



Elisabeth Førde

**“A very nice well-spoken gentlehobbit is Mr. Bilbo, as I’ve always said”**

A Study of the Translation of Linguistic Variation in *The Lord of the Rings* into Norwegian

Master's thesis in English

Trondheim, May 2018

## Abstract

This thesis examines which translation procedures have been used to translate linguistic variation in *The Lord of the Rings* into Norwegian, and sets out to test whether the results confirm the hypothesis that standardization is the predominant translation strategy for the translation of linguistic variation. The study is product-oriented and descriptive-explanatory, using a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches to analyze 10 character samples from the novel, consisting of five different races and two characters for each racial category. The categorization of non-standard markers in Englund Dimitrova (2004) and categorization of translation procedures in Rosa (2012) were used as a framework for the analysis. A low and a high kind of non-standardness were found in the source text, and a varying amount of translation procedures was found in the two *bokmål* translations and the *nynorsk* translation examined. The translation procedures have been used in the following order in all three translations, from most to least used: addition, omission, maintenance and change. The results show that the first *bokmål* translation (TT1) has the highest number of omissions, while this number is somewhat lower in the second *bokmål* translation (TT2) and even lower in the *nynorsk* translation (TT3). Omission is a move towards standardization, meaning that non-standard varieties become more like the standard language, and the high amounts of omissions can therefore be evidence of standardization in the translations. However, the high amounts of additions in all TTs, especially TT3, as well as a few changes, can be seen to function as compensations for the omissions. Additionally, there are some amounts of maintenance in the translations, and these three translation procedures can be said to be a counterpart to omission, since they either transfer non-standardness into a TT or contribute with even more non-standardness in a TT. Adding the numbers of additions, changes and maintained markers together, all three translations have more non-standard markers than the ST, which can be evidence of a move away from standardization. Nevertheless, it is difficult to confirm or disprove the standardization hypothesis, due to the different opinions regarding additions and changes being compensations for omissions in translation.



## Acknowledgements

Writing this thesis has proven to be a challenging project in many ways, but it has also been a very rewarding experience to be able to dedicate so much time to study the Norwegian translations of one of my favorite novels, *The Lord of the Rings*.

First and foremost, I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Annjo Klungervik Greenall, for the help and support throughout the process of writing this thesis and giving me *precious* feedback and motivation. Thank you for helping me decide on the final topic for the thesis and for steering me in the right direction when I was stuck on a problem or wrote too many pages in my enthusiasm for Tolkien's Middle-earth.

I would also like to thank my family for calling me almost every day and giving me motivation when I was feeling overwhelmed by this project, my fellow students for helpful advice and feedback, and my friends for reminding me to enjoy life outside of school as well. Last, but not least, I would like to thank one particular person for encouraging me to keep working, even when I was feeling too irritated, sad, tired or unmotivated to do so. You know who you are, and I am forever grateful.

Elisabeth Førde

Trondheim, May 2018

# Table of contents

## List of tables

## List of abbreviations

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Tolkien's Middle-earth.....	1
1.2	Research question and hypothesis .....	3
1.3	Thesis outline .....	3
<b>2</b>	<b>Theoretical background.....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Linguistic variation .....	5
2.1.1	Linguistic variation, standard and non-standard language.....	5
2.1.2	Language, dialect, sociolect and ethnolect.....	6
2.1.3	Register.....	6
2.1.4	Linguistic variation in literature .....	7
2.1.5	Tolkien's use of linguistic variation .....	8
2.2	Translation of linguistic variation .....	10
2.2.1	Previous research on the translation of linguistic variation .....	11
2.2.2	Tolkien on translation.....	13
2.2.3	Previous research on Tolkien regarding translation of linguistic variation .....	14
<b>3</b>	<b>Material and method.....</b>	<b>17</b>
3.1	Material .....	17
3.1.1	<i>LOTR</i> and its races, characters and linguistic variation .....	18
3.1.2	The Norwegian translations .....	20
3.2	Selection of data .....	21
3.3	Method .....	23
3.3.1	Categorization of non-standard markers .....	23
3.3.2	Categorization of translation procedures.....	24
3.4	Non-standard language in the material.....	25
3.5	Analysis and presentation of data.....	26
3.6	Limitations of the study.....	27
<b>4</b>	<b>Analysis .....</b>	<b>29</b>
4.1	Hobbits .....	29
4.1.1	Gaffer .....	29
4.1.2	Merry.....	32

4.2	Elves .....	33
4.2.1	Haldir.....	33
4.2.2	Galadriel .....	36
4.3	Men.....	38
4.3.1	Ghân-buri-Ghân .....	38
4.3.2	Denethor .....	40
4.4	Orcs .....	43
4.4.1	Tracker .....	43
4.4.2	Shagrat.....	44
4.5	Wizards.....	47
4.5.1	Gandalf .....	47
4.5.2	Saruman.....	48
4.6	Non-standard markers and translation procedures for all characters .....	50
<b>5</b>	<b>Discussion .....</b>	<b>53</b>
5.1	Translation procedures in TTs.....	53
5.1.1	Addition.....	55
5.1.2	Omission.....	55
5.1.3	Maintenance .....	57
5.1.4	Change.....	58
5.2	Standardization.....	59
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>61</b>
6.1	Suggestions for further research.....	62
	<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>63</b>
	<b>Appendix A: Complete analysis of the character samples</b>	
	<b>Appendix B: The Master’s thesis’ relevance for the teaching profession</b>	

## List of tables

Table 1: Non-standard markers in the ST in Gaffer's character sample .....	30
Table 2: Translation procedures in the TTs in Gaffer's character sample .....	30
Table 3: Non-standard markers in the ST in Merry's character sample .....	32
Table 4: Translation procedures in the TTs in Merry's character sample.....	32
Table 5: Non-standard markers in the ST in Haldir's character sample .....	34
Table 6: Translation procedures in the TTs in Haldir's character sample .....	34
Table 7: Non-standard markers in the ST in Galadriel's character sample .....	36
Table 8: Translation procedures in the TTs in Galadriel's character sample.....	37
Table 9: Non-standard markers in the ST in Ghân-buri-Ghân's character sample.....	39
Table 10: Translation procedures in the TTs in Ghân-buri-Ghân's character sample .....	39
Table 11: Non-standard markers in the ST in Denethor's character sample.....	41
Table 12: Translation procedures in the TTs in Denethor's character sample.....	41
Table 13: Non-standard markers in the ST in Tracker's character sample .....	43
Table 14: Translation procedures in the TTs in Tracker's character sample .....	43
Table 15: Non-standard markers in the ST in Shagrat's character sample .....	45
Table 16: Translation procedures in the TTs in Shagrat's character sample .....	45
Table 17: Non-standard markers in the ST in Gandalf's character sample.....	47
Table 18: Translation procedures in the TTs in Gandalf's character sample.....	47
Table 19: Non-standard markers in the ST in Saruman's character sample .....	49
Table 20: Translation procedures in the TTs in Saruman's character sample .....	49
Table 21: Non-standard markers in the ST for all character samples .....	50
Table 22: Translation procedures in the TTs for all character samples .....	51
Table 23: Non-standard markers in the ST and omissions in the TTs .....	52
Table 24: Translation procedures in the TTs, from most to least used .....	53
Table 25: Non-standard markers in the ST and omission in the TTs.....	57
Table 26: Non-standard markers in the ST and maintenance in the TTs.....	58
Table 27: Non-standard markers in the ST and changes in TT3.....	59

## List of abbreviations

**LC Hobbits** Leisure class Hobbits

**LOTR** *The Lord of the Rings*

**SL** Source language

**ST** Source text

**TL** Target language

**TT** Target text

**TT1** *Bokmål* translation by Werenskiold, 1973-1975

**TT2** *Bokmål* translation by Høverstad, 1980-1981

**TT3** *Nynorsk* translation by Myhren, 2006

**WC Hobbits** Working class Hobbits





# 1 Introduction

There are several ways of speaking a language, and the different varieties of a language are often connected to certain geographical areas, social or ethnic groups, cultures and so on. Therefore, linguistic variation can be an important indication of a person's identity, both in real life and in fictional works. One of the functions of linguistic variation in literature is characterization of fictional characters, either by relating a character to a regional, social or ethnic group, or by distinguishing a character as a unique individual from the other characters (Englund Dimitrova, 2004, p. 125). Due to the specific connotations linguistic varieties have in a source language (SL), it can be challenging to translate the varieties into a target language (TL), which has its own connotations to geographical areas or social, ethnic or cultural groups. Thus, it has been suggested that linguistic variation can be considered a case of untranslatability (Englund Dimitrova, 2004, p. 121), and Toury's law of growing standardization, formulated in the 1990s, suggests that, in translation of linguistic variation, there is a tendency of moving from non-standard varieties towards more standard varieties (Toury, 2012, p. 303). However, this is not necessarily the case for all translations in existence, and further research on this issue can contribute in finding out how linguistic variation is used in literature and other media, which translation procedures have been used in its translation into other languages, and if standardization is indeed the predominant translation strategy for linguistic variation. This thesis seeks to contribute with research on the issues concerning translation procedures and the standardization hypothesis, by examining the novel *The Lord of the Rings (LOTR)* by J. R. R. Tolkien and its three translations into Norwegian.

## 1.1 Tolkien's Middle-earth

When it comes to knowledge about language and the use of language and linguistic variation in fictional work, it is difficult to overlook J. R. R. Tolkien and his substantial work on *The Hobbit*, *LOTR* and *The Silmarillion*, to mention some of the books incorporated in his fictional world of Middle-earth. John Ronald Reuel Tolkien (1892-1973) was a Professor of English language at Oxford University, specialized in Old and Middle English, but was fascinated with language in general and has declared himself a "pure philologist" (Tolkien, Carpenter & Tolkien, 2006, p. 264). He was taught and self-taught in several languages, like Latin, French, German, Greek, Middle English, Old English, Old Norse, Gothic, Welsh, Finnish, Spanish and Italian, and some of these languages served as inspiration for his own invented languages, which were 14 in total (Noel, 1980, p. 3). Language was Tolkien's profession and personal passion (Turner, 2005, p. 12), and Tolkien himself has stated that the foundation for all his work is the

invention of languages, in that “the ‘stories’ were made rather to provide a world for the languages than the reverse” and that “to me a name comes first and the story follows” (Tolkien, Carpenter & Tolkien, 2006, p. 219). Tolkien invented languages for the different races living in Middle-earth, like Hobbits, Elves, Men, Dwarves, Orcs and Wizards, and each race also has its own history and culture. Furthermore, he has stated that Middle-earth is our real world, but within an imaginary period and with a different continental shape (Carpenter, 2016, p. 127).

Tolkien’s earliest work on Middle-earth started in 1914 and continued throughout his lifetime (Carpenter, 2016, pp. 101-103). Even though much of Tolkien’s unfinished work were edited and published posthumously by his son Christopher, like *The Silmarillion*, Tolkien was able to complete two of his most famous novels, being *The Hobbit* (1937) and *LOTR* (1954-1955). *LOTR* takes place in the Third Age in Middle-earth and tells the story of a group of nine people of various races called “the Fellowship of the Ring”, that goes on a quest across Middle-earth to destroy the One Ring, a magical ring created by the Dark Lord Sauron in his desire to enslave all of Middle-earth under his power. Parts of Sauron’s soul were poured into the Ring in its creation, and the only way to destroy it, and therefore also Sauron, is to cast it back into the fires of Mount Doom in Mordor where it was forged.

According to Turner (2005), “the convention that all characters in fantastic tales understood one another without further explanation was unsatisfactory” for Tolkien as a professional philologist (p. 37). *The Hobbit* and *LOTR* are supposedly “translations” of the Red Book of Westmarch, a book written by the Hobbits Bilbo and Frodo Baggins as a recording of their adventures. Thus, the novel is told from the viewpoint of Hobbits, a word coined by Tolkien as a mortal race of people small in height, living in holes in the ground in the northern parts of Middle-earth. The original language of the Red Book is Westron, or the Common Speech, which functions as a lingua franca in Middle-earth. To create an effect of verisimilitude, Tolkien presents himself as a pseudo-translator in the Prologue and the six Appendices, having “found” this book in real life and translated it from Westron into modern English (Turner, 2005, p. 15). In Appendix F of *LOTR*, Tolkien explains that “the difference between the varieties observable in the use of the Westron has been lessened”, but that “the whole of the linguistic setting has been translated as far as possible into terms of our own times” (Tolkien, 1955b/2011, p. 1133). Old English, Old Norse and Gothic represent some of the closely related text-world languages in *LOTR*, while Elvish has been left untranslated to preserve some of the exoticness in the eyes of Hobbits (Turner, 2005, p. 15).

Tolkien’s stories were dedicated to England, which is evident in the cultural parallel between Hobbits and “rustic English people” (Carpenter, 2016, p. 234). The parallel to English

people is also evident in the use of linguistic variation, as discussed by Johannesson (1997), who has found many similarities between the varieties spoken by Hobbits of the Shire and the varieties spoken in Oxfordshire and Warwickshire in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. Some of the other races in Middle-earth use archaic language and belong to ancient cultures very different from those found in our modern world. In addition to Hobbits, Men of the country Rohan are strongly connected to Englishness and to Old English specifically, and these strong ties to England can prove difficult to preserve in translation, since a TL has its own connections to geographical areas and language history (Shippey, 2001, p. 91).

## **1.2 Research question and hypothesis**

Due to the novel's apparent connections to England and to varieties of the English language, in addition to the use of dialect and of archaism, linguistic variation within Westron and variations in register, translators are faced with many challenges concerning linguistic variation. Therefore, this thesis seeks to examine which translation procedures have been used to translate linguistic variation in *LOTR* into Norwegian, and if the results confirm the hypothesis that standardization is the predominant translation strategy for the translation of linguistic variation. These issues are interesting to study, since one of the functions of linguistic variation is characterization, and that omission or alternation of linguistic variation in translation can affect the readers' experience of the text. The thesis is a product-oriented, descriptive-explanatory study (Saldanha & O'Brien, 2013, p. 50), where a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches will be used to analyze a selection of data from *LOTR*, consisting of dialogue from two characters for five racial categories. The theoretical works by Englund Dimitrova (2004) and Rosa (2012) will serve as the framework for the analysis.

## **1.3 Thesis outline**

The following chapter will present the theoretical background for the thesis, including the most central terms for the thesis and previous research on linguistic variation and its translation. The methodological framework will be outlined in Chapter 3, including the material, the selection of data and the methods used, while Chapter 4 will present the analysis of the selected data, both quantitatively and qualitatively. Chapter 5 will discuss the results from the analysis in order to answer the research question and to confirm or disprove the hypothesis, while a summary and conclusion will be offered in Chapter 6.



## 2 Theoretical background

### 2.1 Linguistic variation

#### 2.1.1 Linguistic variation, standard and non-standard language

A language can be spoken in several ways, since “all languages exhibit internal variation, that is, each language exists in a number of varieties and is in one sense the sum of those varieties” (Wardhaugh, 2010, p. 23). Hudson and Ferguson (in Wardhaugh, 2010, p. 23) have different definitions of the term *variety*, but they agree that it concerns “a specific set of ‘linguistic items’ or ‘human speech patterns’ (presumably, sounds, words, grammatical features, etc.) which we can uniquely associate with some external factor (presumably, a geographical area or a social group)”. We are thus able to identify specific varieties like Cockney, Jamaican English, Oxford English, and Received Pronunciation, to name a few varieties of the English language. Developing further from a mere linguistic definition, sociolinguistics stresses the importance of including social variation and stylistic variation to the definition, since evidence from sociolinguistic reports have found these factors to be vital when documenting actual language use (Swann et al., 2004, p. 177). The analysis of the translation of linguistic variation in *LOTR* in this study will be based on the models constructed by Englund Dimitrova (2004) and Rosa (2012), and therefore, I will use Rosa’s definition of *linguistic variation* as

a patterning of sounds, grammatical structures, vocabulary, texture, structure (linguistic form) that may carry contextual information on users and uses, in terms of time, space, sociocultural group, situation and individuality (communicative meaning) that is also associated with a given social status and prestige within a linguistic community (socio-cultural value) (Rosa, 2015, p. 210).

This contextual information is communicated to both the characters in the fictional work and the reader, since they are of great importance for the characterization of the characters and therefore their understanding of each other and the reader’s understanding of them. In contrast to linguistic variation is the term *standard language*, which is defined as

a relatively uniform variety of a language which does not show regional variation, and which is used in a wide range of communicative functions (e.g. official language, medium of instruction, literary language, scientific language etc.). Standard varieties tend to observe prescriptive, written norms, which are codified in grammars and dictionaries (Swann et al., 2004, p. 295).

The standard language has gone through a selection, codification, elaboration of functions and acceptance in order to gain the status as an official variety of a language (Englund Dimitrova, 2004, pp. 121-122). *Non-standard language* is the opposite of standard language, defined as “localized vocabulary, items of grammar and pronunciations of individual words that are not sanctioned by teachers, editors and other norm-setters”, and “whose norms are not accepted in

formal speech and writing” (Swann et al., 2004, p. 222). However, in this thesis, non-standard language will include markers of both dialect, which is a low kind of non-standardness, and archaism, a high kind of non-standardness. Archaism can be accepted in speech and writing, but is still not considered standard language use.

### **2.1.2 Language, dialect, sociolect and ethnolect**

The term *language* has two different meanings, depending on whether the term is used as *language* as a mass noun or as *a language*, a countable noun, and the relationship between these concepts is complex, as discussed by Simpson (2001). For the purpose of this study, the term *a language* is the most relevant, which refers to “an abstract system underlying the behavior of speech, writing or signing of an entire community” (Simpson, 2001, p. 31). However, it is difficult to define the term *a language* within linguistic theory, since “no firm boundary can necessarily be drawn between one language and another and one language may contain vast differences of pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary” (Simpson, 2001, p. 33). This term is still widely used and useful, but the term *variety* or *variety of language* can be used as a more neutral description of the phenomenon (Simpson, 2001, pp. 33-34).

A distinction can also be made between language and dialect, where the former is often associated with “a written standard variety or the prestigious spoken form on which a standard is based” (Swann et al., 2004, p. 163). Swann et al. (2004) define *dialect* as “the speech habits (pronunciation, lexicon, grammar, pragmatics) characteristic of a geographical area or region, or of a specific social group” (p. 76). For this study, however, a distinction will be made between the terms *dialect*, *sociolect* and *ethnolect*. Dialect will refer to a variety associated with a geographical area, and sociolect to a variety associated with a specific social group, for example relating to age and socioeconomic status (Englund Dimitrova, 2004, p. 121). Ethnolect is a more specified term for varieties associated with a specific ethnic or cultural group (Swann et al., 2004, p. 178).

### **2.1.3 Register**

In addition to the different linguistic varieties mentioned above, there are also other factors involved that affect the way people speak. The term *register* is defined by Halliday as “variety according to the use”, meaning that varieties can differ according to the situation and the context in which the communication act between people take place (Halliday, 1978, p. 110). According to Halliday, a linguistic situation can differ in three aspects, namely field, tenor and mode (Swann et al., 2004, p. 261). Of these three aspects, the most central term for this study is tenor, which concerns the roles and relationships between the participants, in terms of formality and

the degree of emotional charge between them (Halliday, 1978, p. 33). This aspect is the most relevant, since the relationship between the characters in the novel plays a central part for the interaction between the different races and characters and therefore their use of linguistic variation, especially in terms of formality and archaism.

*Formal* language use is characterized as having “carefully organized discourse, often with complex syntax and vocabulary, which closely follows the standard language, and which is often sensitive to prescriptive judgment”, while *informal* language use is “loosely structured, involving a high level of colloquial expression, and often departing from standard norms” (Crystal, 2003, p. 186). With regards to tenor, the relationship between the participants of the conversation will determine the degree of formality that is shown in their unique linguistic varieties. *Archaism* refers to the survival of linguistic features of a language that are no longer in general use, yet still not obsolete (Wales, 1994, p. 206). However, it is not equal to a modern-day formal register, since it features words and expressions that are not used in everyday conversation or even in academic writing. Archaism tends to be associated with linguistic varieties that are themselves marked, like a regional dialect or registers from an ancient or conservative tradition (Wales, 1994, p. 206). It is for example used in historical novels to give a “period flavor to dialogue” (Wales, 1994, p. 206).

#### **2.1.4 Linguistic variation in literature**

Hodson (2014) argues that the text-internal motivations for studying dialect in literature are extracting information about individual characters, locations, the relationship between the characters, and therefore broader thematic concerns, and a text-external reason is exploring how the linguistic variations “interact with the society within which they appear” (p. 10). Linguistic varieties in fiction are usually based on stereotypes of existing variations within a language in the real world, and readers sharing the knowledge of these stereotypes can assume certain qualities relating to people using these varieties. Standard language tends to be associated with more prestige than non-standard varieties, the latter often associated with peripheral geographical areas and lower sociocultural status (Ramos Pinto, 2009, p. 291). Therefore, if the author wishes to assign these qualities to his or her characters, linguistic variation can be used to achieve this. It is also a way of informing the reader about who is talking in the dialogue, and under which circumstances (Ramos Pinto, 2009, p. 291). It is, however, important to point out that there is a difference between authentic linguistic varieties and pseudo accents and dialects found in literature (Rosa, 2012, p. 82). Since dialects do not usually have an accepted way of being written, literary dialects may not be as authentic as linguistic varieties found in everyday



life, but in order to be used as an artistic device in fiction, they must differ from the standard language and also be intelligible for the readers (Englund Dimitrova, 2004, p. 123). Englund Dimitrova (2004) therefore argues that the author only needs to create an illusion of dialect to distinguish varieties used by the different characters in fiction (p. 123).

### **2.1.5 Tolkien's use of linguistic variation**

Tolkien's invented languages became the foundation for his stories, and his knowledge about languages and linguistic variation became part of the way in which he characterized the different races and characters in his works. Tolkien used this knowledge deliberately and was very aware of this fact, and many of his own subjective and intuitive opinions on this issue have been pointed out and acknowledged in research. Research on this topic is nevertheless important, as it provides objective, empirical evidence of how Tolkien uses linguistic variation, shown in quantitative and qualitative studies.

Johannesson (1997) examines how Tolkien uses non-standard English forms and constructions to characterize particular speaker groups and individual speakers in *LOTR*, with a primary focus on Hobbits from the Shire. The Shire, as other places in Middle-earth and in our world, have inhabitants of different socioeconomic classes, educational backgrounds, ages and genders, which can affect the way they speak. Johannesson (1997) uses linguistic data from all the prose passages that are spoken by the characters, both Hobbits and non-Hobbits, and both phonological and syntactic variables are included as far as possible (p. 12). Johannesson (1997) also makes a distinction between a leisure class of Hobbits (LC Hobbits) and a working class of Hobbits (WC Hobbits). The former includes members who “do not have to work for a living, comprising gentlehobbits of independent means [...] as well as sons of wealthy landowners [...]”, and the latter includes members like “farmers, gardeners, millers, ropers, shirriffs, etc.” (Johannesson, 1997, p. 13). Non-Hobbits include Dwarves, Elves, Ents, Men and Orcs.

Tolkien has stated that the Shire is more or less equivalent to a Warwickshire/Oxfordshire village around 1897, where the scenery and the linguistic varieties of these areas have served as geographical and linguistic raw material for the Shire and its inhabitants (Johannesson, 1997, pp. 13-14). Johannesson's (1997) close study of the non-standard English forms found in the Hobbits' dialogue confirms this fact with one exception, and that “all the dialectal forms used to represent Shiretalk are such as have been recorded in the speech of dialect speakers from Warwickshire/Oxfordshire” (p. 14). Johannesson (1997) examines the following syntactic variables in his study: sentence negation, subject-verb

agreement, auxiliary contraction, progressive verb forms, perfect tense forms, relative pronouns and constructions with *ought to* (p. 13). Putting it briefly, the WC Hobbits and Men of Bree, a village close to the Shire, are the groups that use the low kind of non-standard forms of the syntactic variables mentioned, while others use forms that are more standard. An example of this is from the character Gaffer, a WC Hobbit: “You didn’t never ought to have a’ sold Bag End, as I have always said” (Tolkien, 1955b/2011, p. 1014). Johannesson (1997) concludes that Tolkien has “sub-created a speech community where social stratification is reflected in the speech of the members of this community” (p. 46). His study shows that there is evidence of dialect variation, language change, linguistic insecurity among some of the WC Hobbits in dialogue with LC Hobbits of higher stature, as well as linguistic accommodation between characters of different races and social groups (Johannesson, 1997, p. 46).

Some races in Tolkien’s universe speak in a very formal and archaic manner, especially races of high nobility and royalty, and with high life expectancy, like Elves and high-ranking Men of Gondor, but there are also differences in the degrees and kinds of archaism between these different races, as found in Shippey’s discussion on one of the chapters in *LOTR* (Shippey, 2001, pp. 68-77). Other races, like Hobbits, speak, as we saw, a more informal, rural dialect of Westron that is more closely related to modern day use of English. The relationship between modern and archaic language use is explained by Turner (2005):

Tolkien uses his knowledge of philology to produce a creative interplay between ancient and modern outlooks on the world as an essential part of his literary design for *The Lord of the Rings*. It is this as much as anything else that motivates his use of literary archaism, which has often been criticised in the past as mere sham medievalism (p. 129).

This illustrates how Tolkien uses register, especially tenor, to differentiate between the different races and characters, but also to define their roles and the relationship between the participants in dialogue.

Tolkien was mostly interested in Germanic philology, and especially Old and Middle English, and it has been recognized that Tolkien tends to exploit Germanic elements in English to create an archaic effect (Turner, 2005, p. 40). Archaic lexis includes obsolete words for clothing, weapons and buildings and current words in English that can have an older and a more modern meaning, for example the adjective *cunning* (Turner, 2005, p. 138). The older meaning of this word is *skillful*, which Tolkien uses frequently, while the word has semantically “acquired the pejorative sense of ‘tricky, underhand’” (Turner, 2005, p. 138). Other archaic lexis are compound nouns and adjectives, which are typical features of Germanic languages and have been used to create an epic effect, for example *sister-son* and *dwimmer-crafty* (Turner,

2005, pp. 141-142). Archaism in syntax and information structure includes an extensive use of coordination rather than subordination, but also a frequent use of verb forms without an auxiliary, fronting in which the verb is the second element in the sentence, unusual adverbial placement with the word order Subject-Verb-Adverbial-Object/Complement/Adjunct, structuring alliterations, as well as alliterations in names (Turner, 2005, pp. 144-150). It is important to note, however, that many of these Germanic elements are not necessarily archaic per se, but the frequency in which they are being used and the combination of all the different elements being used together by certain characters and races create an archaic effect, as explained by Turner (2005, p. 141). Tolkien also uses the pronouns *thou* and *thee* from Middle English to represent ceremonious language, in addition to some older verb forms (Tolkien, 1955b/2011, p. 1133). An example of one of the most archaic passages is this, spoken by the character Denethor in a moment of despair:

Thou hadst already stolen my son's love. Now thou stealest the hearts of my knights also, so that they rob me wholly of my son at last. But in this at least thou shalt not defy my will: to rule my own end (Tolkien, 1955b/2011, p. 854).

This level of archaism is not used very often, but Honegger (2011) has found instances of the use of *thou* in *LOTR* in poetry and songs, archaic speech and in speech expressing contempt, high emotion or familiarity, and they are mainly used by Elves and Men of Rohan and Gondor (pp. 7-8).

## **2.2 Translation of linguistic variation**

Due to the particular challenges involved in translating linguistic variation, scholars have presented empirical records of which translation strategies and procedures translators have used for the translation of linguistic variation. There are also different opinions about which strategies are best suited for this purpose (Määttä, 2004, p. 321). Ramos Pinto (2009) points out that the act of translation always involves a process of selecting which elements of the text are the most important to maintain in a translation, which will influence the choice of strategies and the final product (p. 289). Some translators can therefore regard linguistic variation as a less important feature of the ST and focus on the other aspects of the text when translating, while others can regard these varieties as a vital part of, for example, characterization. In the following section, I will present findings from previous studies on translation of linguistic variation in order to point out some of the main tendencies found in research conducted in the last two decades, while the last section of this chapter will present findings from previous research on the translation of linguistic variation in *LOTR* specifically.

### 2.2.1 Previous research on the translation of linguistic variation

Scholars who have studied the translation of linguistic variation empirically have pointed out a range of different challenges, for example if the translator does not know the SL well enough, deciding how important linguistic varieties are to the overall effect of a ST, which dialect the TT should be in, or even if linguistic variation is untranslatable (Sánchez, 1999, pp. 305-309). Englund Dimitrova (2004) mentions that “dialects have specific connotations connected with certain areas or regions in the country of the source language” (p. 121), and dialects in the TL might not have the same connotations. The translator’s concern in this context will be to find a correspondence between the ST language variety and the TT language variety, which can prove to be a difficult task due to large differences between source and target language and culture (Lopes Cavalheiro, 2008, p. 19).

Previous research conducted on the translation of linguistic variation shows that there is a tendency towards *standardization* as the predominant translation strategy used by translators in several languages, including the translation of novels and subtitling (Horton 1998, Sánchez 1999, Lappihalme 2000, Määttä 2004, Lopes Cavalheiro 2008, Rosa et al. 2011, Herrera 2014, Rosa 2015 and Yu 2017). This trend found in previous research thus seems to confirm Toury’s “law of growing standardization”, where

in translation, source text textemes tend to be converted into target-language (or target-culture) repertories [...] 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, 2012, pp. 303-304).

This shows that many translators have ended up using standardization as a translation strategy, despite the risk of losing important thematic indications (Yu, 2017, p. 55). Rosa (2012) defines *standardization* as the “corresponding change from source text stigmatized or less prestigious literary varieties to the most prestigious variety in the TT: the standard” (p. 87). The term standardization in this thesis will, however, include the standardization of all kinds of non-standardness, both a low kind of non-standardness, like dialect markers, and what I define as a high kind of non-standardness, namely archaic markers. Together, these markers will be called *non-standard markers*.

Englund Dimitrova (2004) presents some general tendencies in translation of dialect based on previous research:

1. If the source text has non-codified variants of the SL (e.g. dialect), the tendency will be to translate these by codified variants of the TL.

2. If, however, non-codified variants in the source text are translated by non-codified TL variants, these will usually not be marked for a TL dialect, but will instead be taken from some other non-codified variety or register.
3. We can furthermore assume that if the second alternative holds, there will in fact be a strong tendency to use colloquial markers instead of other markers, and that this is due to the vicinity of these markers to the codified variants [...]. There is thus, so to speak, a movement towards the centre [standardization] (Englund Dimitrova, 2004, pp. 134-135).

The tendencies observed by Englund Dimitrova therefore seem to support the hypothesis of standardization being the predominant translation strategy for the translation of linguistic variation. In her article, Englund Dimitrova (2004) explores how speech and writing in dialect occur in literature, and how dialect can be marked on three different linguistic levels, which are *phonological/orthographic*, *morphosyntactic* and *lexical* (p. 123). Furthermore, Rosa (2012) expands on Englund Dimitrova's work by adding a list of procedures in order to identify the various translation procedures when translating linguistic markers associated with less prestigious discourse, consisting of *omission*, *addition*, *maintenance* and *change* of these linguistic markers (p. 85). According to Skogmo (2017), who uses Rosa's categories in her doctoral thesis, omission is a move towards standardization in a translation in its elimination of non-standard markers, while addition contributes to non-standardness in a translation and moves the translation away from standardization (p. 228). Maintenance and change transfer non-standardness to a translation and are thus "resisting standardisation" (Skogmo, 2017, p. 228). In her final remarks, Rosa (2012) also lists several motivations or constraints for the choice not to recreate linguistic variation in translation, and these motivations seem to be strong, since Rosa also finds the standardization strategy to be a trend in literary translation of linguistic variation (p. 87).

The theoretical works of Englund Dimitrova (2004) and Rosa (2012) have been chosen for this thesis as a foundation for the analysis of the selected data in Chapter 4 and for the discussion in Chapter 5. The particular combination of these two frameworks is credited to Skogmo (2017), who does this in her doctoral thesis on marked language in literary translation of five English novels into Norwegian. Skogmo's (2017) thesis consists of a detailed and structured mapping of challenges when translating linguistic variation and of which translation solutions that have been made in her chosen novels, which is highly relevant for my own study of linguistic variation in *LOTR* and its translations into Norwegian. As Skogmo (2017) explains in her introduction, the two frameworks have been used in order to study a more general level of marked language, instead of the study of one particular type of marked language (p. 2). She points out that Norwegian in this context has not previously been studied in much detail (Skogmo, 2017, p. 3), and therefore, a study using the same theoretical frameworks, but

studying different fictional prose, can provide additional empirical data to this research topic within Translation Studies. It can furthermore contribute to prove or disprove hypotheses regarding general tendencies found in the translation of linguistic variation. According to Skogmo (2017), results from previous research have found that phonological/orthographic markers are “less likely to be standardised than morpho-syntactic features, but more likely to be standardised than lexical features”, which she has also found to be the case in her study (p. 232). She concludes that

while the analysis shows that standardisation of marked language does occur in Norwegian literary translation, there are also many solutions which point in the other direction, and it is clear that further data must be added in order to provide comprehensive explanation for this phenomenon. This study can serve as a natural starting point for further study of standardisation of marked language in Norwegian literary translation, accumulating micro-level analysis to confirm, or indeed contradict, the tentative patterns suggested here (Skogmo, 2017, p. 236).

Skogmo (2017) also suggests that her thesis can provide a starting point for doing quantitative analyses on the topic of standardization of linguistic variation in translation (p. 238), something which will be included in this thesis.

### **2.2.2 Tolkien on translation**

Tolkien has stated that “I have great sympathy with any foreign publisher adventurous enough to embark on a translation of my work”, which suggests that he knew very well of the challenges involved when translating his work (Tolkien, Carpenter & Tolkien, 2006, p. 304). According to Turner (2005), Tolkien was strongly interested in translation in general, and he worked with a number of translations of his own work that were made in his lifetime (p. 11). Nevertheless, he was not particularly happy with some of the final products, like the Swedish translation from 1959 (Tolkien, Carpenter & Tolkien, 2006, pp. 304-307).

Even though Tolkien preferred that the translations of *LOTR* preserved the Englishness of the names in the novel, he realized that the translators might struggle with understanding the novel (Hammond & Scull, 2014, p. 750). This led him to create a glossary for how to translate names and place-names, which was created after the publication of the Dutch and Swedish translation. This document was sent to translators of *LOTR* to help them in their work and has been used by translators of Tolkien’s work ever since, in addition to being published in *A Tolkien Compass* in 1975 (Hammond & Scull, 2014, pp. 750-751). On the issue of the translation of linguistic variation, translators would have to consult the Appendices in *LOTR*, which contain a lot of additional information about the characters and races in Middle-earth, and about the linguistic relationship between different languages. However, several of the first translations of *LOTR* did not include the Appendices (Turner, 2005, p. 36).

### **2.2.3 Previous research on Tolkien regarding translation of linguistic variation**

Many have been fascinated with Tolkien's world, which is shown by the considerable amount of research that has been done concerning several aspects of his works, but there is a limited amount of literature on the translation of Tolkien's work.

Bayona (2011) investigates how socio-linguistic features in the ST have been expressed in Spanish and if the TT readers are able to perceive individual characteristic and social differences through their speech, by looking at linguistic variation of *Hobbits of the Shire* (p. 69). She uses some of the findings in Johannesson (1997) as a starting point for her analysis, including duplication of subject, double negatives, alteration in subject-verb agreement, sound elision, coinage and expressions. The non-standard forms are mainly used by WC *Hobbits*, which was also the conclusion in Johannesson (1997). Bayona's (2011) study shows that the Spanish translator has omitted almost all instances of the non-standard features, and that expressions have been maintained in meaning, but not in the same form as in the ST (p. 79).

Turner (2005) discusses the problems for translation concerning philological elements in *LOTR* with a focus on *Hobbits of the Shire* and *Men of Bree* and of Rohan, and he discusses the solutions made by translators in the Germanic languages German, Dutch and Swedish and the Romance languages French, Italian and Spanish (p. 20). Some of the most important issues on the translation of Tolkien's work in general by Turner (2005) have been addressed in previous sections, and of the philological elements analyzed in Turner's study, only archaism is of relevance for this thesis. The translators of *LOTR* have to decide "the degree of archaism that they consider desirable in the target text in order to accommodate it to the norms of the target culture, which are not necessarily the same as those of the source culture" (Turner, 2005, p. 137). There is limited research done on translation of fictional work that deliberately uses archaism and Tolkien did not create a guide for translators to follow regarding archaism like he did with names and place-names (Turner, 2005, p. 68).

Since the English language has strong ties with Germanic languages, Tolkien exploits Germanic elements that are still possible to use in English to create an archaic effect, but without creating grammatical errors, as explained in 2.1.5. Turner (2005) explains that *LOTR* is self-referential to its own history and culture to English, and thus, in translation, other Germanic languages can do the same in terms of culture and history (pp. 41-42). Romance languages, however, have strong linguistic, cultural and historic ties with the Roman Empire, which may cause some problems in terms of translation. The problem for the Germanic languages examined by Turner (2005) is that many of the archaic elements in the ST are still regular

features of modern German, which can neutralize the archaic effect in the translation, for example compounding of nouns and adjectives for lexical markers (p. 146). Archaism in syntax is considered even more challenging to translate, since syntax is very language-specific, and the use of Germanic elements leads to a neutralization in German, like unusual adverbial placement and fronting (Turner, 2005, p. 149). For Romance languages, the translators must follow grammatical norms of their languages, which may lead to loss of archaic effect. Turner (2005) has found a “strong tendency to smooth out the discontinuities and the irregularities of focus in French”, but some compensations have been made, for example fronting compensated for by clefting, left dislocation and insertion of lexical markers (pp. 148-149). German has also used some compensation techniques, like additions of other alliterations and older morphological forms (Turner, 2005, pp. 150-151). However, Turner (2005) concludes that the compensation techniques “do not go far towards capturing the range of Tolkien’s style, nor of differentiating between different speakers and cultures. Indeed, the usage could be characterised as a conservative, elevated literary style rather than in any way archaic” (p. 152).

With regards to Norwegian translations on Tolkien’s work, Agøy (2011) comments on some of the challenges he faced when translating archaism in *The Silmarillion*. Agøy (2011), who also translated the second translation of *The Hobbit*, explains that the historic differences between the English and the Norwegian language make it difficult to find equivalent elements in Norwegian for archaic language use, due to Norwegian’s strong connection to Danish (p. 36). In his essay, Agøy (2011) therefore explains that he has tried to “construct a language style that would evoke the same reactions in Norwegian readers as I believed Tolkien had intended that his language should evoke in native English-speaking readers” (p. 37). Therefore, other elements than those present in the ST may have been chosen as a way of compensating for archaic elements that are not possible to render in Norwegian.

A new German translation of *LOTR* was published in 2001 as a modernization of the ST and of the first TT published in 1969. Nagel (2011) has found that the new translation tends to modernize syntactic structures where possible (p. 30), for example to simplify the speech patterns of Hobbits and rural folk, and to alter the use of polite addressing (pp. 39-40). Nagel (2011) argues that the new translation oversteps the boundaries of how much can be changed from the ST (p. 42). He concludes that the first translation is closer to the ST, “if need be up to the point of producing awkward German”, while the new translation “is more fluent, but takes unnecessary liberties with OV [ST]” (Nagel, 2011, p. 43). The Dutch translation from 1956 has been through several revisions, and the revision of 1997 shows a modernization of the ST and of the original translation, especially with archaic language use (Vink, 2008).





### 3 Material and method

This chapter will focus on the methodological approach for the study, as well as the material I have chosen. This thesis is a product-oriented study with a descriptive-explanatory purpose, by means of describing and explaining which translation procedures have been used by the three Norwegian translators to translate linguistic variation in *LOTR*, and whether standardization is the predominant strategy for translating linguistic variation. Saldanha and O'Brien (2013) explain that product-oriented studies research “the textual product that is the outcome of the translation or interpreting process” (p. 50), while the descriptive-explanatory approach hails back to Gideon Toury in the 1990s, who advocates a bridging between theory and practice “by taking heed of the full range of real-life behavior [...], along with the factors underlying and conditioning this behavior [...].” (Toury, 2012, p. xii).

#### 3.1 Material

The study of linguistic variation and the translation of linguistic variation in literature depends on the existence of STs where this phenomenon is present, and that there are translations of these STs. I have chosen to study *LOTR*, which satisfies these criteria, with a ST featuring linguistic variation and TTs consisting of three translations. As mentioned in the introduction, Westron functions as the lingua franca in Middle-earth, but there is also linguistic variation within Westron:

The Common Speech, as the languages of the Hobbits and their narratives, has inevitably been turned into modern English. In the process the difference between the varieties observable in the use of the Westron has been lessened. Some attempt has been made to represent varieties by variations in the kind of English used; but the divergence between the pronunciation and idiom of the Shire and the Westron tongue in the mouths of the Elves or of the high men of Gondor was greater than has been shown in this book. Hobbits indeed spoke for the most part a rustic dialect, whereas in Gondor and Rohan a more antique language was used, more formal and more terse (Tolkien, 1955b/2011, p. 1133).

Nevertheless, as explained earlier, Tolkien states that “the whole of the linguistic setting has been translated as far as possible into terms of our own times” (Tolkien, 1955b/2011, p. 1133), and he uses linguistic variation as a tool to differentiate between the various races. Therefore, this material is a rich source of linguistic variation, but also of translation of linguistic variation when examining the translation of the novel into different languages, which in this case is Norwegian.

### 3.1.1 *LOTR* and its races, characters and linguistic variation

The Fellowship of the Ring, the group of nine people that set out to destroy the One Ring, consists of a number of different races, including the Hobbits Frodo, Sam, Merry and Pippin, the Men Aragorn and Boromir, Legolas the Elf, Gimli the Dwarf and Gandalf the Wizard.

Hobbits are small, mortal beings with a life expectancy of approximately 100 years. The communities of Hobbits consist of different socioeconomic classes, as mentioned earlier in Johannesson (1997), and this is reflected in their linguistic variation. Hobbits, who had eventually adopted Westron as their language, speak a more informal, rustic dialect and use it freely and carelessly, since they love the peaceful and quiet life in the countryside, having little business with other folks. Still, the more learned Hobbits can use a more formal language when needed (Tolkien, 1955b/2011, p. 1130). The characters I have chosen to analyze are Hamfast “Gaffer” Gamgee and Meriadoc “Merry” Brandybuck. Gaffer is the father of Sam, a gardener by trade and therefore a WC Hobbit, whose sociolect features many of the non-standard markers listed by Johannesson (1997). Merry is one of the Hobbits in the Fellowship of the Ring, the son of a wealthy landowner and therefore a LC Hobbit, whose sociolect is much closer to the standard than that of WC Hobbits.

Elves are the first and eldest race created and are considered the wisest and most beautiful of all beings in Middle-earth. They are tall and graceful, and also immortal, meaning that they do not age or can be subject to illness, but can nevertheless be killed in battle or by extreme negative emotions. The Elves speak two Elvish languages, *Quenya* and *Sindarin*, but most of their dialogue in *LOTR* is in Westron. According to Tolkien, the Elves, “being above all skilled in words, had the command of many styles, though they spoke most naturally in a manner nearest their own speech, one even more antique than that of Gondor” (Tolkien, 1955b/2011, p. 1134). This “antique” style is represented by the use of archaic non-standard markers, possibly due to the immortality of the Elves and that many of them are thousands of years old. Haldir, representing the low-ranking Elves in this study, is one of the Elves guarding the borders of Lothlórien, an Elven realm. Galadriel is the Lady of Lothlórien, who rules the land together with her husband. She is considered one of the greatest Elves in Middle-earth, and one of the oldest, mightiest, wisest and fairest.

Even though all Men are mortal and related to each other, there are several different groups within this race. Average Men live to approximately 80-100 years old, while the Dúnedain are a line of Men who live three times longer than normal Men, which could explain the difference between the more archaic use of language for the Dúnedain and their descendants, and the more standard language use of lower-ranking Men. I have chosen Ghân-

huri-Ghân and Denethor to represent the race of Men in the analysis. Ghân-huri-Ghân is the chief of the Wild Men of the Woods, a group of Men that live in a forest in more primitive ways than other Men, and that use a wholly alien speech called the Drúadan language. Their dialogue in *LOTR*, however, is in Westron, speaking in very short sentences and with poor grammar. Denethor is the Steward of Gondor, a country where the descendants of the Dúnedain live, and the Stewards took office with an oath to “rule in the name of the king, until he shall return” (Tolkien, 1955b/2011, p. 1052). His position as the Steward is reflected in his formal and archaic use of language, similar to that of the Elves.

The Orcs are evil, disgusting creatures who only take pleasure in killing and destroying. It has been suggested that they were Elves enslaved, corrupted and tortured by the first Dark Lord Melkor, and that they from then on multiplied and spread to other parts of Middle-earth (Tolkien & Tolkien, 1977/2006, p. 38). Tolkien explains the Orcs “had no language of their own, but took what they could of other tongues and perverted it to their own liking”, and the various barbarous dialects of Orkish that developed could not be understood between the different tribes of Orcs (Tolkien, 1955b/2011, p. 1131). Therefore, they started using Westron as a lingua franca, and many eventually adopted it as a native language, but their use of Westron is much more “degraded and filthy” than Tolkien shows in *LOTR* (Tolkien, 1955b/2011, p. 1134). According to Johannesson (1997), the Orcs have been assigned a linguistic variety dominated by non-standard and colloquial English forms to show their brutal way of speaking, and “thus, inevitably, comes close to the representation of the speech of WC hobbits” (p. 34). Tracker, one of the smaller Orcs, represents the low-ranking part of this race, while Shagrat is a large Orc captain in Mordor, who represents the high-ranking part of the Orcs.

The Wizards were created before the creation of the world, and therefore, it is not known how old they are. They are powerful beings, in both wisdom and magic, and each of them has a grade within their Order, however none of them are regarded as low-ranking. Five Wizards came to the north of Middle-earth, two of them named Gandalf the Grey and Saruman the White. The former is presumed the greatest and wisest spirit and the second-highest ranking of the Wizards, and is the leader of the Fellowship of the Ring (Tolkien & Tolkien, 1980/2006, p. 373). The latter is the head of their Order and therefore the highest-ranking of the Wizards, but he eventually betrays his oath and Order and starts working for Sauron. The linguistic variation of Wizards has not been commented upon by Tolkien, except that Gandalf accommodates his speech to his company, since he is well-travelled and mostly speaks with people of other races (Tolkien, 1955b/2011, pp. 1133-1134). The excerpts I have chosen for the analysis suggest that Wizards speak in a manner close to that of the Elves and the high-ranking Men of Gondor.

### 3.1.2 The Norwegian translations

Norway has two written standards of Norwegian, where *bokmål* has its roots in the written Danish language due to the former union with Denmark, while *nynorsk* is based on the various dialects around Norway, with Ivar Aasen considered “the father of *nynorsk*” (Språkrådet, n.d.). The first two translations of *LOTR* into Norwegian are in *bokmål*, the written standard that is being used by the majority of the population, and that enjoys the highest status among the general public, even though the written standards have been considered equal since 1885 (Språkrådet, n.d.).

The first Norwegian translation by Nils Werenskiold (TT1) is in *bokmål*, published in 1973-1975. This translation received a lot of criticism due to some misunderstandings and misinterpretations, probably because *The Silmarillion*, a book that contains more detailed background information that translators might have needed in order to translate Tolkien’s work, was not published until 1977 (Myhren, 2007, p. 24). Due to dissatisfaction with the first translation, a second Norwegian translation (TT2) was made, also in *bokmål*, by Torstein Bugge Høverstad. Høverstad’s translation is the most widely read in Norway (Myhren, 2007, p. 24), the first part published in 1980 and the last two parts in 1981 (Agøy, 2011, p. 32). By that time, the new translator had access to *The Silmarillion*, and perhaps avoided previous misunderstandings like the ones made by Werenskiold. In the translation’s latest revised edition from 1999, which I will use for this thesis, Høverstad has included a footnote to explain some of the changes that have been made since its first publication in 1980-81. He explains that a group of Tolkien experts did a thorough close-reading of his old translation and pinpointed some misunderstandings, omissions and mistakes done by Høverstad, so that the newest edition should become more faithful to the ST (Tolkien, 1955a/2011, p. 387). Additionally, Høverstad explains that he wanted to renew what he called “an aging text” and to create a more fluent text, and therefore, some passages were slightly altered, while others were given a new structure (Tolkien, 1955a/2011, p. 387). There is, however, no specific mention of translation of linguistic variation other than a brief comment on polite address being used where possible to signal politeness in more formal settings and in ceremonial speech, which has only been used a few times in the ST (Tolkien, 1955a/2011, p. 387).

A third Norwegian translation (TT3) was written in *nynorsk* and was published in 2006 by Eilev Groven Myhren. Myhren received two awards for his translation (Noregs Mållag 2007, Johannes H. Bergs Minnefond n.d.) and has also gotten positive feedback from Norwegian readers, as well as other Scandinavian readers (Myhren, 2007, p. 26). The translator has

dedicated seven pages for comments on the translation, where he explains the evolution of the Norwegian language compared to the English language, and explains which dialects, or varieties of *nynorsk*, are being used for the corresponding varieties in the ST (Myhren, 2006, pp. 11-17). Since Tolkien himself states that the differences in linguistic variation have been lessened in his translation from Westron to modern English, Myhren (2006) explains that he wanted to come closer to Tolkien's project of differentiating the various races through linguistic variation (p. 17). Therefore, the translator has chosen to exploit the connection *nynorsk* has to various dialects, in addition to its roots in Old Norse, for example to mark archaic language use (Myhren, 2006, p. 11). *Bokmål*, however, has its roots in Danish, making it more difficult to achieve an archaic effect without sounding Danish (Myhren, 2006, p. 11). The Westron language has evolved for thousands of years, and Myhren (2006) explains that he has chosen to take this into consideration and connect it to the evolution of *nynorsk* from various Norwegian dialects and Old Norse (p.11). The different races in Tolkien's universe are ranked in a hierarchy, where the Elves are the highest-ranking race and the Orcs are the lowest-ranking race, and Myhren has used this hierarchy to assign a different *nynorsk* variety to each race (Myhren, 2007, pp. 24-25). The Elves have been assigned a variety that corresponds to *landsmålsnormalen av 1864*, a *nynorsk* reform from 1864 made by Ivar Aasen (Myhren, 2006, p. 11). There are, however, some differences between the varieties of the lower-ranking and higher-ranking Elves. The Dúnedain and high-ranking Men of Rohan and Gondor use a variety corresponding to *Midlandsnormalen*, a reform passed by the parliament in Norway in 1901, while lower-ranking Men of Gondor have been assigned a variety similar to the Rauland dialect (Myhren, 2006, pp. 12-13). The Wizards use modern *nynorsk*, the Orcs a variety that is a mixture of different Norwegian dialects to reflect their "degraded and filthy" use of language (Tolkien, 1955b/2011, p. 1134), while Hobbits speak in a dialect close to the Hallingdal dialect, which the translator himself is most familiar with (Myhren, 2006, p. 12). However, LC Hobbits speak more standard than WC Hobbits, which can indicate that the translator was aiming for some kind of equivalence effect with different sociolects of Hobbits according to rank, and this was also found by Johannesson (1997).

### **3.2 Selection of data**

The sampling technique I have chosen for this study is *purposive sampling*, by "selecting a sample based on pre-defined critical parameters" (Saldanha & O'Brien, 2013, p. 34). The races I have chosen for the analysis, in addition to the order in which they occur in the analysis, are based on their significance in the narrative, as well as the number of people belonging to these

racess. Therefore, the following races have been chosen: Hobbits, Elves, Men, Orcs and Wizards. Since Tolkien states that *LOTR* is in fact the translation of the Red Book written by two Hobbits, this race has been listed first. Elves and Men are listed next since they are most numerous in population, and because they were the first races to be created. Orcs represent one of the evil races in Middle-earth, and they are great in number, which is why they are listed before Wizards, even though the latter race is very important in the novel.

Firstly, it was important to choose characters from different ranks within each racial category, so that I could examine linguistic variation across different social groups within the races, and also be able to compare the different races. Then I chose characters that speak with other characters of the same race and rank where possible, in order to avoid instances of linguistic accommodation, which Tolkien states occur with some of the “well-travelled folk” who would “note and adopt the style of those whom they met” (Tolkien, 1955b/2011, p. 1133). This has also been commented upon by Johannesson (1997), as mentioned in 2.1.5. This way, I was more likely to find out how the different races, social groups or characters speak as a default, without adapting their speech to others. I had the option of choosing between several characters from each race and rank, but the number of choices became limited by the criteria of characters speaking with another character belonging to the same race and rank. Therefore, I chose the characters that would best represent either the low-ranking or the high-ranking part of their race, based on my knowledge of Tolkien’s universe and of *LOTR* specifically.

Secondly, it was important to find a systematic way of sampling data to avoid searching the ST for specific sections where the occurrence of non-standard markers would be less or more frequent than other sections, or for sections with more unusual or special cases of non-standard markers, which could have altered my results. Therefore, to eliminate some of the threats to the validity of the data collected, I chose dialogue from the first time the chosen characters speak to each other in the novel. I collected approximately 20 sentences from the dialogue of five races and two characters for each race, where I chose to let the characters finish their turn in the dialogue, which means that the number of sentences vary from 18 to 24 sentences. However, this did not affect the data too much, as the amounts of non-standard markers in the ST and translation procedures in the TTs will be presented as percentages, as well as numbers. Thirdly, I have not included interjections as non-standard markers, because there are so many of them and not all of them can be considered non-standard.

### 3.3 Method

Using already established frameworks can strengthen the reliability of a study, which “refers to the extent to which other researchers (or the researcher herself) could generate the same results, or come to the same conclusion, if investigating the same question, using the same data and methods at a different time” (Saldanha & O’Brien, 2013, p. 35). Additionally, it refers to researchers being able to “convincingly demonstrate that the data collection and analysis methods used are dependable [...] and that the methods are transparent, and consequently, the results are credible” (Saldanha & O’Brien, 2013, p. 35). As mentioned in 2.2.1, I have chosen the works of Englund Dimitrova (2004) and Rosa (2012) as the foundation for my analysis and discussion on linguistic variation in *LOTR* and its translations into Norwegian. The strength in these works lies in the fact that they are concerned with the categorization of dialect markers and of translation procedures specific to linguistic variation. Some changes have been made in order to customize the two frameworks even further for this study, which will be stated in sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2. Furthermore, some limitations of this customization will be addressed in 3.6.

#### 3.3.1 Categorization of non-standard markers

In order to examine the presence of non-standard markers in the ST and TTs, I have categorized the data according to dialect markers on three different linguistic levels that Englund Dimitrova (2004) suggests are present in fictional prose: phonological/orthographic, morphosyntactic and lexical markers (p. 123). However, I have customized this framework to include both dialectal and archaic markers. *Phonological/orthographic markers* have alternative spelling to indicate a pronunciation in varieties that deviates from standard pronunciation (Englund Dimitrova, 2004, pp. 123-124). *Morphosyntactic markers* have “non-standard morphology and/or syntactic structure” to contrast them to codified morphology and syntax of the standard language, while *lexical markers* involve “the use of lexical elements, words or expressions, which do not belong to the standard language” (Englund Dimitrova, 2004, pp. 124-125). The examples in Englund Dimitrova’s (2004) theoretical work are in Swedish and their translations into English, but she argues that this categorization is applicable to other languages as well (p. 125).

The use of dialect and archaism can be present on all three linguistic levels. Phonological/orthographic markers will include non-standard pronunciation and phonological reduction. Morphosyntactic markers will include markers like contraction, fronting, duplication of subject, double negation, missing words, alteration in subject-verb agreement, unusual adverbial placement and frequent nominalization. The term *fronting* will be used for cases where a sentence begins with something else than the grammatical subject (Swan, 2005, p. 503).



In Norwegian, some additional morphosyntactic markers will include missing suffixes, the use of “radical” *bokmål* and placement of possessives. According to Reitan (1999), radical forms of *bokmål* are forms closer to spoken *bokmål* and to *nynorsk*, and that “these forms are generally “newer” compared to what has been allowed in older *bokmål* (*riksmål*) [...]” [my translation].<sup>1</sup> Lexical markers will include dialectal and archaic words and expressions, and code-switching.

### 3.3.2 Categorization of translation procedures

The investigation of how linguistic variation in *LOTR* has been translated into Norwegian will be based on four main translation procedures proposed by Rosa (2012), which are used to translate “formal linguistic markers used to recreate less prestigious and substandard discourse” (p. 85). These are *omission*, *addition* and *maintenance* of “linguistic markers signaling contextual meaning associated with less prestigious or substandard discourse” and *change* of “contextual meaning signaled by linguistic associated with less prestigious or substandard discourse [...]” (Rosa, 2012, p. 85). Change either involves “change of a more peripheral substandard towards a less peripheral variety” or “change of a less peripheral variety towards a more peripheral or substandard variety” (Rosa, 2012, p. 85).

In this thesis, these four categories have been customized to include the omission, addition, maintenance and change of all types of non-standardness, not just markers associated with “less prestigious or substandard discourse”. Thus, I will include markers of dialect and of archaic language, which will bring the categories in line with my customization of Englund Dimitrova’s (2004) framework. Maintenance will include the maintenance of exact same words, but also phonological/orthographic, morphosyntactic and lexical markers that have the same meaning or function in the ST as in the TT, like other words, suffixes to words, or expressions. Since *LOTR* features different levels of non-standardness, like a low kind of non-standardness with Hobbits and Orcs, and a high kind of non-standardness with Elves and high-ranking Men, Rosa’s definition of change is not so useful for the present purposes. Therefore, I will use the definition of change proposed by Skogmo (2017), but use the term “non-standardness” for Skogmo’s “markedness”. Skogmo (2017) defines change as

change between the three levels of lexical, morpho-syntactic or orthographic signals of markedness. [...] to study instances where there is a move from one type of markedness to another, for example that a morpho-syntactic signal of markedness [...] is changed to a lexical signal of markedness [...] (Skogmo, 2017, p. 65).

---

<sup>1</sup> “Det jeg kaller radikale bokmålsformer, er både de som er talemålsnære, og de som er nynorsknære. Slike former er som regel “nyere” i forhold til hva som var tillatt i eldre bokmål (riksmål) [...]”

Change will only include changes concerning the corresponding word or words in the ST as in the TT, and not other words in the sentence that are not included in the non-standard marker in the ST. Toury (in Skogmo, 2017, pp. 65-66) “warns against assuming that the addition of something which has been omitted elsewhere in the text is ‘evidence of compensation’, since there may be in fact no link between the motivation for the two solutions”. Therefore, I have marked such instances as additions and omissions rather than a change from one marker of non-standardness to another where it occurs in different places in the same sentence. However, even though I will not include compensation as a translation procedure, (high amounts of) additions and changes can be said to function as compensations in a TT, if the translation also consists of many omissions, an issue that will be discussed in Chapter 5.

### **3.4 Non-standard language in the material**

It was difficult to determine what constitutes non-standard markers in Norwegian, since many different variants of the same word are considered allowed in dictionaries, in addition to the various spelling reforms that have been passed since the 19<sup>th</sup> century. For *bokmål*, there is a difference between moderate and radical *bokmål*, where the moderate *bokmål* is often considered more standard than the radical. Therefore, instances of radical *bokmål* have been marked as non-standard. With regards to *nynorsk*, several problems occurred while analyzing the data. Tolkien has based the linguistic variations in the novel on both dialectal and archaic use of language, and as mentioned in 3.1.2, Myhren (2006) deliberately uses different dialects and spelling reforms from different time periods to mark linguistic variation between the races and characters in *LOTR* for the *nynorsk* translation. According to Brunstad (2011), the modern reader may experience something in a text as archaic, even though it was deemed standard at the time it was written or in the context of the text itself (p. 142). Therefore, Tolkien might not have intended to sound archaic in certain sections of the novel, and the different spelling reforms of *nynorsk* might not have sounded archaic in the time they were used. However, for a modern reader, these can be experienced as markers of dialect or archaism. Thus, I have marked all instances of Norwegian that a modern-day user of Norwegian may experience as non-standard.

In order to determine the categorization of non-standard markers in the ST, I consulted the online Oxford English Dictionary (oed.com) and dictionary.com. These were consulted mostly for morphosyntactic markers to look up word classes, inflectional properties or other grammatical features, and for lexical markers for words that I deemed to be either dialectal or archaic. For the Norwegian translations, I consulted an online dictionary for *bokmål* and

*nynorsk*, ordbok.uib.no, which is a collaboration between the University of Bergen and The Language Council of Norway. The dictionary follows the *bokmål* spelling reform of 2005 and the *nynorsk* spelling reform of 2012, and was frequently consulted for all three types of non-standard markers. Additionally, I have relied on my own intuition, and occasionally on the consultations of fellow students who mainly use *bokmål*, when in doubt about the categorization of non-standard markers in the ST and TTs, as well as the categorization of translation procedures in the TTs. This was especially true regarding the *nynorsk* translation, since I have used this written standard of Norwegian my whole life.

### **3.5 Analysis and presentation of data**

According to Creswell and Plano Clark (2007), using a mixed-methods approach, with both qualitative and quantitative approaches, “provides a better understanding of research problems than either approach alone” (as cited in Saldanha & O’Brien, 2013, p. 23). Therefore, I used the mixed-methods approach for the analysis of the collected data, where I initially started with a qualitative method, followed by a quantitative method.

After the selection of races, characters and excerpts from the ST, I found the equivalent excerpts in the three TTs and transcribed the data into a table of four columns in a Word document, so that I could easily compare the ST and TTs. Then I did a close-reading of each excerpt and color-coded the three different non-standard markers used by Englund Dimitrova (2004) for both the ST and TTs, by consulting the dictionaries and using my own intuition as I explained in 3.4, and the outcome of this process is presented in Appendix A. The next step in the process was to examine which translation procedures had been used in the TTs and decide if the non-standard markers were added, maintained, changed or omitted in the translations. The qualitative analysis is presented in text with examples from the excerpts for each character, but the full analysis is also presented in Appendix A.

The quantitative approach was used to find out which types of non-standard markers were present in the ST, and which translation procedures were used in the Norwegian translations. First, I counted the number of non-standard markers according to Englund Dimitrova’s (2004) categorization and calculated how many percent these non-standard markers counted for against the total number of words in each character sample. This can be described as a translation unit to word ratio, where the various non-standard markers, or translation units, can consist of different numbers of words, and the ratio gives a rough picture of the frequency of non-standardness in the different samples. Therefore, I counted the number of non-standard markers, and not the number of words the markers consist of. Then, I counted the number of translation

procedures found in the TTs and the number of phonological/orthographic, morphosyntactic and lexical markers within each of Rosa's (2012) categories. This way, I was able to find out, for example, which non-standard marker was added the most, or which marker was omitted the most. I also included the percentages for each non-standard marker within each translation procedure, to make the character samples more comparable, since they vary in number of words. The quantitative analysis is also presented in Appendix A.

### **3.6 Limitations of the study**

Guba and Lincoln (in Saldanha & O'Brien, 2013, p. 28) define validity as "the degree to which results match as closely as possible the real state of the world", something which Saldanha and O'Brien (2013) claim "will depend on the extent to which the data we collate and analyze can contribute to answering our research questions" (p. 28). The validity of the study is affected by the type and the size of the sampling. The pre-defined criteria for this thesis might have been different for other researchers wanting to study the same material, and I could have included more races and characters and increased the number of sentences collected. It can be argued that 20 sentences are not enough to examine the linguistic variety of a character or race. Sinclair (in Saldanha & O'Brien, 2013, p. 74) argues that "the problem with using text extracts is that it constitutes a violation of the principle of integrity of the data, and that it is unsafe to assume that any part of a text is representative to the whole". For this novel, it may turn out that many of the characters show some development in their use of language further out in the story. However, I had to limit the number of characters, races and sentences due to space limitations for the thesis and the time-consuming process of collecting, analyzing and interpreting the data.

The criteria I made for the selection of data, as well as the methods I have used, have been an attempt to secure a high level of validity of my results. However, as mentioned above, I had to trust my intuition in cases where the dictionaries provided several possible answers, or in cases where some words or expressions in the data for the *nynorsk* translation sounded unfamiliar or archaic for *bokmål* users, but not for me as a *nynorsk* user. This can have affected the results in the analysis, since there are multiple ways of collecting, categorizing and interpreting the data. Where possible, I consulted books and articles written by researchers with a deeper knowledge of linguistic variation and translation than me, for example Johannesson (1997), who categorizes contractions as syntactic markers (p.13), even though they can be considered phonological/orthographic markers.

The reliability of the study could be affected by the fact that I have customized the frameworks of Englund Dimitrova (2004) and Rosa (2012). In addition to this, I had to rely my

own intuitions, meaning that other researchers may not be able to generate the same results, even though they investigate the same material and use the same methods. However, I have defined the different terms that I have used regarding linguistic variation in Chapter 2, as well as the different categories for non-standard markers and translation procedures as clearly as possible in this chapter, so that other researchers can follow the same methods. In Chapter 4, I have also tried to describe my analysis and interpretation of the data thoroughly, and to present the data in clearly marked tables that other researchers can follow.

Saldanha and O'Brien (2013) argue that "small sample sizes can impose significant limitations on the generalizability of findings", since generalizability is about making claims about the larger population based on the findings, which may be limited to for example a corpus of text or a group of people (pp. 35-36). Thus, the collection of data from *LOTR* may be too small in order to make a generalization of the linguistic variations used by the different races and characters in the novel, and also the translation procedures used by the translators. The problem was mainly in terms of lack of space in the thesis, but also because collecting and interpreting data is time-consuming. However, even though the data may not be generalizable, the findings will hopefully still be valuable since the research question for the thesis is a question of *how* and *why*, in which "the larger the number of instances that show that X leads to Y, the more certain we can be of the magnitude of the impact, so we need to look at several instances of the same phenomenon" (Saldanha & O'Brien, 2013, p. 36).

## 4 Analysis

The following chapter will present the data and the findings regarding non-standard markers in the ST and the translation procedures used in the TTs, presented by race in the following order: Hobbits, Elves, Men, Orcs and Wizards. At the end of the chapter, I will summarize the findings and present the total amounts of non-standard markers and translation procedures for all the character samples combined.

The first table for each character sample shows the numbers and percentages of the different non-standard markers in the ST, using the categorization by Englund Dimitrova (2004), the total number of words for character in sample and the translation unit to word ratio (see section 3.5). The second table for each character sample shows the numbers and percentages of translation procedures for each of Rosa's (2012) categories and the numbers and percentages of the different non-standard markers within each of Rosa's categories. The tables for translation procedures have some abbreviations, where *Pho*, *Mor* and *Lex* mean phonological/orthographic, morphosyntactic and lexical markers. I have changed the order of the four translation procedures suggested by Rosa (2012), to make it clearer for the reader which procedures are the least and most standardizing, with omission as the only procedure leading to standardization. Thus, the procedures are listed in the following order, from least standardizing to most standardizing: addition, maintenance, change and omission. The non-standard markers listed under change are the non-standard marker found in the ST, and what the marker in the ST has been changed into in the TTs will be commented upon in the text. TT1 is the first *bokmål* translation and TT2 the second *bokmål* translation, while TT3 is the *nynorsk* translation.

### 4.1 Hobbits

#### 4.1.1 Gaffer

Gaffer is a low-ranking Hobbit, and his character sample consists of 337 words, where 6.2% are non-standard markers. These are mostly morphosyntactic markers, which count for 66.7% of the markers. His sociolect is that of WC Hobbits, which features most of the non-standard markers found by Johannesson (1997) and Bayona (2011), for example contractions, double negation, duplication of subject and dialectal expressions. In the sample, Gaffer is speaking with Old Noakes, Daddy Twofoot and Sandyman, who are also WC Hobbits. (1) and (2) show the use of morphosyntactic markers, while (3) shows the use of a lexical marker.

(1) There isn't no call to go talking of pushing and pulling. [double negation]

(2) You see: Mr. Drogo, he married poor Miss Primula Brandybuck. [duplication of subject]

(3) Small wonder that trouble came of it, I say. [expression]

Table 1: Non-standard markers in the ST in Gaffer's character sample

	Non-standard markers	
	Number	%
Phonological/orthographic markers	0	0
Morphosyntactic markers	14	66.7%
Lexical markers	7	33.3%
<b>Total number and % of non-standard markers</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total words of character in sample</b>	337	
<b>% of non-standard markers, against total words in sample</b>	<b>6.2%</b>	

Table 2: Translation procedures in the TTs in Gaffer's character sample

	TT1				TT2				TT3			
	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ
<b>Addition</b>												
Number:	5	21	5	<b>31</b>	0	20	2	<b>22</b>	61	13	10	<b>84</b>
%:	16.1	67.7	16.1	<b>100</b>	0	90.9	9.1	<b>100</b>	72.6	15.5	11.9	<b>100</b>
% of total:	<b>59.6% Addition</b>				<b>51.2% Addition</b>				<b>80% Addition</b>			
<b>Maintenance</b>	0	2	3	<b>5</b>	0	6	5	<b>11</b>	0	7	6	<b>13</b>
	0	40	60	<b>100</b>	0	54.5	45.5	<b>100</b>	0	53.8	46.2	<b>100</b>
	<b>9.6% Maintenance</b>				<b>25.6% Maintenance</b>				<b>12.4% Maintenance</b>			
<b>Change</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	6	0	<b>6</b>
	0	0	0	<b>100</b>	0	0	0	<b>100</b>	0	100	0	<b>100</b>
	<b>0% Change</b>				<b>0% Change</b>				<b>5.7% Change</b>			
<b>Omission</b>	0	12	4	<b>16</b>	0	8	2	<b>10</b>	0	1	1	<b>2</b>
	0	75	25	<b>100</b>	0	80	20	<b>100</b>	0	50	50	<b>100</b>
	<b>30.8% Omission</b>				<b>23.3% Omission</b>				<b>1.9% Omission</b>			
<b>Procedures in total</b>				<b>52</b>				<b>43</b>				<b>105</b>

One striking finding in the translations of Gaffer's character sample is the high percentage of additions in TT3, which is 80%. The majority of additions in TT3 are phonological/orthographic markers, most of which are provided by the dialectal pronunciations from Hallingdal, which the sociolect of WC Hobbits has been based on in TT3:

(4) ST: She was our Mr. Bilbo's first cousin on the mother's side (her mother being the youngest of the Old Took's daughters); and Mr. Drogo was his second cousin.

TT3: Ho va vår herr Bilbo sitt suskjinbådñ på morssidun (mor henna va yngste døtte åt Gamal-Tókje), og herr Drogo va tremenningen hass. [Standard nynorsk: var, syskenbarn, morssida, hennar, var, dottera, var, hans]

The additions in TT1 and TT2 are around 51% to 60%, and morphosyntactic markers count for 67.7% of the additions in TT1 and 90.9% in TT2, for example the use of radical *bokmål* with the suffix *-a* for verbs and nouns, like in (5) and (6):

- (5) ST: Anyway: there was this Mr. Frodo left an orphan and stranded, as you might say, among those queer Bucklanders, being brought up anyhow in Brandy Hall.  
 TT1: Altså: Frodo hadde mista både far og mor, dere må gjerne si at han var stranda, der hos alle disse merkelige folka i Vinbukkland. [*mista* vs. *mistet (lost)*, *stranda* vs. *strandet (stranded)*, *folka* vs. *folkene (people)*]
- (6) ST: She was our Mr. Bilbo's first cousin on the mother's side ...  
 TT2: Hun var kusina til herr Bilbo på morssida ... [*kusina* vs. *kusinen (cousin)*, *morssida* vs. *morssiden (mother's side)*]

Another interesting finding is that TT2 has the highest percentage of maintained markers with 25.6%, while it only counts for around 10% to 12% in TT1 and TT3. Fronting and duplication of subject, which are morphosyntactic markers, are often maintained in all TTs, as these markers are considered easy to preserve in Norwegian, like the quote in the title of this thesis in (7). This is also the case with dialectal words or expressions, like in (8):

- (7) ST: A very nice well-spoken gentlehobbit is Mr. Bilbo, as I've always said. [fronting]  
 TT1: For en fin og gentil gentlehobbit Bilbo er, det har jeg alltid ment og sagt.  
 TT3: Ein sær finsle og ordhag herrehobbit er herr Bilbo, som e stødt ha sagt.
- (8) ST: Small wonder that trouble came of it, I say.  
 TT2: Ikke rart det ble sorger av det, sier nå jeg.  
 TT3: Ikkji å undrast på at det gjekk gale, si e.

Only TT3 has used change as a translation procedure for this character sample, which counts for 5.7% of the procedures in TT3, and it involves six morphosyntactic markers changed into four phonological/orthographic markers and two lexical markers. An example of a phonological/orthographic marker is shown in (9) and an example of a lexical marker in (10):

- (9) ST: ... that isn't natural.  
 TT3: ... det er kji som det ska vera. [short for *ikkje (not)*]
- (10) ST: ... till he was drowned.  
 TT3: ... før han gjekk i vatnet og bleiv. [*bleiv = drukna (drowned)*]

Another important finding is that the use of omission as a translation procedure has declined with each translation, from 30.8% in TT1, to 23.3% in TT2 and lastly 1.9% in TT3. These omissions are mostly non-standard forms that are not as easy to preserve in Norwegian, like contraction in (11) and double negation in (12):

- (11) ST: ... as I've always said. [from the thesis' title, also in (7)]  
 TT1: ... det har jeg alltid ment og sagt.
- (12) ST: There isn't no call ...  
 TT1: Det tjener ikke til noe ...

Since omission is a mark of standardization, the percentages can indicate that standardization becomes a less used translation strategy with the new translations. However, since addition, maintenance and change in percentages in total count for more than the amount of omissions,



one can argue that standardization is not the predominant translation strategy if omission is compensated for with other non-standard markers in the Norwegian translations. This will be discussed in Chapter 5.

#### 4.1.2 Merry

Merry is a LC Hobbit and therefore also a high-ranking one, whose sociolect is considered more standard compared to WC Hobbits, as found in Johannesson (1997) and Bayona (2011). The data shown in table 3 is evidence of this fact, which shows that only 2.1% of the total 240 words for this character sample consist of non-standard markers, compared to 6.2% for Gaffer's sample. In the sample, Merry is talking to Frodo and Pippin, who are also LC Hobbits. There are only five markers in total, all of them morphosyntactic ones, like contractions:

- (13) We'll clear up later.  
 (14) And you don't want to.

Table 3: Non-standard markers in the ST in Merry's character sample

	Non-standard markers	
	Number	%
Phonological/orthographic markers	0	0%
Morphosyntactic markers	5	100%
Lexical markers	0	0%
Total number and % of non-standard markers	5	100%
Total words of character in sample	240	
% of non-standard markers, against total words in sample	2.1%	

Table 4: Translation procedures in the TTs in Merry's character sample

	TT1				TT2				TT3			
	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ
<b>Addition</b>												
Number:	0	2	1	3	0	2	0	2	11	2	7	20
%:	0	66.7	33.3	100	0	100	0	100	55	10	35	100
% of total:	37.5% Addition				28.6% Addition				80% Addition			
<b>Maintenance</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	100	0	100	0	100
	0% Maintenance				0% Maintenance				4% Maintenance			
<b>Change</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	100
	0% Change				0% Change				0% Change			
<b>Omission</b>	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	4	0	4
	0	100	0	100	0	100	0	100	0	100	0	100
	62.5% Omission				71.4% Omission				16% Omission			
<b>Procedures in total</b>				8				7				25

There are only three additions of non-standard markers in TT1 and two in TT2, almost all morphosyntactic markers, and they are mostly uses of radical *bokmål*, similar to (5) and (6) in Gaffer's sample. Again, the most striking finding for this sample is the high percentage of additions in TT3 with 80%, while additions count for only 37.5% in TT1 and 28.6% for TT2. There is a similar use of phonological/orthographic markers like with Gaffer, only in a lower frequency with 11 phonological/orthographic markers compared to Gaffer's 61 markers.

- (15) ST: ... and heard the queer sound in Maggot's voice. What do you make of it all, Frodo?  
TT3: ... og den rare tonen i røysta hass Ravle. Ko får du ut av alt dette, Frodo? [Standard nynorsk: *hans, kva*]

The lexical markers used by Gaffer are mostly expressions as a way of confirming a fact, like in (3). In Merry's sample, some lexical markers have been added in TT3 that are considered non-standard words:

- (16) ST: But you can at least tell us, Frodo, whether you think his guess good or bad.  
TT3: Men i det minste kan du sea oss, Frodo, om han gissa godt eller låkt. [*gissa= gjette (guess), låkt= dårleg (bad)*]

Maintenance and change as translation procedures have not been used in any of the TTs in this character sample, except the maintenance of one morphosyntactic marker in TT3. Almost all non-standard markers in the ST have been omitted in the TTs, like the use of contractions in the ST that can be deemed difficult to maintain in Norwegian, like in (17):

- (17) ST: I've heard that ...  
TT1/TT2: Jeg har hørt at ...  
TT3: Eg har høyr at ...

Omission counts for 16% of the translation procedures in TT3, compared to 62.5% in TT1 and 71.4% in TT2. Omission, being a move towards standardization, has therefore been used the most in both *bokmål* translations, compared to the *nynorsk* translation.

## 4.2 Elves

### 4.2.1 Haldir

The linguistic variety of Haldir, and the ethnolect of Elves in general, are formal and archaic compared to the Hobbits' informal and dialectal varieties, with the use of non-standard morphosyntactic markers like fronting, unusual adverbial placement and frequent nominalization, and lexical markers like archaic words or expressions, as explained in 2.1.5. Haldir represents the low-ranking part of the Elves, and non-standard markers count for 5% of the total 240 words in this character sample. Even though Haldir uses a high kind of non-standardness, it is used somewhat less frequently compared to the high-ranking Elf Galadriel,

which will be shown in 4.2.2. In the sample, Haldir is talking to The Fellowship, which consists of various races, and out of the 12 non-standard markers, nine are morphosyntactic and three are lexical markers. Some examples are:

- (18) But there are some of us still who go abroad for the gathering of news and the watching of our enemies, and they speak the languages of other lands. [adverbial placement and nominalization]  
 (19) We had not heard of – hobbits, of halflings, for many a long year, and did not know that any yet dwelt in Middle-earth. [adjective placement and formal word for *reside*]  
 (20) Even our own kindred in the North are sundered from us. [somewhat archaic for *separated*]

Table 5: Non-standard markers in the ST in Haldir’s character sample

	Non-standard markers	
	Number	%
Phonological/orthographic markers	0	0
Morphosyntactic markers	9	75%
Lexical markers	3	25%
<b>Total number and % of non-standard markers</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total words of character in sample</b>	240	
<b>% of non-standard markers, against total words in sample</b>	<b>5%</b>	

Table 6: Translation procedures in the TTs in Haldir’s character sample

	TT1				TT2				TT3			
	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ
<b>Addition</b>												
Number:	0	11	0	<b>11</b>	1	7	1	<b>9</b>	37	17	11	<b>65</b>
%:	0	100	0	<b>100</b>	11.1	77.8	11.1	<b>100</b>	56.9	26.2	16.9	<b>100</b>
% of total:	<b>47.8% Addition</b>				<b>42.9% Addition</b>				<b>84.4% Addition</b>			
<b>Maintenance</b>	0	1	0	<b>1</b>	0	3	0	<b>3</b>	0	2	0	<b>2</b>
	0	100	0	<b>100</b>	0	100	0	<b>100</b>	0	100	0	<b>100</b>
	<b>4.3% Maintenance</b>				<b>14.3% Maintenance</b>				<b>2.6% Maintenance</b>			
<b>Change</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	1	0	<b>1</b>
	0	0	0	<b>100</b>	0	0	0	<b>100</b>	0	100	0	<b>100</b>
	<b>0% Change</b>				<b>0% Change</b>				<b>1.3% Change</b>			
<b>Omission</b>	0	8	3	<b>11</b>	0	6	3	<b>9</b>	0	6	3	<b>9</b>
	0	72.7	27.3	<b>100</b>	0	66.7	33.3	<b>100</b>	0	66.7	33.3	<b>100</b>
	<b>47.8% Omission</b>				<b>42.9% Omission</b>				<b>11.7% Omission</b>			
<b>Procedures in total</b>				<b>23</b>				<b>21</b>				<b>77</b>

Almost all additions in TT1 and TT2 are morphosyntactic markers, and the additions count for 47.8% in TT1 and 42.9% in TT2. One typical added morphosyntactic marker for the *bokmål* translations is the fronting of the possessive determiner before a noun instead of placing it after the noun (21), which is considered more formal (Riksmålsförbundet, 2016). Additionally, all the TTs show some additional cases of fronting, like in (22):

- (21) ST: They are not permitted in our land. I cannot allow him to pass.  
 TT1: De tåles ikke i vårt hjemland. Jeg kan ikke tillate ham å reise gjennom vårt land. [*vårt hjemland* vs. *hjemlandet vårt (our homeland)*, *vårt land* vs. *landet vårt (our land)*]  
 TT2: De slipper ikke inn i vårt land. Jeg kan ikke gi lov til at han får passere. [*vårt land* vs. *landet vårt (our land)*]
- (22) ST: But there are some of us still who go abroad ...  
 TT1: Men ennå er det noen av oss som reiser utenlands ... [(*still*)]  
 TT2: Men noen blant oss er det fremdeles som vandrer ut ... [(*some of us*)]  
 TT3: Men enno er der sume av oss som fara vide ... [(*still*)]

In the *nynorsk* translation, the linguistic variety assigned to the Elves is *landsmålsnormalen*, a spelling reform from 1864, and it is therefore an older version of *nynorsk*. Again, TT3 has a much higher amount of additions with 84.4%. This TT has mostly added phonological/orthographic markers, which are 56.9% of the additions (23), while 26.2% are additions of morphosyntactic (24) and 16.9% are lexical markers (24):

- (23) ST: I cannot allow him to pass.  
 TT3: Eg kann ikkje lata honom ganga gjennom. [Standard *nynorsk*: *kan, la, han, gå, gjennom*]
- (24) ST: ... we are willing to befriend you ...  
 TT3: ... ero me viljuge til å gjeva dykk venskap ... [Lexical marker: *viljuge=villige (willing)*, morphosyntactic marker: *gjeva* vs. the more standard form *gjeve* or *gje (give)*]

Between one and three markers have been maintained in the different TTs, like fronting (25) and unusual adjective placement (26):

- (25) ST: Haldir is my name.  
 TT1: Haldir heter jeg.  
 TT2: Haldir er navnet mitt.  
 TT3: Haldir er namnet mitt.
- (26) ST: ... for many a long year ...  
 TT2: ... på mangt et langt år ...

TT3 is the only translation that has used change as a translation procedure, where the morphosyntactic marker *rumors of you coming* (nominalization) has been changed into the lexical marker *høyrt gjete*, a non-standard expression for *fått vite (have heard)*. As with the non-standard markers for Hobbits, almost all markers in the ST for this character sample have been omitted. Between six and eight of the morphosyntactic markers and all three lexical markers have been omitted, perhaps due to difficulties finding equivalent markers in Norwegian, for example the nominalization *the gathering of news*, which has become a verb phrase in the TTs, and the word *sundered (separated)*, which has been translated into the standard words *skilt (separated)* and *fjerne (removed)*. Omission, which indicates a move towards standardization, has been used in almost 43% to 48% of the cases in TT1 and TT2, while it has been a less used translation procedure in TT3 with only 11.7%. However, the additions in all the TTs can be

said to function as compensations for the omitted markers to a certain degree, which can affect the perceived standardization in the translations.

#### 4.2.2 Galadriel

Most of non-standard markers found in Haldir’s character sample can also be found in Galadriel’s, whose character sample shows the use of morphosyntactic markers like fronting, frequent nominalization, unusual adverbial placement and verb forms without an auxiliary, and also lexical markers like archaic words. In the sample, Galadriel is talking to her husband Celeborn the Elf and The Fellowship, and of the 435 words in the character sample, 6.7% are non-standard markers, compared to Haldir’s 5%. This shows that high-ranking Elves can display use of more archaic language than low-ranking Elves, but the difference is not that great. Additionally, it is possible that Haldir and Galadriel could have adjusted their speech to the point of more standardness in their conversations with The Fellowship, since the group consists of many different races and ranks within the races. 22 of the 29 non-standard markers are morphosyntactic, while seven are lexical, like in the following examples:

- (27) Dark is the water of Kheled-zâram, and cold are the springs of Kibil-nâla, and fair were the many pillared halls of Khazad-dûm in Elder Days before the fall of mighty kings beneath the stone. [Fronting of *dark*, *cold* and *fair*, nominalization]
- (28) Those that followed him knew not his mind ... [missing auxiliary, standard: *did not know*]
- (29) ... would pass nigh ..., though it had become an abode of dragons? [*nigh*= archaic word for *near*, *abode*= a more formal word for *residence*]

Table 7: Non-standard markers in the ST in Galadriel’s character sample

	Non-standard markers	
	Number	%
Phonological/orthographic markers	0	0
Morphosyntactic markers	22	75.9%
Lexical markers	7	24.1%
<b>Total number and % of non-standard markers</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total words of character in sample</b>	435	
<b>% of non-standard markers, against total words in sample</b>	<b>6.7%</b>	

Table 8: Translation procedures in the TTs in Galadriel's character sample

	TT1				TT2				TT3			
	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ
<b>Addition</b>												
Number:	0	13	0	<b>13</b>	0	11	1	<b>12</b>	95	15	30	<b>140</b>
%:	0	100	0	<b>100</b>	0	91.7	8.3	<b>100</b>	67.9	10.7	21.4	<b>100</b>
% of total:	<b>31% Addition</b>				<b>29.3% Addition</b>				<b>82.8% Addition</b>			
<b>Maintenance</b>	0	13	0	<b>13</b>	0	9	0	<b>9</b>	0	9	0	<b>9</b>
	0	100	0	<b>100</b>	0	100	0	<b>100</b>	0	100	0	<b>100</b>
	<b>31% Maintenance</b>				<b>22% Maintenance</b>				<b>5.3% Maintenance</b>			
<b>Change</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	2	4	<b>6</b>
	0	0	0	<b>100</b>	0	0	0	<b>100</b>	0	33.3	66.7	<b>100</b>
	<b>0% Change</b>				<b>0% Change</b>				<b>3.6% Change</b>			
<b>Omission</b>	0	9	7	<b>16</b>	0	13	7	<b>20</b>	0	11	3	<b>14</b>
	0	56.3	43.8	<b>100</b>	0	65	35	<b>100</b>	0	78.6	21.4	<b>100</b>
	<b>38.1% Omission</b>				<b>48.8% Omission</b>				<b>8.3% Omission</b>			
<b>Procedures in total</b>				<b>42</b>				<b>41</b>				<b>169</b>

One key finding for this character sample is the amount of additions in TT3, which are 140, compared to 13 in TT1 and 12 in TT2. These additions count for 82.8% of the procedures in TT3, of which 67.9% are phonological/orthographic markers, 21.4% are lexical and only 10.7% are morphosyntactic. This is a huge difference from the two *bokmål* translations, where additions count for approximately 30% of the procedures, and almost all additions are morphosyntactic markers. The following examples show some of the most typical additions in the TTs, like fronting of the possessive determiner before a noun for the *bokmål* translations in (30). (31) illustrates the use of pronunciations of words from the 1864 spelling reform for *nynorsk*, and (32) shows the use of words that are either considered archaic or less commonly used by modern *nynorsk* users.

(30) ST: ... and the ways of his feet and of his mind are hidden from me.

TT1/TT2: Hvor/hvilke veier hans føtter og hans tanker går, er skjult for meg. [*hans føtter* vs. *føttene hans* (*his feet*), *hans tanker* vs. *tankene hans* (*his thoughts*)]

(31) ST: ... if my designs had not gone amiss, it would have been governed by Gandalf the Grey...

TT3: ... um ikkje planen min havde sviket, skulde Gandalf den Grå hava leidt det ... [standard *nynorsk*: *um, ikkje, hadde, svike, skulle, ha, leidd*]

(32) ST: If our folk had been exiled long and far from Lothlórien, who of the Galadhrim, even Celeborn the Wise, would pass nigh ...

TT3: Um folket vårt longo hadde voret utlæge og langt frå Lothlórien, kven or galadhrim, jamvel den kloke Celeborn, vilde ikkje ganga nær ... [*utlæge*= *forvist* (*exiled*), *or*= *av* (*of*), *jamvel*= *sjølv om* (*even though*)]

Some of the morphosyntactic markers in the ST have been maintained in the all TTs, with 13 in TT1, and nine in TT2 and TT3. Most of these are cases of fronting, like in (33):

- (33) ST: Needless were none of the deeds of Gandalf in life.  
 TT1: Grunnløse var ingen av Gandalfs gjerninger. [(*unjustified*)]  
 TT2: Unødvendige var ingen av Gandalfs gjerninger i levende live. [(*needless*)]  
 TT3: Unaudsynte var ingen av gjeremåli hans Gandalf so lenge han livde. [(*needless*)]

Only TT3 has used change as a translation procedure, where two morphosyntactic markers and four lexical markers have been changed into phonological/orthographic markers:

- (34) ST: He has dwelt in the West ..., and I have dwelt with him ...; for ere the fall of Nargothrond or Gondolin ... [*dwelt= live, ere= before*]  
 TT3: Han hever voret vest ..., og eg hev voret hjå honom .... Eg gjekk yver fjølli fyre Nargothrond og Gondolin fall ... [Standard *nynorsk*: *vore, vore, før*]

Omission has been used in 38.1% of the cases in TT1 and 48.8% in TT2, where all lexical markers and several morphosyntactic markers have been omitted. (35) shows the omission of unusual adverbial placement:

- (35) But we will not here speak of it more openly.  
 TT1: Men la oss ikke snakke om det nå.  
 TT2: Men vi skal ikke snakke åpnere om det her og nå.  
 TT3: Men me skulde ikje tala um henne meir opet her.

Compared to the percentages of omission in TT3 being only 8.3%, there is a clear distinction between the use of omission, and therefore a move towards standardization, in the different TTs. However, in mere numbers, all the TTs have around 14 to 20 omissions for this character sample, but the high number of additions in TT3 can be said to function as compensations for the omitted non-standard markers.

### 4.3 Men

#### 4.3.1 Ghân-buri-Ghân

Ghân-buri-Ghân is the leader of the Wild Men, but is considered a low-ranking Man, due to the low-ranking status these people have among the race of Men in general. In the sample, he is talking to Théoden, the king of Rohan, and Ghân-buri-Ghân's sociolect is characterized by short sentences and morphosyntactic markers like missing words and wrong verb tenses, which make the sentences ungrammatical. The lexical markers are all cases of code-switching into the Drúadan language, where *gorgûn* means *orc-folk*. There are 153 words in total, where non-standard markers count for 19%, which is the highest percentage of non-standard markers for all the characters analyzed so far. 26 of the 29 non-standard markers are morphosyntactic, while three are lexical. Some examples are:

- (36) \_\_ Kill *gorgûn* in \_\_ woods, \_\_ hate orc-folk. [Missing subject, code-switching, missing determiner *the* before *woods*, missing coordinating conjunction]  
 (37) Wild Men live here before Stone-houses; before Tall Men come up out of \_\_ Water.  
 [incorrect verb tense for *live* (*lived*) and *come* (*came*), missing determiner *the* before *Water*]

Table 9: Non-standard markers in the ST in Ghân-buri-Ghân's character sample

	Non-standard markers	
	Number	%
Phonological/orthographic markers	0	0
Morphosyntactic markers	26	89.7%
Lexical markers	3	10.3%
<b>Total number and % of non-standard markers</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total words of character in sample</b>	153	
<b>% of non-standard markers, against total words in sample</b>	<b>19%</b>	

Table 10: Translation procedures in the TTs in Ghân-buri-Ghân's character sample

	TT1				TT2				TT3			
	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ
<b>Addition</b>												
Number:	0	19	0	<b>19</b>	3	29	0	<b>32</b>	4	11	4	<b>19</b>
%:	0	100	0	<b>100</b>	9.4	90.6	0	<b>100</b>	21.1	57.9	21.1	<b>100</b>
% of total:	<b>39.6% Addition</b>				<b>52.5% Addition</b>				<b>39.6% Addition</b>			
<b>Maintenance</b>	0	13	3	<b>16</b>	0	22	3	<b>25</b>	0	18	3	<b>21</b>
	0	81.3	18.8	<b>100</b>	0	88	12	<b>100</b>	0	85.7	14.3	<b>100</b>
	<b>33.3% Maintenance</b>				<b>41% Maintenance</b>				<b>43.8% Maintenance</b>			
<b>Change</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	2	0	<b>2</b>
	0	0	0	<b>100</b>	0	0	0	<b>100</b>	0	100	0	<b>100</b>
	<b>0% Change</b>				<b>0% Change</b>				<b>4.2% Change</b>			
<b>Omission</b>	0	13	0	<b>13</b>	0	4	0	<b>4</b>	0	6	0	<b>6</b>
	0	100	0	<b>100</b>	0	100	0	<b>100</b>	0	100	0	<b>100</b>
	<b>27.1% Omission</b>				<b>6.6% Omission</b>				<b>12.5% Omission</b>			
<b>Procedures in total</b>				<b>48</b>				<b>61</b>				<b>48</b>

One of the most interesting findings for this character is that TT2 has the highest amount of additions with 52.5%, while TT1 and TT3 both have 39.6%. In all the character samples above, additions have had the highest amount in TT3, while TT1 has been in second, but this is not the case for this character sample. Morphosyntactic markers are the most dominant added marker for all TTs, which count for 29 out of 32 markers in TT2, all in TT1 and 11 out of 19 in TT3. A typical example of addition of morphosyntactic marker is shown in (38) with the incorrect verb inflection, since it is missing suffix *-r* to make present tense in *bokmål*. (39) shows the use of phonological/orthographic additions in TT3, and (40) with some lexical additions.

- (38) ST: \_\_ Kill *gorgûn* in \_\_ woods, \_\_ hate orc-folk.  
 TT1: \_\_ Drepe *gorgûn* i skogen, \_\_ hate bergtroll. [*drepe* vs. *dreper* (*kill*), *hate* vs. *hater* (*hate*)]  
 TT2: \_\_ Drepe *gorgûn* i skog \_\_, \_\_ hate orkfolk. [*drepe* vs. *dreper* (*kill*), *hate* vs. *hater* (*hate*)]



(39) ST: They have more.

TT3: Dei hava meir. [Standard *nynorsk*: *har*]

(40) ST: Then you must be quick.

TT3: Då lyt de vera snøgge. [*lyt*= *må* (*must*), *snøgge*= *raske* (*quick*)]

(38) shows that the lexical marker with code-switching has been maintained in all TTs, and this is also true for the two other cases of code-switching with the same word *gorgûn* in this sample. Additionally, many morphosyntactic markers have been maintained in all TTs, like missing subject and coordinating conjunction. TT1 also shows the lack of suffix *-en* to the noun *skog*, which is equivalent to the missing determiner *the* before *woods* in the ST. Maintenance counts for around 33% to 44% of the translation procedures in the TTs, and is therefore a procedure used more than omission, which has not been the case with most of the character samples examined so far. A possible explanation for the high amounts of maintained and added markers is that the linguistic variety of this character consists of many grammatical errors, which can be easily recreated with corresponding errors in Norwegian, or more errors can be added to make the variety more non-standard. Change has only been found in TT3, where two morphosyntactic markers have been changed into a phonological (41) and a lexical marker (42):

(41) ST: ... we \_\_ fight not. [missing auxiliary]

TT3: ... me slæst ikkje. [standard *nynorsk*: *slåst*]

(42) ST: ... men out of far-away ... [instead of standard preposition *from*]

TT3: ... menn utor langt borti ... [*utor*= *ut av* (*out of*)]

Compared to the previously examined samples, this is the first time TT2 has the lowest percentage of omissions with only 6.6%. Omissions count for more of the procedures in TT1 with 27.1% and then in TT3 with 12.5%. Some of the omissions are missing determiners and wrong verb tenses, like the ones in (36) and (37). The move towards standardization with the use of omission is therefore not as striking in any of the TTs in this sample as in some of the other character samples examined earlier, mainly due to the frequent use of addition and maintenance as translation procedures, which can be said to function as compensations.

#### 4.3.2 Denethor

As explained in 3.1.1, Men of Gondor are descendants of the Dúnedain, a line of Men blessed with long life, and Denethor, being the Steward of Gondor and a high-ranking Man, has a sociolect characterized by formal and archaic language use, with a high kind of non-standardness somewhat similar to that of Elves. This includes morphosyntactic markers like fronting and unusual adverbial placement, and lexical markers like archaic words. Denethor is speaking with his son Faramir in the sample, and the character sample consists of 260 words, where non-standard markers count for 4.6%. This amount is much less compared to Ghân-buri-

Ghân, whose sample has 19% non-standard markers, but is similar to the amounts in the samples of Haldir and Galadriel. Out of the 12 non-standard markers in the ST, 10 of them are morphosyntactic and two are lexical. Some examples are:

- (43) He has long had your heart in his keeping. [adverbial placement, nominalization]  
 (44) Ever your desire is to appear ... [fronting]  
 (45) I can see and hear, as was my wont ... [*wont*= archaic word for *habit*]

Table 11: Non-standard markers in the ST in Denethor's character sample

	Non-standard markers	
	Number	%
Phonological/orthographic markers	0	0
Morphosyntactic markers	10	83.3%
Lexical markers	2	16.7%
Total number and % of non-standard markers	12	100%
Total words of character in sample	260	
% of non-standard markers, against total words in sample	4.6%	

Table 12: Translation procedures in the TTs in Denethor's character sample

	TT1				TT2				TT3			
	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ
<b>Addition</b>												
Number:	0	9	1	<b>10</b>	0	11	2	<b>13</b>	33	20	16	<b>69</b>
%:	0	90	10	<b>100</b>	0	84.6	15.4	<b>100</b>	47.8	29	23.2	<b>100</b>
% of total:	<b>45.5% Addition</b>				<b>52% Addition</b>				<b>85.2% Addition</b>			
<b>Maintenance</b>	0	2	0	<b>2</b>	0	4	0	<b>4</b>	0	4	1	<b>5</b>
	0	100	0	<b>100</b>	0	100	0	<b>100</b>	0	80	20	<b>100</b>
	<b>9.1% Maintenance</b>				<b>16% Maintenance</b>				<b>6.2% Maintenance</b>			
<b>Change</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	0	1	<b>1</b>
	0	0	0	<b>100</b>	0	0	0	<b>100</b>	0	0	100	<b>100</b>
	<b>0% Change</b>				<b>0% Change</b>				<b>1.2% Change</b>			
<b>Omission</b>	0	8	2	<b>10</b>	0	6	2	<b>8</b>	0	6	0	<b>6</b>
	0	80	20	<b>100</b>	0	75	25	<b>100</b>	0	100	0	<b>100</b>
	<b>45.5% Omission</b>				<b>32% Omission</b>				<b>7.4% Omission</b>			
<b>Procedures in total</b>				<b>22</b>				<b>25</b>				<b>81</b>

A clear trend in this table too is the high amount of additions in TT3, which count for 85.2% of the translation procedures, while this amount is 45.5% for TT1 and 52% for TT2. TT3 has mostly added phonological/orthographic markers and quite a few of the other markers, since the Men of Gondor have been assigned with a sociolect corresponding to *Midlandsnormalen*, a spelling reform of *nynorsk* from 1901, which is characterized by formal and archaic language use from today's perspective. This is shown in (46) and (47), while the other two TTs almost exclusively have added morphosyntactic markers, like fronting, missing the definite suffix *-en* for nouns and the fronting of possessive determiner, shown in (46).

(46) ST: My son, your father is old but not yet dotard.

TT1: Min sønn, far din er gammel, men noen olding er han ikke. [*Min sønn* vs. *sønnen min* (*my son*), *far din* vs. *faren din* (*your father*), fronting]

TT2: Min sønn, din far er gammel, men ennå ingen olding. [*Min sønn* vs. *sønnen min* (*my son*), *din far* vs. *faren din* (*your father*)]

TT3: Sonen min, far din er gamal, men enn er han ingen fåne. [*far din* vs. *faren din* (*your father*), fronting]

(47) ST: He would have remembered his father's need, and would not have squandered what fortune gave.

TT3:

a. Han vilde hava farens tarv i minne, og vilde ikkje hava øydt det lukka gav. [Standard nynorsk: *ville, hatt, ville, hatt*]

b. Han vilde hava farens tarv i minne, og vilde ikkje hava øydt det lukka gav. [*tarv= interesse* (*interest*), *øydt= sløsa vekk* (*wasted away*)]

Only a few morphosyntactic markers have been maintained in the TTs, like the ones shown in (48) and (49), while TT3 has also maintained one of the lexical markers in the ST, which is *fåne* (*task*) for *dotard*.

(48) ST: He has long had your heart in his keeping. [adverbial placement]

TT1: Han har for lenge siden vunnet ditt hjerte. [(*a long time ago*)]

(49) ST: Ever your desire is to ... [fronting]

TT3: Stødt er ynsket ditt å ...

The other lexical marker in TT3, *wont* (archaic word for *habit*), has been changed into the phonological/orthographic marker *stødt*, written as *støtt* (*constantly*) in standard nynorsk. Apart from this, there have been no changes in TT1 and TT2. The use of omission has decreased with each TT, where it counts for 45.5% of the procedures in TT1, 32% in TT2 and only 7.4% in TT3. This includes omissions of nominalization (48), unusual adverbial placement and of *whom* (50), the latter not having an equivalent form in Norwegian.

(50) ST: ... with the death also of your father, and of all your people, whom it is your part to protect now that Boromir is gone.

TT1: Nei, med din fars død også, med hele folkets død. Det er du som skulle verget dem nå når Boromir er falt.

TT2: ... også død for din far, og hele ditt folk, som det er din plikt å verje, nå som Boromir er borte.

TT3: ... med dauden åt far din attåt, og heile folket ditt, som det er din lut å verja no som Boromir er burte.

The *bokmål* translations show a move towards standardization with high amounts of omissions, but as with the other samples examined so far, the high amounts of additions can be said to function as compensations.

## 4.4 Orcs

### 4.4.1 Tracker

As explained in 3.1.1, the Orcs have been assigned a linguistic variety dominated by non-standard and colloquial English forms, and thus speak with a low kind of non-standardness similar to that of low-ranking Hobbits. Most Orcs have adopted Westron as their native language, but there may be variation in the way they speak Westron, for example since Orcs live in several different parts of Middle-earth. Tracker is a low-ranking Orc, and from the 189 words in the character sample, speaking with Soldier, non-standard markers count for 10.1%. This is the second highest amount of non-standardness so far, after Ghân-buri-Ghân with 19%. Out of the 19 markers, 14 of them are morphosyntactic, mostly contractions like in (51), and five are lexical with dialectal words and expressions, shown in (52):

- (51) They've lost their heads, that's what it is. [contractions]  
 (52) ... \_\_ Tower raided and all, and hundreds of your lads done in, and \_\_ prisoner got away.  
 [and all= expression, lads= men/boys, done in= slang for injure]

Table 13: Non-standard markers in the ST in Tracker's character sample

	Non-standard markers	
	Number	%
Phonological/orthographic markers	0	0
Morphosyntactic markers	14	73.7%
Lexical markers	5	26.3%
<b>Total number and % of non-standard markers</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total words of character in sample</b>	189	
<b>% of non-standard markers, against total words in sample</b>	<b>10.1%</b>	

Table 14: Translation procedures in the TTs in Tracker's character sample

	TT1				TT2				TT3			
	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ
<b>Addition</b>												
Number:	0	2	2	<b>4</b>	5	11	2	<b>18</b>	10	5	5	<b>20</b>
%:	0	50	50	<b>100</b>	27.8	61.1	11.1	<b>100</b>	50	25	25	<b>100</b>
% of total:	<b>17.4% Addition</b>				<b>48.6% Addition</b>				<b>51.3% Addition</b>			
<b>Maintenance</b>	0	0	4	<b>4</b>	0	0	5	<b>5</b>	0	0	5	<b>5</b>
	0	0	100	<b>100</b>	0	0	100	<b>100</b>	0	0	100	<b>100</b>
	<b>17.4% Maintenance</b>				<b>13.5% Maintenance</b>				<b>12.8% Maintenance</b>			
<b>Change</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	1	0	<b>1</b>
	0	0	0	<b>100</b>	0	0	0	<b>100</b>	0	100	0	<b>100</b>
	<b>0% Change</b>				<b>0% Change</b>				<b>2.6% Change</b>			
<b>Omission</b>	0	14	1	<b>15</b>	0	14	0	<b>14</b>	0	13	0	<b>13</b>
	0	93.3	6.7	<b>100</b>	0	100	0	<b>100</b>	0	100	0	<b>100</b>
	<b>65.2% Omission</b>				<b>37.8% Omission</b>				<b>33.3% Omission</b>			
<b>Procedures in total</b>				<b>23</b>				<b>37</b>				<b>39</b>

The clearest trend for this character sample is the amounts of additions in TT2 and TT3, which are approximately 50%, while additions count for only 17.4% in TT1. These amounts show that additions count for much less in this character sample for TT3 compared to the previously examined samples, most of which had additions up to 80% to 85%. TT2 has mostly added morphosyntactic markers, while TT3 has mostly added phonological/orthographic markers. A typical example of addition for TT2 is the use of radical *bokmål* with the suffix *-a* instead of *-et* for verbs in past tense and some cases of alternative pronunciation, both shown in (53). The Orcs in TT3 have been assigned an ethnolect with a mix of different dialects, with for example phonological/orthographic markers for non-standard *bokmål* words (54) and phonological reduction (55).

- (53) ST: ... \_\_ Tower raided and all, and hundreds of your lads done in, and \_\_ prisoner got away.  
 TT2: ... tårnet plyndra og allting, og hundrevis av kara deres kverka, og fangen har stikki av.  
 [Morphosyntactic markers: *plyndra* vs. *plyndret* (raided), *kverka* vs. *kverket* (kill off), standard *bokmål*: *karene* (guys), *stukket av* (ran)]
- (54) ST: I'll say no more and go on thinking.  
 TT3: Eg skal halde kjeft og bruke huet. [*huet*= *hovud* (head)]
- (55) ST: Well, I hope they get him and put him through it.  
 TT3: Eg vonar dei tek'n og gjev'n inn. [*tek'n*= *tek han* (take him), *gjev'n*= *gjev han* (give him)]

Only lexical markers have been maintained in all TTs, like the expressions in (52) and (56).

- (56) ST: ... not along the valley, I tell you.  
 TT1: ... drog langs etter dalen, som jeg sa deg. [(*as I told you*)]  
 TT2: ... ikke langs dalen, har jeg sagt. [(*I have said*)]  
 TT3: ... ikkje langsmed dalen, seier eg deg. [(*I tell you*)]

Change as a translation procedure has only been used in TT3, where the contraction and morphosyntactic marker in “*you don't even know...*” has been changed into “*du veit kje ein gong...*”, a phonological/orthographic marker with phonological reduction of *ikkje* (*not*). Except for this change, all other morphosyntactic markers in the ST have been omitted in the TTs, like the ones in (51). This is mainly due to contractions being more difficult to preserve in Norwegian, which was also the case with Gaffer's character sample. Omission counts for 65.2% in TT1, 37.8% in TT2 and 33.3% in TT3, and this translation procedure, being a move towards standardization, has therefore been used to a greater extent in TT1 than in the other two TTs. In this character sample, however, there is not a huge difference between TT2 and TT3, compared to many of the other character samples analyzed so far.

#### 4.4.2 Shagrat

Shagrat is one of the Orc captains and is therefore a high-ranking Orc. However, since the amount of non-standard markers for this character sample is 13.1% out of the total 175 words,

and Tracker has a lower amount of non-standard markers with 10.1%, there is a clear indication that the linguistic variation of Orcs is a case of ethnolect rather than sociolect. In the sample, Shagrat is talking to the high-ranking Orc Gorbag, and 15 of the 23 non-standard markers are morphosyntactic, mostly contractions, like in (57). There are seven lexical markers with dialectal words and expressions and one phonological/orthographic markers, like the ones in (58) and (59):

- (57) But there's no doubt about it, they're troubled about something. [contractions]  
 (58) But let the lads play! No need to worry about Shelob for a bit, I reckon. [*lads*= *men/boys*, expression]  
 (59) So let 'em laugh. [phonological reduction from *them*]

Table 15: Non-standard markers in the ST in Shagrat's character sample

	Non-standard markers	
	Number	%
Phonological/orthographic markers	1	4.3%
Morphosyntactic markers	15	65.2%
Lexical markers	7	30.4%
<b>Total number and % of non-standard markers</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total words of character in sample</b>	175	
<b>% of non-standard markers, against total words in sample</b>	<b>13.1%</b>	

Table 16: Translation procedures in the TTs in Shagrat's character sample

	TT1				TT2				TT3			
	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ
<b>Addition</b>												
Number:	3	5	3	<b>11</b>	3	4	0	<b>7</b>	20	3	2	<b>25</b>
%:	27.3	45.5	27.3	<b>100</b>	42.9	57.1	0	<b>100</b>	80	12	8	<b>100</b>
% of total:	<b>32.4% Addition</b>				<b>23.3% Addition</b>				<b>52.1% Addition</b>			
<b>Maintenance</b>	1	1	3	<b>5</b>	0	1	3	<b>4</b>	0	2	4	<b>6</b>
	20	20	60	<b>100</b>	0	25	75	<b>100</b>	0	33.3	66.7	<b>100</b>
	<b>14.7% Maintenance</b>				<b>13.3% Maintenance</b>				<b>12.5% Maintenance</b>			
<b>Change</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	4	0	<b>4</b>
	0	0	0	<b>100</b>	0	0	0	<b>100</b>	0	100	0	<b>100</b>
	<b>0% Change</b>				<b>0% Change</b>				<b>8.3% Change</b>			
<b>Omission</b>	0	14	4	<b>18</b>	1	14	4	<b>19</b>	1	9	3	<b>13</b>
	0	77.8	22.2	<b>100</b>	5.3	73.7	21.1	<b>100</b>	7.7	69.2	23.1	<b>100</b>
	<b>52.9% Omission</b>				<b>63.3% Omission</b>				<b>27.1% Omission</b>			
<b>Procedures in total</b>				<b>34</b>				<b>30</b>				<b>48</b>

One central finding for this character sample is the relatively low percentage of additions compared to most of the previously examined character samples, with 32.4% in TT1, 23.3% in TT2, and 52.1% in TT3. This can be an indication that the more non-standardness that are present in the ST, the less additions there are in the TTs, which was also the case with the

samples of Ghân-buri-Ghân and Tracker. Another possible explanation is that the Orcs have been assigned an ethnolect of a mixture of dialects in TT3, which consists of fewer non-standard markers compared to many of the other varieties in TT3. TT1 has a somewhat equal distribution of added markers, while TT2 has added all types of non-standard markers except lexical ones. Morphosyntactic additions are, for example, radical *bokmål* forms of nouns with the suffix *-a*, like *hula* in TT1 and *smørja* in TT2, compared to the more standard forms *hulen* (*cave*) and *smørjen* (*filth*). Phonological/orthographic markers like *sjøl* and *sia* have been added, as non-standard pronunciations of *selv* (*self*) and *siden* (*later*). 80% of the additions in TT3 are phonological/orthographic markers, with cases of non-standard pronunciations of *bokmål* and phonological reduction, as illustrated in (60). (60) also shows the use of the *bokmål* objective case *dem* instead of subjective case *dei* (*they*) in *nynorsk*, which is a morphosyntactic marker.

- (60) ST: They may, but they've got eyes and ears everywhere; some among my lot, as like as not.  
 TT3: Dem kan det, men dem har øyer og ører over alt, no'n i flokken min, så visst som no' anna.  
 [Dem= *dei* (*they*), øyer= *auge* (*eyes*), ører= *øyre* (*ears*), no 'n= *nokon* (*some*), no '= *noko* (*some*)]

Between four and six markers have been maintained in the TTs, mostly lexical markers like colloquial expressions, shown in the following examples:

- (61) ST: No need to worry about Shelob for a bit, I reckon. [expression]  
 TT1: Shelob har nok med seg sjøl for en stund, det skulle jeg mene. [(*I should think so*)]  
 TT2: Ingen vits i å være redd for Hutula på en stund, mener nå jeg. [(*I think think*)]  
 (62) ST: ... some among my lot, as like as not. [colloquial forms: *lot*= *group of people*, *as like as not*= *probably*]  
 TT3: ... no'n i flokken min, så visst som no' anna. [*flokk* (*herd*), *så visst som no' anna*= *det er sikkert* (*that's for sure*)]

Four morphosyntactic markers have been changed into phonological/orthographic markers in TT3, from contractions like *shan't* and *didn't* to *'kke*, a phonological reduction from *ikke* (*not*). The amounts of omissions are highest in TT2 with 63.3% and somewhat less in TT1 with 52.9%, and these amounts seem to suggest that standardization is the predominant strategy for this character in the *bokmål* translations. Almost all of the omissions are contractions that can be difficult to preserve in Norwegian, like the ones in (57), but as seen with the changes in TT3, it is not impossible. This sample shows that TT3 has the fewest omissions with 27.1%. This has also been the case for many of the other samples examined, but the amount of omissions in this character sample is higher than in the samples analyzed earlier.

## 4.5 Wizards

### 4.5.1 Gandalf

Since there are only five Wizards and they are not connected to any specific regions or belong to distinct social classes within their race, their linguistic variety is an ethnolect, with a somewhat high kind of non-standardness similar to that of Elves and high-ranking Men. However, Gandalf is a somewhat lower-ranking Wizard than Saruman and it is possible that his speech is more formal in this conversation with Saruman, since Saruman is the leader of their Order. Out of the 187 words in this character sample, non-standard markers count for 3.2%, which is somewhat lower than in the samples of Haldir, Galadriel and Denethor. There are only four morphosyntactic markers in this character sample, like verb without an auxiliary (63), unusual adverbial placement and fronting (64), and two cases of the archaic word *nay* (*no*) for lexical markers.

(63) What have you to say... [Standard: *What do you have*]

(64) When last I visited you, you were the jailor of Mordor, and there I was to be sent.

Table 17: Non-standard markers in the ST in Gandalf's character sample

	Non-standard markers	
	Number	%
Phonological/orthographic markers	0	0
Morphosyntactic markers	4	66.7%
Lexical markers	2	33.3%
Total number and % of non-standard markers	<b>6</b>	<b>100%</b>
Total words of character in sample	187	
% of non-standard markers, against total words in sample	<b>3.2%</b>	

Table 18: Translation procedures in the TTs in Gandalf's character sample

	TT1				TT2				TT3			
	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ
<b>Addition</b>												
Number:	0	7	0	<b>7</b>	0	6	0	<b>6</b>	1	2	4	<b>7</b>
%:	0	100	0	<b>100</b>	0	100	0	<b>100</b>	14.3	28.6	57.1	<b>100</b>
% of total:	<b>53.8% Addition</b>				<b>50% Addition</b>				<b>53.8% Addition</b>			
<b>Maintenance</b>	0	1	0	<b>1</b>	0	3	0	<b>3</b>	0	2	0	<b>2</b>
	0	100	0	<b>100</b>	0	100	0	<b>100</b>	0	100	0	<b>100</b>
	<b>7.7% Maintenance</b>				<b>25% Maintenance</b>				<b>15.4% Maintenance</b>			
<b>Change</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	0	0	0	<b>100</b>	0	0	0	<b>100</b>	0	0	0	<b>100</b>
	<b>0% Change</b>				<b>0% Change</b>				<b>0% Change</b>			
<b>Omission</b>	0	3	2	<b>5</b>	0	1	2	<b>3</b>	0	2	2	<b>4</b>
	0	60	40	<b>100</b>	0	33.3	66.7	<b>100</b>	0	50	50	<b>100</b>
	<b>38.5% Omission</b>				<b>25% Omission</b>				<b>30.8% Omission</b>			
<b>Procedures in total</b>				<b>13</b>				<b>12</b>				<b>13</b>



The table shows a striking difference from before, in which additions count for almost the same amounts in all TTs, with 53.8% for both TT2 and TT3 and 50% in TT1. This is most likely due to the *nynorsk* translator having used modern *nynorsk* to represent the variety of Wizards, as explained in 3.1.2, and thus creating a variety that is more standard than the varieties of Haldir, Galadriel and Denethor. All the TTs have used fronting of the possessive determiner before a noun as a morphosyntactic marker, but mostly in the *bokmål* translations, shown in (65). Additionally, TT3 has added lexical markers of words that may be perceived as non-standard for modern readers of *nynorsk*, like *skjelm* for *skøyar* (*jester*), *svolk* for *kjepp* (*a stick*), *ovleg* for *særs* (*very*) and *vona* for *håpa* (*hoped*).

(65) ST: ... beyond your comprehension.

TT1: ... overgår din forstand. [*din forstand* vs. *forstanden din* (*your comprehension*)]

TT2: ... overgår din forståelse. [*din forståelse* vs. *forståelsen din* (*your understanding*)]

TT3: ... overstig di fatteevne. [*di fatteevne* vs. *fatteevna di* (*your comprehension*)]

Only between one and three morphosyntactic markers have been maintained in the TTs, like a case of fronting, shown in (66), while change as a translation procedure has not been used in any of the TTs.

(66) ST: But you, Saruman, I understand now too well.

TT1: Men deg, Saruman, forstår jeg så altfor godt.

TT2: Men deg, Sarumann, forstår jeg nå bare så altfor godt.

TT3: Men deg Sarumann, skjønner eg no ovleg godt.

Omission, thus creating a move towards standardization, has been used the most in TT1 with 38.5%, while it counts for 30.8% of the procedures in TT3 and 25% in TT2. For instance, the verb without an auxiliary in (63) and the two cases of *nay* have been omitted in all TTs. Only Ghân-buri-Ghân's character sample has the same pattern as Gandalf's, in which TT2 has the fewest omissions, then TT3 and lastly TT1. Most of the previously examined samples show TT3 as having the fewest omissions, while it has varied between TT1 and TT2 having the most omissions.

#### 4.5.2 Saruman

Saruman is a somewhat higher-ranking Wizard than Gandalf, due to his leader position in their Order, but as suggested in 4.5.1, the Wizards' linguistic variation is a type of ethnolect rather than dialect or sociolect. 4.5% out of the 221 words for this character sample, where he is speaking with Gandalf, are considered non-standard, and this amount is only a little higher than in Gandalf's sample. This can be an indication of linguistic accommodation, since he is speaking to a lower-ranking Wizard. Eight of the 10 non-standard markers are morphosyntactic,

like fronting (67) and unusual adverbial placement (68) and two are lexical markers, with the obsolete words *erred* (*do wrongly*) and *wilfully* (*willingly*).

(67) For you at least I am grieved ...

(68) ... having indeed a store of your own wisdom.

Table 19: Non-standard markers in the ST in Saruman's character sample

	Non-standard markers	
	Number	%
Phonological/orthographic markers	0	0
Morphosyntactic markers	8	80%
Lexical markers	2	20%
<b>Total number and % of non-standard markers</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total words of character in sample</b>	221	
<b>% of non-standard markers, against total words in sample</b>	<b>4.5%</b>	

Table 20: Translation procedures in the TTs in Saruman's character sample

	TT1				TT2				TT3			
	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ
<b>Addition</b>												
Number:	1	14	0	<b>15</b>	0	5	2	<b>7</b>	3	2	10	<b>15</b>
%:	6.7	93.3	0	<b>100</b>	0	71.4	28.6	<b>100</b>	20	13.3	66.7	<b>100</b>
% of total:	<b>60% Addition</b>				<b>41.2% Addition</b>				<b>60% Addition</b>			
<b>Maintenance</b>	0	5	0	<b>5</b>	0	6	0	<b>6</b>	0	3	0	<b>3</b>
	0	100	0	<b>100</b>	0	100	0	<b>100</b>	0	100	0	<b>100</b>
	<b>20% Maintenance</b>				<b>35.3% Maintenance</b>				<b>12% Maintenance</b>			
<b>Change</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	0	0	0	<b>100</b>	0	0	0	<b>100</b>	0	0	0	<b>100</b>
	<b>0% Change</b>				<b>0% Change</b>				<b>0% Change</b>			
<b>Omission</b>	0	3	2	<b>5</b>	0	2	2	<b>4</b>	0	5	2	<b>7</b>
	0	60	40	<b>100</b>	0	50	50	<b>100</b>	0	71.4	28.6	<b>100</b>
	<b>20% Omission</b>				<b>23.5% Omission</b>				<b>28% Omission</b>			
<b>Procedures in total</b>				<b>25</b>				<b>17</b>				<b>25</b>

A clear trend in this table is addition as the most dominant translation procedure in all TTs, and additions count for 60% in both TT1 and TT3, while TT2 has a much lower percentage with 41.2%. However, the fact that TT1 has the same, high amount of additions as TT3 is different from most of the previously examined character samples, in which TT3 very often has had the most additions. Again, this can be explained by the modern *nynorsk* variety assigned to Wizards in TT3, which is more standard than the varieties of Denethor and the Elves. The *bokmål* translations has mostly added morphosyntactic features, with fronting of the possessive determiner before a noun as the most frequent one (69), but also the lack of the definite suffix *-en* to the noun *gang* (*time*). TT3, on the other hand, has mostly added lexical markers (70) and some phonological/orthographic markers (69).

- (69) ST: Even now will you not listen to my counsel?  
 TT1: Vil du heller ikke denne gang lytte til mitt råd? [*gang* vs. *gangen (this time)*, *mitt råd* vs. *rådet mitt (my counsel)*]  
 TT2: Vil du ikke lytte til mitt råd, selv nå? [*mitt råd* vs. *rådet mitt (my counsel)*]  
 TT3: Vil du ikkje lye på rådet mitt no heller? [Standard *nynorsk: lyda*]  
 (70) ST: ... having a noble mind ...  
 TT3: ... då du har ein vyrdeleg hug ... [*vyrdeleg= edelt (noble)*, *hug= sinn (mind)*]

Only morphosyntactic markers have been maintained in all three TTs, where TT2 has the highest percentage of maintenance with 35.3%, compared to TT1 with 20% and TT3 with 12%, for example fronting:

- (71) ST: Much we could still accomplish together ...  
 TT1: Sammen kunne vi to ennå utrette en hel del ... [(*together*)]  
 TT2: Mangt kunne vi ennå utrette sammen ... [(*much*)]

There have been no changes in any of the TTs. The two lexical markers *erred* and *wilfully* have been omitted in all TTs, while between three and five morphosyntactic markers have been omitted, like the fronting of the phrase *even now* shown in (69). The use of omission, and therefore a move towards standardization, in this character sample has increased slightly with each TT, from 20% in TT1, to 23.5% in TT2 and 28% in TT3, and this is a different pattern than the samples examined earlier, where TT1 has often had the most omissions.

#### 4.6 Non-standard markers and translation procedures for all characters

The following is a summary of all the non-standard markers found in the selected samples from the ST and of all the translation procedures in the corresponding TT samples for all the characters. The total number of words for all the characters are 2437, in which non-standard markers count for 6.8%. As shown in table 21, there are 166 non-standard markers in the character samples in the ST, where 76.5% are morphosyntactic markers, 22.9% are lexical and 0.6% are phonological/orthographic.

Table 21: Non-standard markers in the ST for all character samples

	Non-standard markers	
	Number	%
Phonological/orthographic markers	1	0.6%
Morphosyntactic markers	127	76.5%
Lexical markers	38	22.9%
Total number and % of non-standard markers	<b>166</b>	<b>100%</b>
Total words of character in samples	2437	
% of non-standard markers, against total words in samples	<b>6.8%</b>	

Table 22: Translation procedures in the TTs for all character samples

	TT1				TT2				TT3			
	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ	Pho.	Mor.	Lex.	Σ
<b>Addition</b>												
Number:	9	103	12	<b>124</b>	12	106	10	<b>128</b>	275	90	99	<b>464</b>
%:	7.3	83.1	9.7	<b>100</b>	9.4	82.8	7.8	<b>100</b>	59.3	19.4	21.3	<b>100</b>
% of total:	<b>42.8% Addition</b>				<b>43.5% Addition</b>				<b>73.7% Addition</b>			
<b>Maintenance</b>	1	38	13	<b>52</b>	0	54	16	<b>70</b>	0	48	19	<b>67</b>
	1.9	73.1	25	<b>100</b>	0	77.1	22.9	<b>100</b>	0	71.6	28.4	<b>100</b>
	<b>17.9% Maintenance</b>				<b>23.8% Maintenance</b>				<b>10.6% Maintenance</b>			
<b>Change</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	16	5	<b>21</b>
	0	0	0	<b>100</b>	0	0	0	<b>100</b>	0	76.2	23.8	<b>100</b>
	<b>0% Change</b>				<b>0% Change</b>				<b>3.3% Change</b>			
<b>Omission</b>	0	89	25	<b>114</b>	1	73	22	<b>96</b>	1	63	14	<b>78</b>
	0	78.1	21.9	<b>100</b>	1	76	22.9	<b>100</b>	1.3	80.8	17.9	<b>100</b>
	<b>39.3% Omission</b>				<b>32.7% Omission</b>				<b>12.4% Omission</b>			
<b>Procedures in total</b>				<b>290</b>				<b>294</b>				<b>630</b>

Table 22 shows that the total number of translation procedures used in the character samples are 290 in TT1, 294 in TT2 and 630 in TT3. One of the most striking overall findings is that addition is the mostly used translation procedure in all TTs. Another is the high amount of additions in TT3 with 73.7%, compared to approximately 43% in the two *bokmål* translations, and this has been the predominant pattern in the character samples examined. Where TT1 and TT2 have mainly added morphosyntactic markers, TT3 has added mostly phonological/orthographic markers, but also quite a few of the other two markers. Phonological/orthographic and lexical markers have only been added a few times in the *bokmål* translations, where they each count for around 7% to 10%. Maintenance has been used in 23.8% of the cases in TT2, while this procedure counts for 17.9% of the non-standard markers in TT1 and 10.6% in TT3. All the TTs have mainly maintained morphosyntactic markers, then lexical markers, while the single phonological/orthographic marker has only been maintained in TT1. Change as a translation procedure has only been used in TT3, consisting of 3.3% of the translation procedures. The use of omission, meaning a move towards standardization, has decreased with each TT, where TT1 has 39.3% omission, TT2 has 32.7% and TT3 has 12.4%. TT3 has overall the smallest amount of omissions in most character samples, while it varies which of the two *bokmål* translations that have most omissions.

Table 23: Non-standard markers in the ST and omissions in the TTs

Races	Characters	Non-standard markers in ST	Omissions in numbers and percentages		
			TT1	TT2	TT3
Hobbits	Gaffer	21	16 (76.2%)	10 (47.6%)	2 (9.5%)
	Merry	5	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	4 (80%)
Elves	Haldir	12	11 (91.7%)	9 (75%)	9 (75%)
	Galadriel	29	16 (55.2%)	20 (69%)	14 (48.3%)
Men	Ghân-buri-Ghân	29	13 (44.8%)	4 (13.8%)	6 (20.7%)
	Denethor	12	10 (83.3%)	8 (66.7%)	6 (50%)
Orcs	Tracker	19	15 (78.9%)	14 (73.7%)	13 (68.4%)
	Shagrat	23	18 (78.3%)	19 (82.6%)	13 (56.5%)
Wizards	Gandalf	6	5 (83.3%)	3 (50%)	4 (66.7%)
	Saruman	10	5 (50%)	4 (40%)	7 (70%)
<b>Total</b>		<b>166</b>	<b>114 (68.7%)</b>	<b>96 (57.8%)</b>	<b>78 (47%)</b>

Table 23 shows the number of non-standard markers in the ST and how many of these markers have been omitted in the TTs, and the results shown here can indicate that some of the characters have been more standardized than others in the different TTs. Even though omission is only the second most used translation procedure, the table shows that in total, 68.7% of the non-standard markers have been omitted in TT1, while 57.8% in TT2 and 47% in TT3 have been omitted. Thus, if one adheres to Toury's warning against assuming that additions are evidence of compensation as explained in 3.3.2, it can be argued that TT1 and TT2 have been standardized if, for example, more than 50% of the non-standard markers have been omitted. The following chapter will discuss these findings further.

## 5 Discussion

The results from the analysis show the presence of a low and a high kind of non-standardness in the ST, which has also been found in Johannesson (1997), Bayona (2011) and Turner (2005). The Hobbits, the low-ranking Man Ghân-buri-Ghân and the Orcs have been assigned varieties of a low kind of non-standardness, while the Elves, the high-ranking Man Denethor and the Wizards have been assigned varieties of a high kind of non-standardness. The study was conducted to find out which translation procedures have been used to translate linguistic variation in *LOTR* into Norwegian, and to see if the results confirm the hypothesis that standardization is the predominant translation strategy for the translation of linguistic variation. I will focus on the main trends found in the analysis, and the results shown in the tables in this chapter are the same as those presented in Chapter 4 (mainly from 4.6), but they will be presented separately here in order to discuss the occurrences of each translation procedure.

### 5.1 Translation procedures in TTs

The results from the second table for each character sample show that the translation procedures used to translate linguistic variation in *LOTR* vary between the TTs, which is presented in table 24.

Table 24: Translation procedures in the TTs, from most to least used

	<b>Most used</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> most used</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup> most used</b>	<b>Least used</b>
<b>TT1</b>	Addition: 42.8%	Omission: 39.3%	Maintenance: 17.9%	Change: 0%
<b>TT2</b>	Addition: 43.5%	Omission: 32.7%	Maintenance: 23.8%	Change: 0%
<b>TT3</b>	Addition: 73.7%	Omission: 12.4%	Maintenance: 10.6%	Change: 3.3%

The table shows that the use of the different translation procedures is very similar between the two *bokmål* translations compared to the *nynorsk* translation, both in terms of which translation procedures have been used the most and the least, and in terms of percentages of use for each procedure. The percentages of additions are almost identical in TT1 and TT2, while the largest difference seems to be that omission counts for more in TT1 than in TT2, while maintenance counts for more in TT2 than TT1. The most striking difference is found between the *bokmål* translations and the *nynorsk* translation, in that addition counts for so many of the translation procedures in TT3, and omission and maintenance for so few. TT3 is also the only translation that has used change as a translation procedure. These numbers will be further discussed below.

One of the main reasons for these differences between the *bokmål* translations and the *nynorsk* translation is that the *nynorsk* translator has assigned the various races and social groups within the races with different linguistic varieties that correspond to dialects or earlier spelling reforms of *nynorsk*, while the *bokmål* translations have not assigned the different races

and social groups with any specific target culture dialects or variants. Earlier forms of *nynorsk*, like the ones from 1864 used by Elves and 1901 used by high-ranking Men of Rohan and Gondor, have been used as a way of preserving the more formal and archaic language use for these races, while Wizards use modern *nynorsk*. Hobbits have been assigned a dialect close to the Hallingdal dialect, and Orcs with a mixture of different dialects, in order to preserve the low kind of non-standardness for these races. However, the analysis has shown that some of the *nynorsk* varieties are more marked than others, like the varieties of the Elves, high-ranking Men and low-ranking Hobbits. The choice of these specific varieties has not been accidental, as explained in 3.1.2, since the *nynorsk* translator wanted to make the differences between the linguistic varieties in Tolkien's work even more visible after these differences have been lessened in Tolkien's "translation" from Westron to English (Myhren, 2006, p. 14). Additionally, Myhren (2006) states that he wanted to take the evolution of Westron into consideration and connect it to the evolution of *nynorsk*, which he does using older forms of *nynorsk*, Norwegian dialects and *nynorsk*'s connections to Old Norse (p. 11). The translator argues that this made it easier to mark for archaic and dialectal use of language (Myhren, 2006, p. 11), while Agøy (2011) argues that if the *bokmål* translators had used the literary language used in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century in Norway, it would most likely have been perceived as stilted and associated with Danish (p. 36).

Since the *bokmål* translations do not seem to be using any specific target culture variants in their translation of linguistic variation, it seems that one of the tendencies found by Englund Dimitrova (2004), as presented in 2.2.1, can be true, in that if "non-codified variants in the source text are translated by non-codified TL variants, these will usually not be marked for a TL dialect, but will instead be taken from some other non-codified variety or register" (p. 134). Generally, the results suggest that the varieties in the *bokmål* translations are less marked than most of the varieties in the *nynorsk* translation, mainly due to the high amount of additions in TT3. However, the *bokmål* translators could have exploited older, more conservative forms of *bokmål*, the same way that has been done in the *nynorsk* translation, without sounding Danish. As seen in 2.2.3, this has been done by Nils Ivar Agøy, who translated *The Silmarillion* into *bokmål* in 1992. Agøy (2011) explains that he wanted to use a language style that would evoke the same reactions in Norwegian readers as Tolkien's language style did for English readers, and that other elements may have been chosen to compensate for archaic elements that are not possible or desirable to preserve in Norwegian, including phonological/orthographic, morphosyntactic and lexical markers (p. 37).

### 5.1.1 Addition

The translation procedure addition has been used the most in all TTs, with 42.8% in TT1, 43.5% in TT2 and 73.7% in TT3. As explained by Agøy (2011) above, other elements in Norwegian can be added as a way of compensating for the ST elements that are difficult to preserve in translation, and this can explain why addition has been used to such a large extent in all the TTs. Instead of using the markers from the ST, the translators might have deemed other non-standard markers to be more suitable to use in a Norwegian context to show Tolkien's different linguistic varieties, instead of keeping all the ST markers, simply because they are present in the ST. There are perhaps other markers that can show non-standardness more clearly in Norwegian, or create a similar reading reaction for Norwegian readers by using linguistic varieties with certain connotations within Norway, like the use of radical *bokmål* and older forms of *nynorsk*. The *bokmål* translations have mostly added morphosyntactic markers, which count for around 83%, while the *nynorsk* translation has mostly added phonological/orthographic markers, which count for 59.3%. Phonological/orthographic and lexical markers count for only around 7% to 10% of the non-standard markers each in TT1 and TT2, while morphosyntactic and lexical markers each count for 19% to 21% in TT3. A possible explanation for the large amounts of added morphosyntactic markers in TT1 and TT2 is that radical forms of *bokmål* are morphosyntactic features, and these have been added in the varieties of characters with a low kind of non-standardness. For characters that use a high kind of non-standardness, fronting of the possessive determiner before a noun in *bokmål* is more formal than placing the determiner after the noun, but it can be considered a weaker marker of non-standardness than markers found in the ST. Nevertheless, within an already archaic context, this type of morphosyntactic marker can be perceived as archaic. For TT3, phonological/orthographic markers have been added the most, since the older *nynorsk* forms and the dialectal forms are mainly featured with markers that signal alternative pronunciations of words. Additionally, lexical markers count for more in TT3 than in TT1 and TT2, possibly because *nynorsk* have a larger collection of words that most modern readers of *nynorsk* deem non-standard.

### 5.1.2 Omission

The second most used translation procedure in all the TTs is omission, which counts for 39.3% of the procedures in TT1, 32.7% in TT2 and 12.4% in TT3. This shows that omission has become a less used translation procedure with each new translation. A possible explanation for this is that in translation where linguistic variation is a prominent feature of an ST, the translator has to decide how important the linguistic varieties are to the overall effect of the ST (Sánchez,



1999, p. 306). Then the translator has to decide whether or not to recreate these varieties in the TT, which will influence the choice of translation strategies, and also the final textual product (Ramos Pinto, 2009, p. 289). Even though Werenskiold, the translator of the first *bokmål* translation, had the Appendices in *LOTR* available to understand Tolkien's universe and the various characters, cultures and races within this universe, they are very limited compared to the information provided in *The Silmarillion* and *Unfinished Tales of Numenor and Middle-earth*. These books were published after TT1 in 1977 and 1980, and the fact that Tolkien died in 1973, the same year as the first part of TT1 was published, could mean that Werenskiold probably did his work without much help from Tolkien himself during his last years. These books could have helped the translator understand the significance of linguistic variation in Tolkien's work (Myhren, 2007, p. 24), and according to Rosa (2012), "reduced tools available for the translator to recreate in the target text the source text's literary varieties, extra-linguistic connotations and functions" is one of the many possible constraints on the translator (p. 93). Without the additional knowledge of the other books besides *LOTR*, Werenskiold might have decided to focus on preserving other aspects of the novel, and the results found in this study show that 68.7% of the non-standard markers in the ST have been omitted in TT1 (see table 23). As mentioned earlier, this translation received a lot of criticism mainly due to some misunderstandings and misinterpretations (Myhren, 2007, p. 24), and Agøy (2011) states that the dissatisfaction triggered a retranslation of the novel (p. 32). The second *bokmål* translation by Høverstad was published in 1980 and 1981, after the publication of *The Silmarillion*, which may have led to a deeper understanding of Tolkien's universe and the characters, cultures and races within it. Furthermore, it may have led to a more consistent use of non-standard markers than in the other translation, if Høverstad decided that linguistic variation was an important part of the novel. This is suggested by the lower percentage of omissions of the ST non-standard markers in TT2 with 57.8%, as illustrated in table 23, but also the higher percentages of additions and maintained markers, as shown in table 24.

Another possible reason for the frequent use of omission as a translation procedure is that there are some linguistic features in the English language that are not as easy to recreate in Norwegian, in neither *bokmål* nor *nynorsk*. For example, the use of contractions is accepted in English and is used quite commonly, but can be considered more non-standard than their completed forms, like *will not* as *won't* or *'ll not*. It is not impossible to preserve this in Norwegian, like the use of phonological reduction, which is a phonological/orthographic marker rather than a morphosyntactic one, like *kje* for *ikkje* (*not*) and *ska 'kke* for *skal ikkje* (*shall not*). However, contractions have in most cases been omitted in the TTs. The use of

contractions can be said to be stronger markers of non-standardness in Norwegian than contractions in English, since these are used quite often in English, both in spoken and written language. These forms are only used in spoken Norwegian and are not accepted forms in written Norwegian.

There is only one phonological/orthographic marker in the ST, which has been omitted in TT2 and TT3. Other than that, all the TTs show the largest amount of omissions with morphosyntactic markers and then lexical markers, which can be explained by the fact that morphosyntactic markers count for 76.5% of the non-standard markers in the ST, while lexical markers count for 22.9%. The amounts of omissions are presented in table 25.

*Table 25: Non-standard markers in the ST and omission in the TTs*

	<b>ST</b>	<b>TT1</b>	<b>TT2</b>	<b>TT3</b>
<b>Phonological/orthographic marker</b>	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
<b>Morphosyntactic marker</b>	127	89 (70.1%)	73 (57.5%)	63 (49.6%)
<b>Lexical marker</b>	38	25 (65.8%)	22 (57.9%)	14 (36.8%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>114 (68.7%)</b>	<b>96 (57.8%)</b>	<b>78 (47%)</b>

As explained in 2.2.1, Skogmo's study (2017) found that morphosyntactic, then phonological/orthographic markers, are omitted to a larger extent than lexical markers, because these markers pose higher risks for the translation process than lexical markers, especially morphosyntactic ones (p. 232). Risks can for example be to break the ideal of fluency in the TT when there are many elements included from the ST, or that the translator can be accused of low competence (Skogmo, 2017, p. 231). With the exception of TT2 having 0.5% more omissions of lexical markers than morphosyntactic markers, morphosyntactic markers are omitted to a larger extent than lexical markers, which was also the result in Skogmo's (2017) study.

### **5.1.3 Maintenance**

Maintenance is the third most used translation procedure, which counts for 17.9% of the procedures in TT1, 23.8% in TT2 and 10.6% in TT3. One reason for maintaining non-standard markers from the ST is a possible desire to preserve Tolkien's use of linguistic variation in the translation. As explained in 2.2.3, Turner (2005) has found that Tolkien's exploitation of Germanic elements in English has made archaic language use more prominent in the ST, and since Norwegian has similar ties with Germanic languages, these Germanic elements can function the same way in Norwegian as they have in English (pp. 41-42). Such elements can include archaic lexis and morphosyntactic markers like fronting and unusual adverbial placement. The study has also shown that it is possible to maintain elements associated with a low kind of non-standardness with morphosyntactic markers like duplication of subject,

missing words and alteration in subject-verb agreement, and lexical markers like dialectal words and expressions. The amounts of maintained markers are presented in table 26.

Table 26: Non-standard markers in the ST and maintenance in the TTs

	ST	TT1	TT2	TT3
<b>Phonological/orthographic marker</b>	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Morphosyntactic marker</b>	127	38 (29.9%)	54 (42.5%)	48 (37.8%)
<b>Lexical marker</b>	38	13 (34.2%)	16 (42.1%)	19 (50%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>52 (31.3%)</b>	<b>70 (42.2%)</b>	<b>67 (40.4%)</b>

Skogmo's (2017) study found that lexical markers have a higher maintenance than the other two markers (p. 232). With the exception of the single phonological/orthographic marker maintained in TT1, and TT2 having 0.4% higher maintenance of morphosyntactic markers than lexical ones, my study show the same result, as shown in table 26. However, the differences between the percentages of maintained morphosyntactic markers and of maintained lexical markers in TT1 are not that great, and the main reason for the lower amount of maintained morphosyntactic markers in TT3 is that some morphosyntactic markers in the ST have been changed to other markers in TT3.

A possible reason for TT2 having maintained more non-standard markers than TT1, is that the second *bokmål* translation has been called a retranslation, and that it might be argued that the *bokmål* translations confirm the Retranslation hypothesis. This hypothesis claims that "first translations are more domesticating than retranslations" (Paloposki and Koskinen, 2004, p. 27). Furthermore, it claims that the first translation tends to be more assimilating and reduces the otherness of the ST, while the retranslation is a return of the ST, paying more attention to the style of the ST and maintaining the cultural distance (Paloposki and Koskinen, 2004, pp. 27-28).

#### 5.1.4 Change

Change is the least used translation procedure for TT3 and has not been used at all in TT1 and TT2. As shown in table 27, morphosyntactic markers have been changed to both of the other types of non-standard markers, while lexical markers have only been changed to phonological/orthographic markers.

Table 27: Non-standard markers in the ST and changes in TT3

	ST	TT3	Changed into
<b>Phonological/orthographic marker</b>	1	0 (0%)	
<b>Morphosyntactic marker</b>	127	16 (12.6%)	12 phonological/orthographic markers 4 lexical markers
<b>Lexical marker</b>	38	5 (13.2%)	5 phonological/orthographic markers
<b>Total</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>21 (12.7%)</b>	<b>17 phonological/orthographic markers</b> <b>4 lexical markers</b>

This translation procedure could have been used in instances where there were no exact equivalents in Norwegian, but other ways of marking for non-standardness involving the same words. An example of this is contractions, which have been categorized as morphosyntactic markers, but have been changed into cases of phonological reduction, which is a phonological/orthographic marker. Even though the non-standard markers in the ST have not been maintained exactly the same in a TT, change can still be considered a better option than omitting the markers altogether if there are other alternatives. Since most of the changes have been into phonological/orthographic markers, and this type of marker has not been used very frequently in the varieties found in TT1 and TT2, this can explain why there are no changes in these TTs. All varieties in TT3 have phonological/orthographic markers, while this is not the case with the other two TTs, so the alternatives for changes in TT1 and TT2 have been limited for that reason.

## 5.2 Standardization

Previous studies on the translation of linguistic variation, as well as Toury's law of growing standardization, have found evidence of standardization being the predominant translation strategy for the translation of linguistic variation, and therefore, it was reasonable to expect the same result in this study.

On the one hand, there is evidence of many omissions in the translations. As shown in table 25, 68.7% of the non-standard markers in the ST have been omitted in TT1, while 57.8% have been omitted in TT2 and 47% in TT3. Furthermore, the results can indicate that some characters have been more standardized than others in the different TTs, which was suggested in 4.6. As mentioned in 3.3.2, Toury warns against assuming that additions are compensations for omitted markers, since there may not be any connection between the omitted and added marker (Skogmo, 2017, pp. 65-66). Therefore, if one agrees with Toury's opinion, it would seem that TT1 and TT2 have been standardized, if standardization can be defined as the omission of more than 50% of the non-standard markers in the ST. Additionally, standardization has become a less used translation strategy with each translation, and the *bokmål* translations are more standardized than the *nynorsk* translation.

On the other hand, the results from this study seem to be very similar to Skogmo's (2017) results, in that "while the analysis shows that standardisation of marked language does occur in Norwegian literary translation, there are also many solutions which point in the other direction" (p. 236). As stated in 3.3.2, I have not used compensation as a translation procedure in the analysis, but the high amounts of additions in all TTs, and some changes in TT3, can be said to function as compensations. Additions and changes are not necessarily compensations; for example in cases where a TT has maintained all non-standard markers in the ST, they would not have been compensated for anything, but would rather have added or changed markers to mark non-standardness more prominently. Despite Toury's warning, addition and change as translation procedures could have acted as compensations for omitted markers in the ST when these were difficult to preserve in Norwegian and the translator found other ways of marking for non-standardness in the translation. If one were to follow the idea of addition and change as compensations for omitted markers, the conclusion for the standardization hypothesis for this study will be much different. If all translation procedures, except omission, are counted in total, there are 176 non-standard markers in TT1, 198 in TT2 and 552 markers in TT3, which means that the number of non-standard markers in the TTs compared to the non-standard markers in the ST has increased with 6% in TT1, 19.3% in TT2 and 232.5% in TT3. As explained in 2.2.1, addition is a translation procedure that contributes to non-standardness in a TT and therefore moves a TT away from standardization, while maintenance and change are procedures used to "resist standardization" (Skogmo, 2017, p. 228). All these translation procedures can thus be considered counterparts to omission, a procedure that moves a translation towards standardization in its elimination of non-standard markers (Skogmo, 2017, p. 228). Based on the results from this study, and the different opinions regarding the issues of standardization and compensation, it is difficult to confirm or disprove the standardization hypothesis.

## 6 Conclusion

The aim of this thesis has been to examine which translation procedures have been used to translate linguistic variation in *LOTR* into Norwegian, and to see if the results confirm the hypothesis that standardization is the predominant translation strategy for the translation of linguistic variation. The thesis has been a product-oriented, descriptive-explanatory study, and has used a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches to examine excerpts from the novel from five distinct races and two characters for each racial category, in which differences in a low and high kind of non-standardness have been observed. Three different translations were examined, two in *bokmål* and one in *nynorsk*, and the results have found that addition is the most used translation procedure in all TTs, then omission, maintenance and change. The results have also shown that 68.7% of the non-standard markers in the ST have been omitted in TT1, 57.8% in TT2 and 47% in TT3. These percentages alone can therefore indicate that standardization is the predominant translation strategy for at least TT1 and TT2, if one were to define standardization as having more than 50% omission in the translation, while TT3 is just below this amount.

The translation procedure that has been used the most in all TTs, and especially in TT3, is addition, and the high amounts of additions, as well as some degree of maintenance and change, can be said to move the TTs away from standardization, or resist standardization by transferring non-standard markers from the ST into the TTs. Addition and change can thus be said to function as compensations for the omissions. The study has found 166 non-standard markers in the character samples examined, while TT1 has 176, TT2 has 198 and TT3 has 552. This means that the number of non-standard markers has increased with 6% in TT1, 19.3% in TT2 and 232.5% in TT3, compared to the number of non-standard markers in the ST. Thus, if the translation procedures addition and change function as compensations, the standardization hypothesis can be disproved. In conclusion, there are many ways of understanding the relationship between the translation procedures, which makes it difficult to confirm or disprove the hypothesis.

The main explanations proposed for these results were the following: The *nynorsk* translator has assigned each race with a unique linguistic variety, and also for the different social groups within the races, while the *bokmål* translations seem to have used non-specific TL dialects or varieties of *bokmål*. Addition has been used to make the varieties more prominent in the TTs, or to compensate for omissions in translation. Omission has often been used in cases where non-standard markers in the ST have been difficult to preserve in translation due to differences between the English and the Norwegian language. A translator might have

considered other aspects of the ST as more important to preserve in translation, and therefore have chosen not to include that much non-standardness in TT, or the translator might not have been aware of the significance of linguistic variation for the characterization of the races and characters in *LOTR* without additional knowledge of Tolkien's universe. Since there is a connection between the English and the Norwegian language through their roots in Germanic languages, some of the non-standard markers have been possible to maintain in the TTs. Additionally, since TT2 has been called a retranslation of the first TT, it can be argued that the Retranslation Hypothesis has been confirmed in this case. For change as a translation procedure, there can have been markers of non-standardness in the ST that did not have any exact equivalents in Norwegian, and that this has caused the translator to find alternative ways of transferring the non-standard markers in the TT.

### **6.1 Suggestions for further research**

There have been several studies on the translation of linguistic variation, as seen in 2.2.1, and most of these have been translations of English STs to TTs in languages like German, Spanish, Finnish, French, Portuguese and Chinese. As stated by Skogmo (2017), there is limited research on translation of linguistic variation into Norwegian (p. 3), which is one of the reasons why she chose to study marked language in literary translation. This thesis has been an attempt to provide additional empirical data on the topic of translation into Norwegian, including both *bokmål* and *nynorsk*. However, the study has been somewhat limited in scope due to space limitations, and therefore, more studies on this topic would be useful. It would also be interesting to study more translations into *nynorsk*, since most translations into Norwegian are in *bokmål*. With the exception of the few studies addressed in this thesis, there has been very little research done on the problems of translating Tolkien, as well as “the translation of fictional texts which use archaism as a part of their literary design” (Turner, 2005, p. 68). Furthermore, since linguistic variation has an important function in literature, it would be interesting to examine how the selection of translation procedures, and if so, standardization, may affect the characterization of the different characters, social groups and races within Tolkien's universe.

## Bibliography

- Agøy, N. I. (2011). A Question of Style – On Translating *The Silmarillion* into Norwegian. In T. Honegger (Ed.), *Tolkien in Translation* (2nd ed., pp. 31-43). Zurich and Jena: Walking Tree Publishers.
- Bayona, S. (2011). *Begging your pardon, Con el perdón de usted: Some Socio-Linguistic Features in The Lord of the Rings in English and Spanish*. In T. Honegger (Ed.), *Tolkien in Translation* (2nd ed., pp. 69-90). Zurich and Jena: Walking Tree Publishers.
- Bokmålsordboka. Språkrådet and Universitetet i Bergen. Last retrieved May 8, 2018 from <https://ordbok.uib.no/>
- Brunstad, E. (2011). Arkaismar i nynorsken. *Det Kongelige Norske Videnskabers Selskabs Skrifter*, (1), 137-160.
- Carpenter, H. (2016). *J. R. R. Tolkien – A Biography*. London: HarperCollinsPublishers.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (5th ed.). Malden (MA), Oxford, Melbourne & Berlin: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Dictionary.com. Dictionary.com, LLC. Last retrieved May 8, 2018 from <http://www.dictionary.com/>
- Englund Dimitrova, B. (2004). Orality, literacy, reproduction of discourse and the translation of dialect. In I. Helin (Ed.), *Dialektübersetzung und Dialekte im Multimedia* (121-139). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic. The social interpretation of language and meaning*. London: Edward Arnold(Publishers) Ltd.
- Hammond, W. G. & Scull, C. (2014). *The Lord of the Rings – A Reader’s Companion*. London: HarperCollinsPublishers.
- Herrera, J. M. R. (2014). The Reverse Side of Mark Twain’s Brocade: The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn and the translation of dialect. *European Journal of English Studies*, 18(3), 278-294.
- Hodson, J. (2014). *Dialect in Film and Literature*. Hampshire and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Honegger, T. (2011). The Westron Turned into Modern English: The Translator and Tolkien’s Web of Languages. In T. Honegger (Ed.), *Translating Tolkien: Text and Film* (2nd ed., pp. 1-18). Zurich and Jena: Walking Tree Publishers.
- Horton, D. (1998). Non-standard Language in Translation: Roddy goes to Germany. *German Life and Letters*, 51(3), 415-430.
- Johannes H. Bergs Minnefond. (n.d.). Vinnere av Johannes H. Bergs minnepris. Retrieved May 1, 2018 from <http://jhb-minnefond.blogspot.no/p/vinnere-av-johannes-h-bergs-minnepris.html>
- Johannesson, N. (1997). The Speech of the Individual and of the Community in The Lord of the Rings. In P. Buchs & T. Honegger (Eds.), *News from the Shire and Beyond - Studies on Tolkien* (11-47). Zurich: Walking Tree Publishers.
- Leppihalme, R. (2000). The Two Faces of Standardization. *The Translator*, 6(2), 247-269.
- Lopes Cavalheiro, L. (2008). Linguistic Variation in subtitling for audiovisual media in Portugal: Case study of the film *Gone with the Wind*. *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series – Themes in Translation Studies*, (7), 17-27.



- Määttä, S. K. (2004). Dialect and point of view: The ideology of translation in *The sound and the fury* in French. *Target*, 16(2), 319-339.
- Myhren, E. G. (2006). Merknader frå omsetjar. In J. R. R. Tolkien, *Ringdrotten* (pp. 11-17). Oslo: Tiden Norsk Forlag.
- Myhren, E. G. (2007). Ringdrotten og norsk språk. *Språknytt*, (3), 24-26.
- Nagel, R. (2011). "The New One Wants to Assimilate the Alien" – Different Interpretations of a Source Text as a Reason for Controversy: The 'Old' and the 'New' German Translation of *The Lord of the Rings*. In T. Honegger (Ed.), *Translating Tolkien: Text and Film* (2nd ed., pp. 19-47). Zurich and Jena: Walking Tree Publishers.
- Noel, R. S. (1980). *The Languages of Tolkien's Middle-earth*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Noregs Mållag. (2007). Nynorsk litteraturpris 2006 til Eilev Groven Myhren. Retrieved May 1, 2018 from <http://www.nm.no/tekst.cfm?id=2290>
- Nynorskordboka. Språkrådet and Universitetet i Bergen. Last retrieved May 8, 2018 from <https://ordbok.uib.no/>
- Oxford English Dictionary. Oxford University Press. Last retrieved May 8, 2018 from <http://www.oed.com/>
- Paloposki, O. & Koskinen, K. (2004). A thousand and one translations. Revisiting retranslation. In G. Hansen, K. Malmkjær & D. Gile (Eds.), *Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies: Selected Contributions from the EST Congress, Copenhagen 2001* (pp. 27-38). Philadelphia, PA, USA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ramos Pinto, S. (2009). How important is the way you say it? A discussion on the translation of linguistic varieties. *Target*, 21 (2), 289-307.
- Reitan, K. (1999). Radikal bokmål i norsk presse. Retrieved May 1, 2018 from [http://www.sprakradet.no/Vi-og-vart/Publikasjoner/Spraaknytt/Arkivet/Spraaknytt\\_1999/Spraaknytt\\_1999\\_2/Radikalt\\_bokmaal\\_i\\_norsk\\_pres/](http://www.sprakradet.no/Vi-og-vart/Publikasjoner/Spraaknytt/Arkivet/Spraaknytt_1999/Spraaknytt_1999_2/Radikalt_bokmaal_i_norsk_pres/)
- Riksmålsforbundet. (2016). Kapittel 8 Pronomener. Retrieved May 1, 2018 from <https://www.riksmalsforbundet.no/grammatikk/kapittel-8-pronomener/3/>
- Rosa, A. A. (2012). Translating Place: Linguistic Variation in Translation. *Word and Text, A Journal of Literary Studies and Linguistics*, 2(2), 75-97.
- Rosa, A. A. (2015). Translating orality, recreating otherness. *Translation Studies* 8(2), 209-225.
- Rosa, A. A., Falcão, L., Mouta, R., Sengo, S. V. & Botas, T. (2011). Luso-Canadian Exchanges in Translation Studies: Translating Linguistic Variation. *Revista Anglo Saxonica*, 3(2), 41-68.
- Saldanha G. & O'Brien, S. (2013). *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies*. Abingdon(Oxon) & New York: Routledge.
- Sánchez, M. T. (1999). Translation as a(n) (Im)possible Task: Dialect in Literature. *Babel*, 45(4), 301-310.
- Shippey, T. (2001). *J. R. R. Tolkien: Author of the Century*. London: HarperCollinsPublishers.

- Simpson, J. M. Y. (2001). Language. In R. Mesthrie (Ed.), *Concise Encyclopedia of Sociolinguistics* (pp. 31-34). Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Skogmo, S. F. (2017). *Marked language in literary translation - Mapping challenges and solutions in five English novels and their Norwegian translations* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Oslo.
- Språkrådet. (n.d.). Nynorsk. Retrieved May 2, 2018 from <http://www.sprakradet.no/Sprakavare/Norsk/Nynorsk/>
- Swan, M. (2005). *Practical English Usage* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swann, J., Deumert, A., Lillis T. & Mesthrie, R. (2004). *A Dictionary of Sociolinguistics*. Tuscaloosa (Alabama) & Edinburgh: The University of Alabama Press & Edinburgh University Press.
- Tolkien, J. R. R. (1954/1973). *De Sorte Rytterne. Første del av Krigen om Ringen* (N. Werenskiold, Trans.). Oslo: Tiden Norsk Forlag.
- Tolkien, J. R. R. (1954/1974). *De To Tårnene. Annen del av Krigen om Ringen* (N. Werenskiold, Trans.). Oslo: Tiden Norsk Forlag.
- Tolkien, J. R. R. (1954/2002). *To tårn. Andre del av Ringenes Herre* (6th ed.) (T. B. Høverstad, Trans.). Oslo: Tiden Norsk Forlag.
- Tolkien, J. R. R. (1954a/2011). *Ringens brorskap. Første del av Ringenes Herre* (6th ed.) (T. B. Høverstad, Trans.). Oslo: Tiden Norsk Forlag.
- Tolkien, J. R. R. (1954b/2011). *The Fellowship of the Ring. Being the first part of The Lord of the Rings*. London: HarperCollinsPublishers.
- Tolkien, J. R. R. (1954c/2011). *The Two Towers. Being the second part of The Lord of the Rings*. London: HarperCollinsPublishers.
- Tolkien, J. R. R. (1954, 1955/2006). *Ringdrotten* (E. G. Myhren, Trans.). Oslo: Tiden Norsk Forlag.
- Tolkien, J. R. R. (1955/1975). *Kongen Kommer Tilbake. Tredje del av Krigen om Ringen* (N. Werenskiold, Trans.). Oslo: Tiden Norsk Forlag.
- Tolkien, J. R. R. (1955a/2011). *Atter en konge. Tredje del av Ringenes Herre* (6th ed.) (T. B. Høverstad, Trans.). Oslo: Tiden Norsk Forlag.
- Tolkien, J. R. R. (1955b/2011). *The Return of the King. Being the third part of The Lord of the Rings*. London: HarperCollinsPublishers.
- Tolkien, J. R. R., Carpenter, H. & Tolkien, C. (2006). *The Letters of J. R. R. Tolkien*. London: HarperCollinsPublishers.
- Tolkien, J. R. R. & Tolkien, C. (1977/2006). *The Silmarillion*. London: HarperCollinsPublishers.
- Tolkien, J. R. R. & Tolkien, C. (1980/2006). *Unfinished Tales of Númenor and Middle-earth*. London: HarperCollinsPublishers.
- Toury, G. (2012). *Descriptive Translation Studies – and beyond* (Rev. ed.). Amsterdam & Philadelphia (PA): John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Turner, A. (2005). *Translating Tolkien: Philological Elements in The Lord of the Rings*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH, Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften.
- Vink, R. (2008). In de Ban van De Ring - Old and New Fashions of a Translation. *Lembas Extra: Proceedings of the 5<sup>th</sup> Unquendor Lustrum, Baarlo, 9-11 June 2006*, 26-41.

- Wales, K. (1994). Archaism. In R. E. Asher & J. M. Y. Simpson (Eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. Volume 1* (p. 206). Oxford, New York, Seoul & Tokyo: Pergamon Press Ltd.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2010). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (6th ed.). Malden (MA), Oxford & Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Yu, J. (2017). Translating “others” as “us” in *Huckleberry Finn*: dialect, register and the heterogeneity of standard language. *Language and Literature*, 26(1), 54-65.

## Appendix A: Complete analysis of the character samples

Key	
Word	Phonological/orthographic marker
Word	Morphosyntactic marker
Word	Lexical marker
Word	A word is marked in two or three colors if it belongs to more than one nonstandard marker
Word	A word that has two of the same non-standard marker (for example two morphosyntactic markers)
word	Missing word
Word	Missing part of the word
..	Between turns (Other characters speaking)
(A)	Addition
(M)	Maintenance
(C)	Change
(O)	Omission

**Character:** Hamfast “Gaffer” Gamgee

**Race:** Hobbit

**Rank:** Low

**Speaking with:** Old Noakes, Daddy Twofoot and Sandyman (Hobbits)

<b>ST</b> <b>English</b> (Tolkien, 1954-1955)	<b>TT1</b> <b>Bokmål</b> (Werenskiold, 1973-1975)	<b>TT2</b> <b>Bokmål</b> (Høverstad, 1980-1981)	<b>TT3</b> <b>Nynorsk</b> (Myhren, 2006)
<p>A very nice well-spoken gentlehobbit is Mr. Bilbo, as I've always said.</p> <p>..</p> <p>You're right, Dad! Not that the Brandybucks of Buckland live in the Old Forest; but they're a queer breed, seemingly. They fool about with boats on that big river – and that isn't natural. Small wonder that trouble came of it, I say. But be that as it may, Mr. Frodo is as nice a young hobbit as you could wish to meet. Very much like Mr. Bilbo, and in more than looks. After all his father was a Baggins.</p> <p>A decent respectable hobbit was Mr. Drogo Baggins; there was never much to tell of him, till he was drowned.</p> <p>..</p>	<p>For en fin og gentil gentlehobbit (M, A) Bilbo er, det har jeg(O) alltid ment og sagt.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Det er(O) riktig det(A). Ikke sånn å forstå at Vinbukkene bor inne i selve skauen(A) men de er(O) noen underlige typer, ser det ut til. De leiker(A) seg i småbåter på den svære elva(A) – og sånt gjør man ikke(O).</p> <p>Det er nødt å gå gærmt det(A, A, A, O)</p> <p>Men det får nå være som det være vil(A), det fins ikke en bedre hobbit blant ungdommen(O) enn Frodo. Han er nesten som Bilbo sjæl(A), han(A) ligner ham ikke bare av utseende. Når alt kommer til alt, var far(A) hans en Sekker. Drogo Sekker var en real hobbit(O) og en ærlig sjel som</p>	<p>Han er riktig(A) en fin hobbitherre(O), herr Bilbo(A), det har jeg(O) alltid sagt.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Det har du(O) rett i, Fatter(A)! Ikke for det at Brennibukkene til Bukkenland bor i selve Gammelskogen; men et underlig slag(A) skal de være(O), ja. De tuller rundt med båter på den svære elva(A) – og sånt er ikke(O) naturlig. Ikke rart det ble sorger av det, sier nå jeg(M). Men enten det er sånn eller slik, herr Frodo er så kjekk en unghobbit(M) som en kunne ønske seg. Temmelig lik herr Bilbo, og ikke bare på utsida(A). Far(A) hans var jo en Lommelun, iallfall.</p> <p>En skikkelig, respektabel hobbit(M), det(A) var herr Drogo Lommelun; det var aldri</p>	<p>Ein sær s finsle og ordhag herrehobbit(M, A) er herr Bilbo, som e(A) stødt(A) ha(M) sagt.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Det ha(M) du rett i, far! Ikkji(A) at Brennibukkadn(A) i Bukkland bu(A) i sjølve Gamalskogje(A); men dei era(C) eit sært slag, må tru. Dei surre ikring med båta(A) på dei(A) digre elven(A)– og det er kji(C) som det ska(A) vera(A). Ikkji(A) å undrast på at det gjekk gale, si e. (M, A, A). Men det får vera(A) som det vil. Herr Frodo er so fin ein unghobbit(M) som de kunne ynskt dikka(A). Svært lik herr Bilbo, ikkji(A) berre å sjå te(A).Ialffall va(A) far(A) hass(A) ein Skrepping.</p> <p>Ein traust og vyrdeleg hobbit (M, A, A) va(A) herr Drogo Skrepping; de(A) var kji(A) mykji(A) å si(A) um'n(A)</p>

<p>Well, so they say. You see: <b>Mr. Drogo, he</b> married poor Miss Primula Brandybuck. She was our Mr. Bilbo's first cousin on the mother's side (her mother being the youngest of the Old Took's daughters); and Mr. Drogo was his second cousin. So Mr. Frodo is his first <i>and</i> second cousin, once removed either way, as the saying is, if you follow me. And Mr. Drogo was staying at Brandy Hall with his father-in-law, old Master Gorbado, as he often did after his marriage (him being partial to his <b>vittles</b>, and old Gorbado keeping a mighty generous table); and he went out <i>boating</i> on the Brandywine River; and he and his wife <b>were drowned</b>, and poor Mr. Frodo only a child <b>and all</b>.</p> <p>..</p> <p>You <b>shouldn't</b> listen to all you hear, Sandyman. There <b>isn't no</b> call to go talking of pushing and pulling. Boats are quite tricky enough for those <b>that</b> sit still without looking further for the cause of trouble. Anyway: <b>there</b></p>	<p>ingen hadde noe å si på før(O) han gikk bort og <b>drukna</b>(M).</p> <p>..</p> <p>Ja, det sies så. Dere skjønner at Drogo(O) <b>gifta</b>(A) seg med stakkars Primula Vinbukk. Hun er kusine av Bilbo på morssiden, i og med at <b>mor</b> (A) hennes var den yngste av døtrene til Gamle Token. <b>Drogo var og besøkte</b>(A) svigerforeldrene i Vinhall, <b>han</b>(A) gjorde ofte det etter at han <b>gifta</b>(A) seg. Gorbado duket opp skal jeg love dere(O), og Drogo var ikke den som <b>spytta i matfattet</b>(A, A). Så var det en dag at han og <b>kona</b>(A) drog ut i båt på <b>elva</b>(A), og både <b>han og kona</b> (A) <b>blei</b> (A) der <b>de</b>. (O, A) Stakkars Frodo var bare barnet da(O).</p> <p>..</p> <p>Du skal ikke(O) <b>tru</b>(A) alt du hører.</p> <p>Det tjener ikke(O) til noe å gå rundt og <b>slarve</b>(A) om å puffe og trekke. En båt er farlig nok selv om(O) du sitter helt musestille i den, det er ingen grunn til å gjøre det verre enn det er. Altså: Frodo(O) hadde <b>mista</b>(A) både</p>	<p>mye å si på han, helt til(O) han <b>drukna</b>(M), da.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Ja, så sier de, i hvert fall. Det har seg sånn at <b>herr Drogo, han</b>(M) <b>gifta</b>(A) seg med frøken Primula Brennibukk, stakkar. Hun var <b>kusina</b>(A) til herr Bilbo på <b>morssida</b>(A) (<b>mor</b> (A) hennes var den yngste av døtrene til Gammel-Tóken), og herr Drogo var tremenningen hans. Så herr Frodo er både <b>tremenning</b> (A) og firmenningen hans, om dere skjønner. Og herr Drogo var på besøk i Brennihaug hos <b>svigerfar</b> (A) sin, gamle herr Gorbado; han var ofte det, etter at han <b>gifta</b>(A) seg (for han var glad i god mat(O), og gamle Gorbado var ikke den som sparte på kosten); og så gikk han ut i <i>båt</i> på Brennina, og han og <b>kona</b>(A) <b>drukna</b>(M), og stakkars herr Frodo bare ungen <b>og alt</b>(M).</p> <p>..</p> <p><b>Du</b> skulle ikke(O) høre på alt du hører, <b>du</b>(A), Sandemann. Det er ikke(O) godt for noe å gå rundt og prate om dytting og trekking <b>og slikt</b>(A). Det er ille nok med</p>	<p>før(O) han gjekk i vatnet og <b>bleiv</b>(C).</p> <p>..</p> <p>Vel, dei <b>si</b>(A) so. De <b>skjøna</b> (A): <b>Herr Drogo, han</b>(M) ekta arme frøken Primula Brennibukke. Ho <b>va</b>(A) vår herr Bilbo sitt <b>syskinbådn</b>(A) på <b>morssidun</b>(A) (<b>mor</b> (A) <b>henna</b>(A) <b>va</b>(A) yngste <b>døtte</b>(A) åt <b>Gamal-Tókje</b> (A)), og herr Drogo <b>va</b>(A) tremenningen <b>hass</b>(A). Slik er herr Frodo tremenningen og firemenningen <b>hass</b>(A) – ein på <b>kor</b>(A) kant, som dei <b>sea</b>(A), <b>um</b>(A) de <b>hange</b>(A) med. Og herr Drogo heldt til i Brennhol med <b>verfar</b> (A, A) <b>sino</b>(A), gamle meister Gorbado, som han <b>ofto</b>(A) gjorde etter at han gifte <b>se</b>(A) (han var sær <b>mathuga</b>(M), og gamle Gorbado heldt eit stort og raust gjestebod). Han fór ut i båt på Brennevine, og han og <b>kjeringje</b>(A) <b>hass</b>(A) <b>bleiv</b>(C), og arme herr Frodo <b>va</b>(A) berre <b>gutungen</b>(A) <b>og alt</b>(M).</p> <p>..</p>
---	---	--	--

<p>was this Mr. Frodo left an orphan and stranded, as you might say, among those queer Bucklanders, being brought up anyhow in Brandy Hall. A regular warren, by all accounts. Old Master Gorbodoc never had fewer than a couple of hundred relations in the place. Mr. Bilbo never did a kinder deed than when he brought the lad back to live among decent people.</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954b/2011, pp. 22-23)</p> <p>21 sentences</p>	<p>far og mor, dere må gjerne si(M) at han var stranda(A) der hos alle disse merkelige folka(A) i Vinbukkland, ja, så vokste han(A) opp der i Vinhall. Litt av et reir(M), det sier alle. Gamle Gorbodoc hadde aldri færre enn et par hundre slektninger boende hos seg. Bilbo har aldri gjort en bedre gjerning enn da han henta(A) guttungen(M) tilbake og lot ham få bo hos seg.</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954/1973, pp. 32-34)</p> <p>23 sentences)</p>	<p>båter for sånne som(O) sitter still(A), om en ikke skal lete lenger etter grunner til ulykka(A). Men i hvert i(A) fall, der(M) satt nå denne herr Frodo og var foreldreløs og havarert, kunne en kalle det(M), mellom disse underlige bukkendingene, og ble oppdratt så som så i Brennihaug. Det skal visst være litt av et hi(M), om en skal tro det en hører. Gamle herr Gorbodok hadde visstnok aldri mindre enn noen hundre slektninger der samtidig. Aldri(A) har herr Bilbo gjort en bedre gjerning enn da han tok med seg guttungen(M) hjem, så han fikk bo blant skikkelige folk.</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954a/2011, pp. 30-31)</p> <p>21 sentences</p>	<p>Du skulde(A) kji(C) lyde(A) på alt du høyre(A), Sandemann. Det gagna kji(C) noko å slarve(A) om dytting og trekkjing(A). Båta(A) era(A) range(A) nok åt dei som(O) sita(A) i ro um(A) ein ikkji(A) ska(A) gå lenger på leit ette(A) grunna(A) til ulukka. Nok um(A) det. Der(M) var denne herr Frodo etterlaten som burtsett(A) og stranda, kunne ein si(M, A), uppi(A) alle dessa(A) rare bukkendingo(A), og han vart fostra so som so i Brennhol. Eit skikkeleg bøle(M), ette(A) det dei sea(A). Gamle meister Gorbodok hadde alder(A) mindre enn eit par hundre skyldfolk(A) der samstundes. Herr Bilbo gjorde aldri ei bære(A) gjerning enn då han tok gutungen(M) attende te(A) (A) bu i lag med sedelege(A) folk.</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954, 1955/2006, pp. 42-43)</p> <p>24 sentences</p>
--	---	--	---

**Character:** Meriadoc “Merry” Brandybuck  
**Race:** Hobbit  
**Rank:** High  
**Speaking with:** Frodo and Pippin (Hobbits)

<b>ST</b> <b>English</b> <b>(Tolkien, 1954-1955)</b>	<b>TT1</b> <i>Bokmål</i> <b>(Werenskiold, 1973-1975)</b>	<b>TT2</b> <i>Bokmål</i> <b>(Høverstad, 1980-1981)</b>	<b>TT3</b> <i>Nynorsk</i> <b>(Myhren, 2006)</b>
<p><b>We'll</b> clear up later. Now tell me all about it! I guess that you have been having adventures, which was not quite fair without me. I want a full account; and most of all I want to know what was the matter with old Maggot, and why he spoke to me like that. He sounded almost as if he was <i>scared</i>, if that is possible.</p> <p>..</p> <p>And what are they?</p> <p>...</p> <p>I should think you were making it all up if I had not seen that black shape on the landing-stage – and heard the queer sound in Maggot's voice. What do you make of it all, Frodo?</p> <p>..</p> <p>Old Maggot is a shrewd fellow. A lot goes on behind his round face that does not come out in his talk. <b>I've</b> heard that he used to go into the Old Forest at one</p>	<p>Vi(O) venter med oppvasken! Fortell alt fra begynnelsen. Jeg tenker nok dere har opplevd mye underveis mens jeg måtte skramle på <b>flyttevogna</b>(A). Dere må ikke hoppe over den minste ting. Hva gikk det av gamle Maggot for eksempel? Snakke til meg på den måten. Det var akkurat som om han var redd for noe. Jeg trodde ikke han var så skvetten av seg.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Sorte Ryttere?</p> <p>..</p> <p>Det virker som dere har diktet det opp! Men jeg så jo den svarte skikkelsen på <b>kaia</b>(A)– og hørte den underlige låten i stemmen til Maggot. Hva kan det være for noe, Frodo?</p> <p>..</p> <p>Gamle Maggot er ikke dum. Han har flere tanker i hodet enn han gir uttrykk for. Jeg har(O) hørt</p>	<p><b>Rydde opp</b>(A) kan vi(O) gjøre etterpå. Fortell meg nå alt sammen! Jeg kan gjette meg til at dere har opplevd eventyr, og det var ikke helt pent uten meg. Jeg vil ha alle enkeltheter; og først og fremst vil jeg vite hva som var i veien med gamle Åmeng, og hvorfor han snakket til meg på den måten. Det lød nesten som om han var <i>redd</i>, om en skulle tenke seg noe slikt.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Hva er det for slags?</p> <p>..</p> <p>Jeg hadde nesten trodd dere diktet i hop alt sammen om jeg ikke hadde sett den svarte skikkelsen på <b>brygga</b>(A)– og hørt den underlige klangen i stemmen til Åmeng. Hva får du ut av dette, Frodo?</p> <p>..</p> <p>Gamle Åmeng er en klok kar. Det går for seg mye bak det</p>	<p>Me(O) ryddar opp <b>seinar</b>(A). Fortel meg alt no! Eg trur nok de har opplevd eitt og anna, og det var urettvist at ikkje eg fekk <b>vera</b>(A) med. Eg vil ha full rekneskap, og eg er sær <b>huga</b>(A) på å få vita <b>ko</b>(A) som var i vegen med gamle Ravle, og <b>kofor</b>(A) han tala slik til meg. Han let nesten som han var <b>skræmd</b>(A), om slikt er mogleg.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Og <b>ko</b>(A) <b>e</b>(A) dei?</p> <p>..</p> <p>Eg ville ha trutt at de fann på alt ihop var det ikkje for den svarte skapnaden på bryggja – og den rare tonen i røysta <b>hass</b>(A) Ravle. <b>Ko</b>(A) får du ut av alt dette, Frodo?</p> <p>..</p> <p>Gamle Ravle er ein skarping. Det hender mykje bak det runde <b>andletet</b>(A) som ikkje kjem fram i orda hans. Eg har(O) høyrte at</p>



<p>time, and he has the reputation of knowing a good many strange things. But you can at least tell us, Frodo, whether you think his guess <span style="background-color: #90EE90;"> </span> good or bad.</p> <p>..</p> <p>I think I could help you by telling you some of it myself.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Just this, my dear old Frodo: you are miserable, because you <span style="background-color: #90EE90;">don't</span> know how to say good-bye. You meant to leave the Shire, of course. But danger has come on you sooner than you expected, and now you are making up your mind to go at once. And you <span style="background-color: #90EE90;">don't</span> want to. We are very sorry for you.</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954b/2011, pp. 102-103)</p> <p>18 sentences,</p>	<p>at han ofte streifet om i Gamleskogen før, og han er kjent for å ha kunnskaper om mange rare ting. Frodo, du kan da i det minste fortelle oss om han har(O) gjettet riktig.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Jeg kunne <span style="background-color: #FF00FF;">saktens</span>(A) hjelpe deg på vei. Jeg kunne jo begynne med å fortelle det lille jeg vet.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Ikke annet enn at du føler deg nedfor, min gode Frodo. Du skjønner ikke(O) hvordan du skal få sagt adjø til oss. Du har tenkt å forlate Fylket, det vet jeg. Men farene truet deg før du hadde regnet med, og nå haster det for deg med å komme videre. I grunnen har du ikke(O) lyst. Vi synes synd på deg.</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954/1973, pp. 123-124)</p> <p>24 sentences</p>	<p>runde fjeset hans som ikke kommer frem i det han sier. Jeg har(O) hørt at han hadde det med å gå inn i Gammelskogen før i tiden, og han har ord på seg for å kjenne til mange underlige ting. Men Frodo, du kan i hvert fall fortelle oss om du mener han har(O) gjettet riktig eller dårlig.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Jeg tror jeg kunne hjelpe deg ved å fortelle litt av det selv.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Ikke noe annet enn dette, kjære, gamle Frodo: du har det ille, fordi du ikke(O) vet hvordan du får sagt far vel. Du hadde planlagt å dra fra Hobsyssel, det er opplagt. Men faren har innhentet deg før du ventet det, og nå er du i ferd med å bestemme deg for å dra med det samme. Og det har du ikke(O) lyst til. Vi synes synd på deg, alle sammen.</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954a/2011, pp. 106-107)</p> <p>18 sentences</p>	<p>han <span style="background-color: #FF00FF;">pla</span>(A) gå inn i Gamalskogen før i tida, og han har ord på seg for å kjenne til <span style="background-color: #FF00FF;">mangt</span>(A) underleg. Men i det minste kan du <span style="background-color: #FFFF00;">sea</span>(A) oss, Frodo, om han <span style="background-color: #90EE90;"> </span>(M) <span style="background-color: #FF00FF;">gissa</span>(A) godt eller <span style="background-color: #FF00FF;">låkt</span>(A).</p> <p>..</p> <p>Eg trur eg kunna hjelpe deg ved å <span style="background-color: #90EE90;">seia</span>(A) noko <span style="background-color: #FFFF00;">tå</span>(A) det sjølv.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Berre dette, kjære, gamle Frodo min: Du er ulukkeleg, fordi du ikkje(O) veit <span style="background-color: #FFFF00;">koss</span>(A) du skal få sagt farvel. Du tenkte å reise frå Heradet, sjølvsgagt. Men faren er over deg før du venta det, og no <span style="background-color: #FF00FF;">eslar</span>(A) du deg til å reise på staden. Og det vil du ikkje(O). Me tykkjer særst synd i deg.</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954, 1955/2006, p. 114)</p> <p>18 sentences</p>
---	---	--	--

**Character:** Haldir

**Race:** Elf

**Rank:** Low

**Speaking with:** The Fellowship of the Ring (Hobbits, Men, Dwarf, Elf and Wizard)

<b>ST</b> <b>English</b> <b>(Tolkien, 1954-1955)</b>	<b>TT1</b> <b>Bokmål</b> <b>(Werenskiold, 1973-1975)</b>	<b>TT2</b> <b>Bokmål</b> <b>(Høverstad, 1980-1981)</b>	<b>TT3</b> <b>Nynorsk</b> <b>(Myhren, 2006)</b>
<p>Welcome! We seldom use any tongue but our own; for we <b> dwell now </b> in the heart of the forest, and do not willingly have dealings with any other folk. Even our own kindred in the North are <b> sundered </b> from us. But there are some of us <b> still </b> who go abroad for <b> the gathering of news and the watching of our enemies </b>, and they speak the languages of other lands. I am one. <b> Haldir </b> is my name. My brothers, Rúmil and Orophin, speak little of your tongue. But we have heard <b> rumours of your coming </b>, for the messengers of Elrond passed by Lórien on their way up the Dimrill Stair. We had not heard of – hobbits, of halflings, for <b> many </b> a long year, and did not know that any yet <b> dwelt </b> in Middle-earth. You do not look evil! And since you come with</p>	<p>Velkommen. Vi bruker sjelden annet enn vårt eget språk. Vi bor <b>(O, O)</b> i hjertet av skogen og har ikke gjerne noe med andre folk å gjøre. Selv våre egne slektninger i nord er skilt <b>(O)</b> fra oss. Men <b> ennå </b>(A) er det <b> noen </b> av oss <b>(O)</b> som reiser utenlands for å spørre <b> ___ </b>(A) nytt <b>(O)</b> og holde oss underrettet om fiendens bevegelser <b>(O)</b>, <b> noen </b>(A) som snakker fremmede språk. Jeg er en av dem. <b> Haldir </b>(M) heter jeg. <b> Mine to brødre </b>(A), Rúmil og Orophin, snakker dårlig utenlandsk. Vi hørte at dere kanskje ville komme <b>(O)</b> <b> her </b>(A) forbi. Elronds budbringere kom forbi Lórien på hjemveien opp Dimrillstigen. Vi hadde ikke hørt om hobbitter, om halvinger, på mange <b>(O)</b> år, og visste ikke at de stadig bodde <b>(O)</b> i Midgard. Dere ser ikke onde ut! Og siden dere kommer sammen med en</p>	<p>Velkommen! Det er sjelden vi bruker andre tungemål enn vårt eget; for <b> nå </b>(A) bor <b>(O, O)</b> vi i hjertet av skogen og har ikke frivillig med andre folk å gjøre. Selv våre egne frender i nord er blitt fjerne <b>(O)</b> for oss. Men <b> noen blant oss </b>(A) er det <b> fremdeles </b>(M) som vandrer ut etter nytt <b>(O)</b>, eller for å holde øye med fiendene våre <b>(O)</b>; og de snakker andre lands språk. Jeg er en av dem. <b> Haldir </b>(M) er navnet mitt. Brødrene mine, Rúmil og Orophin, snakker lite av <b> deres mål </b>(A). Men vi har hørt rykter om at dere var på vei <b>(O)</b>, for Elronds sendebud <b> fór </b>(A) gjennom Lórien på hjemveien, og opp Dimrennstigen. Vi hadde ikke hørt noe om – hobbitter, om halvinger, på <b> mangt </b>(M, A) et langt år, og <b> ikke </b>(A) visste vi at det bodde <b>(O)</b> slike i Midgard ennå. <b> Onde </b>(A) ser dere ikke ut!</p>	<p>Ver velkomne! <b> Sjeldan </b>(A) <b> nytta </b>(A) me andre mål her enn vårt <b> eget </b>(A); <b> no </b>(A) bur <b>(O, O)</b> me i hjarta av skogen, og <b> samrøda </b>(A) ikkje <b> viljugt </b>(A, A) med andre <b> folkeferd </b>(A). <b> Jamvel </b>(A) <b> ætti </b>(A) vår i nordre <b> lond </b>(A) er skild <b>(O)</b> frå oss. Men <b> enno </b>(A) er der <b> sume </b>(A) av oss <b>(O)</b> som <b> fara </b>(A) vide på leit etter nytt <b>(O)</b> og til <b> vaka yver fiendane våre </b>(M, A, A), og dei <b> tala </b>(A) andre <b> lands </b>(A) tungemål. Eg er ein av <b> deim </b>(A). <b> Haldir </b>(M) er namnet mitt. <b> Brøderne </b>(A) mine, Rúmil og Orophin, <b> tala </b>(A) ikkje stort av dykkar målføre. Me <b> hava </b>(A) <b> høyrte gjete </b>(C) at de <b> voro </b>(A) på veg, <b> av di </b>(A) bodberarane til Elrond <b> fóro </b>(A) langsmed Lórien på vegen sin <b> upp </b>(A) Dimrennstigen. Men me <b> havde </b>(A) ikkje <b> høyrte gjete </b>(A) –</p>

<p>an Elf of our kindred, we are willing to befriend you, as Elrond asked; though it is not our custom to lead strangers through our land. But you must stay here tonight. How many are you?</p> <p>..</p> <p>The name of Aragorn son of Arathorn is known in Lórien, and he has the favour of the Lady. All <b>then</b> is well. But you have yet spoken <b>only</b> of seven.</p> <p>..</p> <p>A dwarf! That is not well. We have not had dealings with the Dwarves since the Dark Days. They are not permitted in our land. I cannot allow him to pass.</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954b/2011, p.343)</p> <p>21 sentences</p>	<p>alv av vår egen ætt, er vi villige til å gi dere <b>vårt vennskap</b>(A), som Elrond bad oss. Skjønt det er <b>nå</b>(A) ikke <b>vår skikk</b>(A) å la fremmede få dra gjennom landet vårt. Men i natt må dere bli her. Hvor mange er dere?</p> <p>..</p> <p>Navnet Aragorn sønn av Arathorn er kjent og aktet i Lórien. Vår dronning holder ham høyt i ære. Så langt(O) er alt vel og bra. Men du har ikke nevnt flere(O) enn sju?</p> <p>..</p> <p>En dverg! Det er verken vel eller bra. Vi har ikke hatt noe med dverger å bestille siden den mørke <b>tidsalder</b> (A). De tåles ikke i <b>vårt hjemland</b>(A). Jeg kan ikke tillate ham å reise gjennom <b>vårt land</b>(A).</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954/1973, pp. 389-390)</p> <p>25 sentences</p>	<p>Og ettersom dere kommer sammen med en alv av vår egen slekt, er vi villige til å by dere vennskap, slik Elrond ba oss; skjønt det er ikke <b>vår skikk</b>(A) å føre fremmede gjennom landet vårt. Men dere må bli her i natt. Hvor mange er dere?</p> <p>..</p> <p>Navnet Aragorn, Arathorns sønn, er kjent i Lórien og han har vår dronnings gunst. Da(O) er alt vel. Men hittil har du bare(O) nevnt sju.</p> <p>..</p> <p>En dverg! Det var ikke så vel. Vi har ikke hatt med dverger å gjøre siden de mørke tidene. De slipper ikke inn i <b>vårt land</b>(A). Jeg kan ikke gi lov til at han får passere.</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954a/2011, pp. 328-329)</p> <p>21 sentences</p>	<p>hobbitar, eller halvingar, i mange(O) <b>langår</b>(A), og visste ikkje av at det framleis var nokre att(O) i Midgard. De <b>sjå</b>(A) ikkje <b>vondhugade</b>(A) ut! Og <b>av di</b>(A) de <b>ero</b>(A) komme med ein alv av <b>ætti</b>(A, A) vår <b>eigi</b>(A), <b>ero</b>(A) me <b>viljuge</b>(A) til å <b>gieva</b>(A) dykk venskap, som Elrond bad oss; sjølv <b>um</b>(A) det ikkje er <b>sedn</b>(A) vår å <b>leida</b>(A) framande <b>gjennom</b>(A) landet vårt. Men de <b>ljota</b>(A, A) <b>vera</b>(A) her i <b>nott</b>(A). Kor <b>mangje</b>(A) <b>ero</b>(A) de?</p> <p>..</p> <p>Namnet Aragorn Arathornsson er kjent i Lórien. Og han <b>hev</b>(A) <b>godhug</b>(A) hjå <b>fruva</b>(A). Då(O) er alt vel. Men enn <b>hev</b>(A) du berre tala(O) <b>um</b>(A) <b>sjau</b>(A)?</p> <p>..</p> <p>Ein dverg! Det er ikkje vel. Me <b>hava</b> (A) ikkje <b>havt</b> (A) med dvergar å <b>gjera</b> (A) sidan <b>Myrkredagane</b>(A). Dei <b>sleppa</b>(A) ikkje inn i landet her. Eg <b>kann</b>(A) ikkje <b>lata</b>(A) <b>honom</b>(A) <b>ganga</b>(A) <b>gjennom</b>(A).</p> <p>Tolkien, 1954, 1955/2006, pp. 327-328) 22 sentences</p>
--	--	--	---

**Character:** Galadriel

**Race:** Elf

**Rank:** High

**Speaking with:** Celeborn (Elf) and The Fellowship of the Ring (Hobbits, Men, Dwarf, Elf and Wizard)

<b>ST</b> <b>English</b> (Tolkien, 1954-1955)	<b>TT1</b> <b>Bokmål</b> (Werenskiold, 1973-1975)	<b>TT2</b> <b>Bokmål</b> (Høverstad, 1980-1981)	<b>TT3</b> <b>Nynorsk</b> (Myhren, 2006)
<p>Nay, there was no change of counsel. Gandalf the Grey set out with the Company, but he did not pass the borders of this land. Now tell us where he is; for I much desired to speak with him again. But I cannot see him from afar, unless he comes within the fences of Lothlórien: a grey mist is about him, and the ways of his feet and of his mind are hidden from me.</p> <p>..</p> <p>He would be rash indeed that said that thing. Needless were none of the deeds of Gandalf in life. Those that followed him knew not his mind and cannot report his full purpose. But however it may be with the guide, the followers are blameless. Do not repent of your welcome to the Dwarf. If our folk had been exiled long and far</p>	<p>Nei(O), planen ble ikke forandret. Gandalf den Grå var med i følget, men han kom ikke over grensen til oss. Si meg nå hvor han er, jeg skulle så gjerne(O) (A) snakket med ham. Men jeg kan ikke se ham så langt borte, bare hvis han kommer innenfor Lothlóriens grenser kan jeg(A) se ham(A). Han er omgitt av grå skodde nå. Hvor hans føtter(A) og hans tanker(A) går(O), er skjult for meg.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Ja, det ville sannelig vært(O) en forhastet dom. Grunnløse(M) var ingen av Gandalfs gjerninger. De som fulgte ham, kunne ikke(O) lese hans tanker(A) og kan ikke vite hvilke planer han hadde. Men hvordan det nå er eller ikke er med anføreren, kan vi ikke sette</p>	<p>Nei(O), noen endringer i planene(A) var det ikke. Gandalf Grå la ut med resten av følget, men han har ikke gått over grensen til vårt land(A). Si oss nå hvor han er; for jeg har(O) lengtet sterkt etter å få tale med han på ny. Men jeg kan ikke se ham på avstand, om han ikke kommer innenfor Lothlóriens grenser; han er omgitt av en grå tåke, og hvilke veier hans føtter(A) og hans tanker(A) går(O), er skjult for meg.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Det ville i sannhet(O) talt uoverlagt som sa noe slikt. Unødvendige(M) var ingen av Gandalfs gjerninger i levende live. De som fulgte ham, kjente ikke(O) hans grunner(A), og kan ikke berette om</p>	<p>Nei(O), ikje(A, A) var der nokot(A) annat(A) rådlag. Gandalf den Grå sette ut med Laget, men han gjekk ikje(A) yver(A) skjeli(A, A) i dette landet. Seg(A) oss no hvor(A) han er; eg(O) ynskte storleg å tala ved honom(A) att. Men eg kan ikje(A) sjå honom(A) på langan(A) leidi(A, A), um(A) han ikje(A) kjemer(A) innum(A) Lothlóriens hegn(A). Det ligger(A) ei grå skodd kring honom(A), og leidi(A, A) han gjenger(A) eller aktar seg(O), er løynd(A, A) fyre(A) meg.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Den som mælte(A) slikt, vore(A) nok(O) brålyndt(A). Unaudsynte(M) var ingen av gjeremåli hans Gandalf(A, A) so lenge han livde(A). Dei som fylgde honom(A) kjende ikje(C) hugen(A) hans og kann(A)</p>

from Lothlórien, who of the Galadhrim, even Celeborn the Wise, would pass **high** and would not wish to look upon their ancient home, though it had become an **abode** of dragons? **Dark** is the water of Kheled-zâram, and **cold** are the springs of Kibil-nâla, and **fair** were the many pillared halls of Khazad-dûm in Elder Days before the **fall of mighty kings beneath the stone**.

..  
Your quest is known to us. But we will not **here** speak of it more openly. Yet **not in vain** will it prove, maybe, that you come to this land seeking aid, as Gandalf himself plainly purposed. For the Lord of the Galadhrim is accounted the wisest of the Elves of Middle-earth, and **a giver of gifts** beyond the power of kings. He has **dwelt** in the West since the days of dawn, and I have **dwelt** with him years uncounted; for **ere the fall of Nargothrond or Gondolin** I passed over the mountains, and **together through ages of the world** we have fought the long

skylden på **hans følge**(A). Du må ikke angre på at du har ønsket dvergen velkommen. Hvis **vårt folk**(A) hadde vært lenge i landflyktighet langt fra Lothlórien, tror du da at ikke noen av oss, at ikke du selv gjerne(O) ville **gjensett**(A) **ditt gamle rike**(A), selv om drakene hadde tatt bolig(O) der? **Mørkt**(M) er Kheled-zârams vann, og **kalde**(M) er Kibil-nâlas kilder, og **vakre**(M) var søylehallene i Khazad-dûm i Den Eldste Tidsalder før **de store bergkongers fall**(M).

..  
Vi kjenner **ditt oppdrag**(A). Men la oss ikke(O) snakke om det nå. Kanskje(O) har dere ikke kommet **forgjeves**(A) hit hvis dere vil ha hjelp. Det var tydelig Gandalfs hensikt. For Kongen over Galadhrim blir regnet for å være den viseste blant alver i Midgard og **hans gaver**(M) er mer enn kongelige. Han har holdt(O) til her i vest siden tidenes morgen, og jeg har vært(O) hans i utallige år. **Før Margothrond og Gondolin falt**(O, M, O) kom jeg hit over

**hans hensikter**(A) fullt ut. Men hvordan det enn kan ha seg med føreren, er de som fulgte ham uten skyld. Gå ikke tilbake på **din velkomst**(A) til dvergen. Om **vårt folk**(A) hadde levd i landflyktighet lenge, og langt fra Lothlórien, hvem blant galadhrim var det da, om det så var Celeborn den vise, som kunne gå forbi(O) uten å ønske seg et blikk på **sitt eldgamle hjem**(A), og det om så draker holdt til(O) der? **Mørkt**(M) er Kheled-zârams vann, og **kalde**(M) er Kibil-nâlas kilder, og **fagre**(M) var Khazad-dûms søylehaller i alders tid, før de mektige kongene falt under fjellet(O).

..  
Vi kjenner formålet med ferden din. Men vi skal ikke(O) snakke åpnere om det her og nå. Kan hende(O) kan det vise seg at dere ikke **forgjeves**(A) er kommet hit til lands etter hjelp, slik Gandalf selv åpenbart hadde til hensikt. For herren over galadhrim er regnet for å være den viseste blant alvene i Midgard, og det står ikke i

**ikke**(A) **gjeva**(A) bod **um**(A) kva han heilt og fullt **aktade**(A) på. Men korleis det **munde**(A) **vera**(A) med vegvisaren, **ero**(A) **fylgjesveinarne**(A) utan last. **Treg**(A) **ikke**(A) på at du **fagna**(A) dvergen. **Um**(A) folket vårt **longo**(A, A) **havde**(A) **voret**(A) **utlæge**(A) og langt frå Lothlórien, kven **or**(A) galadhrim, **jamvel**(A) den kloke Celeborn, **vilde**(A) **ikke**(A) **ganga**(A) nær(O) utan ynskje **um**(A) å sjå til sin eldgamle heimstad, **um**(A) det so var drakar som heldt hus(O) der? **Døkke**(M, A) **ero**(A) **votni**(A) i Kheled-zâram, og **kalde**(M) **ero**(A) **kjeldorne**(A) i Kibil-nâla, og **fagre**(M) **våro**(A) **hallerna**(A) med mange søyler i Khazad-dûm i gamal tid **fyre**(A) dei **mektuge**(A) **kongarne**(A) under stein fall(O).

..  
Me kjenner **uppgåva**(A) di vel. Men me **skulde**(A) **ikke**(O, A) tala **um**(A) **henne**(A) meir **opet**(A) her. Det(O) **kann**(A) **vera**(A) det **ikke**(A) vil syna seg fåfengt at du kom på leit etter **stød**(A) i dette landet, slik

<p>defeat. <b>I</b> it was who first summoned the White Council. And if my designs had not gone amiss, it would have been governed by Gandalf the Grey, and then <b>mayhap</b> things would have been gone otherwise. But <b>even now</b> there is hope left. I will not give you counsel, saying do this, or do that. <b>For not in the going or contriving, nor in choosing between this course and another</b>, can I avail; but only in knowing what was and is, and in part also what shall be. But <b>this</b> I will say to you: your Quest stands upon the edge of a knife. Stray <b>but</b> a little and it will fail, to the ruin of all. Yet hope remains while all the Company is true.</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954b/2011, pp. 355-357)</p> <p>24 sentences</p>	<p>fjellene, <b>sammen</b>(M) har vi gjennom lange tidsaldre kjempet mot fiendens arge list. Det(O) var jeg som første gang fikk innkalt Det Hvite Rådet. Og var det gått som jeg ville, hadde Gandalf blitt dets leder. Da ville det kanskje(O) sett lysere ut. Men <b>ennå</b>(M) er det håp. Jeg vil ikke gi dere noen råd om hva dere skal gjøre eller ikke gjøre. <b>For verken i råd eller dåd, verken i valg av vei eller midler</b> (M, M, M) kan jeg hjelpe. Jeg vet bare hva som er, hva som har vært, og litt om det som skal bli. Men <b>dette</b>(M) skal dere vite! Dere balanserer på knivseggen. Vakler dere det aller(O) minste, vil dere falle og bringe verdens undergang med dere i fallet. <b>Så lenge dere alle i følget er sanne og tro</b>(A), er håpet levende.</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954/1973, pp. 403-405)</p> <p>31 sentences</p>	<p>kongers makt å gi gaver som hans(O). Han har vært(O) i Vesten siden dagenes morgen, og jeg har levd(O) med ham i år uten tall; for <b>før Nargothrond eller Gondolin falt</b>(O, M, O), kom jeg over fjellene, og <b>gjennom verdens tideverv</b>(M) har vi kjempet sammen i vårt lange nederlag. Det(O) var jeg som først sammenkalte Det hvite rådet. Og hadde ikke <b>mine planer</b>(A) slått feil, ville Gandalv Grå ført forsetet der, og da hadde kan hende(O) <b>mangt</b>(A) sett annerledes ut. Men <b>fremdeles</b>(M) er det håp. Jeg vil ikke råde dere og si gjør slik eller gjør så. <b>For det er ikke i dette</b>(M) jeg kan være til hjelp, ved å handle, eller legge planer(O), eller velge mellom den ene utveien og den andre(O); alt jeg kan, er å vite hva som var, og er, og litt om hva som vil bli. Men <b>dette</b>(M) vil jeg si dere: nå balanserer ferden deres på en knivsegg. Ta et skritt feil(O), og den vil mislykkes, til undergang for oss alle. Men det er håp, så lenge alle i følget er sanne og tro.</p>	<p>Gandalv sjølv <b>klårt</b>(A) nok <b>havde</b>(A) meint. <b>Galadhrimsdrotten</b>(A) er halden å <b>vera</b>(A) den klokaste av <b>alvarne</b>(A) i Midgard, og han skjenkjer <b>gåvor</b>(C) som <b>mektuge</b>(A) kongar <b>ikke</b>(A) evnar <b>_____</b>(A) <b>gjeva</b>(A). Han <b>hever</b>(A) <b>voret</b>(C) vest i <b>verdi</b>(A) frå <b>gryningsdagarne</b>(A), og eg <b>hev</b>(A) <b>voret</b>(C) hjå <b>honom</b>(A) i tallause år. Eg gjekk <b>yver</b>(A) <b>fjølli</b>(A) <b>fyre</b>(C) Nargothrond og Gondolin fall(O, O), og <b>gjennom</b> <b>heimsens ævor</b> (M, A, A, A, A) <b>hava</b>(A) me stridt det lange tapet. Det(O) var eg som fyrst <b>kallade</b>(A) saman Det kvite rådet. Og <b>um</b>(A) <b>ikke</b>(A) planen min <b>havde</b>(A) <b>sviket</b>(A), <b>skulde</b>(A) Gandalv den Grå <b>hava</b>(A) <b>leidt</b>(A) det, og so <b>kunde</b>(C) det <b>vera</b>(A) at <b>mangt</b>(A) <b>havde</b>(A) hendt seg på anna vis. Men <b>jamvel no</b>(M, A) er der <b>leivt</b>(A) oss <b>von</b>(A). Eg vil <b>ikke</b>(A) råda deg og <b>segja</b>(A): gjer dette eller hit. For eg <b>kann</b>(A) <b>ikke</b>(A) <b>hjelpa</b> (A) i <b>gjeremål</b> eller <b>påhitt</b>(M, A), eller i <b>val av den eine eller hine</b></p>
---	---	--	--

		<p>(Tolkien, 1954a/2011, pp. 340-342)</p> <p>24 sentences</p>	<p>leidi(O, M, A, A, A), men berre i vissa um(A) kvat(A) som var og er, og i eit mun(A) kvat(A) som verder(A). Men dette(M) vil eg segja(A) deg: Uppgåva(A) di stender(A) på ei knivsegg. Eit lite steg(O) or(A) vegen og ho vil fara gale til øyding(A) fyr(A) alle. Enn(A) er der von(A) so lenge alle i Laget ero(A) trugne.</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954, 1955/2006, pp.339-340)</p> <p>26 sentences</p>
--	--	---	---

**Character:** Ghân-buri-Ghân  
**Race:** Man (Wildman)  
**Rank:** Low  
**Speaking with:** Thèoden (Man)

<b>ST</b> <b>English</b> <b>(Tolkien, 1954-1955)</b>	<b>TT1</b> <b>Bokmål</b> <b>(Werenskiold, 1973-1975)</b>	<b>TT2</b> <b>Bokmål</b> <b>(Høverstad, 1980-1981)</b>	<b>TT3</b> <b>Nynorsk</b> <b>(Myhren, 2006)</b>
<p>No, father of Horse-men, we fight <b>not</b>. <b>   </b> Hunt <b>only</b>. <b>   </b> Kill <b>gorgûn</b> in <b>   </b> woods, <b>   </b> hate orc-folk. You hate <b>gorgûn</b> too. We help as we can. Wild Men have long ears and long eyes; <b>   </b> know all paths. Wild Men <b>live</b> here before Stone-houses; before Tall Men <b>come</b> up out of <b>   </b> Water.</p> <p>.. <b>   </b> Bring news. We look out from <b>   </b> hills. We climb <b>   </b> big mountain and look down. Stone-city is shut. Fire burns there outside; now inside too. <b>   </b> You wish to come there? Then you must be quick. But <b>gorgûn</b> and men <b>out of</b> far-away sit on <b>   </b> horse-road. <b>   </b> <b>   </b> Very many, more than Horse-men.</p> <p>.. Wild Men are wild, <b>   </b> free, but not children. I am <b>   </b> great headman, Ghân-buri-Ghân. I</p>	<p>Nei, far over hestemenn, vi(O) slåss ikke(O). <b>   </b>(M) Bare <b>jakte</b> (O, A). <b>   </b>(M) <b>Drepe</b> (A) <b>gorgûn</b>(M) i skogen(O), <b>   </b>(M) <b>hate</b> (A) bergtroll. Dere <b>hate</b> (A) <b>gorgûn</b>(M) også. Vi <b>hjelp</b> (A) på vår måte. Villmenn har lange ører og lange øyne, <b>   </b>(M) <b>kjenne</b> (A) alle stier. Villmenn <b>leve</b>(M) her før Steinbyen. <b>Før Høye menn kom hit, opp av vannet</b>(O, O, A).</p> <p>.. <b>   </b>(M) <b>Bringe</b> (A) nytt. Vi <b>speide</b> (A) fra(O) åsene. Vi <b>klatre</b> (A) opp på <b>   </b>(M) <b>høye</b>(A) fjell og <b>se</b> (A) ned. Steinbyen er stengt. Ild <b>brenne</b> (A) like utenfor den, inni byen også nå. (O) Vil dere gjerne dit? Da må dere være snare. Men <b>gorgûn</b>(M) og menn fra(O) fjerne land sitter på(O) Hesteveien. <b>   </b>(M) <b>   </b>(M)</p>	<p>Nei, du hestemenns far. Vi <b>ikke</b>(M) <b>kjempe</b> (M). <b>   </b>(M) Bare <b>jage</b> (O, A). <b>   </b>(M) <b>Drepe</b> (A) <b>gorgûn</b>(M) i <b>skog</b> (M), <b>   </b>(M) <b>hate</b> (A) orkfolk. Dere <b>øg</b>(A) <b>hate</b> (A) <b>gorgûn</b>(M). Vi <b>hjelp</b> (A) som vi kan. <b>Villemenn</b>(A) <b>ha</b> (A) lange ører og lange øyne, <b>   </b>(M) <b>kjenne</b> (A) alle stier. <b>Villemenn</b>(A) <b>bo</b>(M) her før steinhus, før høye menn <b>komme</b>(M) opp fra(O) Vannet.</p> <p>.. <b>   </b>(M) <b>Komme</b> (A) med nytt. Vi <b>se</b> (A) ut fra <b>åser</b>(M). Vi <b>klatre</b> (A) opp <b>   </b>(M) stort fjell og <b>se</b> (A) ned. Steinby <b>   </b>(A) stengt. <b>Brenne</b> (A) <b>brann</b>(A) utenfor der; innenfor øg, nå. (O) Dere <b>vil</b>(A) dit? Da må <b>   </b>(A) være <b>snar</b> (A). Men <b>gorgûn</b>(M) og menn fra(O) <b>langt-ifra</b>(A) <b>stå</b> (A) på <b>hestevei</b> (M).</p>	<p>Nei, du, far til hestemenn, me <b>slæst</b>(C) ikkje(O). <b>   </b>(M) Berre <b>veider</b>(O, A). <b>   </b>(M) <b>Drep</b> <b>gorgûn</b>(M) i <b>skogar</b>(M), <b>   </b>(M) hatar orkefolk. De hatar <b>gorgûn</b>(M) øg. Me hjelper som me kan. Villmenn <b>hava</b>(A) lange <b>øyro</b>(A) og lange <b>augo</b>(A). <b>   </b>(M) Kjenner alle stigar. Villmenn <b>bu</b>(M) her føre steinhus, før høye menn kom(O) opp <b>or</b>(O, A) vatnet.</p> <p>.. <b>   </b>(M) <b>Koma</b>(A) med nytt. Me <b>sjå</b>(A) ut frå <b>berg</b> (M). Me <b>klatra</b> (A) <b>   </b>(M) stort fjell og <b>sjå</b>(A) ned. Steinby er stengd. Eld brenn der utanfor, no øg på innsida. (O) <b>Vilja</b>(A) de dra dit? Då <b>lyt</b>(A) de <b>vera</b>(A) <b>snøgge</b>(A). Men <b>gorgûn</b>(M) og menn <b>utor</b>(C) langt borti sit på <b>hesteveg</b> (M). <b>   </b>(M) <b>   </b>(M) Retteleg mange, fleir enn hestemenn.</p>



<p>count many things; stars in [red] sky, leaves on trees, [red] men in the dark. You have a score of scores counted ten times and five. They have more. [red] Big fight, and who will win? And many more walk round [red] walls of [red] Stone-houses.</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1955b/2011, p. 832)</p> <p>23 sentences</p>	<p>Forferdelig mange, flere enn hestefolk.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Villmenn er ville, [red](M) fri (A), men ikke barn. Jeg [red](A) [red](M) stor høvding, Ghân-buri-Ghân. Jeg regne (A) [red](A) mangt, stjerner på(O) himmelen, blad på trær, [red](M) menn i mørke (A). Du har et tjau ganger tjau ti ganger og fem til. De har flere. [red](M) Hard kamp, og hvem vil vinne? Og mange flere(A) er det utenfor(O) murene rundt(O) Steinbyen.</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1955/1975, pp. 115-116)</p> <p>24 sentences</p>	<p>[red](M) [red](M) Veldig mange, flere enn hestemenn.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Villemenn(A) er ville, [red](M) er fri (A), men er ikke barn. Jeg er [red](M) stor høvding, Ghân-buri-Ghân. Jeg telle (A) mange ting: stjerner på himmel (M), blad på tre(A), [red](M) menn i mørke (A). Dere ha (A) snes av snes ti ganger, og fem til. De ha (A) mer. [red](M) Stort slag, [red](A) hvem [red](A) vinne det? Og mange flere gå (A) rundt murer (M) ved steinhus (M).</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1955a/2011, p. 90)</p> <p>24 sentences</p>	<p>..</p> <p>Villmenn er ville og(O) frie, men ikkje born. Eg er [red](M) stor hovding, Ghân-buri-Ghân. Eg reknar [red](A) mangt, stjerner på himmel (M), lauv på tre, [red](M) menn i mørker(A). De hava(A) eit snes ti gonger og fem snes til. Dei hava(A) meir. [red](M) Stor kamp, og kven vil vinna(A)? Og mange fleir ganga(A) kring murar(M) til Steinhus (M).</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954, 1955/2006, pp. 766-767)</p> <p>24 sentences</p>
--	---	---	--

**Character:** Denethor

**Race:** Man

**Rank:** High

**Speaking with:** Faramir (Man)

<b>ST</b> <b>English</b> <b>(Tolkien, 1954-1955)</b>	<b>TT1</b> <b>Bokmål</b> <b>(Werenskiold, 1973-1975)</b>	<b>TT2</b> <b>Bokmål</b> <b>(Høverstad, 1980-1981)</b>	<b>TT3</b> <b>Nynorsk</b> <b>(Myhren, 2006)</b>
<p>Ill? Why do you ask? The men were under your command. Or do you ask for my judgement on all your deeds? Your bearing is lowly in my presence, yet it is long now since you turned from your own way at my counsel. See, you have spoken skillfully, as ever; but I, have I not seen your eye fixed on Mithrandir, seeking whether you said well or too much? He has long had your heart in his keeping. My son, your father is old but not yet dotard. I can see and hear, as was my wont; and little of what you have half said or left unsaid is now hidden from me. I know the answer to many riddles. Alas, alas for Boromir!</p> <p>..</p> <p>Would that have availed to change your judgement? You would still have done just so, I deem. I know you well. Ever</p>	<p>Galt? Hvorfor spør du om det? De var under din kommando. Mener du at jeg skal råde deg i alt du gjør?</p> <p>Så lenge jeg er her spiller du ydmyk, men det er lenge siden du begynte å gå dine egne veier uten å høre på meg.</p> <p>Joda, du har snakket godt for deg, som alltid. Tror du ikke jeg(O) har lagt merke til at du hele tiden(A) har hatt blikket festet på Mithrandir, for å se om du har sagt det som skal sies, eller kanskje for meget(A)? Han har for lenge siden(M) vunnet(O) ditt hjerte(A).</p> <p>Min sønn(A), far (A) din er gammel, men noen olding(A) er(O) han ikke(O). Jeg kan stadig både se og høre, som før(O). Lite av det du har sagt halvveis bare(A) eller forsøkt å skjule, er hemmelig for meg. Jeg</p>	<p>Ille! Hvorfor spør du? Mennene sto under din befaling. Eller ber du om min dom(A) over alt du foretar deg? Ydmykt(A) er ditt vesen(A) i mitt nærvær(A), men tross det er det lenge siden du på mitt råd(A) fulgte en annen vei enn din egen. Du har talt behendig(A), som alltid; men jeg, har jeg(M) ikke sett hvordan øynene dine er festet på Mithrandir, for å se på ham om du har talt vel eller til overmål? Lenge nå(A) har(O) hjertet ditt ligget i hans hånd(M).</p> <p>Min sønn(A), din far(A) er gammel, men ennå (M) ingen olding(O). Jeg kan se og høre, nå som før(O); og lite av det du har halvt sagt, eller helt utelatt, er skjult for meg. Jeg kjenner svaret på mange gåter. Ve, ve for Boromir!</p> <p>..</p>	<p>Ille? Kvi(A) spyr(A) du? Mennane(A) var under ditt bod. Elder(A) fretter(A) du etter min dom(A) yvi(A) alle dine gjeremål(A)? Du læst(A) vera(A) audmjuk når eg er nær, men det er lenge sidan du heller enn å lyde meg, valde å fylgje(A) dine egne råd. Sjå, du hev(A) tala hagleg(A) som alltid. Men eg, hev(A) eg(M) ikkje sett augo(A) dine feste(A) på Mithrandir, når du undrast um(A) du hev(A) tala vel elder(A) i meste laget? Longo(A, A) hev(O, A) han havt(A) hjarta ditt hjå seg(O). Sonen min, far (A) din er gamal, men enn(A) er(O) han ingen fâne(M). Eg kan sjå og høyre, som eg stødt(C) gjorde det. Og lite av det du halvt hev(A) sagt elder(A) ikkje sagt er løynd(A, A) for meg no. Eg veit svaret på mange gåtur(A).</p>

<p>your desire is to appear lordly and generous as a king of old, gracious, <span style="background-color: yellow;"> </span> gentle. That may well befit one of high race, if he sits in power and peace. But <span style="background-color: yellow;">in desperate hours</span> gentleness may be repaid with death.</p> <p>..</p> <p>So be it! But not with your death only, Lord Faramir: with the death <span style="background-color: yellow;">also</span> of your father, and of all your people, <span style="background-color: yellow;">whom</span> it is your part to protect now that Boromir is gone.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Yes, I wish that indeed. For Boromir was loyal to me and no wizard's pupil. He would have remembered his father's need, and would not have squandered what fortune <span style="background-color: yellow;">gave</span> <span style="background-color: yellow;"> </span>. He would have brought me a mighty gift.</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1955b/2011, pp. 812-813)</p> <p>23 sentences</p>	<p>kjenner svaret på mange gåter. Ve, Boromir, ve!</p> <p>..</p> <p>Ville det hjulpet deg til en bedre dømmekraft? Du ville gjort akkurat det samme, så vidt jeg vet. Jeg kjenner deg. (O) Du vil alltid spille kongelig og storsinnet, være snill og(O) vennlig. Det kan sømme seg for en mann av edel byrd, en som har makt i fredstid. Men <span style="background-color: yellow;">i desperat kamptid</span>(M) blir dumsnillhet gjerne lønnet med døden.</p> <p>..</p> <p>La så skje, ja. Men ikke med din død alene, Faramir. Nei, med din fars død også(O), med hele folkets død. (O) Det er du som skulle verget dem nå når Boromir er falt.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Ja, i sannhet. Boromir var meg <span style="background-color: yellow;">tro</span>(A), han var ikke elev av noen trollmann. <span style="background-color: yellow;">Han</span> ville tenkt på <span style="background-color: yellow;">sin far</span>(A) i nødens stund, <span style="background-color: yellow;">han</span>(A) ville ikke ha skuslet bort det lykken gav(O) ham i hende. Han ville brakt meg en stor gave.</p>	<p>Hadde det bidratt til å endre beslutningen? Du ville likevel gjort nøyaktig det samme, tror jeg for visst. Jeg kjenner deg godt. (O) Du higer alltid etter å opptre så høysinnet og gavmildt som en konge i fordums tid, nådig og(O) edel. Det kan være <span style="background-color: yellow;">meget</span>(A) passende for en av høy byrd, om han sitter med makt i fred. Men <span style="background-color: yellow;">i fortvilelsens time</span>(M) kan edelmotets lønn bli døden.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Det får så være! Men ikke din død alene, herr Faramir; også død(O) for <span style="background-color: yellow;">din far</span>(A), og hele <span style="background-color: yellow;">ditt folk</span>(A), som(O) det er din plikt å verge, nå som Boromir er borte.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Ja, i sannhet er det <span style="background-color: yellow;">mitt ønske</span>(A). For Boromir var lojal mot meg, og ingen trollmanns læregutt. Han ville husket sin fars nød og ikke ødslet bort det skjebnen skjenket(O) ham. Han ville brakt meg en mektig gave.</p>	<p><span style="background-color: yellow;">illt</span>(A, A), <span style="background-color: yellow;">illt</span>(A, A) var det med Boromir!</p> <p>..</p> <p><span style="background-color: yellow;">Vilde</span>(A) det <span style="background-color: yellow;">hava</span>(A) gjort noko til å endre <span style="background-color: yellow;">di avgjerd</span>(A)? Eg trur nok du endå <span style="background-color: yellow;">vilde</span>(A) <span style="background-color: yellow;">hava</span>(A) gjort <span style="background-color: yellow;">nett</span>(A) so. Eg <span style="background-color: yellow;">kjenne</span>(A) deg godt. <span style="background-color: yellow;">Stødt</span>(M, A) er ynsket ditt å synast fyrsteleg og gåverik som ein konge <span style="background-color: yellow;">or</span>(A) gamal tid, raus(O) og blid. Det <span style="background-color: yellow;">munde</span>(A) nok <span style="background-color: yellow;">høve</span>(A) for ein av høg ætt, <span style="background-color: yellow;">um</span>(A) han sit i velde og fred. Men <span style="background-color: yellow;">i rådville stundir</span>(M, A) <span style="background-color: yellow;">kann</span>(A) slik <span style="background-color: yellow;">godhug</span>(A) verte <span style="background-color: yellow;">løna</span>(A) med dauden.</p> <p>..</p> <p>La so <span style="background-color: yellow;">vera</span>(A)! Men ikkje einast med din daude, <span style="background-color: yellow;">høgvyrde</span>(A) Faramir, med dauden(O) å <span style="background-color: yellow;">far</span>(A) din attåt, og heile folket ditt, som(O) det er din <span style="background-color: yellow;">lut</span>(A) å <span style="background-color: yellow;">verja</span>(A) no som Boromir er <span style="background-color: yellow;">burte</span>(A).</p> <p>..</p> <p>Ja, det ynskjer eg vel. Boromir var <span style="background-color: yellow;">trugen</span>(A) mot meg og ikkje noko <span style="background-color: yellow;">trollmanns</span>(A) læresvein. Han <span style="background-color: yellow;">vilde</span>(A) <span style="background-color: yellow;">hava</span>(A) <span style="background-color: yellow;">farens</span>(A) <span style="background-color: yellow;">tarv</span>(A) i <span style="background-color: yellow;">minne</span>(A), og <span style="background-color: yellow;">vilde</span>(A) ikkje <span style="background-color: yellow;">hava</span>(A) <span style="background-color: yellow;">øydt</span>(A, A) det</p>
---	---	---	--

	(Tolkien, 1955/1975, p. 91) 27 sentences	(Tolkien, 1955a/2011, p. 71) 23 sentences	lukka <b>gav</b> (M). Han <b>vilde</b> (A) <b>hava</b> (A) gjeve meg ei stor g�ve.  (Tolkien, 1954, 1955/2006, pp. 748-749) 25 sentences
--	---	--	---

**Character:** Tracker (unnamed)

**Race:** Orc

**Rank:** Low

**Speaking with:** Soldier (unnamed, Orc)

<b>ST</b> <b>English</b> <b>(Tolkien, 1954-1955)</b>	<b>TT1</b> <b>Bokmål</b> <b>(Werenskiold, 1973-1975)</b>	<b>TT2</b> <b>Bokmål</b> <b>(Høverstad, 1980-1981)</b>	<b>TT3</b> <b>Nynorsk</b> <b>(Myhren, 2006)</b>
<p>Nar! I'm going home. No good wearing my nose out on stones any more. There's not a trace left, I say. I've lost the scent through giving way to you. It went up into the hills, not along the valley, I tell you.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Then what have you seen with them? Garn! You don't even know what you're looking for.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Ar! They've lost their heads, that's what it is. And some of the bosses are going to lose their skins too, I guess, if what I hear is true: Tower raided and all, and hundreds of your lads done in, and prisoner got away. If that's the way you fighters go on, small wonder there's bad news from the battles.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Ar! Who says there isn't?</p>	<p>Nei! Jeg(O) går hjem. Det er ikke noen vits i å slite ut hesa(A) mi på naken stein mer. Har jeg ikke sagt deg at det ikke(O) er ferten av dem tilbake(O). Jeg har(O) mistet luktesansen bare fordi jeg gav etter for deg. Han søkte opp i fjellene og drog langs etter dalen, som jeg sa deg(M).</p> <p>..</p> <p>Hva har du sett med øynene dine, tør jeg spørre? Dra deg vekk! Du vet ikke(O) en gang hvem du er(O) på jakt etter.</p> <p>Aff. De har(O) mistet vettet, det er(O) det som er. Noen av storkarene(A) kommer til å miste hodet også, tror nå jeg. Om det er sant som de sier. (O) Tårnet som er stormet og all tingen(M), og hundre av karene(M) dine gjort kål på(M). (O) Fangen unnsnapp. Er det(O)</p>	<p>Næ! Jeg(O) går hjem. Det er bare tull å slite ut hesa(A) mi på bare stein og mer stein. Det er(O) ikke ferten igjen, sier jeg jo(M). Jeg har(O) mista(A) sporet, bare fordi jeg hørte på deg. Det gikk opp i åsene, ikke langs dalen, har jeg sagt(M).</p> <p>..</p> <p>Å jasanya, og hva er det du har sett med de øya(A), kanskje? Tullprat! Du aner ikke(O) engang hva det er du(O) ser etter.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Ørr. De har(O) mista(A) vettet, det er(O) det de har. Og noen av sjefene kommer til å miste skinnen med, tror nå jeg, hvis det jeg hører, er sant: (O) tårnet plyndra(A) og allting(M), og hundrevis av kara(M, A) deres kverka(M, A), og (O) fangen har stikki(A) av. Om det er(O) sånn</p>	<p>Næh! Eg(O) går heim att. Lite gagn(A) i å slite nasen min ut på stein meir. Det er(O) kje(A) eit spor att, seier eg(M). Eg(O) miste(A) teven(A) då eg hørde på deg. Han gjekk opp i berga, ikkje langsmed dalen, seier eg deg(M).</p> <p>..</p> <p>Og kva har du sett med slike auer(A)? Drit på deg! Du veit kje(C) ein gong kva du(O) ser etter.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Ørr! Dei har(O) misti(A) huet(A), det er(O) det som har hendt. Og eg trur at somme av sjefane kjem til å mista(A) huda si med, om det eg hører er sant: (O) Tårnet rana og alt i hop(M), og hundrar(A) av karane(M) dine kverka(M) – og (O) fangen rømd(A). Om det er(O) slik de herfolk(A) held på, er det ikkje</p>

<p>.. All right, all right! I'll say no more and go on thinking. But what's the black sneak got to do with it all? That gobbler with the flapping hands?</p> <p>.. Well, I hope they get him and put him through it. He messed up the scent back there, pinching that cast-off mail-shirt that he found, and paddling all round the place before I could get there.</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1955b/2011, pp. 924-925)</p> <p>21 sentences</p>	<p>slik dere krigere går fram? Da er det jamen ikke rart at det er(O) dårlig nytt fra slagmarken.</p> <p>.. Aff, hvem sier at det ikke(O) gjør det?</p> <p>.. Ja ja, ja ja. Jeg skal(O) ikke si mer, men jeg tenker nå mitt. Men hva har(O) han svarte sniken med alt dette å gjøre? Det gadd(A) jeg gjerne visst. Han derre(A) slukhalsen med de slaskete hendene?</p> <p>.. Ja, jeg håper de får tak i ham og lar ham få gjennomgå. Han ødela sporet for meg bakom der, da han rippet brynjeskjorta(A) han fant og snoket rundt på hele plassen før jeg rakk å komme dit.</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1955/1975, pp. 225-226)</p> <p>25 sentences</p>	<p>dere krigera(A) driver på, så er det(O) ikke rart det går skitt(A) med slaget.</p> <p>.. Ørr! Hvem sier at det ikke(O) gjør det?</p> <p>.. Ja vel, ja vel! Jeg skal(O) ikke si mer, og tenke mitt i stedet. Men hva har(O) den der(A) svarte sniken med alt dette her å gjøre? Han der(A) gulperen(A) med danskehenda?</p> <p>.. Ja, jeg håper de får tak i ham og sender ham gjennom kjøttkverna(A). Han ødela hele ferten baki(A) der, da han sneik(A) til seg den brynja(A) han fant og tassa(A) rundt overalt, før jeg fikk komme til.</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954/2002, pp. 178-179)</p> <p>21 sentences</p>	<p>rart at det kjem(O) dårleg nytt frå slagmarka.</p> <p>.. Ørr! Kven seier det ikkje(O) er det?</p> <p>.. Javel, javel! Eg skal(O) halde kjeft og bruke huet(A). Men kva har(O) den svarte sniken å gjørra(A) med alt detta(A)? Han gulparn(A, A) med klaskenevane?</p> <p>.. Eg vonar(A) dei tek'n(A) og gjev'n(A) inn. Han rota til teven(A) baki der, snappa den bortslengde brynjeserken(A) han fann, og labba kringom heile staden før eg kom så langt.</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954, 1955/2006, pp. 847-848)</p> <p>21 sentences</p>
---	--	--	--

**Character:** Shagrat

**Race:** Orc

**Rank:** High

**Speaking with:** Gorbag (Orc)

<b>ST</b> <b>English</b> <b>(Tolkien, 1954-1955)</b>	<b>TT1</b> <b>Bokmål</b> <b>(Werenskiold, 1973-1975)</b>	<b>TT2</b> <b>Bokmål</b> <b>(Høverstad, 1980-1981)</b>	<b>TT3</b> <b>Nynorsk</b> <b>(Myhren, 2006)</b>
<p>Go on, Gorbag! Yours are making more than half the noise. But let the lads play! No need to worry about Shelob for a bit, I reckon. She's on a nail, it seems, and we shan't cry about that. Didn't you see: a nasty mess all the way back to that cursed crack of hers? If we've stopped it once, we've stopped it a hundred times. So let 'em laugh. And we've struck a bit of luck at last: I got something that Lugalbúrz wants.</p> <p>..</p> <p>I Don't know till we've had a look.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Sh, Gorbag! They may, but they've got eyes and ears everywhere; some among my lot, as like as not. But there's no doubt about it, they're troubled about something. The Nazgûl down</p>	<p>Gi deg nå, Gorbag! Dine egne lager brorparten(A) av ståket(A). La gutta(M, A) more seg! Shelob har nok med seg sjøl(A) for en stund, det skulle jeg mene(M). Hun har(O) nok satt på seg et spyd eller noe, det er ikke(O) noe å gråte for. Så du det(O) ikke(A) da? Gørr og slim hele veien tilbake til den fordømte hula(A) Hennes. Er Hun(O) stoppet en gang, er Hun(O) stoppet for alltid. La du bare gutta(M, A) le. Lykken har(O) smilt til oss til sist, vi(O) har fått fatt i noe som Lugalbúrz er ute etter.</p> <p>..</p> <p>I(M) Er ikke(O) godt å vite det, før(O) vi har(O) fått kikket nærmere på ham.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Hysj, Gorbag! Du kan ha rett i det, men de har(O) øyne og ører over alt, det er sikkert noen av</p>	<p>Slutt selv, Gorbag! Over halvparten av bråket(A) er det dine som lager. Men la kara(M, A) leke seg litt! Ingen vits i å være redd for Hutula på en stund, mener nå jeg(M). Hun har(O) visst satt seg på en spiker, ser det ut til, og det skal ikke(O) vi grine for. Så du ikke(O) det: den ekle smørja(A) hele veien bort til den forbanna sprekken hennes? Hvor mange ganger har vi(O) stengt den igjen? Sikkert hundre(O). Så la dem(O) le. Og nå har vi(O) fått flaks for en gangs skyld: vi(O) har noe som Lugalbúrz vil ha tak i.</p> <p>..</p> <p>I(M) Vet ikke(O), før(O) vi får tatt(O) en kikk på den.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Sssj, Gorbag! Kan hende det, men øyne og ører(A) har de(O) overalt; noen av mine folk(O)</p>	<p>Driv på, Gorbag! Dine folk(A) steller til meir enn halvparten av bråket. Men la no gutta(M, A) more seg! Ingen grunn til å værre(A) redd for Vevkjerringa i kveld(O). Hu(A) har(O) nok sett seg på ein spiker, og det ska(A) 'kke(C) vi gråte over. Så 'kke(C) du det: eit fært(A) far(A) heile vegen opp til den dritale(A) sprekken hennar? Har vi(O) stoppa det til ein gong, så har vi(O) stoppa det til hundre gonger. Så la dei(O) le. Og endeleg har vi(O) hatt litt flaks, I(M) fann no'(A) som Lugalbúrz er på jakt etter.</p> <p>..</p> <p>I(M) Ha(A) 'kke(C) aning før(O) vi har(O) sett etter.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Sh, Gorbag! Dem(A) kan det, men dem(A) har(O) øyer(A) og ører(A) over alt, no'n(A) i flokken(M) min, så</p>

<p>below are, by your account; and Lugbúrz is too. Something nearly slipped.</p> <p>..</p> <p>All right, but <b>we'll</b> talk of that later. Wait <b>till</b> we get to the Under-way. <b>There's</b> a place there where we can talk a bit, while the <b>lads</b> go on.</p> <p>..</p> <p>You should try being up here with Shelob for company.</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954c/2011, pp. 736-738)</p> <p>19 sentences</p>	<p>mine egne(O) som spionerer på <b>meg</b>, det skulle ikke forbause <b>meg</b>(O, A). Men det er ikke(O) til å komme forbi at det er(O) noe de er redd for. Du sa selv at Nazgûlen der nede er litt ute av seg. Lugbúrz er også ute av humør. Det er noe som nesten gikk galt.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Samme for meg. Vi(O) snakker om det siden. <b>Vi</b> venter til(O) vi kommer inn på Underveien, <b>der</b>(O, A) kan <b>vi</b>(A) snakke sammen mens <b>gutta</b>(M, A) går i forveien.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Du kunne jo prøve her oppe, i selskap med Shelob.</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954/1974, pp. 411-413)</p> <p>21 sentences</p>	<p>òg, skal jeg vedde på(O). Men det er ikke(O) tvil om at det er(O) noe som uroer dem. Sånn er det med nazgûl der nede, etter det du sier, og sånn er det i Lugbúrz også. Det var et eller annet som nesten glapp.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Ja vel, da, men det kan vi(O) snakke om <b>sia</b>(A). Vent til(O) vi kommer til Underporten. <b>Der</b>(O, A) er det et sted vi to kan prate litt, mens <b>kara</b>(M, A) går videre.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Du skulle prøvd å være her oppe og holde Hutula med selskap.</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954/2002, pp. 316-317)</p> <p>20 sentences</p>	<p><b>visst som no'anna</b>(M, A). Men det <b>æ</b>(A) 'kke(C) tvil om at <b>dem</b>(A) er(O) redde for <b>no'</b>(A). Nazgûlen <b>nedafor</b>(A) er det, etter det du melder: og Lugbúrz med. Noko gjekk mest <b>gæli</b>(A).</p> <p>..</p> <p>Javel. Men det pratar vi(O) om sidan. Vent til(O) vi kjem til undervegen. <b>Der</b>(O, A) kan vi prate litt, medan <b>gutta</b>(M, A) driv på.</p> <p>..</p> <p>Du <b>sku</b>(A) prøve på å <b>værra</b>(A) her oppe i lag med Vevkjerringa.</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954, 1955/2006, pp. 680-681)</p> <p>20 sentences</p>
---	---	--	--



**Character:** Gandalf

**Race:** Wizard

**Rank:** High

**Speaking with:** Saruman (Wizard)

<b>ST</b> <b>English</b> <b>(Tolkien, 1954-1955)</b>	<b>TT1</b> <b>Bokmål</b> <b>(Werenskiold, 1973-1975)</b>	<b>TT2</b> <b>Bokmål</b> <b>(Høverstad, 1980-1981)</b>	<b>TT3</b> <b>Nynorsk</b> <b>(Myhren, 2006)</b>
<p>What <b>have you</b> to say that you did not say at our last meeting? Or, perhaps, you have things to unsay?</p> <p>..</p> <p>Saruman, Saruman! Saruman, you missed you path in life. You should have been the king's jester and earned your bread, and stripes too, by mimicking his counsellors. Ah me! Understand one another? I fear I am beyond your comprehension. But <b>you</b>, Saruman, I understand now too well. I keep a clearer memory of your arguments, and deeds, than you suppose. When <b>last</b> I visited you, you were the jailor of Mordor, and <b>there</b> I was to be sent. <b>Nay</b>, the guest who has escaped from the roof, will think twice before he comes back in by the door. <b>Nay</b>, I do not think I will come up. But listen, Saruman, for the last</p>	<p>Hva har du(O) å si meg som du ikke fikk sagt sist vi møttes? Eller kanskje det er noe du helst så usagt?</p> <p>..</p> <p>Saruman, Saruman. Saruman, du har kommet på gale veier i livet. Du skulle vært kongens hoffnarr og tjent <b>ditt brød(A)</b>, og pryl også, med å herme kongens rådgivere. Bevares! Komme til forståelse? Jeg er redd jeg overgår <b>din forstand(A)</b>. Men <b>deg(M)</b>, Saruman, forstår jeg så altfor godt. Jeg har både <b>dine ord og gjerninger(A)</b> i minne. <b>Sist gang (O, A) jeg</b> besøkte deg, var du Mordors fangevokter, (O) <b>jeg(A)</b> skulle sendes dit. Nei(O), en gjest som har unnsloppet fra taket, tenker seg om to ganger før han kommer tilbake inn <b>døra(A)</b>. Nei(O), jeg tror ikke jeg vil komme opp. Men hør på meg</p>	<p>Hva har du(O) å si, som du ikke sa sist vi møttes? Eller har du kan hende ting du vil ha usagt?</p> <p>..</p> <p>Sarumann, Sarumann!</p> <p>Sarumann, du har valgt gal livsvei. Det var kongens narr du skulle vært; du skulle tjent <b>ditt brød(A)</b>, og prylen med, ved å herme etter <b>hans rådgivere(A)</b>. Nei, å nei! Forstå hverandre? Jeg er redd jeg overgår <b>din forståelse(A)</b>. Men <b>deg(M)</b>, Sarumann, forstår jeg nå bare så altfor godt. Jeg har bedre minne for <b>dine argumenter(A)</b>, og gjerninger òg, enn du tror. Da jeg <b>sist(M)</b> besøkte deg, var du Mordors fangevokter, og <b>dit(M)</b> var det jeg skulle sendes. Nei(O), den gjesten som har unnsloppet fra taket, tenker seg om to ganger før han kommer inn igjen gjennom døren. Nei(O), jeg tror ikke jeg</p>	<p>Kva har du(O) å seie som du ikkje sa sist vi møttest? Eller kanskje du har noko du skulle ha usagt?</p> <p>..</p> <p>Sarumann, Sarumann!</p> <p>Sarumann, du har valt galen livsveg. Du skulle ha vore <b>kongens(A) skjelm(A)</b> og tent til mat og <b>svolk(A)</b> ved å ape etter rådmennene hans. Kjære vene! Skjöne einannan? Eg er redd eg overstig <b>di fatteevne(A)</b>. Men <b>deg(M)</b>, Sarumann, skjønar eg no <b>øvleg(A)</b> godt. Eg minnest kva grunnar du gav meg, og gjerningane med, <b>klårare(A)</b> enn du rekna med. Då(O) eg kom til deg sist, var du fangevaktar for Mordor, og <b>dit(M)</b> skulle du sende meg. Nei(O), gjesten som har kome seg bort frå taket, tenkjer seg nok om før han kjem inn att gjennom døra. Nei(O), eg trur ikkje eg vil kome opp. Men</p>

<p>time! Will you not come down? Isengard has proved less strong than your hope and fancy made it. So may other things in which you still have trust. Would it not be well to leave it for a while? To turn to new things, perhaps? Think well, Saruman! Will you not come down?</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954c/2011, pp. 581-582)</p> <p>21 sentences</p>	<p>Saruman, for siste gang! Vil du ikke komme ned? Isengard var ikke så sterk som <b>du</b> innbilte deg, som <b>du</b>(A) drømte om. Kanskje andre ting som du sverger til, heller ikke er så sterke som du tror. Kanskje du skulle slå inn på noe nytt? Tenk deg godt om, Saruman! Vil du ikke komme ned?</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954/1974, pp. 215-217)</p> <p>20 sentences</p>	<p>kommer inn. Men hør på meg, Sarumann, for siste gang! Vil ikke <i>du</i> komme ned? Jarnagard har vist seg mindre sterkt enn <b>dine håp</b> (A) og <b>din fantasi</b>(A) ville ha det til. Det samme kan andre ting du ennå fester lit til. Hadde det ikke vært bedre å legge alt dette bak seg for en stund? Vende seg mot nye ting? Tenk deg vel om, Sarumann! Vil du ikke komme ned?</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954/2002, pp. 167-168)</p> <p>21 sentences</p>	<p>høyr, Sarumann, for siste gong! Vil du ikkje kome ned? Jarnagard har synt seg mindre sterk enn du tenkte og <b>vona</b>(A) på. Slik kan det og vere med anna du framleis lit på. Ville det ikkje vere godt å la det liggje ei tid? Å vende seg til andre saker, kanskje? Tenk godt på det, Sarumann! Vil du ikkje kome ned?</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954, 1955/2006, p. 538)</p> <p>21 sentences</p>
--	--	--	--

**Character:** Saruman  
**Race:** Wizard  
**Rank:** High(er)  
**Speaking with:** Gandalf (Wizard)

<b>ST</b> <b>English</b> <b>(Tolkien, 1954-1955)</b>	<b>TT1</b> <b>Bokmål</b> <b>(Werenskiold, 1973-1975)</b>	<b>TT2</b> <b>Bokmål</b> <b>(Høverstad, 1980-1981)</b>	<b>TT3</b> <b>Nynorsk</b> <b>(Myhren, 2006)</b>
<p>But you, Gandalf!  <b>For you at least</b> I am grieved, feeling for your shame. How comes it that you can endure such company? For you are proud, Gandalf – and not without reason, having a noble mind and eyes that look both deep and far. <b>Even now</b> will you not listen to my counsel?          ..          Unsay? Unsay? I endeavoured to advise you for your own good, but you scarcely listened. You are proud and do not love advice, having <b>indeed</b> a store of your own wisdom. But <b>on that occasion</b> you <b>erred</b>, I think, misconstruing my intentions <b>wilfully</b>. I fear that in my eagerness to persuade you, I lost patience. And indeed I regret it. For I bore you no ill-will; and <b>even now</b> I bear none, though you return to me in the company</p>	<p>Men <b>du</b>, Gandalf, <b>deg</b>(M, A) sørger jeg i det minste over. Du må da skamme deg? Hva går det av deg som ferdes i slikt selskap? Du som er en stolt mann, Gandalf, og ikke uten grunn. Du er av et edelt sinn, <b>dine øyne</b>(A) skuer både vidt og dypt. (O) Vil du heller ikke denne <b>gang</b> (A) lytte til <b>mitt råd</b>(A)?          ..          Usagt? Usagt? Jeg forsøkte å råde deg til ditt eget beste, men du <b>gad</b>(A) nesten ikke høre på meg. Du er en stolt mann, <b>du</b>(A) liker ikke å få råd, (O) så mye visdom som du sitter inne med. Men <b>akkurat den gang</b> (M, A) tok du feil(O), jeg tror at du bevisst misforstod <b>min gode hensikt</b>(O, A). Jeg er redd jeg var så oppsatt på å overbevise deg at jeg rent mistet tålmodigheten. Er det noe jeg</p>	<p>Men du, Gandalf! <b>Deg</b>(M) i det minste sørger jeg over, og føler for deg i <b>dim skam</b>(A). Hvordan har det seg at du kan holde ut slikt selskap? For du er stolt, Gandalf – og ikke uten grunn; du har et edelt sinn og øyne som ser både dypt og langt. (O) Vil du ikke lytte til <b>mitt råd</b>(A), selv nå?          ..          Usagt? Usagt? Jeg gjorde et forsøk på å råde deg til ditt eget beste, men du hørte knapt etter. Du er stolt og tar ugjerne imot råd, for <b>faktisk</b>(M) har du jo et forråd av egen visdom. Men <b>ved det høvet</b>(M) gjorde du feil(O), tror jeg, og mistolket <b>mine hensikter</b>(A) med vilje(O). Jeg er redd jeg mistet tålmodigheten i <b>min iver</b>(A) etter å overtale deg. Og det angrer jeg i sannhet på. For jeg hadde ingen uvilje mot deg;</p>	<p>Men du, Gandalf! <b>Deg</b>(M), i det minste, sørgjer eg over, og har medkjensle med skamma di. Kva kjem det seg av at du kan halde ut slikt følge? Du er stolt, Gandalf – og ikkje utan grunn, då du har ein <b>vyrdeleg</b>(A) <b>hug</b>(A), og auge som ser både djupt og langt. (O) Vil du ikkje <b>lye</b>(A) på rådet mitt no heller?          ..          Usagt? Usagt? Eg <b>freista</b>(A) på å råde deg til ditt eige beste, men du har knapt lydt etter det. Du er stolt og lyder ikkje på råd, og har <b>sjølv sagt</b>(M) nok med din eigen klokskap. Men(O) du fór vill(O) den gongen, trur eg, og mistydde siktemåla mine med vilje(O). Eg er redd eg <b>miste</b>(A) tolmodet i iveren etter å overtale deg. Og det <b>tregar</b>(A) eg sanneleg på. Eg hadde ingen vond vilje mot deg, og(O) eg ber ingen no heller, sjølv om du</p>

<p>of the violent and the ignorant. How should I? Are we not both members of a high and ancient order, most excellent in Middle-earth? Our friendship would profit us both alike. <b>Much</b> we could still accomplish together, to heal the disorders of the world. Let us understand one another, and dismiss <b>from thought</b> these lesser folk! Let them wait on our decisions! <b>For the common good</b> I am willing to redress the past, and to receive you. Will you not consult with me? Will you not come up?</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954c/2011, p. 581)</p> <p>22 sentences</p>	<p>angrer på, så er det det. <b>Jeg</b> ville <b>deg</b> ikke noe vondt, <b>ennå</b>(M) i dag vil <b>jeg</b>(A) <b>deg</b>(A) ikke det, selv om du kommer til meg i følge med voldsmenn og uvitende pakk. Hvorfor skulle jeg ville deg vondt? Er vi ikke begge to medlemmer av en høy og gammel orden, den største av alle i Midgard? Vennskap ville være til det beste for oss begge. <b>Sammen</b>(M) kunne <b>vi</b> to ennå utrette en hel del, <b>vi</b>(A) kunne skape ro og orden i verden. La <b>oss</b> komme til forståelse, la <b>oss</b>(A) ikke bry <b>våre tanker</b>(O, A) med disse småfolkene her. La dem vente til vi treffer <b>vårt valg</b>(A)! <b>For den gode saks skyld</b>(M) er <b>jeg</b> villig til å slå en strek over fortiden, <b>jeg</b>(A) vil ta imot deg. Vil du ikke rådslå med meg? Vil du ikke komme opp?</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954/1974, pp. 215-216)</p> <p>23 sentences</p>	<p><b>selv nå</b>(M) har jeg ikke det, skjønt du vender tilbake til meg i følge med uvitende voldsmenn. Hvordan kunne jeg det? Er vi ikke begge medlemmer av en høy og urgammel orden, den fremste i Midgard? Vennskap mellom oss ville vært til lik <b>gavn</b>(A) for oss begge. <b>Mangt</b>(M, A) kunne vi ennå utrette sammen, for å lege verdens uorden. La oss forstå hverandre, du og jeg, og slutte å bry(O) tankene våre med slike småfolk! La dem avvente <b>våre beslutninger</b>(A)! <b>For det felles beste</b>(M) er jeg villig til å gjøre opp med fortiden og ta imot deg her. Vil du ikke rådslå med meg? Vil du ikke komme inn?</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954/2002, p. 167)</p> <p>22 sentences</p>	<p>kjem att til meg i lag med valdelege og grove folk. Korleis skulle eg? Høyrer vi ikkje begge til ein høg og eldgamal orden, den mest høgverdige i Midgard? Venenskapen vår ville gagne oss <b>båe</b>(A, A) i lik <b>mon</b>(A). (O) Vi kunne framleis få til mykje i lag, til <b>lækjedom</b>(A) for <b>heimsens</b>(A) ro. La oss skjöne einannan, og stenge(O) desse mindre folka ute <b>or</b>(A) <b>hugen</b>(A)! La dei <b>bide</b>(A) våre på bod! <b>Med tanke på ålmenn velferd</b>(M, A), vil eg gjerne slå strek over fortida og ta imot deg. Vil du ikkje rådslå med meg? Vil du ikkje kome opp?</p> <p>(Tolkien, 1954, 1955/2006, pp. 537-538)</p> <p>22 sentences</p>
---	--	--	--



## **Appendix B: The Master's thesis' relevance for the teaching profession**

This thesis was written as a part of a five-year program for teacher education at NTNU, and the thesis is relevant for the teaching profession in several ways.

Firstly, writing a thesis about translation has made me more aware of the similarities and differences between the English and the Norwegian language, since I have studied how markers of linguistic variation have been added, maintained, changed or omitted in translation. I have learned more about the grammatical properties of the two languages, as well as non-standard lexis and pronunciation of words, and I have therefore become more capable of teaching my future students about linguistic variation within the English language. I have become more aware that many aspects of the English language are not easy to preserve in Norwegian, and sometimes even impossible to preserve, and that my future students may have difficulties expressing themselves in English due to lack of equivalence between the two languages. Students of lower and upper secondary school are still developing their English language skills, and it will be important for me to be able to communicate in two languages simultaneously if the students are struggling to understand something, for example how to express a word in English, or what a word means in Norwegian. Furthermore, my own language skills in English have improved a great deal in the process of writing this thesis, which will also improve the quality of my teaching.

Secondly, I have learned a lot about the process of writing such a long text, which consists of revising the text several times for grammatical errors and better sentence and paragraph structure. Students in upper secondary schools must be able to write longer texts themselves, and having gone through this process myself, I will be much more capable of giving useful feedback and helping them improve their texts concerning content, language and structure. I have also learned a lot about helpful feedback from my supervisor, who has commented on several drafts of the thesis, and also from my fellow students by giving and receiving feedback. Additionally, citation of sources, as well as critical reading of sources, are vital in academic writing, and after writing this thesis, I am much better prepared for teaching these things to my future students, especially in upper secondary school.

Lastly, *LOTR* has become massively popular since its publication in the 1950s and even more after the movie adaptation of the novel. Having studied linguistic variation in *LOTR* and its translations into Norwegian, I can use the novel and movies to teach my students about this topic as a way of incorporating popular culture into language learning.