The British hedgerow in Sweden

Dealing with spatial differences and reader differences related to the author-reader relationship and culture-specific referents aided by a translation-oriented text analysis model
Abstract

This study sets out to test Christiane Nord’s translation-oriented text analysis model (1997:59-67, 2005) in relation to identifying problem areas and making translation decisions concerning cultural differences. The study has shown that this model can be of use in identifying translation problems. It further suggests that it will contribute to making informed translation-related decisions in problematic instances. The focus of the study lies on problems and corresponding decisions related to cultural differences between the source text reader and the target text reader, specifically differences concerning the author-reader relationship and culture-specific references (i.e. referential differences). It also focuses on problems that arose due to spatial differences between the source text and the target text. The author-reader relationship of the target text was generally neutralised or generalised when it was explicit or specific in the source text. Furthermore, implicit information in the source text was generally explicated due to referential differences between the readers of the source text and the target text and also due to spatial differences between the texts. This study forms the basis for further studies on the generalisations made here.
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1. Introduction

The way I see it, a translator’s job is to keep everyone involved in the translation happy, by balancing between the original text, the purpose of the translation and the new readership. However, one often feels torn between an obligation to the text that is being translated and to the readers of the translation. “Acting within the interface of two different cultures, bearing in mind the interests of several participants, is what makes translation-relevant decisions a highly complex matter” (Loogus 2012:369). Thus, translating a text is arguably no easy task and the “translation-relevant decisions” Loogus (2012) speaks of are of interest in this study. Translation-related decisions could simply be described as instances when the culture from which the original text derives and the culture in which the translation will function do not line up and the translator has to make a translation decision based on the options and information at hand.

In the example below the culture of the original text (English) and the culture of the translation (Swedish) diverge in that they refer to the same entity with different referents. In the English text the birch in question is referred to as *the silver kind*. However, in Swedish *silverbjörk* (*silver birch*) refers to a shrub and the tree mentioned in the example below is instead referred to as *vårthjörk*.

The birch we’re talking about here is *the silver kind* [...] *the birch is so-named for its silvery white bark*, which is broken up by a design of horizontal black lines. (Nozedar 2012:27)

Björken som vi talar om här är *vårthjörken* [...] *Björken* [...] *kallas vårthjörk på grund av dess hartsvärtiga årsskott*. Barken är vit och bryts upp av horisontella svarta linjer.

Both referents are descriptive, as they are directly related to the appearance of the tree. This is further explicated in the English text with an explanation, *the birch is so-named for its silvery white bark*. However, in Swedish focus lies on a different aspect of the appearance of the tree. This could pose a problem as the explanation in the English text would not correlate with the information that the referent of the translation carries. Here the translator has to decide whether the English referent should be omitted along with the explication, or if it should be transferred with an additional explanation stating that the referent and explication relates directly to the culture of the English text. A Swedish substitution could also be used in the translation. The decision depends on many factors, such as the reason behind the translation,
its purpose, the original purpose of the original text, who the reader of the translation may be
and who the reader of the original text is, what expectations the author may have of both the
text and its readers, if there are any space restrictions etc. It can therefore be argued that the
more information a translator has on a given translation task, the more s/he will have to base
her/his decision on, which in turn would result in an enhanced translation decision.

The intention of this paper is partially to investigate if it is possible to ease the complexity
of making translation-related decisions with the help of a translation-oriented text analysis
model. The model (see further sections 2.1 and 3.1) will be applied to the material on which
this study is based, i.e. the English text and its Swedish translation. I will investigate if the
text analysis model could firstly aid in the identification of translation problems and then be
of use in the process of making decisions related to the translation of these issues.
Furthermore, specific translation problems that arose in the translation process will also be of
interest. The focus of the translation problems discussed in this paper ultimately lies on
cultural differences between source text readers and target text readers as well as spatial
differences between the two texts. The example above is an indication of the type of problems
that are discussed here. This example highlights a translation problem which is related to the
difference between the ways in which entities are referred to in the two cultures (in this case
the British culture and the Swedish culture). In this paper, differences related to referencing,
i.e. the way in which we refer to things, are termed “referential differences”. Arguably,
referential differences ultimately points to the diverging background knowledge of the source
text readers and target text readers seeing as our knowledge and past experiences determine
how we put the world around us into words.

Firstly there will be a section where the translation-oriented text analysis model is applied
to the process of translating an English text about the British hedgerow into Swedish.
Secondly, there will be a section where reader differences are discussed in relation to the
author-reader relationship and in relation to culture specific referents. Lastly there will be a
section on translation problems related to spatial differences.
1.1 Aim
The aim of this study is twofold. Firstly, a translation-oriented text analysis model (section 2.2) will be applied to the text(s) on which this study is based (section 3.1), in an attempt to investigate how, and if, the model could aid in the translation process.

Secondly, specific problem areas of the translation will be highlighted and problematized. The focus lies on reader differences (section 3.2) in relation to the author-reader relationship and culture-specific referents, as well as spatial differences (section 3.3) between the original text and the translation.

Ultimately, this study aims to investigate how potential translation problems were identified, approached and solved by the translator.

1.2 Material
This study is based on the translation of pages 9-29 in Adele Nozedar’s book The Hedgerow Handbook – Recipes, Remedies and Rituals, published in London in 2012. The original text (Nozedar 2012), henceforth the source text, is focused on botanical information with detailed descriptions of hedgerow plants as well as their different uses, history and related folklore. It also contains recipes specific to hedgerow plants. The text is quite colloquial which can be seen in the use of contractions (such as: we’re, it’s, don’t etc.), non-standard punctuation (i.e. overuse of exclamation mark and full stops) and the way in which coordinators can be found in initial position of a sentence or question (e.g. And do remember […]], But the time to harvest […] etc.), and more. The frequent use of the first person pronoun I makes Ms Nozedar’s voice heard throughout the book. She also addresses the reader directly (you) which gives the text a conversational and personal tone, adding to the colloquial style. These stylistic features make the text easy to read, which in turn has contributed to the popularity of the book (Amazon.co.uk, Goodreads). Both the subject matter of the text (the British hedgerow) as well as its place of publication (London) indicates that the readership is British. The subject matter further suggests that the reader has an interest in, and enjoys being in, nature. Foraging is also likely to be an interest.

The text is translated for the purpose of publishing and selling the book in Sweden. As foraging has become increasingly popular in the target culture, the publisher is aiming to sell a sufficient number of this informative, enjoyable and practical text to Swedes with an interest in what British nature as well as Swedish nature may have to offer. It is therefore assumed, for
much of the same reasons as mentioned above, that the Swedish readers have an interest in foraging and nature. The material will be further addressed in section 3.1 in relation to the analytical tools termed “text analysis” and “translation brief” which in turn will be explained in the theoretical chapter, section 2.2.

1.3 Method
This study was carried out in four steps. First, the English source text (Nozedar 2012:9-29) was approached using the analytical tools of the translation-oriented text analysis model (see section 2.2). This step allowed a profile of the source text to be made as well as a preliminary idea of the intended target text (i.e. the translation) to be outlined. The source text profile and the preliminary outline of the target text were then compared and analysed to identify problem areas of the translation. This procedure could arguably have a positive effect on the translation as it makes the translator aware of problem areas specific to the translation at hand. However, it could also be argued that because certain problem areas are highlighted the translator might overlook other, perhaps less common, translation problems that will arise in the translation process, as her/his focus will lie on the areas highlighted in the analysis. Nevertheless, as long as the translator is thorough the latter will not pose much of a problem.

The second step consisted of translating the source text into Swedish. Various aids were used in the translation process, such as online encyclopaedias, dictionaries and thesauruses, all of which contributed to a deeper understanding of the subject matter, as they contain both general and specific information on the subject matter, terminology and even specific linguistic phenomena. Parallel texts such as different fora, specialised web pages and books were consulted as a means to, amongst other things, identify subject specific terminology, stylistic features, common expressions and sentence structures that are typical for Swedish texts similar to the source text. Both different corpora and Google aided in establishing common collocations and in what contexts certain terms and expressions could be found, and to what extent they were used.

The third step was also conducted during the translation process. With a focus on the problem areas that became evident after comparing the two text profiles in step one, issues related to the topic of this study, i.e. the differences between the cultural backgrounds of the source text readers (i.e. the British readers) and the target text readers (i.e. Swedish readers) and spatial differences between the source text (United Kingdom) and the target text
were identified and problematized in a pilot study. These differences were first identified in the source text analysis, where instances related to the above mentioned translation problems were highlighted, and later also in the translation. Lastly, in step four, the analysis was carried out. The analysis is of a qualitative nature as it is descriptive with a focus on detailed, interpretive analysis rather than quantification of linguistic items.

Moreover, the examples presented in the analysis are representative of the types of problems that were found in the process of the first step mentioned above (see also 3.1). These examples also represent reoccurring problems that were encountered in the translation of this particular text (the source text).

Table 1. Source text details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The source text</th>
<th>The full text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapters</td>
<td>4 + introduction</td>
<td>37 + introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate word count</td>
<td>5 800 (this is approx. 9% of the book)</td>
<td>65 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a short sample (see table 1 above) of the book a numerous amount of instances demonstrating reader differences were encountered. More specifically, 12 instances relating to reader differences and the specific problems analysed in section 3.2 were found (see table 2 below).

Table 2. Reader differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Number of occurrences found in the source text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (author-reader relationship, section 3.2.1)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 (culture-specific referents, section 3.2.2)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reader differences total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It also became evident that most of the plant chapters (in relation to this study: 3 out of 4 chapters, not including the introduction) consisted of at least one instance where spatial differences between the source text and the target text became problematic in the translation.

Table 3. Spatial differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Number of occurrences found in the source text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-6 (spatial differences, section 3.2.2)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial differences total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, Example 2 (see section 3.2.1) not only represent reader differences and the author-reader relationship, but it was also incorporated in the analysis as an attempt to demonstrate the complexity of the relationship between the author and the reader (for further discussions on the author-reader relationship see section 3). The theoretical aspects of this study will be presented and discussed in the following chapter.
2. Theoretical background
This chapter introduces the theoretical tools and concepts needed in order to understand the analysis. It starts with Nord’s translation-oriented text analysis approach (1997:59-67, 2005), in which aspects of Reiss’ text types (1981/2004:163-65) have been included. Next, there is a section where theoretical concepts discussed in this study are briefly presented. Lastly, different translation strategies discussed in the analysis will be presented and explained.

2.1 The translation-oriented text analysis model
Nord’s (1997:59-67, 2005) translation-oriented text analysis is based on a functional approach, i.e. translation is seen as part of communication between cultures, and it emphasizes features of the source text and the target text as well as the purpose of the translation. In her model, Nord (1997:59) highlights three aspects of functionalism which she considers particularly useful, namely the translation brief, a source text analysis and the classification and hierarchy of translation problems. Here we will look at the theoretical aspects of the translation brief and the source text analysis, these aspects will later be integrated in the analysis (see section 3.1). The classification and hierarchy of translation problems that arose in the current study will also be discussed in the analysis (see section 3.1 below).

First, a text analysis of the source text will help achieve a functional translation, as the findings of the analysis may help solve problem areas of the text on a “lower linguistic level” (Nord 1997:62-63). It should according to Nord (1997:62) be based on a pragmatic model which can be applied to the communication situation of the source text and the translation (brief) respectively, as a comparison of the two will show where the source text and the intended target text may diverge. Furthermore, a comparison of the target text reader and the source text reader will indicate what adjustments and adaptions may be necessary to achieve a functional translation. Ultimately, “the comparison between the source text and the target text profiles shows very clearly what source text information or linguistic elements can be kept invariant and what has to be adjusted to the requirements of the translation purpose” (Nord 1997:64).
Next, the translation brief should, according to Nord (1997:60), outline both the source text and the target text in terms of:

1) The (intended) text function(s),
2) The target text addressee(s),
3) The (prospective) time and place of text reception,
4) The medium over which the text will be transmitted, and
5) The motive for the production or reception of the text (Nord 1997:60)

The translation brief will ultimately help outline the communication situation of the translation. The communication situation will, in turn, help identify translation issues once it has been compared to the source text analysis and communication situation. The information will arguably also either support or oppose different options, which in turn will provide a foundation to support translation choices. Each aspect of the brief will now be presented in turn.

To begin with, the text functions (1) are important as they refer to what role the text is intended to have. Reiss’ (1981/2004:163-65) classification of text types in terms of function, focus and purpose will help establish the role of the text. Reiss (1981/2004:163-64) distinguishes four categories of text type, however, only the three that are relevant to this study will be mentioned here, namely the informative, the expressive and the operative text types. First, informative texts, such as instruction manuals or biographies, focus on factual content and they have an informative function, with the purpose of informing the reader (Reiss 1981/2004:163). Reiss (1981/2004:167) suggests a content focused translation strategy for these texts as the informative function and the content of the text is in focus. Next, expressive texts, such as travel guides or poems, focus on the artistic and aesthetic form, and it has an expressive function, with the purpose of expressing the sender’s vision (Reiss 1981/2004:163) and, according to Nord (1997:41), attitude. Here the translator should focus on “the artistic and creative intentions of the source language author” (Reiss 1981/2004:167) to maintain the expressive function. Lastly, operative texts, such as advertisements or warning signs, has an appellative function (e.g. making a plea, demand or request to the reader), with the purpose of eliciting a response from the reader. For operative texts, the appellative
function should be in focus, i.e. one should aim at eliciting a similar response from the target text reader as one would from the source text reader (Reiss 1981/2004:168).

However, according to Reiss one text can contain a mix of text functions, which is the case of the material on which this study is based (see section 3.1), yet most often there is one function that takes priority over the others (Reiss 1981/2004:164). A book on India could for example contain factual information such as when, where and how the Taj Mahal was built, it could also present an artistic description of the Indian festival, Diwali. It could further comprise typical Indian recipes where a response from the reader is anticipated. In this case, the informative function is the primary function. However, recipes are first and foremost operative in nature which means that the operative function overrides the informative function where a recipe is presented.

Secondly, the information on the addressees (2), i.e. the target text readers, should be as detailed as possible and contain aspects such as cultural background, expectations towards the text, the extent to which they may be influenced etc. (Nord 2005:11). This will make it possible to identify areas which may need special attention in the translation. Next, the time and place (3) of publication are important details, especially if there are major temporal and spatial differences between the source text and the target text. For example, temporal differences between an article from 2009 and its 2014 translation may not seem important, but the article could contain temporal references such as yesterday, last Monday and next month which, because of the temporal difference, will need special attention in the translation.

The medium (4) of a text is also important as it could dictate the style and format of the text, as well as space restrictions etc. Lastly, why the source text was written could help determine the motive (5) of the translation, and as mentioned above the purpose of a translation is a key factor in Nord’s approach. She (Nord 2005:8-17) argues that any translation is determined by its purpose, and that it is a way of communicating across cultures, in which both the source text and the target text relate to their respective cultural and linguistic contexts.

For example, a speech made by President Obama is translated into Swedish for educational purposes where students are discussing and analysing the issue of the speech. On one hand, the primary function of the source text is expressive and maybe even appellative in its cultural context, as it could be seen as a form of propaganda. On the other hand, the primary function of the target text is to inform as the text will be used as study material. Thus, the function of the target text within its cultural context and communicative situation is not the same as that
of the source text, due to the purpose of the translation. One could therefore argue that knowing the similarities and differences between the source text and the target text contexts will allow the translator to make informed decisions, specific for the translation task in question.

The theoretical aspects of Nord’s approach will be further commented on in relation to the source text and target text on which this study is based in chapter 3 (section 3.1). We will now turn our attention to theoretical concepts discussed in the analysis.

2.2 Theoretical concepts related to translation issues

Each and every profession has specific tools necessary to complete the work at hand. Ingo (2007:175) states that all tools have different qualities and that different tools are handled in different ways. For example, a hammer and a sledgehammer have different qualities which means that the builder handles them differently. Ingo (2007:175-76) argues that languages are the tools of a translator and that each language is used in different manners in terms of structure, variety, semantics and pragmatics. This means that sometimes the target language may not make use of the same linguistic structures as the target language or that an expression in the source culture is conveyed in a different manner in the target language.

As the cultural background of the source text readers and the target text readers is based on the culture to which they belong they will have diverging background knowledge and will therefore relate to different referents. The use of the term “referential differences” is, as mentioned above (section 1), in this paper directly connected to differences between the ways in which entities are referred to in the two cultures. It could for example be that in Sweden we distinguish between maternal grandparents (mormor and morfar) and paternal grandparents (farmor and farfar) whereas in Britain they do not (grandmother and grandfather), they do however have a variety of referents for grandmother (grandma, granny, gram etc.) and grandfather (grandpa, granddad, gramps etc.). A translator may also encounter instances where the target language lacks a direct equivalent for a word expressed in the source text. In this study, instances such as these are called “non-equivalents” (Baker 2001:20). One type of non-equivalence is when “the source language concept is not lexicalized in the target language” (Baker 2001:21), which means that the source language concept is known in the target culture but there is no word for it in the target language. The English word savoury is such an example. The word expresses a concept which is easy to understand, yet it has no
equivalent in Swedish. Another type of non-equivalence is when the source language contains a word which expresses a concept that is unknown in the target culture. Baker (2001:20) calls this a “culture specific concept”. For example, the Swedish *sparkstötting* (a type of sled) is a culture-specific concept unknown to Brits thus there is no equivalent for it in English.

In addition, the source text may include instances where information is implied in the target text. This could arguably be explained by the fact that the author and reader share the same cultural background. Hence the author is presupposing that the readers have the same cultural background as her/him, i.e. they share the same knowledge about cultural norms (e.g. Brits: having a roast for Christmas dinner), culture-specific referents (e.g. Swedes: a reference to *Kling och Klang* instead of explicitly referring to the police), commonly shared experiences (the experience of dancing around the midsummer pole during midsummer celebrations in Sweden) and much more. For example, a book written by a Swedish author is based on the cultural background of the author. Thus, Swedish readers are expected to understand a reference to the (bad) smell of “surströmming” (fermented Baltic herring) made in the text, as it is likely they have experienced the smell at some point in their lives (at the very least, the bad smell should be common knowledge amongst Swedish readers). A British reader on the other hand is most likely not familiar with “surströmming” or its smell, thus the implication that it smells bad becomes a problem if the text were to be translated into English. Similarly certain things may be explicit in the source text, such as the fact that it is the British Prime Minister that lives in 10 Downing Street. An explication such as this may be necessary in a text intended for a Swedish readership but it would be rendered superfluous in a text intended for a British readership.

Furthermore, names are often viewed as instances lacking semantic meaning (Ingo 2007:137), however, I beg to differ. For example, the plant *Hyacinthoides non-scripta* has the English name *Bluebell* (NHM), which arguably carries semantic value as the name indicates the colour (*blue*) and form (*bell*) of the flower of the plant. Ingo (2007:137) is of a similar opinion, as he suggests that most names originate in appellatives and that they therefore may carry semantic value. Thus, certain names can therefore be viewed as semantic expressions and nicknames can further be viewed as culture-specific referents.

The source text of this study contained a number of the issues and concepts discussed in this section, all of which will be addressed in the analysis (chapter 3 below). However, before we turn our attention to the analysis we will have a look at certain translation strategies connected to these issues.
2.3 Translation strategies
Chesterman (2002:7-11) describes translation strategies (though he calls them “conceptual tools”) as mental processes or ideas in which certain translation related issues are offered generalised solutions. In this section we will look at the translation strategies that were used in the translation on which this study is based.

Firstly, Vinay and Darbelnet’s (1958/1995:36-38) translation strategies “transposition” and “modulation” are useful when a problem arise in the translation process because of the difference in the manner in which the source language and the target language are used. Vinay and Darbelnet describes transposition (1958/1995:36) as a method where one word class in the source text is replaced with a different word class in the target text, without the sense being changed. However, Eriksson (1997:20-21) further suggests that transposition happens on a phrasal level: the principal of the school (prepositional phrase) → skolans rektor (noun (genitive) phrase). Modulation (Vinay and Darbelnet 1958/1995:37-38) is a different strategy where the point of view changes in the translation. It is often used when literal or transposed translations are viewed as awkward, unidiomatic or unsuitable (1958/1995:36). For example; the positive expression nice! could be translated into Swedish with an expression written in the negative inte illa! (“not bad”).

Next, the issue of non-equivalence mentioned above (2.2) will be discussed. The strategy of “translation by cultural substitution” (Baker 2001:31-34) is when a source culture concept is replaced with a target culture concept which may not mean the same thing but is likely to effect the target text reader in a similar manner. For example: when the English concept of afternoon tea is translated with the Swedish concept kaffepaus or fika. Another strategy could be “translation using a loan word or a loanword plus explication” (Baker 2001:34-36). A loanword could for example be culture-specific items (pizza), modern concepts (Internet), buzz words (selfie) etc. If the loanword occurs frequently in the text, an explanation is useful because once the word is explained it can be used on its own. Vinay and Darbelnet’s (1958/1995:32-33) “calque” is similar to the latter translation strategy, but here the source language expression is literally translated instead of directly transferred (e.g. I was hanging with friends (Eng.) → Jag hängde med polarna. (Swe.)). Furthermore, a word could be omitted (Baker 201:40-42) to enhance readability, if the word is likely to distract the reader and if the inevitable loss of information does not impede the development of the text.
Lastly, possible problems caused by implicit or explicit information in the source text could be solved with the strategies of explication and implication respectively (Ingo 2007:123-24). For example: implicit information in the source text is explicated in the target text: Vi möttes på Arlanda → We met at Stockholm airport, Arlanda. This strategy is used when it is believed the target reader needs clarifications to understand what is implied. Implication is the opposite of explication: explicit information in the source text is left implicit in the target text (We met at Stockholm airport, Arlanda → Vi möttes på Arlanda).

In this section, different translation strategies in connection to different translation issues have been presented, however, the context and purpose of the translation often dictates what strategies should be used in each case (Baker 2001:20-21). It can thus be argued that the translation-oriented text analysis model mentioned above (section 2.1) will ultimately aid in making translation choices. However, the analytical tools presented in this chapter (the translation-oriented model (2.1), the conceptualisation of issues (2.2) and the translation strategies (2.3)) will be applied and discussed more in depth in the analysis.
3. Analysis
This chapter is introduced by a section on the translation-oriented text analysis model in relation to the material (3.1). Here the communication situations of the source text and the target text will be outlined and compared, this, in turn, will indicate areas of possible translation problems. The analysis then continues with two sections where issues related to differences between the communication situations of the source text and the target text are discussed: first, a section on differences between the source text reader and the target text reader in relation to the author-reader relationship (3.2.1) and then in relation to culture specific referents (3.2.2), and lastly a section on the spatial difference between the source text and the target text (3.3).

3.1 The source text analysis and translation brief model
In this section Christiane Nord’s text analysis approach is applied to the material on which this study is based. First the material will be approach through a source text analysis (see also section 2.1), then there is an outline of the translation brief (also section 2.1 above) and the section ends with a discussion on similarities and differences between the source text and the intended target text.

The source text is mainly content focused which, according to Reiss (1981/2004:163), indicates that it is primarily an informative text. However, it also contains expressive instances (the ribbon of a river glinting in the sun as it twists towards the horizon (Nozedar 2012:9) and the recipes in the text are operative as they consist of directives (Pop the keys in a large pan and cover with water (Nozedar 2012:20) which are supposed to elicit a response from the reader. Thus, its functions are to inform, to elicit a response from the reader and to entertain. The colloquial style and light tone are stylistic features which, in addition to its content, are the reasons behind the popularity of the book (Amazon.co.uk, Goodreads).

The assumption that the readers of the source text are British (see section 1.2) can be further supported by culture-specific referencing found in the text, such as The Enclosure Movement, poems of John Clare etc. These references are phenomena found specifically within the British culture, e.g. the The Enclosure Movement is an event in British history and John Clare is a British poet. It could therefore be argued that the author expects the readers of the text to have the same cultural background as her. Mainly because a British reader is more likely to be familiar with these culture-specific references than, for example, a Swedish or German reader.
The direct address of the reader, as well as Ms. Nozedar’s presence throughout the text explicates the author-reader relationship, which in turn is one of the stylistic features that contribute to an enjoyable reading experience. Moreover, the author-reader relationship is further explicated when the author includes the reader in what seems to be viewed as common experiences and beliefs, which, in turn, also suggests that the author and reader of the source text share the same cultural background; our landscape, our supermarkets, we know that, we hardly even notice etc. Implicitly Nozedar suggests that the landscape and supermarkets are British (as she herself is British; i.e our (British) landscape) and that both she and the reader experience the same thing(s); notice and know.

Next, what Nord (1997:59) calls the translation brief relates to the communication situation of the intended target text. First, in relation to Reiss’ (1981/2004:163-65) text types, the intended text functions (1) of the translation are informative, expressive (seen, for example, in the dialogic form) and operative (mainly in the recipes). Secondly, the target text readers, termed the addressees (2) by Nord (1997:60), are Swedes with an interest in the British hedgerow, nature and foraging. They may have some pre-knowledge on the subject matter. The readers will also expect being able to apply information in the text to plants found in Swedish nature. Thirdly, the target text is to be published (4) in Sweden in 2014. Furthermore, it will be published in the same medium (5), i.e. format (book) and size, as the source text. It will include the same images and the content will also be presented in alphabetical order, as is in the source text. Lastly, the source text was well received in the source culture (as stated in section 1.2 above) and it is expected to be received in a similar manner in the target culture. This is one of the reasons why it is being translated. The motive (5) for its production is hence to reach new readers and to sell more copies of the book.

Lastly, the source text analysis and the translation brief will be compared and discussed to highlight differences between the communication situations of both texts. This procedure will indicate problem areas (in bold) of the translation, or instances where special attention is needed. It will also point out source text elements that should be reproduced (underlined).

1) **The function**: Both the source text and the intended target text have the same functions; mainly informative and operative (the recipes). However, the expressive function is also important, as it is part of the style (e.g. the dialogic form seen in the presence of the author and the direct address of the reader, and personal descriptions such as; a truly magnificent tree, its fragile, elegant loveliness etc.). Thus, the translation should
firstly focus on the content of the text and the appellative function of the recipes, and secondly on the expressive form.

2) **The addressee:** The source text reader and the target text reader come from different countries and will therefore have **different cultural backgrounds.** This means that the prominent **author-reader relationship** (3.2.1), as well as **culture-specific phenomena** (3.2.2) may cause problems in the translation.

3) **Time and place:** The time difference (2 years) between source text and target text publication will not cause any problems because of the nature of the subject matter. The **spatial differences** (3.3) between the source text and the intended target text will however be a problem as the source culture and the target culture belong to **different grow zones.** In addition to being informed on British plants, the target reader is expected to apply the content to the target culture, which means that some information may have to be explicated. For example, the time of bloom of one particular plant may diverge between the two cultures because of the differences in grow zones. Therefore, certain instances may have to explicitly inform the reader that the information concerns the source culture and not the target culture.

4) **Medium:** The translation will be published in the same medium and format as the source text so there are **some space restrictions.**

5) **Motive:** The **light tone of the text should be maintained** as it is part of why the book sold in the source culture and because the purpose of the translation is to sell a sufficient number of books in the target culture.
3.2 Reader differences
In this section, problems originating in cultural differences between the source text reader and the target text reader will be presented and analysed. First in relation to the author-reader relationship (3.2.1) of the text and then in relation to referential differences (3.2.2). The author-reader relationship contributes partially to the light colloquial style of the text and partially to the expressive function of the text. The author-reader relationship is prominent throughout the source text and an important aspect of the translation. It will therefore also be part of the discussion of both referential differences and spatial differences.

3.2.1 The author-reader relationship
As has been mentioned above, the text used in this study is in itself quite conversational with a colloquial and personal tone, which can be noted in the visibility of the author in the text. The reader is also addressed, thus making the author-reader relationship explicit. More importantly, this relationship is also a stylistic feature of the text. In itself, the pronoun I does not pose any major translation issues, as this linguistic component has got a valid equivalent in the target language, namely the Swedish pronoun jag. The reader is addressed by means of the second person pronoun you, and for the same reason as above, this does not pose much of an issue, even though the English pronoun you could be translated with either du (informal) or ni (formal and quite uncommon). In this context the informal option du is the obvious choice. However, due to the author and target reader’s different cultural backgrounds the author-reader relationship becomes problematic when the reader is included in the experiences of the author.

On the one hand, the intended source text reader is expected to have the same cultural background as the author, which can be seen in author assumptions, such as those presented in Example (1A) below. The author assumes that both she and the reader view the landscape as theirs, and that both of them barely take notice of the hedgerow. On the other hand, the new reader, the intended target text reader, does not have the same cultural background as the author, since the target text has been moved to a different culture and is, therefore, presented in a different setting. This corresponds to what Ingo (2007:15-16) refers to as one of the “situational factors” that affects a translation, he suggests that “the cultural context” (2007:16) of the text changes when it is being translated. In this case, the target text readers cannot be expected to view the British landscape as their own; they might not even be familiar with the landscape at all. This also makes it difficult to include the readers in the assumption that they
barely take notice of the hedgerow, which, in turn, makes it difficult to use the same referents (our and we) in the target text. So, should the target text reader be included or excluded in the target text when the author is using inclusive referents such as we and our?

(1A) If there’s one distinctive feature of the British countryside, it has to be the hedgerow. In fact, it’s such an established part of the structure of our landscape that sometimes we hardly even notice it. (Nozedar 2012:9)

If the target text reader was to be excluded from the text – for example by using explications (Ingo 2007:123-124) such as: vår brittiska (our British) or vi britter (we, the British), making it clear that the author is addressing the British reader (i.e. the source text reader) and not the Swedish reader (i.e. the target text reader) – a very important characteristic of the text, namely the author-reader relationship, would be lost. In addition, if excluded, the target text reader would be distanced from the text which could arguably contribute to a slightly negative reading experience. Consequently, the target text reader should be included, as to maintain the author-reader relationship throughout the text. This, however, means that certain instances, such as the one in Example (1A) above, require special attention. Thus, instead of defining landscape with the possessive pronoun vår (our), landskapstruktur is defined by the definite suffix -en in the target text. This contributes to a more general word which the new reader is not automatically excluded from. Also, the inclusive we in the source text was replaced with the more neutral quantitative pronoun man in the target text. The Swedish pronoun man could however be perceived in different manners:

i. man as in they (in this context the people of Great Britain)

ii. man as in people in general (including both author and reader, even the British)

iii. man as in I (possibly also people in general)

The first option (i) excludes both author and reader from the experience and consequently upholds the author-reader relationship. The second option (ii) includes both author and reader in the experience in a more generic way, thus maintaining the author-reader relationship. The last option (iii) also maintains the author-reader relationship, however, in a slightly weaker manner than the first two options. Here the author is perceived to focus on herself, while
neither explicitly excluding nor including the reader in the experience. Instead she leaves it up to the reader to choose if they want to share the experience with her or not, which, in turn, points to an author-reader relationship.

Consequently, an explication which makes it clear that the author is addressing the source text readers and not the target text readers, as mentioned above, or the use of the Swedish equivalents, vår and vi, results in no author-reader relationship, as the reader is explicitly excluded. In contrast, the solution used here (the definite suffix, -en, and the neutral pronoun, man, see Example 1B below) maintains an author-reader relationship, however different from the one found in the source text. These generalisations contributed to a more neutral tone, which neither includes nor excludes the target text reader, while still maintaining the author-reader relationship:

(1B) Om det finns ett utmärkande kännetecken för det brittiska landskapet måste det vara lähäcken. Den är faktiskt en sådan etablerad del av landskapsstrukturen att man ibland inte ens lägger märket till den.

The next example (2) also relates to cultural differences between the source text reader and the target text reader, which ultimately affects the author-reader relationship. The introduction of the book (Nozedar 2012) begins with the sentence Imagine you’re a tourist flying into Britain for the very first time. This is then followed by a description of the British landscape from a bird’s view and the section later ends with a reference back to the tourist in the first sentence, see Example (2) below. Here, the difference between the source text reader and the target text reader is that the reader of the target text might very well be a tourist flying into Britain for the very first time, whilst the source text reader is most likely not. This, in itself, does not pose a major issue as the author is telling the reader to imagine this scenario through an imperative clause, which will hopefully elicit the same response from both the source text reader and the target text reader respectively. However, the problem lies in the reference at the end of the section: that traveller, see Example (2) below.

As the author-reader relationship has already been established by use of the inclusive pronouns we and our earlier in the section (see Example (1) above), the premodifier that, which is a demonstrative pronoun, is distancing the traveller from both author and reader. This distance that the demonstrative pronoun denotes, suggests that the reference that traveller neither refers to the author nor the source text reader. The difference between the
source text reader and target text reader becomes a problem as the target text reader might actually be \textit{that traveller}. Therefore, if the expression would be translated with an equivalent such as \textit{resenären}, the target text reader would be excluded from the author-reader relationship.

(2) But, without these hedgerows, the landscape would look very different and \textit{that traveller} would see a very different picture... (Nozedar 2012:9)  

Utan dessa lähäckar skulle dock landskapet se väldigt annorlunda ut, och från planet skulle man se en helt annan bild...

The target text reference was changed to \textit{från planet} (‘from the plane’) in order to maintain the author-reader relationship in the target text. This is what Vinay and Darbelnet would call a modulation (1995:37-38) (see section 2.3 above). Instead of referring back to the \textit{person} (the tourist) \textit{who sees} the picture, the target text now refers back to the \textit{place} (the plane) \textit{from which} the picture is seen. However, because a subject doing the action (\textit{see}) is necessary in a clause like the one in Example (2) above, the person who actually sees the picture was in the target text replaced with the more neutral pronoun \textit{man} (for a discussion on the pronoun \textit{man}, see the discussion of Example (1) above). This solution (see Example (2) above) both maintains the source text perspective of the sentence (the picture is viewed from above) as well as the author-reader relationship, since the target text reader is not explicitly excluded.

As has been discussed above, differences between the source text reader and target text reader, in terms of cultural background and experience, has led to a more neutral author-reader relationship. In some cases the relationship has changed from being explicit in the source text to being implicit in the target text (example (1) above). Next we will look at referential differences between the source text reader and the target text reader.

3.2.2 Referential difference

The next example concerns a problem based on referential differences between the target text reader and the source text author, which ultimately affects the author-reader relationship. In this case (see Example (3A) below) the author is referring to one of the trees (the Ash) presented in the book with a culture specific expression, \textit{the Queen of the Forest}. The source text reader is likely to be familiar with this reference as both author and reader of the source text communication situation have the same cultural background. There is a quiet understanding between the author and the source text reader that both are familiar with the
reference, *the Queen of the Forest*, and it is implied that the expression is source culture specific (the Ash is seen as the Queen of the *British* forests). Thus the author-reader relationship is implicit as there is no need for further explanations of the expression.

(3A) It’s with good reason that it’s called *the Queen of the Forest*, the counterpart to the oak as the King. (Nozedar 2012:19)

The target text readers on the other hand do not have the same cultural background as the author because of the new cultural context (Ingo 2007:16) of the translation, which means that it is unlikely that they are familiar with the reference. Furthermore, the reference is not used in the target culture nor is there an equivalent for it in the target language. In addition, it may also be unclear to the target text reader that the expression is a reference used explicitly in the source culture. As a result the communication situation of the target text needs special attention in the translation process.

The reference in Example (3A) carries semantic value (the tree is seen as the Queen of the trees) which suggests that the tree is valued highly (majestic, grandiose, royal etc.) in the source culture. Additionally, the informative function is, as established above (section 3.1 above), the main function of the target text and should for that reason be maintained where possible. According to Reiss (1981/2004:167) this would suggest that the translation strategy should be content focused. Therefore an omission is not considered an adequate translation strategy as it would result in information loss. Consequently, the expression should be translated in such a manner that the information and its semantic value is transferred.

In English, *of*-constructions are used in genitive instances where “the ‘owner’ is not a person, animal, collective noun or geographical name” (Estling Vannestål 2007:119), in contrast, a genitive *s*-construction or a prepositional phrase can be used in Swedish (Estling Vannestål 2007:119, Ingo 2007:185-86). Thus both calque and transposition (Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995:32-33, 36-38) (see section 2.3 above) are possible translation strategies. A calque does however produce an, for the target language, unidiomatic and awkward expression: *Drottningen av skogen*. Therefore, Eriksson’s (1997:20-21) transposition on a phrasal level (see also section 2.3) becomes an adequate translation strategy: *The Queen of the Forest* (a prepositional phrase) → *skogens drottning* (a noun (genitive) phrase). This option works well in the target text, as well as it maintains the semantic value of the expression. However, as the target readers are not familiar with the referent “the Queen of the Forest” an
explication stating that this is a British expression is necessary. Furthermore, to produce an idiomatic sentence the pronoun it, which refers to the tree, was in the target text explicated with the name of the tree, resulting in the translation found in Example (3B) below.

(3B)  
It’s with good reason that it’s called the Queen of the Forest, the counterpart to the oak as the King. \(\text{Nozedar 2012:19}\)

Det är inte för inte som britterna kallar asken för skogens drottning och eken dess kung.

In the source text of example (3B), the author-reader relationship is implicit but because of differences between source text reader and target text reader an explication (britterna) of the author-reader relationship was necessary in the target text.

The expression above concerned a reference which is sometimes used to refer to one of the trees presented in the source text. In Example (4A) below, an old name (Bellyache weed) of the Angelica Sylvestris is considered a culture-specific concept as it is specific for the source culture but an unknown reference in the target culture (Anderberg 2008, Dyntaxa).

(4A)  
[...] an infusion of the leaves [...] will ease tummy pains and help prevent flatulence. Bellyache weed, one of the old names of the plant, reflects this use. \(\text{Nozedar 2012:15-16}\)

As mentioned above (section 2.3), an omission may affect the translation positively, as it could enhance readability, but it should only be considered when readability clearly outweighs meaning. In this case the name Bellyache weed quite clearly carries semantic meaning. The name reflects not only the use of the plant as a relief for flatulence and stomach ache (Bellyache), which the reader was informed of in the preceding sentence, but it may also reflect its frequency and ease of growing (weed). An omission of the name would leave a sentence that does not actually contribute with any valuable information (One of the old names of the plant reflects this use) and it might interfere with the reading experience the reader. This, in turn, would make the whole sentence redundant and result in information loss. An omission is therefore considered a last resort.

Baker’s (2001:31-34) translation strategy of using a cultural substitution could be an option if a concept with similar qualities (something related to the medicinal use of the plant, preferably related to stomach pain) was found. Although the target culture has alternative names for the plant (such as skogspipa, bjennstut, björnpipa) a suitable cultural substitution
could unfortunately not be found in the target language. Since the sentence becomes redundant without a similar semantic equivalent, it would have to be severely altered to make any contextual sense. Such alterations to the text should be avoided as to keep within the restrictions of the translation brief.

Because the meaning of the name is deemed important, a word-for-word translation, i.e. a calque (Vinay and Darbelnet 1958/1995:32-33), could be an adequate translation. This would result in a translation including denotations for both the medicinal use of the plant and its weed like growth. Bellyache is rather colloquial which suggest that the target language equivalent should be colloquial as well:

*Bellyache → Magknip* (wordfinder)

According to the Oxford English Dictionary (OED 2014) *weed* is listed with a number of definitions, out of relevance to the analysis only three of these will be presented. Firstly it is described as “a herbaceous plant not valued for use or beauty, growing wild and rank, and regarded as cumbering the ground or hindering the growth of superior vegetation”, which would render the target language term *ogräs* (Wordfinder). Secondly, it is described as being “used, with defining word, to form the names of wild plants” (Wordfinder), which would render the target language terms *ört* or *växt*. Lastly it is described as “any herb or small plant. Chiefly poet.” (Wordfinder). Again, both *ört* and *växt* are valid translation options. Hence there are three options for the translation, and it is also worth mentioning that the Swedish language favours compound which means that the options would be:

*Bellyache weed → magknipsogräs, magknipsört, magknipsväxt*

The latter is dismissed as Angelica Sylvestris is mostly referred to as a herb (*ört*) rather than a plant (*växt*) (Anderberg 2008, Dyntaxa, Nationalencyklopedin) and the first option (*magknipsogräs*) is dismissed because of the negative connotations *ogräs* contribute with, but also because *ogräs* is rarely used to form the names of wild plants in the target language. This leaves the middle option, *magknipsört*, as the preferred translation.

However, *Bellyache weed* is also a name, and according to Ingo (2007:137) the translation of names have three different strategies; a direct transfer, using a target language equivalent or, if there are different versions of the name in the target language, use the option that is most natural in the context. According to Ingo’s (2007:138) approach the name *Bellyache weed* should be transferred because the target language does not have different versions of the name nor is there an equivalent in the target language and.
Baker’s strategy, loanword plus explication (2001:34-6), thus comes in mind: *Bellyache weed* (*magknipsört*). This translation (see Example (4B) below) presents the source language name with an explication (in the form of a calque) that transfers its semantic meaning to the target text. This solution is likely to soften any disruptions the name could possibly cause the target reader.

(4) [...] an infusion of the leaves [...] will ease tummy pains and help prevent flatulence. *Bellyache weed*, one of the old names of the plant, reflects this use. (Nozedar 2012: 15-16)

Ett av de gamla *brittiska* namnen på växten, *Bellyache weed* (*magknipsört*), reflekterar denna användning.

Next we will look at problems in the translation arising from spatial differences between the source text and the target text.

### 3.3 Spatial difference
The content of the source text is explicitly related to common British plants. Some of the information presented in the text relates directly to the grow zone to which Great Britain belongs. For example, the spread and time of bloom of the plants are explicitly linked to Britain and related grow zones. As previously mentioned in the discussion of Nord’s (1997:60) translation brief (section 3.1 (3) above) instances of grow zone related information could become problematic. According to Ingo (2007:123-124) instances such as these could be explicated in the target text to avoid confusion and to make it clear to the target text reader that the information presented refers to the source culture and not to the target culture.

If an explication is not included in the translation the information has to be altered to comply with the equivalent information of the target culture. However, such information also has to be explicated, making sure that the reader knows it relates explicitly to the target culture and not the source culture. In addition, such alterations to the content would contribute to a re-writing and it would change the subject matter of the text; the book would no longer be about common British hedgerow plants.

Another option would be to transfer the source text information with an addition of the equivalent target text information. For example, the information presented in Example (5) below, *the leaves of the birch makes a decent show in early March*, would be transferred with the addition of the same information true to the birch trees in Sweden (the leaves usually
show in May (Anderberg 1999)). Though an explication for the additional information would have to be included to avoid confusion, resulting in a translation such as this: *björken får vanligtvis musöron i början av mars, i Sverige i början av ...* However, as was pointed out in section 3.1 (4) above, there are some space restrictions which means that any additions should be carefully considered before being added to the target text.

(5) The best time to harvest birch sap is early spring, as soon as the fresh young leaves are making a decent show – *usually in early March.* (Nozedar 2012:27)

Den bästa tiden för att tappa björksav är tidigt på våren, precis innan björken får musöron – *i Storbritannien händer detta vanligtvis i början av mars.*

A simple explication (*i Storbritannien*) of the source text information is thus considered the best translation option, even though the author-reader relationship becomes somewhat more explicit. The author-reader relationship is brought to the surface as it becomes evident that the target text reader needs a clarification of the information presented in the text. An explication does, however, not affect the translation negatively as it maintains both the author-reader relationship (the target text reader is not excluded) and the informative function of the text. At the same time, it avoids both confusion, which could lead to a negative effect on readability, and lengthy additions, which would negatively affect the format of the target text. Example (5) below presents the source text with its corresponding translation where an explication was used as a translation strategy.

The next example (6) also points to a translation issue due to spatial differences between the source text and the target text.

(6) The beech tree is arguably one of our most beautiful and graceful trees, although it’s so common that we sometimes don’t notice its fragile, elegant loveliness. (Nozedar 2012:23)

Man kan nog påstå att boken är ett av Storbritanniens vackraste och elegantaste träd, fastän det är så vanligt förekommande att man ibland inte märker till dess sköra och eleganta skönhet.

Here, the difference between grow zones cause a problem because the spread of the tree diverges between source culture and target culture. In Great Britain the tree is common...
throughout the country (Wildlife trust, Wikipedia). However, in the target culture the tree only grows in the southern parts of the country (Anderberg 2011, Kunskap direkt). For the same reasons as above, an explication is considered the best translation strategy in this instance. However, due to the problem of the inclusive pronouns we and our (see section 3.2.1 for a discussion on this) an explication, our, has been replaced with Storbritanniens (Great Britain’s) in the target text, has already been made (see Example (6) below). Furthermore, another explication would render a repetitive and superfluous target text sentence which could lead to a negative reading experience. Thus, the instance of spatial differences (the commonness of the tree) was translated with a corresponding expression in the target language. No further explication was deemed necessary due to the preceding explication, Storbritanniens.

As has been discussed, instances of spatial differences caused problems in the translation, however, these problems were solved with explications of implicit source text information (see examples (5-6) above).
4. Discussion and conclusion
This study was set out to investigate how issues in the translation of a sample of Nozedar’s (2012:9-29) book were identified, approached and solved. As translation-relevant decision making could be quite difficult I decided to make use of Christiane Nord’s text analysis model to see whether it could help in the translation process.

A source text analysis as well as an outline of the intended target text in the form of a translation brief was carried out, both of which produced profiles of the communication situation and context of the source text and the intended target text (3.1). These profiles provided an informative basis that either supported or opposed certain translation choices. For example, in section 3.2, example (3), the translation strategy of omission was decided against even though it may have positive effects on a text (enhanced readability for example). However, in this case, an omission would result in information loss and ultimately affect the informative function, which in turn was stated in the translation brief (3.1) as the main function of the intended target text.

Furthermore, the source text and target text profiles were compared to highlight areas of the source text that should be maintained and areas that could cause problems (see section 3.1). This procedure suggested that differences between the cultural background of the source text readers and the target text readers could cause problems in the translation process. Since the source culture and target culture belong to different grow zones, the spatial difference between the source text and target text also became evident. Consequently, Nord’s model helped indicate problem areas of the translation in question. This, in turn, aided in the identification of the translation issues that were discussed in the analysis (reader differences in relation to the author-reader relationship (3.2.1) and referential differences (3.2.2) and spatial differences (3.3) between the source text and the target text).

Furthermore, the comparison of the profiles showed that there would be some space restrictions to take into account in the translation process and that the functions and light tone of the source text should be maintained. It also showed that the colloquial tone as well as the author-reader relationship should be retained where possible. This, in turn, made it possible to make informed decisions in the translation process. For instance, example (1) in section 3.2.1 showed that, due to cultural differences between the source text readers and the target text readers, instances where the inclusive pronouns we and our were used, had to be altered to maintain an author-reader relationship in the target text.
Furthermore, various translation strategies (see section 2.2 for an overview) were used in the process, however, all of the decisions that were made were based on discussions referring to the information deriving from the text analysis model in 3.1. In conclusion, Nord’s (2005, 1997) model aided in both identifying (section 3.1) translation problems and solving them (sections 3.2 and 3.3) with confidence. As Loogus (2012:382) puts it “only after the translator has become aware of a problem, is he/she able to handle it and turn the conflict into a constructive force”. Thus, the identification of translation issues is arguably an important first step in solving issues and making translation decisions.

This study pointed to changes that happened in the translation process. A general observation is that instances related to the cultural differences between the readers (3.2.1) were specific in the source text whereas they became generalised or implied in the target text, thereby affecting, yet maintaining, the author-reader relationship. In addition, problems due to both referential differences (3.2.2) and spatial differences (3.3) were generally implicit in the source text but, because of the author-reader relationship and the informative function, these instances were explicated in the target text. These changes (from specific to general or from implicit to explicit) could be the basis for further studies. A qualitative analysis could for example be carried out with the aim to either support or refute the general observations made in this study.

Finally, as Nord’s model can be applied to different text types and contexts it is evident that a translator will have to keep asking her/himself questions about readers, style, tone, aim etc. to be able to produce a functional translation. Arguably, the more information one has on the translation task at hand, the easier it will become to make informed translation-relevant decisions.
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