

Acknowledgements

Writing this thesis has been equal parts challenging and rewarding. It's been a long journey, and I owe some people a great deal.

I'd first like to thank my supervisor, Annjo K. Greenall, whose advice and guidance has been invaluable. This thesis would not have been the same without her insight and her sharp mind.

I also want to thank my parents for their love and encouragement throughout this process. Finally, I would like to acknowledge with gratitude, all of the love and support I've received from my girlfriend Marita during these long months of writing and re-writing. You kept me going, and I am for ever grateful for that.

Trondheim, May 2015

Daniel Didriksen

Table of contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Theoretical background	5
2.1. The concept of hybridity	5
2.1.1. Cultural hybridity	9
2.1.2. Textual-linguistic hybridity	10
2.2. Hybridity and translation	13
2.2.1. Translation leading to hybridity	13
2.2.2. Hybrid originals in translation	18
3. Method	23
3.1. The data	23
3.2. Chesterman's 'Comparison of Translations and their Source Texts'	24
3.3. Analytical tools	25
3.3.1. Eugene Nida's equivalences	25
3.3.2. Vinay and Darbelnet's translation strategies	28
3.3.3. Antoine Berman's Negative Analytic	31
3.5. Weaknesses, limitations, and clarifications	36
4. Analysis	39
4.1. A short summary of the plot of <i>American Gods</i>	39
4.2. ST hybridity	42
4.2.1. Preserved hybridity	43
4.2.1.1. Intralingual hybridity	43
4.2.1.2. Interlingual hybridity	46
4.2.1.3. Creole language	50
4.2.2. Neutralized hybridity	52
4.3. No ST Hybridity, TT Hybridity	58
4.3.1. Non-translation of intertextual elements	58
4.3.2. Non-translation of Anglophone names	61
4.3.3. Miscellaneous TT exclusive hybridity	62
5. Discussion	67
5.1. Main findings	67
5.2. The translation of hybrid elements in <i>American Gods</i>	68
5.2.1. Preserved hybridity	68
5.2.2. Neutralizing hybridity	72
5.2.3. Hybridity exclusive to the TT	75
5.2.3.1. Non-translation	76
5.2.3.2. Miscellaneous translation-induced hybridity	81
6. Conclusion	85

1. Introduction

One question that has always intrigued me is what happens to demonic beings when immigrants move from their homelands. Irish-Americans remember the fairies, Norwegian-Americans the nisser, Greek-Americans the vrykólakas, but only in relation to events remembered in the Old Country. When I once asked why such demons are not seen in America, my informants giggled confusedly and said, "They're scared to pass the ocean, it's too far," pointing out that Christ and the apostles never came to America.

Richard Dorson, "A Theory for American Folklore,"
American Folklore and the Historian
(University of Chicago Press, 1971) ¹

The Richard Dorson quote above is surprisingly fitting as an analogy to hybridity in translation. The ocean often symbolizes change (both physical and psychological) in literature, and this transformative power of the sea is perhaps even more prevalent in American literatures than most others. The process of translation also relies on transformation and change by transferring a text from one linguistic and cultural context to another. What happens to linguistic and cultural items that are deeply rooted in the source culture and language in this process? In which ways are these elements altered and re-written? These are some of the questions that led me to the overarching theme of this thesis: the translation of hybrid texts.

¹ Dorson, Richard. "A Theory for American Folklore." *American Folklore and the Historian*. University of Chicago Press: 1971. Qtd in Gaiman, Neil. *American Gods*. New York: Harpertext, 2002. Preface. Print.

The concept of a globalization of cultures has only increased in relevance the past decades, and some would argue that we are moving towards a world where borders between languages and cultures are starting to weaken and collapse. This view of the world might sound bleak and worried – but more importantly, it can help explain the concept of hybridity that will be central to the thesis.

Translation of hybrid texts is undeniably a complex and challenging task, and in light of the growing hybridization of cultures and languages all over the world this particular area of translation studies seems more relevant now than ever before. The texts that I will be looking at in this thesis are Neil Gaiman's 2001 novel *American Gods*² and its Norwegian translation from 2012.³ Gaiman's novel is what one can classify as a hybrid text: it displays a wide selection of different types of textual hybridity as well as a clear element of cultural hybridity. It is a novel written by an Englishman, set mostly in modern day America, and it deals with themes such as religion and spirituality, immigration, and mixed cultural identities. All of this makes *American Gods* a well-suited text for the purposes of this thesis. As we explore the nature of translation of hybrid texts, the main research questions will be as follows: does the Norwegian translation of Neil Gaiman's *American Gods* preserve or neutralize hybridity found in the source text, and is it possible to identify and explain any patterns in the representation of ST hybridity within the TT? Additionally, could translation be seen to give rise to new, TT-exclusive forms of hybridity?

² Gaiman, Neil. *American Gods*. New York: Harpertext, 2002. Print.

³ ---. *Amerikanske Guder*. Trans. Ina Vassbotn Steinman. Kristiansund: Vendetta Forlag AS, 2012.

In the search for answers to the research questions above this thesis will move on to a presentation of the most central theories and writing on hybridity and hybrid texts as a foundation for further exploration and analysis of the research material. Before moving on to the analysis, there is a section dedicated to the methodology and terminology which will be applied to the material in the analysis. The analysis chapter will be concentrated on identifying preserving or neutralizing procedures applied to the hybrid ST-elements, as well as a paying attention to any hybridity which may be exclusive to the TT. The analysis is followed by a discussion chapter where central discoveries from the analysis are presented and discussed in greater detail. Finally, some concluding thoughts will be presented.

2. Theoretical background

This chapter will focus on theory which deals with the concept of hybridity, both as an aspect of texts in general as well as a phenomenon which might be seen as a result of translation processes. We will start with an outline of the various views on hybridity before moving on to a discussion of whether or not translation can be seen as a process that creates hybridity.

2.1. The concept of hybridity

Hybridity is a difficult term to fully grasp - there is no universal agreement about exactly what this phenomenon is; no consensus as to what constitutes it. This chapter will nonetheless be dedicated to presenting the different ideas that surround the term. To give a short, simple definition of hybridity can be a challenge, but for the purposes of this introduction we can start with Mikhail Bakhtin's definition of linguistic hybridity.

Bakhtin sees this hybridization as "a mixture of two social languages within the limit of a single utterance, an encounter ... between two different ... consciousnesses, separated from one another by an epoch, by social differentiation or by some other factor".⁴

Following this, hybridity can be seen as something which arises from mixing elements from different languages, cultures, ethnicities, epochs, and so on. Hybridity used to be seen as something which was closely connected to postcolonial countries where identities, culture and language were shaped by the relationship between the colonizers and the colonized. In the postcolonial world, international migration and cultural

⁴ Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. p. 358, qtd. in Marwan, Kraidy M. *Hybridity, Or the Cultural Logic of Globalization*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2005. Web.

globalization are seen as great contributors to hybridity, and fragmentation and softening of national and cultural borders has been claimed to result in the increasingly mixed identities of our time.⁵

Zauberga is a commentator who reflects on hybridity's emergence in the new world, i.e. globalized society and culture. He writes:

“[hybridity] as a feature [can] be traced far beyond the realm of translation ... the world ... has become an immense contact zone where cultures, previously separated, come together and establish ongoing relations ... Hybridity in translation should not necessarily be treated as linguistic and cultural interference but rather as a natural consequence of crossing cultural barriers”.⁶

Zauberga's discussion of hybridity is closely related to translation (which will be discussed in more detail later), but it can also be helpful as a description of the world at large. In a sense, we could say that hybridity on the macro level (globalized society) leads to hybridity on the micro level (linguistic and cultural spheres). Hybridity is then seen as a phenomenon which is deeply connected to the changes in cultural and linguistic spheres that a globalized world brought with it. In this globalized society borders are more flexible than before, allowing ideas, languages, literature, music, people, et cetera, to move freely between cultures and countries – and this cultural and linguistic 'freedom' creates hybridity. This, as Zauberga put it, is only a natural consequence of the times we live in (265-266). Mary Snell-Hornby's understanding of

⁵ Cohen, Robin & Paola Toninato. "Hybridity". *The University of Warwick, Department of Sociology*, 15. Nov 2007. Web.

⁶ Zauberga, Ieva. "Discourse interference in translation." *Across Languages and Cultures*. 2 (2001): 265-276. Print. pp. 265-266. All future references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text.

hybrid texts is also linked to globalization, and she writes that “hybrid texts, whether in postcolonial literature or other genres, reflects the reality of our world today, itself a hybrid world ... The hybrid text is a natural result of our international, intercultural, globalised lives”.⁷ Edward Said also acknowledged this when he wrote that “... all cultures are involved in one another; none is single and pure, all are hybrid, heterogeneous.”⁸ Purity is a difficult word in this particular context: “translated texts mark lines between at least two languages and cultures,” says Pym, and “they posit the separation and the possible purity of both.”⁹ Said’s and Pym’s understanding of globalized society and its effects on cultures, as well as practices such as translation, are closely linked. Said argues that no culture is free from outside influence, and that as a result of this all cultures must be hybrid and heterogeneous – the point Pym makes is similar. He calls attention to the fact that translation, if seen as a contributor to hybridity, is an idea which is based on the assumption that cultures and languages are in fact pure. If none are pure, then how can we tell where to draw the line between them? This is in many ways one of the things what lie at the heart of the discussion of hybrid texts in translation, and it illustrates the complexity of the topic.

When we are discussing and exploring ideas about globalized society and its connection to hybridity there are many possible angles from which we could approach this. A sociologist could for instance look at how hybridity of both cultural and linguistic natures affect areas such as religion, law, or sexuality. Within translation studies the

⁷ Snell-Hornby, Mary. “The Space ‘In Between’: What is a Hybrid Text?” *Across Languages and Cultures*. 2 (2001): 207-216. Print. p. 208. All future references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text.

⁸ Said, Edward W. Qtd. in Burke, Peter. *Cultural Hybridity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2009. Print. p. xxix.

⁹ Pym, Anthony. “Against Praise of Hybridity.” *Across Languages and Cultures*. 2 (2001): 195-206. Print. p. 196.

approach is perhaps a bit narrower: here, hybridity is either a quality of the source- or target text. The focus is on how these hybrid qualities are handled in the process of translation. Generally, theorists that operate within translation studies approach the subject of hybridity with a sense of descriptivism, but historically, prescriptive approaches are not entirely uncommon. Equivalence (which must be considered a prescriptive approach to translation) had its heyday in the 1970's and 80s, with a focus on achieving equal value between languages in the translation process.¹⁰ For the purposes of this thesis, theories and ideas of both prescriptive and descriptive natures will be presented and employed in the analysis.

The phenomenon we can identify as hybridity in texts are often divided into two different categories, namely 'cultural', e.g. non-textual hybridity, and 'textual-linguistic' hybridity. The main focus of this study will be to explore this in the context of translation, with an emphasis on the latter. Firstly, there will be a description of the two main categories of hybridity (cultural, and textual-linguistic), followed by an introduction to theories connecting hybridity to translation. Towards the end of this chapter we consider the ways in which hybrid source texts may be treaded in translation.

¹⁰ Pym, Anthony. *Exploring Translation Theories*. Oxon: Routledge, 2010. p. 6. All future references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text.

2.1.1. Cultural hybridity

Sherry Simon begins a discussion of hybridity by explaining how cultural relations in our present times are best described with words beginning with the ‘trans’, rather than the ‘inter’ prefix.¹¹ Cultural identities, like most countries, are no longer hermetically sealed and secure – we are all products of our time, and our identities reflect this. Simon recalls one of her first encounters with what she would call a hybrid text, the 1985 novel *Comment faire l’amour avec un nègre sans se fatiguer* – or *How to Make Love to a Negro*. She comments on how the language of the novel itself is not particularly hybrid. There is no code switching; no calque; no ‘weakness’ in the mastery of the linguistic code. The novel’s hybrid elements are visible in the way the author uses cultural references, such as the names of streets and cafés. Simon also comments on how the main characters spend a lot of time discussing art, religion and politics, referencing Freud, Islam and jazz music (Sherry 218). By bringing all this cultural diversity into the text, the author creates a work that exists in a space which is not culturally pure – imagine zooming out on the map: as you move further away from the map, the lines which mark borders begin to blur and disappear, and you’re no longer seeing just one culture, but many. It is here that we find hybrid texts such as *How to Make Love to a Negro*. Cultural phenomena such as ideas and ideals, names, literature, and music do not adhere to country borders. Peter Burke says that “examples of cultural hybridity are to be found everywhere, not only all over the globe but in most domains of culture – syncretic religions, eclectic philosophies, mixed languages and cuisines, and hybrid styles in architecture, literature

¹¹ Sherry, Simon. “Cultural and Textual Hybridity.” *Across Languages and Cultures*. 2 (2001): 217-226. Print. p. 217. All future references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text.

and music.¹² In the case of literature, Burke explains how literary genres may be hybrids, pointing out that “the Japanese novel, the Arab novel, the African novel and possibly the Latin American novel ... should be regarded – and judged by critics – not as simple imitations of the Western novel but as literary hybrids ... a combination of foreign techniques with local culture, especially popular culture” (18).

2.1.2. Textual-linguistic hybridity

We can also observe and classify hybridity as textual, or linguistic. This is in a way a catch-all term that describes hybrid phenomenon which deals with language. This means that there are quite a lot of hybrid elements that are classified as ‘textual-linguistic’. Christina Shäffner and Beverly Adab define hybrid texts by the way they “... [show] features that somehow seem ‘out of place’ / ‘strange’ / ‘unusual’ for *the receiving culture*, i.e. the target culture.”¹³ The elements one can classify as hybrid according to Shäffner and Adab are those which seem strange or unusual for the target culture – these features might appear perfectly normal for source culture readers. It is, as we have commented on earlier, the transposition of elements from one culture to another that creates these hybrid elements. Shäffner and Adab’s definition is useful here because it is adequately wide, allowing us to explore a whole host of different hybrid elements. I must however, be noted, that Vinay and Darbelnet’s definition only pertain to translated texts,

¹² Burke, Peter. *Cultural Hybridity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2009. Print. p. 13. All future references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text.

¹³ Shäffner, Christina, and Beverly Adab. “The Idea of the Hybrid Text in Translation: Contact as Conflict.” *Across Languages and Cultures*. 2 (2001): 167-180. Print. p. 169. Emphasis mine. All future references to this source will be cited parenthetically in the text.

not to source texts. As a counterpoint to (and augmentation of) the above definition of hybridity, Sherry Simon's definition of textual hybridity is useful:

Hybrid texts are those which use "translation effects" to question the borders of identity. Dissonances, interferences, disparate vocabulary, a lack of cohesion, unconventional syntax, a certain "weakness" in the mastery of the linguistic code: these are elements which enter into the deterritorialising strategies, the acts of creolisation, which make up the hybrid text. Without necessarily being translations of a previous text, these works involve acts of interlingual creation. They arise out of those hybrid sites of belonging which are now encroaching on the general civic space (Simon 218).

The usefulness of Simon's definition is marked by the acknowledgement of the influence cultural, linguistic, and political landscapes can exert on translators. It does also explain how source texts can display features which can be classified as hybrid, as well as how these features might manifest themselves in the text, emphasizing that hybrid texts not only can be results of translation, but also be results of deliberate decisions by translators to "question the borders of identity".

A multilingual text – that is a text which consists of more than one language – is an example of a text in which we can find hybrid elements of a textual-linguistic nature. A linguistic element such as code-switching is an example of how this multilingualism might manifest itself in the text. The term describes situations where more than one language or dialect is used in a sentence or conversation.¹⁴

¹⁴ Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. *Code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. Web. p. 4.

We could also see hybridity arise from transporting a linguistically or culturally bound idiom from one culture to another. Anthony Pym illustrates this with the following example:

Friday the thirteenth is an unlucky day in English-language cultures but not in most other cultures. In Spanish, the unlucky day is *Tuesday* the thirteenth. So when we translate the name of that day we have to know exactly what kind of information is required. If we are just referring to the calendar, then Friday will do; if we are talking about bad luck, then a better translation would probably be “Tuesday the thirteenth”. ... The world is full of such examples (Pym, “Exploring Translation Theories” 7).

What Pym is implying here is that Friday the thirteenth would possibly be seen as a bit unusual to most Spanish speaking people, the same way Tuesday the thirteenth would appear to the English-speaking portion of the world if it was used to designate an unlucky day.

It must be noted that what is labeled ‘cultural hybridity’ above might be identified as ‘textual-linguistic’ in some cases. This complicates things slightly, but the general idea is that when the hybrid element appears within the text it must be textual. Still, keeping this kind of distinction is useful, in that it enables the inclusion of elements that are not purely ‘linguistic’ at heart – such as cultural allusions and genre-related hybridity.

2.2. Hybridity and translation

“In a sense all translations qualify as hybrids as long as they can be viewed as a transplant of the source text in an alien target culture environment.”¹⁵ (Zauberga 266)

This statement by Zauberga sums up a central thought within translation theory: if translation is a process of transplanting something from one cultural environment to another, then texts produced in this manner must be hybrid almost by default. This topic will be explored further in 2.2.1.

Another central aspect of translation that needs commenting on is the translation of hybrid texts, i.e. hybrid source texts. This topic is discussed and presented in 2.2.2.

2.2.1. Translation leading to hybridity

As we touched upon above, translation is often seen as a contributing factor to a text’s hybrid nature. Something happens when we transport meaning from one language / culture into another, and it is often thought that in doing so, hybridity is created.

An idea that many translation theorists seem to subscribe to is that translated texts must be seen as both a product of the source and target culture and language. Alan Duff speaks of a ‘third language’, which includes traits from both target and source languages – it is a language of translation where “all words are known but put together in an

¹⁵ Zauberga, Ieva. “Discourse Interference in Translation.” *Across Languages and Cultures*. 2 (2001): 265-276. Print. p. 266. All future references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text.

unfamiliar way.”¹⁶ Mary Snell-Hornby, as well as Sherry Simon echo Duff’s view, claiming that translation is something that occupies a space in between languages and genres.¹⁷ These hybrid texts exist within and because of overlapping cultural and linguistic spheres. This can be pictured as two or more circles overlapping, and the points where they cross each other are the spaces where hybridity can be found. These understandings of translation are centered on the idea that translative action is not just a matter of transplanting something from one cultural context into another, but rather a subtle merging of aspects from both sides. When there are elements from both the source and target culture present in the translated text, this can ultimately be viewed as hybridity of both a textual and cultural character, and this brings us back to Zauberga’s idea that translated texts are all, in a sense, hybrid.

Zauberga presents us with three major factors that he feels may increase the degree of hybridity of target texts (268). The first factor is “ideological background’, i.e., power and prestige accorded to the source culture in relation to the target culture”. For instance, we might illustrate this with the way some translations of French theory were handled. There were all kinds of syntactic interferences, such as sentences beginning “For X cannot be held to be...,” or high proportions of cleft sentences (complex sentences with one main clause and a dependent clause that has a meaning that could be expressed by a simple clause). Pym writes that “[s]ince the source culture (“French theory”) is held to be prestigious, the interferences are tolerated” (*Exploring Translation Theories*, 83). If the power balance between target and source cultures is uneven, this

¹⁶ Duff, Alan. Qtd. in Zauberga, 279.

¹⁷ Shäffner, Christina, and Beverly Adab. “The Idea of the Hybrid Text in Translation Revisited.” *Across Languages and Cultures*. 2 (2001): 277-302. Print. p. 279.

could possibly manifest itself in translations between these two, and be measured in terms of hybridity.

Secondly, Zauberga brings up the translator's in/competence as a factor. This can be understood as a translator's "in/ability to rationalize translation process (sic) and choose an adequate translation strategy." For instance, if a translator should lack an awareness of cultural differences between source and target cultures then this might lead to 'errors', possibly creating something 'strange' or 'unusual' for the receiving culture. It should be pointed out that studying this with a view to identifying the cause of such 'errors' brings with it considerable methodical challenges. Apart from asking the translator him/herself, how can we tell if something is a result of a deliberate strategy, or simply a plain error?

The last factor Zauberga mentions is the function of the text, meaning that specific hybrid features could be deliberately imposed upon the translation to enable the text to serve a given purpose. Zauberga acknowledges that not all hybrid texts are the results of translation mishaps, and that sometimes the hybridity is intentional. He exemplifies this with 'EU-texts', e.g. texts produced within and for the European Union. He notes how "EU legal acts have emerged as a specific text type – they could be called "supernational hybrids with specific conventions of their own. They are drafted, sometimes even by non-native speakers, in one of the 11 EU official languages, deliberately using a reduced vocabulary, with meanings that tend to be universal and specific grammatical forms" (273).

Tirkkonen-Condit explains how "[e]very language has linguistic elements that are unique in the sense that they lack straightforward linguistic counterparts in other

languages.” These elements may be lexical, phrasal, syntactic or textual, and they are not necessarily untranslatable; “they are simply not similarly manifested (e.g. lexicalized) in other languages.”¹⁸ Basically, what this means is that equivalent translation between languages is a rare phenomenon, and more often than not translators will have to alter the text for syntactical, lexical, phrasal, or textual reasons. These alterations might then bring hybridity to the text by bringing elements from the SL into the TL.

Shäffner and Adab’s understanding of hybridity is closely linked to translation: they suggested that “[a] hybrid text is a text that results from a translation process” (“Contact as Conflict” 169). As we saw, they define ‘translation processes’ as something which manifests itself in features which might seem strange or unusual for TT readers; features which often times might be classified as hybrid (keeping in mind that not all textual ‘strangeness’ can be labeled hybrid). We should however not mistake these features as simply instances of lacking translational competence, but rather as “evidence of conscious and deliberate decisions by the translator” (“Contact as Conflict” 176).

The definition given by Shäffner and Adab appeared in an article published in “Across Languages and Culture”, a journal which deals with translation studies and interpreting studies. The issue in which their article appeared was in fact edited by Shäffner and Adab themselves, and revolved around a discussion article written by them, with response articles written by others within the field, before closing with a ‘revised’ version of their original article, where they take into account the responses they got. One of the responders was Anthony Pym, who commented on how “hybridity is not

¹⁸ Tirkkonen-Condit, Sonja. “Unique items – Over- or Under-represented in Translated Language?”. Ed. Anna Mauranen and Pekka Kujamäki. *Translation Universals. Do they Exist?* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins, 177-186. Print. p. 177.

necessarily the result of a translation process, but a fact of the increasingly intercultural nature of source text generation processes” (Shäffner and Adab “...Revisited”, 300). For Pym then, hybridity in texts is a phenomenon which is directly connected to the environment in which these texts are created. Texts generated in intercultural places might then render both source and target texts hybrid. In their “revisited” article, Shäffner and Adab offer a reformulation of their initial definition, which reads: “Hybrid texts, in addition to being products of text production in a specific cultural space, which is often in itself an intersection of different cultures, can also result from a translation process” (“Revisited” 300). Similarly to Shäffner and Adab’s ‘strangeness’, Burke comments on how he feels that translations are some of the most obvious cases of hybrid texts, “since the search for what is often called ‘equivalent effect’ involves the introduction of words and ideas that are familiar to the new readers but might not be intelligible in the culture in which the book was originally written” (17). Burke’s understanding of hybrid texts is interesting in that it seems to contradict a central thought within translation studies, namely that the introduction of foreign items and ideas (from the source text and culture) into the TT would result in hybridity features. Burke on the other hand, seems to suggest that it is the other way around. For him, hybridity is brought about by the introduction of ideas and words that are unfamiliar and foreign to the *source culture*. Interestingly, these hybrid texts could then be viewed as domesticated, or predominately neutralized. This goes to show that different perspectives and orientations can drastically alter the way texts can be analyzed and understood.

2.2.2. Hybrid originals in translation

As we have mentioned earlier, hybridity can be observed in original works (i.e. source texts), keeping in mind also that translation is a process that, according to some, might create hybridity. Translators tasked with translating such texts are likely to face challenges of a linguistic nature, but they might also face dilemmas linked to language and culture ethics. The ways in which hybrid phenomena may be displayed in texts has been explained in the preceding sections; the focus here will be on how these traits *might* be handled in translation. Additionally, the debate on what *should* happen to hybrid traits in translation needs a mention here as well.

A good point of departure for this topic is Schleiermacher's description of the two possible paths available for translators, here paraphrased by José Ortega Y Gasset: "either the translator is brought to the language of the reader, or the reader is carried to the language of the author."¹⁹ This understanding of translation presents us with two opposing methods, and leaves us with an impression that where one path is taken, the other must remain closed. This is perhaps – as we will return to in the discussion chapter – a simplification of the possibilities and strategies a translator might possess. Still, this formulation is useful as an analogy to 'faithful' vs. 'free' translations; Nida's dynamic vs. formal equivalence; and, Vinay and Darbelnet's concept of direct and oblique translation – terms which will be explained in greater detail in the following chapter.

¹⁹ Gasset, José Ortega Y. "The misery and the splendour of translation". Trans. Elizabeth Gamble Miller. *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Venuti, Lawrence, and Mona Baker. Routledge: London and New York, 2000. Pp. 49-65. Web. P. 60.

The debate surrounding the strategies of either neutralizing or preserving hybrid ST elements has sparked quite a few prescriptive responses. Rizzardi, for instance, feels that “to purge a text of its estranging elements in order to facilitate the reading is like mutilating its physiognomy (...)”.²⁰ He also proposes that translators typically tend to normalize the text to some extent in order for it to appear *smoother*, which he calls a domesticating process that aims at shrinking diversity, thus creating sameness (187). Commenting on Schleiermacher’s two paths, Rizzardi says: “The translator who decides to follow the second path destroys the features of the source language and culture and normalizes them” (187). If a translation were to be made completely ‘smooth’, the target text would show none of the source texts ‘strange’, or ‘unfamiliar’ traits – the hybridity would be lost.

If we abandon this prescriptive approach to translation of hybrid features, we arrive at an objective examination of *how* translations of said features might be carried out. The main aim of this thesis is to investigate whether or not a Norwegian translation of Gaiman’s hybrid novel *American Gods* preserves or neutralizes hybrid features, and by which means this might or might not have been carried out. The terms ‘preserve’ and ‘neutralize’ are used here as they are by Antoine Berman, a theorist whose ideas and opinions will be presented in the method chapter following this section. As suggested by the Schleiermacher claim above, translators will typically face the issue of either keeping or abandoning elements one can classify as hybrid. In doing this, translators rely on various methods, procedures, and strategies. This too will be a central topic for the method section below. What can be said here though, is that no discussion of hybridity

²⁰ Rizzardi, Biancamaria. “Opening Up to Complexity in the Global Era”. *Language and Translation in Postcolonial Literatures: Multilingual Contexts, Translational Texts*. Ed. Simona Bertacco. New York and Oxon: Routledge, 2014. p. 187. All future references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text.

would be complete without a mention of Lawrence Venuti's twin concepts 'domestication' and 'foreignization'. Even if these terms, for reasons explained in the method chapter, will not be utilized in the analysis chapter of this thesis, they ought to at least be mentioned. The terms, as used by Venuti, are connected to the two paths demonstrated by Schleiermacher. Repurposing Schleiermacher's parable, the path that takes the reader toward the writer is understood as a 'foreignizing' approach, whilst moving the writer towards the reader would be considered 'domestication'. For Venuti, the ideal translation is one which follows the path that leads to foreignizing approaches to translation, rather than the one leading to domesticating approaches. There are noticeable similarities between Venuti's foreignizing translations and what Schäffner and Adab call a hybrid translation, e.g. a translation which is received as strange, or unusual, for the receiving culture.

Returning once more to a more descriptive account of what might be likely to happen to hybrid elements in translation, Grutman asks: "what happens to multilingualism in translation?"²¹ The term 'multilingualism', as it is used in this thesis, follows Delabastita and Grutman's understanding of the concept: they favor an open and flexible understanding of the term, which "acknowledges not only the 'official' taxonomy of languages but also the incredible range of subtypes and varieties existing *within* the various officially recognized languages."²² These linguistically hybrid texts present translators with difficult decisions. Do you keep or discard – neutralize or preserve?

²¹ Grutman, Rainier. "Multilingualism and Translation". *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Ed. Baker, Mona. London: Routledge, 2001. Pp. 157-60. 13 May 2015. Web. p. 160. All future references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text.

²² Delabastista, Dirk, and Rainier Grutman. "Fictional representations of multilingualism and translation". Nd. p. 27. Web. All future references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text.

Delabastita and Grutman recognize the challenges involved in translating multilingual, or hybrid, texts, stating that:

The translation of multilingual texts – whether they involve translation or not – always presents a unique challenge. It involves the reconfiguration of multilingual relations obtaining within the source texts, but the significance of these relations is deeply rooted in the source culture by the way in which they present or transform multilingual relations existing in social reality (Delabastita and Grutman 27).

Exploring how hybrid traits can be handled in translation, Grutman consults Henry Schogt, a writer who did a comparison of Western translations of the Russian classics, who claims that “as a rule only the main language of the text is replaced, the foreign elements remaining unchanged (Schogt qtd. in Grutman 160). Whether this can be applicable to translations in general as a sort of universal of translation is hard to say, but the insight it provides into the possible choices and strategies translators are equipped with remains relevant. Further exploration of what *should* and *might* happen in translation of hybrid texts will be resumed and expanded on in the method chapter below.

3. Method

Since the aim of this thesis is to explore and describe how hybrid elements from the ST are handled in the TT, it is necessary, not only to be able to identify these hybrid elements, but to apply a methodology that can describe what happens during translation. Hybridity obviously comes in many different shapes and forms, and the methodology presented here reflects this: it is based on a broad selection of theories and terms, which will be applied to the analysis where they are needed.

3.1. The data

The data used in the analysis is gathered from Neil Gaiman's *American Gods* (2001) and its Norwegian translation, *Amerikanske Guder* by Ina Vassbotn Steinman (2012). The examples that are used in the analysis were selected in an initial, simultaneous, close reading of both the target and source text. This resulted in a great deal of data; some examples were discarded, others not. The earlier stages in the process of gathering the data relied quite heavily on my own understanding of what hybridity might entail, as the theoretical background was not yet fully in place. Once the theory was in place, this became the guideline for further acquisition of data, as well as helping sort previously gathered data.

In the data, some patterns emerged: Gaiman's novel is full of references to different cultural creations; popular culture and high culture alike. A big part of this aspect of cultural hybridity in *American Gods* can be found at the start of each chapter, where Gaiman presents the reader with quotes from songs, literature, and poetry. There are

also similar references scattered throughout the novel. Intertextuality, then, is a prominent feature in *American Gods*. Apart from that, a central theme in *American Gods* is the folklore of the diaspora, which leads to references and mentions of a whole host of religious and folkloric beings. This too contributes to the element of cultural hybridity. Perhaps less visible, but certainly essential to the novel, is the element of linguistic hybridity that it possesses. The use of non-standard English is the most prominent feature of linguistic hybridity, but other phenomena, such as the use of creole language, is also present. Such variety in terms of hybridity makes *American Gods* well suited for a comparative analysis of the source and target text.

3.2. Chesterman's 'Comparison of Translations and their Source Texts'

Though the analysis is supported by many different concepts, at heart it relies heavily on the method Chesterman and Williams describe in *The Map: A Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies* as 'comparison of translations and their source texts.'

The fundamental principle described by Chesterman and Williams is that "the *analysis of translated texts* involves the textual comparison of a translation with its original," and that a translation comparison ought to deal with a specific aspect of the texts.²³

Whatever aspect is the focus of the study, the aim should be trying to discover patterns of correspondence between texts. This might involve uncovering "possible regularities of the translator's behaviour, and maybe also the general principles that seem to determine how certain things get translated under certain conditions" (7).

²³ Williams, Jenny, and Andrew Chesterman. *The Map: A Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies*. New York and Oxon: Routledge, 2014. p. 6. All future references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text.

In the case of this thesis, the aim is to investigate the instances of hybridity in the source text, and then attempt to identify tendencies and patterns in the translation of these elements.

3.3. Analytical tools

Chesterman and Williams's method is well suited for the analysis, but it is reliant on specific and concrete terminology in order to be able to comment on, explain and classify the many different procedures and actions that shape the translation.

This selection of 'tools' are presented in detail below, and consists of Eugene Nida's concepts of formal and dynamic equivalence and the principle of equivalent effect, which enables us to separate between 'formal equivalence' and 'dynamic equivalence' – which is to say, between recreation of form or meaning; and Vinay and Darbelnet's translation strategies, which, alongside Antoine Berman's 'negative analytic' can be helpful for uncovering whether and how a translation amplifies or decreases hybrid elements, hence adding important detail to an analysis of domesticating and foreignizing strategies.

3.3.1. Eugene Nida's equivalences

Eugene Nida's take on equivalence set him apart from other theorists of his time by promoting a possibility of equivalence not only at the level of the words or sentences, but in a much wider sense (which will be explained below).

Jeremy Munday comments on how Nida appeared to reject old terms such as 'literal', 'free' and 'faithful' translation in favor of what he called 'two basic orientations' or 'types of equivalence'.²⁴

The first of these types of equivalence is 'formal equivalence', which Nida defines as an approach that "focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content," and where the translator "is concerned that the message in the receptor language should match as closely as possible the different elements in the source language" (Munday 66). Munday considers this a clear orientation to the ST structure, which he assumes "exerts strong influence in determining accuracy and correctness" (67).

Formal equivalence (which Nida would later rename as 'formal correspondence'), is, as Nida puts it, a "quality of a translation in which the features of the form of the source text have been mechanically reproduced in the receptor language."²⁵ This is the opposite principle of dynamic equivalence. Typically, formal correspondence distorts the grammatical and stylistic patterns of the receptor language, and hence distorts the message, so as to cause the receptor to misunderstand or to labor unduly hard (Nida 201).

The second type of equivalence described by Nida is what he calls 'dynamic', and later 'functional equivalence'. This is based on what Nida calls 'the principle of equivalent effect', where "the relationship between receptor and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message"

²⁴ Munday, Jeremy. *Introducing Translation Studies. Theories and Applications*. New York and Oxon: Routledge, 2012. p. 66. All future references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text.

²⁵ Nida, Eugene A., and Charles Russell Taber. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill, 2003. p. 201. All future references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text.

(Munday 67). What this means is that the message, in essence, has to be tailored to the receptor's linguistic needs and cultural expectation and 'aims at complete naturalness of expression' (Munday 67). Naturalness is a key term for Nida, and he defines the goal of dynamic equivalence as seeking 'the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message' (Munday 67). To achieve such naturalness the translator needs to consider adjustments of grammar, of lexicon (e.g. lexemes) and of cultural references. Optimally, the TT language should not show interference from the SL, and the 'foreignness' of the ST setting is minimized (Munday 67). Nida lists four 'basic requirements of a translation', that will lead to equivalent effect or response, and that govern the success and quality of a translation. These requirements are: (1) making sense; (2) conveying the spirit and manner of the original; (3) having a natural and easy form of expression; (4) producing a similar response (Munday 67).

In recent years writers have expressed certain criticisms of Nida's 'dynamic equivalence', questioning its scientific merit. For instance, Nida's work has been seen as designed to convert people to the dominant ideas of Protestant Christianity. Additionally, several religious groups have expressed that the pursuit of dynamic equivalence, by changing the Word of God, would be sacrilegious (Pym, *Introducing Translation Studies* 69). Discussing equivalent effect, Peter Newmark wrote:

As I see it, 'equivalent effect' is the desirable result, rather than the aim of any translation ... it is an important translation concept which has a degree of application to any type of text, but not the same degree of importance. (...) In the

communicative translation of vocative texts, equivalent effect is not only desirable, it is essential.”²⁶

Equivalent effect is also problematic on account of the difficulties one will encounter trying to measure the effect. Nida presents us with no definite way of measuring, or indeed explaining exactly how equivalent effect has been achieved. Pym writes that “methods like componential analysis or the identification of procedures can to some extent explain the equivalent pairs that we find, but they cannot claim to represent the way translators think” (*Exploring Translation Theories* 20).

As a tool in the analysis, Nida’s work is nevertheless helpful in that it provides useful terminology that, as Munday puts it, develops a “path away from strict word-for-word equivalence” (68), allowing us to comment on how certain parts of the text is translated in relation to the ‘four basic requirements of a translation’ presented above.

3.3.2. Vinay and Darbelnet’s translation strategies

In their *Stylistique compare du français et de l’anglais: méthode de traduction*, which was later translated into English as *Comparative stylistics of French and English: a methodology for translation*, Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet describe two main strategies for translation, which include seven procedures (which are specific techniques or methods that are used by the translator at certain points in the text).

These procedures and techniques can be valuable analytical tools for the analysis as they not only provide us with much needed terminology, but by enabling us to comment on the overall orientation of the translator. Like Venuti’s twin terms domestication and

²⁶ Miao, Ju. “The limitations of ‘equivalent effect’, *Perspectives: Studies in*

foreignization mentioned in the previous chapter, it can also help reveal whether or not the translator seems to favor a 'free' or 'literal' translation, e.g. faithfulness towards the TT or the ST (Munday 86).

The two strategies are identified by Vinay and Darbelnet as *direct translation* and *oblique translation*. The two strategies cover seven procedures, of which *direct translation* covers three: *Borrowing*, *Calque*, and *Literal translation*.

The procedure of **borrowing** is used when a word or phrase from the SL is transferred directly to the TL. Words such as the Russian *glasnost* and *perestroika* (Munday 86), or the French words *chauffeur* or *abattoir* are examples of borrowing between Russian and French to English. This term would also cover instances where a longer section of a text is directly transferred, as an element of non-translation.

Calque and borrowing are closely connected – calque is, as Munday puts it, 'a different kind of borrowing' where the SL expression or structure is transferred in a literal translation (87). Rather than borrowing a word, calque covers instances where entire SL expressions or structures are transferred in literal (e.g. 'word-for-word') translations. The example provided by Munday is the French calque *science-fiction* for the English.

Literal translation, as it is used by Vinay and Darbelnet covers instances of 'word-for-word' translation. This is also the preferred procedure, as seen by them, and they hold that "literalness should only be sacrificed because of structural and metalinguistic requirements and only after checking that the meaning is fully preserved" (Munday 87).

The four remaining procedures are meant to cover instances where translators find a literal translation impossible. The term that Vinay and Darbelnet use to cover the strategies here is 'oblique translation', and it covers the procedures of 'transposition',

'modulation', 'équivalence', and 'adaptation'. The procedures covered by oblique translation that will be most relevant for the present analysis are équivalence and adaptation.

Transposition is the changing of one part of speech for another (such as noun for verb) without changing the sense (Munday 87). Vinay and Darbelnet separate transpositions into two categories: obligatory and optional. Obligatory transposition is when the change must be made for the structure of the utterance to comply with the grammatical rules of the TL; optional transposition is not governed by grammatical rules (or rather, instances where the rules are the same in the SL and the TL), or there are alternative options for transposition²⁷. Vinay and Darbelnet see transposition as "probably the most common structural change undertaken by translators" (Munday 87). **Équivalence**, as it is used by Vinay and Darbelnet here must not be confused with the more general use of the word within translation studies. The strategy covers cases where languages describe the same situation by different stylistic or syntactical means, and it may prove particularly useful in translation of idioms and proverbs (Munday 89). **Adaptation** is similar to équivalence, but is more focused on 'cultural equivalence', so to say. It involves changing cultural references in instances where a situation in the source culture does not exist in the target culture (Munday 89). For instance, one might substitute the infamous English insane asylum *Bedlam* for the French asylum *Charenton*.

Vinay and Darbelnet's translation strategies are useful – not only to describe some of the things that go on during translation, but perhaps more importantly to say something about where the translation is moving in terms of hybridity (even if it may however not always be that simple, as some of the examples in the analysis will illustrate). Still, we

²⁷ "Transposition". *Anukriti, Central Institute of Indian Languages. n. pag.* Web. 04 Apr. 2015.

could say that procedures covered by oblique translation can be seen as moving towards the TT, while the procedures covered by direct translation are more source text oriented. Although coming from two noticeably different areas of translation studies, Vinay and Darbelnet's procedures appear to describe and explain much of the same things as Venuti's domestication and foreignization (which will be presented shortly), albeit more loosely connected to translation and language ethics as such.

3.3.3. Antoine Berman's Negative Analytic

Another set of useful procedures that compliments Vinay and Darbelnet's procedures and describe translative action can be found in Antione Berman's article 'La traduction comme épreuve de létranger', which was later translated into English by Lawrence Venuti as "Translation and the trials of the foreign".²⁸

In it, he describes translation as an *épreuve* (meaning 'experience' or 'trial'). The trial, as explained by Munday, exists in two senses: **1. for the target culture in experiencing the strangeness of the foreign text and word; 2. for the foreign text in being uprooted from its original language context** (Munday 222).

Berman feels that it is necessary with a reflection on the "properly *ethical* aim of the translating act" (285), by which he means receiving the foreign as foreign. In regards to hybrid texts this becomes particularly relevant. By Berman's prescription, hybrid texts, which are in essence characterized by their elements of foreignness, ought to be received as such after translation as well. Hybridity should then be transported onto the

²⁸ Berman, Antoine. "Translation and the trials of the foreign". Trans. Lawrence Venuti. *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti, Mona Baker. Routledge: London and New York, 2004. Pp 284-97. Web. 4 May 2015. All future references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text.

TT. There are however obstacles which may possibly prevent this from happening.

Berman's examination of these instances of 'textual deformation', as he calls them, is the central idea presented in the article, and what he refers to as the 'negative analytic'. The procedures involved in the negative analytic can be understood as similar to those described by Venuti as domesticating procedures.

The negative analytic, he writes "is primarily concerned with ethnocentric, annexation-ist translations and hypertextual translations (pastiche, imitation, adaptation, free writing), where the play of deforming forces is freely exercised... The focus ... will be the deforming tendencies that intervene the domain of literary prose – the novel and the essay" (Berman 286-87). Prose, as opposed to poetry, then becomes Berman's focus for the 'negative analytic'. He comments on how "it is easy to detect how a poem by Hölderlin has been massacred," whereas to "see what was done to a novel by Kafka or Faulkner, especially if the translation seems "good"," is a lot harder. "The deforming system", he observes "functions here in complete tranquility." This is also why he feels the need to elaborate an analytic for the translation of novels (Berman 287).

The ethnocentric forces that Berman names a primary factor contributing to the deforming tendencies are something he feels every translator is "inescapably exposed to", and that "these unconscious forces form part of the translator's *being*, determining the *desire* to translate (Berman 286, author's emphasis). Freeing oneself from the confines of this requires a "psychoanalytic analysis of the translator's work, and by making the translator aware of the forces at work, that such tendencies can be *neutralized*" (Munday 222, emphasis mine).

Berman describes twelve deforming tendencies in ‘Translation and the trials of the foreign’, six of which may prove particularly useful in the analysis of *American Gods* and its target text: rationalization, ennoblement (and popularization), the destruction of rhythms, the destruction of vernacular networks or their exoticization, the destruction of expressions and idioms, and the effacement of the superimposition of languages (Berman 288).

As a counterpoint to the ‘negative analytic’, Berman introduces the ‘positive analytic’, which holds Berman’s preferred type of translation required to render the foreign *foreign* in the TT. As with Venuti and his foreignization concept, Berman’s positive analytic endorses translation that does not erase or neutralize the foreign word of the ST, and stands as a key concept within Berman’s translation ethics.

Before Berman’s negative analytic and its collection of terms can be applied to the analysis, some clarification of them is needed.

Rationalization involves modification of syntactic structures such as sentence structure and order, as well as punctuation. Berman illustrates this with the general hostility of French towards repetition, the proliferation of relative-clauses and participles, long sentences or sentences without verbs – all of which he considers essential elements of prose (288-89). **Ennoblement** describes the tendency of certain translators to ‘improve’ the ST in a process of what Berman calls ‘rhetorization’, “which consists in producing “elegant” sentences, while utilizing the source text, so to speak, as *raw material*” (290). Rather than translation, Berman feels that this becomes “a rewriting, a “stylistic exercise” based on – and at the expense of – the original” (291). **The destruction of rhythms** is, simply put, the tendency for translators to ‘destroy’ rhythm, either by

deformation of word order or punctuation. Berman feels that the novel is more robust than poetry and drama in this sense, but still vulnerable to rhythmic destruction (292).

The destruction of vernacular networks or their exoticization is essential “because all great prose is rooted in the vernacular language”, Berman writes, and therefore “the effacement of vernaculars is thus a very serious injury to the textuality of prose works” (9). He views *exoticization* as the traditional method of preserving vernaculars, and this can take two forms: Either a typographical procedure (such as italics) is used to isolate what does not exist in the original, or “more insidiously, it is “added” to be “more authentic”, emphasizing the vernacular according to a certain stereotype of it” (294), like Mardrus’s translations of the *Thousand and One Nights* and the *Song of Songs*, which Berman view as examples of over-Arabization (or, alternatively, over-exoticization). On his discussion of vernaculars, Berman ends with a warning: “an exoticization that turns the foreign form abroad into the foreign at home winds up merely ridiculing the original”, pointing out that “a vernacular clings tightly to its soul and completely resists any direct translating into another vernacular” (294).

The destruction of expressions and idioms describes a tendency to replace an idiom or proverb with its TL ‘equivalent’, and Berman views this as an ethnocentrism. He acknowledges the fact that a proverb may have its equivalents in other languages, but holds that “these equivalents do not *translate* it”. “To translate,” he writes “is not to search for equivalences” (295). Here it should be noted that Berman’s term appears to overlap with Vinay and Darbelnet’s term *équivalence*, even if they view the use of idiomatic equivalences with different degrees of severity.

The last of Berman's deforming tendencies that need a presentation here is what he calls **the effacement of the superimposition of languages**. By this, Berman means that translation tends to erase traces of different forms of language that may exist within the ST (Munday 224). For Berman, this must be considered a "central problem posed by translating novels," and he adds that "every novelistic work is characterized by linguistic superimpositions, even if they include sociolects, idiolects ..." (296). Failing to keep these intact in the process of translation would have to be seen as a neutralization of the TT, and it seems that avoiding this would have to depend on the translator's imagination and linguistic abilities.

Despite the clear prescriptive aspect of Berman's discussions of translation, his negative analytic remains a useful tool for describing various translative actions. Some of the deforming tendencies may also work as indicators of where the translator is moving in terms of hybridity. Like Venuti's concepts of *foreignization* and *domestication* (which Berman undoubtedly was a huge inspiration for), Berman's negative analytic makes the distinction between moving the text towards the reader, or moving it towards the author; towards ST or TT culture and language. It also presents us with a wide selection of terms that are valuable in an analysis of a translation of a hybrid text. Utilizing Berman's negative analytic in the analysis of Gaiman's *American Gods* and its target text will then enable an interpretation as to where the translator is taking the text (along with its hybrid elements).

3.5. Weaknesses, limitations, and clarifications

One describes a tale best by telling the tale. You see? The way one describes a story, to oneself or to the world, is by telling the story. It is a balancing act and it is a dream. The more accurate the map, the more it resembles the territory. The most accurate map possible would be the territory, and thus would be perfectly accurate and perfectly useless.

The tale is the map that is the territory.

You must remember this.

From the notebooks of Mr. Ibis (Gaiman 545).

The phrase “the map is not the territory” first appeared in print in a paper by the American scientist and philosopher Alfred Korzybski in 1931. What is meant by the phrase is that an abstraction derived from something, or a reaction to it, is not the thing itself. This was further illustrated by the Belgian surrealist painter René Magritte, who famously painted a picture of a pipe with the caption *Ceci n'est pas une pipe* (‘this is not a pipe’)²⁹. Gaiman’s parable is an extension of Korzybski’s original formulation: the story is not necessarily a true representation of reality – storytelling relies on a certain balance between fact and fiction. This is true of all art forms – translation included. The point I am trying to make here is one concerning the nature of translation. Translations are not identical – can never be identical – to its source. The source text is to the translation what the territory is to the map. This understanding of translation acknowledges the losses which translation is sure to bring upon the source text, as well

²⁹ “Map-territory relation.” *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. 9 Apr. 2015. Web. 14 Apr. 2015.

as the gains one might observe in the translated text. This descriptive approach will be emphasized throughout this thesis.

Another point that needs commenting on here is the possible lack of generalizability in this study. I only look at one source text and its translation, which means that forming universal ideas from the results of this study becomes difficult. What might be true of this particular case might not represent the whole picture. Ideally, this study would take into account many other source texts within the same genre and source culture, as well as their translations into Norwegian – but, because of limitations in regards to time, this remains a study for the future.

Lastly, the exclusion of Venuti's concept of domesticating and foreignizing translations needs to be commented on here. As mentioned briefly in the previous chapter, these terms are allied with Schleiermacher's 'paths': domesticating translation "involves an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to receiving cultural values," whilst a foreignizing translation relies on strategies which seek to 'send the reader abroad' by making "the receiving culture aware of the linguistic and cultural differences inherent in the foreign text" (Munday 219). These concepts, as used by Venuti, are deeply rooted in language-political views.

Even if these terms, as Pym confess, "does enable us to talk about translators as real people in political situations, about the quantitative aspects of translation policies, and about ethical criteria that might relate translators to the societies of the future", we must as Munday points out, recognize that "Venuti does not offer a specific methodology to apply to the analysis of translation" (Munday 231). This means that it will be hard to

apply these concepts satisfactorily in an analysis. Furthermore, the concepts of domestication and foreignization can be problematic in light of hybridity theory:

As previously mentioned, several writers such as Pym, Zauberga, and Snell-Hornby have offered explanations of hybridity which take into account the mixed and globalized nature of present times. If one subscribes to this, then no culture can possibly be seen as culturally, or linguistically, *pure*. If so, then how can we then say that a translation is domesticating? If all cultures are mixed, then one might assume that the same is true of the texts produced within these cultures. The concept of hybridity seems to better support this view of the world, and more importantly, it takes into account the fact that both source- and target texts can be culturally and linguistically mixed – a quality that is essential to this thesis' analysis. Venuti's domestication and foreignization could naturally be useful terms, but it seems that the concept of hybridity, coupled with a methodical framework made up of Berman, Nida, and Vinay and Darbelnet is overall more suited to the purposes of this thesis.

4. Analysis

This chapter deals with the data gathered from the source and target texts, which will be presented and analyzed below. For those who have not read Neil Gaiman's *American Gods*, this chapter starts off with a short introduction to the novel's plot, style, as well as its hybrid nature. The analysis chapter consists of two main parts: first, an analysis of the novel's original hybridity and its translation into Norwegian; secondly, a section dedicated to instances where there is no source text hybridity and the translation process has produced hybridity in the TT.

4.1. A short summary of the plot of *American Gods*

Defining and explaining America is no simple task, and Gaiman is not the first writer ever to attempt this. The pursuit of America's *essence* or *heart* can be traced back to the country's early days, and writers such as Walt Whitman and Ralph Waldo Emerson in the 19th century. In "Song of Myself" Whitman wrote "Do I contradict myself? Very well then I contradict myself, (I am large, I contain multitudes)",³⁰ perhaps creating a fitting analogy for America. Gaiman also seems to acknowledge the contradictory and multiple nature of America. He has expressed how he feels that America is the only country that does not know what it is, and is preoccupied with finding it out, something he later elaborated on, saying that he sees America as one of these "new countries of immigrants in which pretty much everyone is an immigrant who displaced an indigenous population

³⁰ Whitman, Walt. "Song of Myself". *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*. Gen. ed. Nina Baym, 8th ed. New York: Norton, 2013. pp. 1024-1067. Print. p. 1066.

and had to invent themselves.”³¹ A passage from *American Gods* that seems to echo this view goes “Nobody’s American. Not originally.”³²

The most central premise in *American Gods* is that gods and mythological creatures exist because people believe in them, and that when immigrants from around the world crossed the ocean and settled in America they brought with them these creatures. These beings have lost much power since their arrival to the New World, and spend their time in the 21st century working as cab drivers, prostitutes, and con artists. People have cast aside the old gods in favor of newer, more modern gods. These new gods seem to embody many of America’s obsessions, such as media, technology, economy, and secret, shadowy government conspiracies such as the men in black and black helicopters.

The novel’s protagonist is Shadow, an ex-convict working for Mr. Wednesday (Odin), and we follow them on their quest to recruit the old gods for a final battle with the new gods. Gaiman’s style of writing is hard to define, as he often seems to operate between genres and conventions. One could argue that a certain form of genre hybridity in many cases seem central to his writing, as a reviewer for the Seattle Post-Intelligencer pointed out, writing that “Gaiman’s books don’t fit a comfortable niche like horror or fantasy, though *American Gods* contains elements of both, as well as aspects of a thriller, a road trip, and vignettes of Midwestern life, all elegantly tied together in an adventure that

³¹ “A Fan’s Interview With ‘American Gods’ Author Neil Gaiman”. *Here & Now With Robin Young and Jeremy Hobson*. 28 Jul. 2011. Web. 20 Jan. 2015 < <http://hereandnow.wbur.org/2011/07/28/gaiman-american-gods> >

³² Gaiman, Neil. *American Gods*. New York: Harpertext, 2002. Print. p. 105. All future references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text.

uses myths to define what makes America.”³³

The country in which the story is set is itself a hybrid place, and by bringing together all these different mythological and religious figures Gaiman mirrors this and sheds light on what makes America *American*, which is the mix of different people, cultures, and languages. Most of the story is told from the perspective of the character Shadow, but there are short passages in-between, where we get a glimpse into Mr. Ibis’s stories. Ibis is a manifestation of the ancient Egyptian god Thoth, a god of knowledge and writing, and he writes short biographies of sorts, documenting the lives of certain people who brought with them their gods and spirits to the new world. These short passages work as breaks from the main narrative, and they all highlight the personal relationships between man and myth – but more importantly it shows us how the various beliefs may have ended up in America. This, as well as the way Gaiman frequently uses quotes from art, such as poems, novels, and songs throughout the novel can be seen as instances of cultural hybridity. It resembles what Simon experienced as culturally hybrid in *How to Make Love to a Negro* (which we touched upon in 2.1.1.), a text which showed little or no linguistic hybridity, but consisted of culturally diverse elements, drawing equally from Freud, Islam, and Jazz music (Simon 218). Similar to this, eclectic mixing of cultural items appear to be a distinct feature in Gaiman’s novel, resulting in a text as culturally hybrid as the country in which it is set. Linguistic hybridity is also a reoccurring feature in *American Gods*, and it can be seen in the way Gaiman uses dialects, as well as accents, pronunciation, and jargon as defining characteristics for several characters.

³³ “Seattle Post-Intelligencer.” Preface / Reviews. Gaiman, Neil. *American Gods*. New York: Harpertext, 2002. iv. Print.

4.2. ST hybridity

American culture is a culture of hybridity. It is also highly incorporated into other cultures around the world, making the lines between American culture and other cultures hard to define. Studying and analyzing hybridity within the context of American culture can therefore be challenging.

Nationality as identity is a central theme in *American Gods*. Coming to the New World meant leaving behind certain parts of your identity, rebuilding it within a culturally diverse environment. Naturally, this might lead to confusion around identity, or rather a mixed identity, and one of the ways the characters are able to keep parts of their old selves is through language. Most of these characters are the American versions of gods from the old country. For instance, the character called Czernobog is the manifestation of the Slavic god of the dead, the night, and chaos. He is depicted as an old, grumpy, short spoken Eastern European immigrant. His name translates literally from Russian as 'black god.'³⁴ His language can be described as English with a substrate, or simply, as 'broken English'. Some of the examples in 4.2.3 deal with Czernobog's speech. Another central character that is characterized by his manner of speaking, is the Irish immigrant / leprechaun Mad Sweeney. Whereas Czernobog's English has elements of a foreign language thrown into it, Sweeney's speech is characterized by his Irish accent, which means his speech consists of a mix of Irish English and Standard English. This too will be presented further below.

³⁴ "Czernobog." *Only the Gods Are Real: A Tribute to Neil Gaiman's American Gods*. n.d. Web. 13 Nov. 2014. < <http://www.frowl.org/gods/gods.html> >

The use of different accents, dialects, and nonstandard pronunciation amongst the Standard English reveals something about the characters – where they come from, certainly, but it also plays with the reader’s prejudices and connotations emanating from that particular way of speaking. When these non-standard ways of writing are mixed with Standard English, this will involve a combination of different sets of linguistic norms within the same text, resulting in hybridity.

4.2.1. Preserved hybridity

The examples presented here all have one thing in common: the hybrid element(s) from the ST are either kept or recreated in the TT. The various hybrid elements in these examples (as well as the procedures involved in their translation) are however not entirely similar in all cases, and this section on preserved hybridity is therefore divided into two subsections: hybridity of an intralingual character; and, hybridity of an interlingual character.

4.2.1.1. Intralingual hybridity

Hybrid features which can be classified as intralingual are marked by variations within a language. Similar to the relationship Berman paints of a common language and a dialect in his negative analytic, it is the tension between, or multiplicity of, that makes it stand out as hybrid. Dialects are obvious contributors to this particular kind of linguistic hybridity, and this is true of Gaiman’s *American Gods* as well. The examples below examine instances where the element of dialect has transferred from the ST to the TT.

Mad Sweeney, which is one of the character's whose dialogue is marked by an intralingual hybridity, is a manifestation of an old Irish king, taken from the legend of *The Madness of Suibhne*, but in the novel, Sweeney introduces himself as a leprechaun, possibly as a comment on how Irishmen are perceived in America ³⁵. Gaiman portrays him as a foul-mouthed drinker, and likely a borderline junkie. Sweeney's dialect is not too heavily emphasized; it is subtle but clearly present in his speech. Gaiman inserts certain words, such as *fucken*, *'twere*, and *bastards're*, and this stands out in-between the Standard English and creates a mix of linguistic norms within the same language. Sweeney does not speak Irish English, but rather American English with a dash of Irish. This gives the ST a trait that we can classify as intralingual hybridity, as it involves variations within the same language.

Table 1

Source text	Target text
Then he said, " 'M not a troll. (217)	Så sa han, «Jeg ikke noe troll. (238)

In the example above " 'M not' ('I am not') becomes 'Jeg ikke' ('Jeg er ikke'), mimicking the contracted form from the ST. In the ST it is 'I am' [Jeg er] that is contracted; in the TT it is the words 'er ikke' [am not] that are contracted. The TT phrase as a whole retains the element of contraction from the ST, even if the contracted words differ. A useful term that can describe this is Vinay and Darbelnet's 'compensation', which they define as a procedure where translators makes up for, or compensate, a loss (of meaning, structure,

³⁵ "American Gods – Characters." *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. 3 Apr. 2015. Web. 14 Apr. 2015.

and so on) by introducing a gain in the TT (Munday 90). Following this, one could argue that the less specific 'ekke' might be seen as a compensation for the potential loss of the hybrid element, 'M not'. It is less specific here than in the ST in that 'ekke' is connected to various eastern Norwegian dialects, whereas 'M not' (in the context of the ST) represents an Irish dialect specifically.

Nida's concept of dynamic equivalence might also be applicable here. He is concerned with 'naturalness', and allowing the text a "natural and easy form of expression" (Munday 67). As mentioned in the method chapter, Nida legitimizes adjustments of grammar, lexicon, and cultural references in the pursuit of naturalness. In light of this, the translation of *M not* into the Norwegian *Jeg ikke* can be seen as an attempt at recreating the vernacular of the ST into a target culture equivalent. The Irish dialect is recreated as a more generic, Eastern Norwegian dialect, and, if we apply Berman's 'negative analytic' here as well, it could point at a deforming tendency which he calls the destruction of vernacular networks. By the generalization of the Irish (or Irish-American) dialect which the example in table 1 is marked by, one could argue that the vernacular has been – if not neutralized – then certainly uprooted from the culture it adheres to. To use Berman's words, we could say that the translation has turned the "foreign from abroad into the foreign at home" (Berman 9).

Table 2

Source text	Target text
<p>“Greeks,” said the Iceman, with disgust.</p> <p>“And it ain’t true what they say about them neither ...” (6)</p>	<p>«Grekere,» sa Ismannen med avsky. «Og det e’kke sant det de sier om dem, heller ...» (16)</p>

In table 2 there is another example of how dialect is handled in the process of translation. The contraction ‘ain’t’ is part of many non-standard Englishes and does not necessarily have to be connected to one specific dialect. It has got an informal tone to it, and its usage is often stigmatized and used as a marker of socio-economic or regional status or education level³⁶. To translate this as ‘e’kke’, which is the contracted form of ‘er ikke’ [is not] in Norwegian points to a literal translation. They also seem to share some of the associations and stigmas connected to these words. It would seem that the hybrid element of the ST in this case transferred quite effortlessly to the TT and TL.

4.2.1.2. Interlingual hybridity

Unlike the use of Irish dialect, which was represented largely by nonstandard spelling, the use of foreign accents in *American Gods* appear to rely more on non-native English. The examples below can thus be understood as housing elements of interlingual hybridity. One could also classify these examples as examples of English with a substrate, which covers situations where English vocabulary is grafted onto the syntax

³⁶ “Ain’t.” *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. 29 Mar. 2015. Web. 14 Apr. 2015.

of a non-English speaker’s native language, including word order, other aspects of sentence structure, and the presence or absence of articles in the speaker’s native language.

Table 3

Source text	Target text
<p>“Doesn’t work. We call the super, ask him when he going to fix, when he going to mend the heating, he does not care, goes to Arizona for the winter for his chest.” Her accent was thick, Eastern European, Shadow guessed.” (73)</p>	<p>«Virker ikke. Vi ringer vaktmesteren, spør ham når han fikse, når han fikse sentralfyringa, han ikke bryr seg, drar til Arizona om vinter for brystet sitt.» Aksenten hennes var tykk, østeuropeisk, gjettet Shadow.» (90)</p>

In the example above, both the ST and the TT display what we may classify as interlingual hybridity. Gaiman uses the unconventional syntax as a tool to reveal the Eastern European variety of the characters speech. The most singular trait of this transferal of Eastern European syntax into the English vocabulary is the disappearance of the verb *is*, which can be clearly seen in the sentence: “We call the super, ask him when he (is) going to fix, when he (is) going to mend the heating ...”. Normally, ‘is’ would function as an auxiliary verb accompanying the main verb of the clause, ‘going’.

In the TT translation, the broken English is reimagined as broken Norwegian. This means that foreign linguistic norms are applied to the Norwegian vocabulary, creating a hybrid between the two. Where the ST had the missing ‘is’, the TT phrase is missing the

auxiliary verb 'vil' [will]. The syntax of the second sentence does also break with standard Norwegian in that the word order is unconventional, as in "han ikke bryr seg" (which would typically be written "han bryr seg ikke".) This signals to the TT reader that the person speaking may not be entirely proficient in the language he or she is using. Another example of how the translator recreates broken language in a Norwegian setting is the way the noun *vinter* [winter] appears in the sentence. Within that sentence, the noun would normally appear in a singular definite form, like in 'drar til Arizona om vinteren for brystet sitt'. In the ST, the noun is accompanied by the definite article, *the*, making the phrase grammatically correct. What this illustrates is that the translator has chosen to recreate the element of broken speech, rather than just copying it, i.e. directly translating it from the ST, which could once more point to a procedure of compensation. It is the concept rather than the exact wording is transferred to the target culture. If the same linguistic 'mistakes' do not occur with Eastern European Norwegian accents as with the English variety (which our examples above seem to suggest), then translating word-by-word could possibly lead to a formulation that would seem unfamiliar for TT readers. Instead, the translator creates something that is similar to the ST and yet different. The hybrid element of the ST is very much present in the TT here, albeit in a *slightly* different form.

This reimagining of English with a substrate as Norwegian with a substrate then quite clearly fits Nida's concept of dynamic equivalence, as the TT translator in essence has tailored to the receptors' linguistic needs, as well as possibly producing an equivalent response by adhering to Nida's four requirements for this: (1) making sense (the meaning of the ST phrase remains the same in the TT); (2) conveying the spirit and

manner of the original (the TT keeps the element of foreign accent); (3) having a natural and easy form of expression (the TT phrase does come across – at least to me – as easy and natural); and (4) it produces a similar response (both source and target text readers ought to pick up on a foreign accent).

Table 4

Source text	Target text
“He don’t want to see you. I don’t want to see you neither. You bad news.” (73)	«Han ikke vil treffe deg. Jeg ikke vil treffe deg heller. Du dårlige nyheter.» (90)

This example is also taken from the speech of a character with an Eastern European background. In English, ‘don’t’ is used when speaking in the first and second person plural and singular and the third person plural (‘I’, ‘you’, ‘we’, and ‘they’). The correct English would be to say “He doesn’t want to see you.” In the TT the element of broken English is once more adapted to the Norwegian language. Similar to what happened in the example from table 3, the translator has altered the syntax, creating something that does not adhere to the standard linguistic norms. Once more this can be seen as a procedure of compensation. In the last sentence both the ST and the TT create the ‘foreign’ element by removing the verb *are / er*. This would then be a procedure of literal translation, and by Nida’s definition an instance of functional equivalence.

Table 5

Source text	Target text
“Maybe you should go. Is not a good time.” (582)	«Kanskje du bør gå. Er ikke et bra tidspunkt.» (628)

The example above, in table 5 also indicates a procedure of compensation. In the ST phrase the pronoun ‘*it*’ is missing from the sentence “Is not a good time”. In the TT phrase the Norwegian pronoun ‘*det*’ is missing. This is then an example of a literal translation as well. The same can be seen below in table 6, where the pronoun ‘*it*’ / ‘*det*’ once more is removed in order to create an element of interlingual hybridity.

Table 6

Source text	Target text
“Is good.” (82)	«Er greit.» (100)

4.2.1.3. Creole language

Creole language is a language that has developed from a pidgin (i.e. a simplified version of a language used for communication between groups who do not have a language in common) into a language that has been nativized by children as their primary language³⁷. All languages are affected by each other of course, but creoles are typically

³⁷ “Creole Language.” *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. 13 Apr. 2015. Web. 14. Apr. 2015.

'younger' languages, which makes it easier to pinpoint the linguistic mix it consists of. Gaiman's *American Gods* explores the multiplicity of American culture, and it is then perhaps not surprising to see creole speech entering the novel. The creole element is not expressed in dialogue, as one typically would expect, but rather as some kind of combination of cultural and textual-linguistic hybridity in the form of a quote (seen below, in table 7).

Table 7

Source text	Target text
<i>Look at my King all dressed in Red, Iko Iko all day, I bet you five dollars he'll kill you dead, Jockamo-feena-nay (33)</i>	<i>Look at my King all dressed in Red, Iko Iko all day, I bet you five dollars he'll kill you dead, Jockamo-feena-nay (45)</i>

The excerpt from the ST above does have an element of interlingual hybridity in a way that may be more pronounced, or visible, than the examples listed in 4.2.1.2. Here, the linguistic mix is not only manifested as a juxtaposition of Standard English and Creole Patois. The song was written by James "Sugar Boy" Crawford from New Orleans in the 1950's, and the patois is taken from phrases chanted by the Mardi Gras Indians (which are African-American revelers in New Orleans). The meanings of the lines are unclear, and Crawford stated that he himself did not know their meaning³⁸.

³⁸ "Iko Iko." *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. 20 Dec. 2014. Web. 14 Apr. 2015.

The strategy used in the translation of the ST phrases in table 7 relies on borrowing, in the form of non-translation. Within the context of the source culture, the quote as a whole represents a mix of two languages, namely English and Louisiana Creole. For the receiving culture, i.e. the target culture, the quote (within the context of TT at large) must be seen as a mix of three languages: Norwegian, English, and Louisiana Creole. This means that the interlingual hybridity has not only been recreated, but also augmented.

4.2.2. Neutralized hybridity

The examples below present instances where hybrid ST elements have not been transferred to the TT, but rather, through various procedures, been neutralized.

Table 8

Source text	Target text
Shit. Those bastards're fucken <i>mean</i> . (217)	Helvete. De jævlene er faen meg <i>slemme</i> .» (238)

In table 8, the hybridity shows through the use of the phrases 'bastards're' and 'fucken'. 'Bastards're' is the contracted form of 'the bastards' and 'are'. Here it seems the translator has gone for another approach, as the phrase becomes simply 'jævlene er' [the bastards are], and the hybrid element is not carried over to the TT. One possible explanation could be that there simply were not many available options to choose from in translating 'those bastards're' into Norwegian. If the Norwegian 'er' appears in front

of a negation, such as 'ikke', a contracted form appears to be possible – if, on the other hand it appears after another word, like in the case of 'jævlene er', this becomes problematic. This may then be attributed to syntactic differences between English and Norwegian.

Similarly, 'fucken' becomes 'faen meg', which may be seen as a reduction of hybridity as the element of dialect is removed. The two phrases are the same in regards to their syntactic function in the sentence, although not intra-phrasally – the phrase 'fucken mean' / 'faen meg *slemme*' is the adjective phrase describing the noun phrase 'those bastards' / 'de jævlene'. Exactly what type of strategy or procedure that has been used here is hard to pinpoint. One possibility is to categorize this as an instance of what Vinay and Darbelnet calls *équivalence*. As a part of their strategy of oblique translation (which is the opposite of direct translation), the term *équivalence* describes situations where the translator opts for a sense-for-sense translation that retains the meaning from the ST-phrase, though in a different form, using different stylistic or structural means (Munday 89). Both 'fucken' and 'faen meg' work as phrasal adjectives that are used as intensifiers, i.e. a linguistic element that describes force or emphasis to the element it modifies. The meaning is not lost in the process of translation, even if there are stylistic changes. Berman's deforming tendency of rationalization describes instances where syntactic structures are modified in order to be better suitable for the TL readers. In a sense, this seems to be what has happened here. Alternatively, or in addition to this, this might once more be an instance of destruction of vernacular networks if we view 'faen meg' as a neutralization of 'fucken'. And, on a more general level, there is dynamic translation taking place here (e.g. equivalence on the level of function). The translator is

moving the writer towards the reader, so to say. This is in essence the general result of neutralization.

Table 9

Source text	Target text
“ ‘Twere better I had never been conceived, ...” (219)	«Det ville vært bedre om jeg aldri hadde blitt unnfanget, ...» (242)

The above example, same as that of table 1 is characterized by a hybrid element in the ST that is of an intralingual character. Here it is the Irish dialect word *twere* that gives the phrase most of its hybrid quality, but the syntax of the sentence as a whole represents the Irish dialect. This element is not present in the TT phrase, resulting in a loss of hybridity.

‘Twere’ is the contracted form of *it were*. In the TT, this is rendered as ‘det ville vært’, which differs syntactically from the ST-phrase. A literal, word-for-word translation would have been ‘Det var bedre jeg hadde aldri blitt unnfanget’, but the translator has gone for another approach. The changing of the verb ‘were’ in the ST into ‘ville vært’ [would have been] in the TT points to a procedure of modulation. The tense of the verb is changed in the translation process when it goes from past tense in the ST (‘it were’) to future tense in the TT (‘ville vært’ [would have been]). Both phrases are subjunctive forms, even if they express it differently. The procedure of modulation then seems to

work in terms of a change of perspective here. The hybrid language of the ST has certainly been neutralized in this case.

Table 10

Source text	Target text
“Elm, he do brood And oak, he do hate But the willow-man goes walking, If you stays out late.” (97)	“Almen, han grubler Og eiken, han hater – Men pilegubben følger etter deg Om du er ute for sent” (116)

The example in table 10 above shows an example of dialect. The nursery rhyme seen in the ST depicts a Cornish English dialect, and is set apart from Standard English by a few elements. Most noticeably, the conjugation of the verb ‘do’ marks a break from the standard linguistic norms, as it would normally be conjugated as ‘he does brood’. The same goes for the phrase ‘he do hate’. The conjugation of the verb ‘to stay’ in the last line also differs from Standard English.

These hybrid elements are not transferred onto the TT. The main focus of this translation appears to have been the message itself, as opposed to the non-standard grammar in the ST phrases. Since the ST phrases represent a specific English dialect, this of course makes things difficult for the translator. Nonetheless, by removing the non-standard grammar (which is connected to the dialect), results in what Berman calls ‘neutralization’, either by destruction of vernacular networks, or by rationalization, or even a destruction of rhythms. Whether multiple deforming tendencies can be seen at

work simultaneously is an interesting consideration, and one we will have to reflect further on in the discussion chapter.

Table 11

Source text	Target text
“Damn your dark eyes, you gave it a-fucken-way.” (219)	«Faen ta de mørke øynene dine, du ga den faen meg bort.» (241)

Some notion of the context behind this excerpt is needed to avoid confusion here. It is taken from a scene where Sweeney realize that Shadow has given away a valuable gold coin he gave him, and that he, as a result is most likely to end up dead.

‘Fucken’ is the Irish English equivalent of the Standard English ‘fucking’, which means the phrase in Table 11 has got an interlingual quality, which in turn means it can be classified as hybrid. Another interesting feature of this phrase is the use of tmesis: ‘gave it **a-fucken-way**’ (*emphasis mine*). Tmesis is a linguistic phenomenon that involves a word or phrase which is separated into two parts, with other words interrupting between them, such as Shakespeare’s ‘*how dearly ever parted*’³⁹. Neither the element of dialect, nor the use of tmesis is transferred to the TT here. Still, what makes the ST phrase in table 5 hybrid is the use of dialect, not the tmesis. Vinay and Darbelnet’s strategy of transposition seems to cover this if we allow it to cover syntactical or grammatical shifts in general.

³⁹ Shakespeare, W. *Troilus and Cressida*. III.iii.100.

Table 12

Source text	Target text
And though the squire laughed at such things, the kitchen-folk always put out a china saucer of the creamiest milk at night, put it outside the kitchen door, for the piskies. (93)	Og, selv om godsieren lo av slike ting, satte kjøkkenbetjeningen alltid ut en porselensskål med den mest fløteaktige melken om natta, de satte den utenfor kjøkkendøra til smånissene. (112)

The piskies, or pixies, are mythological creatures of folklore considered to be particularly concentrated in the high moorland areas around Devon and Cornwall. They are thus a uniquely British phenomenon. In a wider, more traditional use they are seen as synonymous with fairies or sprites – even if there in folklore is an enmity, and even war, between the two races⁴⁰.

The hybrid element in the ST phrase in table 12 is twofold: (1) it possesses a culturally hybrid element, i.e. the piskies, and (2) it has got a clear element of linguistic hybridity, in the form of the regional spelling of the word pixies. There is no exoticization of the word, even if it might appear foreign to readers outside the UK. In the text this appears in a section which deals with a Cornish woman's life and journey to America.

The nisse is a mythological creature from Scandinavian folklore. They are similar to the piskies in that they are traditionally depicted as quite small creatures. Another interesting similarity would be the tradition of placing a gift for both the nisser and the piskies outside of your door at night. The piskies get milk; the nisser get porridge. It may well be that these creatures play similar roles in both cultures, and this might have led to the rendering of piskies as nisser in the TT. This suggests a strategy of adaptation, where

⁴⁰ "Pixie." *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. 6 Feb. 2015. Web. 14 Apr. 2015.

the translator have identified and used a Norwegian 'cultural equivalent' of the Cornish piskies. Nida and Berman would likely represent opposing views on this adaptation: for Nida, adjustments of cultural references are a valid method for achieving what he calls 'naturalness'. He would possibly argue that the mentioning of the nisse and the piskie would produce a similar response to ST and TT readers alike. Berman, on the other hand, would most certainly call this act of adaptation an act of ethnocentrism, pointing to the effacement of the superimposition of languages and cultures, by which he means the way translation tends to erase traces of different forms of language found in source texts. What both theorists might agree on though, is the fact that the hybrid element of the ST has been neutralized, or reduced.

4.3. No ST Hybridity, TT Hybridity

As commented on earlier, hybridity can be seen as a phenomenon arising from intercultural and interlingual interaction in a general sense, but it can also be created by translation as a specific form of such interaction. The examples provided in this section may be seen as instances where translation has led to hybridity in the TT where there was none in the ST.

4.3.1. Non-translation of intertextual elements

The ST contains a lot of short quotes and references, and it seems a great portion of these, but not all, are transferred directly in the translative process, i.e. rendered in English in the Norwegian edition. This is what Vinay and Darbelnet would term

'borrowing', a type of direct translation that brings lexical items from one language directly into another.

Within the context of the ST, these quotes can be seen as instances of cultural hybridity, as this in many ways seem to be a central theme of the novel. When these quotes are transferred directly to the TT they acquire an element of linguistic hybridity as well on account of the mix between English and Norwegian it brings to the translation as a whole.

The Stephen Sondheim quote below is one example of this non-translation, or borrowing, found in the TT. Lines five and six from the ST are joined together in the TT. Line seven in the ST is also altered in the TT, as the comma between 'me' and 'him' is missing in the TT. These may just be small errors. Finally, the writer's name and the name of the song are put in capital letters in the TT. This is the only place in the TT where this type of capitalization occurs.

Table 14

Source text	Target text
<i>Hey, old friend.</i>	<i>Hey, old friend.</i>
<i>What do you say, old friend?</i>	<i>What do you say, old friend?</i>
<i>Make it okay, old friend,</i>	<i>Make it okay, old friend,</i>
<i>Give an old friendship a break.</i>	<i>Give an old friendship a break.</i>
<i>Why so grim?</i>	<i>Why so grim? We're going on forever.</i>
<i>We're going on forever.</i>	<i>You, me him-</i>

<i>You, me, him–</i> <i>Too many lives are at the stake...</i> <i>–Stephen Sondheim, “Old Friends” (383)</i>	<i>Too many lives are at the stake...</i> - STEPHEN SONDHEIM, «OLD FRIENDS» (417)
--	---

Another example of non-translation of quotes is found at the beginning of chapter 5:

Table 15

Source text	Target text
Madam Life’s a piece in bloom Death goes dogging everywhere: She’s the tenant of the room, He’s the ruffian on the stair. - W. E. Henley, “Madam Life’s a Piece in Bloom” (203)	Madam Life’s a piece in bloom Death goes dogging everywhere: Shes the tenant of the room, He’s the ruffian on the stair. - W. E. Henley, “Madam Life’s a Piece in Bloom” (122)

Apart from the misspelling of ‘She’s’ in the TT, these two pieces of text are identical.

One possible explanation for the use of borrowing of quotes was that the quotes that appeared in Norwegian were based on existing translations, i.e. previous translations into Norwegian. This would explain why some were translated and others left alone.

This, however, does not seem to be the case, as several of these excerpts has never been

published in Norwegian translation. An example that illustrate this can be found below in table 13, where the translator of *American Gods* appear to have translated (at least this excerpt) of Wendy Cope’s poem “A Policeman’s Lot” into Norwegian.

Table 13

Source text	Target text
Not to mention the mythic creatures in the rubble... (233)	For ikke å snakke om de mytiske vesenene i ruinene... (257)

The examples above show only some of the non-translation of quotes that can be found in the TT. Each chapter in *American Gods* start off with a quote of some sort, and out of the 20 chapters that make up the novel, 9 of the chapters in the TT start with a quote that has been directly transferred, i.e. non-translated. 6 of these quotes are from songs, while the remaining 3 are taken from poems.

4.3.2. Non-translation of Anglophone names

Other than the direct translation of these quotes, there are examples of borrowing in the form of Anglophone names, such as *Reader’s Digest* and *Scientific American*. To go for a strategy of borrowing does make sense with *Scientific American*, because this magazine has got no Norwegian ‘equivalent’. *Reader’s Digest*, on the other hand, is published in Norway under the name *Det Beste*, making a strategy of adaptation possible here, like

the translator did with Agatha Christie’s novel *The Murder of Roger Ackroyd*, which was rendered as *Doktoren mister en pasient*, which is the name of the Norwegian translation.

4.3.3. Miscellaneous TT exclusive hybridity

The selection of examples below do not fit comfortably into any specific category other than one containing various forms of translation induced hybridity.

Table 16

Source text	Target text
“Dame rumor says that you’ve been out talking to all manner of folk” (351)	“Mrs. Rykte sier at du har vært rundt og snakket med alle mulige folk” (381)

The title ‘Mrs.’ is deeply connected to the English speaking part of the world, and not much used outside of those contexts. In the example in table 16, ‘Mrs.’ is used in the TT, though not in the ST. One could argue that this is an example of the opposite strategy of Berman’s ‘ennoblement’, where the translator has been too ‘popular’ in the use of colloquialisms, leading to a more ‘casual’ tone in the TT phrase than its ST counterpart. This also brings an interlingual element into the phrase, where the English meets Norwegian, creating hybridity. In a way, this could be viewed as an instance of exoticization, where a foreign element is kept, i.e. the title ‘Dame’, even if it is changed substantially during translation. This translation substitutes an arguably little known foreign concept (the title of Dame), into a well-known one (Mrs.). Neither of these titles

is traditionally used in Norwegian speech, which means that, despite it being altered slightly, it stands out as an ‘exotic’ concept. We should also consider the fact that the novel is set in the United States, and that seeing ‘Americanized’ speech in the TT might simply be a result of the translator wanting add some local colour.

Table 17

Source text	Target text
<p>“... have not yet been tipped over the edge by that last showing of <i>It’s a Wonderful Life</i>, have not quite encountered the final straw, or should I say, the final <i>sprig of holly</i> that breaks not the camel’s but the <i>reindeer’s</i> back.” (192)</p>	<p>«... som ikke ennå har blitt dyttet over kanten av den siste visningen av <i>Livet er vidunderlig</i>, eller helt støtt på dråpen som får begeret til å renne over, eller kanskje jeg bør si den siste <i>kvisten med kristtorn</i> som ikke brekker kamelens, men <i>reinsdyrets rygg</i>.» (213)</p>

In the example above it seems Gaiman is playing with expressions and idioms, and translating phrases such as the ones above can be a difficult task for translators.

Translation procedures which might be suited for the example above include Vinay and Darbelnet’s *équivalence*, adaptation, literal translation, and calque – and, fittingly, it seems the translator has touched upon most of these in her translation of the TT phrase.

Whereas the procedures of literal translation and *équivalence* frequently lead to a reduction of hybridity, calques can be seen as contributors to hybridity in the text. The idiom ‘the final straw’ is rendered as ‘dråpen som får begeret til å renne over’ [the drop

that spilled the cup], which is an example of *équivalence*, i.e. conveying the sense, though not the image, of the saying. Applying Berman's 'negative analytic' here would point us to a tendency of 'destruction of expressions and idioms'. Whichever term we apply here, the expression is recreated using a SL 'equivalent'. The phrase 'the final *sprig of holly*' can be seen as word play involving the previous image of the straw, and it is translated as 'den siste *kvisten med kristtorn*', which is a literal translation. The phrase as a whole, 'den siste *kvisten med kristtorn som ikke brekker kamelens, men reinsdyrets rygg*', gives the translation its hybrid quality as we can classify it as a calque.

Calque involves literal translation of expressions, which can in turn cause foreignness in the target text, and this is precisely what has happened here. The breaking of the camel's back alludes to the proverb "it is the last straw that breaks the camel's back", for which there are several similar sayings, or idioms, in all cultures. In the example above however, it was an English variation of the saying that got directly translated, resulting in foreignness in the TT.

Table 18

Source text	Target text
"It's warm as toast in there right now." (296)	"Det er varmt som ristet brød der inne akkurat nå." (324)

The translation of the ST phrase in table 15 is another example of calque. The Anglo-American idiom 'warm as toast' becomes 'varmt som ristet brød' in this literal translation. The expression's *meaning* however is not entirely carried over to the TT phrase, as the idiom in its Norwegian guise appears unconventional, strange, or foreign

to TT readers, and by doing so calling attention to the fact that it is translated – a quality which fits both Berman and Venuti’s translation ethics.

Translation of characters names in *American Gods* and its Norwegian translation is an interesting point to visit. In table 19 below some of the names of characters in the ST and their TT translations are presented.

Table 19

Character names (source text)	Character names (target text)
Shadow	Shadow
Wednesday	Onsdag
Easter	Easter
Loki	Loke

The examples in *table 13* reveal two opposing translation strategies in use. The protagonist’s name, Shadow, remains the same in both source and target text, and must be considered an instance of borrowing; Wednesday, on the other hand, is translated as Onsdag, which is a direct translation. Similarly, Easter remains Easter, while Loki becomes Loke. In the ST, these names cannot be considered hybrid elements, but by borrowing the English names (Shadow and Easter) these become examples of linguistic hybridity within the TT, especially considering their semantic content in that they are descriptive names.

5. Discussion

This chapter presents a summary and clarification of the ways in which the data relate to and address the research questions, which are: does the Norwegian translation of *American Gods* preserve or neutralize the hybridity of the original, and can we identify and explain any patterns in the representation of ST-hybridity in the TT? Are there instances where the TT displays hybridity where the ST does not?

The discussion chapter gives a short summary of the main findings, before moving on to central aspects which can be derived from these findings and their relation to the theoretical background provided for this thesis.

5.1. Main findings

Many of the hybrid source text elements are neutralized in the TT, and the instances of intralingual hybridity, such as the use of Irish dialect, are mostly neutralized. Instances of interlingual hybridity, on the other hand, in the form of English with a substrate, are adapted to the TL as Norwegian with a substrate, meaning that the hybrid element is transferred onto the TT. There are also a considerable number of examples of hybridity arising from the translation of the ST, creating hybrid elements that are specific and unique to the TT itself. A large portion of this TT hybridity manifests itself in the form of non-translation (i.e. borrowing), or as calques.

5.2. The translation of hybrid elements in *American Gods*

The aim of this thesis, which is expressed in the research questions at the start of this paper, is to determine whether or not the TT preserves the hybrid elements found in the ST. Following writers such as Pym and Zauberga, one can consider all translations hybrid, keeping in mind that translators make conscious choices that can either neutralize or reinforce hybridity which may be found in the source text. From the analysis it became clear that the Norwegian translation of Gaiman's *American Gods* moves both ways in regards to preserving or neutralizing hybrid ST-elements, but it would be inadequate to simply state this as the answer to the research question. Instead, this should lead us to further questions: what appears to govern preservation and neutralization of hybrid ST-elements in the Norwegian translation of *American Gods*? Is it possible to create any assumptions as to why certain aspects of ST-hybridity are kept while others are neutralized? Also, we should ask in which ways the neutralization or preservation of hybrid elements effect the text. In the pursuit of the answers to these questions the sections below (specifically 5.2.1. and 5.2.2.) are dedicated to this purpose.

5.2.1. Preserved hybridity

Preserving hybrid elements in translation can be a complex and challenging task. Most translation theorists would acknowledge that translation often involves loss – and it may be that linguistic hybridity is especially vulnerable to such loss during translation on account of its aesthetic nature. Literary writing also has a clear creative and artistic aspect which complicates the translation of such texts. An interesting observation made in the analysis was that hybrid elements of an interlingual character (such as the use of

accents, or substrates) were mostly preserved, while instances of intralingual hybridity were typically neutralized in the translation. The instances where intralingual elements were seen to be preserved are few. Still, a couple of examples can be found in tables 1 - 2, where use of an Irish dialect and an American sociolect respectively, were preserved in translation through procedures of adaptation and compensation. In both of these cases, the translator relied on the Norwegian dialect / sociolect word 'ekke' to recreate some of the hybridity from the ST in the TT.

Interlingual elements such as accents were largely preserved by reimagining them within the target language. The English with a substrate became Norwegian with a substrate – once more through adaptation.

The data analyzed suggests a trend towards preserving hybrid elements that transfer easily from the source to the target language. The examples that best illustrate this are the ones dealing with foreign accents, as mentioned above. English dialects, on the other hand, are altogether neutralized. For the target text this means that the intralinguistic element is nowhere to be seen – and therefore, target text readers cannot experience the text the same way a reader of the source text could. One possible explanation for this neutralization could be that recreating, or reimagining, these English varieties would – not only be extremely challenging – but also, if we follow Berman, pointless, pointing out that “a vernacular clings tightly to its soul and completely resists any direct translating into another language” (9). This discussion will be resumed below, in 4.2.2. Either way, this ought to lead us to the following question: How does preserving of ST hybridity affect the TT, and with it, its reader’s experience with the text? Keeping in mind that this will be an exercise in presuming how the readers think (and the difficulties involved

with using terms such as Nida's equivalent effect), we can allow ourselves some careful speculation.

To understand how preserved ST hybridity might affect the translation, and with it its readers, the potential effect of the ST on the ST audience must be our point of departure. Since interlingual elements such as accents have been mostly preserved, it might be useful to examine how these can be seen to affect the source text. First of all, characters speaking with an accent leads to them being perceived by readers as 'foreign'. On a larger scale though, the presence of multiple languages, or varieties of languages, give the text a bilingual aspect. In the case of *American Gods* we might also suspect that Gaiman's use of non-standard languages and pronunciations are closely connected to the novel's theme of identity as something which is closely connected to nationality, or origin, within Northern America. To which degree, and in what form, might we then say that the translation achieves equivalent effect? The hybridity which has been preserved (accents, sociolects) can probably be seen to fulfill a similar purpose in the TT as the ST. If TT readers perceive the characters which speak with an accent in the TT as foreign, then one might call this an example of the TT producing a similar response as the ST. This would also be produced in the spirit and manner of the original, as well as making sense. Based on this, we might conclude that the TT (in these cases) has come a long way in terms of achieving equivalent effect.

How readers might respond to hybrid TT is another interesting topic for reflection. Most readers of translated novels are aware that they are just that – translated, not original texts. If the 'foreign' name of the author is not enough to alert readers to the fact

that they are holding a translated work in their hands, then the fact that it says 'Translated by ...' will. Translations are – as presented in the theory chapter – texts that are made in the space in-between cultures and languages. Snell-Hornby and Pym have both argued in their own way that because of their origin, translated texts are hybrid almost by default. Whether this is something most readers of translated literature would subscribe to is hard to say – most likely, the responses to hybridity in translated literature would be nuanced and mixed. Perhaps some people would prefer texts which are free from signs of the source culture and language. But equally, there should be readers who readily embrace all traces of the foreignness translated texts are often characterized by. Perhaps most readers exist somewhere between these two, towards the middle of the spectrum. The notion of 'universals' can be problematic in instances such as this. The point is that if what Snell-Hornby, Pym, and others with them hold true for translated texts, then readers ought not to be surprised by traces of foreign influence or hybridity in the text.

Writers on translation often express opposing views on the role of, or indeed the purpose of translation. Within the equivalence paradigm approaches have typically been prescriptive. The focus was to achieve equal value between languages in the translation process. One of the most central and influential figures within the paradigm was Eugene Nida (whose concept of 'equivalent effect' was presented in 3.4.1.). Nida's ideal translation was the one where the translator was able to reproduce, in the receptor language, the closest natural equivalent of the source-language message⁴¹. Put simply, Nida's translation ethics are strongly receptor-oriented in that his ideal translations should aim for naturalness in the receptor language – this naturalness is achieved when

⁴¹ Pym, Anthony. "Natural and directional equivalence in theories of translation." *Target* 19:2 (2007): 271-294. Web. p. 277.

the TT manages to rid itself of interferences from the ST (Nida, qtd. in Munday 67).

Whether or not the translator of *American Gods* has been influenced by Nida's concept of natural equivalence is difficult to say. It may perhaps be more likely that professional norms such as those described by Chesterman⁴² exert more pressure on the translator than theory does. The only thing that can be said for certain is that (in light of the theory and method applied in the analysis) the TT translator has chosen to preserve a fair share of the interlingual hybridity which the ST displays. The intralingual elements on the other hand, have been mostly neutralized.

5.2.2. Neutralizing hybridity

A large portion of the linguistic hybridity in the ST is manifested in the use of different English dialects, i.e. intralingual elements (seven of the examples listed in the analysis displayed intralingual hybridity; four displayed interlingual hybridity). In the translation of the sections containing these intralingual elements, the translator seems to have favored a neutralizing approach. In the translation of these linguistically hybrid elements, the TT translator has applied procedures of modulation, adaptation, and *équivalence*.

It was briefly mentioned in the analysis that one could observe more than one of Berman's deforming tendencies at work in the example in table 10. This is an interesting observation, as Berman himself never explicitly stated whether or not this is common, or indeed even possible within the framework of the negative analysis. He did however

⁴² Chesterman, Andrew. "Teaching Strategies for Emancipatory Translation". *Developing Translation Competence*. Ed. Schäffner, Christina, and Beverly Adab. John Benjamins Publishing Co.: Amsterdam, 2000. Pp. 77-89. Web. p. 85-7.

note that all deforming tendencies in the analytic lead to the same result, namely “the production of a text that is more “clear,” more “elegant,” more “fluent,” more “pure” than the original” (Berman 297). The analysis as a whole pointed out that the various deforming tendencies could be observed at work in different places throughout the novel’s translation. It would then seem that the answer to our question depends on the scope of our analysis, or the size of the selection of data. If we look at the target text as a whole, then the deforming tendencies can certainly be seen as working simultaneously – if we look at small portions of the text, however, it would appear that multiple deforming tendencies rarely affect the same portion of the translation (even if they, as the example in table 10 suggests, occasionally might do).

Although through different procedures, these translations can all be described as contributing to what Berman would term ‘the effacement of the superimposition of languages’. This is also the deforming tendency Berman spends most time discussing in “Translation and the trials of the foreign”, which seems to signal its importance. Berman writes that this tendency involves the loss of the relation between languages. He claims that the “relation of tension and integration that exists in the original between the vernacular language and the koine ... tends to be effaced” (Berman 295). Berman uses James Joyce’s *Finnegan’s Wake*, with its sixteen agglutinated languages, as the utmost example of linguistic hybridity, pointing to its vulnerability to translation. But most forms of writing containing a mix of languages or linguistic norms, and are therefore prone to this particular deforming tendency. This also seems to be the case with the Norwegian translation of *American Gods*. In light of Berman’s discussion, one could identify the koine of Gaiman’s *American Gods* as Standard English, and the various forms

of non-standard English as the opposing vernacular. A great deal of the vernacular present in the ST has been subject to neutralizing procedures, resulting in a less diverse use of language in the TT: the tension between koine and vernacular is effaced.

In the discussion of preserved hybridity, in section 5.2.1, it was briefly argued that neutralization of dialect could be a conscious decision based on the idea that recreating the element of dialect, either through adaptation or équivalence, would be unsatisfactory. Perhaps it would come across as forced, or unnatural. Translating a dialect from one language to another is certainly complex and challenging, and this might have been part of the translator's assessment as well. Keeping in mind Berman's warning that "to translate is not to search for equivalences" (295), it seems plausible that the TT translator has abandoned this idea, resulting in a neutralization of said elements. This could be due to the TT translator's ethical views – it may be that the idea of rendering an English dialect, or variety, as a Norwegian dialect was seen as too ethnocentric. Alternatively, it might also be that the decision to neutralize these elements depended on the translator's aesthetical preferences, or some other unknown factor.

Looking at which hybrid elements the translator of *American Gods* chose to neutralize, it leaves us with the impression of a pragmatic approach to the material: hybrid elements that do not translate easily between source and target language and culture appear to have been neutralized. Applying theory from Nida and Berman here, one could argue that the Norwegian translation of Gaiman's novel seems to aim at fulfilling Nida's four

criteria for a successful translation (making sense, conveying the spirit of the original, easy / natural form of expression, producing a similar response as the ST). The exception to this would have to be the reduction of the tension between the vernacular and the koine (when it comes to the STs intralinguistic hybrid elements) seen in the translated text. One might, at the same time argue that in order to meet these criteria the translator has used procedures leading to various deforming tendencies. In light of this, certain aspects of the translation appear to be both 'dynamic' and 'deforming'. The full picture is however more complex, as the TT-exclusive hybridity discussed below will illustrate.

5.2.3. Hybridity exclusive to the TT

Yet who would wish to discourage the peoples of the world from translating, merely
because it is *fundamentally impossible*?

Thomas Mann ⁴³

A great deal of the hybridity identified in the TT is not shared with the ST. The examples of this TT hybridity presented in the analysis seem to reinforce the claim made by many translation theorists that translation may lead to hybridity. As mentioned in the theory chapter, translated texts are often thought of as products of both source and target cultures – what this entails is that translated texts are influenced by both sides, creating something that is neither source, nor target-culturally pure. It becomes mixed; it

⁴³ Mann, Thomas. "Letter to a Translator, Jenő Tamás Gömöri, Hungarian translator of Mann." trans. Richard Winston and Clara Winston, *Delos* 3 (1969): 210. Web. 14 Apr. 2015.

becomes hybrid. This is also the case with the Norwegian translation of Gaiman's *American Gods*.

5.2.3.1. Non-translation

A prominent feature of the TT is the consistent use of non-translation, which gives the TT a unique hybrid element. The examples shown in the analysis in tables 13 and 14 are but a few examples of non-translation that can be found in the TT. As mentioned in the analysis, a possible explanation for why certain quotes appear untranslated, i.e. in English in the TT, could be that the ones rendered in Norwegian were based on previous translations into Norwegian. The Wendy Cope poem in table 12 seems to suggest otherwise. The poem has never received a Norwegian translation. This translation has thus been carried out by the TT translator.

The amount of English in the TT can perhaps be partially explained by two factors: (1) the relative proficiency in the English language in the target culture (i.e. Norway), and (2) the status and prestige of the English language within this culture. If the translator can safely assume that readers will be able to understand passages that appear in English, and that these passages will not typically be viewed as 'interference', or seen as contributors to the global hegemony of the English language (which some theorists claim is all too real), then this direct transferal of passages and words in English becomes a possibility. It may not entirely explain *why* it is done (although one might to some extent wonder if it is done because the translator knows that he *can*), but it may shed some light on *how* it can be done. This in turn opens up for an interesting question: why translate into English at all if the receiving culture already knows the language?

There is perhaps no definite answer to this, but one could argue that people translate and read translations for reasons extending beyond mere *understanding* of the language in question. In an article concerning the practice of song translation in Scandinavia, Annjo K. Greenall identifies four different *skopoi*, or functions, connected to it.⁴⁴ These four different functions of these translations in the target culture are: tribute, pedagogical, language-political, and artistic. Of the language-political function of translation, she writes “in many ways, any decision to translate a song from English – the dominant, world language – into a smaller language could be construed as language-political, especially when it is also the case that the act of translation is not strictly speaking necessary for understanding” (Greenall 200). Greenall’s focus here is obviously song translation, but this function seems applicable to other areas of translation as well. An interesting thought regarding this is whether or not we might view the opposite, e.g. non-translation as a language-political act as well? If the element of non-translation in the TT is possible, or even acceptable within the linguistic culture in Norway, then this could suggest overlapping or ‘diluted’ cultural and linguistic borders between English and Norwegian. Following this, the element of non-translation can then be seen as an acknowledgement of this environment, which makes it an expression carrying language-political significance. It may be as Simon argues, that “in a global political context which favours the voices of strong, unified identities, the hybrid text has an important message to deliver” (226).

⁴⁴ Greenall, Annjo K. “Scandinavian popular song translations in the late twentieth and early twenty-first century and their *skopoi*”. *True North: Literary Translation in the Nordic Countries*. Ed. B.J. Epstein. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014. Pp. 191-210. Print. p. 198. All future references are to this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text.

It might however be possible to make some other assumptions as to why certain quotes are left alone, i.e. transferred directly. The instances of non-translation that deal with the quotes that appear at the beginning of chapters in *American Gods* have one thing in common: they are all taken from either a poem or a song. Poetry and lyrics are by their very nature more emphatic and expressive than many other forms of linguistic expression, and this makes poetry notoriously difficult to translate. Even if the translator is able to recreate the metre; even if the sense is transferred, the poetic emotion which is unique to the ST may not always survive translation. With this in mind, we should question whether or not the TT translator's ethics may hold the key to explaining the extensive use of non-translation in the TT.

Translation is, as Mann acknowledges, a process which involves a certain amount of loss, and it might be that poetry is more vulnerable to this than other forms of writing. To directly translate these quotes might then be seen as an attempt at presenting them, in their purest form (or, giving an as accurate as possible description of the map), to the readers of the TT as they were presented to their original readers. The selection of texts that Gaiman brings into his own text is not accidental; the quotes are carefully selected to understate central themes and plot devices. For instance, chapter six opens with an excerpt from Thomas Bailey Aldrich's poem "The Unguarded Gates" from 1882. In his poem, Aldrich laments the fate of America, describing the foreign masses as they enter the New World, writing "in streets and alley what strange tongues are loud, accents of menace alien to our air, voices that once the Tower of Babel knew!" Immigration is obviously central in Aldrich's poem, and it is clear where he stands on the matter. It has been commented on how the poem, to contemporary audiences, "reeks of nationalism and white supremacy", and that it now serves as a "chilling portrayal of the xenophobic

strains weaving through our country's history"⁴⁵. It also serves as a reminder of the paradoxical nature of anti-immigration in a country built on values of diversity and freedom. The allusions brought to the text by Aldrich's poem may certainly not always be the same to readers of the ST and the TT – people are always going to interpret things differently. Cultural references and prior knowledge influence how we as readers experience texts, and leaving Aldrich's poem untouched, i.e. non-translated, signals a certain trust in readers of the TT – a confidence in their abilities to make sense of a culturally, as well as linguistically hybrid text.

Another possible reason for why translating poetry and lyrics can be such a difficult exercise may have to do with, as Berman points out, the fact that these genres seem more prone to suffer deforming tendencies than prose is (7). In addition to linguistic challenges, poetry and lyricism face challenges of an aesthetic character, such as structure, sound, and metaphorical expressions⁴⁶. It might however be just as plausible that these elements were treated the way they were because of stylistic preferences, or as suggested above, even ethical considerations.

It can be useful to revisit a topic briefly discussed at the beginning of the theory chapter here. There seems to be mostly agreement within the field of translation studies that globalized culture naturally contributes to the hybridization of all kinds of writing. Zauberga, for instance, pointed out that "the world... has become an immense contact

⁴⁵ "Thomas Bailey Aldrich, "The Unguarded Gates," (1895)." *American Studies at the University of Virginia*. n.d. Web. 06 Apr. 2015.

⁴⁶ Hariyanto, Sugeng. "Problems in Translating Poetry". *Translation Dictionary*. Web. 30 Mar. 2015

zone where cultures, previously separated, come together and establish ongoing relations,” and that hybridity in translation should be treated as “a natural consequence of crossing cultural barriers” (265-66). The spaces between cultures get harder and harder to define; they shift constantly, and cultural borders seem to erode over time. Norway’s cultural and linguistic spheres are no exception to this – like our neighboring countries, we are constantly moving towards a more culturally diverse society.

The role of English in globalized culture must also be mentioned here. Selma Sonntag writes that “we can define global English as part of globalization. It is part of the cause, the process, and the product of globalization”⁴⁷. The fact that English plays a very special part in globalized society is hardly contested, and with English language comes English culture – or rather Anglo-American culture. Translation theorists such as Berman and his intellectual successor Venuti have both expressed concerns about global English. They, and others with them, consider globalization a chief contributor to a creeping homogenization of culture. Others, such as Zauberga, Pym, or Snell-Hornby simply state that globalization (and with it, hybridization) reflects the world today. Whichever way we choose to look at it, we must recognize the strong cultural and linguistic influence of Anglo-American culture and language. Seeing large portions of English within the TT might then be linked to this. We can assume that both the English language and Anglo-American culture overall will not be considered *too* foreign by TT readers. We must also presuppose that the translator of *American Gods* has got a firm grasp of both the language and culture from which she is translating, as well as that of the target culture. Even if the significance, or the connotations brought on by the quotes might not produce a similar response to target text and source text readers, the translator might safely

⁴⁷ Sonntag, Selma K. *The Local Politics of Global English: Case Studies in Linguistic Globalization*. Oxford: Lexington Books, 2003. p. xii. Web. 10 Apr. 2015.

assume that most TT readers will be able to *understand* the language itself – which once more makes the whole discourse on translation ethics even more complex by begging the question: why translate at all?

There is, as mentioned before, some evidence that seem to support the fact that the translator of *American Gods* trusts in the TT reader's abilities. Shäffner and Adab have also pointed to the cultural expertise of translators as an important factor to how hybridity may be expressed in translated texts, saying that "it may well be that such translators, because they are more aware and conscious of cultural overlaps, differences, or peculiarities, are more likely to give expression to this awareness in the text itself" ("... Revisited" 299).

5.2.3.2. Miscellaneous translation-induced hybridity

The non-translation discussed above makes up the majority of what can be classified as uniquely TT hybrid elements. It is, however, not the only way this translation-induced hybridity manifests itself in the TT. Other examples include calques (a SL expression grafted onto the TL), character names that lead to intralingual hybridity in the TT, as well as Anglicization (such as in the example in table 16, where 'Dame' was transferred as 'Mrs.' in the TT).

The analysis pointed to some instances where calques resulted in uniquely TT hybrid elements. Calques are expressions or idioms which have been recreated using a SL 'equivalent'. The procedure resembles non-translation in that it is a form of borrowing. It is however not the words themselves that are transferred directly to the TL, but rather the expression or structure. This affects the TT in ways that help remind readers of the

fact that they are reading a translation, which is true of the examples in tables 17 and 18 in the analysis chapter. These are instances of interlingual hybridity, albeit in a slightly different form than what we have identified other places in the texts.

Character names in *American Gods* and its Norwegian translation is another interesting topic. The names themselves are not hybrid within the ST, but some of them – through translation – became hybrid within the TT. For instance, the main character is called Shadow Moon in both texts. Within the ST, these words do not stand out – within the TT, however, this becomes a foreign element in the sense that English words become intertwined with the Norwegian. This can then be classified as interlingual hybridity. Characters' names are obviously an area of translation that can be quite difficult. This might be especially true for translation of fantasy literature⁴⁸, a genre which *American Gods* can be understood as part of. Shadow Moon is but one example of this linguistic hybridity arising from the direct translation of character names in the TT. Others include the names Easter, Mr. Wood, Mr. Town, Mr. World, and Mad Sweeney. An interesting thing to point out here is that Mr. Wednesday has been translated as 'Onsdag' in the Norwegian version. Mr. Wednesday is an American version of the Norse god Odin. The weekday known as Wednesday in English speaking parts of the world is actually derived from the Old English 'Wōdnesdæg', meaning 'the day of Woden'⁴⁹. Woden is the Old English name for Odin. In the Norwegian translation, however, Wednesday becomes Onsdag, which is a literal translation. The Norwegian 'Onsdag' also means 'Odin's day'. Translating his name into the Norwegian equivalent does not involve any loss of meaning, and this might have been a factor influencing the translator. Still, one could

⁴⁸ Great examples of translation of character names within this genre can be found in Torstein Bugge Høverstad's translations of the Harry Potter books, as well as his translation of Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings* trilogy into Norwegian.

⁴⁹ "Wednesday." *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. 12 Mar. 2015. Web 14 Apr. 2015.

argue that translating Shadow into the Norwegian 'Skygge' would also not involve any loss, same as with translating Easter to 'Påske'. Rejecting a literal translation of these character names might again be tied to a notion discussed earlier, namely the translator's trust in the reader's abilities. Alternatively, it could also be explained by a possible intertextually generated familiarity with characters with names of days in Norwegian, such as through the character Friday (Fredag) in Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, and that accordingly, the Norwegian translator of *American Gods* might be aware of this particular intertextual familiarity – thus allowing her to employ it in the TT.

6. Conclusion

Dette er ikke den enkleste boka i verden å oversette. Hvis jeg kunne gå tilbake i tid og snakke til den meg som skrev boka, ville jeg antakelig påpekt at å skrive en bok der flere nøkkelpoeng i handlingen var avhengig av engelske ord som har mer enn én betydning, eller varierende uttalelser av engelske ord, ikke ville være lett for, eller snilt mot, oversetterne. Derfor sier jeg unnskyld til alle mine oversettere (*Amerikanske Guder* 8).

The overall aim of this thesis has been to examine the translation of hybrid source texts using Neil Gaiman's *American Gods* and its Norwegian translation as the material for this exploration. In attempts to shed light on this complex area of translation the following research questions worked as guidelines: does the Norwegian translation of Neil Gaiman's *American Gods* preserve or neutralize hybridity found in the source text, and is it possible to identify and explain any patterns in the representation of ST hybridity within the TT? Could translation be seen to give rise to new, TT-exclusive forms of hybridity? The analysis revealed translative strategies and procedures moving in both directions in regard to the preserving and neutralizing hybrid ST elements. This then called for further questions; what could be the reasons that might lie behind the translator's decisions to either neutralize or preserve certain hybrid elements, and how can these decisions affect the text?

One of the most striking observations made was the translator's decision to neutralize a great portion of the use vernacular language, such as expressions representing dialects and sociolects, which exist in the source text. This observation does seem to support Berman's warning that vernaculars have a hard time translating into other linguistic

spheres. In the discussion chapter this was linked to what might have been both an aspect of the translator's language ethics, as well as a genuine desire to provide readers with a fluid and enjoyable literary experience.

Of the novel's many hybrid features, the aspects of it that were neutralized in translation make up but a small part of it. For the most part the Norwegian translator of *American Gods* seems to acknowledge Gaiman's linguistically and culturally mixed writing, and express an honest interest in transferring it into the Norwegian version so long as it does not (hypothetically) interfere with the readability of the translation. Cultural hybridity does clearly make up a considerable portion of the novel's overall hybrid quality, and for the most part these elements are dealt with in procedures that allow them to transfer easily to the TT. The only exception to this would be the tendency to apply procedures of adaptation and *équivalence* to the names of certain mythological creatures (e.g. 'piskies' -> 'smånisser'). This however, seems to be the exception, not the rule.

What may be the most interesting and curious observation made in the analysis is the extensive use of non-translation, or borrowing. A key concept in much of the theory presented in this thesis was the possibility of translation as a practice which produces hybrid texts. This hypothesis has seen some confirmation through the data in the analysis, but a considerable portion of this hybridity which is unique to the TT finds no concrete explanations in the theory. As mentioned in the discussion chapter, seeing large portions of English in a Norwegian translation raises certain questions. For instance, it might be useful to spend some time considering the role of English as a world

language, and particularly its position within the Norwegian language climate. Are these elements of non-translation accepted because of the relative competence with the language in Norway, or is it tolerated because of English's central role in the linguistic and cultural globalization of today? These questions take us beyond the initial aim of this thesis, but they should still be reflected upon.

It should also be noted here that the role of English in the tendency towards increasing multilingualism might not solely be of a neutrally contributing nature. Some writers discussed in this thesis have warned us against what they view as a global hegemony of English bringing with it a monolingual mindset. Rising multilingualism in parts of the world, coupled with the increasingly delicate and shifting cultural and linguistic borders discussed earlier in this has recently pointed researchers from wide-ranging academic disciplines towards researching the effects of hybridity on cultural and linguistic spheres. These questions are not yet resolved. One needs not go back that far in history to get to a time where the cultural and linguistic landscape looked remarkably different. To quote a famous British politician, one could argue that "the Kaleidoscope has been shaken. The pieces are in flux. Soon they will settle again."⁵⁰ How we make sense of these pieces; how we interpret and explain the current, as well as the future linguistic and cultural landscape should provide a much needed awareness of the world at large, as well as our place in it.

⁵⁰ Blair, Tony. "Full text: Tony Blair's speech (part two)." 2001: The Guardian.

Works Cited

- "A Fan's Interview With 'American Gods' Author Neil Gaiman". *Here & Now With Robin Young and Jeremy Hobson*. 28 Jul. 2011. Web. 20 Jan. 2015.
- Ahmadian, Moussa, and Hooshang Yazdani. "A Study of the Effects of Intertextuality Awareness on Reading Literary Texts: The Case of Short Stories." *Journal of Educational and Social Research* 3 (2013): 155-66. Web. 14 Apr. 2015.
- "Ain't." *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. 29 Mar. 2015. Web. 14 Apr. 2015.
- "American Gods – Characters." *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. 3 Apr. 2015. Web. 14 Apr. 2015.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. p. 358, qtd. in Marwan Kraidy. *Hybridity, Or the Cultural Logic of Globalization*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2005. Web. 4 Apr 2015.
- Berman, Antoine. "Translation and the trials of the foreign". Trans. Lawrence Venuti. *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti, Mona Baker. Routledge: London and New York, 2004. Web. 4 May 2015.
- Blair, Tony. "Full text: Tony Blair's speech (part two)." 2001: The Guardian. Web. 21 Apr. 2015.
- Burke, Peter. *Cultural Hybridity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2009. Print.
- Chesterman, Andrew. "Teaching Strategies for Emancipatory Translation". *Developing Translation Competence*. Ed. Schäffner, Christina, and Beverly Adab. John Benjamins Publishing Co.: Amsterdam, 2000. Pp. 77-89. Web. 9 May 2015.
- Cohen, Robin & Paola Toninato. "Hybridity". *The University of Warwick, Department of Sociology*, 15. Nov 2007. Web. 13 Apr. 2015.
- "Creole Language." *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. 13 Apr. 2015. Web. 14. Apr. 2015.
- "Czernobog." *Only the Gods Are Real: A Tribute to Neil Gaiman's American Gods*. n.d. Web. 13 Nov. 2014.
- Gaiman, Neil. *American Gods*. New York: Harpertext, 2002. Print.
- . *Amerikanske Guder*. Trans. Ina Vassbotn Steinman. Kristiansund: Vendetta Forlag AS, 2012.
- Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. *Code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. Web. 14 Mar. 2015.

- Grutman, Rainier. "Multilingualism and Translation". *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Ed. Baker, Mona. London: Routledge, 2001. Pp. 157-60. Web. 4 May 2015.
- Hariyanto, Sugeng. "Problems in Translating Poetry." *Translation Dictionary*. Web. 30 Mar. 2015.
- "Iko Iko." *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. 20 Dec. 2014. Web. 14 Apr. 2015.
- Gasset, José Ortega Y. "The misery and the splendour of translation". Trans. Elizabeth Gamble Miller. *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Venuti, Lawrence, and Mona Baker. Routledge: London and New York, 2000. Pp. 49-65. Web. 10 May 2015.
- Greenall, Annjo K. "Scandinavian popular song translations in the late twentieth and early twenty-first century and their skopoi". *True North: Literary Translation in the Nordic Countries*. Ed. B.J. Epstein. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014. Pp. 191-210. Print.
- Kraidy, Marwan M. *Hybridity, Or the Cultural Logic of Globalization*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2005. Web. 5 Feb. 2015.
- Mann, Thomas. "Letter to a Translator, Jenő Tamás Gömöri, Hungarian translator of Mann." trans. Richard Winston and Clara Winston, *Delos* 3 (1969): 210. Web. 14 Apr. 2015.
- "Map-territory relation." *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. 9 Apr. 2015. Web. 14 Apr. 2015.
- Munday, Jeremy. *Introducing Translation Studies. Theories and Applications*. New York and Oxon: Routledge, 2012. Print.
- Nida, Eugene A., and Charles Russell Taber. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill, 2003. Web. 3 Mar. 2015.
- Nouss, Alexis. "The Butterfly and the Translator. Reflections on Hybrid Textuality." *Across Languages and Cultures*. 2 (2001): 227-35. Print.
- "Pixie." *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. 6 Feb. 2015. Web. 14 Apr. 2015.
- Pym, Anthony. "Against Praise of Hybridity." *Across Languages and Cultures*. 2 (2001): 195-206. Print.
- . *Exploring Translation Theories*. Oxon: Routledge, 2010. Print.
- . "Natural and directional equivalence in theories of translation." *Target* 19:2 (2007): 271-94. Web. 4 Mar. 2015.

- Rizzardi, Biancamaria. "Opening Up to Complexity in the Global Era". *Language and Translation in Postcolonial Literatures: Multilingual Contexts, Translational Texts*. Ed. Simona Bertacco. New York and Oxon: Routledge, 2014. Web. 15 Apr. 2015.
- "Seattle Post-Intelligencer." Preface / Reviews. Gaiman, Neil. *American Gods*. New York: Harpertext, 2002. iv. Print.
- Shäffner, Christina, and Beverly Adab. "The Idea of the Hybrid Text in Translation: Contact as Conflict." *Across Languages and Cultures*. 2 (2001): 167-80. Print.
- . "The Idea of the Hybrid Text in Translation Revisited." *Across Languages and Cultures*. 2 (2001): 277-302. Print.
- Shakespeare, W. *Troilus and Cressida*. III.iii.100.
- Sherry, Simon. "Cultural and Textual Hybridity." *Across Languages and Cultures*. 2 (2001): 217-26. Print.
- Snell-Hornby, Mary. "The Space 'In Between': What is a Hybrid Text?" *Across Languages and Cultures*. 2 (2001): 207-16. Print.
- Sonntag, Selma K. *The Local Politics of Global English: Case Studies in Linguistic Globalization*. Oxford: Lexington Books, 2003. Web. 10 Apr. 2015.
- "Thomas Bailey Aldrich, "The Unguarded Gates," (1895)." *American Studies at the University of Virginia*. n.d. Web. 6 Apr. 2015.
- Tirkkonen-Condit, Sonja. "Unique items – Over- or Under-represented in Translated Language?". *Translation Universals. Do they Exist?* Ed. Anna Mauranen and Pekka Kujamäki. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins, 177-86. Web. 4 Apr. 2015.
- "Transposition". *Anukriti, Central Institute of Indian Languages*. n. pag. Web. 4 Apr. 2015.
- Zauberga, Ieva. "Discourse Interference in Translation." *Across Languages and Cultures*. 2 (2001): 265-76. Print.
- "Wednesday." *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. 12 Mar. 2015. Web. 14 Feb. 2015.
- Whitman, Walt. "Song of Myself". *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*. Gen. ed. Nina Baym, 8th ed. New York: Norton, 2013. pp. 1024-1067. Print.
- Williams, Jenny, and Andrew Chesterman. *The Map: A Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies*. New York and Oxon: Routledge, 2014. Web. 1 Mar. 2015.