

## **Summary**

The main objective of this thesis has been to investigate what the dominant strategy used to translate references to and names of institutions in Marekors from Norwegian into English is. I have used Toury's three-phase methodology, and found that the translator has used a mixture of the three strategies domestication, foreignization and exoticization, but that the main strategy has been exoticization.

## **Introduction**

Jo Nesbø's books have grown massive popularity world-wide. His books had in 2014 sold for over 60 million kroners in English (Hagen, 2015), and an article from July 2018 reported that his books had sold over 35 million copies worldwide (Høgseth, 2018). The book "Marekors" was the first of Jo Nesbø's books to be translated into English. It is the fifth book of a series regarding the detective work of the fictional police investigator Harry Hole, published in Norwegian in 2003. An English translation came in 2005 by Don Bartlett, titled "The Devil's Star".

Guided tours have been set up in Oslo to take fans to the locations set in the book. A film adaptation of "The Snowman", the seventh book in the series, was made in 2017, with Michael Fassbender in the leading role as Harry Hole. The series and Jo Nesbø himself are now key parts of what encapsulates the "Nordic Noir" genre, and it is safe to say that had it not been for the English translations of the books, there would not have been such an opportunity, and the books would not have amassed such a large readership across the world.

The books in the Harry Hole series are mainly set in Oslo. Many references are made to institutions, place names and other culture-specific items. Given that Norwegian is a very small language with limited use outside of Norway itself, and that its culture is not generally known outside of the country, it is interesting to see how the cultural-specific items in the book have been translated into English, being a global language and a culture that many people outside English speaking communities have knowledge about. Comparing the two gives you a chance to see whether the translator found it fitting for the reader to read the book through the lens of a foreigner looking into a different culture, or if he would try to alter the foreignness into something familiar to the target culture. In this paper I will be looking at some of the culture-specific institutions of Norway mentioned in the text, and what procedures Dan Bartlett chose to translate these. More specifically, I will try to answer the question; What is the dominant strategy used to translate references to and names of institutions in "Marekors" from Norwegian into English?

## **Method**

In carrying out my analysis I will be using Gideon Toury's three-phase methodology (Munday, 2016, p. 175). Toury wanted a clear-cut system to follow in the descriptive branch of translation, in order to better be able to carry out and compare data in this field. In "Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications" (2016, p. 175), Munday explains the three parts. The first part involves situating the text within the target culture system, looking at its significance or acceptability. This stage is connected to Itamar Even-Zohar's polysystem theory of a literature's role in a culture and will be discussed in the theoretical part of the thesis text. The second phase, identifying coupled pairs, will be presented in the tables below. The third phase, attempting to generalize the patterns identified, will be carried out in the Data and Analysis discussion at last.

This is a small study, with limited amounts of data for generalizations to be made. I therefore decided to focus on a specific group of material, namely institutions. I will not be going through an exhaustive list of every culture-specific item or reference to institutions in the book, but rather a select few.

## **Theoretical background**

Firstly, a definition of a culture-specific item needs to be established. Axeliá attempts this in "Translation, Power, Subversion" (1996, p. 58) and it is the definition I will be going by: "Those textually actualized items whose function and connotations in a source text involve a translation problem in their transference to a target text, whenever this problem is a product of the nonexistence of the referred item or of its different intertextual status in the cultural system of the readers of the target text".

When a translator comes across culture-specific items in a text, they are left with the choice of how to translate it. Do they stay as true to the source text as possible, by keeping the CSI unchanged? Do they change it into the closest they can come to an equivalent in the target text culture? Certain factors play a role in this choice, and these are important in order to understand the choice

made by the translator. Many different theorists have used different terms to generalize some common efforts. I have chosen to look at Itamar Even-Zohar's polysystem theory, along with some of Lawrence Venuti's strategy definitions and Javier Franco Axeliá's procedure definitions.

Even-Zohar's polysystem theory emphasizes the dynamic hierarchy of a country's literature, changing according to the historical moment (Munday, 2016, p. 171). He writes in his article "The position of translated literature within the literary polysystem" (Venuti, 2004, p. 200): "Whether translated literature becomes central or peripheral, and whether this position is connected with innovatory ("primary") or conservatory ("secondary") repertoires, depends on the specific constellation of the polysystem under study".

There are three major cases that can lead to translated literature having a central position in the literary polysystem (Venuti, 2004, p. 200). Those three are: 1. When a polysystem has not yet been crystallized, 2. When a literature is either "peripheral" or "weak", or both, and 3. When there are turning point, crises, or literary vacuums within a literature. Translated literature having a secondary position within the polysystem is conditioned by the lack of these states. This secondary position leads to the translated literature not having influence on major processes and it is modelled according to norms already conventionally established by an already dominant type in the target language. In this case, instead of bringing something new into a culture, it becomes a way to preserve traditional taste.

The position that a literature has within the polysystem will have an impact on the translational norms, behaviors and policies (Venuti, 2004, p. 203). When it has a central position, the translator does not seek ready-made models from the target text culture to transfer the source text into, but instead is prepared to violate home conventions, and will likely produce a translation closer to the original in terms of adequacy. If the new trend is not too foreign and deemed unacceptable to the target text reader, the translation code may become more flexible in the future. Translatability is high when the traditions involved are parallel and when there has been contact between the two traditions. The

means of translation will depend on the tolerance of the target text culture towards the source text culture.

It is also emphasized that the polysystem theory is not a black-and-white matter. Translated literature is not necessarily simply on one side or the other. Translated literature is also itself stratified, and one piece of work can assume a central position while another has a peripheral one (Venuti, 2004, p. 202). An example given is how in the Hebrew literary polysystem between the two world wars, Russian literature had a central position while works translated from other languages were secondary.

The question then becomes what position “The Devil’s Star” has in the polysystem. There are certain factors indicating that it has a secondary position. Norwegian as both a language and a culture is, as mentioned before, not well-known outside of the country itself. With that said, the culture does not really stand out massively from that of Western European countries, where the series are selling well. Most of the institutions mentioned in “Marekors” are likely to have a comparable version in English-speaking countries.

The books of the series belong in the category of Nordic Noir, which although massively popular worldwide, might not be entirely innovatory. The crime genre characterized by realism and critique of society, often driven by detective investigators was originated in the US around the 1930s (Skei, 2018). The Nordic Noir genre can therefore be seen as a continuation of what had already gained popularity and canonization. The Martin Beck-series of Sjöwall and Wahlöö consisted of ten books and to a large degree put Nordic countries on the map of the crime fiction genre. Since then, Nordic novels of the genre has become internationally widespread. It has given international readers a new look into the cultures of Northern European countries, in a way that was perhaps more difficult to get access to before. According to Venuti (2008, p. 154), between around the years 2000 and 2007 approximately fifteen crime novels by six Norwegian writers were translated and published into English. With that said, it is not necessarily presenting the readers with a flux of cultural diversity and differences in values.

Venuti claims that there is a “current regime of fluent domestication” in English-language translations (2008, p. 151). He writes that English-speaking countries have a tradition of ethnocentric, domesticating strategies of translation, and that the recent trend of translations of foreign crime fiction can be explained as “exoticizing” as opposed to “foreignizing”. This leaves the reader with a superficial cultural difference (Venuti, 2008, p. 160). They do not, like a foreignizing method would, question or upset values, beliefs and representations in Anglophone cultures, instead leaving the reader with a shallow sense of the foreign. If the genre exists within the cultural canon of the target culture, then the foreign elements in the translated text may come to be expected, hence it will leave a smaller impression and draw less attention (Venuti, 2008, p. 163). Whether a translation can be seen as foreignizing or exoticizing would then depend on to what degree it affects or is different from familiar cultural values. By disrupting the cultural codes that prevail in the translating language, a foreignizing method accentuates the “foreign”.

The terms “domesticating” and “foreignizing” translation are presented by Venuti in his book “The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation” (2008). He points to the German theologian and philosopher Friederich Schleiermacher who said that there were really only two methods of translating a text, either leaving the author in peace, as much as possible, and moving the author towards him, or leaving the reader alone, as much as possible, and moving the author towards him (p. 15). The choice then, according to Venuti, stood between a domesticating practice, which would mean “an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to receiving cultural values, bringing the author back home”, and “a foreignizing practice, an ethnodeviant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad”.

The preferred strategy, according to Venuti, is foreignization. It signifies the differences of the foreign text, yet only by disrupting the cultural codes that prevail in the translating language. It is important against the unequal cultural exchanges between the hegemonic English-language nations and their global

others, and a fight against ethnocentrism and cultural narcissism (Venuti, 2008, p. 16). It does not offer unmediated access to the foreign, but rather constructs a certain image of the foreign that is informed by the receiving situation but aims to question it by drawing on materials that are not currently dominant, namely the marginal and the nonstandard, the residual and the emergent (Venuti, 2008, p. 20). He stressed that no culture should be considered immune to self-criticism, and that such practices as foreignizing translation is important to test its limits, to avoid narcissistic complacency and becoming a fertile ground for ideological developments such as nationalisms and fundamentalisms.

Aixelá defines some of the strategies similar to Venuti's domestication, foreignization and exoticizing practices (1996). He makes a distinction between the two major methods: conservation and substitution. Conservation methods would involve repetition, orthographic adaptation, linguistic (non-cultural) translation and extratextual gloss. Substitution involves synonymy, limited universalization, absolute universalization, naturalization and deletion. He also emphasizes that translation of course is not limited to these techniques only, but they are some of the ones often used.

When the translator attempts to stay close to the original CSI reference, conservation methods can be used. The repetition method is used in keeping as much as possible of the original reference. An example of this would be to keep place names as they are, as opposed to substituting them with a compatible version in the target text culture. Orthographic adaptation involves methods such as transcription and transliteration, e.g. when the reference is made in a different alphabet. Linguistic (non-cultural) translation involves using a target language version of the original reference, while still belonging to the cultural system of the source text. This could be used if, for example, a reference does not have an equivalent in the target culture, or the source text culture reference is well-known within the target text culture. Extratextual and intratextual gloss involves the above-mentioned procedures, but with additional explanations of meaning or implications the culture-specific item mentioned. In extratextual gloss, this is not in the text, but outside of it, through footnotes

etc. It is included in the text in intratextual gloss, making something only partly revealed in the original text explicit.

The substitution methods are used when the translator derives from the source text culture and changes the word (Axeliá, 1996). This involves methods such as synonymy, which is done by using a synonym or parallel reference to the CSI in order to avoid repeating the word, closer to one of similar meaning in the TT culture. Limited universalization is another method explain by Axeliá, which replaces the CSI with a more usual reference in the TT culture, being closer to the target readers, but one that also belongs to the source language culture, often if the original CSI is considered too obscure. Absolute universalization is also used when the CSI is considered too foreign or obscure, but in this case a better known CSI is either not found, or it is preferred to delete any foreign connotations and a neutral reference substitutes the original CSI. Naturalization is done when the translator alters the CSI into a TT version, changing the morphology of the word into something familiar, but is not frequently used. Deletion, omitting a CSI or part of a CSI, can be used by a translator, often if the word is considered unacceptable on ideological or stylistic grounds, or if it is not considered relevant for the comprehension of the word. It can also be used if the CSI is too obscure.

## **Data**

I compared the ST references to the TT references by using digital versions of the book, bought on iTunes. I then read them through iBooks and found the above references to institutions in the ST. I went to the same chapter in the TT and found the translations. I was also able to easily search for specific culture-specific items I thought would be in the books, such as “Vinmonopolet” and “Politihuset”. I chose to list them in the order of the procedures. I emphasize once again that this is a small scale study, and the list does not contain an exhaustive amount of every institution referenced in the book, but a select few. The page numbers are parenthesized.

Source Text	Target Text	Procedure
-------------	-------------	-----------

Videonova (303)	Videonova (284)	Repetition
Aftenposten (70)	<i>Aftenposten</i> (68)	Repetition
Vinmonopolet (57)	The Vinmonopol (56)	Repetition
Kiwi (86)	Kiwi (83)	Repetition
Aftenposten (9)	A newspaper (11)	Limited universalization
Voldsavsnittet (14)	Crime Squad (16)	Limited universalization
Ransavsnittet (15)	Crime Squad (17)	Limited universalization
Ordensvakta (550)	Regular uniformed police (521)	Limited universalization
Betjenter fra Krimvakta (550)	Frontline officers (521)	Limited universalization
Hybelhuset (299)	Student building (281)	Synonymy
Studenthuset (311)	Student building (292)	Synonymy
Beredskapstroppen (300)	Special Forces (282)	Synonymy

Barneombudets (312)	The Children's Council's (294)	Synonymy
Politi høyskolen (242)	Police College (221)	Synonymy
Politihuset (550)	Police HQ (521)	Synonymy
Kriminalsjefen (52)	The Chief Superintend ent (50)	Synonymy
Legevakta (301)	Casualty (283)	Synonymy
Forsvarets etterretningstjen este (302)	The intelligence service working at the Ministry of Defence (284)	Synonymy
Forsvaret (303)	Ministry of Defence (285)	Synonymy
Folkeregisteret (307)	National Registry Office (289)	Synonymy
POT (218)	The security service guys, POT (207)	Intratextual gloss
SEFO (17)	SEFO, the independent	Intratextual gloss

	police investigation authority (19)	
Kriminalsjefen (52)	The head of <i>Kripos</i> (51)	Intratextual gloss
7-Eleven (303)	7-Eleven shops (284)	Intratextual gloss
Krimteknisk (15)	<i>Krimteknisk</i> , the forensics department (17)	Intratextual gloss
Harry Lyd (301)	Harry Sounds (283)	Orthographic adaptation

## Discussion

The items used to translate the institutions in the book are mostly synonyms. The nature of the CSIs is important here, as most of the examples are related to institutions of public services. These are institutions that, although separate, serve the same purpose across borders, e.g. “Legevakta” to “Casualty”, and “Politihuset” to “Police HQ”. They are universal items, and involve a transparency across cultures. It is therefore difficult to place it within a spectrum of domestication or foreignization. Overall, there seems to be a general tendency of substitution, which could be said to have a domesticating effect. This is perhaps because, as mentioned, Norwegian culture not being well-known outside of the country’s borders.

However, other CSIs of similar institutions, such as “POT”, “SEFO” and “Krimteknisk” are repeated with the addition of intratextual gloss. The words are all repeated later in the text as pure repetitions, without the intratextual gloss. It is, however, an interesting choice not to translate “POT” to “Secret

Service”, similar to how “Beredskapstroppen” is translated to “Special Forces”. Perhaps it is due to “POT” being an acronym and that it therefore does not disrupt the reader as much as a long foreign word such as “Beredskapstroppen” would.

In the case of “Krimteknisk”, intratextual gloss has also been used in this translation. It could possibly have to do with the fact that this word is phonetically quite similar to a direct translation of a word with the same meaning in English, and therefore perhaps easily associated with the meaning by an English reader. This stands in contrast to e.g. “Barneombudet”, which might have disrupted the target text reader to a higher degree, as the words are not easily recognizable. “7-eleven” was translated with an additional “shops” at the end, and “Videonova” was not. The sentence they both belong to is plural: “han var lei av å installere butikkovervåkningskameraer for 7-Eleven og Videonova (Nesbø, Marekors, p. 303). “he was sick and tired of setting up surveillance cameras in 7-Eleven shops and Videonova” (Nesbø, *The Devil’s Star*, p. 284). The choice to put “shops” after the “7-Eleven” and not after both is an interesting one.

The CSIs translated by limited universalization are also mostly of the same nature. It is perhaps more difficult to find a specific word for these in English, so they are made less specific in their translations, such as “Voldsavsnittet” and “Ransavsnittet” both being translated into “Crime Squad”, and “Betjenter fra Krimvakta” being translated into “Frontline officers”. “Harry Lyd” is likely translated into “Harry Sounds” to avoid ambiguities.

In other words, there are certain elements that indicate that the translator has attempted to reduce cultural disruption by the target text reader. The items that have been translated through conservatory methods are quite short and do not crave much attention. The institutions so far have mainly been translated using substitution methods, which has a slight domesticating effect. However, as mentioned, because of the nature of the CSIs and their universality, it could be argued that this domesticating effect is not very dominant in these cases. The ones that are translated through intratextual gloss, such as “POT” and “SEFO”

could be argued to have an exoticizing effect, as it does not really disrupt any cultural values in the target reader, but perhaps simply gives a shallow sense of something foreign.

The use of repetition in the translation can be said to have a foreignizing effect. Words such as “Aftenposten” and “Vinmonopolet” is likely to draw a certain amount of attention from a foreign reader. However, these examples are quite few and far between, and are often quite obvious in their meaning through the context surrounding it. In order to be foreignizing, it should question or upset values, beliefs and representations in Anglophone cultures, as stated before. These words might be entirely foreign to the reader, and give them some insight into the Norwegian culture.

It could also be argued that the use of repetition is mostly exoticizing. Perhaps the mentions of institutions like grocery stores, “Kiwi”, and small shops “Videonova” is not enough in itself to give the reader a real experience of the culture. It could, like Venuti stated, leave the reader with a shallow, superficial sense of the foreign. This combined with the high usage of synonymy, and intratextual gloss only when most convenient, suggests that the overall strategy used is exoticization.

As was discussed in the polysystem theory, a source text country’s role in the target text culture will affect the translation. Norwegian language and culture not being all that well-known outside of Norway, likely impacted the translation in regards to the amount of substitution methods. Of course, with the increase of globalization, a bit more knowledge has been made possible, but it does not necessarily extend beyond superficialities. Nordic Noir as a genre, despite its undeniable popularity, was already canonized within the English-speaking culture before it was “Nordic”. So perhaps the interest of the readers of the books are not predominantly getting an understanding of Nordic culture, but the crime genre itself, which might lead to more domestication of the translations.

The findings of the thesis are also colored by the fact that only references to or names of institutions are looked at. The nature of these have been universal, and therefore understandably translated into English version, being the global language that it is. It also cannot be stressed enough, the relative nature of any definitions regarding the method of translation. This is a process of many possibilities, and can be difficult to define. Oftentimes translation choices can be ascribed to more than one procedure.

## **Conclusion**

The main objective of this thesis was to find out what the dominating strategy of translating the references to and names of institutions in the book. The results indicate that the main strategy is exoticizing. The use of substitution of the institutions in the text is quite high, and it could be argued that the use of conservation has an exoticizing effect as opposed to a foreignizing one.

The findings of this paper can be helpful and used in research of related translation strategies, whether to compare to different findings of different genres or to further understand translation strategies of Nordic Noir into English.

## **Bibliography**

Aixelá, J. F. (1996), Culture-specific items in translation. In R. Alvarez & C. Vidal (ed.), *Translation, Power, Subversion* (pp. 52-78)

Clevedon/Philadelphia/Adelaide: Multilingual Matters

Even-Zohar, I. (1978/1990) The position of translated literature within the literary polysystem. In Venuti, L. (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*, (2<sup>nd</sup> edition, pp. 199-204) London & New York: Routledge

Hagen, A. W. (2015, January 18th). Nesbø-feber i USA. Retrieved from <https://www.dn.no/boker/jo-nesbo/litteratur/nesbo-feber-i-usa/1-1-5289665>

Herseth, T. M. (2017) *Culture-Specific Items in Nordic Noir – A Descriptive Translation Study with Focus on Three Novels by Jo Nesbø* (Master's Thesis). Norges teknisk-naturvitenskapelige universitet, Trondheim. Retrieved from <https://ntnuopen.ntnu.no/ntnu-xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/2457678/Tonje%20Milli%20Herseth.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

Høgseth, M. H. (2018, July 15th). Boksuksess doblet inntektene for Nesbø. Retrieved from <https://e24.no/naeringsliv/boksuksess-doblet-inntektene-for-nesboe/24394347>

Munday, J. (2016), *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge

Nesbø, J. (2003). *Marekors* [iBooks]. H. Aschehough & Co., Oslo.

Nesbø, J. (2005) *The Devil's Star* (Bartlett, D., translator). Harper Collins Publishers

Skei, H. H. (2018, December 6<sup>th</sup>). Kriminallitteratur. In Store norske leksikon. Retrieved may 10<sup>th</sup> 2019 from <https://snl.no/kriminallitteratur>

Toury, G. (1978/2004), The nature and role of norms in literary translation. In Venuti, L. (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*, (2<sup>nd</sup> edition, pp.198-211), London & New York: Routledge

Venuti, L. (2004) *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), London & New York: Routledge