go to the lavatory" (TT1 113), which could indicate the same pattern of interpreting the tense superficially and not conveying the same sense of immediacy. Alternatively, these divergences could be attributed to the translator's non-nativeness, but I would argue that a mix of these explanations have come into play, since, overall, the chapter studied does include a fair amount of progressive verb forms, just not to the extent that it reproduces the same sense of urgency displayed in ST1. The mix of the progressive and simple aspect in TT1 also causes the repetitive element of focusing on the moment in ST1 to diminish. Seeing as TT1 has half of the expected present progressive

verb forms that are expressed without aspect in ST1, we can say that there has been a moderation of immediacy in TT1, which the above two examples illustrate.

From this, we can assert that the reduction of progressive verb forms in TT1 is domesticating and that it consequently has a weaker sense of immediacy than the original. The translation of tense has, to some extent "return[ed] the text to a publicly approved style" (Parks 15), which challenges my hypothethis that the TT1 translator preserves idiosyncrasies to a greater exent.

5.3.2 Loe-esque expressions in ST2 translated as unmarked in TT2

Parks claims that unconventional expressions used by D. H. Lawrence, like "in complete ease" (40), "get their meaning through their provocative distance from the conventional" (ibid., 41), and that the translation of these often lead to "more conventional, commonplace concepts than those generated in the English" (ibid., 41). This is also the case when it comes to the translation of Loe's manipulated expressions, which often are a far cry from conventional.

It is difficult to categorise the translation of these expressions by means of Vinay and Darbelnet's équivalence seeing as there are no equivalent expressions to match Loe's divergent turn of phrase. An equivalent core-expression is often possible to find; that is, the original expression sans its alteration, but an equivalent that includes the divergence is of course unavailable and forces the translator to be imaginative, both if s/he wishes to preserve them, omit or modulate the alteration, thus leaving it less marked.

The result in TT2 is often that literal translation or modulation is used if there is an existing expression in the target language with the equivalent wording, while the alteration is often translated with modulation. The translation of "[d]u er ikke akkurat den skarpeste i klassen" (ST2 38) into "[y]ou may not be the sharpest knife in the drawer" (TT2 34) shows how the core expression is translated with the corresponding English expression, using modulation, which is also used on the source text malapropism caused by the word 'klassen'. Équivalence is used if there is an existing expression in the target culture with different wording, which often results in translating the core with équivalence while omitting or modulating the alteration. Modulation is used on the whole expression when there is neither an equivalent nor a literal version of the source expression in the target language as is the case with the phrase "tanken må krype til korset og melde pass" (ST2 28), which is translated into "the mind has to acknowledge its limitations and pass" (TT2 24).

The fact that many of the expressions used in ST2 have literal or equivalent counterparts in English anticipates translation that easily incorporates the alterations. The translators commented that they "tried to find a similar expression and change it in the same way" (Bartlett and Shaw). This, however, does not always happen in TT2 and therefore signalise that many of the expressions have been standardised (see Toury 268). Target readers would probably not raise eyebrows at the TT2 phrase "I laugh my arse off" (TT2 71), whereas the corresponding ST2 unconventional phrase "[r]æva mi ler" (ST2 71) might catch source readers off guard. When expressions like these are surprising to the source reader, they might even be hard to identify for a translator, whose uncertainty might lead them to simply "impose a target-language interpretation of it" (Baker 67). This seems to be the case with the above example. Similarly unconventional expressions were translated with "entirely standard locutions" in Parks' study of L1 translations into Italian (40).

A domesticating approach and a loss of style in this case is therefore to be expected. The unconventional expressions Loe uses could be examples of "stylistic peculiarities" that, according to Venuti, are normally weeded out of translations into English to ensure that fluency is maintained (*Invisibility* 1). The TT2 translator's inclination to translate many core-expressions with équivalence does not necessarily suggest intentional domestication, but might simply be a result of the close proximity between English and Norwegian language and culture which makes this kind of language transfer possible. Alternatively, this translation shift could illustrate Toury's "law of growing standardization", based on translation trends including the use of target language words "whose collocability … is much more habitual" than those in the original (269). The target language expression 'I laugh my arse off' is made up of words habitually collocated in English, whereas 'ræva mi ler' is hardly heard of in Norwegian.

To briefly sum up, the alterations in Loe-esque expressions are often omitted or modulated in TT2, making them less marked and leaving the text more fluent.

5.3.3   Less repetition of marked content words in TT2

Both Berman and Newmark advocate for preserving source text repetition in a translation (Berman 287; Newmark 147). The TT2 translators, however, seem to opt for a more varied language when it comes to the translation of content words.

TT2 is more unmarked than its source text insofar as it varies content words that are repetitive and suggestive in the source text. There might be a reason why Loe has chosen

certain words to focus on like 'flink' and 'ugjerne' (Berman 285). As earlier mentioned, the words could be connected to the subject matter of ST2, which is escaping conformity; a juxtaposition of the two words illustrates Doppler's main struggle: 'jeg vil ugjerne være flink' (I unwillingly want to be clever).

When it comes to 'ugjerne', more conventional words like 'ikke' or 'nødig' would perhaps not illustrate Doppler's reluctance towards conformity. Seeing as 'ugjerne' is a negation of 'gjerne', a word that normally expresses eagerness and positivity, it illustrates Doppler's reluctance to societal and linguistic conformity. Neither TT2's "reluctant" nor "don't like" (35) demonstrates reluctance at a semantic level in the way that 'ugjerne' does. Therefore, one might say that the translation has left these words unmarked, thus not conveying the same sense of language rebellion in the main character. Furthermore, the translator's choice to not repeat one word or the other, results in a loss of repetition and lexical significance. In turn, the target reader loses a "linguistic structure" through which literary interpretation is gained, which is the very point of certain stylistic features (Simpson 3).

'Flink' is repeated to a much greater extent than 'ugjerne' in ST2 and is significant in underlining the subject matter. Translating it into various words, like in TT2, results in a loss of rhythm and loss of meaning. Leaving a stylistic trait more unmarked, like the repetitive use of certain content words, eliminates some of the rhythm and meaning in the source text. The avoidance of repetition of these words in TT2 suggests a more unmarked use of vocabulary, which perhaps is an effort to meet the target culture's expectation of what is deemed 'a rich vocabulary', in which case it would be domesticating. This might, again, exemplify Toury's "law of growing standardization" in which "textual relations obtaining in the original are often modified, sometimes to the point of being totally ignored, in favour of more [habitual] options offered by a target repertoire" (Toury 268).

The loss of repetition supports my hypothesis that the TT2 translators are more invested in adapting and, above all, explicitating the meaning of source text words, rather than retaining the stylistic function that lies in the defamiliarization of certain content words and the repetition of these.

5.3.4   Moderating swear words in TT2

In addition to adapting most swear words from religious to anatomical, like both TT1 and TT2 does, there is a trend in TT2, more so than in TT1, to moderate swearing. This discovery

is based on Lie's and Millwood-Hargrave's surveys, respectively. The moderation could be attributed to the fact that expletives create more discomfort when heard or read in one's L1 (Harris, Aycicegi and Gleason 574), which could explain why the TT2 translators have avoided the most severe swear words and spared the target readers the same discomfort of reading the most severe expletives in TT2. This could suggest that target reader might get a lower level of discomfort than the source reader by reading the more severe swearwords in ST2. The translator's comment suggests that this moderation is not intentional, but that editorial pressures might have prompted them to avoid words considered politically incorrect, of which there are none in ST2: "[w]e don't consider English-speaking readers more sensitive to swearing than Norwegians. On the other hand, we have experienced that English and American editors are far more sensitive to non-pc language. Words such as 'homo', 'negro', 'Red Indian', 'Aborigine', 'mongol' would be unacceptable" (Bartlett and Shaw).

Adaptation has rendered the swear words domesticated in the translation, so what do we make of the moderations? It could be argued that it creates differing characterisations of the narrator. The more severe swearing register we find in ST2 characterises the narrator as someone who resists conventional politeness, whereas in TT2, milder swearing, like 'bloody', paints the narrator as someone who conforms more to 'proper' swearing.

This change of characterisation confirms my hypothesis that the TT2 translators do not always retain stylistic nuances, like the type of register a certain type of swearing can give connotations to. The shift in register can change the target readers' impression of the main character, and thus, the stylistic element of employing certain expletives over others, is not fully preserved. The differing levels of discomfort that might arise in source and target readers could be the result of the domesticating procedure adaptation, and moderation on part of the translators and/or editors.

5.3.5   Literal translation of allusions in TT2

As established, cultural allusions are challenging to reproduce for translators and difficult to grasp for readers (Schleiermacher 52; Newmark 142; Parks 63). Venuti advocates for direct transfer of cultural allusions by means of footnotes, thus highlighting the foreign (*Scandals* 22; see also Lefevre 25; Newmark 147; to a certain extent, Parks 61-63).

The literal translation and consequently eclipsing of the already covert allusions in ST2, for example that to Obstfelder, could be a consequence of intentionally leaving it unexplained, accepting that it is hardly translatable. The translators, on their part, elaborate on

the subject and state that: "[s]ometimes it is necessary to add a brief gloss, such as ... the famous skier. Sometimes we retain a word in italics and make the context clear (*gymnas*)" (Bartlett and Shaw). The instances when neither approach is applied in the translation, a loss of humour and cultural connotations takes place. The humour that arises from a 'low' character alluding to 'high' culture, as with the Obstfelder allusion, is lost and takes away from the "sparkle and charm" of ST2 (Nida 161). According to Parks, however, "there is very little a translator can do" to reproduce the feelings allusions inspire in the source reader (64). Thus, the TT2 translators could have simply accepted the impossibility of recreating, in the translation, textual elements that generate the same feelings that were generated by similar text elements in the original. Alternatively, certain allusions could simply have escaped the translator's notice, by virtue of their covertness. If so, it could explain why the translators have chosen to add glosses or italics to some allusions while leaving others unexplained and unmarked, which would be an argument for L2 translation as they probably have a greater ability to spot allusions in their native language. This argument aside, the TT2 translators *do* sporadically attempt to explain allusions; the allusion to Hauge, for instance, is noted and clarified by means of explicitation and thus calls attention to the source culture (see above in section **3.4.1**).

Even if it leads to the loss of cultural connotations in TT2, utilising literal translation could be a compromise that effectively avoids "an appropriation of foreign cultures" (Venuti, *Invisibility* 14), and simply makes the foreign culture invisible. Substituting the Obstfelder allusion with an allusion to another modernist poet, like T. S. Eliot, thus applying the procedure adaptation, would be highly domesticating, while explaining the allusion, by means of a footnote, would be highly foreignizing. Thus, by choosing literal translation, the translators have settled for a middle ground that is neither intensley domesticating nor markedly foreignizing, but that, however, ensures transparency.

On a side note, italicisations of movie or book titles in TT2 where there are no italics or inverted commas in the original, makes TT2 more domesticated. The absence of such markers in the original demonstrates the main character's disregard for conventionality and is therefore a telling stylistic feature.

In light of this, literal translation of allusions may signify that the translators have accepted that cultural losses in some cases are inevitable, and furthermore, that they, for the most part resist adaptation and domestication. The discovery weakens my hypothesis that L1

translators domesticate stylistic features. A divergence from this trend is discussed in the subsequent section.

5.3.6 Loss of 'Swedishness' in both target texts

Parks' comments on the evocative effect of "culture-specific material" (67) are also pertinent when in comes to the cultural loss of references to Swedish culture in both TT1 and TT2. The representation of Swedish language and culture in both ST1 and ST2 attests to the interrelationship between Scandinavian cultures.

Both translations of allusions to Swedish culture tend towards domestication. Even though most of the items on the lists in ST1 are translated literally or borrowed, like the earlier mentioned 'Fjällreven', other examples illustrate a cultural loss. For instance, the translation of "svensk ZTV" (ST1 16) into "some programme or other" (TT1 11) is generalising and domesticating, in that it neither indicates that it is a television channel, nor that it is Swedish, which reduces the evocative impact it has in the source text. The use of the Swedish language in the following list could evoke the patriotic feeling of unity and brotherhood that exists between Scandinavian languages and cultures. This is impossible to replicate without annotative supplement and could be the reason why it has been rendered in English in TT1 with no indication that Swedish is used in the source text. Both my hypothesis, the TT1 translator's expressed intention to educate the target reader on Scandinavian culture (Solberg), and the ensuing propensity to explain allusions in footnotes, however, lead to an expectation that the Swedish references would be explained and foreignizing in the translation. Regardless, it is unrealistic to expect a complete transfer of such connotations, but this erasure of 'Swedishness' nevertheless conflicts with the translator's objective and do not give the target reader the possibility "look things up if desired" (Solberg).

A similar trend is detected in ST2 where an allusion to the Swedish cultural phenomenon *Emil fra Lønneberget* is lost and leads to domestication. The sentence "du och jag, Bongo" is very reminiscent of Astrid Lindgren's world and would rouse childish nostalgia and memories of 'barne-TV' in many source readers. The TT2 translators, on their part, comment on the difficulty of transferring such culture specific values in a translation:

> This tends to be one of the most difficult problems in translation – translating culture. The homegrown public understands references which the target readership would not.

... Sometimes, but rarely, we find an alternative English or American cultural reference to create a similar effect (Bartlett and Shaw).

The adaptation into 'you and me kiddo' is possibly an instance where the translators have substituted a source culture reference for an American one. 'Kiddo' is "a term of address, often affectionately" ("kiddo") and could have a similar effect in the target culture, in that it could give connotations to a father and son relationship similar to that between Emil and Alfred. The allusion in TT2 is not particular insofar as it refers to a specific text line, but it nevertheless refers to a popular term, or a trope even, which can give connotations to various pop culture items, like the movie *Kill Bill*, where the protagonist is nicknamed 'Kiddo'. This cultural shift is one of the exceptions to the trend that the TT2 translators use literal translation to explain allusions.

These findings partly confirm what I hypothesised, namely that the TT2 translators would be less invested in introducing the source culture to the target audience, but rather adapting it to fit the target culture. However, it was surprising to discover that TT1 has similar tendencies to domesticate, which, once again illustrates the inconsistency in translatorial choices.

5.4 The translation of the naïve: Which translation preserves style more and which is more foreignizing?

So what impression do we get of the naïve style by reading the translations? In TT1, the naïve language is generally preserved, and sometimes intensified, apparent by the increase of simple sentences and sentence fragments. However, some of the swearing, most notably 'shit' colours the TT1 narrator as more grown-up than the ST1 narrator. TT1 does not convey the same sense of immediacy and focus on the moment, qualities that Holst attributed to that of a child's (41). This is evidenced by less thematisation of the word 'now', and less use of verb forms conveying continuous action. Furthermore, repetition is substituted with a slightly more varied vocabulary, thus affecting the naïve language in ST1, which has been described as simple, unvaried and child-like (Andersen 650; Pollen 15).

TT2 represents the naïve or teenage-like narrator as more 'proper' and less nonconformist. The more varied vocabulary, more so than in TT1 contributes to this characterisation. TT2 has a resigned mood, which could be attributed to the retention of a majority of the litotes, thus ensuring defamiliarization (Holst 65) and "stoical restraint"

("litotes"). TT2 conveys less of the humor stemming from a 'low' narrator alluding to 'high' culture and conveys Doppler's hubris as less obvious and he seems more mature and, in Loe's terms, 'sympatisk'.

Both translations can be said to have a more unmarked style in relation to their respective source texts. Though compared to each other, TT1 retains more of the defamiliarization in Loe's style than TT2, for example by copying the exact same realistic documents, preserving Loe-esque expressions to a greater extent, and including more simple sentences and sentence fragments than its original. The style rendered in TT2, on the other hand, is less defamiliarizing, which illustrates that the TT2 translators repeat the trend noted in Parks' research that an L2 translator "eliminates certain tics" from the source text (15). 'Tics' that are less noticeable in TT2 are first and foremost, the Loe-esque expressions, but also repetition and the humorous allusions that are integrated in the dialogue in ST2. My hypothesis that the TT1 translator would preserve Loe's style to a greater extent is therefore supported.

No translations are purely foreignizing or domesticating, but they can, however, lean more towards one or the other. TT1 demonstrates the most conspicuous examples of foreignization, namely, the handwritten annotations explaining Norwegian swear words and borrowing of numerous culture specific allusions. Of course, deviations from this trend do occur as exemplified by the adaptation of children's songs and swearing. The procedure most frequently used in TT1, however, is literal translation, which can be both foreignizing or domesticating. Borrowing is more frequently used in TT1, which makes it more foreignizing. To be fair, ST1 is a source text where borrowings and explicitations are more likely to occur due to the many pop culture references, so the fact that TT1 borrows more is to a certain extent expected, regardless of language background. The TT1 translator's expressed wish to educate the target culture about Norwegian culture could account for this tendency and confirms my hypothesis that L2 translators are more invested in showing off their own source culture. Thus, the TT1 translator has achieved his objective:

> it had to be as close to what the source text gave me, really, so I would say it was a general orientation to preserve rather than to recreate. The prose itself was largely simple enough for that to be done by a budding translator like I was, but at times the simplicity was also deceptive - I had an English-speaking reader (a friend) help me spot errors, of which there were a handful (Solberg).

However, when evaluated on its own, TT1 is not "disconcerting[ly] foreign" (Venuti, *Invisibility* 5). It highlights the foreign in a way that does not happen to the same extent in TT2 but not so that is unsettles the "values, beliefs and representations" of the target culture (ibid., 160). The exceptions are the handwritten annotations in "Biblioteket" and slightly more severe expletives in TT1, which demonstrate that Harris, Aycicegi and Gleason's study can possibly be applicable to translators. This leads me to conclude that TT1 is overall exoticizing, rather than foreignizing, whilst often disrupting fluency. TT1 is therefore an exception to the norm that most translations into English are domesticating (Venuti, *Invisibility* 11).

TT2, on the other hand, is a translation that, for the most part fulfils the expectation to domesticate texts that are translated into English. The procedure most frequently used in TT2 is équivalence, the use of which has a domesticating effect. However, literal translation, a mainly foreignizing procedure, is used to almost the same extent, but in TT2, it often has a domesticating effect in that it tends to leave allusions to the source culture undetectable to the target reader. Deviations from this trend occur, as in any translation, by, for instance using literal translation that leads to the use of the archaism 'devilry'. Furthermore, the fact that experienced L1 translators translate TT2, probably gives them an innate sense of how to avoid 'false friends' that could arise from too literal translations. Moreover, adaptation, a clearly domesticating procedure, is widely used when it comes to swearing, and the moderation of expletives demonstrates the validity of Harris, Aycicegi and Gleason's study. There are, on the other hand, very few stylistic traits that are translated with borrowing in TT2. I would therefore claim that TT2 is the more domesticating translation, since there are more examples of distinctly domesticating shifts and the fact that foreignizing procedures are rarely used.

From these findings, we can confirm parts of my hypothesis, while slightly modifying it into 'TT1, which is an L2 translation, *does* preserve style to a greater extent and is the more foreignizing of the two translation, *but individually, TT1 is often merely exoticizing*, while TT2, which is an L1 translation, *does* give less precedence to style and *is* more domesticating.'

5.5 Two types of translators – two types of cultural and stylistic exchange: Future prospects

In this study, I asked how the different language backgrounds of the TT1 translator and the TT2 translator affect the translation of style. As mentioned, L2 translation is not what is

preferred in the translating world (Campbell 57). The TT1 translator in this study, however, is an example that good translations into English can come from an L2 translator, thus exemplifying competence that could qualify for "native ability" (Campbell 104; se also Pokorn 1). This is a discussion the translators were aware of. The TT1 translator explains how he views his role as a translator in this way:

> I realised translating into a second language is uncommon practice. Nevertheless, I related to the style of the prose and I felt confident enough to take it on. Also, I'd written considerably more copy in English than in Norwegian in the preceding couple of years. At any rate, the actual translating of this book was conceived as a challenge to myself. I was not under contract or otherwise in touch with a publisher; I simply wanted to see if I could make a good-enough job of it. The message of the book was so appealing, and I wanted my close friends to read it. So I translated it and made eight illegal copies as Christmas presents (Solberg).

This suggests that the he has not been under any publisher's constraint and thus been able to choose his approach freely. This is further supported by his comment about the post editorial process: "[i]n correspondence at the time of publishing, the publisher noted "only minor" corrections being needed. … When I did re-read it later on, I actually found very few changes indeed" (Solberg). The comments from the translator moreover give the impression of him being new to the profession and this could explain why he foreignizes one trait and domesticates another. He had, however, settled on the objective to educate the target culture about Norwegian culture (Solberg), thus seeming to have as his main intention to purposely foreignize the text, which confirms my hypothesis that the TT1 translator has an integrated bias towards his native culture. The TT2 translators, on their part, said the following about L1 and L2 translation:

> We think translation into one's first language is always the best. The more experience you have in any language, the better equipped you are as a translator. This doesn't rule out the possibility of a second-language translator excelling (Bartlett and Shaw).

The TT2 translators therefore do not close the door completely on L2 translation. Parks points out that L1 translators sometimes tend to refine what is interpreted as "inelegance" (Parks 15). This trend could have been repeated in TT2, especially with the translation of the Loe-esque expressions, descriptions of amounts and toned down repetition and swearing, which have the impression of being less defamiliarizing and could suggest that translators have refined what

have been interpreted as mistakes or "inelegance" in Loe's style (Parks 15). This operation could, of course, be attributed to an intention to domesticate the text.

The findings presented in this thesis – that the L2 translation is overall more foreignizing and the L1 translation overall more domesticating – illustrate that L2 translators can be important in proliferating foreignization and to diminish the current Anglo-American cultural and linguistic dominance that Venuti deplores (*Invisibility* 12; also discussed in Klaudy 43). Since the the current status of English makes it seem unnecessary for future native English speakers to learn a second language, it might lead to fewer proficient L1 translators being available to translate from minor languages. Campbell explains that "the supply of translators into particular languages may not match the demand, so that translation sometimes (or perhaps even often) has to be undertaken into the second language", as is the case with Finland (57). If the hegemony of the English language continues to grow, which is very likely, there might be a higher demand for L2 translators in the world, especially when it comes to minor languages. Championing of L2 translation and the foreignization that ensues could also lead to a more balanced and accurate representation of cultures on the international scene. Cultural exchange in the western world currently happens through filtering out 'otherness' through an Anglo-American sieve, the result of which is presented not only to Anglo-American audiences, but target groups with English as their L2, like Norwegian audiences, thus proliferating monotony and disregard for markedly foreign modes of expression (*Invisibility* 12). Even though Anglo-American audiences show an interest in other cultures, much of the input is 'anglified', to the point where knowledge of other languages is unnecessary. For example, non-Anglo-American TV series and films are spoken wholly or partly in English (Lilyhammer), or adapted into English-speaking versions (The Bridge, Homeland, Brothers), leaving the audience linguistically inert (cf. *Invisibility* 12). Continuing to exclusively praise domestication and L1 translation and conversely excluding foreignization and L2 translation could possibly exacerbate this situation. Therefore, the stigma surrounding L2 translation will hopefully be shed so that we can continue with meaningful intercultural exchange.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

The main intention of this thesis was to identify stylistic traits connected to naïvism in Erlend Loe's *Naiv. Super.* and *Doppler* and to find out if L1 and L2 translators translated style differently and if this, in turn, could be related to their differing language backgrounds. Moreover, I wanted to figure out if the stigma connected to L2 translation is justifiable or if my findings could lead to a positive re-evaluation of such translation. The main argument has been that L2 translators produce more foreignizing translations that retain stylistic idiosyncracies to a greater extent than do L1 translators. Early on, I therefore hypothesised that TT1 would be more foreignizing and faithful to Loe's style, whereas TT2 would demonstrate an opposite trend.

The main points made in this thesis are, among others, that the most conspicuous instance of foreignization in TT1, namely the numerous borrowings of expletives and the ancillary handwritten annotations, was attributed to the TT1 translator's wish to educate the target culture about the source culture. This is an argument that strongly supports my hypothesis that L2 translators gravitate more towards foreignization. Additionally, the intensification of swearing, most notably that of 'shit' was found to be foreignizing and as slightly mischaracterising the narrator and the otherwise innocent and naïve tone in the original text line. The translation of allusions in TT1 attests to a mix of foreignizing procedures, which often results in exoticism, and domesticating procedures, which results in an adjustment of cultural references to fit the target culture. Over all, it was discovered that TT1 demonstrates a more marked style than its original, specifically when it comes to sentence fragments. It was discovered that TT2, on its part, domesticates allusions, and swearing and thus expediting the "complacency in British and American relations with cultural others" (Venuti, *Invisibility* 13). Moreover, TT2 was shown to standardise certain defamiliarizing elements, such as the Loe-esque expressions and repetition, thus confirming my assumption that TT2 would be less idiosyncratic than its original.

In light of these main discoveries, one main conclusion in this thesis is that TT1 proved to be the more foreignizing of the two translations, while sometimes being merely exoticizing, and that it retains more of Loe's idiosyncratic style. The exoticism in TT1 could be accounted to the fact that translations between Norwegian and English represent cultural exchange between audiences that, by and large, have the same "values and beliefs" (Venuti,

Invisibility 160), which possibly minimises the chances of distinct foreignization. TT1 is, moreover, visible as a translation as it preserves defamiliarizing stylistic elements to a greater extent.

The other main conclusion is conversely, that TT2 was more likely to domesticate and normalise style. My prediction that the L2 translator would be more prone to foreignize and preserve style is thereby confirmed. TT2 was additionally declared to be less visible as a translation; it uses more domesticating procedures, and generally ensures that transparency is upheld by standardising more of Loe's idiosyncracies. TT2 therefore fulfills the expectation that it would be the more domesticating translation and encompass a more unmarked style. Divergences from this main trend in both TT1 and TT2 demonstrate that neither of the translators commits solely to either foreignization or domestication at all costs. However, as a general rule, TT1 is symptomatic of what could be considered foreignizing procedures like literal translation, adaptation and borrowing. Conversely, TT2 demonstrates a habitual use of domesticating procedures like équivalence. An additional discovery was that both translations were domesticating to a certain extent, which was manifested by the loss of Swedishness in both target texts and confirms Klaudy's observation that translations from minor into major languages are generally domesticating (43).

In addition to these main points and conclusions, we can argue for the likelihood that the separate trends regarding L1 and L2 translation are due to differing language backgrounds. As we can detect in this study, the TT1 translator seems to choose certain translation procedures over others and this could arguably be attributed to the fact that he, in the case of ST1, translates into his L2. The interview comments from the TT1 translator suggest that this might be the case. The TT2 translators, on the other hand could also be choosing their approach based on their language background. Being English and thus an integrated part of a domesticating translation culture and set of norms, they are arguably more inclined to domesticate translations. Like I have pointed out, L2 translation is generally unfavoured (Campbell 57; Newmark 26), though some seem to think that L2 translators, in some cases, can be adequately proficient (Campbell, Pokorn, Bartlett and Shaw). According to the findings in this study, L2 translators can indeed produce adequate translations. What is more, they could, in fact, be necessary if the monolingualism of the dominant English culture and language expands. Additionally, as the L2 translator in this study was seen to foreignize more and expressed an agenda to draw attention to the source culture, L2 translation of

literary texts from minor languages, could prove to be helpful in propagating more direct non-Anglo-American values, thus interfering with the Anglo-American cultural hegemony.

The overview of Erlend Loe's most prominent stylistic features will hopefully contribute to the research on his literary style. The amalgamation of foreignization and domestication with Vinay and Darbelnet's translation procedures might hopefully facilitate future research on the cultural effect of stylistic translatorial shifts.

One limitation in this thesis revolve around the challenges of manual counting; having exact, preferably digital, counts for every stylistic trait would have ensured more exact data and saved a lot of time in the assembling process. This will hopefully and probably be available in the future, as Google Books and other digital libraries continue to digitise written texts. It is likely that *Naiv. Super* and *Doppler* can be recounted more thoroughly a few years from now, perhaps alongside other, similar texts, in a more comprehensive corpus study. Another thing that could make for a stronger argument in this thesis would be a comparison of more than one set of L1 and L2 translators. This would give more proof as to how persistent the trend of foreignizing L2 translation is.

Future research to explore the trends discovered in this study are contrastive studies on other text types, like legal documents translated from English into other minor languages like Finnish or Icelandic to investigate if the same patterns of foreignization or domestication continue.

Works cited

Andersen, Per Thomas. *Norsk Litteraturhistorie.* 2nd ed. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2012. Print.

"Animation." *Ordnett.no.* Kunnskapsforlaget Aschehoug og Gyldendal. N.d. Web. 7 May 2015.

Baker, Mona. *In Other Words: a Coursebook on Translation.* London: Routledge, 1992. Print

Barslund, Charlotte. "The translation of literary prose." *The Oxford Handbook of Translation Studies.* Eds. Kirsten Malmkjær, Kevin Windle. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011. 139-152. Print.

Bartlett, Don. Interview by Sarah Smith. "A Conversation with Don Bartlett." *World Literature Today.* University of Oklahoma, 2014. Web. 17 Dec. 2014.

Bartlett, Don. Interview by Scott Esposito. "Translating Knausgaard: An Interview with Don Bartlett." *The Paris Review.* The Paris Review, 2015. Web. 10 May 2015.

Bartlett, Don., Shaw, Don. "Re: Questions for my master's thesis about "Doppler"." Message to the author. 3 Mar. 2015. E-mail.

Boase-Beier, Jean. *Stylistic Approaches to Translation.* Oxon: Routledge, 2006. Print.

---. "Stylistics and Translation." *The Oxford Handbook of Translation Studies.* Eds. Kirsten Malmkjær, Kevin Windle. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011. 71-82. Print.

Berman, Antoine. "Translation and the trials of the foreign." Trans. Lawrence Venuti. *The Translation Studies Reader.* Ed. Lawrence Venuti. New York: Routledge, 2004. 276-289. Print.

Brodskaya, Nathalia. *Art of Century : Naive Art*. New York: Parkstone International, 2012. *ProQuest ebrary*. Web 5 Feb. 2015.

Campbell, Stuart. *Translation Into the Second Language.* Essex: Addison Wesley Longman Limited, 1998. Print.

English Standard Version. The Holy Bible. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Bibles, 2000. Print.

"Equivalence. " *Ordnett.no.* Kunnskapsforlaget Aschehoug og Gyldendal. N.d. Web. 7 May 2015.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. "The Position of Translated Literature Within the Literary Polysystem." *The Translations Studies Reader.* Ed. Lawrence Venuti. New York: Routledge, 2004. 199-204. Print.

Fjeld, Ruth. "Banning – makt eller avmakt?" *Språknytt* 32.3-4 (2004): 30-33. *Språkrådet.* Web 19 Oct. 2014.

Fjeld, Ruth. Interviewed by Cathrine Hellesøy. "Mangler kunnskap om banning."

    Aftenposten. Aftenposten, 29 Sept. 2011. Web. 3 Dec. 2014.

Genette, Gérard *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. New York:

    Cornell University Press, 1980. Print.

Harris, Christine L., Aycicegi, Ayse., Gleason, Jean Berko. "Taboo words and reprimands

    elicit greater autonomic reactivity in a first language than in a second language."

    Applied Psycholinguistics 24.4. (2003): 561-579. Web. 20 Nov. 2014.

Hasund, Ingrid Kristine. "Religiøs banning og nestenbanning." *Språknytt* 34.1 (2006): 20-23.

    Språkrådet. Web. 20 Nov. 2014.

Hauge, Olav H. "Det er den draumen." *Lyrikk fra antikken til vår tid*. Eds. Jon Haarberg,

    Hans Skei. Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, 2002. 284. Print.

Hollander, Lee M. "Litotes in Old Norse." *PMLA* 53. 1 (1938): 1-33. *Jstor.* Web. 19 Nov.

    2014.

Holst, Wera Birgitte. *Jakten på det umiddelbare. En analyse av Naiv.Super. og Doppler.* MA

    thesis. Universitetet i Oslo, 2006. *UIO - DUO.* Web. 18 Sept. 2014.

Hughes, Geoffrey. *An Encyclopedia of Swearing: The Social History of Oaths, Profanity,

    Foul Language, and Ethnic Slurs in the English Speaking World.* New York: M.E.

    Sharpe, Inc., 2006. Print.

Irwin, William. "Against Intertextuality." *Philosophy and Literature* 28.2 (2004): 227-242.

    Project Muse. Web. 17 Nov. 2014.

Jeffries, Lesley., McIntyre, Daniel. *Stylistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

    Google Books. Web. 4 Dec. 2014.

Jakobson, Roman. "Linguistics and poetics." *Modern Criticism and Theory.* 2nd edition. Ed.

    David Lodge. New York: Pearson Education, Inc., 2000. 31-55. Print.

"Kiddo." *The Concise New Partridge Dictionary of slang and Unconventional English.* Eds.

    Tom Dalzell, Terry Victor. Oxon: Routledge, 2008. Print.

Klaudy, Kinga "Linguistic and Cultural Asymmetry in Translation from and into Minor

    Languages." *Domestication and Foreignization in Translation Studies.* Eds. Hannu

    Kemppanen, Marja Jänis, Alexandra Belikova. Berlin: Frank & Timme GmbH Verlag

    für wissenschaftliche Literatur, 2012. 33-48. Print.

Lefevre, André. *Translating Literature: Practice and Theory in a Comparative Literature

    Context.* New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1992. Print.

Lie, Sondre. Appendix. *Translate this, motherfucker! A contrastive study on the subtitling of*

taboo words. MA thesis. Universitetet i Oslo, 2013. 1-15. *UIO - DUO* Web. 13 Feb. 2015.

"Litotes."a. *Ordnett.no.* Kunnskapsforlaget Aschehoug og Gyldendal. N.d. Web. 7 May 2015.

"Litotes."b. *Encyclopedia Britannia Online*. Encyclopedia Britannica Online, n.d. Web. 19 Nov. 2014.

Loe, Erlend. *Doppler.* Oslo: J.W. Cappelens Forlag, 2004. Print.

---. *Doppler.* Trans. Don Bartlett, Don Shaw. UK: Head of Zeus Ltd, 2012. Print.

---. *Naiv. Super.* N.p.: CAPPELEN DAMM AS, 2009. Print.

---. *Naïve. Super.* Trans. Tor Ketil Solberg. Edinburgh: Canongate Books, 2005. Print.

Loe, Erlend. "Erlend Loe om naivisme." *NRK.no*. NRK, 2 Dec. 2014. Web. 1 Oct. 2014.

Malmkjær, Kirsten. "Translational stylistics: Dulcen's translations of Hans Christian Andersen." *Language and Literature* 13.1 (2004): 13-24. *Sagepub.* Web. 1 Mar. 2015.

Marco, Josep (2004) "Translating style and styles of translating: Henry James and Edgar Allan Poe in Catalan" *Language and Literature* 13.73 (2004): 73-90. *Sagepub.* Web. 24 Nov. 2014.

Millwood-Hargrave, Andrea. *Deletive expletives?* Research undertaken jointly by the Advertising Standards Authority, British Broadcasting Corporation, Broadcasting Standards Commission and the Independent Television Commission. ASA, BBC, BSC and ITC: London, 2000. Web. 20 Nov. 2014.

Morson, Gary Saul. "The Russian Debate on Narrative". *Literary Theory and Criticism.* Ed. Patricia Waugh. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006. 212-222. Print.

Munday, Jeremy, *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Application.* 3rd edition. Oxon: Routledge, 2012. Print.

Nabokov, Vladimir. "Problems of translation: *Onegin* in English." *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. New York: Routledge, 2004. 113-127. Print.

"Naiv. Super." Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. 28 Feb. 2014. Web. 10 Mar. 2015.

Nida, Eugene. "Principles of correspondence." *The Translations Studies Reader.* Ed. Lawrence Venuti. New York: Routledge, 2004. 153-167. Print.

Obstfelder, Sigbjørn. "Jeg ser." *Dikt fra antikken til vår tid.* Eds. Jon Haarberg, Hans H. Skei. Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, 2002. 225. Print.

Parks, Tim. *Translating Style: The English Modernists and their Italian Translations.* London: Cassel, 1998. Print.

"Personification." *Ordnett.no.* Kunnskapsforlaget Aschehoug og Gyldendal. N.d. Web. 7 May
      2015.

Pokorn, Nike K. *Challenging the Traditional Axioms: Translation Into a Non-mother Tongue.*
      Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2005. *ProQuest ebrary*. Web. 5
      February 2015.

Pollen, Andrine. "Om livet for barn og andre I 90-åras norske barne- og ungdomslitteratur"
      Forankring og fornying. Oslo: Cappelen Akademisk Forlag as, 1999. 11-22. *NB*
      Digital. Web. 2. Okt 2014.

Rodriguez Rodrigues, Beatriz. *Literary Translation Quality Assessment.* München: LINCOM
      Europa, 2007. Print.

Rottem, Øystein. "Utspekulert naivisme." *Dagbladet.* Dagbladet., 29 Oct. 1996. Web. 11
      Nov. 2014.

Rødseth, Inger "*En god latter: En analyse av komikken i Erlend Loes Doppler of Volvo*
      Lastvagnar." MA thesis. Universitetet i Oslo, 2007. *UIO - DUO.* Web. 30 Sept. 2014.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. "On the Different Methods of Translating." Trans. Susan
      Bernofsky. *The Translations Studies Reader.* Ed. Lawrence Venuti. New York:
      Routledge, 2004. 43-63. Print.

Simpson, Paul. *Stylistics: A Resourcs Book for Students.* Oxon: Routledge, 2014. Print.

Skoleutgave. Bibelen. N.p.: Det Norske Bibelselskap, 2001. Print.

Solberg, Tor Ketil. "Re: Spørsmål til masteroppgave." Message to the author. 10 Mar. 2015.
      E-mail.

"Thematising." *Ordnett.no.* Kunnskapsforlaget Aschehoug og Gyldendal. N.d. Web. 7 May
      2015.

Thomas, Richard F. "Virgil's Georgics and the Art of Reference." *Harvard Studies in*
      Classical Philosophy. 90 (1986): 171-198. *Jstor.* Web. 13 Jan. 2015.

Toury, Gideon. *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins
      Publishing Co, 1995. Print.

"Turd." *Ordnett.no.* Kunnskapsforlaget Aschehoug og Gyldendal. N.d. Web. 7 May 2015.

Institute of Translation and Interpreting. *Code of Professional Conduct.* Approved: n.p. 2013.
      Web. 18 Nov. 2014.

Tønnessen, Elise Seip. "Dannelsesprosjekt i to generasjoner: en krysslesning av Dag Solstad
      og Erlend Loe." *Norsk Litterær Årbok.* Oslo: Det norske samlaget, 2001. 121-138.
      Print.

Vassenden, Eirik. "Den store overflaten: Erlend Loes romaner." *Den Store Overflaten: tekster om samtidslitteraturen.* N.p.: N.*W.* DAMM & SØN AS, 2004. Print.

Venuti, Lawrence *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation.* 2nd edition. Oxon: Routledge, 2008. Print.

---. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference.* London: Routledge, 1998. Print.

Vinay, Jean-Paul., Darbelnet, Jean. *Comparative Stylistics of French and English A methodology for translation.* Trans./Eds. Juan C. Sager, M. -J. Hamel. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co, 1995. Print.