Function and Relevance in Literary Translation

A Systemic Functional and Relevance-Theoretic Approach to the Evaluation of Norwegian Translations of Leonard Cohen

Mari Ueland Norås

Master's Thesis

Department of Literature, Area Studies and European Languages

Faculty of Humanities

UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

Spring 2013

Function and Relevance in Literary Translation

A Systemic Functional and Relevance-Theoretic Approach to the Evaluation of Norwegian Translations of Leonard Cohen

Mari Ueland Norås

Department of Literature, Area Studies and European Languages

Faculty of Humanities

UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

2013

2013

Function and Relevance in Literary Translation

Mari Ueland Norås

http://www.duo.uio.no

Trykk: Reprosentralen, Universitetet i Oslo

Abstract

This thesis evaluates two linguistic approaches to literary translation. The study examines two Norwegian translations of poetic texts by Leonard Cohen – one song and one poem. The analyses and evaluations are from the point of view of Systemic Functional Grammar and Relevance Theory. The research includes evaluations of the applicability of the two approaches to translation criticism, as well as a comparison of the two translations based on the translator's choices and intentions.

Results showed that when translating the song, the translator had made sacrifices in semantic representations in order to prioritise prosodic elements (rhyming and rhythm). The translated song had also gone through a cultural filter and undergone changes in situation. The target text was a *version* rather than a translation of the source text. When translating the poem, however, the translator had aimed for resemblance both on a semantic and pragmatic level. The systemic functional approach made it possible to apply labels to the constituents in the individual clauses in the texts. This helped to identify the translator's choices and whether the translated texts were functionally equivalent to the source texts. The relevance-theoretic approach made it possible to consider and describe the poetic effects and interpretative resemblance of the translations.

While there were limitations to both theories, they did to some extent complement each other. Systemic Functional Linguistics provided a useful framework for categorising the translator's semantic choices, while Relevance Theory provided a vocabulary for describing the cognitive effects and poetic value of the translator's choices.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to my supervisor, Bergljot Behrens. I always left our meetings feeling inspired.

I would also like to thank my fellow students at the Faculty of Humanities for making this angst-filled ride enjoyable.

Table of contents

1 Introduction

This thesis will analyse and evaluate two Norwegian translations of two poetic texts by Canadian author, poet and singer-songwriter Leonard Cohen. Both translations are by Norwegian poet and translator Håvard Rem. One text is a short poem while the other is a song. I will analyse and evaluate the translations by applying two linguistic approaches, Systemic Functional Grammar and Relevance Theory. I chose to do a study on literary translation because it would allow me to combine language and literature. In this introductory chapter I will discuss how translation of literary texts and especially poetry might require a different approach than the translation of descriptive prose, then present my aims and methods, and lastly introduce the authors and the texts.

1.1 What is translation?

To translate, according to the dictionary, is to "express the meaning of speech or writing in a different language" (*Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* 2005: 1631). Is it just the *meaning*? And what is *meaning*? "Behind the *surface structure* is the *deep structure*, the meaning. It is the *meaning* that serves as a base for translation into another language" (Larson 1984: 26; cited in Gutt 1991: 81). It might serve as a *base*, but a structure is more than its foundation.

Translator David Bellos's way of putting it is that translation "provides for some community an acceptable match for an utterance made in a foreign tongue" (2011: 283). But this definition also produces the questions "What makes a match acceptable?" and "What do we mean by 'match', anyway?" (Bellos 2011: 283). An *acceptable* translation is one that is *adequate* – one that satisfies sufficiently. But what are the criteria that need to be satisfied? A *match* is when *equivalence* is attained. But words, phrases or sentences can have multiple-layer meanings. How do we find their target-language equivalents? Does equivalence exist?

In Mona Baker's *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation* (2011), equivalence is either at the word-level, above the word-level, on a grammatical level, textual level or pragmatic level. Equivalence problems – translation problems – are then also on one of these levels. A culture-specific concept is an example of something that, on the word-level, has no equivalent in the target language, and cultural substitution is a possible way of dealing with

this problem (Baker 2011). However, depending on the function of the text, and, indeed, the style of the translator, cultural substitution may very well be employed even if the source culture concept in the original is not entirely culture-specific in Bakers terms, that is, expressing “a concept which is totally unknown in the target-culture” (2011: 28). Is a concept that has been adjusted in the translation to fit the target culture equivalent to the original concept, or is the literal translation of the source culture concept (or even the loan word) the equivalent? It would depend heavily on the type of text, and, to some extent, the style of the translator. "The translation type then determines whether the translated text should conform to source-culture or target-culture conventions with regard to translation style" (Nord 1997: 68).

"'Translation proper' is frequently associated with word-for-word fidelity to the source text, even though the result may not be considered appropriate for the intended purpose" (Nord 1997: 4). When is a translation ‘faithful’ to the original? When it is translated word-for-word or sense-for-sense? Do these not overlap? A sign in a hotel saying that the lift is out of order should surely be translated word-for-word, so-called ‘literally’, as there will be no style or wordplay to consider – unless the hotel staff is a particularly witty one. But is this not the same as translating the *sense*, or *meaning*? If the words on the sign convey the literal meaning of the message, then word and sense go hand in hand. If a translation of a poem is carried out word-for-word, it could have a catastrophic outcome, but it could also result in a target language poem with the source language meaning intact, depending on the importance of the semantic value of the words.

Translation, claims Jin, is “neither achieved word for word, nor sense for sense, but message for message and effect for effect” (2003: 52).

An overt translation is meant to be read as a translation – as something of a supplement to the original, or an opportunity to read the original in another target language. Translations of poetry are often overt. Covert translations are independent texts, and the fact that the text is translated need not be considered. "The fact that [a translation] is covert does not of course mean that the reader cannot recognize it as a translation”, Boase-Beier points out, “but only that its relation to an original text is unimportant” (2010: 28).

’Translation’ is not “a long-established academic discipline", Bellos writes, because

translation is “always approximate” (2011: 5). It “covers issues too wide for any one discipline" (Gutt 1991: 21). Then how do we make sense of what, exactly, makes a ‘good’ translation? Is there a point to ‘translation theory’? "Theories, approaches and views, whether one accepts them or rejects them, are just aspects of knowledge”, Boase-Beier writes, “and knowledge of one's subject is likely to have an influence on practice" (2010: 111). Therefore, "there is no reason to avoid gaining knowledge of theory, and it is likely to be a useful tool" (Boase-Beier 2010: 111).

Boase-Beier, when discussing style in translation (2010), writes that because style is so closely connected to the creativity of literary texts, it is easy to think of it as something that is mainly intuitive and therefore needs no explanation. However, it is still important to explain “the factors that affect such intuitive behaviour" (Boase-Beier 2010: 146-147). The same can be said for translation theory in general.

1.2 Literary translation

“Literary texts must use the same linguistic devices as non-literary texts but they are read differently” (Boase-Beier 2010: 26).

In translation, there is no correct answer. Or in Bellos’s words: “One of the most awkward and wonderful truths about translation (...) is this: any utterance of more than trivial length has no one translation" (2011: 5). There are no perfect synonyms, especially not across languages. This is particularly true of literary translation, where the point of the translation is not merely to communicate the contents of a certain message. A translation cannot be judged like a mathematics test. Certain ‘criteria’ may be fulfilled – the rhyme scheme could be intact, the metaphors satisfactory, a respectable amount of alliteration preserved, the style of the original author attempted, and the *meaning*, whatever that means, the same – but when it comes down to it, a literary translation is a work of art, like the original, and it should be evaluated as such.

There are also, of course, different genres to consider within the term ‘literary’. Poetry is possibly the most interesting, because poetry is concentrated language. Every word has been chosen carefully, and demands special attention, from both the reader and the translator. Moreover, poetry often, though not at all always, follows a rhyme scheme, and the metre

tends to be quite different from that of prose. Translation of poetry can also be a minefield, because, as Bellos points out, “we get attached to poems, in contexts that endow the attachment with personal emotion” (2011: 154). Or in Pinker’s words: "Semantics is about the relation of words to thoughts, but it is also about the relation of words to other human concerns. ... It is about the relation of words to emotions; the way in which words don't just point to things but are saturated with feelings, which can endow the words with a sense of magic, taboo, and sin" (2008: 3). The emotions may be different for each reader, but, ideally, the translated poem should have the potential to trigger the same emotional responses as the original.

According to translator Burton Raffel, the translation of a literary work is not worth much unless the translator has done justice to the work’s “aesthetic claim” (1998: 167). “Aesthetic claim” does sound rather important, but its meaning is quite vague. "I *do* know that in order to translate poetry one has to be a poet" Raffel writes (1988: 102). Bellos agrees that the quality of a translated poem has to do with the translator’s skill as a poet (2011: 150-151). Octavio Paz calls poetry translation “the art of producing, with a different text, a poem similar to the original” (in Honig 1985: 155). This also suggests that the most important thing is that the finished product can still be called poetry. Does this mean that the translation is successful if the translated poem is ‘good’? It is certainly a valid point, but it is difficult to judge this objectively. Then again, whether or not the original poem is any ‘good’ is also up to the individual.

“Poetry is what is lost in translation” is an adage generally attributed to the poet Robert Frost (see Bellos 2011: 152). In order to claim that ‘poetry’ has been ‘lost’, we need to be able to describe what ‘poetry’ *is*. Is it the prosody, the ambiguity of semantic value, or the aesthetic quality? If it is all of the above, what should the translator prioritize if all of it cannot be salvaged? “If something is lost, something is also recovered”, Honig maintains (1985:154). And as Bellos points out, if poetry is translated, then that is a way of keeping it alive, and therefore, “poetry is not what is lost, but what is gained from [the translators’] work" (Bellos 2011: 156). Honig believes that it is the physical text, and not necessarily the ‘poetry’ that is lost in translation, because the text will inevitably be transformed (1985: 154).

"Literary texts by their very nature allow multiple interpretations" (Boase-Beier 2010: 108). In literary translation, the text sometimes ends up being less opaque than the original. It is as

though the translator has taken on the role as analyst. When in fact the translator's role is to convey the same opaqueness in order to make the readers arrive at their own interpretation. "Ideally a translation will leave the text open to as many readings as possible, rather than forcing its reader to accept one interpretation over another (Boase-Beier 2010: 116). In his translation of Cohen's *The Song of the Hellenist* (Cohen 1989: 30), Rem includes translator's footnotes. However, they are not footnotes explaining translation decisions or anything of that matter. His footnotes have nothing to do with the translation as such. They are footnotes explaining some of the terms in the original poem, and subsequently in the translation. These are terms that are not explained in the original. These terms (*Bleinstein with a cigar* and a Leviticus reference) are not explained in the original, so why are they in the translation? Perhaps Rem felt that an English-speaking audience would be more familiar with the *Bleinstein* poem, and even Leviticus? Still, it renders the reader's own interpretation useless.

Some poetry is set to music and is therefore intended for singing more than reading. Attention to rhyme and metre will then be even more important. A translator who translates a poem that is not intended to be sung may choose to omit the rhyme scheme and change the metre – it would be a rather different poem, but it could contain the same message. The translator would then have used his or her artistic freedom to sacrifice some features for others (metaphor, ambiguity, semantic value, and so forth). But a poem that functions as a song lyric is not allowed this freedom. The melody remains the same. Sometimes the meanings of the words will have to be changed in order to match the prosody. "To attempt to match not only the words but also the music would present complications of enormous difficulty, involving such issues as singability of consonants, the difficulty of certain vowels at higher pitch levels, and so on" (Raffel 1988: 145-146).

Jin maintains that the translator may not take advantage of his or her creative freedom just for the sake of creative writing, but that creativity and fidelity may in fact go together if the translator is able to employ "his or her own imagination for the purpose of preserving the artistic integrity of the text and conveying the source message as closely as possible" (2003: 101).

1.3 Aims

The questions I will endeavour to answer are the following: How can Systemic Functional Linguistics and Relevance Theory be used to approach the notion of 'equivalence' in a translation? Can they help shed light on the translator's choices? How well do they apply to the evaluation of literary translation? The translator's choices will depend on the text's function – what can we say about the translator's choices in poetry translation as opposed to song lyric translation? And finally, do the two approaches complement each other?

My aim is not to be the judge of whether or not the translations in question are 'good'. That is entirely up to the individual reader. I shall attempt to evaluate the applicability of two different linguistic approaches to translation. Equivalence, non-equivalence, the source and target texts' function, and the translator's choices will be discussed from the point of view of these two approaches. "In translation criticism it is important to be maximally aware of the difference between (linguistic) analysis and (social) judgement", House explains – that is, "there is a difference between comparing, describing and explaining differences established in linguistic analysis and judging "how good a translation" is" (2001: 155).

Judgement of this sort ('good' versus 'bad') can be avoided by, according to House, limiting the criticism to the "modest goal" of illustrating "exactly where and with which consequences and (possibly) for which reasons (parts of) translated texts are what they are in relation to their "primary texts"" (2001: 156). This is how I plan to carry out my evaluation.

1.4 Method

The thesis is structured as follows. I will end this first chapter – after introducing the author of the source texts, Leonard Cohen, and the author of the target texts, Håvard Rem – by presenting the literary data. The source texts will be interpreted and analysed. An interpretation of the source text is necessary in order to be able to evaluate the translation. "We cannot judge whether a text is effective unless we know what it means" (Halliday 2001: 14). I will also offer some commentary on the translations. The purpose of the preliminary comments is to highlight some cases of non-equivalence I will analyse further in chapter 3.

I chose to work with translations of Leonard Cohen's texts because Norwegian translations of his work are easy to find and plentiful, but also because he has written both song lyrics and

poetry and I was interested in whether the translations of the song lyrics differ from the translations of the poems.

Norwegian translations of Cohen's work are, as I mentioned above, not hard to come by. Kaj Skagen notably translated both his novels, *The Favourite Game* (*Yndlingsleken*, Cohen 1972) and *Beautiful Losers* (*Skjønne Tapere*, Cohen 1973). However, I was more interested in the poetry. Cohen's recent book of poetry, *Book of Longing* (2006a), was translated into Norwegian by an ensemble of poets and songwriters, among them Kari Bremnes, Ragnar Hovland and Frode Grytten (*Lengselens Bok*, Cohen 2006b). I chose to analyse Rem's translations because not only has he translated many of Cohen's poems, he has also translated a handful of his songs. What was even more interesting about the translated song lyrics was that they were not only translated into Norwegian, they were adapted to be sung by women. Surely this is pushing the boundaries of 'faithful translation', and inviting the discussion of 'translation' versus 'adaptation' or 'version'.

Chapter 2 will explain the theories or approaches upon which I will base my analysis. These approaches are Systemic Functional Linguistics and Relevance Theory.

I chose Systemic Functional Linguistics because it can evaluate equivalence on three different levels – a semantic level, a pragmatic level and a textual level. This systemic organisation becomes a helpful tool for determining the texts' function – and consequently the translations' functional equivalence. Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics is not a translation theory, but it is a functional approach to communication. Translation is undeniably a form of communication. Nørgaard (2003: 15) claims that Systemic Functional Grammar can in some ways be better suited for literary analysis than more formal approaches, as literary texts are not necessarily examples of 'formal' language.

I chose Relevance Theory because of its concern with implicature – implied meaning. Relevance Theory is suited for literary analysis due to its concern with "pragmatic and cognitive aspects of style", as Boase-Beier writes (2010: 19-20). Relevance Theory is not a translation theory either – in fact, Gutt somehow manages to use Relevance Theory to explain how translation as such needs no 'theory' (1991) – but it has been applied to translation evaluation (e.g. Thorsell 1998). According to Gutt and Relevance Theory, a target language

text is equivalent to the source language if it "purports to interpretively resemble the original" (1991: 163). This seemed like an interesting criteria by which to judge the translated poetry.

Chapter 3 will feature analyses and discussions of *Famous Blue Raincoat* and *Folk* and their respective translations from all three metafunctions in Systemic Functional Linguistics, as well as analyses and discussions of the texts from the point of view of Relevance Theory. Chapter 4 will evaluate the two approaches and their applicability to literary translation, as well as the combination of the two theories. Finally, Chapter 5 will conclude the thesis.

1.5 Leonard Cohen

Leonard Cohen was born in Montreal in 1934 into a well-off Jewish family with roots from Russia (then Poland) and Lithuania. His family observed Jewish holidays and tradition, and Judaism became the cultural, if not overtly religious, backdrop of Cohen's childhood. An on-going quest for spiritual awakening has resulted in several samplings from the religious buffet, including a brief flirtation with Scientology in the seventies and regular stays at a Zen Buddhist centre in Mount Baldy, California. His later poems, especially those in the 2006 book *Book of Longing* (Cohen 2006), make many references to Mount Baldy and Cohen's Zen teacher Roshi, whom he met in the sixties. His native Quebec was predominantly Catholic, and that has influenced him as well. His literary debut in 1956, at age 22, was called *Let Us Compare Mythologies* (Cohen 2007). It is a collection of poetry written in his teens. In *Kjærlighet og Hat* (Cohen 1989), a collection of Cohen's poetry translated into Norwegian by Håvard Rem, Rem calls *Mythologies* an attempt to compare elements from Jewish, Christian and Greek mythology. Jesus makes appearances in several songs and poems by Cohen – perhaps most famously in the song *Suzanne* (1967; lyrics found in Cohen 1993: 95), based on an earlier poem. *Suzanne* is about Suzanne Verdal, an old bohemian friend of Cohen who lived on a houseboat in Montreal. The second verse references Montreal's mariners' church and its figure of Virgin Mary, blessing the sailors. Cohen's Jesus *was a sailor*, and *all men will be sailors, then, until the sea shall free them* (Cohen 1993: 95). Linking Suzanne's everyday magic *among the garbage and the flowers* (Cohen 1993: 95) to Mariolatry gives the love song a mythical, otherworldly lift. "Utan denna andra vers skulle 'Suzanne' ha blivit en visserligen mycket vacker men traditionall kärlekssång. Men detta är

Cohens trick; ur det vardagliga utvinner han ett 'ickelogiskt' stickspår, en väg in i ett större, allmängiltigare landskap och därmed in i lyssnarens egen själ" (Lindforss 2007: 10). *Joan of Arc* (Cohen 1993: 147) tells the story of Joan of Arc who was burned at the stake for heresy, but with a twist: it is a love song; the fire is her lover. It has little to do with the original story, and nothing to do with religion. It is a metaphor for all-consuming love. "His religious sensibilities also enables him to utilise religious phraseology in songs with entirely secular subjects", writes Ratcliff (1999: 6). *Story of Isaac* (Cohen 1993: 139) uses the Biblical story of Abraham and Isaac as a metaphor – Ratcliff (1999: 25) suggests for the conflict between counter-culture and tradition. His song *Hallelujah* (Cohen 1993: 347) (now one of his most famous due to numerous covers) uses religious language and references to Biblical characters (David, Bathsheba, Samson and Delilah), but the song is not about love and not religion. *Who By Fire* (Cohen 1993: 207) is based on a Hebrew prayer, and lists all the ways Death can come knocking. *Sisters of Mercy* (Cohen 1993: 109) conjures up the image of nuns, but is in fact just about a couple of young women. One exception is *If It Be Your Will* (Cohen 1993: 343), which appears to actually be religious in meaning. It is open to individual interpretation, of course, but it reads, and feels, like a prayer. Nadel writes of *Let Us Compare Mythologies* that the book "provides glimpses of his using poetry as a form of prayer and the role of the poet as a sacred, if not prophetic, voice" (1994: 40). His *Book of Mercy* (Cohen 1984), is a collection of poems that are intended to be read as prayers. *Kohen* is, after all, Hebrew for *priest*.

Another theme in Cohen's work is war. For a while, his band was known as The Army. As with religion, references to war are often metaphorical. *Field Commander Cohen* (1993: 201) and *There Is A War* (1993: 202) both employ the language of war without being about actual wars. Cohen's father was wounded in World War Two, and passed away when Cohen was still a child.

His first novel, *The Favourite Game* (Cohen 1963; here 2009 is about a Jewish, fatherless writer from Montreal, and it is laden with autobiographical elements. His next (and to date, latest) novel was *Beautiful Losers* (Cohen 1966a), a hallucinatory story about a love triangle in which the third party may or may not exist. One may draw parallels to his songs *Master Song* (Cohen 1993: 106) and *Famous Blue Raincoat* (Cohen 1993: 153). The Greek island of Hydra, his native Montreal, New York City and Mount Baldy have all created a geographical backdrop for Cohen's work.

"Leonard Cohen writes not so much to change the world as to understand himself", Nadel (1994: 13) writes. "Gone are the effusive and hysterical tirades against politicians, mass-murderers, saints and sinners", Devlin writes of Cohen's poetry from the sixties; "Leonard targets 'you', 'we' and 'I'" (1996: 21). Rem agrees that the poet behind *Parasites of Heaven* (1966b) is not concerned with social issues, but with himself (Cohen 1989: 12). This can be said for most of his work. It makes for deeply personal poetry. He has never denied his poetry the depression he has battled his entire life.

Love is naturally one of the most common themes, as it tends to be in poetry in general. Love comes in many shapes and forms. The love Cohen describes seems for the most part to be of the lost or broken kind. There is a lot of bitterness and rejection. Very often, love comes in the form of sex. "Peace, when it comes, occurs only through sexual bliss, which substitutes intensity for anxiety" (Nadel 1994: 11). Sex – and love – is rarely romanticised. Our hero is extremely human. Since the eighties, the self-ironic references to ageing have not been few – age and love, age and sex – and not without the characteristic wry humour. Few love songs are truly happy – except maybe some that are mostly about physical love. Those that do appear to be happy often reveal themselves to be bittersweet or pessimistic.

Cohen was already an established poet and author by the time his official career as a singer/songwriter began. But Cohen was already interested in music by the time he started to publish poetry, and had taken guitar lessons and played in a country band with friends from University. Several of the poems in *Mythologies* have the word *song* in the title. "Poetry and music did not compete for Cohen's attention because his earliest poetry contained the basic structures and qualities of song. The two have always coexisted, although his interest in music may predate his interest in poetry" (Nadel 1994: 26). Most of the poems in *Mythologies* book do not rhyme, however, or follow a strict metre. "The lack of 'formal' structure in so many pieces of prose or poetry was an early and distinct Cohen trademark" (Devlin 1996: 18). His poems have always had different styles: most of them are written in free verse, but some are metric and many rhyme. Some are lyrical poems or stichic poems. Some resemble Shakespearean sonnets (he did study English literature in University). His songs rhyme more often than his poems, but even the songs appear to rhyme "where possible" rather than follow any scheme, and they often rely more on stress patterns and alliteration and assonance than strict rhymes. Lennard, in his *The Poetry Handbook*, mentions

Suzanne as an example of using stress patterns as an equivalent to rhyme: "[*Suzanne*] relies to considerable effect on a single stressed rhyme in each stanza (*blind*/*mind*) amid lines with persistently unstressed endings" (1996: 90).

There have been many Scandinavian translations or adaptations of both Cohen's songs and poetry. His records have always done considerably well in Norway. Norwegian Marianne Ihlen is one of the greatest loves of his life. Rem credits, among other things, the northern, melancholy latitudes connecting Montreal to Oslo or Stockholm (1990: 226).

1.6 Håvard Rem

Håvard Rem was born in Norway in 1959. His father was a pastor in the Pentecostal church. Like Cohen, Rem's literary debut happened at quite a young age. Religious themes are easily detected in his work, but while Cohen's literary references to religion have more to do with Jewish history and tradition, Rem's are rooted in a deeply religious upbringing.

Rem has written fiction, non-fiction, poetry, song lyrics and plays, and has translated non-fiction, poetry, song lyrics and plays. His poems, like Cohen's, have different forms. Some are short while some are long; some rhyme while some are in free verse. Some are stichic or lyrical poems. Rem translated a selection of Cohen's poetry in the book *Kjærlighet og Hat* (Cohen 1989), where in the translator's preface he expressed his relief with not having to translate Cohen's songs, as "Cohen på rim er noe av det mest uoversettelige jeg har vært borti som gjendikter" (Cohen 1989: 22). However, he would later go on to translate a handful of Cohen's songs for the album *Hadde Månen en Søster* (1993).

Rem's poem *Abrahams Sønner* (Rem 1996: 92) mentions both a Leonard in Montreal with the Torah and a Håvard in Eydehavn with a Bible – both reading about Abraham. In Rem's poem *Hallelujah* (2012: 114-115), most stanzas end in *Hallelujah* as in Cohen's song of the same title (1993: 347). One stanza even mentions Cohen by name. Sex, as in Cohen's poetry, is a common theme, either in subtle or graphic terms, but usually without the self-deprecating humour normally found in Cohen's sexually themed poetry.

Rem often uses the word *gjendiktning* when talking about his translations, which is close in meaning

to *adaptation. Stor norsk-engelsk ordbok* at *ordnett.com* translates *gjendiktning* into *reinterpretation*, *retranslation*, or *version*, and *Thesaurus.com* suggests *conversion* and *reworking* as possible synonyms for *adaptation*. *Stor engelsk-norsk ordbok* at *ordnett*, however, also lists *gjendiktning* as a translation for *translation*. House (2001) also discusses the difference between a translation and a version, which I will come back to in chapter 3.

Rem argues that there is no such thing as perfect synonymy (1990: 156), which would consequently mean that there is no absolute 'equivalence'.

He claims that his poems, like language itself, are somewhere in between text and song (Rem 1996: 9 - foreword). Perhaps this is one of the reasons he has occupied himself with Cohen's texts, as Cohen has bridged this gap between poetry and song.

1.7 Data

Below, I will present the two source texts and the two target texts that serve as my literary data for this thesis. I will point out some of the cases of equivalence and non-equivalence, but they will be discussed in more technical terms in chapter 3 from the point of view of Systemic Functional Linguistics and Relevance Theory.

1.7.1 *Famous Blue Raincoat*

(As it is technically a song, not a poem, I will use the terms *verse*, *chorus* and *line* when discussing the lyrics to *Famous Blue Raincoat* (Appendix 1) (Cohen 1993: 153) and its translation (Appendix 2) (lyrics printed in the booklet to the CD *Hadde Månen En Søster*, 1993), not *stanza* and *verse*.)

Can there possibly be a *Famous Blue Raincoat* without the, well, *famous* eponymous raincoat, and without Jane?

Leonard Cohen's *Famous Blue Raincoat* was released in 1971. It is formed as a letter, signalled by *I'm writing you* in the first verse, and especially by the last line, *Sincerely, L. Cohen*.

The writer of the letter is writing to someone with whom he used to be close (*my brother*; *I miss you*), henceforth *the addressee*, but who has had an affair with the writer's wife or girlfriend, Jane.

The writer knows that the addressee is retreating into *the desert*, and notes that the last time they met, the addressee looked *so much older* and that the addressee's *famous blue raincoat was torn at the shoulder* – the addressee is ripping at the proverbial seam. The addressee is also *living for nothing now*, which could mean that he is living a simple life, but it could also insinuate that he now has nothing to live for. The addressee's affair with Jane appears to have broken him more than it has Jane, and even the writer – although it has apparently broken Jane and the writer's relationship (*she was nobody's wife*). The writer takes some sort of solace in this, and is therefore able to come to terms with what happened, and express forgiveness and even gratitude. Just a *flake* of the addressee removed *the trouble* from *her eyes*, something that all of the writer could not even attempt to do. Hence the bitter admission, *I'm glad you stood in my way*. Jane has come home to the writer after the affair (*when she came back*) – albeit with 'a lock of your hair', a relic or token of their relationship; a piece of the addressee – but the writer has realized that he and Jane should not be together – *your woman is free* – and calls a truce – *your enemy is sleeping*. The writer allows for communication between Jane and the addressee (*she sends her regards*), and gives the addressee his blessing if he wishes to reclaim her (*If you ever come by here, for Jane…*) or rekindle his friendship with the writer (*… or for me*).

The fact that the writer signs the letter with Leonard Cohen's own name could suggest that the text is autobiographical, but Cohen himself has maintained that he does not remember who he wrote about, which could mean that it is largely fictitious, or symbolic (i.e. the third party is not an actual person – which may or may not be the case in the aforementioned novel), and that he is being intentionally ambiguous.

New York is cold but I like where I'm living. The writer is lonely now, but embraces it. His own 'house deep in the desert' is a cold metropolis. The difference is that the writer is content.

Several interpretations of the song have arrived at the conclusion that the writer and the addressee are the same person; the real or fictional L. Cohen is writing to himself in the past,

or a part of his own personality. This interpretation rests mainly on the fact that Cohen himself owned a blue raincoat. “His contemporary friends all report Cohen´s attachment to this coat, even after it had become distressed and had been repaired” (Ratcliff 1999: 37). Is Cohen the one who planned to go ‘clear’?

“The song can be seen as Cohen’s shouldering of his own responsibility for the failure of his relationship(s). The ‘thin gypsy thief’ is a self-portrait and the hope that ‘you’re keeping some kind of record’ is realized in the very song that expresses it.” (Ratcliff 1999: 38). Indeed, the poem *Purest of Occasions* contains the verses *Sing for him, Leonard/your love of honey qualifies you/to wear his raincoat* (Cohen 1993: 177). "I believe Leonard Cohen divided himself into two people. Kind of like in [the novel] *Beautiful Losers*. When I emailed him to ask if I was onto something, he replied: ‘Dividing yourself into two personalities is always a good idea’" (Lindforss 2007: 93, *my translation*). The fact that Cohen himself owned a ‘famous’ (among his friends, at least) blue raincoat (that was even at one point torn, if not at the shoulder) does not necessarily mean that he is singing to himself. The song need not be 100% autobiographical. His raincoat could have just served as inspiration.

Håvard Rem's Norwegian translation is performed by Kari Bremnes. The writer is now a woman. The same is true of the addressee. Jane is an unnamed man. The translation is not only a translation from one language from another, but from one gender to another. Rem has chosen to let Jane go – but, thankfully, has not replaced her with Jan.

Perhaps a bolder choice than removing the famous Jane, Rem has also eliminated the eponymous raincoat. The title has become *Gikk Du Noen Gang Fri?*, based on the line *Har du noen gang gått fri?* 'Did you ever go free?', the translation of the original lyric *Did you ever go clear?* The blue raincoat from the original title appears in the original text in the second verse: *Your famous blue raincoat was torn at the shoulder.* Rem's translation reads *du kledde ikke klærne du hadde tatt på deg* – more or less literally *the clothes you wore did not suit you*. Why Rem has opted to leave the raincoat out is unclear. It is not a gender issue, as both men and women can wear blue raincoats. It is not a culture-specific term – Norwegians certainly know what a raincoat is. *Famous*, *blue* and *raincoat* all have Norwegian equivalents, so the problem is not at the word level. *Blue* (sad; melancholy) and *raincoat* (shelter; protection) can both have symbolic value, but these would be transferrable. It could be because Rem did not find the *poetry* transferrable – not semantically, but aesthetically. The blue raincoat is an

iconic image. Perhaps *den berømte, blå regnjakka* did not do the original title poetic justice. Or it could be that it was difficult or awkward to fit it into the metre. The simplest explanation is probably because Rem wanted to make the line rhyme with the one preceding it, and the rhyming couplet ending in *så deg*/*på deg* was the least complicated way around it. The translator has in that case 'sacrificed' literal equivalence (among other things) for a prosodic device. In any event, it certainly does not make for a translation that is word-for-word faithful to the original. One could certainly argue that it also removes some of the 'beauty', as *your famous blue raincoat was torn at the shoulder* produces a stronger mental image in the mind of the reader than *du kledde ikke klærne du hadde tatt på deg*. In chapter 3, I will employ Systemic Functional Linguistics and Relevance Theory to further discuss the non-equivalence in this particular line.

In order to make the lyrics be from the woman's perspective, some pronouns have been changed, for one thing. Jane is simply *han*/*ham* 'he'/'him'. The gypsy has been given a female form. *My woman* has become *min elsker* – gender neutral, but satisfying the syllabic requirement. There is no L. Cohen, just *din venn* 'your friend'. (This change is necessary not just because of the gender shift, but because it is a cover, and the writer of the letter is clearly no longer 'L. Cohen'.) Lili Marlene is James Dean in the translation. Lili Marlene is a girl in a wartime song for soldiers. James Dean was a handsome actor. James Dean does not really carry the same symbolic value as Lili Marlene, who is the idealised dream girl of a man who is enduring a battle. *My brother, my killer* is translated into *min søster, min morderske* 'my sister, my killer', which is the exact female equivalent, but which does not retain the heavy Biblical allusion.

Not only is the letter written by a woman in the Norwegian translation – the story is set in Oslo, Norway instead of in New York City. Fortunately, both Oslo and New York are *cold* by *the end of December*. Clinton Street has become Pilestredet. The desert has become an isle off the coast. Both the desert and the island are symbols of isolation, and in fact the line *I hear that you're building your little house deep in the desert* may be entirely metaphorical. Rem is not using cultural substitution in his translation because a Norwegian listener would not understand the original terms. Few people are unfamiliar with New York City, and it is fairly easy to discern that Clinton Street is located in said city. Deserts are hard to come by in Norway, but that does not mean that a Norwegian listener has no concept of a desert or its symbolic value. The cultural substitution seems to be more about making the lyrics sound

natural in the target language. It is naturalness over accuracy. The Norwegian woman singing it would seem more removed from the very personal lyrics if they were in an unfamiliar setting. I will come back to this situation shift in chapter 3 and 4. The issue is, then, how much of Leonard Cohen is left? Did he make it safely to Oslo? Did his luggage get lost in transfer?

The original as well as the translation rhymes (or near-rhymes) for the most part but with no strict rhyming scheme. The first verse in particular makes little effort to rhyme, but it is sprinkled with assonances (e.g. *f**our** in the **mor**ning*) and alliteration (e.g. *I **l**ike where I'm **l**iving*; ***d**eep in the **d**esert*). The translation has not kept up with the alliteration in the first verse, but lines 3 and 4 rhyme (*stedet*/*Pilestredet*).

The original metre is mainly dactylic, turning the melody into a melancholy sort of waltz. (Note: Had the poem not been a song, it could be argued that the metre is amphibrachic: *it's FOUR in | the MORning*. When set to music, however, it makes more sense to consider the first syllable an upbeat: *it's | FOUR in the | MORning, the*…). Speaking in dactyls would be unnatural in both Norwegian and English, but it works in a song written in waltz time. Bremnes' song has strayed from the waltz and is in fact in a different time signature. It is also more up-tempo. The metre of the translation is still essentially dactylic, in that it would be possible, with a little tweaking, to sing the Norwegian words in something resembling a dactylic metre – at least if the original time signature had been preserved (dactyls are not very compatible with common time). Bremnes opts for more of a free metre when singing, though, which is completely acceptable in popular music. As I have previously mentioned, Cohen often employs stress patterns to substitute or complement rhyming and similar devices. This makes the lyrics sound more like poetry. Is this something integral to Cohen's poetic style, or is it just a part of his *music*? That is, should it be considered in translation? Rem seems to have considered the metre more than Bremnes has, and whatever artistic freedom Bremnes has insisted upon with regard to the melody probably has little to do with Rem's translation, and thus the translation should not be judged by the musical arrangements.

The implication of *you treated my woman to a flake of your life* (the fact that the addressee just gave Jane a fraction of himself, and the bitter sarcasm in the use of the phrase 'to treat someone to something') is somewhat lost, but replaced with wordplay of similar semantic value: *Så tok du min elsker, du tok ham for gitt* 'then you took my lover, you took him for

granted'. The message is similar because *you took him for granted* also implies that the addressee did not treat the third party very well. There is also some rather clever wordplay involved (the two uses of the verb 'to take').

Spørre deg om hvordan du har det 'ask you how you are doing' in the first verse is more neutral than the original *see if you're better*, as *see if you're better* more strongly implies that the addressee has not been doing well.

Vår 'spring' in the chorus, though *spring* can be a highly symbolic word in poetry (often symbolising life or something new), is used in the translation solely for rhyming purposes, as there is no mention of that season in the original text. The word is in all likelihood used for its phonological, not semantic, properties.

Another season is mentioned in the translation, namely winter. New York is described as being cold, but *det er vinter i Oslo. Cold* does not necessarily refer to the actual temperature (even though we know that the letter is written in December and therefore it probably *is*, literally, cold), but to the 'cold' atmosphere in the big city. The symbolic value of *winter* is traditionally not so much *cold* (in the sense of *reserved*) as it is *dark*, *dormant* or even *old*. *Men for meg er det stedet* seems to suggest that the writer enjoys Oslo even though it is literally cold. Whereas in the original the writer accepts his somewhat isolated existence in New York – he is building his little house in the asphalt jungle rather than in the desert. This can be seen as a sort of cultural substitution, though – one would have to accept the cold in order to stay in Norway, and one would have to accept the loneliness of a metropolis in order to stay in New York.

We learn in the chorus that the addressee 'planned to go clear'. *Did you ever go clear?* L. Cohen wonders, either taunting or genuinely interested, and Rem has chosen this lyric for the title of his translated version. The meaning of *go clear* is quite vague. "Perhaps it's drug-slang for quitting; or maybe it's just simple-speak for going away" (Devlin 1996: 51). Perhaps it means leaving Jane. Rem translated it into *[gå] fri* 'go free', which is also quite vague. It could mean ending the relationship, going away, or getting rid of some emotional baggage. It could also mean quitting drugs or being acquitted of a crime. What is important to take into account here is the fact that Cohen briefly dabbled in Scientology around the time *Famous Blue Raincoat* was written. According to the Church of Scientology, "Clear" is a

desired state of consciousness in which one's mind is immune to outer stimulus (*whatisscientology.org*). If this is in fact the original meaning of the lyric, it is lost in translation. But Cohen could have used the term metaphorically – to achieve control of one's feelings or peace of mind – in which case the translation is semi-equivalent. "I know Leonard has been nosing around in many places, but I hope that in this case it is just about 'being free'" (Lindforss 2007: 95, *my translation*).

Finally, *sincerely* is more expressive than *med hilsen*. Of course, it is a standard way of signing a letter, and could in fact be there just to make it clear that the song is meant to be just that. But in its literal sense it does express that the writer really means what he is saying, which the more neutral *med hilsen* does not. *L. Cohen* is interesting: both more personal (in that it at least gives the reader a name) and more formal (and perhaps more 'cold') than *din venn*.

I chose *Famous Blue Raincoat* for several reasons. It was mainly interesting from the point of view of modality: it is laden with it. I wanted to look at how the use of modality affected the interpretation and mood of the original text, and how it had been preserved in translation, and how in turn that affected the interpretation of the target text. *Famous Blue Raincoat* is a well-known song of Cohen's, and it is very open for interpretation. Who is the third person? Is the narrator addressing himself? Who has wronged whom, and who got the short end of the stick? What is the meaning of the mysterious question *did you ever go clear*? Relevance Theory could help shed some light on whether or not the target text 'interpretively resembled' the source text. A transitivity analysis could help explain in concrete terms if and how this ambiguity had been preserved in translation. I was also undeniably fascinated with the translator's decision to leave out the raincoat. How could this choice be justified? Furthermore, in addition to being from a woman's perspective instead of a man's, the translation is set in Oslo instead of New York. I wanted to explore to what extent the gender shift and cultural substitution changed the text and what it did to the *style* of the text: Is it still 'the same text'? How much of the original author remains?

1.7.2 *Folk*

Cohen's short poem *Folk* (Cohen 1989: 54) (Appendix 3) is most known for the opening phrase *flowers for hitler.* This is also the title of the book in which it was first published (Cohen 1964). In the introduction to the book, Cohen offered these notes on the title:

> "A while ago this book would have been called SUNSHINE FOR NAPOLEON, and earlier still it would have been called WALLS FOR GENGHIS KHAN" (1964).

A 'while' ago, meaning before Nazi Germany and the Holocaust. And in the 1960s, the Holocaust was merely a couple of decades ago. How different would Cohen's childhood in the 1940s have been had his Jewish family not left Europe for Canada a few generations back? "Writing about the Holocaust becomes a moral obligation of the survivors, with poetry serving as a memorial" (Volkmann 2003: 217). But how do you write about the Holocaust? In Cohen's case, in Volkmann's words, by "fully employing the repertoire of Holocaust motives … fusing them with a heavy dose of pop poetry motives", achieving "jarring juxtapositions" (2003: 222).

I chose to analyse Rem's translation (Appendix 4) of the poem *Folk* (Cohen 1989: 54) for a couple of reasons. First of all, it is short (nine verses). Poetry is condensed language, bursting with implicature (a term I will come back to in chapter 2) – short poems even more so. Short poems normally express very much in very few words. Transferring the meaning while using approximately the same amount of words can be challenging. Second, the poem is highly intriguing. Especially considering Cohen's Jewish background, the casual mention of Hitler bookending the poem's straight-forward description of a piece of civilization (in a poem titled *Folk*) makes the poem stand out. Delving into the poem itself as well as translation options was irresistible.

Hitler is mentioned twice in *Folk*, in identical lines, bookending the poem: *flowers for hitler the summer yawned*. Other than this, there is nothing in the poem that overtly suggests any relation to the Holocaust. Much like the mention of Jesus in the second verse of *Suzanne* lifts the poem about a woman to a more spiritual plane, the mention of Hitler in *Folk* casts a dark shadow over a poem that would otherwise just depict a happily drowsy small town.

Flowers for hitler ... all over my new grass, the summer declares – with a yawn. The summer – the new, easy days – is either bored or blissfully lazy, or both. The grass is fresh. And it becomes the foundation for flowers – flowers that grow from something; flowers that are beautiful. The flowers are art. There is nothing in our shameful existence so ugly that we cannot extract art from it. And art is beauty. Holocaust poems are flowers for Hitler. "The moments of beauty which the poet attempts to create … are moments which cannot come into being unless evil is first admitted" (Djwa 1967: 34-35).

Present in the poem are words like *painting* (refurbishing; fixing up; making pretty), *church* (purity; holiness), *school* (intellect; education), *flags* ((national) pride; celebration), and *laundry* (cleaning). These words also represent daily life – rituals; chores; work.

History is a needle/for putting men to asleep Cohen claims in *On Hearing A Name Long Unspoken* (1993: 66). Another poem is titled *Opium and Hitler* (Cohen 1993: 49). Are the flowers in the new grass of the opiate variety? That would certainly make the summer sleepy. Can you pretend it never happened once you've fulfilled your survivor's obligation? The summer – the present – produces flowers for Hitler, art for past crimes, and then yawns. And then the village folk carry on. They cover it with a new coat of paint. They worship (in a church, that is – not a synagogue). They teach. They clean. They make love.

Flowers also contains a poem called *All There Is To Know About Adolph Eichmann* (1993: 53). The poem's purpose is to paint a picture of Eichmann, a Nazi criminal, as an ordinary man. His physical features are *medium*. He does not, in fact, have claws, or horns, or anything of that sort. He is a person, not a monster. Evil is carried out by the hands of men. And evil men look just like ordinary men, carrying on. *What did you expect,* the poem challenges the reader, *madness?* On what do we blame evil? What makes us feel better?

The dogs in *Folk* are *making* love. Animals are rarely described as *making love*. Their mating is not usually seen as something romantic. Why the anthropomorphism? Are animals capable of human emotions? Are the beasts starting to resemble men? Adolph Eichmann does not have talons.

The poem *What I'm Doing Here* declares *I wait/for each one of you to confess* (Cohen 1993: 45). "The confession that Cohen commands is one which accepts personal responsibility for evil as the natural corollary of being human" (Djwa 1967: 35).

A Migrating Dialogue (1989: 50) expresses unimaginable horrors in childishly humorous words: *Peekaboo Miss Human Soap.* This dark humour emphasises the banality of evil. "Cohen has presented horror as an absurdity", asserts Djwa – it is an attempt to "exercise evil by filtering it through the comic mode" and "come to terms with a painful experience" (1967: 40). "Black humour is one of Cohen's main devices to come to terms with the death camp atrocities he presents in his poetry", Volkmann (2003: 233) agrees.

> "In *Flowers for Hitler* this knowledge of the ubiquity of evil results in a reversal of conventional aesthetics. The poems in the book present a series of disparate, surreal glimpses of scenes that revel in the grotesque, the senseless, the tasteless. Rather than follow a logical progression, the individual pictures seem joined together to create an atmospheric effect designed to take the reader into Cohen's world of aesthetic and moral inversions. Cohen becomes a chronicler of the dark side of life, which is at the creative root of the work: Flowers for Hitler draws its creative strength from a celebration of all those elements that in conventional aesthetics stand for decay." (Wynands 1999: 203)

Back to *Folk*. The poem follows no rhyme scheme, but there is quite a lot of repetition (four verses start with *here*, three start with *flowers*, and the first and last verse are identical). The repetition creates a sort of straightforward, almost boring (or bored) rhythm that accentuates the everyday life described in the poem. It is written in all lowercase letters, and there is no punctuation. All of these technicalities are preserved in the translation, and righty so, because they are important to the poem's style and message. Even *hitler* is in lowercase. It is no longer a name; it is more of a concept. Hitler is reduced from a person to a thing, or something you remember in the back of your head. The lowercase and the lack of punctuation make the poem sort of *yawn* like the summer. The lack of commas makes you read it in one breath.

Are the words in the translation the same? Is the meaning the same? I will proceed to outline some of the instances of non-equivalence in the translation, and in chapter 3 I will offer a more in-depth and theory-based discussion of the same instances.

Holiday is ambiguous. Is it as in *vacation* or as in *observed holiday*? Are *they* painting the village for a special occasion, or are they, as the translation seems to suggest, finishing a paint job before taking some time off?

Laundry is ambiguous. Dictionary.com defines the noun as articles of clothing "that have been *or are to be* washed" (my emphasis). While the translation clearly states that the flags are bright as *clean* laundry. This interpretation is probably due to the word *bright* – would dirty laundry be bright? But that could be the point – the flags are no brighter than dirty laundry. Are these white flags? A tainted white flag could be a deceitful peace offering. *Renvasket* would have been more ambiguous than *nyvasket*. While that too implies that the laundry – or flags – have been washed, it sparks up connotations to something not entirely decent. It implies washing your hands clean of something, like Pilate before the crucifixion of Christ. *Hitvasking* – laundering of money – could also have been an alternative. Something has been washed, but that does not make it clean. *Flaggene skinner som tøyvasken* would have been closer to a literal translation, but this results in an awkward rhythm. *Flaggene er rene som tøyvasken* would contain the ambiguity of the original (even though *rene* is not a literal translation of *bright*), but would be even worse, rhythm-wise. *The flags are bright as laundry* is iambic and *flaggene skinner som nyvasket tøy* is dactylic (with a stressed hyperbeat at the end), so while they do not follow the same metre, they both are rhythmically pleasing. But *nyvasket* could still have been *renvasket* or *hvitvasket* and fit the metre.

Doggies is translated into *vovvover*. Are these equivalent? They are both informal, but *vovvover* is slightly more childish. Furthermore, the possible sexual innuendo is lost. Nevertheless, a less neutral, more playful version of *dog*/*hund* is used, making the dogs less intimidating. Indeed, they are making love, not war. The concept of *love* is still in the translated *elsker*, but *making*, the dynamic act of creating something, is lost.

Whether or not adequate equivalents of all the terms in the poem have been used in the translation can be discussed, and depends upon the interpretation of these terms. But as some of the ambiguity is lost, much of the interpretation has already been done for the reader of the translation. However, the translation is still successful in that it presents a lazy civilization carrying on as normal although its flowers sprung from evil. The translated poem still creates something seemingly beautiful out of disturbing historical events.

2 Theory

2.1 Functional approaches to translation

Functionalism is the "methodological approach where the translator's decisions are governed by the intended *function* of the target text or any of its parts" (Nord 1997: 138; my italics). Equivalence, then – or *functional equivalence* – is a concept "describing a relationship of 'equal communicative value' between two texts" (Nord 1997: 68). This means that nothing is untranslatable, because something that is "apparently untranslatable" can be replaced by "another device serving the same purpose" (Nord 1997: 73). Changing or even omitting something from the original text is justifiable as long as the communicative value, or the function of the text, is intact. Functional equivalence will sometimes require translation by paraphrase or explanation (see Baker 2011: 33, 36, 38) in order to get the meaning across to the target culture: If a Norwegian source text mentioned Kari Bremnes, a functional English translation might read *Norwegian singer-songwriter Kari Bremnes*.

Nord points out that, in functional translation, problems should be dealt with top-down (as opposed to bottom-up, that is, starting on the word level): "This means that a functional translation process should start on a pragmatic level by deciding on the intended function of the translation" (Nord 1997: 68). "If we start from the premise that language has evolved for the function of communication, this must have a direct and controlling effect on its design features – in other words, the form of language can be substantially explained by examining its functions" (Thompson 2004: 7).

Critics of functionalism, especially in literary translation, would argue that functional approaches are more useful when it comes to instrumental texts, as opposed to texts where the artistic quality and integrity of the original are important (Nord 1997: 120). "Functionalists have probably insisted more on cases where adaptive procedures ensure the functionality of the original than all the other cases where documentary translation forms are called for" (Nord 1997: 120). The communicative intentions are generally different in literary texts. The texts provide certain *clues* to the writer's intentions, but the clues in literary texts can be less obvious and less standardized than in non-literary communication. Communicative clues will be mentioned again in 2.3. "A translator who uses the stylistic means that the author used in the original cannot be sure the effect will be the same … An

ideal [literary] translation would then have the same function and effect as the source text" (Nord 1997: 89).

Nord notes that "what is actually translated is not the sender's intention but *the translator's interpretation of the sender's intention*", and observes that "translations based on the most personal interpretations are often the ones that become most famous" (1997: 90). In 2.2, I will present my functional framework for the analysis, Systemic Functional Grammar.

2.2 Systemic Functional Linguistics

A central contribution of Systemic Functional Linguistics, or Systemic Functional Grammar, developed by Michael Halliday (here Halliday and Matthiessen 2004), in translation is its "potential to strengthen connections to higher-level and transdisciplinary questions in investigations of the semiotics of culture and language", writes Steiner (2005: 489). It can also bridge gaps between literary studies and linguistics, two disciplines that are both important for translation studies (Steiner 2005: 490).

Systemic Functional Linguistics differs from traditional functional approaches in that its framework is organised around systems, hence the name. From the point of view of Systemic Functional Linguistics, language is structured to make "not just one but essentially three different kinds of meanings simultaneously": **Experiential** meanings, "relating to how we represent experience, **interpersonal** meanings, relating to "the relations between the interlocutors", and **textual** meanings, "related to our organization of text" (Nørgaard 2003: 13-14). I will further explore these three metafunctions below.

Systemic Functional Linguistics is a descriptive theory rather than a formal theory, and "focuses on language in use rather than a more abstract concept of language competence" (Nørgaard 2003: 12). It attempts to "frame a grammatical description that includes an explanation of the meanings of whole messages rather than just individual words" (Thompson 2004: 29). Thompson likens the contrast between Transformative Generative Grammar and Systemic Functional Grammar to the dichotomy of nature versus nurture – "and the answer is most likely to lie in a combination of both" (2004: 7).

"In functional approaches to grammar we essentially equate meaning with function",

Thompson writes (2004: 28), because language users "respond above all to the meanings that are expressed and the ways in which those meanings are expressed" (2004: 6). And if the *meaning* is indeed the *function*, then the meaning is undeniably dependent on the context (Thompson 2004: 7-8).

In order to examine the speaker or writer's intended message, that is, the function of the text, then we cannot get around the term 'choice' (Thompson 2004: 8). Thompson notes that "the term 'choice' does not necessarily imply a conscious process of selection by the speaker" (2004: 9). Systemic Functional Linguistics examines "the range of relevant choices" and why we choose one particular wording as opposed to the others (Thompson 2004: 8). Language is a "system network of interlocking options and a semiotic system, from which each choice is made against the backdrop of other available alternatives that could have been chosen but were not" (Ng 2009: 35).

Halliday finds it important to "clarify from the start that grammar and vocabulary are not two separate components of a language", but rather "two ends of a single continuum" (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 7). Systemic Functional Linguistics uses the term **lexicogrammar** to describe this cooperative aspect of lexis and grammar – how we construe meaning by interpreting the words of the message *and* the way these words are put together (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004).

Fang *et al* argue that "if we view a translation from a systemic functional perspective, both the macro-level of contextual focus on ideology and socio-cultural factors and the micro-level focus on textual linguistic features will be covered" (2008: 285). Steiner uses similar terms – but includes a third level – when he claims that Systemic Functional Grammar brings the macro-level of literary studies, the micro-level of linguistics, and the mezzo-level of stylistics "together in one perspective" (2005: 490). *Style*, which I will come back to in section 2.3, is then *how something is said*, and it lies between text and context.

2.2.1 Register and Genre

Register "is a variety of language that a language user considers appropriate to a specific situation" (Baker 2011: 13) and has three dimensions: field, tenor and mode. **Field** refers to "what is being talked about" (Thompson 2004: 40), or "what is going on" (Baker 2011: 14).

The speaker or writer makes linguistic choices based upon the context in which the communication situation plays out. **Tenor** describes "the relationships between the people taking part in the discourse" (Baker 2011: 14): the linguistic choices made by the speaker or writer are chosen according to his or her relationship with the addressee. **Mode** is a term for "the role that the language is playing" and "its medium of transmission" (Baker 2011: 14); that is, whether it is written or spoken, and whether is an instruction manual or a wedding toast.

Genre is explained by Thompson as "register plus purpose" (2004: 42). A genre uses the resources of one or more registers in order to "achieve certain communicative goals" (Thompson 2004: 43). Genre is superordinate to register and operates on a macro-level, connecting the text to the "linguistic and cultural community" (House 2001: 138).

2.2.2 The Experiential metafunction

The ideational, or experiential, metafunction is dedicated to human experience (Halliday & Matthiessen 2004: 29). In this metafunction we use functional labels to express the content of a clause in terms of "**processes** involving **participants** in certain **circumstances**" (Thompson 2004: 87). The lexicogrammar of this metafunction is realised by the **transitivity** system. We use the term transitivity because while it describes the whole clause, it focuses on the verbal group, and the verbal group determines how the participants are labelled (Thompson 2004: 89). "The analysis of the Transitivity structures of a text makes clear who is doing what to whom, where, when, why, and with what" (Nørgaard 2003: 14). "The transitivity system construes the world of experience" into process types, which provide their own "model or schema for construing a particular domain of experience as a figure of a particular kind" (Halliday & Matthiessen 2004: 170).

Material processes describe physical actions:

*Rory **walked** over to Amy's house.*

Mental processes occur in the Participant's mind:

*Rory **loves** Amy.*

Behavioural processes are somewhere in between material and mental, and present "the outer manifestations of inner workings" (Halliday & Matthiessen 2004: 171):

*Rory **sighed**.*

Verbal processes are processes "enacted in the form of language" (Halliday & Matthiessen 2004: 171):

*Rory **asked** Amy to marry him.*
Relational processes identify the Participant or describes the Participant's attributes:

*Rory **is** engaged.*

Existential processes recognize the Participant as something that exists:

*There **is going to be** a wedding.*

The participants of a clause are labelled according to the Process type. This will be elaborated upon in chapter 3.

2.2.3 The Interpersonal metafunction

"The analysis of Mood structures tells us what the speaker uses language to do in relation to other interlocutors" (Nørgaard 2003: 14). Seen from the point of view of the interpersonal metafunction, the clause is an "interactive event involving speaker, or writer, and audience" (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 106).

The fundamental speech roles are **giving** – of either **goods-&-services** or **information** – or **demanding** – either **goods-&-services** or **information** (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 107). The four primary speech functions are thus **offer** (giving **goods-&-services**), **command** (demanding **goods-&-services**), **statement** (giving information), and **question** (demanding information) (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 108).

A **proposition** is a clause that exchanges information, and propositions have a "clearly defined grammar": so an understanding of the clause in its exchange function is gained by interpreting the structure of declarative and interrogative sentences" (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 110).

The principal grammatical system of the interpersonal metafunction is that of **Mood** (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 106). The clause's **Mood** element consists of the **Subject** (a nominal group) and the **Finite** (part of a verbal group) (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 111) In a declarative clause – i.e. where the speech role is **giving information** – the Subject will precede the Finite. So in the clause below, *Martha* is the Subject and *has* is the Finite.

Martha has travelled through time and space.

In an interrogative clause – where the speech role is **demanding information** – the Finite will precede the Subject:

Has Martha travelled through time and space?

The part of the clause that is not the Mood is labelled **Residue**. The functional elements that can be found in the Residue are **Predicator**, **Complement** and **Adjunct**" (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 121).

The Finite expresses polarity and modality as well as the tense, but the expression of polarity and modality is not restricted to the Mood (Thompson 2004: 66). Interpersonal meanings "tend to cluster around the Mood", but they can be "spread over the whole clause" and may also be reinforced (Thompson 2004: 66). "A simple starting definition of modality is that it is the space between 'yes' and 'no'" (Thompson 2004: 66).

Modality can express validity of the presented information, probability, frequency, the speaker's confidence, the speaker's willingness, or the addressee's obligation (Thompson 2004: 67). Modality is expressed by means of **modal Adjuncts**, **modal commitment**, **modal responsibility**, and **appraisal**. These types of modality will be explained in the analysis in chapter 3.

2.2.4 The Textual metafunction

In order to see how the writer has organised the text, we can analyse the text for **Theme**. "The analysis of Theme structures throws light on the way information has been organized in the text and reveals the various foci of the speaker" (Nørgaard 2003: 14). The thematic structure "gives the clause its character as a message" (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 64). The clause "has some form of organization whereby it fits in with, and contributes to, the flow of discourse" (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 64).

The Theme is the first constituent of the clause that has experiential meaning (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 66). This constituent naturally becomes the focal point of the clause. The rest of the clause is labelled Rheme (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 64).

The most common type of Theme is a nominal group (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 67) acting as the clause's Subject. If the Theme is not the Subject, it is considered marked (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 73). The Adjunct functioning as Theme is the most common form of marked Theme. The most uncommon choice in English is thematised Complement (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 73).

Cohesion is another way of organizing a text. "Conjunction refers broadly to the combining of any two textual elements into a potentially coherent complex semantic unit" (Thompson 2004: 189). The terms *cohesion* and *coherence* are closely related; the difference being that cohesion refers to actual linguistic devices while coherence occurs in the writer's or reader's mind and cannot be quantified (Thompson 2004: 179). Cohesion can thus result in a more coherent text. Cohesion can be realised by **conjunction**, **reference**, **ellipsis**, or **lexical cohesion** (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004).

"Conjunctions mark relations where one span of text elaborates, extends or enhances another, earlier span of text" (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 540). **Elaboration** can be appositive (*for instance*, *I mean*) or clarifying (*or rather*, *actually*) (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 540-541). **Extension** is either additive (*and*), adversative (*but*) or varying (*alternatively*) (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 543-544). Types of **enhancement** are spacio-temporal (*here*), manner (*similarly*), causal-conditional (*therefore*), and matter (*in that respect*) (Halliday and Matthiessen 544-548).

"Reference is the set of grammatical resources that allow the speaker to indicate whether something is being repeated from somewhere earlier in the text … or whether it has not yet appeared in the text" (Thompson 2004: 180). Reference differs from conjunction in that it creates links between elements rather than between clauses (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 534).

*I have **a** box. **It** is blue.*

A box refers to something "outward from the text" and is therefore an exophoric reference, while *it* refers to he aforementioned box, and is an anaphoric reference (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 534-535).

Reference can also be comparative (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 560):

*You box is **bigger** on the inside* [than it is on the outside].

Ellipsis is the act of leaving out parts of a clause if they can be "presumed from what has gone on before" (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 535):

What colour is your box?
[it is] *Blue.*

Substitution is a "systemic variant" of ellipsis (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 535), and occurs when "a linguistic token is put in the place of the wording to be repeated from elsewhere" (Thompson 2004: 180):

*Your box is smaller on the outside. Deceptively **so*** [=smaller].

Lexical cohesion "operates within the lexical zone of lexicogrammar", and refers to the act of creating cohesion through the choice of words (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 570). This can include repetition, the use of synonyms, hyponymy, meronymy, and collocation (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 571-578).

2.2.5 Systemic Functional Linguistics and translation

One could argue that Systemic Functional Grammar would be more useful for analysing translations of non-literary texts, as functional approaches are concerned with the function of the text. Nord (1997: 120) points out that critics of a functionalist approach deem it more suitable for translating instrumental texts rather than literary texts because functional approaches are not primarily concerned with stylistic qualities. "In functional approaches to grammar we essentially equate meaning with function", Thompson writes (2004: 28), and "the meaning is *always* more than the sum of the individual words" (2004: 29). In literary texts, and especially poetry, the individual words are carefully chosen, and the meaning is to a large extent tied up in the actual words. However, the literal meanings of the actual words are not necessarily what the author intended to convey. The words in poetry are often chosen for their semantic ambiguity, and therefore it can be difficult to apply systemic functional labels to the constituents in a clause. As we have seen, for instance, a verb can fit into two or even three different Process types, depending on the interpretation. However, when it comes to analysing translations of poetry, Systemic Functional Grammar can be a method for 'measuring' the ambiguity. The role of the translator is not to interpret the poem for the reader, but to preserve the layers and ambiguity in order for the target text to be as open for interpretation as the source text. If we can assign as many labels to the element in the target text as in the source text, then that is a way of knowing that the translator has preserved the ambiguity. If they match the original labels both in amount and type, then we can say that the ambiguity is equivalent (if not the meaning).

"Speakers have a reason for saying something, and for saying it in the way that they do" Thompson (2004: 8) writes, and "what we aim to uncover through a functional analysis are the reasons why the speaker produces a particular wording rather than any other" (2004: 9). The choices made in natural speech may be subconscious, but the choices a poet makes are not. For that reason it is very interesting to apply Systemic Functional Linguistics to poetry. Not to mention to translated poetry, as the translator's job is to make choices based on the poet's choices.

Matthiessen believes the act of translation should be contextualized "top-down" rather than "bottom-up" (2001: 115). As I mentioned in chapter 2, Nord also believes a functionally equivalent translation should start with pragmatics (1997: 68). Nørgaard also argues that literary texts should be seen in

their entirety, “since one sentence acquires parts of its meaning through its relations with the rest of the text” (2003: 15). A pragmatic approach to literary translation should then be appropriate.

Nørgaard also observes that Systemic Functional Linguistics can be a “useful model for bridging the gap between linguistics and literary criticism because it combines text with context, linguistic description with linguistic interpretation, and language with situation” (2003: 11-12). Fang *et al* explain why a systemic functional approach is applicable to translation by pointing out that “translation itself is a meaning-realization process which involve choices of different language resources”, and systemic functional linguistics provides us with a system for describing these choices and how these linguistic choices realise meaning (2008: 286).

Systemic Functional Linguistics has been applied to translation before. For example, Fang *et al* (2008) conducted a comparative study of two different translations of the same Chinese text, and discovered that the two translators’ different choices within the Mood system reflected their different social status. Ng (2009) used a systemic approach to compare four different Chinese translations of Hemingway, and concluded that the style of the translations depended on sociocultural environments. Both of these studies compared translations of the same text by different translators. My thesis studies two different texts by the same author, translated by the same translator.

In 3.1, I will apply Systemic Functional Grammar to the evaluation of Rem’s Norwegian translation of Cohen’s song *Famous Blue Raincoat*. I will first have a look at the text from the point of view of Halliday’s terms Register and Genre, and following that, I will work my way through the experiential metafunction, the interpersonal metafunction, and the textual metafunction. In 3.2 I will follow the same procedure for the evaluation of Rem’s Norwegian translation of Cohen’s poem *Folk*. Are the source texts and target texts functionally equivalent? Did Systemic Functional Linguistics prove useful for ‘measuring’ ambiguity and shedding light on non-equivalence? An evaluation of the systemic functional approach to translation will follow in Chapter 4.

2.3 Relevance Theory

Sperber and Wilson's (1986) Relevance Theory explains the form of communication that is found in implicit inferences. *Inference* is what the receiver will interpret from the communication – another word for (subconscious) 'reasoning' (Sperber 1995). The receiver in a communication situation will take away from the communication the meaning that is *relevant* to them. The *speaker's meaning* is then not necessarily the same as the *sentence meaning* (Sperber 1995). The speaker or writer's intention is more than – or in some cases completely different than – the meaning represented by the actual words communicated.

"Human cognition is geared towards the maximization of relevance (that is, to the achievement of as many contextual (cognitive) effects as possible for as little processing effort as possible)" Carston (2002b: 379) puts it, and defines relevance thusly: "An assumption is relevant to an individual at a given time if and only if it has some positive cognitive effects in one or more of the contexts accessible to him at that time" (2002b: 380).

If you were to ask your friend Donna to come travelling with you, and Donna's reply was 'That sounds dangerous', then you could infer from that that Donna does not want to travel with you – perhaps because you know Donna to be a rather nervous homebody, but also because she has an apologetic look upon her face. "Context is a crucial factor in utterance interpretation" (Pilkington 1989: 126), so you might in fact infer from Donna's message that she *does* want to travel with you – if you know Donna loves life on the wild side and her face displays excitement.

"Relevance Theory can be seen to combine pragmatic and cognitive aspects of style in a way which fills a number of the perceived gaps in formalist approaches" Boase-Beier writes (2010: 19-20).

Communication need not be lexicalized, but "linguistic communication is the strongest possible form of communication" in that it "introduces an element of explicitness where non-verbal communication can never be more than implicit" (Sperber and Wilson 1986: 175).

Gutt writes that it is possible in principle to convey any message to any receiver, regardless of their cognitive environment (1991: 96). *Message* is defined by Nida and Taber as "the total

meaning or context of a discourse; the concepts and feelings which the author intends the reader to understand and perceive" (1969: 205; cited in Gutt 1991: 69). Jin also defines *message* as "the sum total of what is communicated by the text … the spirit … ; the substance … ; the tone" (2003: 52).

How is Relevance Theory relevant (as it were) for the analysis of poetry? Stylistic devices are vital communicative clues within the context of literary texts. These clues cause the reader to go beyond the minimal processing effort and consciously infer the weakly implied meanings that may lie in figurative language or semantic ambiguity. The "stylistic dimension of communication", that is, not only *what* the writer intends to convey, but *how* it is conveyed, is of particular interest to literary studies (Gutt 1991: 123). Stylistic devices are "elements in the text which are unusual, striking, or simply indicative of attitude" (Boase-Beier 2004: 278). They may include "repetition and alliteration ... the use of different registers, the use of specific syntactic constructions such as the passive to suggest a particular type of behaviour, or the repetition of words from the same semantic field to indicate a state of mind" (Boase-Beier 2004: 279). Whereas primary meanings are determined by the words, implied meaning is in the style (Boase-Beier 2010: 36).

Some see art as the artistic object (e.g. the poem) itself, while others see art as the artist's artistic action – or in the audience's experience of the artistic product (Guijarro 1998: 124). Guijarro (1998: 124-125) proposes that we see art as an attitude – an attitude being "a way of processing" the message of a communication situation. Art is "the processing of information in a special way", and everything can become art "if we adopt a certain attitude with respect to the information we can extract from it in special circumstances" (Guijarro 1998: 125). We can take this to mean that what makes a text literary is its implicature – or the way its implicature and clues enable the reader to judge the text as literary. If Relevance Theory explains communication by means of inference, then it can be very interesting to apply to literary texts indeed. "In poetry and poetic prose the extended search for relevance adds to the pleasure of interpreting (Thorsell 1998: 28).

2.3.1 Relevance Theory and translation

Relevance Theory as applied to translation is first and foremost associated with Ernst-August Gutt's 1991 book *Translation and Relevance*. Gutt's aims were "to show that we can

explain (rather than merely classify and describe) the facts of translation without the need for a special translation theory, focussing on translation as communication" (Boase-Beier 2010: 43).

A target language text, then, is equivalent to the source language text if it "purports to interpretively resemble the original completely in the context envisaged for the original" (Gutt 1991: 163). Gutt points out that the target text need not necessarily actually achieve interpretive resemblance as long as it "creates a *presumption* of complete interpretive resemblance" (1991: 186).

Relevance Theory does not attempt to describe and classify communication, but to understand communication "in terms of cause-effect relationships" (Gutt 1991: 21). Translation as such is also seen as communication (Gutt 1991).

Implicatures are weakly implied pieces of information, as opposed to explicatures, which are messages that are stated explicitly. In order to identify implicature, and determine their communicative value, context is very important. "Use of the wrong context can lead to the deviation of implicatures not intended - or it can cause implicatures to be missed" (Gutt 1991: 73). Therefore, Gutt writes, the sum total of explicatures and implicatures in the source text must be matched in the target text (1991: 95).

Gutt notes that sometimes a translation will actually be more relevant and more successful in terms of communication if it sacrifices some degree of its *resemblance* to the original (1991: 112). However, as I have already pointed out, literary translations should not attempt to heighten any relevance or make communication more smooth, but rather leave the receiver with as many – and as opaque – clues as the original message.

Gutt suggests that the stylistic properties of a text should be preserved in a translation mainly because they provide clues that guide the receivers to the intended interpretation (1991: 127). Surely, at least in literary translation, style should also be preserved because it affects the aesthetic quality of the text. Boase-Beier argues that content is secondary to, and a vehicle for, style (2004: 280). Therefore, "a translator must start with the style, not the content" (Boase-Beier 2004: 285). Boase-Beier points out that the "concern with what goes beyond content" challenges the way dictionaries define translation – as expressing the meaning, or

sense, in another language “as though the manner in which the sense is expressed was irrelevant” 2010: 11).

Since, Boase-Beier (2004) points out, a literary text is inherently untrue (in that it is fiction), the responsibility of truth is shifted from the content to the style. Style, then, represents the author’s cognitive state, and is what Boase-Beier calls “the truth of literature" (2004: 280). If the style of the original is successfully transferred, then the readers of the target text will be able to experience a cognitive state similar to that of the readers of the source text, and the author (Boase-Beier 2004).

Stylistic analysis of a translation involves explaining how and why texts have the effects they have on the readers (Boase-Beier 2010: 29). It can certainly be argued that this is an important part of literary analysis, as literature is intended to have an emotional or cognitive effect on the reader, rather than to just inform the reader.

A stylistic effect may be more subtle in translated text, because style is not always easy to imitate. The translated stylistic features may demand extra attention to notice, but poetry should demand extra attention to begin with.

Boase-Beier suggests that, basically, literary translation is the translation of style, because style reflects the mind, as does literature (2010: 112).

That the translator, especially of literary texts, needs to consider what goes beyond content, makes perfect sense. Boase-Beier does not, however, provide any direct method for doing so. "The nub of the question is this: given that a translation preserves the information and the general force of the original, in what respect is it possible to say that its manner or style or tone is like those features of its source?" (Bellos 2011: 334).

Gutt (1991: 127) points out that achieving stylistic resemblance is far more challenging than achieving resemblance in semantic representation, as stylistic properties “often consist in linguistic features that are far from universal”.

“One use of language which might seem to require a more extensive search for context is metaphor. Metaphorical use is seen in relation to a literalness-looseness continuum.

Looseness is defined in terms of formal and logical resemblances between the propositional form of an utterance and the propositional form of the thought of the speaker" (Pilkington 1989: 127).

In 3.3, I will apply Relevance Theory to the evaluation of Rem's translation of *Famous Blue Raincoat*, and I will do the same to Rem's translation of *Folk* in 3.4. A discussion of a relevance-theoretic approach to translation will follow in Chapter 4.

3 Analysis

3.1 Systemic Functional Linguistics applied to *Famous Blue Raincoat* and its Norwegian translation

3.1.1 *Famous Blue Raincoat* from the point of view of Register and Genre

Field

In *Famous Blue Raincoat*, the context is a peace offering from one person to another following a love triangle of which the outcome appears to be that all three parties have ended up alone. The writer now has limited, if any, contact with the addressee (signalled by phrases such as *I hear that you're…*, suggesting second-hand contact). The writer now expresses interest in the addressee's wellbeing (*to see if you're better*) – admittedly with a hint of *schadenfreude* (e.g. *the last time we saw you you looked so much older*) – and buries the hatchet (*I guess I forgive you*; *your enemy is sleeping*). The field is the same in the Norwegian translation.

Tenor

The participants involved in the text are the writer and the addressee, although the addressee is only present as an intended recipient and does not actively contribute to the communication situation. The two have seemingly been close friends at some point (*my brother*; *I miss you*), and it is even possible to interpret the addressee as being a past version of the writer, or a different aspect of his personality. The writer seems to be well aware that the addressee is doing less than swell. He uses thinly veiled sarcasm when expressing this, particularly in the lines *I hope you're keeping some kind of record* – one cannot really keep a record of 'nothing' – and *your famous blue raincoat* – as *famous* is not likely to mean that the coat itself is renowned for something; rather that the addressee has received attention for it or been known to take pride in it. And if we see the raincoat as a metaphor (or synecdoche) for the man, then *famous* can mean something along the lines of *respected* or *highly regarded*. What was once famous is now falling apart, and the addressee is no longer the man he used to be.

Well I see you there with a rose in your teeth/one more thin gypsy thief reveals that there is still some animosity towards the addressee. The *I guess* preceding *I miss you* expresses a hint of reluctance or hesitation, but the *thanks* and *I'm glad* towards the end seem sincere. The text ends with the slightly formal *sincerely* and the even more formal *L. Cohen* – revealing that there is still a great figurative distance between the former friends.

In the translation, the relationship between the two participants is roughly the same, although they are now women (*mannen hennes*; *min søster, min morderske*; *sigøynerske*). There is no longer mention of a torn, *famous* blue raincoat; instead there is a remark about the addressee's clothes not suiting her. This could possibly be a reflection of the gender shift, as a woman is perhaps more inclined (stereotypically, at least) to comment on her competition's lack of style than lack of status or pride. However, *du kledde ikke klærne* is more direct than *your famous blue raincoat was torn* which contains more of the aforementioned thinly veiled sarcasm. *Syns du skal føre et slags regnskap* also sounds slightly more like an actual suggestion than a sarcastic one. The gypsy is no longer described as *thin* or a *thief* (at least not directly). *Munn* is also undoubtedly more gentle than *teeth*. This part comes off as less hostile. *Med hilsen* is also semi-formal, but *en venn* is friendlier than *L. Cohen*. The inclusion of *for Jane or for me* after *if you ever come by here* in the source text also implies that the writer is open for reconciliation of their friendship, not just indifferent to reconciliation between the addressee and the third party.

So while the translation is similar to the original regarding tenor, it is not completely equivalent. The biggest difference is that the original has more of a *sting* – there is more bitterness and hostility. The formal *sincerely, L. Cohen* accentuates this.

Mode

The text is in the form of a letter, signalled by *I'm writing you*/*Jeg skriver* and *Sincerely, L. Cohen*/*Med hilsen, din venn*, and is therefore written. The frequent use of words such as *well*, *yes* and *and* to initiate sentences suggests an informal tone – it is a 'social' letter, not a business letter. This is, of course, a 'mode-within-a-mode', as the letter is in reality a poem, or rather, a song. It is then being spoken – or sung – as if being written. We recognise it as a song from literary devices such as rhyme, rhythm and line breaks, and, especially, the repeated chorus (*And Jane came by…*). The mode is equivalent in the translation.

Genre

The register is that of informal yet reserved and slightly bitter letter to old friend offering truce and forgiveness, realised by song. The author's intention is, put simply, to write a song about a love triangle: this is the text's purpose. The song's themes are universal, but in the translation the setting has been moved to the target-culture country and the gender of the speaker/writer has been changed to match the target-culture singer. This, along with a few other lexical and pragmatic mismatches has resulted in a slight shift in the target text register, mainly within the dimension of tenor. Many of these mismatches appear to be 'sacrifices' made by the translator in order to preserve rhythm or rhyme (and therefore 'singability') or to support the male-to-female shift. The target text genre is more or less equivalent to the source text genre, even if there is some non-equivalence on the micro-level.

3.1.2 *Famous Blue Raincoat* and the Experiential metafunction

I will now attempt to analyse Cohen's *Famous Blue Raincoat* and Rem's *Gikk Du Noen Gang Fri?* from the point of view of transitivity. This analysis will sort out the Processes, Participants and Circumstances in the two texts – who does what to whom, and under what circumstances? A more thorough discussion will follow below.

Transitivity Analysis of *Famous Blue Raincoat* and *Gikk Du Noen Gang Fri?*

[Carrier] It [Process: relational, attributive] 's [Attribute] four in the morning, the end of December

This is what Halliday and Matthiessen call a circumstantial clause (2004: 240). *Is* (or *'s*) is an attributive relational Process, and the circumstantial element expressing location in time – *four in the morning, the end of December* – is here functioning as the Attribute, describing the Carrier's (*It*) quality (although in this case, the Carrier is a dummy pronoun and not an actual Participant).

[Carrier] Det [Process: relational, attributive] er [Attribute] fire om morgenen
[Carrier] det [Process: relational, attributive] er [Attribute] sent i desember
As in the original, the circumstantial element functions as an Attribute in a relational clause; the difference being that in the translation the circumstantial element has been split into two circumstantial elements – one expressing the time of day and the other expressing time of year – each having its own Carrier and Process. I will comment the effect of this in the discussion below.

[Actor] I [Process: material] 'm writing [Beneficiary] you [Circumstance: location, time] now [Circumstance: cause, purpose] just <to see if <you're better>>
[Process: mental, perception] to see [Phenomenon] if <you're better>
[Carrier] You [Process: relational, attributive] 're [Attribute] better
I is the Actor of the material Process *[am] writing*. The Actor is "the participant who does something" (Nørgaard 2003: 30). *You* is the Beneficiary – the one who "benefits from the Material process" (Nørgaard 2003: 30). *Just to see if you're better* is a cause Circumstance expressing purpose or reason. *To see* – in this case meaning *to find* out – is also a mental Process expressing perception, making *if you're better* Phenomenon – "that which is sensed" (Nørgaard 2003: 31). *Writing* also has verbal qualities, as it is a way of saying something. But the verbal meaning is realised by a material Process. The Process in the Phenomenon, *'re*, is relational, with *you* being the Carrier and *better* the Attribute.

[Actor] Jeg [Process: material] skriver [Circumstance: cause, purpose] for <å spørre deg <hvordan du har det>>
[Process: Verbal] å spørre [Receiver] deg [Verbiage] <hvordan du har det>
[Attribute] hvordan [Carrier] du [Process: relational, attributive] har det
The original and the translation both use a material Process with verbal qualities (*am writing*/*skriver*), but the additional Process in the original line (*to see*) is mental, while the additional Process in the translation (*å spørre*) is directly verbal, and the translation then loses the more 'indirect' effect of the mental Process (*to see if you're better* expresses interest but is not an actual question).

[Carrier] New York [Process: relational, attributive] is [Attribute] cold (but) [Senser] I [Process: mental, emotion] like [Phenomenon] where I'm living
New York is the Carrier of the Attribute *cold*, making *is* an attributive relational Process. *But*

is a conjunction and has no experiential meaning. Conjunctions will be handled in the textual analysis. *I* is the Senser – "the participant who senses" (Nørgaard 2003: 31), *like* is a mental Process of emotion, and *where I'm living* is the Phenomenon.

[Carrier] Det [Process: relational, attributive] er [Attribute] vinter [Circumstance: location, place] i Oslo
(men) [Circumstance: angle, viewpoint] for meg [Process: relational, attributive] er [Carrier] det [Attribute] stedet
The original assigns a quality to New York, while the translation describes the weather/season, and reduces the city of the writer's residence from Carrier to Circumstance. I will address this further when analysing Theme. Oslo is a Carrier in the second clause (or rather *det*, but this refers to Oslo), of an Attribute that roughly means *the place to be*. But this focuses more on the writer's feelings towards Oslo, whereas the translation to a larger extent describes the writer's feelings about his living situation – which is a contrast to the implications of the addressee not being happy.

There [Process: existential] 's [Existent] music [Circumstance: location, place] on Clinton Street [Circumstance: extent, duration] all through the evening
There is an existential *there*, *'s* is the existential Process, and *music* is the Existent – "that which is said to 'be' or 'happen'" (Nørgaard 2003: 35). *On Clinton Street* is a location Circumstance of place, and *all through the evening* is an extent Circumstance of duration.

Det [Process: existential] er [Existent] musikk [Circumstance: location, place] fra kaféen i Pilestredet
The translation is also an existential clause. Apart from the obvious cultural substitution of Clinton Street for Pilestredet, the circumstantial elements are slightly different. The translation mentions a café, and excludes the original's duration circumstance.

[Senser] I [Process: mental, perception] hear [Phenomenon] that <you're building your little house deep in the desert>
[Actor] You [Process: material] 're building [Goal] your little house [Circumstance: location, place] deep in the desert
I is again the Senser of a mental Process of perception (*hear*) and the projected clause is labelled *Phenomenon.* "Perception and emotion processes involve existing phenomena ... so

even if the 'thing' is expressed as a clause it will be labelled Phenomenon" (Thompson 2004: 118). In the projected clause, *you* is Actor, *'re building* is a material Process, *your little house* is Goal – "the participant 'influenced' by the Actor's action" Nørgaard 2003: 30), and *deep in the desert* is a Circumstance of location (place).

[Senser] Jeg [Process: mental, perception] har hørt [Phenomenon] at <du flyttet til en øy ute ved kysten>
[Actor] du [Process: material] flyttet [Circumstance: location, place] til en øy ute ved kysten
The mental Process is the same (though with a shift in tense), and the place circumstance has gone through a cultural filter, but is still a metaphor for isolation. *Building* and *flyttet* are both material Processes, so they are equivalent from a transitivity point of view, although *building* implies *creation*, and the translation does not.

[Actor] You [Process: material] 're living [Circumstance: manner, means *or* cause, purpose] for nothing [Circumstance: location, time] now
You is the Actor and *'re living* is a material Process. *For nothing* is either a Circumstance of manner (means) or cause (purpose), depending on the interpretation (is his lifestyle spartan or does he have nothing to live for?). *Now* is a Circumstance of location (time).

[Process: -] Kan [Actor] du [- material] leve [Circumstance: manner, means *or* cause, purpose] for ingenting [Circumstance: location, time] nå?
With a material Process and a circumstance that is equal in ambiguity, the clause is very similar to the original in transitivity terms. It is, however, an interrogative sentence rather than a declarative one, which I will come back to in the textual analysis.

[Senser] I [Process: mental, cognition] hope <you're keeping some kind of record>
[Actor] you [Process: material] 're keeping [Scope] some kind of record
I is again the Senser, but this time the mental Process *hope* is one of cognition, and *you're keeping some kind of record* is a projected clause. *You* is Actor, *'re keeping* is a material Process, and *some kind of record* is Scope – "a nominal group which works together with the verb to express the process" (Thompson 2004: 107).

[Process: mental, cognition] Syns <du skal føre et slags regnskap>
[Actor] du [Process: material] skal føre [Scope] et slags regnskap
Jeg is the implied Senser of the mental clause. While both *syns* and *hope* are mental, and both *are keeping* and *skal føre* are material, they differ slightly in meaning, which I will discuss in the modality analysis.

(And) [Actor] Jane [Process: material] came by [Circumstance: accompaniment, comitative] with a lock of your hair
Jane is Actor, *came by* is a material Process (*come by* is a phrasal verb), and *with a lock of your hair* is a comitative accompaniment Circumstance. *And* is another conjunction, and will be discussed in the textual analysis.

(Og) [Carrier] han [Process: material] var [Circumstance: location, place] her [Circumstance, accompaniment, comitative] med en lokk av ditt hår
Var her means *visited*, so the meaning is material although it looks relational. The relational 'appearance' of the Process makes the clause feel more 'permanent' (*he was here*), while *came by* implies a very short visit.

[Sayer] She [Process, verbal] said <that you gave it to her that night that <you planned to go clear>>
[Actor] You [Process: material] gave [Goal] it [Beneficiary] to her [Circumstance: location, time] that night that <you planned to go clear>
[Senser] You [Process: mental, cognition *or* desideration] planned to [Phenomenon] go clear
She is Sayer – self-explanatory; "the participant who does the saying" (Nørgaard 2003: 33), *said* is a verbal Process, and the rest is a projected clause in which *you* is Actor, *gave* is a material Process, *it* is Goal and *to her* is Beneficiary. *That night that you planned to go clear* is a Circumstance of location in time, containing the clause *you planned to go clear*, in which *you* is Senser because *planned to* can be seen as a mental Process, expressing cognition but also desideration ("a technical term for 'wanting'" (Thompson 2004: 94)), and for now it will suffice to label the ambiguous *go clear* Phenomenon, though this phrase will receive more attention in the next line.

[Sayer] Han [Process: verbal] sa <han fikk den den natten i vår da <du trodde <du skulle gå fri>>>
[Actor] han [Process: material] fikk [Goal] den [Circumstance: location, time] den natten i vår da <du trodde <du skulle gå fri>>
[Senser] du [Process: mental, cognition] trodde <du skulle gå fri>
[Carrier] du [Process: material] skulle [Goal] gå fri
The third party is now the Actor of the Process involving the giving (although he is semantically still the receiver). This breaks the pattern of the addressee being the Actor. *Planned* is also more desiderative (or even material) than *trodde*. I have for the time being labelled *gå fri* the Goal of a material Process (*skulle*), but I will get back to this element in the analysis of the following line.

[Process: -] Did [Carrier] you [Circumstance: location, time] ever [- relational, attributive] go [Attribute] clear?
***or* [Process: -] Did [Actor] you [Circumstance: location, time] ever [- material] go [Scope] clear?**
Go clear is difficult to label, as the meaning is unclear. The most uncontroversial way to do it would be to label *you* the Carrier, *ever* a Circumstance of location (time), *did go* an attributive relational Process, and *clear* Attribute. As *go* is coupled with an adjective and not a location or manner adverbial, we can deduce that it is used to mean *turn*, and not *travel*. However, *go* can also be seen as a material Process of which *clear* is Scope, if *go clear* is an expression for something that involves as action.

[Process: -] Har [Actor] du [Circumstance: location, time] noen gang [- material] gått [Attribute] fri?
***or* [Process: -] Har [Carrier] du [Circumstance: location, time] noen gang [- relational, attributive] gått [Attribute] fri?**
***or* [Process: -] Har [Actor] du [Circumstance: location, time] noen gang [- material] gått [Scope] fri?**
One option is to treat *gå fri* as an expression in which *gå* is the Process, which we will label material because *gå* is mainly used in material settings in Norwegian, and *fri* is Scope. We can also label *fri* the Attribute of the material Process *gå.* While mainly a participant in relational clauses, "[the participant Attribute can enter] into 'material' clauses in a restricted way. In certain clauses with an 'elaborating outcome, the Attribute may be used to construe

the resultant qualitative state of the Actor or Goal after the process has been completed" (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 195). The third option is to analyse *du* as Carrier and *fri* as Attribute of the relational Process *gå.* This immediately comes off as marked in Norwegian as *gå* is not normally used to mean *turn* or *become*. I will come back to the issue of *go clear* and *gå fri* in the discussion below, as well as in the Relevance analysis.

[Circumstance: location, time] The last time <we saw you> [Carrier] you [Process: relational, attributive] looked [Circumstance: manner, degree] so much [Attribute] older
[Senser] we [Process: mental, perception] saw [Phenomenon] you
The last time we saw you is a Circumstance of location in time (in which there is a mental Process of perception, *saw*). *You* is Carrier, because *older* is an Attribute, making the Process *looked* a relational one. *So much* is a Circumstance of manner (degree).

[Carrier] Du [Process: -] så [Circumstance: manner, degree] mye [Attribute] eldre [- relational, attributive] ut [Circumstance: location, time] sist gang <vi så deg>
[Senser] vi [Process: mental, perception] så [Phenomenon] deg
This is identical to the original in terms of transitivity. The circumstantial element has been moved, but this is an issue of Theme and will be handled later.

[Carrier] Your famous blue raincoat [Process: relational, attributive] was [Attribute] torn [Circumstance: location, place] at the shoulder
Your famous blue raincoat is Carrier and *torn* is Attribute of the attributive relational Process *was.* We can also label *at the shoulder* a location Circumstance.

[Behaver] Du [Process: behavioural] kledde ikke [Range] klærne <du hadde tatt på deg>
[Actor] du [Process: material] hadde tatt på deg
This clause describes the addressee rather than the raincoat (the raincoat is taken out of the equation), and it does so with a behavioural Process rather than an attributive one. This is a rather drastic rewrite; I have already mentioned the effects of this in the discussion of Register, and it will be further elaborated upon below.

[Actor] You [Process: material] 'd been [Circumstance: location, place] to the station [Circumstance: cause, purpose] to <meet every train>
[Process: material] meet [Goal] every train
You is Actor, *'d been* is a material Process, *to the station* is a Circumstance of location (place) and *to meet every train* is a Circumstance of cause (purpose).

[Behaver] Du [Process: behavioural] sto [Circumstance: location, space] på perrongen der <hver møtte sin>
[Actor] hver [Process: material] møtte [Goal] sin
Here the Process is behavioural. The purpose Circumstance has been omitted, but *der hver møtte sin* still implies that the train station is a meeting place for lovers.

(And) [Actor] you [Process: material] came [Scope] home [Circumstance: accompaniment, comitative] without Lili Marlene
You is Actor, *came* is a material Process, *home* is a circumstantial element, but functions as Scope, and *without Lili Marlene* is a comitative accompaniment Circumstance.

(Men) [Actor] du [Process: material] gikk [Circumstance: extent, frequency] alltid [Circumstance: location, place] hjemover [Circumstance: accompaniment] uten James Dean
This is similar to the original in transitivity terms, except for the added frequency Circumstance.

(And) [Actor] you [Process: -] treated [Beneficiary] my woman [- material] to [Goal] a flake of your life
You is once again Actor, *treated to* is a material Process, *my woman* is Recipient or Beneficiary, and *a flake of your life* is Goal.

[Circumstance: location: time] Så [Process: material] tok [Actor] du [Goal] min elsker
[Actor] Du [Process: material] tok [Goal] ham [Circumstance: role, guise] for gitt
Again, the added circumstantial element alters the timeline of the events that have taken place prior to the letter being written. The first Process is still material, although it focuses on the 'stealing' from the writer rather than the treatment of the third party. The second material Process is the same Process although this time it has metaphorical meaning and focuses on

the addressee's treatment of the third party. The translation has a functional similarity (if not transitivity equivalence) to the original but is expressed in different terms.

(And) [Circumstance: location, time] when <she came back> [Carrier] she [Process: relational, attributive] was [Attribute] nobody's wife
[Actor] she [Process: material] came [Scope] back
When she came back is a Circumstance of location in time (in which *she* is Actor, *came* is a material Process and *back* is Scope), *she* is Carrier and *nobody's wife* is Attribute of the attribute relational Process *was.*

(Og) [Circumstance: location, time] da <han kom hjem> [Process: -] var [Carrier] hans liv [- relational, attributive] ikke [Attribute] mitt
[Actor] han [Process: material] kom [Scope] hjem
In terms of transitivity, it is identical to the original, but the original describes Jane's freedom while the translation expresses the writer's loss.

(Well) [Senser] I [Process: mental, perception] see [Phenomenon] you [Circumstance: location, place] there [Circumstance: accompaniment, comitative] with the rose in your teeth. (One more thin gypsy thief.)
I is Senser, *see* is a mental Process of perception, making *you* Phenomenon. *There* is a Circumstance of location (place), *with the rose* is a Circumstance of accompaniment (comitative) and *in your teeth* is a Circumstance if location (place). *One more thin gypsy thief* is a minor clause, without a Process. As it elaborates on *you*, it can be seen as part of the Phenomenon.

Å, [Senser] jeg [Process: mental, perception] ser [Phenomenon] deg [Circumstance: location, place] der [Circumstance: accompaniment, comitative] med en rose [Circumstance: location, place] i munnen
[Actor] Ei sigøynerske [Process: material] gjorde [Scope] et funn
The first part is identical to the original in as far as transitivity goes, but the second part is no longer a minor clause. The gypsy is now the Actor of a material Process. The *thief* element in the source text is here expressed by means of a Verb and a Complement (functioning as Scope as it works with the verb to convey the meaning).

(Well) [Senser] I [Process: mental, perception] see [Phenomenon] <Jane's awake>
[Carrier] Jane [Process: relational, attributive] 's [Attribute] awake
I is one again Senser, *see* is a mental Process of perception, making *Jane's awake* Phenomenon. *Jane* is Carrier, *'s* a relational Process, and *awake* is Attribute.

Vel, [Senser] jeg [Process: mental, perception] ser [Phenomenon] <han er våken her nå>
[Carrier] han [Process: relational, attributive] er [Attribute] våken [Circumstance: location, place] her [Circumstance: location, time] nå
This line is the same as the original except for the added circumstantial elements *her* and *nå.*

[Sayer] She [Process: verbal] sends [Verbiage] her regards
Since this technically means *she says hello*, we will label *she* Sayer, *sends* a verbal Process, and *her regards* Verbiage – "that which is said or signalled by the Sayer" (Nørgaard 2003: 33).

[Sayer] Han [Process: verbal] ber [Receiver] meg <hilse>
[Process: verbal] hilse
This is still a verbal clause in which the third party 'says hello' to the addressee via the writer, but the translation has included the writer in the exchange more explicitly. English does not include the middleman in the expression 'to send one's regards'. In Norwegian, this is optional. *Han hilser* would have been perfectly correct, but a few syllables too short.

(And) [Verbiage] what [Process: -] can [Sayer] I [- verbal] tell [Receiver] you, my brother, my killer
Can tell is a verbal Process, making *I* Sayer, *what* Verbiage, and *you, my brother, my killer* the Receiver of the Verbal process.

[Verbiage] Hva [Process: -] kan [Sayer] jeg [- verbal] si [Receiver] deg, min søster, min morderske?
The translation is equivalent to the translation from a transitivity point of view.

[Verbiage] What [Process: -] can [Sayer] I (possibly) [- verbal] say?
Again, *I* is Sayer and *what* is Verbiage. *Can say* is the verbal Process. *Possibly* is a Comment

Adjunct and does not have any experiential meaning. It will be discussed in the modality analysis.

[Verbiage] Hva [Process: -] kan [Sayer] jeg [- verbal] si [Receiver] deg [Circumstance: manner, means] med ord?
Still similar to the original, but the translation uses a manner circumstance expressing means where the original uses a Comment Adjunct.

[Senser] I [Process: mental, cognitive] guess <that I miss you>
[Senser] I [Process: mental, emotion] miss [Phenomenon] you
I is Senser, and *guess* is a cognitive mental Process. In the projected clause, *I* is again Senser, *miss* is an emotive mental Process and *you* is Phenomenon.

[Senser] Jeg [Process: mental, cognition] tror (nok) <jeg savner deg>
[Senser] jeg [Process: mental, emotion] savner [Phenomenon] deg
The translation is very similar in terms of transitivity. *Nok* is a modal particle and will be dealt with in the modality analysis.

[Senser] I [Process: mental, cognitive] guess <I forgive you>
[Actor] I [Process: material] forgive [Beneficiary] you
Once again, *I* is Senser and *guess* is a cognitive mental Process. The Process *forgive* in the projection is somewhat bothersome. While it does happen first and foremost in the mind, it is ultimately done *to* someone, which is why I have labelled it material – making *I* Actor and *you* Beneficiary.

[Process: mental, cognition] tror (nok) <jeg tilgir deg>
[Actor] jeg [Process: material] tilgir [Beneficiary] deg
This line also mirrors the transitivity in the original.

[Carrier] I [Process: relational, attributive] 'm [Attribute] glad <you stood in my way>
[Actor] you [Process: material] stood [Scope] in my way
I is Carrier *'m* is an attributive relational Process, and *glad* is Attribute. This type of Attribute has a function similar to the Process of a mental clause (as it describes the Carrier's feelings), and can therefore be followed by a projected clause (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 226). In

the projected clause, *you* is Actor, *stood* is a material Process, and *in my way* is Scope.

[Attribute] Glad <at du gjorde det du gjorde>
[Actor] du [Process: material] gjorde [Goal] <det du gjorde>
[Goal] det [Actor] du [Process: material] gjorde
The process types are the same as in the original, although the translation focuses more on the addressee's actions rather than the writer's lack thereof.

[Circumstance: contingency, condition] If <you ever come by here, for Jane or for me>, [Behaver] your enemy [Process: behavioural] is sleeping
[Actor] you [Circumstance: location, time] ever [Process: material] come by [Circumstance: location, place] here [Circumstance: cause, purpose] for Jane or for me
If you ever come by here for Jane or for me is a Circumstance of contingency (condition), including Actor *you*, Circumstance of location (time) *ever*, material Process *come by*, Circumstance of location (place) *here*, and Circumstance of cause (purpose) *for Jane or for me*. *Is sleeping* is a behavioural Process. *Your enemy* is the Behaver.

[Circumstance: contingency, condition] Om <du kommer tilbake>, om <du kommer forbi>: [Behaver] Din fiende [Process: behavioural] sover [Circumstance: location, time] nå
[Actor] du [Process: material] kommer [Scope] tilbake
[Actor] du [Process: material] kommer [Scope] forbi
Kommer tilbake seems to imply a return rather than a visit, but this clause is modified by the next clause where *kommer forbi* means roughly the same as *come by*. It is interesting to note that the purpose Circumstance has been omitted. The following peace offering is more powerful when the writer has made the addressee's return for Jane a possibility.

(And) [Carrier] his woman [Process: relational, attributive] is [Attribute] free
His woman is Carrier, *is* is an attribute relational Process, and *free* is Attribute.

(og) [Carrier] mannen hennes [Process: relational, attributive] er [Attribute] fri
Save for the gender shift, this is equivalent to the original.

(And thanks for) [Goal] the trouble [Actor] you [Process: material] took [Beneficiary] from her eyes

Thanks is an exclamation that offers the writer's comment on the clause. While it is certainly an important word in this text, it does not really have any experiential meaning. But we could attempt to give it experiential meaning by analysing it as a noun in the (implied) phrase "I give thanks", which would make it something like the Range in a behavioural Process – "which is not a real participant but merely adds specification to the process" (Thompson 2004: 104). *For the trouble you took from her eyes* can then be labelled Circumstance of cause (reason). If we look at the clause that *has* experiential meaning, *Took* is a material Process, making *you* Actor, *the trouble* Goal, and *from her eyes* Beneficiary. *Thanks* will be mentioned again in the modality analysis.

(Og takk for) [Goal] det mørket [Actor] du [Process: material] tok [Beneficiary] fra hans blikk

The translation is identical to the original in terms of transitivity.

[Senser] I [Process: mental, cognition] thought <it was there for good so <I never tried>>

[Carrier] it [Process: relational, attributive] was [Attribute] there for good

[Actor] I [Circumstance: extent, frequency] never [Process: material] tried

I is Senser, *thought* is a cognitive mental Process, and *it was there for good* is a projected clause with *it* as Carrier, *was* as attributive relational Process, and the circumstantial element *there for good* functioning as Attribute. *For good* is technically a circumstance expressing duration, but in this case it is part of the Attribute, because *there for good* is what the writer thought the trouble *was*, not just *there*. In the second clause, *I* is Actor, *never* is Circumstance of extent (frequency), and *tried* is a material Process.

[Goal] Det [Process: -] har [Actor] jeg [Circumstance: Extent, frequency] aldri [- material] forsøkt

[Senser] Jeg [Process: mental, cognition] trodde ikke <det gikk>

[Actor] det [Process: material] gikk

The first clause is identical to *so I never tried* in terms of transitivity. It is still different in ways that will be discussed in the Theme analysis. The translation still has the cognition

Process, but *det gikk* is material and differs from the original's relational clause in transitivity but not in function.

Discussion of transitivity in *Famous Blue Raincoat* and its Norwegian translation

You/*du* is mainly Actor of the material Processes in the text. *I*/*Jeg* is mainly Senser, and sometimes Sayer. The addressee is the one who has done things, and the writer has been affected by the addressee's actions and is now acting as observer and commenter. The only material Processes of which *I* is Actor is *am writing*, but this is closely related to a verbal Process, as what is being written is a letter (and the letter is the writer's (*I*) way of communicating with the addressee (*you*)), and *forgive*, which is closely related to a mental Process, as it is an emotional reaction. *I*/*Jeg* being mainly Senser/Sayer and *You*/*du* being mainly Actor has been preserved in the translation, although in the second line, the mental Process *to see* has been changed to the verbal Process *spørre* 'ask'. *Spørre* comes off as being more direct, because it demands an answer to a stronger degree than *to see if you're better.*

The relational clause *for meg er det stedet* only describes the writer's feelings towards the city she resides in. Whereas the emotive mental process in *I like where I'm living* more strongly conveys a state of being content. The writer is making sure to express this because it contrasts all the notions of the addressee not doing well, and emphasises the writer's weakly implied *schadenfreude*.

In the translation, the Circumstance of extent (frequency) *alltid* 'always' and the Circumstance of location (time) *så* 'then' have been added to the part about the addressee waiting in train stations. The inclusion of these circumstances, which are not found in the source text, appears to have shifted the meaning slightly, as *alltid* indicates repeated action, and *så* indicates that *du* took *min elsker* after having been to train stations rather than before.

You gave it to her and the translation *han fikk den* are both material clauses, but in the original the Actor is *you*, the addressee, while in the translation the Actor is *han*, the third party. Even though it is implied in the translation that the addressee is the giver, it is not explicit, and it does not stick to the 'theme' of the addressee being the Actor of most of the material Processes.

It's four in the morning, the end of December has been translated into *Det er fire om morgenen, det er sent i desember*. In the original, the circumstantial element expressing the time of day and the circumstantial element expressing the time of year can be combined into one circumstantial element – expressing location in time (and functioning as Attribute) – *it's four in the morning [in late] December*. The clause also has only one Carrier and one Process. In the translation, however, the clause has been split in two, with the Carrier and Process repeated, and the circumstantial element (still functioning as Attribute) being two separate ones (both expressing location in time). How does this change things? The 'meaning' hasn't changed; the fact that the letter is written at four in the morning in late December is still perfectly clear. We get an extra Participant and an extra Process, but they are repetitions and not new additions. It is common to write the date before beginning a letter. *Four in the morning, the end of December* sounds more technical – like dating a letter – than the translation. Why has the Process and the Participant been repeated in the translation? Possibly because the translator felt it suited the rhythm better. The original has the article *the*, and adding *det* (or rather *d'er*) matches the rhythm.

As previously discussed, *go clear* can have several interpretations, and is therefore problematic to both analyse and translate. Does *gå fri* allow for as many interpretations as *go clear*? And even if it does, does it allow for the same interpretations? I will come back to this in the Relevance analysis. We can for now at the very least say something about the translation's equivalence to the original in terms of transitivity. *Clear*/*fri* are both Attribute (or alternatively Scope), *ever*/*noen gang* are both Circumstances expressing location in time, and *go*/*gå* can both be interpreted as either material or relational attributive Processes (making *you*/*du* both Actor or Carrier, depending on the Process). While *gå* her appears to mean *turn* as in the original (as it is coupled with the adjective *fri* instead of an adverbial), *gå* is not traditionally used in this way in Norwegian, and the meaning of *gå* is usually material. *Gå* can be used with an adjective in some expressions, and *gå fri* is a fixed expression meaning *to be acquitted*. However, this is not what *go clear* means (although *to clear one's name* has a similar meaning), nor would it make *fri* an Attribute as it would be part of the Process. This results in a distinct markedness, as it forces a relational reading of a Norwegian Process that is traditionally material.

There are several relational Processes in the text (all attributive), describing New York, the present, the addressee, the raincoat, Jane (especially Jane's roles: She is *free*, she is *nobody's*

wife, and even *awake* can be seen as metaphorical of her freedom), and the writer's feelings. Some of these have been changed in the translation; most notably in the clause *your famous blue raincoat was torn at the shoulder.* The raincoat is not even mentioned in the target text, and instead the addressee is described using a behavioural Process (*du kledde ikke klærne*). The addressee's clothes have been reduced from (eponymous) Carrier to Range. The raincoat will be further discussed later in the chapter, especially in the Relevance section.

3.1.3 *Famous Blue Raincoat* and the Interpersonal metafunction

I will now perform an analysis of *Famous Blue Raincoat* and *Gikk Du Noen Gang Fri?* from the point of view of modality. A modality analysis will reveal the speaker's attitudes, as well as their relationship with the other participants in the communication situation.

Modality analysis of *Famous Blue Raincoat* and *Gikk Du Noen Gang Fri?*

Modal Adjuncts

The original has two Comment Adjuncts – Adjuncts that "comment on the clause as a whole rather than give circumstantial information" (Thompson 2004: 64). The first is *possibly*. The writer is finishing his letter, and is reaching his conclusion. *What can I possibly say?* is his question. In the translation, this has been replaced with the circumstantial element *med ord* (literally *with words*, i.e. *what can words express*). The comment Adjunct is gone, but the clause expresses the same meaning. The other comment Adjunct in the original text is in the final line: *Sincerely*. The song is written in the form of a letter, and *sincerely, L. Cohen* finishes it. *Sincerely* is a standard way of ending a letter, as is the translation *med hilsen*, but as I have previously discussed, *sincerely* has a deeper meaning than *med hilsen* in that it expresses the writer's sincerity.

Mood Adjuncts resemble circumstantial Adjuncts, but instead of modifying the Predicator, they "express meanings associated with tense, polarity and modality" (Thompson 2004: 64). In the chorus, the modal *ever*, signalling usuality ("how frequently it is true", Thompson 2004: 67), is literally translated into *noen gang*. In the last verse of the song, the modal *never*, signalling polarity, is literally translated into *aldri*. The original uses *ever* in the offer *if you ever come by here* – the translation does not. It does not really change the meaning, but one

could argue that the modal in the original makes it clearer that the offer will stand indefinitely. In the translation, *alltid*, signalling usuality, is included in the line about leaving the train station alone. This suggests that this is a repeated action. Along with the Adjunct *så* (here 'then') in the next line, this seems to suggest that the addressee used to unsuccessfully look for love in stations, and then took the writer's lover. Whereas in the original it appears that after the Jane ordeal, Jane and the writer meet the addressee (looking *so much older*) after he has returned from the station.

Modal commitment

Modal commitment expresses commitment to the validity of the statement. We can divide commitment into the values high, median and low (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 148). There is no modal commitment to speak of in the original, but in the Norwegian text the line *I hope you're keeping some kind of record* has been translated into *syns du skal føre et slags regnskap*. *Skal* in this context is pretty much equal to *should*. *I hope you are* has become *I think you should*. S*kal* expresses median commitment. The translated clause is more direct and commanding than the English one.

Modal responsibility

Modal responsibility is a way for the speaker to signal that what is being expressed is his or her personal opinion. This type of modality is expressed in the translation in the line *for meg er det stedet*. The original reads *I like where I'm living*, but that expresses the speaker's actual feelings more than his 'responsibility' for his feelings. *For meg* 'to me' makes it clear that the attitude about to be expressed is from the writer's viewpoint. The aforementioned line about the keeping of records contains the modal *I hope* in the source text and *[jeg] syns* 'I think' in the target text. As previously stated, *syns* in addition to the median commitment modal *skal* makes the translated clause more of a firm suggestion than the more passive *I hope*, but both *I hope* and *syns* claim modal responsibility. *Jane's awake* has been modified by the modal *I see*, and the translation follows the same formula. Towards the end, when the writer has reached his conclusion, he offers *I guess that I miss you/ I guess I forgive you*. It is perhaps difficult to admit to both missing and forgiving the receiver, and so the bold statements have both been modified by the modal *I guess*. The same effect is achieved in the target text by modifying *tror* ('believe') with the modal particle *nok*.

Appraisal

Appraisal, or evaluation, can be defined as "the indication of whether the speaker thinks that something … is good or bad" (Thompson 2004: 75). There are different types of Appraisal. **Affect** expresses the feelings of the speaker, **Judgement** focuses on the qualities of a person and **Appreciation** focuses on the qualities of a thing, action or event (Thompson 2004: 76). Examples of Appreciation are when New York is *cold* in the original, and Oslo is *stedet* (here meaning *the place to be* or *the ultimate place*) in the translation, and when the raincoat is *famous* but *torn* in the original. The translation does not describe or even mention the raincoat, nor are the addressee's clothes described beyond the fact that she did not look good in them, which can be seen as Judgement. This means that while the translator mentions how the addressee looks, the original author focuses more on describing the actual raincoat, which becomes more of a metaphor for the addressee. However, the addressee is described as looking *older* (Judgement) both in the source text and the target text. *My killer* and *min morderske* can also be labelled Judgement for *my brother* in the source text and *min søster* in the target text respectively. *Thin*, or even the entire nominal group *one more thin gypsy thief* in the original is Appraisal (Judgement) for the addressee, whereas in the translation, *ei sigøynerske gjorde et funn* focuses on the actions of the gypsy (the addressee) rather than the qualities. Affect can be found in the admission *I'm glad you stood in my way*, both in the source text (*glad*) and the target text (*glad*). I have also chosen to place *thanks* and the translated *takk* in the category of Appraisal (Affect), as it expresses the speaker's feelings towards an action. The translation has less Appreciation (or Appraisal in general) than the original, and this is particularly apparent where colourful lines such as *your famous blue raincoat was torn at the shoulder* and *one more thin gypsy thief* have become considerably blander.

3.1.4 *Famous Blue Raincoat* and the Textual metafunction

I will now proceed to analyse *Famous Blue Raincoat* and *Gikk Du Noen Gang Fri?* from the point of view of the textual metafunction. This will shed some light on how the texts are organised. I will first look Theme choice, and then Cohesion. A more thorough discussion will follow below.

Theme analysis of *Famous Blue Raincoat* and *Gikk Du Noen Gang Fri?*

The following are the most obvious or interesting mismatches in terms of Them choice:

New York	is cold
Det	er vinter i Oslo

The two Theme choices are both Subjects, but the original focuses on the city while the translation focuses on the weather/season (as *det* is a dummy subject introducing *vinter*).

You	're living for nothing now
Kan	du leve for ingenting nå?

The original is a declarative clause whereas the translation is interrogative. The declarative construction allows for *you* to be Subject and Theme. In the original, the only question the writer directly asks the addressee is the nebulous *did you ever go clear?* (Granted, *what can I tell you* and *what can I possibly say* are questions, but these are questions the writer asks himself, and which he immediately answers – *I guess that I miss you*, etc.). This lone question stands out, especially since we never do find out whether the addressee 'went clear', and this line lingers in our minds as unanswered questions are wont to do.

You	gave it
Han	fikk den

The original sticks to the theme (not Theme) of the addressee being the Actor. The translation focuses on the third party.

The last time we saw you	you looked so much older
Du	så mye eldre ut sist gang vi så deg

This time the translation focuses on the addressee, while the original places the time Adjunct in thematic position.

Your famous blue raincoat	was torn at the shoulder
Du	kledde ikke klærne du hadde tatt på deg

Again, the translation thematises the Subject and focuses on the addressee. *Your famous blue raincoat* is also a thematised Subject, but this is the part in the source text where the author indirectly describes the addressee by using his raincoat as a metaphor. This is lost in translation.

You	treated my woman to a flake of your life
Så	tok du min elsker

Back to the source text's focus on *you* as the Actor by means of an unmarked Theme choice. The translation, however, thematises the time Adjunct *så.* The biggest mismatch here lies in the anachronism, as the original never suggests that the events of this clause occurred after the evens of the previous clause (as *så* suggests) – quite the contrary.

I	never tried
Det	har jeg ikke forsøkt

Original focuses on the writer's action (or lack thereof) versus the addressee's action (this time a positive one). The translation places the Complement in thematic position and ends up focusing on the action itself.

Cohesion analysis of *Famous Blue Raincoat* and *Gikk Du Noen Gang Fri?*

Conjunction, Reference and Ellipsis

The text employs many short, informal conjunctive elements; many of the songs lines start with *and* or *well*. This gives the letter a colloquial tone (in a more formal letter

the conjunctions might have been *in addition* or *in any event*). *And* is an extending conjunction, while *well* (here 'anyway') is an elaborating conjunction (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 541, 543). These informal conjunctions also reveal that this is a poetic text that should be sung, not read. The conjunctions mostly land on the upbeats, and are thus instrumental in making the words fit the melody. *Well* is only translated into the Norwegian *vel* once (*vel jeg ser han er våken her nå*). *Well* and *vel* are 'false friends' in that they are equivalent at the word-level but *vel* (when used as an elaborating conjunction) is less colloquial in Norwegian than *well* is in English. The first *well* in the source text is translated into *å*, which is not a conjunction, but rather an exclamation or interjection. It only has a syllabic function in this line. Similarly, *og* is not always used for *and* (there is one *men*, one *så* and one omission). Perhaps the translator wished to create more lexical variation – but this results in unnecessary infidelity to the original text.

Better/*bedre* in the first verse is a contrastive reference. The same can be said for *older*/*eldre* in the second verse. In the original, the third party in the love triangle is identified as *Jane* in the chorus. Throughout the rest of the text, the pronouns *her* and *she* are anaphoric references to Jane. The original only mentions *han*. Throughout the text, the pronouns *han*, *ham* and *hans* are anaphoric references to this *han*, although who *han* is (ex-lover to both the writer and the addressee) is only implied. As is Jane, but at least she is introduced by name. In the chorus, both the original and the translation use *it*/*den* as an anaphoric reference to the lock of hair, and *that night*/*den natten (i vår)* as a cataphoric reference to *when you planned to go clear*/*da du trodde du skulle gå fri*. In the bridge, *it* in the source text (*I thought it was there for good*) is a reference to the trouble in Jane's eyes, whereas *det* in the target text (*det har jeg aldri forsøkt*) is a reference to the action of removing this 'trouble'.

Lexical cohesion

The song is in the form of a letter, and within the lexical field 'letter/correspondence' we find *writing, regards, tell you, say* and *sincerely* in the source text and *skriver*, *spørre*, *hilse*, *si deg* (x2) and *med hilsen* in the target text. Clinton Street can be found in New York, so the mention of this street is a cohesive tie. This is adapted for the

target culture as Pilestredet and Oslo in the target text. The target text creates a contrast between *vinter* and *vår*, as well as winter being superordinate to December.

As the text is a song, the first chorus is repeated (although *har du noen gang gått fri* changes to *Sincerely L.Cohen* the second time). *Go clear*/*gå fri* is also repeated, emphasising the importance of this phrasal verb: in the translation, this element is even put in the title, increasing its status even further. The conjunctions *and* and *well* are repeated in the original; these are more varied in the translation. *I guess*/*tror nok* is repeated. In the opening line, *det er* is repeated in the translation, creating two independent clauses, even though this does not happen in the original I already commented on the resulting effect of this in the experiential section. *Om du kommer* is also repeated in the translation, creating cohesion but at the expense of the elaborating *for Jane or for me* in the original. *Si deg* is repeated in the translation; the original uses the synonyms *tell you* and *say*. Both repetition and synonymy creates a cohesive tie.

If we create a lexical field called 'animosity', with words that express the writer's lingering and/or past hard feelings towards the addressee, we find the words *thief*, *killer* and *enemy* in the source text but only *morderske* and *fiende* in the target text (*thief* is somewhat made up for in the translation with the word *tok*, as in *så tok du min elsker*, but this is less severe. *Så stjal du* would have been a closer match, but that would ruin the double meaning in *du tok ham for gitt*). If we search for words and phrases describing the sad state of the addressee, we discover *deep in the desert* (metaphor for isolation), *living for nothing*, *older*, *torn* and *thin* – possibly also *better* [= the addressee has not been doing well] and *came home without Lili Marlene*. In the translation we find *øy* (metaphor for isolation; compare *desert*), *leve for ingenting*, *eldre*, *kledde ikke* – and we can similarly extend to *bedre* and *gikk alltid hjemover uten James Dean*. The only element missing a target text equivalent is *thin*, but *torn* is worse than *kledde ikke – kledde ikke* is not necessarily an indication of something unravelling, or even of anything being wrong.

Discussion of Theme and Cohesion in *Famous Blue Raincoat* and its Norwegian translation

The thematic choices and cohesive ties in the translation of *Famous Blue Raincoat* did not always correspond with those of the source text. Nonetheless, the target text utilises cohesion sufficient to create a coherent text, the function of which is still 'song about a love triangle, based upon the original lyrics but set in a slightly different environment'. Since the function of the translated song opens for a more liberal approach to 'equivalence', the textual elements need not be translated literally in order to create an adequate translation or a coherent text. But a cohesive and coherent target text will not automatically interpretatively resemble the source text in every aspect, as we shall see when applying Relevance Theory.

3.2 Systemic Functional Linguistics applied to *Folk* and the Norwegian translation

3.2.1 *Folk* from the point of view of Register and Genre

Field

The text describes a small village where everyday life carries on uneventfully; the villagers are obscured, the summer and the animals are anthropomorphised, and there are flowers growing in new grass – for Hitler. The field is equivalent in the translation.

Tenor

The writer lets 'the summer' do the talking. It speaks to no one in particular – only the reader of the text. The tone is mostly neutral as far as formality goes, except for the childish use of *doggies* instead of *dogs*. This, along with yawned, suggests that the speaker appears not to take things very seriously. Meanwhile, *making love* is a slightly formal and romanticised term for 'having sex'. Most lines are short and repetitive, and are generally lacking comment adjuncts and other 'embellishments'. Adjectives are used sparingly. The text itself does not offer much guidance as to how the reader is supposed to feel. The tenor is equivalent in the translation

Mode

The text is a poem. We can tell from the line breaks, the rhythm and the repetition, but also from the marked choices such as *doggies making love* (animals normally 'mate'), and figurative language such as *the summer yawned*. The mode is equivalent in the translation.

Genre

The register is that of a poem describing a piece of civilization in which flowers grow 'for Hitler', and the purpose is to paint a picture of something beautiful growing from an 'evil' foundation (and the disturbingly normal setting in which this can occur). We can call the genre 'Holocaust poem'. The poem is intended for adults – anyone interested in poetry – and the mention of Hitler makes it fairly easy to connect to Nazism and the Holocaust, regardless of the reader's cultural background. It is up to the reader to interpret why and how the flowers are 'for Hitler'. From the point of view of register and genre, the translation can be said to be 'equivalent'.

3.2.2 *Folk* and the Experiential metafunction

I will now perform a transitivity analysis of Cohen's *Folk* and Rem's translation in order to find out if the target text is equivalent to the source text in terms of Processes, Participants and Circumstances. I will also include a discussion.

Transitivity analysis of *Folk* and its translation

(flowers for hitler) [Behaver] the summer [Process: behavioural] yawned
(flowers all over my new grass)
or
(flowers for hitler) [Sayer] the summer [Process: verbal] yawned

The poem opens with a projected clause. The second verse is also a projected (reported) minor clause (it has no verb). *The summer* is the Participant and *yawned* is the Process. Yawning is a behavioural Process, making the summer the Behaver. In this context, the Process is also undeniably a sort of verbal Process, as the Participant communicates a message with this yawn. *The summer yawned* on its own would have been merely

behavioural, but due to the projected clauses, *yawned* in this case means something to the extent of *said lazily*, and the Process can therefore be categorized as both behavioural and verbal. *Yawned* is also verbal in that it can project. The projected clause of a verbal Process is not analysed as a participant (Thompson 2004: 102). The first verse is repeated at the end of the poem.

(blomster til hitler) [Process: behavioural] gjespet [Behaver] sommeren
(blomster overalt i det nye gresset mitt)
***or* (blomster til hitler) [Process: verbal] gjespet [Sayer] sommeren**
Identical to the original: Two projected minor clauses along with *gjespet* being a behavioural Process with verbal qualities and *sommeren* being the Behaver/Sayer.

(and) [Circumstance: location, place] here [Process: existential] is [Existent] a little village
Is is an existential Process, with *a little village* being the Existent. *Here* sort of functions as an existential *here* (like an existential *there*), but it is indeed a location Circumstance, although the location is not a geographical one: the village is here, growing with the flowers in the new grass – here, in the middle of summer. Here, and now. *Here* almost appears to be an Attribute, in which case *a little village* would have been the Carrier of a relational Process.

(og) [Circumstance: location, place] her [Process: existential] er [Existent] en liten landsby
Er is still an existential Process, with *en liten landsby* being the Existent. *Her* is like *here* in the original in that it is an existential location Circumstance that could alternatively be an Attribute in a circumstantial relational clause (*it is here*).

[Actor] they [Process: material] are painting [Goal] it [Circumstance: cause, purpose] for a holiday
Are painting is a material Process; *they* are the Actor carrying out the action; *it* (the village) is what is being painted – the Goal. *For a holiday* is a causal Circumstance, explaining the purpose (Thompson 2004: 110).

[Actor] de [Process: material] maler [Goal] den [Circumstance: location, time] nå før ferien

Maler is still a material Process, with *de* being the Actor and *den* the Goal. *Nå før ferien* is the Circumstance, but the Circumstance now appears to be more of a location Circumstance, describing the point in time at which the village is being painted, rather than explaining why it is being painted.

[Circumstance: location, place] here [Process: Existential] is [Existent] a little church
[Circumstance: location, place] here [Process: Existential] is [Existent] a school

These verses echo verse three – *is* is an existential Process, and *a little church* and *a school* serve as Existents. Again, while having existential qualities, *here* is a Circumstance, locating the church and the school within the aforementioned village.

[Circumstance: location, place] her [Process: Existential] er [Existent] en liten kirke
[Circumstance: location, place] her [Process: Existential] er [Existent] en skole

Er is existential and *en liten kirke* and *en skole* are Existents. *Her* is a location Circumstance.

[Circumstance: location, place] here [Process: Existential] are [Existent] some doggies <making love>
[Process: material] making [Scope] love
***or* [Process: behavioural] making love**
***or* [Process: material] making [Goal] love**

Again, *are* is an existential Process. *Some doggies* is the Existent. *Making love* is a subordinate clause – *[that are] making love* – consisting of a Process. This Process is a tricky one. *To make love* (when it is a euphemism for *to have sex*) is definitely a physical action, and therefore a material Process. Another way to analyse it would be to call *making* the material Process and *love* the Scope, as *love* can be seen as a type of Object that is an "extension of the verb" (Thompson 2004: 107). But it could be argued that the Process is straddling the fine line between material and behavioural. The poem describes life in a village, and it makes sense to say that this verse describes *how the animals are behaving* rather than *what they are doing*, especially when the action is in the present progressive. "Behavioural processes serve as a reminder that transitivity categories are inherently fuzzy and overlapping" (Thompson 2004: 104). We can also interpret *making love* as having a second meaning: *to create love*. In which case *making* would be the material Process and *love*

would be the Goal. The (existential) *here* once again functions as a Circumstance, placing the doggies both on the new grass and in the village.

[Circumstance: location, place] her [Process: Existential] er [Existent] noen vovvover <som elsker>
(som) [Process: material] elsker
***or* [Process: behavioural] elsker**
***or* [Process: mental] elsker**
Er is again an existential Process, with *noen vovvover* being the Existent. The Process in the subordinate clause can still be said to be somewhere in between material and behavioural. That is, as long as the meaning is 'copulating'. If the meaning is 'loving', then the Process is a mental one. The Verb phrase consist of only one word in Norwegian, and therefore it is not possible to label something Scope or Goal. *Her* is a location Circumstance.

[Carrier] the flags [Process: relational, attributive] are [Attribute] bright
[Circumstance: manner, comparison] as laundry
Are is an attributive Relational Process – the only Relational Process in the poem. *The flags* (Carrier) are described as *bright* (Attribute). *As laundry* is a Circumstance of manner (comparison).

[Behaver] flaggene [Process: behavioural] skinner [Circumstance: manner, comparison] som nyvasket tøy
Skinner is a behavioural Process. The Behaver is *flaggene*, and *som nyvasket tøy* is a comparison Circumstance.

Discussion of transitivity in *Folk* and its Norwegian translation
The original poem lacks mental Processes. Existential clauses are in the majority. There are also a few behavioural and material Processes. The original has one attributive relational Process (apart from the semi-relational *here*-verses), but this is changed to behavioural in the translation. The behavioural Process *yawned* can also, in this context, be seen as verbal, in that it can project.

With only two material processes, there are not many Actors. The Participants are usually Behavers or Existents. This gives the poem a passive feel. The summer is the closest thing to

a Sayer. The summer is not a person but can communicate a message. The summer thus sort of becomes the main character: it is she who nurtures the flowers for Hitler. They grow from her new grass – or rather, from her yawn. The material Process *are painting* have *they* as the Actor, but who *they* are, exactly, is not specified. The Actor of *making* (*love*) is technically *some doggies*, but *some doggies* is the Existent in the main clause. There is then only one Actor in the poem – *they* – and it is a vague one.

The Processes in the poem are then mostly about being (describing, or rather mentioning, the village and ordinary things that can be found in it) or doing (describing the actions or behaviours of the inhabitants) – as previously mentioned there are only two material Processes, but combined with the behavioural ones, 'doing' Processes still outnumber verbal and mental Processes. Most things in the poem are not elaborated upon. Breaking the pattern is the relational Process in verse 8, describing the flags. The flags have a quality and are not just simply existing or doing. In the translation, however, the Process becomes behavioural. *Som nyvasket tøy* is still a simile, so the flags are still being described, but it is now less clear that this is a quality possessed by the flags.

The fact that the verses initiated by *here* are existential clauses realised by a structure that appears relational gives them a distinct markedness. This effect is equivalent in the translation.

Making love in the original is quite layered in that *making* suggests the act of creating something, but from a transitivity perspective the translation becomes layered as well, because *elsker* is both a material Process and a mental Process, depending on the interpretation. It is interesting to note, though, that this extra mental 'layer' is in all likelihood more a coincidence than the result of a conscious choice made by the translator. The phrasal verb *make love* has been translated into its equivalent euphemism (which happens to be more 'mental' than the English version) rather than its word-for-word equivalent (and rightly so!).

They are painting it for a holiday and the translation *de maler den nå før ferien* appear to mean two different things. The original suggests that the village is being either refurbished or decorated for some special occasion. The translation suggests that the villagers are finishing a paint job before a vacation. This becomes quite clear when looking at the different types of

Circumstance – the cause Circumstance *for a holiday* answers the question *what for?*, while the location Circumstances *nå før ferien* answers the question *when?*

3.2.3 *Folk* and the Interpersonal metafunction

Here I will offer a brief discussion of modality in *Folk* and its Norwegian translation. As the poem is short and the modal elements are sparse, the analysis will not be extensive.

Modality analysis of *Folk* and its translation

The Adjuncts in *Folk* are mainly circumstantial, such as *for a holiday*/*nå før ferien* and *here*/*her*. There are no Comment Adjuncts that "comment on the clause as a whole" (Thompson 2004: 64). There is no modal commitment or modal responsibility. There is little to be said about modality in *Folk*. There is some modal Appraisal, but never in the category of Affect, which "focuses on the feelings of the appraiser" (Thompson 2004: 76). The adjectives all describe things (as opposed to people or events), and they are quite neutral, especially *little*/*liten*. Villages are inherently 'small', and *little village*/*liten landsby* is not so much evaluation as it is a common collocation. The church is also *small*. The grass is *new*, which serves as a metaphor for something 'growing' (or a new beginning) rather than an evaluation of the grass. In the original, *the flags* are described as *bright*, which is the closest we get to an "indication of whether the speaker thinks that something … is good or bad" (Thompson 2004: 75). In the translation, however, this has been translated into the Predicator *skinner*. The Appreciation in the translated verse is *nyvasket* – referring to the Noun *laundry* in the original. While not entirely 'equal', the *amount* of modality (or lack thereof) has been preserved in the translation. The speaker is removed and casual, and describes the village in a straight-forward manner, emphasized by the repetition. The speaker does not offer much (overt) commentary on the events and circumstances in the poem; the poem paints a picture without much colour, and the reader is expected to look past the distancing effect of the summer's yawn and read between the lines. The fact that Hitler is mentioned so casually, sandwiched between *flowers* and *summer*, is more than enough to help us as readers realise that we need to look beyond the sleepy village. However, we need Relevance Theory terminology to point out that *hitler* is a communicative clue.

3.2.4 *Folk* and the Textual metafunction

The final analysis within the field of Systemic Functional Linguistics will be of Theme and Cohesion in Cohen's *Folk* and Rem's translation of the same name. This will reveal if the translation is equivalent to the original in terms of how the text is organised and how coherent it is. A discussion will follow the analyses.

Theme analysis of *Folk* and its translation

flowers for hitler	the summer	yawned
blomster til hitler	gjespet	sommeren

In the case of quotes, both the reporting clause and the reported clause are analysed for Theme and Rheme (Thompson 2004: 161). However, in this case, the reported clause *flowers for hitler* is an exclamative minor clause (in that it does not have a Predicator), and minor clauses are not analysed for Theme and Rheme (Thompson 2004: 148). Thus the only Theme in the first verse is *the summer* (the Subject) in the original and *gjespet* (the verb) in the translation. This is the only verse in which the translation differs from the original regarding Theme choice; however, as this is due to Norwegian syntax norms, it is a 'forced choice', and not a conscious choice to focus on the yawning rather than the summer. Systemic Functional Linguistics defines Theme in accordance with English syntax. This is an example of how this theory has limitations regarding translation evaluation. The fact that the opening (and closing) phrase is a minor clause results in a sense of markedness: The reader is left with the feeling that the clause is 'missing something'.

flowers all over my new grass		
blomster overalt i det nye gresset mitt		

This is also a minor clause in both the source text and the target text, and is not analysed.

(and) here	is a little village
(og) her	er en liten landsby

And/*og* is a conjunction. If conjunctions are present in a clause, they should be in first position because their purpose is to signal how the coming clause relates to other clauses (Thompson 2004: 157), but they cannot be Theme alone as they have no experiential meaning. *Here*/*her* is then Theme, and this is a case of thematised Adjunct. This is considered marked in English, as English is an SV (Subject-Verb) language. Choosing the location Adjunct for Theme puts the focus on the location, but as the location of the village is not specified (other than perhaps *all over my new grass*), *here* in verse 3 (along with *is*) means something to the extent of *let me present to you*. Adjunct in thematic position is not as marked in Norwegian, as Norwegian is a V2 (verb second) language and is therefore more liberal in terms of which constituent precedes the verb. However, the construction *her er en liten landsby* still sounds marked, as a more colloquial way of putting it would be *her er det*, i.e. with an anticipatory Subject after the verb to introduce the new referent; a common feature of Norwegian. *Her er* means *here exists*. Her *er* seems first and foremost to convey the *here I present* meaning. This feels more marked in verses 5-7, where the location corresponding to *here*/*her* (in the village) has been established.

they	are painting it for a holiday
de	maler den nå før ferien

They/*de* is the Theme, and the Subject. This is the unmarked Theme choice for a declarative sentence (Thompson 2004: 144).

here	is a little church
her	er en liten kirke

here	is a school
her	er en skole

here	are some doggies making love
her	er noen vovvover som elsker

In these verses, the Theme is the same as in verse 3 (minus the textual element *and*/*og*), both in the source text and the target text. This creates repetition: a list of things that can be found in the village.

the flags	are bright as laundry
flaggene	skinner som nyvasket tøy

The flags/*flaggene* is Theme and Subject. As in verse 4, this is am unmarked Theme choice for a declarative clause.

Cohesion analysis of *Folk* and its translation

Conjunction, Reference and Ellipsis

And (verse 3) is a positive additive extending conjunction (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 543). It connects the clause to the previous one; however, it is slightly unclear how exactly they are linked. It appears to mean *let me paint a bigger picture*. The translation *og* is equivalent.

The demonstrative adverb *here* in verse 3 (see Thompson 2004: 182) can be interpreted as an anaphoric (pointing backwards) reference to *my new grass*, or some other, unspecified location. It also works as a cataphoric (pointing forwards) reference to *a little village*. The translation *her* is equivalent. *A little village*/*en liten landsby* is an exophoric (pointing outwards) reference to something outside the text. *Here*/*her* are also used in verse 5,6 and 7, where they are anaphoric references to *a little village*, or cataphoric references to *a little church*/*en liten kirke*, *a school*/*en skole* and *some doggies*/*noen vovvover*, respectively. The personal pronoun *it*/*den* (verse 4) refer anaphorically to the village. *They*/*de* (verse 4) is a reference, but to what? A likely inference is that it refers to the villagers, but we cannot know for sure. It looks like an

anaphoric reference to a participant that has already been mentioned, but it is in fact exophoric, as it must point to something outside the text. The fact that these (presumed) villagers are so faceless, as it were, adds to the text's reserved tone and unsettling atmosphere. *Nå* in the translation (verse 4) is a reference to the adverb *før ferien*. There is no such reference in the original. This is a mismatch. *Ferien* also seems to suggest that the reader knows which holiday is being talked about, which the original *a holiday* does not.

There is not much ellipsis to speak of. There is an implied *who are* before *making love* (verse 7). This element, the relative pronoun, cannot be excluded in Norwegian, and is present in the relative clause conjunction *som*.

Lexical cohesion

In the lexical field which we shall call 'things and beings in the village', we can name *church*, *school*, *they* (if they are indeed the villagers), *doggies*, and perhaps also *flags*. These are all present in the translation as well. We can name these items meronyms – parts of a whole – because they are parts that make up the village. In the lexical field 'everyday life', we find *church*, *school*, *painting*, *making love*, *laundry*. These can all be found in the translation. There is also lexical cohesion between *summer*, *grass* and *flowers* – and *sommer*, *gresset* and *blomster* in the translation. There is a lot of repetition, most notably the entire first verse (including the words *flowers*/*blomster*, *hitler*, *the summer*/*sommeren* and *yawned*/*gjespet*) and *here*/*her*, but also *little*/*liten* in verse 3 and 5, and *flowers*/*blomster* again in verse 2. Finally, we have the more subtle lexical field of 'making something/something being new/pretty/clean'. This includes *new grass*, *painting*, *bright* and *laundry*. These are all represented in the translation by the words *nye gresset*, *maler*, *skinner* and *nyvasket tøy*. Perhaps we could also include *church*/*kirke* and *school*/*skole* in this field, as they can be metaphors for pure souls and fit minds.

Discussion of Theme and Cohesion in *Folk* and its Norwegian translation

The fact that the translation of *Folk* is equivalent to the original in terms of Theme choice (except for the unavoidable thematised verb in the opening and closing verses) shows that the translator has respected the syntax of the English poem and recognised

the pattern achieved by consistently placing the adjunct *here* in thematic position (in the verses in which this Adjunct occurs).

All clauses are declarative – the poem asks no questions. The poem presents a scenario, and it is the reader's task to ask the questions. As the unmarked Theme choice for declarative clauses is Subject, verse 4 and verse 8 are the only unmarked clauses. That is, with the exception of *the summer yawned* (source text only), but this is not necessarily 'felt' to be the Theme as it does not actually initiate the sentence.

The fact that the translator has also kept up with the original's cohesion (except for the mismatch in the inclusion of *nå* in verse 4) shows that on a textual level, this is a clause-for-clause translation; some of the verses are also word-for-word. As I will discuss below, when applying Relevance Theory, this does not necessarily result in a target text that interpretatively resembles the source text.

The many cohesive elements in *Folk* results in a text that is – save for the first and last verses – quite coherent. The reader needs to dig a little deeper in order to relate the opening and closing verses to the rest of the poem, but the cohesive ties serve as clues. Nevertheless, the target text is as cohesive as the source text, and the target text will subsequently be as coherent as the source text.

In both the source text and the target text, *they* and *de* look like anaphoric references as they are personal pronouns, but they do not refer to anything that has been previously mentioned. *The village* has been mentioned, however, and we need to infer from this that *they*/*de* refers to the villagers. Inference is a term employed by Relevance Theory, as we will see in 3.3.

3.3 Relevance Theory applied to *Famous Blue Raincoat* and its Norwegian translation

I will now proceed to take a relevance-theoretic approach to the evaluation of Rem's translation of *Famous Blue Raincoat*. Gutt writes that the sum total of explicatures and implicatures in the source text must be matched in the target text (1991: 95). How does Rem's translation of *Famous Blue Raincoat* fare with regard to this statement?

See if you're better strongly implies that *you have not been doing well*. *Spørre deg hvordan du har det* is more neutral and explicit. *Har det* does not rhyme with *desember*. Since the translator has already chosen to abandon the rhyme in this particular case, *spørre deg om det går bedre* would have successfully preserved the implicature of the original.

As discussed in the Systemic Functional section, *cold* in the line *New York is cold* is more metaphorical than *vinter*. In this sense, the line source text carries more implicature than the line in the target text. The implicature is strong, as *New York is cold* also has explicit meaning. *Cold* can literally be applied to New York (a city can have cold weather). It is the ambiguity of *cold* (does it refer to atmosphere or temperature?) that is partially lost in translation, not a grand poetic effect as result of a more imaginative, weakly implied metaphor – something like *New York is an igloo*, where the reader would first have to infer that an igloo can be a symbol of somewhere cold as well as somewhere isolated in order to understand the metaphor (see Carston 2002a: 87-88). "Weak communication is an important vehicle for the achievements of poetic effects" (Gutt 1991: 86). Still the decreased ambiguity results in decreased interpretative resemblance.

The loneliness and isolation implicitly expressed in *deep in the desert* is adequately transferred in *en øy ute ved kysten*. The implicature of *meet every train* is 'to meet the people who are arriving by train'. But the reader of the translation still has to infer that *der hver møtte sin* means 'people met their friends and/or lovers'. The implicature of *Lili Marlene* is slightly different than that of *James Dean*, as discussed in chapter 1, but they are both implicatures, as neither the source text not the target text intends to express that the addressee literally planned to meet Lili Marlene or James Dean. The fact that they are both implicatures does not necessarily mean that they will result in the same inference. I will come back to Lili and James in chapter 4. The implicature of *you treated my woman to a flake of your life* (irony) is lost in the more explicit *du tok ham for gitt.* But the repetition of *tok* in the translation is a nice stylistic effect. The Biblical implicature of *my brother, my killer* is lost in the translation *min søster, min morderske*.

Did you ever go clear? The fact that the meaning of *go clear* is so difficult to decipher is definitely a communicative clue. This calls for special attention – conscious interpretation rather than immediate inference.

Why not *gå klar? Gå klar* may be used in Norwegian to mean 'quitting drugs' (as in English) but this is not a common collocate outside this context. *Gå klar av* can be used to mean *avoid* (*Free Online Dictionary*), but this idiomatic phrasal verb needs an object. *Gå klar* would probably not have been layered enough as it would mainly be associated with drug culture.

Neither *clear* nor *fri* are adverbials, which suggests that they are not there to modify *go* and *gå* in the way that *clearly* or *fritt* would. This again suggests that the verbs *go* and *gå* are not used to mean *travel* and *walk*, respectively, but are used more metaphorically, as in *to turn* or *to become*. *Clear* and *fri* then describe a mental or physical state. *Go* can mean *turn* or *become* in English – as in to *go crazy*. While using *go* to mean *become* is not uncommon in English, the collocation *go clear* is. And "ideally, the translation of a marked collocation will be similarly marked in the target language" (Baker 2011: 65). *Gå* is not commonly used in this way in Norwegian – *gå gal* sounds awkward and too 'foreign' – but in this translation it is, as the translator did probably not intend for it to literally denote 'walking'. This gives *gå fri* an extra layer of markedness. The poetic effect lies in the markedness and ambiguity of the term *go clear* – and this is preserved in the translation even though the translation does not necessarily interpretatively 'resemble' the original in every way. We may never know exactly what Cohen meant by *go clear*, so it will suffice to say that *gå fri* is equally *open* for interpretation even though not all alternatives for interpretation have survived the translation.

Gutt uses the phrase *yours sincerely* as an example of an expression that functions in terms of its "encyclopaedic rather than semantic purposes" (1991: 149). While the word *sincerely* literally means that the writer is sincere, when we see it at the end of a letter we do not really think of its semantic value. It is a fixed expression in a particular context. However, while this is a poem in the form of a letter, it is still a poem. The words are written to be analysed. Perhaps they should function in terms of their expressive rather than encyclopaedic purposes. *Sincerely* becomes rather ambiguous – it expresses the writer's honest sincerity while at the same time being a formal expression, suggesting distance. It is quite fitting of the letter it completes. *Med hilsen* cannot be said to be as layered.

Gutt points out that there are cases where the translator will choose to not make semantic resemblance first priority, for example in the case of rhymed poetry (1991: 129). We can see this in Rem's translation of *Famous Blue Raincoat*.

What of the aesthetic dimension? Few would argue that *your famous blue raincoat* has more aesthetic value than *du kledde ikke klærene*. But as this to a large extent concerns the notion of 'sounding pretty', a theoretical explanation of this would be vague at best. But the translation maintains the rhythm, manages to rhyme (*så* deg/*på deg*) and adds alliteration (*kledde ikke klærne*), so stylistic effects are undeniably present. What of the interpretative resemblance? *Du kledde ikke klærene* still describes the addressee's appearance in negative terms, so there is some resemblance on a very fundamental stratum. But *famous*, *blue*, *raincoat* and *torn* are all clues, whereas *du kledde ikke klærne* is quite explicit.

Et funn in the target text does not have the same negative connotations as *thief* in the source text. And as for stylistic effects, the gorgeous alliteration of *thin gypsy thief* is lost, but *gjorde et funn* matches *rose i munn* masterfully as far as rhyme and assonance go (note: the word in the target text is *munnen*, but it is pronounced *munn* in the song, which is likely to have been the translator's intention). The stylistic effect is matched in quantity if not quality.

3.4 Relevance Theory applied to *Folk* and its Norwegian translation

The final analysis is of Rem's translation of Cohen's *Folk* from the point of view of Relevance Theory. Does the total sum of explicatures and implicatures in the source text match the total sum of explicatures and implicatures in the target text, like Gutt (1991: 95) says it should? Verses 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 9 are translated word-for-word, or close to word-for-word (the deviations are mostly due to Norwegian syntax norms). The strong implicature of *hitler* will be the Holocaust in both Norwegian and English (so strong an implicature that it can be considered metonymy). The symbolic value of *flowers* and *summer* will be transferred, as will the explicit and implicit meanings readers will infer from *village*, *church* and *school*.

"Context is a crucial factor in utterance interpretation" (Pilkington 1989: 126). The brief mention of Hitler in the first verse is a communicative clue that cements the context. Without it, we would have no way of knowing it was a 'Holocaust poem', and the rest of the poem would probably not have struck the reader as unsettling.

Her er noen vovvover som elsker is also close to being a word-for-word translation of *here are some doggies making love*. *Doggies* is a clue, in that an informal form of *dog* has been chosen. An informal form of *hund* is therefore used in the target text. If the implicit meaning of *doggies* is a pet name or a child's name for a dog (*Oxford English Dictionary* online) – making the dogs sweet and friendly rather than ferocious, then *vovvover* is adequately equivalent (*Bokmålsordboka*). If, however, the implicit meaning of *doggie* is the sexual position of the same name (*Online Etymology Dictionary*) (thus serving as a crude contrast to the more romanticised *making love* and thereby putting the Hitler in one's flowers, as it were), *vovvover* is not equivalent. According to the online *Oxford English Dictionary*, *doggy* is also military slang for 'an officer's servant or assistant', which *vovvov* certainly is not. This interpretation may be far-fetched, but still interesting to note in a poem that conjures up associations to war. Nevertheless, both *doggies* and *vovvover* carry implicit meaning to a certain extent. The idiomatic *making love* has been replaced with the equivalent *elsker*. But *elsker* is only equivalent in the idiomatic sense (as in 'to have sex'). *Making love* is ambiguous in English because it also has the literal meaning of 'creating love'. Similarly, *elske* is ambiguous in Norwegian because it also has the literal meaning 'to love'. This ambiguity is weakly implied because all definitions can be found in a dictionary. However, only the meaning 'to have sex' is fully transferred.

Let us look at *they are painting it for a holiday* versus *de maler den nå før ferien*. As I have already discussed in the Systemic Functional section, translating *for* into *nå før* (as well as changing the noun from the indefinite *a holiday* to the definite *ferien*) results in a slight shift in meaning. But what are the important implicatures in this verse? The symbolic values of *painting* can be transferred to *maler*. The same is true of *holiday* and *ferien*, or at least to a certain extent (*holiday* is arguably more religious in its implicature).

As I have previously discussed in the Cohesion analysis, *they*/*de* is likely to refer to the villagers, but the reader needs to infer this as it is not made explicitly clear. The fact that *they*/*de* is an 'empty reference' (personal pronouns are traditionally used only when the we know who or what they refer to) is a clue. The reader needs to infer that the pronoun refers to the villagers that have only been indirectly introduced (*here is a little village*). The empty reference also creates a poetic effect in that these 'faceless' villagers add to the reserved atmosphere of the poem.

The flags are bright as laundry in verse 8 is ambiguous. We can infer from this either that the flags are bright or that they are not. The second interpretation – that the flags are indeed *not* bright because the laundry they are being compared to is of the dirty variety – is not *implied*. The two meanings are both explicit. "In cases of ambiguity, a surface form encodes more than one logical form" (Carston 2001: 3). Implicature involves reading between the lines. *Laundry* literally means "articles of clothing, linens, etc., that have been or are to be washed" (*dictionary.com*) and therefore explicitly expresses both *the flags are as bright as clean laundry* and *the flags are as bright as dirty laundry*. In this sense, the translation *skinner som nyvasket tøy* does not interpretatively resemble the original, because this only means *the flags are as bright as clean laundry*. Immediate inference is sufficient. However, we can infer implicit meaning from *laundry* as well, as the notion of cleaning something can be metaphorical. This implicature can still be found in the translation, as there is still 'washing' going on. The problem is, though, that in the source text, the ambiguity of *bright as laundry* gives the reader a communicative clue that he should go beyond the immediate inference and take a few seconds to consciously interpret the meaning of the clause. If the reader is not provided with this clue, as he is not to the same extent in the target text as the translator has already arrived at an interpretation, he may not pay close enough attention to notice the implicatures. Another possible clue in *bright* is the fact that it resembles the word *white*, both phonologically (it rhymes and has the same amount of syllables) and semantically (as *bright* can mean *light*). In a Holocaust poem, any association to the colour white should be taken seriously. (It should also be pointed out, again, that the house of worship mentioned in the poem, the church, is of the Christian variety.) Any connection between *skinner* and *white* is far-fetched. *Flaggene*, however, has the same semantic value as *the flags*.

Pilkington argues that a poet is ultimately trying to achieve "poetic effect", not "an interpretative puzzle" (1989: 122). But is *Folk* not an 'interpretative puzzle'? The reader infers the meaning – and effect – of *Folk* by means of working out the puzzle. The communicative clues are the corner pieces.

The biggest communicative clue of the poem is undoubtedly *hitler*. This word serves as a clue for the entire poem, not just the clauses in which it occurs. It triggers, or evokes, relevance in the other verses that would have gone unnoticed were it not for this clue. Both the explicit meaning and the implicit meaning of *hitler* (including the fact that the name is spelt with a lower-case *h*) definitely survive the translation.

4 Discussion and Evaluation of the two approaches

4.1 Evaluation of a systemic functional approach to translation

Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar is not a 'translation theory'. However, there have been systemic functional approaches to translation (e.g. House 2001; Ng 2009; Fang *et al* 2008), and Systemic Functional Grammar makes for a very useful framework for analysis.

This functional framework becomes a tool for both discovering and discussing differences (and similarities) between the source text and the target text. One example is how we can assign *gå fri* from the translation of *Famous Blue Raincoat* approximately the same amount of ambiguity as *go clear* in the original *Famous Blue Raincoat* based on the Process and Participant types, even though the actual meaning of both phrases are unclear (indeed, they *should* be unclear). And while *elsker* in the translation of *Folk* loses the element of *making*, it is still successful as being layered, in that it straddles three Process types – material, mental and behavioural. When *are bright* in *Folk* is translated as *skinner*, it becomes easier to explain exactly how they are non-equivalent when we can label *skinner* a behavioural Process and *are* a relational Process of which *bright* is Attribute. A missing, changed or added modal in the translation or a change in thematic choice can also help explain how the text has changed. Equivalence in Theme choice and cohesion (especially repetition) contribute to 'rhythmic equivalence', as it will mean that the syntax in the translation similar to the original. This is especially apparent in the translation of *Folk* where the repetition of the existential place adverbial has been preserved.

Some of the differences in the Norwegian texts are due to differences in the two languages rather than due to the translator's choices. When, for instance, the aforementioned relational Process *are bright* in *Folk* becomes the behavioural *skinner*, and similarly when the relational clause *your famous blue raincoat was torn at the shoulder* in *Famous Blue Raincoat* becomes the behavioural clause *du kledde ikke klærne*, it is not because English is a more 'descriptive' language or because Norwegian tends to prefer verbs that express behaviour. In the case of

the former, *skinnende* is possibly the Norwegian word that is closest in meaning to *bright*, at least within the context of flags, even though *skinnende* is a participle and *bright* is an adjective (the adjective *klar* is probably the Norwegian equivalent to *bright*, but this is not a common collocate of *flagg*). But as *flaggene var skinnende* is awkward, a slight rewrite was necessary. The latter is more of a dramatic rewrite, and the changes are possibly made for the purposes of preserving the metre and rhyming.

From a non-literary point of view, *du kledde ikke klærne du hadde tatt på deg* would, perhaps, according to Nord (1997) to some extent be *functionally equivalent* to *your famous blue raincoat was torn at the shoulder*. The 'message' of the addressee's appearance upon his/her last meeting with the writer is still conveyed on a very basic level. But this is a literary text. Poetry is more than its fundamental 'message', or it would not be poetry. "An ideal [literary] translation would then have the same function *and effect* as the source text" (Nord 1997: 89; *my italics*). Just because the message is preserved does not mean that the poetic effect has been preserved (even if prosodic devices such as rhyme and metre have been preserved, and one stylistic device even added: the alliteration in *kledde klærne*). I will come back to the notion of 'poetic effect' in my discussion of Relevance Theory.

"A 'good' translation is a text which is a translation (i.e. is equivalent) in respect of those linguistic features which are most valued in the given translation context", Halliday (2001: 17) suggests. This conclusion sounds very satisfying, but it is not as simple as it appears. Who decides which features are most valued? As stated above, the non-equivalence of the translation of the line *your famous blue raincoat was torn at the shoulder* is likely to be mainly for rhyming purposes (the couplet *så deg*/*på deg* possibly being the translator's only rhyming option within the context of 'the state of your clothes upon our last meeting'), and to a certain extent for rhythmic flow. Stress patterns and rhyming are features that are undeniably valued in the context of poetry translation. With this particular text being a song, these features become essential for the 'singability' of the text.

Lexicogrammar can explain why *go clear*/gå *fri* is marked. But all a transitivity analysis can really tell us is that it is ambiguous in both languages.

Rem appears to have had different priorities when translating the poem as opposed to the song. Even though, as I have pointed out in chapter 3, there are a couple of transitivity

mismatches that can result in a slight shift in meaning (*nå før ferien* and *flaggene skinner*), the poem closely resembles the original in choice of words and form, and this results in a poem that is by and large equivalent in Register and Genre. With the translated song, however, the intention is not necessarily for the target text to be as close as possible to the original, but to produce a new poetic text (or song, rather) set in a new environment, *based on* the original text. The intention is to write something that works better as a song than as a text, as Rem himself clarifies in the liner notes to *Hadde Månen En Søster* (1993). Some of the expressive meaning has then been sacrificed in order to preserve rhythm and rhyme – e.g. *your famous blue raincoat was torn at the shoulder* versus *du kledde ikke klærne du hadde tatt på deg*. As we have seen in chapter 3, while the target text has undergone some changes on the micro-level (which have had an effect on the Tenor), the Genre is still intact. The differences between the two translations are related to the distinction between covert and overt translation. A covert translation is "a type of translation where the translated text is made to appear as though it originated in the target culture" (House 2009: 116). An overt translation, on the other hand, is a translation where "the cultural features of the original text are deliberately retained" (House 2009: 118). An overt translation (need not be but) might be "presented in a bilingual edition, with a translator's preface and occasional footnotes" (Boase-Beier 2010: 28) – that is, an overt translation makes no attempt to 'hide' the fact that it is a translation. Rem's translation of *Folk* is in a book in which the source texts and target texts are presented side by side and that features a translator's preface and translator's footnotes.

House also distinguishes between a translation and a *version* (2001: 143). A covert version of an original text when the translator's intention to preserve its function results in the translator applying a cultural filter and consequently makes "changes on the situational dimensions" (House 2001: 143). This would be the case in Rem's translation of *Famous Blue Raincoat*, as the source text is set in Oslo instead of New York, and from the point of view of a woman instead of a man. The gender shift is not cultural, but it is situational. The main advantage of using cultural substitution is that "it gives the reader a concept with which he or she can identify" (Baker 2011: 29). In the case of *Gikk Du Noen Gang Fri?*, it is also a question of giving the performer of the song (a Norwegian woman) concepts with which she can identify in order to give a stronger and more personal performance.

Rem's translation of *Folk* is overt in that it is openly presented as a translation, but it can be seen as somewhat covert in that it can stand alone as a poem in the target language, and the reader need not have any knowledge of the original poem to appreciate it. There are also aspects of overtness to Rem's translation of *Famous Blue Raincoat* as it is featured on a musical album with Cohen's name in the title and translator's notes in the liner notes. We can thus see the notions of *overt* and *covert* translation as opposite ends of a scale as opposed to two absolutes.

The translation of *Folk* is not necessarily different (in terms of function and choices) from the translation of *Famous Blue Raincoat* because one is a song and one is a poem, but because the poem is closer to 'overt' on the overt-covert scale, and the poem can be seen as a translation of the original while the song can be seen as a version of the original.

House maintains that a systemic functional approach provides "one of the most fruitful basis" for analysing and evaluating both source and target texts because of its attempts to "explicitly link text and context" and "at the same time take account of the human agents involved" (House 2001: 134).

Were there any limitations to a systemic functional approach? Systemic Functional Grammar is not really concerned with implicit meaning as such. It is useful for systemically analysing the semantic and textual choices made by the translator and the effects of the translator's choices in comparison to the original author's choices and in comparison to the choices he alternatively could have made. But this framework does not provide a satisfactory tool for evaluating the aesthetic value of the translation.

As I pointed out the introduction as well as in the analysis, *Lili Marlene* does not really carry the same implicature as *James Dean*. Lili Marlene is a 'prize', or promise, at the end of an ordeal – but she is just a fantasy, and the soldier will never meet her at the station when the war is over. James Dean is just someone desirable. Granted, the addressee in the translation is no more likely to meet James Dean as the addressee in the original is to meet Lili Marlene, and in this respect they are both fantasies. Both Lili and James are metaphors for dream girl/dream boy. However, the associations to war and the light at the end of the tunnel are lost in the translation. A systemic functional analysis cannot properly highlight this non-equivalence. Lili Marlene and James Dean are not given different labels in any metafunction.

We need to describe this non-equivalence in the relevance-theoretic terms *implicature* and *inference*. The same can be said for *my brother my killer* and *min søster min morderske*. They are equal in terms of transitivity and modality, but Systemic Functional Linguistics cannot express that the Biblical allusion in the original is lost in translation.

Is 'function' (and, as a consequence, the concept of *functional equivalence*) primarily restricted to non-literary texts? No – all texts have a 'function'. And as we have seen, it is perfectly possible to describe a poetic text's Genre and Register. The notions of *covert* and *overt* and *translation* and *version* also contribute to an understanding of a text's function. But the concept of *function* becomes arguably more vague within the context of expressive texts – or *art*, to classify it as such. And as Nørgaard points out, "in a literary context, the concept of 'purpose' and 'goal' may seem a little obscure" (2003: 239).

Halliday observes that while the linguist's perspective on translation is systemic – "language as system" – the translator's perspective will be more instantial – "language as text" (2001: 14). It is important to note that the translator is very unlikely to consciously think of his choices in terms of labels and systems and metafunctions. The translation critic can therefore, for example, think of the choices in terms of Process types, and 'measure' the equivalence based on the particular Process types, but the translator critic cannot claim that the translator's intention was to preserve the 'material-ness' of a Process, or to make an existential Process more marked by turning it slightly relational.

4.2 Evaluation of a relevance-theoretic approach to translation

Like Systemic Functional Linguistics, Relevance Theory is not a translation theory, but a pragmatic approach to communication. This relevance-theoretic approach proved quite effective for pointing out essential communicative clues. "Responses to poetry will never be absolutely identical", Pilkington writes, "but responses to poems can be more or less successful" (1989: 131). This also applies to responses to translations of poems.

Gutt claims that the translation need only "*purport* to interpretatively resemble the original completely" (1991: 163; *my italics*). Yet he writes that "the sum total of explicatures and

implicatures in the source text must be matched in the target text" (Gutt: 1991: 95) for the target text to interpretatively resemble the source text. This is somewhat contradictory, because the translator may *intend* for *du kledde ikke klærne* to interpretatively resemble *your famous blue raincoat was torn at the shoulder*, but the sum total of implicature in *kledde ikke klærne* does not match the implicature in *famous*, *blue*, *raincoat*, and *torn*. The translator's intention is not enough, as implicature – and interpretative resemblance – happens to a large extent in the mind of the reader.

Rem intends for *Folk* to interpretatively resemble the original both on a semantic and pragmatic level. On the semantic level, there are a few mismatches, the most crucial being that *nyvasket tøy* is not ambiguous like *laundry*. But the most important word and vital communicative clue in the poem is *hitler* – the implicature in this word will inevitably influence the reader's reading of the whole poem – and this is equivalent in the target text. This word is thus vital for both semantic and pragmatic equivalence.

Rem intends for *Gikk Du Noen Gang Fri?* to resemble *Famous Blue Raincoat* on a pragmatic level but not on a semantic level. Semantic resemblance has seemingly not had first priority, and has often been sacrificed, either to accommodate the shift in gender and location or to preserve rhyme and rhythm. If we view the target at the 'pragmatic macro-level' – that is, the 'message' of the text as a whole, then it largely resembles the source text in that it is still a song in the form of a letter, in the aftermath of a love triangle, in which the writer expresses bitterness but also forgiveness. If we look at the 'pragmatic micro-level' – that is, the 'message' in the individual clauses, then some target text clauses resemble the source text (for example *thanks for the trouble you took from her eyes*/*takk for det mørket du tok fra hans blikk*) in terms of explicature and implicature, while others do not (for example *your famous blue raincoat was torn at the shoulder*/*du kledde ikke klærne du hadde tatt på deg*). *Gå fri* and *go clear* are not necessarily equivalent in all the different ways in which they may be interpreted, but they are both ambiguous and marked – and thus communicative clues. If we consider the stylistic mezzo-level, we can again use the infamous example of the famous raincoat as an example of non-equivalence regarding poetic effect.

Were there any limitations to the relevance-theoretic approach? Implicature in poetry is to a large extent tied up in the use of metaphor and semantic ambiguity. It is therefore difficult to 'measure' the amount of implicature in a literary text. How do we 'count' the implicatures

and explicatures in something like *here are some doggies making love*, and *her er noen vovvover som elsker*? In this sense, Relevance Theory is limited when applied to translation evaluation. It does not provide a tool for systemically organising and classifying choices in the same way that Systemic Functional Grammar does.

Thorsell (1998) challenges the notion of inference in evaluations of literary translation, as connotations are subjective. The idea that "just about anything the reader might think of or fuzzily imagine is valid" might be acceptable in poetry analysis, she writes, but for translation criticism, a system "that allows us to determine whether inference-triggers have been preserved" is needed (Thorsell 1998: 31).

How did Relevance Theory complement the systemic functional approach? Steiner mentions a stylistic mezzo-level (2005: 490), but the notion of 'style' is normally only indirectly referred to in Systemic Functional Linguistics as 'choice' – that is, "the ways in which [meanings] are expressed" (Thompson 2004: 6). *How* the writer chooses to express a message is undeniably related to the *style* of the message. Relevance Theory relates these choices to cognitive and poetic effects. Relevance Theory is then able to take account of the poetic value of the text, which a systemic functional approach cannot. This is especially essential when evaluating literary translation.

Systemic Functional Linguistics can map out the translator's choices, which in turn can say something about the target text's Register and Genre – and functional equivalence to the source text. Relevance Theory provides a vocabulary for describing the interpretative and poetic effects of these choices. We can use Systemic Functional Linguistics to point of that the 'empty' reference in *Folk* (*they*) is marked, and we can then bring in Relevance Theory to explain that this is a communicative clue. Systemic Functional Linguistics can detect that the modality in *sincerely* trumps that of *med hilsen*, but we need Relevance Theory to describe the ambiguity of the term. We can use Systemic Functional Linguistics to point out that *du kledde ikke klærne du hadde tatt på deg* is a behavioural clause whereas *your famous blue raincoat was torn at the shoulder* is a relational clause (and therefor more descriptive and as a consequence of this more expressive), and then we can apply relevance-theoretic terms to explain that the higher amount of implicature in the original will result in a higher degree of poetic effect. Relevance Theory can also help identify the fact that the raincoat is used as a metaphor for the person as a clue. *Blue* (sad) and *raincoat* (shelter) as well as *torn* all have

metaphorical meaning in their own right. Metaphors as such are not particularly dealt with in Systemic Functional Grammar. In the translation, the addressee's clothes do not suit her – but this is in the eyes of the beholder and therefore just the writer's personal opinion. The fact that the addressee's coat is falling apart is for the whole world to witness. This is not particularly interesting unless the reader is able to infer that the raincoat is a metaphor for the person. Systemic Functional Grammar can classify the coat, but not the person, as a Carrier of the Attribute *torn*.

5 Conclusion

5.1 Summary

I have now attempted to apply Systemic Functional Linguistics and Relevance Theory to the evaluation of two of Håvard Rem's translations of Leonard Cohen's poetic texts. I adopted a systemic functional approach and a relevance-theoretic approach to literary translation in order to test the applicability of both but also to find out if the two approaches could complement each other.

5.1.1 Applicability

Systemic Functional Linguistic has three different approaches for classifying the different constituents in a sentence. It can therefore also describe the non-equivalence in functional terms. A change in syntax can be 'non-equivalence in thematic choice', an added *skal* in the target text can be 'non-equivalence in modal commitment', and *flaggene skinner* is 'non-equivalence in Process type'. The labels we are able to apply to the different constituents (and cases of non-equivalence) help us gain an understanding of the translator's choices.

A text's cognitive effect is an individual experience, but as Pilkington points out, responses to texts can be "more or less successful" (1989: 131). Relevance Theory proved to be a useful tool for determining if the translated texts triggered 'successful' responses – that is, if they contained the communicative clues needed for successful interpretation. The approach allows the translation evaluator to point to cases where the translator's choices may result in different readings (inferences). However, Gutt writes that "the total sum of implicatures and explicatures must be matched" in the translation (1991: 95), but this makes it sound easier than it actually is to catalogue all the explicatures and implicatures.

5.1.2 Similarities

Gutt writes that "we are not usually aware of the communicative clues provided by the semantic representation of an utterance, but only of its interpretation as a whole" (1991: 131). This suggests that the reader's approach to interpretation is top-down rather than bottom-up. Functionalists Matthiessen (2001: 115) and Nord (1997: 68) also believe that the act of

translation should be top-down rather than bottom-up. Functionalism then values a pragmatic approach to translation, which agrees with Relevance Theory's pragmatic idea of cognitive effect. By the same token, Boase-Beier thinks a literary translation should focus on style before content (2004: 285).

The two theories often explain the same phenomena in different terms. What might be called a 'marked choice' in Systemic Functional Linguistics is a 'communicative clue' in Relevance Theory. A systemic functional vocabulary rarely includes 'style', but the approach is concerned with *how* the speaker or writer chooses to express something depending on context – and this is very much related to style. Language users "respond above all to the meanings that are expressed and the ways in which those meanings are expressed" (Thompson 2004: 6). *The way a meaning is expressed* includes *the style in which it is expressed*. This is also related to poetic effect. Systemic Functional Linguistics is not concerned with implicature *per se*, but an author's – and a translator's – choice can trigger particular inferences in particular contexts and can therefore be an implicature.

Boase-Beier discusses stylistic devices, "elements in the text which are unusual [or] striking" (2004: 278). These stylistic devices – being unusual or striking – are communicative clues. Systemic Functional Grammar is also concerned with communicative clues like these, but they are not referred to as 'stylistic devices' – rather (for example) 'marked Theme choice' or 'lexical cohesion'. And, unconscious or not, style represents the author's choices (Boase-Beier 2010: 53).

5.1.3 Poem versus song

Style and choice is related to the text's function. The translator may make different choices depending on the function of the particular text. In this thesis, I wanted to find out if Systemic Functional Linguistics and Relevance Theory could shed some light on the differences between Rem's translation of a song and Rem's translation of a poem.

The translator intends for both the song and the poem to interpretatively resemble the source texts on a pragmatic level, but it appears that he has chosen to only stay faithful to semantic resemblance in the case of the poem. The song rhymes, but the poem does not. This makes it easier to stay faithful to the original author's lexical choices. "Rhyme imposes a constraint upon the writer, a constraint which

bears most heavily on the essential feature of the translator's art, his choice of words. It is scarcely possible to find a rhymed translation of a lyric which does not contain evidence of this as shown either by the omission of something that the original author wrote, or the inclusion of something that he did not" (Savory 1957: 85; cited in Gutt 1991: 130). However, much of the non-equivalence in the translated song was rooted in the fact that it is a covert *version*. The translated poem, on the other hand, is not a version, and while it has value as an independent target language text, it is closer than the translated song to overt on the overt-covert scale.

5.1.4 Combining the two approaches

The relevance-theoretic approach was somewhat limited in that cognitive effects are individual – especially in literary texts where the individual reader may infer different things from semantic ambiguity – and the notion of 'interpretative resemblance' cannot be easily 'measured'. Gutt (1991: 95) writes that the translation is 'equivalent' if a target text has the same amount of implicature and explicature – but how does one count implicature in a poetic text? If every word is carefully chosen (which they may not be but we as readers must expect them to), does not 'every' word carry implicature? Systemic Functional Grammar provided tools for labelling the translator's choices and thus for 'measuring' the equivalence in an organised and systemic manner, which Relevance Theory did not. However, while Systemic Functional Linguistics is useful for labelling, counting and juxtaposing, Relevance Theory is able to account for figurative language and aesthetic value in ways which the systemic functional approach cannot.

Therefore, both approaches had limitations for dealing with equivalence literary translation ('equivalence' in literary translation is, at best, an approximate notion in general), but the two approaches appeared to fill each other's gaps in vital ways.

5.2 Suggestions for future research

Suggestions for further research would be to analyse translations of the same text by different translators. The different source texts would, in theory, have the same *function*, and it would be interesting to see if the translators had realised this function with the same choices.

Comparative studies of different translations of the same text from the point of view of Systemic Functional Grammar has been done before; e.g. Fang *et al* 2008 and Ng 2009, but systemic functional approaches in combination with a relevance-theoretic approach are harder to come by. Rem is not the only translator who has tackled Cohen's *Famous Blue Raincoat* – it would be interesting to compare Rem's version to translations of the same song in other target languages than Norwegian. Have they been through a 'cultural filter' as well? How did they approach the question *did you ever go clear*? Have they at the very least kept the raincoat?

In this thesis, a systemic functional approach to translation evaluation has been complemented by Relevance Theory. A future study might combine Systemic Functional Linguistics with a different approach to evaluation, such as Koller's hierarchy of equivalence (see Munday 2008: 46-48). Combining Koller's hierarchy of equivalence with Systemic Functional Grammar would be combining a linguistic approach with a translation approach.

References

Baker, M. 2011 (2nd edition). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. Oxon & New York: Routledge.

Bellos, D. 2011. *Is That a Fish in Your Ear? The Amazing Adventure of Translation*. London: Penguin.

Boase-Beier, J. 'Saying what Someone Else Meant: Style, Relevance and Translation'. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 14(2) (2004): 276-287.

Boase-Beier, J. 2010. *Stylistic Approaches to Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Bokmålsordboka: http://www.nob-ordbok.uio.no/perl/ordbok.cgi?OPP=&bokmaal=+&ordbok=bokmaal [Accessed 3 May 2013]

Carston, R. 'Relevance Theory and the Saying/Implicating Distinction'. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 13 (2001): 1-34.

Carston, R. 'Metaphor, Ad Hoc Concepts and Word Meaning – More Questions than Answers'. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 14 (2002a): 83-105.

Carston, R. 2002b. *Thoughts and Utterances: The Pragmatics of Explicit Communication*. Malden, MA, Oxford, Victoria, and Berlin: Blackwell Publishing

Church of Scientology International: *What is Scientology: Scientology glossary of terms*: http://www.whatisscientology.org/html/Part14/Chp50/pg1019-a.html [Accessed December 8 2012]

Cohen, L. 1964. *Flowers for Hitler.* Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.

Cohen, L. 1966a. *Beautiful Losers*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.

Cohen, L. 1966b. *Parasites of Heaven*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.

Cohen, L. 1972. *Yndlingsleken*. Oslo: Tiden.

Cohen, L. 1973. *Skjønne Tapere*. Oslo: Tiden.

Cohen, L. 1984. *Book of Mercy*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.

Cohen, L. 1989. *Kjærlighet og hat: Utvalgte dikt.* Oslo: Cappelen.

Cohen, L. 1993. *Stranger Music: Selected Poems and Songs*. London: Jonathan Cape Random House.

Cohen, L. 2006a. *Book of Longing*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.

Cohen, L. 2006b. *Lengselens bok*. Oslo: Tiden.

Cohen, L. 2007. *Let Us Compare Mythologies*. NY, New York: Harper Collins.

Cohen, L. 2009. *The Favourite Game*. London: Blue Door.

Devlin, J. 1996. *In Every Style of Fashion: The Works of Leonard Cohen*. London: Omnibus Press.

Djwa, S. 'Leonard Cohen: Black Romantic'. *Canadian Literature* 34 (1967): 32-42.

Dictionary.com: http://dictionary.com [Accessed 24 January 2013]

Fang, J, Zhongwei Song and Canzhong Wu. 'What may be Hidden behind a Translator's Choices: A Comparative Analysis of two Translations of *The Art of War*'. Nina Nørgaard (ed.) *Systemic Functional Linguistics in Use. Odense Working Papers in Language and Communication* 29 (2008): 283-306.

Guijarro, J.L. 'The Possible Place of *Relevance Theory* in a Cognitive Explanation of Literature'. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses* 11 (1998): 117-137

Gutt, E. 1991. *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hadde Månen en Søster: Cohen på norsk. 1993. Oslo: Kirkelig Kulturverksted. (CD)

Halliday, M. A. K. 2001. 'Towards a theory of good translation' in E. Steiner & C. Yallop (Eds.) *Exploring Translation and Multilingual Text Production : beyond content*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter: 13-18.

Halliday, M. A. K. and Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (3rd edition). London: Arnold

Honig, E. 1985. *The Poet's Other Voice: Conversations on Literary Translation*. Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press.

House, J. 2001. 'How do we know when a translation is good?' in E. Steiner & C. Yallop (Eds.) *Beyond Content: Exploring Translation and Multilingual Text Production*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter: 127-160.

House, J. 2009. *Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jin, Di. 2003. *Literary Translation: Quest for Artistic Integrity*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Lennard, J. 1996. *The Poetry Handbook: A Guide to Reading Poetry for Pleasure and Practical Criticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lindforss, P. 2007. *Mannen som förstörde mitt liv - En bok om Leonard Cohen*. Lund: Ellerströms.

Matthiessen, C. 'The environments of translation' in C. Yallop & E. Steiner (Eds.). 2001. *Beyond Content: Exploring Translation and Multilingual Text*. Berlin: de Gruyter: 41-124.

Munday, J. 2008 (2nd edition). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and applications.* Oxon and New York: Routledge.

Nadel, I. 1994. *Leonard Cohen: A Life in Art*. Toronto: ECW Press.

Ng, Y. L. E. 2009. *A Systemic Approach to Translating Style: A Comparative Study of Four Chinese Translations of Hemingway's* The Old Man and the Sea. PhD. University College London.

Nord, C. 1997. *Translation as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Norwegian Dictionary, Free Online Dictionary: http://no.thefreedictionary.com [Accessed 2 May 2013]

Nørgaard, N. 2003. *Systemic Functional Linguistics and Literary Analysis: A Hallidayan Approach to Joyce A Joycean Approach to Halliday*. Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark.

Online Etymology Dictionary: www.etymonline.com [Accessed 2 May 2013]

Oxford English Dictionary: www.oed.com [Accessed 2 May 2013]

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (7th ed.) 2005. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pilkington, A. 'Poetic effects: A relevance perspective'. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 1 (1989): 119-134.

Pinker, S. 2008. *The Stuff of Thought: Language as a Window into Human Nature*. London: Penguin.

Raffel, B. 1988. *The Art of Translating Poetry*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Ratcliff, Maurice. 1999. *The Complete Guide to the Music of Leonard Cohen*. London: Omnibus Press.

Rem, H. 1990. *Den Femfotete Kamel: Artikler om poesi*. Oslo: Cappelen.

Rem, H. 1996. *Taksameteret Går: Utvalgte dikt 1977-1996*. Trondheim: Cappelen.

Rem, H. 2012. *30-40-50*. Oslo: Schibsted.

Sperber, D. 'How Do We Communicate?' In John Brockman & Katinka Matson (eds). 1995. *How Things Are: A Science Toolkit for the Mind*. New York: Morrow. 191-199.

Sperber, D. and Deirdre Wilson. 1986. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Steiner, E. 'Halliday and Translation Theory: Enhancing the Options, Broadening the Range and Keeping the Ground'. In Hasan, R., Christian Matthiessen & Jonathan W. Weber (eds.) 2005. *Continuing Discourse on Language: A Functional Perspective* (Volume 1). London and Oakville: Equinox.

Stor Engelsk-Norsk Ordbok, ordnett: www.ordnett.no [Accessed 13 January 2013]

Stor Norsk-Engelsk Ordbok: www.ordnett.no [Accessed 13 January 2013]

Thesaurus.com: http://thesaurus.com [Accessed 13 January 2013]

Thompson, G. 2004 (2nd edition). *Introducing Functional Grammar*. London: Hodder Education.

Thorsell, M. D. 'Relevance and the Translation of Poetry'. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses* 11 (1998): 23-32.

Volkmann, L. '"Flowers for Hitler": Leonard Cohen's Holocaust Poetry in the Context of Jewish and Jewish-Canadian Literature'. In Antor *et al* (eds.). 2003. *Refractions of Germany in Canadian Literature and Culture*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Wynands, S. 'The Representation of the Holocaust in Flowers for Hitler'. *Essays on Canadian Writing*. 1999 (69): 198-209.

Appendix 1

Source text 1: ***Famous Blue Raincoat***

(Cohen 1993: 153)

It's four in the morning, the end of December
I'm writing you now just to see if you're better
New York is cold, but I like where I'm living
There's music on Clinton Street all through the evening
I hear that you're building your little house deep in the desert
You're living for nothing now, I hope you're keeping some kind of record

And Jane came by with a lock of your hair
She said that you gave it to her
That night that you planned to go clear
Did you ever go clear?

The last time we saw you you looked so much older
Your famous blue raincoat was torn at the shoulder
You'd been to the station to meet every train
And you came home without Lili Marlene
And you treated my woman to a flake of your life
And when she came back she was nobody's wife

Well I see you there with the rose in your teeth
One more thin gypsy thief

Well I see Jane's awake
She sends her regards

And what can I tell you, my brother, my killer
What can I possibly say?
I guess that I miss you, I guess I forgive you
I'm glad you stood in my way
If you ever come by here, for Jane or for me
Your enemy is sleeping, and his woman is free

And thanks for the trouble you took from her eyes
I thought it was there for good so I never tried

And Jane came by with a lock of your hair
She said that you gave it to her
That night that you planned to go clear

Sincerely, L. Cohen

Appendix 2

Target text 1: ***Gikk Du Noen Gang Fri?***

(*Hadde Månen en Søster* 1993)

Det er fire om morgenen, det er sent i desember.
Jeg skriver for å spørre deg hvordan du har det.
Det er vinter i Oslo, men for meg er det stedet.
Det er musikk fra kaféen i Pilestredet.
Jeg har hørt at du flyttet til en øy ute ved kysten.
Kan du leve for ingenting nå?
Syns du skal føre et slags regnskap.

Og han var her med en lokk av ditt hår.
Han sa han fikk den den natten i vår,
da du trodde du skulle gå fri.
Har du noen gang gått fri?

Du så mye eldre ut sist gang vi så deg.
Du kledde ikke klærne du hadde tatt på deg.
Du sto på perrongen - der hver møtte sin,
men du gikk alltid hjemover uten James Dean.
Så tok du min elsker, du tok ham for gitt.
Og da han kom hjem, var hans liv ikke mitt.

Å, jeg ser deg der, med en rose i munnen.
Ei sigøynerske gjorde et funn.

Vel, jeg ser han er våken her nå.
Han ber meg hilse.

Hva kan jeg si deg, min søster, min morderske?
Hva kan jeg si deg med ord?
Jeg tror nok jeg savner deg, tror nok jeg tilgir deg,
glad at du gjorde det du gjorde.
Om du kommer tilbake, om du kommer forbi:
Din fiende sover nå,
og mannen hennes er fri.

Og takk for det mørket du tok fra hans blikk.
Det har jeg aldri forsøkt.
Jeg trodde ikke det gikk.

Og han var her med en lokk av ditt hår.
Han sa han fikk den den natten i vår,
da du trodde du skulle gå fri.

Med hilsen din venn.

Appendix 3

Source text 2: *Folk*

(Cohen 1989: 54)

1 flowers for hitler the summer yawned

2 flowers all over my new grass

3 and here is a little village

4 they are painting it for a holiday

5 here is a little church

6 here is a school

7 here are some doggies making love

8 the flags are bright as laundry

9 flowers for hitler the summer yawned

Appendix 4

Target text 2: *Folk*

(Cohen 1989: 54)

1 blomster til hitler gjespet sommeren

2 blomster overalt i det nye gresset mitt

3 og her er en liten landsby

4 de maler den nå før ferien

5 her er en liten kirke

6 her er en skole

7 her er noen vovvover som elsker

8 flaggene skinner som nyvasket tøy

9 blomster til hitler gjespet sommeren