



Universiteit  
Leiden

## **Oi Geordie, wanna see something?**

The Role of Foreignization and Domestication  
in the Translatability of Culture, Class, and Dialect in *Billy Elliot*

MA Thesis

R.H. van Hofwegen

s1154974

r.h.van.hofwegen@umail.leidenuniv.nl

[rosalievanhofwegen@gmail.com]

June 26 2017

Faculty of Humanities

Leiden University Centre for Linguistics

MA Linguistics

Translation in Theory and Practice

Supervisor: Drs. K.L. Zeven

Second reader: Dr. A.G. Dorst

“What if life were more like theater? Wouldn’t it be grand?” – Neil Patrick Harris

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1. FOREIGNIZATION AND DOMESTICATION	10
2.1.1. DEFINING THE CONCEPTS	10
2.1.2. EVALUATIONS AND CRITIQUES	12
2.1.3. VARIATIONS ON THE THEME	14
2.1.4. RELEVANCY	15
2.2. DESCRIPTIVE TRANSLATION STUDIES	16
2.2.1. DTS: ORIGIN, EXPLANATION, AND ELABORATION	16
2.2.2. MOTIVES FOR THE USE OF DTS	19
2.2.3. DTS, THE MANIPULATION SCHOOL AND BEYOND	20
2.3. THE ROLES OF TRANSLATABILITY	22
2.3.1. TRANSLATABILITY – THE IDEA	22
2.3.2. LAWS OF TRANSLATABILITY	24
2.3.3. LIMITS OF TRANSLATABILITY	26
2.3.4. LINGUISTIC TRANSLATABILITY: THE RELATION BETWEEN ENGLISH AND DUTCH	27
2.3.5. THE TRANSLATABILITY OF MUSICALS, OR THEATER MORE GENERALLY	29
<b>3. METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>31</b>
3.1. RESEARCH QUESTION AND HYPOTHESES	31
3.2. THE METHOD	31
3.2.1. THE ANALYSIS	32
3.2.2. THE CASE STUDY MATERIAL	33
3.3. INFLUENTIAL FACTORS	33
3.3.1. TOURY’S NORMS	33
3.3.2. THE TRANSLATION OF SONGS	34
3.4. DRAWBACKS AND SHORTCOMINGS	36
3.5. SETTING THE SCENE: <i>BILLY ELLIOT</i>	36
<b>4. <i>BILLY ELLIOT</i>: THE ANALYSIS</b>	<b>39</b>
4.1. THE TRANSLATION OF CULTURE	39

<b>4.2. THE TRANSLATION OF CLASS (AND SWEARING)</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>4.3. THE TRANSLATION OF DIALECT</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>4.3.1. THE DIALECT IN THE ORIGINAL BILLY ELLIOT</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>4.3.2. THE DIALECT IN THE DUTCH TRANSLATION OF BILLY ELLIOT</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>4.3.3. FROM SOURCE DIALECT TO TARGET DIALECT: A COMPARISON</b>	<b>54</b>
<b><u>5. DISCUSSION</u></b>	<b><u>56</u></b>
<b>5.1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>5.2. MAIN FINDINGS AND COMPARISON WITH EARLIER STUDIES</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>5.2.1. THE TRANSLATION OF CULTURE</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>5.2.2. THE TRANSLATION OF CLASS (AND SWEARING)</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>5.2.3. THE TRANSLATION OF DIALECT</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>5.3. ANSWERING THE RESEARCH QUESTION</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>5.4. LIMITATIONS, SHORTCOMINGS, AND FURTHER RESEARCH</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>5.5. CONCLUSION</b>	<b>62</b>
<b><u>REFERENCES</u></b>	<b><u>64</u></b>

## Abstract

Despite the fact that in our day and age in which downloading movies, streaming Netflix, and playing online games have become a mainstream source of entertainment for many, a vast audience still knows how to make their way to the theater. In addition to the grand Broadway showstoppers, there are a number of musicals that bring an additional set of features to the stage and provide the audience with an insight into the cultural, historical, political or societal background against which these stories are set. England-based *Billy Elliot* incorporates ‘songs in community centres, village halls, and pubs, [set] during the 1970s and early 1980s with the aim of exposing the inequalities of British Society from a Marxist perspective’ (Gordon, 2016, p. 426). Through the use of Venuti’s dichotomous notions of foreignization and domestication, this thesis attempted to find whether these cultural-historical musicals allow for translatability and what role his notions play in the process. Set within the framework of a target text-oriented DTS-based comparative analysis, the areas of culture, class, and dialect are examined which play a significant role in *Billy Elliot* and many other cultural-historical musicals. While other studies on foreignization and domestication have primarily found a preference for domestication (McKelvey, 2001; Xu & Tian, 2013; Yılmaz-Gümüş, 2012), this three-fold study rather found an overall compensating strategy in which culture and class received a more domesticating approach while the dialect was approached through foreignization – a compromise in order to chiefly retain the musical’s source culture and simultaneously educate and entertain the target culture’s audience.

## 1. Introduction

Storytelling, dance, music. These three primary cultural elements together comprise one of the most popular forms of theatrical entertainment. Musicals bring together ‘the most basic of our human actions’ and, if composed exceptionally well, can make you experience “stage magic” – ‘the charisma that lifts it above all the others and makes it transcendent’ (Leon, 2010, p. 6; Leon, p. 7). Blending elements from French ballet, acrobatics, and dramatic interludes, the first musical comedy premiered in 1866 in New York, after which the capital city of musicals changed frequently over time; from London and Paris in the early 1900s to Vienna later on and, triggered by a thorough dislike for any German-language show during and following the Great War, finally settling at today’s heart of musical theater: Broadway (“Musical,” n.d.; “musical theatre,” Chambers, 2002). Even in the earlier days, Europe already ‘took the dance music elements of the new-style American show song and fabricated their own up-to-date musicals, in which the rhythms of the New World were blended with more traditional local elements’ (Chambers, 2002), demonstrating that they were not afraid to place their own cultural stamp on this theater form. While the majority of musicals is solely produced for entertaining purposes, there are some that bring a deeper meaning on stage by incorporating, for example, cultural, political, and dialectal aspects. In this category, musicals such as *Les Misérables*, *Miss Saigon*, *West Side Story*, and *Dutch Soldier of Orange* are found. Though many musicals from Broadway have been translated into many languages, the question remains whether these culturally and historically “literate” musicals can at all be translated into a target language (henceforth: TL) and target culture (henceforth: TC) *properly* as such that the cultural, historical and/or political subtleties stay intact while the stories are still able to engage the “foreign” audience.

*Billy Elliot*, based on the earlier 2000 movie version, might be one of the strongest examples in this category. While the story was originally not even intended for stage, it has run for eleven years in the United Kingdom, undeniably proving its popularity on Anglo-Saxon soil. However, when *Billy Elliot* was translated and brought to different theaters in non-English-speaking countries, the expected impact failed to occur: while it has run for a short period in the Netherlands, Brazil, and South-Korea, the reception here was considerably different (Telegraph Reporters, 2015). Similar trends are found for other cultural-historical musicals; *Les Misérables*, *Soldier of Orange*, and *West Side Story* never achieved or are not expected to achieve the same effect in other countries as in their country of origin (“Les Misérables (comédie musicale),” n.d.; Bradner, 2016; “West Side Story,” n.d.; Gordon & Jubin, 2016, p. 12).

This thesis seeks to explore the influence of Lawrence Venuti's notions of *foreignization* and *domestication* on the translation processes of these cultural-historical musicals. Through examining predominantly "foreignization" – 'choosing a foreign text and developing a translation method along lines which are excluded by dominant cultural values in the target language' (Venuti, 2005, p. 20) – and "domestication" – 'the foreign text is imprinted with values specific to the receiving culture' (Venuti, 2005, p. 20) – and how these strategies interrelate with the fields of culture, class, and dialect, I hope to find an answer to the following research question: *To what extent is translatability achievable in cultural-historical musicals and what role do Venuti's notions of foreignization and domestication play in the translation process?*

While unfortunately little research is available on the role of foreignization and domestication in the translation of these cultural-historical musicals in particular, more research can be found on their role in the translation of culture and dialect, two major elements in the above-mentioned type of musicals. One of the few, if not only, studies available within this field was conducted by Myles McKelvey. He found that the strongly domesticating approach that was used for the first translation of "Les Misérables" in 1980 from French to English 'seems to suggest that a foreign work must adopt the target culture's norms and genres if it wants to be accepted by it' (2001, p. 73). Following, he argued that in the case of the French and their habitually chauvinistic approach to foreign cultural items, exhibited by the poor reception of the back-translation of *Les Misérables* from English to French, their behavior 'seems to suggest that if a given culture does not have a particular genre in its repertoire, in all likelihood, it will not accept foreign models of that genre into its PS' [i.e. "polysystem"]' (2001, p. 74). From his own findings and other studies, McKelvey concluded that Gideon Toury might be "right" after all in the sense that 'non-obligatory shifts from the source text do appear to be a universal of translation' (2001, p. 76). It should however be taken into consideration that French inherently 'has a more "classicizing" translation culture' (Berman, 2004, p. 288). Next, though concerning a slightly different field, Xu and Tian investigated the role of foreignization and domestication in the Disney movie "Mulan" which is not necessarily an extraneous field. Additionally, several Disney movies have been adapted for stage such as *The Lion King*, *Beauty and the Beast*, and *Tarzan*, and both genres also incorporate text, music, and song into one discipline. In their paper, Xu and Tian found that for the Disney adaptation of the story of Mulan, and in Disney movies in general, both domesticating and foreignizing methods are used to achieve "transculturation": a process that among others domesticizes foreign culture as a whole and thereby causes

cultural hybridization (2013, p. 185). While domestication was used most heavily, showing favor towards American culture, foreignization, was predominantly used to restore ‘the original Chinese cultural context’ (2013, p. 194). Tang (2008) found that if a subtitle translator wishes to fulfill the expectations and preferences a target audience holds, he or she is more likely to adopt a domesticating approach, rather than a foreignizing one (p. 161).

Researchers within other cultural genres found a somewhat heavier use of foreignization rather than domestication; Matielo and Espindola for example found that in Brazilian subtitling for the American series “Heroes,” ‘the predominant treatment given to the CSIs [i.e. Culture Specific Items] was foreignization’ while the few moments where domestication was used, it was for the purposes of ‘diminishing the impact of otherness as regards cultural elements’ (2011, p. 89). Lastly, in her research into foreignization and domestication within the context of English-to-Turkish translated self-help literature, Yılmaz-Gümüş found that a domesticating approach for the translation of CSIs in this particular genre was preferred since ‘the foreignizing procedures in translation probably interrupt a fluent reading of the target text and prevent the text from fulfilling its function of offering quick and easy solutions to readers’ (2012, p. 128).

This thesis firstly features a theoretical framework in which an explanation and discussion of “foreignization” and “domestication” is provided, followed by sections on Descriptive Translation Studies (henceforth: DTS), target-text oriented (henceforth: TT-oriented) approaches, and the concept of translatability. The main part consists of a comparative analysis of three subject areas that play a significant role in the translatability and the translational decision-making process of cultural-historical musicals: sculture, class, and dialect. Case study material is taken from the original English and translated Dutch songs from the musical *Billy Elliot* which will be examined through a TT-oriented approach. Not only are the above-mentioned subject areas evidently present in *Billy Elliot* but they are also found – to a bigger or lesser extent – in other musicals from the same category. *Les Misérables*, for example, features a stronger representation of history and culture while in *West Side Story*, class, politics, and sociolect play a more significant role. In the final chapter, the research question will be answered through a discussion of the findings and comparison with earlier studies.

While little research has been done within the field of musicals and the translation of musicals, there is definitely still room for more descriptive and TT-oriented research work. Musical such as *Billy Elliot* could, in theory, provide the target audience with an insight into a social, cultural, and political background in addition to the generally trivial entertaining



nature of musicals. This thesis seeks to find correlations between the different elements that together compile these cultural-historical musicals that are so deeply grounded into their source culture (henceforth: SC) while also examining if and how translatability of these works is to be achieved and what role foreignization and domestication play in this. After all, a translation is meant to help readers ‘signify the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text’ (Venuti, 2005, p. 23). While theory is where research starts, I believe it is practice from which we can learn most and which can enable further growth in our understanding of what translation can achieve and the bridges it can build for source-text writers and target-text audiences.

## 2. Theoretical framework

### 2.1. Foreignization and domestication

#### 2.1.1. Defining the concepts

As early as the 15<sup>th</sup> century, William Caxton already found himself in a dilemma that many translators would later face: while he was linguist nor literary scholar, one of the issues he had to tackle was whether he should ‘use foreign words in his translation or replace them by native English words’ – without even considering the myriad of other problems at hand in this period of great dialect diversity, large scribal variation, and different literary styles (Crystal, 1995, p. 57). Some five hundred years later, the problem Caxton faced proved to be as relevant as ever. In his seminal work *The translator’s invisibility*, Lawrence Venuti not only coined the concept of “the translator’s invisibility,” a technique that enables a translated text to seem like an “original,” but also discussed the notions of *foreignization* and *domestication*. While these concepts were certainly not new to the field, Venuti is likely most well-known for having discussed them. As early as 1813, Friedrich Schleiermacher examined the dichotomy that foreignization and domestication have long entailed: ‘either the translator leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader towards him; or he leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author towards him’ (Lefevere, 1977, p. 74). Even before Schleiermacher’s time, Cicero already made a distinction between *ut interpretes* and *ut orator*, i.e. ‘like a literalist interpreter’ and ‘like a public speaker’ (Pym, 2010, p. 31). Despite these various discussions, for this study, Venuti’s definitions of foreignization and domestication will be used, and for different reasons. The primary reason is his clear dichotomy with foreignization on the one side and domestication on the other, implying that no middle ground exists – an insinuation that will be examined in more detail in the main part of this thesis. In addition, while Venuti is most widely known for the two terms, he (and others too) have done little research into the relation between the two strategies and translatability as such. This thesis seeks to go into further detail on this particular relation. Furthermore, Venuti recognized the relation between foreignization and domestication and DTS – a topic that will be discussed in more detail in the following paragraph. Lastly, it is rather striking that Venuti showed such a heavy favor towards foreignization per definition. It might prove interesting to examine whether this strategy is indeed always the better and/or more appropriate choice.

Using a foreignizing approach ‘signifies the difference of the foreign text, yet only by disrupting the cultural codes that prevail in the target language’ (Venuti, 2005, p. 20); a

process that can best be explained as ‘an ethnodeviant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad’ (2005, p. 20). Contrarily, domestication produces ‘the illusion of transparency’ – alluding to the translator’s invisibility – through ‘an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values’ (2005, p. 20). Particularly found within the context of translation in the English-speaking world, ‘the aim of translation is to bring back a cultural other as the same, the recognizable, even the familiar’ which inherently ‘risks a wholesale domestication of the foreign text’ (2005, p. 18). Venuti’s work clearly condemned the domesticating translations that the English-speaking world is replete with according to him and rather advocated a foreignizing approach that is generally used in (smaller) European languages (2005, p. 20).

At the very beginning of his seminal work, Venuti raised an important matter, namely the obvious dilemma translation poses:

...the reconstitution of the foreign text in accordance with values, beliefs and representations that pre-exist it in the target language, always configured in hierarchies of dominance and marginality, always determining the production, circulations, and reception of texts. Translation is the forcible replacement of the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text with a text that will be intelligible to the target-language reader. (2005, p. 18)

This statement not only emphasized the issue of translation itself but also to a certain extent the struggle between foreignization and domestication; dependent on the target audience, TL, time, place, and other factors, a translator will either accommodate by giving the source text (henceforth: ST) a recognizable, familiar look or challenge the reader to leave the *comfort zone* of their source language (henceforth: SL) and SC to undergo a foreign experience. Contrary to Pym’s view, who noted that ‘the decision [for a certain strategy] does not particularly depend on the nature’ of the ST (2005, p. 31), certain genres arguably do lend themselves better for a foreignizing approach, such as historical texts or touristic texts (Ellis & Oakley-Brown, 2009, p. 342): these kinds of texts require the retention of foreignness as the target audience usually wants to read and learn about the foreign in all its authenticity. Other genres such as medical translations, legal translations, the Bible, and children’s literature generally lend themselves better for a domesticating approach (Paloposki & Oitinnen, 2000, p. 378; Xu & Tian, 2013, p. 185; Snell-Hornby, 2006, p. 12). In contrast, prose and poetry often remain in a gray area of various and diverse translation strategies.

Venuti, in contrast, held a somewhat stronger view and argued that the choice between foreignization and domestication ‘has been allowed only to translators of literary texts’ (2005, p. 41). Foreignization can influence a translation as such that it affects its production and reading through ‘human subjectivity,’ which is strongly at odds with the ‘humanist assumption’ that is found in domestication (Venuti, 2005, p. 24).

Subsequently, the conclusion may be drawn that both foreignization and domestication can benefit and hinder a translation due to the interference of a translator. Foreignization helps a reader to gain new insights about a TL and TC while it can simultaneously hinder a reader in their reading experience as such that the reading flow of the text is interrupted by its alien, heterogeneous nature. Domestication, on the other hand, can facilitate access to a more extensive and diverse world of literature while simultaneously limiting the reader in their foreign venture. As the two translation strategies are highly contrastive, it may be questioned whether there is no in-between. According to Venuti (1986), the ‘contemporary call for fluency or easy readability’ – hinting to domestication – is manifested through the *consumability* of a text; ‘the ideology which mediates between the production of a fluent translation and its commodification’ (p. 187). This would imply that a translator is always faced with an either/or dilemma: either accommodating the reader by opting for a domesticating strategy *or* opting for a foreignizing translation strategy and thereby impeding the reader. Nonetheless, despite Schleiermacher and Venuti’s view that ‘translation can never be completely adequate to the foreign text’ (Venuti, 2005, p. 20), there must be a way of compromise.

### **2.1.2. Evaluations and critiques**

While Venuti’s “domestication” and “foreignization” have often been cited, comparably little evaluation or critique has been provided on the dichotomy itself and the theory behind it. The first and likely most obvious drawback is that the two translation strategies appear polar opposites and therefore do not leave much space in between; time and time again, a translator faces ‘the choice of whether to domesticate or foreignize a foreign text’ (Venuti, 2005, p. 41). In his influential work *Exploring translation theories*, Anthony Pym posed the obvious question that follows: ‘surely most translation problems can be solved in *more* than two ways?’ (2010, p. 33). He elaborated that one of the main reasons for the rigid partition might be that Schleiermacher, who was the first and most well-known for making the binary distinction, argued that ‘there are only two’ and ‘it was not possible to mix the two’

(Lefevere, p. 74; Pym, 2010, p. 34). Later theorists such as Venuti, but also Vermeer and Berman, stuck to this understanding and at times even reinforced it. According to Denecke (2014), the Japanese concept of *kundoku* – reading Chinese texts through Japanese glossing – constitutes a technique that allegedly ‘upsets the common polarity’ that underlays Venuti’s two strategies and so could form a kind of solacing countermovement (p. 210; p. 214). Similarly, other translation theorists such as Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) introduced more diverse and elaborate models in which a scale or a broader division is found. Overall, these models proved to be the exception rather than the rule and were less exploited and elaborated upon by other theorists. The most obvious reason for this may be that defining translation strategies through a dichotomy offers a more concrete distinction and easier categorization of case studies and examples than offering a broad, multi-layered classification.

Secondly, as Snell-Hornby noted also, Venuti’s description of the two notions has been somewhat exaggerated and molded into a highly specific Anglo-American framework (2006, p. 146); Venuti believed that on the outer one side of the scale domestication is found and foreignization on the outer other side, and his studies have solely focused on case studies in which the SL or TL was of Anglo-American origin. Especially this last tendency is forms a strong drawback as research into cross-cultural studies or language varieties that are not Anglo-American are thereby indirectly somewhat discouraged, underlining a certain limitation to Venuti’s study field. Contrarily, Paloposki and Oitinen did stress the importance of language context. In addition to the influence of time and place, they advocated the significance of translation directionality. In their study, they investigated two diverse types of literature, *Macbeth* and *Alice in Wonderland*, and yet one overarching conclusion: ‘the direction of the cultural transfer also matters’ as ‘translating *into* English is different from translating *from* English’ (2000, pp. 374-375; p. 386); while no concrete examples were provided for this statement, it seems evident that in any translation, each individual SL and TL sets different rules, restrictions and expectations. They elaborated by stating that ‘we domesticate for Finns, for children, for minority cultures, for majority cultures, for political ideals, for religious beliefs’ (2000, p. 387). In addition, they rejected, to a certain extent, the notion of domestication and foreignization altogether and concluded that ‘perhaps we should only speak of different levels and dimensions of domestication’ instead (2000, p. 386).

Though also found in earlier works on domestication and foreignization such as Schleiermacher’s and Berman’s, a final problematic aspect discussed here is the subjectivity with which Venuti’s discussion of the two translation strategies is entrenched. While (the

assessment of the quality of) translations are inherently prone to subjectivity, translation studies is a field of study that requires objectivity. Nonetheless, Venuti showed to be a strong advocate for foreignization and certainly made no secret of his preference; he openly stated that foreignization is ‘fundamentally good’ while domestication is ‘fundamentally bad’ (Snell-Hornby, 2006, p. 146). In addition, ‘Venuti’s few resistant translators [were] “banished to the fringes” of not just Anglo-American culture but of whatever culture they were involved with’ (Pym, 1996, p. 168). Paloposki and Oitinnen came to similar conclusions, stating that from Venuti’s viewpoint ‘it can be inferred that foreignness as such is something desirable, and that domestic values, linguistic codes, and aesthetics are undesirable (as they should be challenged, not conformed to)’ (2000, p. 374).

### 2.1.3. Variations on the theme

Preceded by authors such as Schleiermacher, Foucault, and Berman, and followed by others such as Vermeer, Venuti’s two-fold translation strategy distinction that has been discussed so fervently has appeared under many different names. Even Venuti himself labeled the two terms with different names as well; in addition to the foreignization-domestication distinction, he named the two strategies *fluent* and *resistant* translations too (2005, p. 4). In 1984, around a decade before Venuti coined the now widely-known terms, Antoine Berman already displayed his preference towards a foreignizing strategy: should a translator ‘lead the author to the reader,’ rather than the other way around, he or she ‘betray[s] the foreign work as well’ (1992, p. 4). In addition, he later made a clear distinction between *l’étranger* and *le propre*, i.e. the foreign and the own, accentuating the fact that there are always two sides to a translation. In his subsequent work “Translation and the trials of the foreign” (2004) – in which he discussed his later well-known notion of *the negative analytic* – he also quoted Foucault (1969), who proved to be another forerunner of Venuti, arguing ‘it is quite necessary to admit that two kinds of translations exist’: ‘in one, something (meaning aesthetic value) must remain identical and is given passage into another language’ while in another, one language is ‘hur[ed] (...) against another,’ ‘taking the original text for a projectile and treating the translating language like a target’ (as cited in Berman, 2004, p. 285). Berman then named this latter type “naturalization,” which is understood to be a synonym of Venuti’s domestication. Lastly, Hans Vermeer discussed the two opposing strategies as well in 1994 but referred to them as *verfremdendes* and *angleichendes* ‘Übersetzen’ [i.e. alienating and assimilating translation] (as cited in Snell-Hornby, 2006, p. 145). In contrast to all other

domestication-foreignization theorists, Vermeer held a more neutral opinion on the matter. He believed them to be equal, share much common ground, and did not consider a domesticating approach to ‘destroy the source culture,’ holding a considerably more nuanced view of the dichotomy than other theorists (as cited in Reinhardt, 2009, p. 11).

*Similar concepts, different phrasings*

Anthony Pym, once again, managed to adequately formulate the question that this multitude of domestication-foreignization distinctions raised: ‘have translation theorists been saying the same thing over and over, down through centuries?’, followed by the conclusive answer ‘not really’ (2010, p. 32). Although there are many theorists that seem to have written on the exact same topic, they did often differ in certain aspects or they would approach the matter from a different angle. Pym referred to this view as “polarities of directional equivalence”; ‘many theories of directional equivalence are based on two opposed ways of translating, often allowing that there are possible modes between the two poles’ (2010, p. 33). Within this list, different pole sets are found such as House’s *overt* and *covert* translation, Nord’s *documentary* and *instrumental* translation, and naturally also Nida’s *formal* and *dynamic equivalence*. Whereas the distinctions differ in the area of focus – i.e. the text, the audience/writer, the feeling, and so forth - ‘they are all thinking in twos’ (2010, p. 33). The polarity Pym spoke of here was formulated back in 1926 by Franz Rosenzweig as a dilemma in which a translator must always ‘serve two masters’: ‘the foreign work and the foreign language’ and ‘one’s own public and one’s own language,’ and he or she has to decide which of the two to serve more loyally (as cited in Berman, 1992, p. 35). The two “ends” that all the above-mentioned theorists discuss thereby becomes a matter of serving one master more loyally than the other, put simply.

**2.1.4. Relevancy**

As was already noted above in the introduction, there are some studies that discuss foreignization and domestication in relation to theater, audiovisual entertainment or a sociocultural context more generally. Most of the available studies have concluded that to both strategies are found to different extents, though generally there appears to be a modest inclination towards domestication (McKelvey, 2001; Tang, 2008; Xu & Tian, 2013; Yılmaz-Gümüş, 2012). Tang noted that choosing domestication, or even a blending of domestication and foreignization, cannot only result in “easier” reception by the target audience but also in

transculturation or cultural hybridity, which is generally badly received by a production's nation of origin (Xu & Tian, 2013, p. 199; Tang; see also McKelvey, 2001). Matiolo and Espindola, contrarily, found a heavier use of foreignization in the subtitling of CSIs of the American action series "Heroes" and added that domestication was only used to adjust an SC to TC in order to reduce the impact of 'the otherness' (2011, p. 89).

The relevance and interest of foreignization and domestication for the field of theater, or more specifically cultural-historical musicals, is primarily found in the strategies' influence on translatability, reception, and how to leave the source as "intact" as possible. Intrinsically, this last point will always remain the biggest challenge of all within translation since any translation decision will alter the ST's denotation and connotation. Nevertheless, 'decisions are required in translation, because there is always loss and gain in moving between languages and between cultural discourses, because a translator cannot capture everything' (Tymoczko, 1999, p. 55).

For theater, naturally, reception is a very important aspect as well since this will influence the "life expectancy" of the show; opting for one strategy or another can certainly have different effects on the translation and the reaction it sparks with the target audience. In the following methodology chapter, the reception of Billy Elliot will be discussed in further detail. Hence, it seems only natural that choosing either strategy is done with ST, SC, TC, and target audience in mind for only in this way the remaining element can be satisfied: the TT. In the end, it is a three-level process that presents itself here: while the final shape of the translation is governed by the choice for a certain translation strategy, the choice for strategy is governed from a higher level by other (non-)translational factors as well, factors that will be thoroughly evaluated in the main part of this study.

## **2.2. Descriptive Translation Studies**

### **2.2.1. DTS: origin, explanation, and elaboration**

Before the introduction of DTS, the main approach to translation studies was the prescriptive method; primarily from the 1960s onwards, a more practical application was used and consisted of translation approaches that were rather normative and thereby imposed 'criteria stipulating the way translation should be performed in a particular culture' (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 1997, p. 130). This tendency towards prescriptivism went hand in hand with terms such as "source-text oriented," "linguistic," and "atomistic" (Snell-Hornby, 2006, p. 49), and was, mostly before the 1950s, for a long period the sole approach within translation studies,



advocated by theorists such as Tytler, Nida, and Newmark (Xiao & Hu, 2015, p. 2). In 1995, Toury concluded that it was a ‘small wonder that a scholarly framework geared almost exclusively towards applicability in practice should show preference for prescriptivism at the expense of description, explanation and prediction’ (p. 2).

In the early 1980s, a different school of thought started to gain popularity in the field of translation studies: descriptive translation studies. This change in focus was later also referred to as “‘the cultural turn’ of the 1980s’ – referring to the turn from “text” to “culture” – and certainly marked a new era for translation studies (Snell-Hornby, 2006, p. 47; p. 50). While previously most, if not all, translation studies had been viewed from a prescriptive point of view, James S. Holmes introduced a new, rather comprehensive overview of how translation studies was – in his view – built up, which would later be styled into a well-organized map by Gideon Toury (1995). In his overview, Holmes discussed the subcategory of “Pure Translation Studies” – as opposed to “Applied Translation Studies” – by which he referred to ‘research pursued for its own sake, quite apart from any direct practical application outside its own terrain’ which he again subcategorized into “Theoretical Translation Studies” and “Descriptive Translation Studies” (2004, p. 176). From the way Holmes categorized Translation Studies, it was to be understood that ‘the theoretical branch was subordinated to the descriptive branch; as case studies were described and empirical data collected, the theory would evolve’ (Gentzler, 1993, p. 92). Holmes described DTS as being ‘the branch of the discipline which constantly maintains the closest contact with the empirical phenomena under study’ (2004, p. 176), and according to Hermans (1985) this proved to be ‘a considerable widening of the horizon, since [hereby] any and all phenomena relating to translation, in the broadest sense, become objects of study’ (p. 14).

Within DTS, Holmes made a three-fold distinction to which Gideon Toury later referred as ‘the main relations within *DTS*’ (1995, p. 14). The distinction made by Holmes was based on different aspects of translation in general and consisted of “product-oriented,” “function-oriented,” and “process-oriented” DTS. Further on in his work, Toury stressed the interdependency of all three elements within the overarching framework: he believed that ‘functions, processes and products are not just ‘related’ (...), but rather form one complex whole whose constitutive parts are hardly separable from one another for purposes other than methodical’ (1995, p. 11). Within the group of function, process and product, all three were argued to be connected as such that the first determines the second and the second governs the third respectively (Toury, 1995, p. 13).

Product-oriented DTS concerns the description of existing translations and revolves around a two-phase process: first, the study of ‘individual translations, or text-focused translation description’ and second, the comparative translation description which is executed through comparing multiple translations of one text in one or multiple languages (Holmes, 2004, p. 176). Function-oriented DTS then focuses on what a translation induces in a ‘recipient socio-cultural situation,’ focusing more on the context in which the translation is received rather than the text itself (Holmes, 2004, p. 177). Thirdly, Holmes discussed process-oriented DTS which ‘concerns itself with the process or act of translation itself,’ or ‘the problem of what exactly takes place in the “little black box” of the translator’s “mind”’ (2004, p. 177). He also noted that although it is a complex type of research, it has received little attention in translation studies which continues to be the case. The majority of research rather focused on the products to be, how they should be or on already constructed translation products. Nevertheless, the importance of this unexploited area remains; ‘the “how?” questions logically precede the “why?” questions, but it is the latter that help us understand the phenomena in question’ (Paloposki & Oitinnen, 2000, p. 375).

In Toury’s significant work *Descriptive translation studies and beyond* (1995), he further developed and elaborated on DTS but also showed his gratitude to Holmes for the inherent practicality of his divisional method:

For me, the main merit of Holmes’ program has always lain in its convincing notion of *division*; not as a mere necessary evil, that is, but as a basic principle of organization, implying as it clearly does a proper *division of labour* between various kinds of scholarly activity. (p. 9)

Indeed, Holmes would later be often cited for his well-organized overview but it is Gideon Toury who is universally connected with the field of DTS. The main reason that a considerable period of time passed before DTS was exploited further after Holmes’ publication was that his pioneering article was available to a select few theorists only for a long time (Toury, 1995, p. 8). In addition, the rise in popularity required the gathering of scholars from different smaller countries and with corresponding smaller languages such as Czech, Slovak, Dutch, and Hebrew, which together created a network that was known under different names such as DTS but also “the Manipulation School” (Pym, 2016, p. 119; Toury, 1995).

Toury advocated for an increasing interest in descriptive rather than prescriptive studies in order to ‘refrain from value judgments in selecting subject matter or in presenting findings, and/or refuse to draw any conclusions in the form of recommendations for “proper” behaviour’ (1995, p. 2). He stressed that the importance of DTS lies in its ability to facilitate proper research as such that ‘while one is always free to speculate and/or indulge in introspection, it is only through studies into actual behaviour that hypotheses can be put to a real test’ (1995, pp. 16-17). Consequently, the biggest advantage of DTS, placing it opposite other approaches, is that it focuses on practice rather than theory; DTS is the only branch within translation studies that lends itself to perform empirical research on existing translations without having to depend on theories, presuppositions or prescriptivisms (1995, p. 19).

### **2.2.2. Motives for the use of DTS**

In *The translator’s invisibility* (1986), Venuti already discussed the way to approach translation studies and critical readings of translations by showing a heavy favor towards DTS. He stated that one must ‘describe – rather than prescribe – the practice of translation and, furthermore, to describe it in such a way that (...) respects the linguistic specificity of the translated text while inserting it in the social context in which it was produced’ (1986, p. 181). In addition, DTS seems inherently better-fitting for examining foreignization and domestication as it enables the researcher to analyze and examine existent translations and the strategies that were used during the translation. Research shows that while most theorists do favor one over the other, foreignization and domestication are more frequently grounded in a DTS-based study rather than a prescriptive sort (Yılmaz-Gümüş, 2012; Xu & Tian, 2013; Matielo & Espindola, 2011). Back in 1985, Hermans stated that the aim of DTS was ‘to establish a new paradigm for the study of literary translation, on the basis of a comprehensive theory and ongoing practical research’ (p. 10). Especially this latter aspect is of interest for investigating the use of foreignization and domestication, but also for the case study in this thesis: the translation of musicals and songs. Unfortunately, few fields other than literary translation have been investigated with regard to foreignization and domestication and DTS. Exceptions to this tendency are for example Matielo and Espindola’s research into subtitling and Xu and Tian’s research into Disney movies. However, other less related fields such as legal, medical or technical texts have so far been barely studied.

The central issue in DTS, but also in the translation of musicals, is how the translation will function in the TC (Snell-Hornby, 2006, p. 49) – i.e. its reception. Apter and Herman noted that when the translation of a song is performed subtly and adequately, ‘a well-conceived foreignizing translation can usually overcome reluctance on the part of the audience to encounter something strange’ (2016, p. 34). Thus, not only is context relevant to the field of DTS but also to foreignization and domestication. Paloposki and Oitinen agreed with this notion as well: ‘going back to Venuti, and on the basis of the data presented [in this study], it seems evident that foreignizing and domesticating are contextual phenomena and need to be studied as such’ (2000, p. 386). Plainly, the only obvious way to study context and contextual phenomena is indeed by examining translations, the SL, TL, TC, and correspondingly the reception of translation – all by describing *how* translation takes place and *what* is happening.

Saving a prominent place for context and attempting to link foreignization, domestication, and DTS to the translation of culture, class, and dialect, the focus of this thesis will largely incline towards Holmes’ product-oriented DTS as it will use existing translations for case study material and will pay considerable heed to the role of the SL, SC, TL, and TC. Nonetheless, it must be kept in mind that the bigger picture should always be considered. A DTS-based study generally, and therefore the study at hand as well, should according to Toury (1995) advance as a ‘two-fold enterprise’:

each (...) is a local activity, pertinent to a certain corpus, problem, historical period, or the like, as well as part of an overall endeavor, an attempt to account for ways in which function, process and product can and do determine each other. (p. 11)

### **2.2.3. DTS, the Manipulation School and beyond**

After the above-mentioned cultural turn towards DTS, almost all studies up to today have been conducted through a descriptive perspective. While Holmes and Toury would later become and still are most widely known for their discussion of DTS, Snell-Hornby pointed out that it was actually Theo Hermans who initiated this new movement (2006, p. 48). As was noted above, Hermans underlined the important aspect of practical research within the context of DTS rather early on, and this would indeed later form the framework of DTS: an approach in which both theory and practice would be equal rather than a dominant position for theory and instructions, as was the case with earlier prescriptive translation studies.

However, by describing what happens in translation, theorists and translators will still, to a certain extent, draw rules or norms from this: ‘theory affects practice because it is a known and often agreed way of describing the world, and people will act accordingly’ (Boase-Beier, 2011, p. 77). Together with theorists Lambert, van Gorp, Bassnett, and Lefevere, Hermans started the movement that would be later known as DTS, or “the Manipulation School.” This latter name resulted from his and the other scholars’ belief that ‘from the point of view of the target literature, all translation implies a certain degree of manipulation of the source text for a certain purpose’ (Snell-Hornby, 2006, p. 48; Hermans, 1985, p. 11). Evidently, foreignization and domestication fit in perfectly here since both strategies require manipulation to a bigger or lesser extent towards the foreign or the domestic.

While “the Manipulation School” arguably carried a name and ideology that would seem more concrete than DTS, the latter name stuck over the years and is the field of study we still associate with the above-mentioned theorists. As DTS has developed into a rather broad field, Pym (2010) discerned that there are roughly five concepts in DTS that have been examined by specific theorists (p. 66). For this study, Pym’s second DTS subfield, discussed by Even-Zohar, Holmes, and Toury, concerning the dependence of an ‘innovative or conservative position of translations within a cultural system’ with regard to ‘the system’s relation with other systems, correlat[ing] with the type of translation strategy used’ will likely prove most relevant for examining this thesis’ case study (Pym, 2010, p. 66). Since they have provided ample research regarding the relation between translation strategies, translations within certain cultural systems, and the way these systems correspond with one another, their fields of interest certainly match the study at hand. As this thesis focuses on the translation strategies of foreignization and domestication this is naturally the most logical area of focus. Secondly, as this thesis’ main part will examine different relevant areas, or systems, such as dialects, class, but also culture, this subcategory of DTS proposed by Pym will be most adequate. Of particular interest is the correlation between different topics and their corresponding translation strategies as it is indeed expected that certain fields of translation are better suited for a foreignizing strategy rather than a domesticating one or vice versa.

This subcategory naturally started with Holmes’ distinctions within DTS which are, according to Pym (2010), ‘systematic (ordered, thorough, complete), but not necessarily systemic’ since Holmes’ exposition belonged to the theorist rather than the practitioner (p. 70; Toury, 1995, p. 16). Toury later invented a more practical approach through the use of norms, which will receive further discussion in the methodology chapter. After Holmes and Toury laid the foundation, Itamar Even-Zohar introduced his “polysystem theory” which elaborated

on the notion of systems and how they interfere with one another. He believed that ‘a culture is a system made up of other systems’; his theory would enable explaining ‘the mechanism of these relations and consequently the specific position and role of literary types in the historical existence of literature’ (Pym, 2010, p. 72; Even-Zohar, 1978, p. 119). Furthermore, Even-Zohar believed that translated works correlated in a two-way relationship: firstly, ‘in the way they are selected by the target literature’ and secondly, ‘in the way they adopt specific norms, behaviours, and policies which are a result of their relations with other co-systems’ (1978, p. 118). The true relevance of this DTS-subcategory lies in the fact that ‘the term “system” (...) varies in meaning and importance from theorist to theorist’; ‘in strong systems theory’ theorists claim that ‘systems themselves do things, as if they were people,’ as found for example with Even-Zohar’s polysystem theory, while ‘in other approaches, [such as Toury’s,] people are portrayed as doing things within systems of constraints’ (Pym, 2010, p. 72).

### **2.3. The roles of translatability**

#### **2.3.1. Translatability – the idea**

The last major topic that will be discussed in this theoretical framework is “translatability,” defined as ‘the extent to which it is possible to translate either individual words and phrases or entire texts from one language to another’ and considered by some ‘the law governing the translation’ (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 1997, p. 179; Benjamin, 2004, p. 16). According to Catford (1978), this should not be seen as a clear-cut dichotomy but rather as a cline: an ST is ‘*more or less* translatable rather than absolutely *translatable* or *untranslatable*’ (p. 93). In addition to foreignization and domestication, translatability is a key aspect in this study as it works in two ways: not only should the use of foreignization or domestication ultimately lead to the translatability of a text but the translatability of a text also determines the appropriate or most useful strategy. In the majority of translation studies research, translatability will always play a role, either to a bigger or lesser extent. Consequently, for the study at hand, too, it is likely that translatability will govern the choice of strategy and thereby the translation itself.

Iser (1994) stressed that translatability could actually be seen as a counter-movement to a long-lasting trend in which one culture would superimpose another, or as a ‘counter-concept to the otherwise prevailing idea of cultural hierarchy’ (p. 5); a foreign culture is not simply converted but, instead, ‘the very frame is subjected to alterations in order to

accommodate what does not fit' (1994, p. 4). This notion of superimposition was already proposed by Toury in 1995, who believed that tolerance of interference is higher when the ST is a 'major' or highly prestigious one, especially 'if the target language/culture is "minor" or "weak" in any other sense' (p. 278). Pym (1996) was rather skeptical about this and argued that within this line of reasoning, 'one would expect fluency ("non-tolerance of interference") to come to the fore in any TC in a relatively superior or prestigious position with respect to a source culture' (p. 172).

As an attempt to formulate a motive behind translatability, Shuttleworth and Cowie (1997) stated that the discussion of the issue of translatability actually developed from a two-fold issue that caused constant tension:

The first of these is the indisputable fact that different languages do not "mesh together," in that the unique configurations of grammar, vocabulary and metaphor which one finds in each language inevitably have some bearing on the types of meaning that can be comfortably expressed in that language; the second is that, in spite of this consideration, translation between languages still occurs, often with an ostensibly high degree of success. (pp. 179-80).

Literature on translatability shows that it is found on many different levels: from word level to phrase level to sentence level or from grammar to lexicality. Depending on the theorist's stance, this approach would be taken from either a more linguistic perspective or a broader, literary one. Van den Broeck (1981), for example, spoke of four different ways in which the translatability of metaphors could be achieved. He regarded these metaphors as whole units rather than linguistic entities that can be broken down to a lexical or morphological level all the while taking note of the importance of context (p. 77). He concluded that 'translatability keeps an inverse proportion with the quantity of information manifested by the metaphor and the degree to which this information is structured in the text' (1981, p. 84). In contrast, Catford actually approached translatability from a more linguistic point of view and regarded translatability in terms of levels of phonology, morphology, graphology, and so forth (also see below). An arguably third approach is a more philosophical one, contemplating the concept of translatability: what it entails and how it is manifested within literature and linguistics. Walter Benjamin is one of the theorists discussing this third interpretation of translatability: 'translatability is an essential quality of certain works, which is not to say that it is essential that they be translated; it means rather that a specific significance inherent in

the original manifests itself in translatability' (2004, p. 16). This last approach has, however, been covered far less in translation studies research than the first two approaches.

Complementary to translatability, Roman Jakobson discussed the notion of "equivalence." Regarding the equivalence of meaning, Jakobson believed that 'there is ordinarily no full equivalence between code-units,' establishing 'the general principle of interlinguistic difference between terms and semantic fields' (2004, p. 114; Munday, 2012, p. 59); Dutch *kaas* will never elicit the same denotation and connotation as German *Käse* or English *cheese* does. Benjamin agreed by stating that 'the words *Brot* and *pain* "intend" the same object, though the modes of intention are not the same (2004, p. 18). While equivalence is not the main focus of this study, it is however closely associated with translatability. Catford, clearly acknowledged the importance of equivalence too. He defined translation as 'the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL)' by which means the central problem to the practice of translation becomes 'that of finding TL translation equivalents' (2004, p. 20; p. 21).

### 2.3.2. Laws of translatability

In his *Introduction to a theory of literary translation* – here following van den Broeck's 1981 interpretation – Itamar Even-Zohar introduced his notion that the degree of translatability could be broken down into four basic laws, together governed by one overruling law: 'the degree of translatability increases when the relational series which produce information and rhetoric in the SL and TL grow closer' (1971, p. IX). Even-Zohar's four laws of translatability (as cited in van den Broeck, 1981) are then formulated as follows:

'translatability is high when a pair of languages are of a close basic 'type,' provided that the conditions [under laws two and three] are fulfilled'; 'translatability is high when there is contact between SL and TL'; 'translatability is high when the general cultural evolution in SL and TL proceeded on parallel lines'; and 'translatability is high when translation involves no more than a single kind of information' (p. 84).

This last point refers to a certain informational complexity that is often found for example in artistic texts but not in pragmatic texts such as technical brochures as they usually serve only one purpose (Delabastita, 1993, p. 185). Van den Broeck and Lefevere (1984) for example pointed out that a pun proves a good example of several kinds of information since it



provides information on both a referential as well as a metalinguistic level, and sometimes – within the structure of an artistic text – also on an esthetic level (p. 63).

Applying Even-Zohar's philosophy on this case study, it is obvious that essentially all necessary elements are present to fulfil the four laws. Vandepitte (2010) came to similar conclusions and said that 'in a Dutch-English or English-Dutch translation situation, conditions (1), (2) and (3) are fulfilled' while the last law regarding singularity of information proves a bigger problem since translators often encounter texts that are multifaceted (p. 2). Especially regarding the first two laws, it can certainly be established that fulfilment takes place; Dutch and English are not only very closely related within the Indo-European language family but have also been in contact for a considerable period of time – at least as early as the eleventh century when an Old Dutch sentence was written by a Flemish monk in an English monastery (Hermans, 2009, p. 391). Furthermore, regarding the third cultural point, it is clear that this law too is fulfilled as both the Netherlands and the United Kingdom form part of what Berman referred to as the 'western tradition' (2004, p. 288); a tradition in which the English and Dutch culture and language have been intertwined for a considerable time now, and even more strongly so during the past century. Examples of this intensified bond are found for example in the increasing popularity of bilingual high school education, the majority of higher education and university education being taught in English, and widespread appreciation of English television and film as it frequently appears on Dutch television and in Dutch cinemas (Van Oostendorp, 2002, p. 152). As Vandepitte pointed out too, the last law regarding a single kind of information might indeed be more problematic and is therefore also part of this study. By nature, cultural-historical musicals do not only offer two kinds of information: speech and singing, but also incorporate different influential aspects such as culture, history, politics, and many more; Myles McKelvey could not think of a more heterogeneous translation context than the translation of the musical *Les Misérables*' (2001, p. 3). This conclusion came in response to a dialogue with Itamar Even-Zohar regarding how polysystem theory applied to musical translation. Even-Zohar noted 'that at one and the same time, concurrent (and competing) options operate in culture,' which 'appl[y] to any social situation' and therefore also to cultural-historical musicals (1971, p. 3). McKelvey elaborated by noting that the production and translation of a musical result in 'an infinite number of extra-textual issues to consider' (2001, p. 3).

### 2.3.3. Limits of translatability

As ‘few theories claim that all meanings are always translatable,’ logically, there must be boundaries to what *can* actually be translated (Pym & Turk, 2005, p. 273). Indeed, John Catford for one stated that the limits could be summarized through two basic generalizations, drawing upon the theory of translation equivalence. Firstly, ‘*translation between media is impossible* (i.e. one cannot “translate” from the *spoken* to the *written form* of a text or vice-versa)’ by which he referred to the impossibility of translating, for example, a spoken SL segment into a written TL unit or vice versa (1978, p. 53). Secondly, ‘*translation between either of the medium-levels (phonology and graphology) and the levels of grammar and lexis is impossible* (i.e. one cannot “translate” from SL *phonology* to TL *grammar*, or from SL *lexis* to TL *graphology* ... etc.)’ (Catford, 1978, p. 53). In spite of his seemingly clear-cut limitations, he did note that his explanation is too simplified as such that ‘SL texts and items are *more or less* translatable rather than absolutely *translatable* or *untranslatable*’ (1978, p. 93).

Some theorists have argued that there are not only boundaries to translation but even *untranslatability*. As translatability – and inevitably therefore untranslatability as well – forms part of the focus of this study, a few broader statements will be presented by widely-known theorists from the field. Peter Lewis, for example, believed that ‘to claim that philosophy or linguistic theory should not, or need not, reckon with the incidence of untranslatability seems hopelessly defensive’ (2004, p. 272). Instead of believing that STs, fragments or words can be untranslatable, Walter Benjamin deemed TTs to suffer from untranslatability; he found that translations are untranslatable ‘not because of any inherent difficulty, but because of the looseness with which meaning attaches to them’ (2004, p. 23). Bhabha (1994), in contrast, believed that untranslatability was actually a kind of *resistance* and a ‘negation of complete integration’ (as cited in Pym, 2010, p. 145). Additionally, MacIntyre (1988) stressed the importance of history, tradition, and culture. He stated that in a ‘tradition-bearing community’ – a label that is definitely applicable to communities in Berman’s earlier-discussed western tradition – the ‘language-in-use is closely tied to the expression of the shared beliefs of that tradition,’ giving a certain ‘historical dimension’ to languages which often gets lost during the translation process (1988, p. 284). This type of untranslatability is portrayed most strongly by ‘internationalized languages-in-use in late twentieth-century modernity’ that ‘have minimal presuppositions in respect of possibly rival belief systems,’ leading them to ‘neutralize’ the historical aspect of foreign texts (MacIntyre, 1988, p. 384). It should be noted here that this sense of “neutralize” is a more general one,

contrary to the term discussed by Vandepitte in section 5.2.1. This type of neutralization MacIntyre discusses may however be equally relevant for this study as Vandepitte's (2010).

Lastly, regarding specifically the translatability between Dutch and English, which will be discussed in further detail in the following paragraph, Vandepitte found that untranslatability is displayed in different areas, but predominantly in the translation of cultural references, names, technical references, imagery, non-standard language, second source language items, and humour (2010, p. i-iii). Though Vandepitte does provide quite specific examples of what challenges a Dutch-to-English or English-to-Dutch translator may face, she does not discuss any issues that play a role in the translatability between English and Dutch more generally.

#### **2.3.4. Linguistic translatability: the relation between English and Dutch**

In addition to the fulfilment of Even-Zohar's laws of translatability, this paragraph will succinctly address the relation between English and Dutch. As the main part of this thesis consists of a comparative analysis of the original English songs and translated Dutch songs from *Billy Elliot*, the (potential) translatability between the two languages from a linguistic point of view is evidently worth some mention.

Although English and Dutch are relatively closely connected to one another within the Indo-European language family tree, together falling under the branch of West Germanic languages, the two languages do differ much on several linguistic and grammatical levels. Firstly, considering the phonetics between the two, both languages contain phonemes that are not found in the other language; English contains among others the idiosyncratic phonemes [ʒ], [ʃ], and [ð] while Dutch has [x], [ø:], and [ɥ], for example (Collins & Mees, 2003, p. 2-3; p. 12; p. 14). It is exactly these sounds that usually prove most difficult for native speakers of either two languages to master when learning the other language. Linguistic differences can also be found in Dutch and English phonology: English, by rule, never features a [kn]-sequence while it is commonly found in Dutch, and in English the difference in pronunciation between [d] and [t] at the end of a word can clearly be distinguished while in Dutch it is lost due to final devoicing (Collins & Mees, 2003, p. 3; 51). Lastly, considering syntax and morphology, differences are found for example in the lack of dominant word order in Dutch while in English, predominantly subject-verb-object is found and though both languages' morphology exhibit strong suffixing, only English is exclusively concatenative (Dryer, 2013; Bickel & Nichols, 2013). Lemmens and Parr even pointed out a set of recurring issues in

translations from English to Dutch: the traditional problem areas of tense and auxiliary verbs, but also the ordering of information in a sentence, ways in which sentences are connected, and differences in use of punctuation to express different relations between clauses (1995, p. 6). In addition to these key translation issues, Pinker points out the highly differentiating use of prepositions, despite the closeness of the two languages: while *on* can be used consequently for the following phrases ‘a picture *on* a wall,’ ‘a ring *on* a finger,’ or ‘an apple *on* a branch,’ Dutch favors a more various use of prepositions (2008, p. 177); ‘*op* for a book on a table, *aan* for a picture on a wall, and *om* for a ring on a finger’ (2008, p. 177-178).

Despite all these differences, sufficient beneficial linguistic aspects remain regarding the relation and translatability between English and Dutch. Firstly, both languages draw the majority of their vocabulary from Germanic roots and have experienced an enormous influx of French loanwords throughout history (Van Oostendorp, 2002, p. 35-36). Still, also on a more linguistic level as discussed above, similarities are found: both languages portray complex consonant clusters that are found in the onset as well as the coda, a relatively simple complexity of letter-phoneme alignment, and a frequency of vowel diagraphs (i.e. two vowels being pronounced as one sound) (Marinus, Nation & de Jong, 2015, p. 128; van den Bosch, Content, Daelemans & de Gelder, 1994, p. 184). Lastly, the directionality of the translation for this case study, going from English to Dutch, is certainly advantageous in terms of translative freedom; as Dutch has no fixed word order, it can “mold” the English ST phrases in many different grammatical ways, providing the translator with much freedom than if the translation direction would be opposite.

In relation to *Billy Elliot*, it can be expected that some of the issues pointed out above could impede an easy translation process. For one, the differences Pinker pointed out in the use of prepositions will make it more difficult to maintain end rhyme in sung lines containing prepositional verbs since the use of prepositions differs so widely between English and Dutch. Furthermore, the issues raised by Lemmens and Parr regarding auxiliary verbs and the ordering of information, could become problematic as such that given the shorter nature of auxiliary verbs, they are more easily and therefore frequently used than longer, complex verbs and since only a limited space is available in which information can be placed, any ordering of information can become troublesome. These aspects will be discussed in further detail in the methodology section and the analysis.

### 2.3.5. The translatability of musicals, or theater more generally

While the translation of culture will be addressed in the main part of this thesis, the translatability of theater and musicals will be briefly discussed in this theoretical framework as well. Although culture comes in many definitions, forms, and shapes, theater in general manages to incorporate many different disciplines into one shape; ‘the duality inherent in the art of the theatre requires language to combine with spectacle, manifested through visual as well as acoustic images’ (Anderman, 2009, p. 74). This struggle is manifested even more strongly in cultural-historical musicals as a translator not only faces the translatability of drama, culture, and history, but also of songs, which particularly restrict the way in which the SL and the SC are allowed to be represented in a TL – a restriction, and corresponding ways to cope, that will be more thoroughly discussed in the main part of this thesis.

A theater text can be seen as ‘rich and fertile,’ and both the original text as well as the translation should be regarded as a rented apartment in which the renters make smaller or bigger changes to make themselves comfortable (Aaltonen, 2000, p. 112). While this “room-setting” on first sight only may seem relevant for stage directors and actors, translators of theater too have to find a way to “organize their apartment.” Anderman agreed with this notion and discussed the problems that may arise through differences in association with regards to cultural norms and habits, requiring adjustments to be made so that a play will become a successful translation (2009, p. 72). In addition, translatability of drama and musical (songs) is also dependent on the relation between ST and TT; Anderman believed that for speakers of lesser-known languages, it may be assumed that due to the target audience’s familiarity with English social and cultural structures, chances are big that the translation ‘will be closer to the original, and translators tend to face fewer problems with respect to having to make adjustments’ (2009, p. 73). It may be argued however that this view is actually a manifestation of what Venuti refers to as the imposition of ‘Anglo-American cultural values on a vast foreign readership’ (2005, p. 15). Lastly, and most relevant for this thesis’ purposes, Aaltonen stated that ‘the agency of translation strategies in representing various cultural, social and theatrical codes is of primary interest for the study of what happens when texts cross cultural borders’ (2000, p. 112). In the end, it is the receiving target society and the exact discourses found in the ST that ultimately decide whether or not “the Foreign” is accepted in the repertoire of the TL’s theater (p. 112). McKelvey found a similar tendency and noted that, in order to be accepted by a target audience, a foreign work should adopt its cultural norms and genres (2001, p. 73). Ultimately, it may be concluded that

when this acceptance takes place, translatability is fulfilled and the translation is considered successful by all parties involved.

Although studies regarding foreignization and domestication have mostly only focused on literature, drama and musicals can certainly be placed in the same category. In particular, when following Berman's (2004) 'broader division,' drama and musicals can be placed opposite 'non-literary translations (technical, scientific, advertising, etc.)' as it seems evident that in texts from the former category indeed 'two languages enter into various forms of collision and somehow *couple*' (p. 285). Contrariwise, Van den Broeck rather saw the categorization as a dilemma in which the translator needs to choose between regarding drama as literature or as one of the many elements of a theatrical production (1988, pp. 55-56). This alleged dilemma has resulted in the fact that little to no research on the translatability and translation of theater has been available thus far (Anderman, 2009; Lefevere, 1980). What can be taken from the above-mentioned literature, however, is that the translatability of musicals is challenging given the many factors involved. All in all, 'complexity seems thus to be an inescapable characteristic of theatre and drama' (Aaltonen, 2000, p. 34). McKelvey decided that the goal of translatability, or equivalence, might be an unreachable one after all; however, 'the impossibility of exact recreation does not preclude the possibility of *approximation* – and it is precisely on approximation that good lyric translation is built' (2001, p. 53).

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1. Research question and hypotheses

As was stated in the introduction, the main research question for this study is: “*To what extent is translatability achievable in cultural-historical musicals and what role do Venuti's notions of foreignization and domestication play in the translation process?*”

This question is answered through a three-fold subject area study: culture, class, and dialect. *Billy Elliot* ‘is [after all] concerned with class and gender’ and ‘evoke[s] a disappearing world of northern working-class culture’ (Sinfield, 2006, p. 168; Gordon, 2016, p. 419). I expected that there would be differences within these three areas as translatability is not as easily achievable in each of the three fields given the highly diverse constraints on the translation and the choices made in the translation process. In addition, it seemed likely that cultural ST items will receive the most domesticating approach as the translatability is most difficult to achieve in this field, given its idiosyncratic nature. Although McKelvey’s study showed a preference towards domestication, this study does not involve French, which is known for its nationalistic inclinations, as discussed earlier.

#### 3.2. The method

##### *The approach – target text orientation*

In addition to the background of DTS, the main part of this thesis features the use of a TT-oriented approach. Not only is this approach most frequently found in DTS-based studies, but several theorists have explicitly agreed to and underlined the relevance of this type of approach for a DTS study. Gideon Toury, for one, was named the founder of this particular approach to literary translation by Shuttleworth and Cowie (1997, p. 164). Toury (1984) argued that any translation should be considered within the context of the TT and the position it holds in the TC: he suggested a model in which the TT and its corresponding place within the TC should be the main focus, since the identity of the TT is mainly determined by the ‘constellation of the target culture itself’ (pp. 75-76). A year later, he phrased his beliefs even more convincingly and argued that ‘translations are facts of one system only: the target system’ (1985, p. 19). Pym explained that this does not entail that target texts do not actually have source texts from which they have been derived, but rather that ‘the factors needed to describe the specificity of how translations work may all be found within the target system’ (2010, p. 78). Nevertheless, Toury did to a certain extent consider the ST and TT to be two fully separate entities, whereby the particular aim of studies with this kind of approach is ‘the

understanding and explanation of translation phenomena within the literary [or cultural, linguistic or other] system in their own terms' (1984, p. 78; Shuttleworth & Cowie, 1997, p. 165).

As this case study primarily considers translation choices made in the translation of *Billy Elliot* and why they were made, the choice for a TT-oriented approach seemed evident. Firstly, due to its proven and by many argued link with DTS and secondly because a TT-oriented approach lends itself perfectly for the examination of case studies: 'target-oriented empirical approach[es] depended upon and [were] derived from case studies' (Gentzler, 1993, p. 135). The aim of this thesis – or any TT-oriented study in general – was therefore 'to extrapolate from particular case studies in order to reach conclusions as to what is general or even universal in the process of translation itself' (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 1997, p. 165).

In addition to influential factors on this thesis' analysis, a plot summary of *Billy Elliot* and an overview of the socio-historical setting have been provided in order to set a clear background for the analysis and the ST material.

### **3.2.1. The analysis**

Conclusions on the use of foreignization and domestication have been obtained primarily through the use of a comparative analysis with the English songs in *Billy Elliot* functioning as ST and the translated Dutch songs as TT. All three subsections have been constructed rather similarly. First, a definition is provided of each subsection subject – culture, class, and dialect respectively – after which relevant material from *Billy Elliot* lyrics will be examined. Alternatively, for the third subject area of dialect, a comparative reflection of dialectal features that are found in ST and TT dialects is provided, highlighting phonological, grammatical, and lexical features. As translations often feature different procedures to move from ST to TT, Vinay and Darbelnet's model (2004; see also 1995) will be used to describe what procedures occur in the first two paragraphs of this analysis, after which these procedures are linked to wider context of foreignization and domestication (pp. 89-93; as cited in Munday, pp. 190-191).

I have opted for a comparative analysis as it will enable me to elucidate the choices that were made by the translator, establishing trends and tendencies and ultimately link these to earlier research. Williams and Chesterman stressed that the comparative model lends itself perfectly 'for studying shifts (differences, resulting from translation strategies that involve changing something)' in which there are STs on the one side and TTs on the other so that differences between them can be analyzed (2002, p. 50; pp. 50-51). In order to establish



which of Venuti's two approaches is primarily used in most, if not all, such musicals, a comparative analysis has been performed in the three earlier-mentioned subject areas. In other foreignization and domestication studies, researchers have frequently also opted for a contrastive or comparative analysis and acknowledged its relevancy and usefulness. Yilmaz-Gümüş, for example, noted that 'a descriptive study based on the comparative analysis of source and target texts from a specific perspective allows us to identify translational behaviors and to study any matches and mismatches between theory and practice' (2012, p. 118). The most closely related case study currently available is McKelvey's study of the translation of *Les Misérables*. While McKelvey's focused more heavily on the rhythmic constraints of musical translation in his study, his research was also conducted through the use of a contrastive analysis. He advocated the use of a descriptive theory combined with a target-oriented approach 'that would focus on the position and role of the translation within the norms of the target culture'; 'a theory that would focus on the *contextualization* of translation, that is, the idea that translation should be studied in the context of the culture receiving it' (2001, p. 2).

### **3.2.2. The case study material**

The examined material in the comparative analysis consists of a selection of songs from the original English version of *Billy Elliot* and the translated Dutch version; *Shine, Solidarity, Merry Christmas Maggie Thatcher*, and *Deep into the ground*. I have opted for these particular songs as they contain the most cultural and class-related references, compared to the other songs. While much material available of the English version of *Billy Elliot*, unfortunately no CDs or DVDs were ever made available of the Dutch production, most likely due to its far less favorable reception. As no "official" material exists as such, the Dutch versions of the songs have been transcribed from movie clips from the Dutch musical, acquired through YouTube.

## **3.3. Influential factors**

### **3.3.1. Toury's norms**

Gideon Toury's norms are addressed briefly in this section as they play a significant role in 'directing translation activity in socio-culturally relevant settings,' an element that is also found in the analysis of this study (Toury, 1995, p. 53). Moreover, in the context of a TT-oriented approach, the relevance of norms is evident as well. According to Toury: 'as strictly

translational norms can only be applied at the *receiving* end, establishing them is not merely *justified* by a target-oriented approach but should be seen as its very *epitome*' (2004, p. 198). Thus, translational norms can be seen as the middle ground of a socio-cultural scale of constraints that features on one end 'general, relatively absolute *rules*' – which are also to be regarded as '[more] objective' norms – and on the other end 'pure *idiosyncrasies*' – also regarded as '[more] subjective' norms (Toury, 1995, p. 54). The middle ground is thus formed by 'intersubjective factors commonly designated norms' of which some are stronger and others weaker, depending on aspects such as concept, type of agent or type of activity (1995, p. 54). Moreover, they are argued to play a key factor when explaining the social relevance of activities as their existence and widespread relevance 'are the main factors ensuring the establishment and retention of social order' (Toury, 1995, p. 55).

More relevant to the notion of foreignization and domestication is the proposition of two sets of norm-systems a translator constantly faces:

being a text in a certain language, and hence occupying a position, or filling in a slot, in the appropriate culture, or in a certain section thereof; [and,] constituting the representation in that language/culture of another, pre-existing text in some other language, belonging to some other culture and occupying a definite position within it. (Toury, 1995, p. 56)

Making a decision regarding the fulfilment of the requirements that these two systems impose, and thereby fulfilling the norms of either system, is then regarded as the '*initial norm*' (Toury, 1995, p. 56) – and represents, in fact, opting for foreignization or domestication. Naturally, these norms apply to the case study at hand, but also to any translation in general, and above all: 'it is norms that determine the (type and extent of) equivalence manifested by actual translations' (Toury, 1995, p. 60). However, especially category of textual-linguistic norms will prove interesting for this study's purposes since the main part of this thesis features an examination of in what ways the different categories of culture, class and dialect correlate with the use of foreignization and domestication.

### **3.3.2. The translation of songs**

While others such as McKelvey have focused more on the musical aspect of the translation of songs, this study is more directed towards the actual translation strategies used and the

different areas that are involved in cultural-historical musicals. Nevertheless, the strain and restrictions the format of song puts on the actual translation choices should be considered here in the methodology section.

Firstly, fact is that ‘during the process from [the] translated text to it finally being performed on stage, changes are inevitable’ (Sorby, Belle, Echeverri, Gagnon, & Vandaele, 2015, p. 371). Further elaboration for this statement is found in Apter and Herman’s *Translating for Singing*, in which they discuss more general aspects that influence the translation of songs. They noted that ‘the translation should communicate to the target language audience that the work is worth its attention by revealing at least something of the special excellence of the original’ (2015, p. 15). According to them, it is however, not specifically necessary to maintain the sounds of words exactly similar to the original, though this could however entail that a translator should attempt to recreate the original in terms of beauty and pleasure by creating word-music sounds, by which means the translator can also recreate the original’s word-music interactions partially (2015, p. 15).

In their work, Apter and Herman discussed the ways Eugene Nida and Peter Low had successfully summarized the problems a translator of songs encounters in well-organized lists. While the two theorists may have phrased and framed the restrictions somewhat differently, both approaches do revolve around the same aspects. In 1964, Nida summarized the difficulties a translator of poetry set against music primarily faces in a fourfold overview. Nida’s points below are evidently also applicable to the translation of musical songs:

...the translator must concern himself with a number of severe restrictions: (1) a fixed length for each phrase, with precisely the right number of syllables, (2) the observation of syllabic prominence (the accented vowels or long syllables must match correspondingly emphasized notes in the music), (3) rhyme, where required, and (4) vowels with appropriate quality for certain empathic or greatly lengthened notes.  
(p. 177)

Some forty years later, Peter Low (2005) described the matter as a five-fold criteria list: singability, sense, naturalness (i.e. register and word order), rhythm, and rhyme. He claimed that the success of translation is dependent upon the overall score of all five factors, rather than scoring perfectly in each individual category (2005, p. 192; p. 195). In addition to these overviews, Apter and Herman listed the additional requirements of ‘sometimes plac[ing] a word or idea on specific musical notes’ and ‘the need to preserve both plot details and the

way individual characters speak' (2016, p. 17). Conclusively, Apter and Herman suggested that for any translation, a translator should construct a set of principles that are relevant to the translation, after which the translator has to decide which aspects deserve more priority than others (2016, p. 17). This suggested approach can then be placed alongside Toury's above-mentioned norms: no DTS theorist ever distinctly suggested that an aspect should *always* be preserved, rather they 'constitute "translation norms," unwritten rules that everyone at a given time in a given culture simply "knows"' (Apter & Herman, 2016, p. 17). Despite the many difficulties song translation poses, this particular type of translation can also be placed in a more positive light since they also provide the translator with a myriad of options: 'two aural systems, the musical and the verbal, pattern sense when words are sung' as words and music function as both meaning and music' (Apter & Herman, 2016, p. 19).

### **3.4. Drawbacks and shortcomings**

As Pym stressed as well, one of the downfalls of using a TT-text oriented approach is that a researcher may suffer from a tunnel vision in which he or she solely considers the TT, TL, and TC. However, 'the target side cannot explain all relations' (2010, p. 84); there are always two cultures that are involved and at stake which is why translations should rather be seen as concerning the relation between cultures and how a text can be transferred within this relation, regardless of the use of a TT-oriented approach (Pym, 2010, p. 84).

A second point of critique is the fact that this case study is not an original work as such that it has been adapted from a movie. Rather than being originally written for stage, the musical production of *Billy Elliot* was adapted from the 2000 film, directed by Stephen Daldry. While the movie did contain music that was especially written for it by Stephen Warbeck, these were only musical scores and did not contain any singing.

Lastly, the case material had to be obtained through YouTube rather than an official CD, DVD or screening of the production. Unfortunately, as no other medium was available, circumstances forced opting for this irregular source of study material.

### **3.5. Setting the scene: *Billy Elliot***

#### *The plot*

*Billy Elliot* is a story about an eleven-year old boy from the fictional town Everington near Durham in Northern England who lives with his father, brother, and grandmother, his mother having passed away at a young age. Both his father and brother are coal miners but are

throughout the show taking part in strikes as the British government is looking to close many coal mines, leaving them without a job. By accident, Billy joins Sandra Wilkinson's ballet class, that is given after one of his weekly boxing lessons. Billy takes up ballet and proves to be very talented but, when his father discovers about the classes, Billy is forbidden to continue with the ballet classes. Behind his father's back, Billy secretly receives individual ballet classes from Miss Wilkinson as she encourages him to audition for the Royal Ballet School. After many arguments and one missed audition, Billy's father accidentally sees Billy doing ballet in a gymnasium and perceives Billy's talent with his own eyes. Later, Miss Wilkinson is able to convince Billy's father to let Billy take an audition in London, reassuring him of Billy's potential. Accompanied by his father, Billy goes to the audition where he, despite a physical conflict with a fellow auditioner, is accepted.

### *The socio-historical setting*

Billy's story is set in the years 1984-85 in which the British government, under the lead of Margaret Thatcher, commonly also referred to as 'Maggie,' was planning to close down around twenty coal mines that were considered unproductive in the north of England ("Margaret Thatcher," 2017). While many meetings with the National Union of Mineworkers followed, Thatcher refused to agree to any of the Union's demands and was ultimately victorious as the miners returned to work without having been granted any concessions ("Margaret Thatcher," 2017). As mining was the main occupation of many working-class Northerners, these strikes were accompanied with violent riots and demonstrations in the streets of the northern towns in which both locals and the police clashed frequently ("United Kingdom," 2017). As becomes clear in *Billy Elliot*, too, the coal mine villagers greatly detested Margaret Thatcher and Michael Heseltine, her Secretary of State for Defence and from 1981 onwards *de facto* Minister for Merseyside, most heavily demonstrated by the song "Merry Christmas Maggie Thatcher" in *Billy Elliot* in which Christmas is primarily celebrated as it is 'one day closer to [Margaret Thatcher's] death' ("Michael Heseltine," 2017; John, 2005b, track 9). In this period, Thatcher noted that 'there is no such thing as society; there were only individuals,' 'and the strongest survived in a world in which governments did not re-distribute wealth or subsidize employment' (Simmons, 2006, p. 122). Although Simmons' article featured the movie version rather than the stage version, his summary of the problem at hand in *Billy Elliot* is certainly applicable to latter version as well: 'this ideological struggle between workers' unions and a government that was bent on destroying them is captured in *Billy Elliot*' (2006, p. 122).

In addition to this political context, class and social order played a heavy role in this period in England as ever: as is also portrayed in *Billy Elliot*, the working-class inhabitants of the mining towns regarded themselves right opposite the higher, political classes. Similar tendencies are found in their relation with the police, as is demonstrated in the song “Solidarity” in which the police remind the miners of their differences in class, income, and origin: “We send our kids to private school, on a private bus”; “a nice extension on the house and a fortnight in Majorca” (John, 2005d, track 4). This difference is also underlined when Billy auditions for the Royal Ballet School in London where he encounters a father and son from obviously higher classes, demonstrated by differences in speech and manners. Simmons concludes that the tension in *Billy Elliot* largely derives from the social order and ‘the world in which the character lives and its values’ (2006, p. 122).

Lastly, regarding conceptions of society and people as well, the element of gender roles is important for the setting of *Billy Elliot* too. As ballet was, and to a certain extent still is, considered a female sport, this is one of the main reasons for Billy’s father and brother to discourage Billy’s attempt at it. As *Billy Elliot* is set in the 1980s, some thirty years before same-sex marriage became officially legal in England and Wales, unconventional gender role behavior by a man or woman, was certainly not approached as open-minded as it is nowadays. Generalized preconceptions of male and female behavior are thoroughly explored in *Billy Elliot*, standing in relation to the notion of social constructivism: ‘all of us are constructed by culture and (...) there are no fixed roles or codes (such as dress) that are essentially male and female’ (Simmons, 2006, p. 122). Perfect examples are found throughout the musical: Billy and his best friend Michael “explore” their female sides through ballet and crossdressing while Billy’s father and brother are struggling to “keep up” their masculinity in their work, family, and community, and Sandra Wilkinson stands up for herself against a conventional community in which men usually have the last word. In summary, *Billy Elliot* ‘question[s] conventional gender roles rather than affirm[s] them (Judy, 2010, p. 2).

#### 4. *Billy Elliot: the analysis*

##### 4.1. The translation of culture

In this first subsection, cultural references have been drawn from the following songs from *Billy Elliot: Shine* (“*Schijn*”), *Solidarity* (“*Solidariteit*”), *Merry Christmas Maggie Thatcher* (“*Vrolijk kerstfeest Maggie Thatcher*”), and *Deep into the ground* (“*Diep onder de grond*”) (John, 2005a, track 10; John, 2005b, track 9; John, 2005c, track 2; John, 2005d, track 4; Kippers, 2016). While it is quite challenging to concretely define culture as such, the instances provided below do show that this group of references form a connected group. Raymond Williams acknowledged the complicatedness of defining “culture” and considered it to be ‘one of the two or three most complicated words in the English language’ (2011, p. 76). The definition provided by the *Oxford English Dictionary* does, however, capture what the examples below together constitute: ‘The distinctive ideas, customs, social behaviour, products or way of life of a particular nation, society, people or period. Hence: a society or group characterized by such customs, etc.’ (“culture,” n.d.). It is especially this last part of the definition that will challenge the translatability of these references as they symbolize English culture.

##### *Shine*

In *Shine*, an example of a cultural reference is found in the form of a theatrical term:

##### Example 1:

ST: Turn on the old pizzazz

TT: Geef ze een pond pizzazz

Example 1 exhibits a cultural reference that is certainly unique to both the English language and culture. Interestingly, while “pizzazz” is non-existent in Dutch culture and does not have an equivalent in the Dutch language either, it has been retained in the translation, demonstrating a case of borrowing and thereby a clear foreignizing approach. While Van Dale suggests translating “pizzazz” as ‘pit,’ ‘fut’ or ‘lef,’ these translations do lack the theatrical connotations and onomatopoeic feature that “pizzazz” holds, which therefore seems an obvious motive for its retention (“pizzazz,” n.d.). Another logical reason for borrowing “pizzazz” is the stress pattern in the sung line; as most Dutch words receive primary stress,

Dutch words that are longer than one syllable would fit in the stress pattern in *Shine*.

### *Solidarity*

In this song, many more references relating to different aspects of English culture have been integrated. As can be seen below, varying translation approaches have been taken:

#### Example 2:

ST: When you were on the picket line we went and fucked ye missus

TT: Intussen hebben wij je vrouw een flinke beurt gegeven

#### Example 3:

ST: Keep it up till Christmas lads

TT: Blijf nog effe staken boys

#### Example 4:

ST: We send our kids to private school, on a private bus

TT: We sturen onze kinders naar een hele dure school

#### Example 5:

ST: A nice extension on the house and a fortnight in Majorca

TT: Vakantie op Mallorca plus een mooie nieuwe keuken

#### Example 6:

ST: We'll boot your fucking cockney skulls right back to Bethnal Green

TT: We trappen jullie dikke reet weer naar de grote stad

#### Example 7:

ST: It's tutu bleeding tea dance

TT: Het is hier geen kinderfeessie

Examples 2 up to 7 show that unless a cultural feature is either easily translatable or also found in Dutch, a domesticating approach has been taken. In examples 4, 6 and 7, the ST items have been replaced with more general and less connotative TT items; i.e. the English cultural items have been lost here. In Example 4, as sung by the policemen, the denotation



and connotation belonging to private schools have been “summarized” in the translation of “hele dure school” (“very expensive school”) – an obvious choice as the public school/private school dichotomy does not exist in the Netherlands. In the case of example 6, Bethnal Green does prove inherently difficult to translate as it likely refers to a very specific event: the occupation of the Public Library in Bethnal Green, London, by the Council of Action on the fifth day of the miners’ strike in 1984 (German & Rees, 2012, p. 192). As this connotation is surely lost on any Dutch audience, the modulation from particular to general here is a logical choice; i.e. “weer naar grote stad” (“back to the big city”).

Interestingly, similar approaches have been taken in Examples 2 and 3 where “picket line” has been replaced with “intussen” (“in the meantime”), and even “Christmas” has been generalized by opting for the translation of “effe” (“for a bit”), even though the latter could have been simply translated in a straightforward (and foreignizing) fashion as “Houd nog vol tot Kerstmis boys,” fitting the stress and rhythm pattern. All of these examples clearly demonstrate some sort of loss and a “non-foreignizing” approach as the cultural items were apparently considered too foreign to retain. The term “non-foreignizing” approach is used here as an alternative for domestication since the translation procedures that have been applied here actually exhibit neutralization in general rather than concrete adaptation to the TC. This definition of “non-foreignizing” is unrelated to Wong’s (2014) usage which appears to be – as concluded from the fact that no actual definition is provided – a plain synonym of domestication.

The only exception to this tendency is found in Example 5, in which, despite the modulation in the form of change of symbol in “an extension on the house” to “een mooie nieuwe keuken” (“a nice new kitchen”), the holiday on Majorca has been retained in Dutch. While Majorca is a holiday destination that is more strongly embedded in English culture, it has not been domesticated into a destination that holds the same position in Dutch culture, such as Lake Garda in Italy or Costa del Sol in Spain. Nonetheless, while the destination itself is retained, the connotations do lack in Dutch.

### *Merry Christmas Maggie Thatcher*

In *Merry Christmas Maggie Thatcher*, many more cultural references are found in the form of geographical locations, Christmas customs, and nicknames for the police. In these instances, it becomes much clearer that translatability is harder to achieve as all these references are so heavily embedded in English society that, in combination with the restriction of the sung format, foreignization becomes an unfavorable strategy, whereby most

instances are therefore domesticated. This has mostly been done through the use of generalization – ‘a specific (or concrete) term is translated by a more general (or abstract) term.’ (Vinay and Darbelnet, 1995, p. 343).

Example 8:

ST: Is it old Rudolph the Reindeer?

TT: Is het Rudolph soms, het rendier?

Example 9:

ST: Is it Santa on his sleigh?

TT: Of de kerstman op z'n slee?

Example 10:

ST: It's heading up to Easington

TT: Komt deze kant uit, opgepast

Example 11:

ST: It's coming down the Tyne

TT: Want kijk haar nou toch zijn

Example 12:

ST: They've come to raid your stockings

TT: Ze gaptten onze kerstboom

Example 13:

ST: And to steal your Christmas pud

TT: Ze aasten de kalkoen

Example 14:

ST: And they've brought their boys in blue

TT: En munitie zonder eind

Example 15:

ST: And the whole Trade Union Congress

TT: En de wetten van ons bazen

Contrary to earlier-discussed examples, the translations in Examples 8 and 9 show a clear foreignizing approach despite containing typically Anglo-American (and thereby non-Dutch) cultural elements: “Rudolph the Reindeer” and “Santa on his sleigh.” Interestingly, in Example 12 and 13 other Christmas-related items are found yet in these instances the ST items have not been retained. Instead, “stockings” have been replaced with “kerstboom” (“Christmas tree”) and “Christmas pud” with “de kalkoen” (“the turkey”). In these last two cases, the ST items have been transformed through adaptation, which is ‘used in those cases where the type of situation being referred to by the SL message is unknown in the TL culture’ (Vinay & Darbelnet, 2004, pp. 90-91). While both Santa and Rudolph are familiar concepts in the Netherlands, due to the heavy influx of English and American Christmas culture, stockings and Christmas pud were however not preserved in Dutch. Though van Dale suggests translating the former as “sok” or “kous” and the latter as “pudding” or “toetje,” these translations would lack its ST connotations; no equivalence between code-units could possibly arise here (see section 2.3.1 on Jakobson’s discussion of *Käse* and *cheese*). In addition, expanding these more general translations with the Dutch prefix “kerst-” (“Christmas ...”) would render the nouns too long for the sung line and syllable and stress pattern. These different reasons show a clear motivation for the “non-foreignizing” strategy that was used here.

In Examples 10 and 11, the geographical locations have been removed altogether by means of a modulation from particular to general in the translation of the ST item “Easington,” a town in Durham County, to “deze kant” (“this way”), while for the line “It’s coming down the Tyne” the ST phrase has been altered completely: “Want kijk haar nou toch zijn” (“Take a good look at her”). The replacement of the two geographical ST items is not obligatory as such that the lines could have been translated as “Het komt omhoog naar Easington” or “Het stijgt omhoog naar Easington” and “’t Gaat neerwaarts op de Tyne” as well, respectively, fitting the ST’s lyrical stress and rhythm patterns. This ST generalizing procedure fits a domesticating, or actually “non-foreignizing,” strategy perfectly as the ST cultural items and corresponding connotations have been removed altogether.

The cultural items found in Examples 14 and 15 – “boys in blue” and “Trade Union Congress” – have, similar to earlier examples, been generalized as well. In theory, “boys in

blue” could have received a more foreignizing approach, for example by translating it as “smerissen,” “wouten” or even “mannen in het blauw”; in order to comply with the stress and rhythm pattern. In addition, suitable domesticating options would have for example been “En hun mannen in het blauw” or “En namen hun wouten mee.” Rather, a modulation in the category of change of symbol has taken place through the use of a metonymy from “boys in blue” to “munitie zonder eind” (“endless munition”), as this is evidently associated with the police. In Example 15, another generalization can be found: the ST unit “the whole Trade Union Congress” has been replaced by “ons bazen,” which indeed technically comes down to the same reference though the cultural aspect has been lost due to the applied translation procedure.

#### *Deep into the ground*

Lastly, in *Deep into the ground*, a reference similar to the last-mentioned example is found, as it concerns the Trade Union once more:

#### Example 16:

ST: And on me fifteenth birthday, I paid my Union dues

TT: Op m'n vijftiende verjaardag, toen kwamen ze me halen

The procedure that was taken here, is clearly also similar to the example in *Merry Christmas Maggie Thatcher*, namely generalization. As any literal translation of “Union dues” into Dutch – e.g. “vakbondsbijdrage,” simply “bijdrage” or “gelden” – would not only be too long to fit within the restriction of the sung line, the TL audience would likely also miss the connotations that belong to the ST item within the ST context and culture.

The majority of examples provided in this part of the analysis regarding culture demonstrate that in many cases – often also largely due to the restriction the lyrical stress and rhythm patterns place on the translation choices – a domesticating or “non-foreignizing,” approach is taken. However, this approach does not directly entail domestication; as the ST items are often generalized in the TL, this is a case of the items being “toned down” rather than adjusted for or remodeled to fit into the TT culture. In these type of cases, therefore, instead of *true* domestication, it is rather “non-foreignization” that is found.

#### 4.2. The translation of class (and swearing)

In this paragraph, the translation of class and swearing will be discussed. Even today, class still plays an important role in English society and is therefore also found throughout *Billy Elliot*. Accordingly, Simmons noted that ‘Billy’s whole life is circumscribed by his class, his gender and his age’ (2006, p. 122). Arguably no other country can be found in Western-Europe in which a person’s regional, financial, and even political background determines his or her status so heavily and in which terms such as “middle class” and “upper class” are still thus frequently used. Moreover, this trend looks to be particularly strong in the north of England. ‘Historically, regionality and class have been entwined and conflated: the working class was Northern and the North was working class’ (Tomaney, 2010, p. 87). Below, most class-related references consist of examples in which regional background plays a significant role. In the case of *Billy Elliot*, Billy’s class has been established through both his regional as well as his financial background: as both his father and brother are miners, and therefore “real” working-class men from the north of England, Billy can certainly be regarded in this context as “lower class.”

For many cities in England, regional nicknames, or ethnonyms, have been assigned to the corresponding residents – from Scousers to Brummies and from Geordies to Mancs. While the majority of these ethnonyms are found in the north of England, Londoners, or more precisely those belonging to the lower classes in London, are likewise often referred to as “cockney.” Pearce (2015) argued that ‘folk ethnonyms are never simple labels neutrally referencing to the inhabitants of a place’ (p. 76); it does not exclusively refer to a person’s place of origin. The ethnonym *Geordie*, for example, has been provided with different denotations and connotations throughout different decades and is nowadays primarily associated with inhabitants of Newcastle because of arguable cultural appropriation by Newcastle and the recent popularity of the tv series *Geordie Shore* (Pearce, 2015, p. 83). Conversely, from the early nineteenth century onwards, *Geordie* was a nickname for miners or seamen from the north of England more generally (Pearce, 2015, p. 81); ‘when Geordie is a pit-worker and sailor he is situated across the region’ (Pearce, 2015, p. 80). In addition to these occupational associations, the ethnonym *Geordie* has had to suffer additional negative class-related connotations resulting from ‘the unequal social and economic outcomes for different parts of the North East consequent upon de-industrialization’ (Pearce, 2015, p. 82), which seems rather unjust as the North was not the sole region that suffered from the de-industrialization.

Additionally, this subsection features swearwords as well. While empirical research has proven the contrary (McEnery & Xiao, 2004; van Hofwegen, 2015), class and swearing regularly remain heavily associated with one another; ‘according to notions of “received wisdom” concerning the sociolinguistic modes of English society, which still preserves its traditional class structure to surprising degree, swearing is a low-class habit’ (Hughes, 2006, p. 80). This preconception is also accurately portrayed in the scene in which Billy and his father go to the auditions for the Royal Ballet School in London. Strengthening these prejudices, Bonvillain argued that ‘language use both reflects and reinforces class differences’ (1993, p. 208) – a feature that is certainly seen being exploited in *Billy Elliot*. The majority of the examples provided in this paragraph of the analysis features references to regional backgrounds and swearwords.

### *Shine*

In *Shine*, a prime example of class-related references is found in the use of regional background. In the sequence “maimed” and “lame,” “Leeds” has been placed alongside the former two, implying that being born in Leeds is equally bad as being maimed or lame. As this geographical class-related reference would be received purely denotatively by a Dutch TT audience – i.e. they would miss the connotations that are attached to the ST item – the ST item has been generalized into “bijna dood” (“nearly dead”), as can be seen in Example 17. While the obvious negative denotation remains, the geographical reference and connotation have been lost.

### Example 17:

ST: Maimed or lame, or born in Leeds

TT: Stram of lam, of bijna dood

### *Solidarity*

In *Solidarity*, many more examples of class-related references and swearing can be found. Especially the contrast between the policemen and the miners is exaggerated through the use of earlier-mentioned ethnonyms which, especially in the context of this song, truly emphasize the fact that a person’s place of origin defines his or her class in England, and thereby the person as a whole within English society.

Example 18:

ST: Oi Geordie

TT: Oi tuig

Example 19:

ST: You think you're smart ya cockney shite

TT: Daar sta je dan, politieplik

Example 20:

ST: We've got a lot to thank you for, Geordie you're a corker

TT: Het levert zoveel op voor jou, de harses in te beuken

Example 21:

ST: We'll boot your fucking cockney skulls

TT: We trappen jullie dikke reet

In Examples 18 up to 21, two particular ethnonyms are found: “Geordie” and “cockney.” While the former is used as a noun and the latter as an adjective, both ST items have largely been generalized in all four TT phrases. In the case of “Geordie” in Example 18, for instance, “Geordie” has clearly been generalized through a replacement with “tuig” (“scum”) in the TT. In Example 20, an even more rigorous adaptation of the ST unit has taken place: the ST’s intensive verb phrase “Geordie you’re a corker” has been transposed into an infinitival prepositional verb phrase that has lost both the ethnonym and the ironic usage of “corker” (as it has not been used here in its original, literal sense) that are found in the ST: “de harses in te beuken” (“crack your skull”).

Moreover, the instances of “cockney” proved even more difficult to translate. Because of the societal discontent that resulted from the government’s decisions and ensuing political unrest, additional police forces were employed ‘as a nationally coordinated arm of government authority’ (Gordon, 2016, p. 430). Within this particular context, the adjective “cockney” is obviously used here to refer to the police forces originating from London that were stationed in the Durham area. Moreover, the “Geordies” can be seen here as a broader representation of the hard-working, honest working class of the north versus the different policemen from various regions from the middle and South of England – i.e. the “cockneys” who together symbolized what the northerners detested most: Westminster, representing the

political capital of England. The translation of “cockney” has been approached in two different ways: in Example 19, the ethnonym has been made semantically explicit by rendering it into “politie-” (“police”) in the TT while in Example 21, a case of loss is found as “cockney” has been translated into “dikke” (“fat”) in the TT.

In addition to these ethnonyms, there are also a number of swearwords to be considered: “shite” in Example 19, “corker” in Example 20, and “fucking” in Example 21. Though “corker” in as used in Example 20 is not necessarily a swearword, it has been included here as it is used ironically in the ST. While “corker” and “fucking” have been lost, “shite” has undergone a transposition from adjective to a compound noun – i.e. “politieplik” (± “police dick”) – and has therefore received a less generalizing procedure as the swearword has been retained. It is evident that in these four examples above, again, mainly a domesticating or “non-foreignizing” strategy has been applied, to bigger and lesser extents.

Example 22:

ST: You fucking worms  
 You fucking moles  
 You fucking Geordie shits  
 We’re here to kick your Geordie arse  
 You little Geordie gits

TT: Hé focking plebs  
 Hé focking shits  
 Hé focking kolentuig  
 We rammen jullie stuk voor stuk  
 De konten in je huig

The first two lines containing “worms” and “moles,” a reference to the miners’ underground stationing, features a loss and compensation simultaneously; while the ST items “worms” and “moles” have been completely omitted, the translation of “plebs” and “shits” do compensate for the swearing and connotations attached to “Geordies” that have been lost in other references. Again, one of the most probable reasons for this is the fact that the translation concerns a song: a literal translation in the form of “wormen” (“worms”) or “mollen” (“moles”) would not fit the ST rhyme and stress scheme. Interestingly, contrary to Example 21, the threefold use of “fucking” has actually been retained in the Dutch TT, though having undergone a phonological adaptation from English /ʌ/ to Dutch /ɔ/.



While the ethnonym “Geordie” appears three times in the ST, it has been translated differently in each TT segment. In the first instance of “Geordie shits,” the least domesticating strategy can be found since a modulation from abstract to concrete has taken place: while “Geordie” does indeed refer to miners from the north of England, this is covertly captured in the ethnonym. By opting for the translation of “kolentuig” (“coal scum”) in the TT, an explicitation, or concretization of the ST item has occurred. In the other two cases of “Geordie arse” and “Geordie gits” no such procedure has been applied but rather a loss has taken place: as this fourth and fifth line have been rendered into the TT as “We rammen jullie stuk voor stuk, De konten in je huig” (“We’ll kick your asses into your throat, one by one”), both the swearwords as well as the ethnonyms (or any ethnonymous remnant) have been lost.

### *Merry Christmas Maggie Thatcher*

#### Example 23:

ST: You’re a tosser, you’re a wanker

TT: Je bent een viesnek, en een hufter

In *Merry Christmas Maggie Thatcher*, a final line with two examples of swearing is found, in the forms of “tossler” and “wanker” – two distinctly English swearwords that have thus far not been borrowed into the Dutch language as swearwords (van Hofwegen, 2015; Rassin & Muris, 2005; van Sterkenburg, 2008). While the most foreignizing approach would be to retain the original swearwords, a rather domesticating approach has been taken here as the translator has implemented native Dutch (swear)words into the TT: “viesnek” (± “scum”) and “hufter” (“asshole”). In addition, it is striking that the two TT swearing items differ heavily in their harshness in comparison to the corresponding ST items: while Dutch “viesnek” is less coarse than English “tossler,” Dutch “hufter” is (nowadays arguably more than in earlier periods) a rougher swearword than English “wanker.” As these two translations balance each other out, it is reasonable to argue that translational compensation takes place here.

### **4.3. The translation of dialect**

Perteghella (2002) aptly noted in her article on language and politics on stage that dialect and slang play a very important role in theater as it can ‘shape dramatic characterization and position the character within a certain community or group and within a specific cultural and linguistic tradition’ (p. 45). On a more linguistic level, she acknowledged that ‘dialects can be

both geographical and social' (2002, p. 45) – an important aspect that is certainly proven by the dialect spoken in *Billy Elliot* as well. Possibly stronger than in any other part of the United Kingdom, in England sociolects and dialects are heavily intertwined. In his introduction to *Translating Dialects and Languages of Minorities*, Federico Federici (2011) discussed dialect and sociolect thus interchangeably that he clearly considered the two heavily intertwined as well. He supported this view by citing Crystal (1991): 'the study of dialects is sometimes seen as a branch of sociolinguistics, and sometimes differentiated from it, under the heading of dialectology, especially when regional dialects are the focus of study' (pp. 319-320). Peter Trudgill, forerunner in the field of English dialectology, discerned dialects as differing 'in their pronunciation – their accents – and in their grammar and vocabulary' (1999, p. 14). A similarly broad definition of "dialect" is found in Chambers and Trudgill's work: varieties 'which are grammatically (and perhaps lexically) as well as phonologically different from other varieties' (1998, p. 5). One of the issues, according to Federici, that arises by naming this specific type of language a "variety" is that it implies that a "standard" exists, and thereby a hierarchical system (2011, p. 3). However, certainly in England, this is indeed the case – both in terms of class as well as dialect: 'dialects in England have historically been regarded as degradations of standard English since they depart from "Received pronunciation" which established itself throughout the centuries as a model of correct English' (De Martino Cappuccio, 2011, p. 61). Both in *Billy Elliot* as well as in England as a whole, culture, class, and dialect truly do form a trinity and are interconnected.

While the above definitions vary from one to another, some generalizations can be made: a dialect is often closely associated with a regional and/or social background and it generally differs from other varieties in terms of phonology, grammar, and lexicon. Therefore, the "dialect" in the original and translated version *Billy Elliot* will thus be examined and discussed from a largely phonological point of view, complemented by grammatical and lexical features. Lastly, a comparison and evaluation of the translation approach taken will be provided. While the original dialect found in *Billy Elliot* is existent, and based on a dialect spoken in northern England, the dialect used in the Dutch translation of *Billy Elliot* consists of a number of various features found in different dialects from the Netherlands, in addition to invented features – a strategy to which Perteghella refers to as 'pseudo-dialectal translation' (2002, p. 50).

### 4.3.1. The dialect in the original *Billy Elliot*

As *Billy Elliot* is situated in a mining village in the county of Durham (Gordon, p. 429), it is evident that the variety spoken in the musical is a northern English dialect. For an objective and broader perspective, this analysis will consider expositions of this particular dialect by Peter Trudgill and David Crystal, a pioneer in the field of English linguistics. Though dialectal classifications generally differ per author or work, a set of overlapping linguistic features can generally be discerned. Peter Trudgill, for one, famous for his work *The Dialects of England*, argued that realistically ‘there is really no such thing as an entirely separate, self-contained dialect’ (1999, p. 6). While he does ‘realize that dialects form a continuum,’ Trudgill has however divided this continuum up ‘into areas at points where it is least continuum-like,’ ‘for the sake of clarity and brevity’ (1999, p. 3).

#### *Phonology and phonetics*

Likely the most general phonological division distinguished in England is that between the north and south. Although this concerns a somewhat broader division, it does contain a number of (mostly vowel-related) features that do stand out in the Durham dialect, which are also found in *Billy Elliot*. While this dialect is rather distinct by nature, it is also part of the bigger “North-East” and the “North” region and therefore exhibits a fair number of their larger regional phonological features as well.

First of all, in northern English there appears to be one vowel less than in the southern variety as they rhyme “but” with “put” and “could” with “cud” by pronouncing these vowels with a ‘short “oo” vowel throughout’ (Trudgill, 1999, p. 51), a type of shortened realization of Royal Pronunciation (henceforth: RP) /ʊ:/. This vowel is maintained in ““but”-words’ such as “cup,” “up,” “butter,” “some,” “other,” [and] “luck” (Trudgill, 1999, p. 51). Similarly, the “a” in words such as “gate” are pronounced as a monophthong rather than as a diphthong, which is the case in most parts of the middle and south of England; in the Durham dialect and in many dialects from the Manchester area up to Newcastle “gate” is roughly realized as “geht,” or even as the alternative diphthong “ee-a,” contrary to the RP diphthong /eɪ/ (Trudgill, 1999, p. 60; p. 67). Secondly, and more specifically found in the northeastern dialect area of Newcastle, Sunderland, and Durham, the vowel found in the final syllable of words such as “coffee,” “city,” “seedy,” and “money” is pronounced as a short /ɪ/ or /e/ vowel (as found in the RP realization of “kitten” and “bed”), contrary to most parts of the country where it is pronounced as a long vowel, namely RP /i:/ (Trudgill, 1999, pp. 59-60). Also, “bird,” “shirt,” and “work” are pronounced identically to “north” and “for” – namely

‘with the same “aw” vowel,’ causing ““shirt” and “short” [to become] identical’ (p. 67). Furthermore, when “a” is followed by “r” and an additional consonant in the Durham dialect region, “a” is fronted and realized as /æ:/ (Crystal, 1995, p. 320).

Regarding the use of consonants, there are four more phonological features to be discussed: final consonant cluster simplification, whereby consonants that follow a consonant and precede a vowel are dropped, such as in “firs(t) answer” and “poun(d) of tea” (Chambers & Trudgill, 1998, pp. 129-130; p. 133); affrication of initial /p t k/ whereby “tart” is realized as /tsɑ:t/ (Collins & Mees, 2003, p. 296); realization of final “-ing” as /ŋ/ instead of /ŋ/ (Collins & Mees, 2003, p. 297); and glottal replacement of medial /t/ such as in “bottle,” causing it to be realized as /bɒʔəl/ (Collins & Mees, 2003, p. 297).

#### *Features from other linguistic categories*

In addition to these phonological features, the dialect in Durham county exhibits a number of additional particularities found in other linguistic categories: in relation to morphology, the first singular form of “to be” is realized as “I aren’t” or as “I isn’t” (Crystal, 1995, p. 322); syntactic variation is exhibited in ditransitive verb phrases in which “give me it” is preferred over “give it to me” (Crystal, 1995, p. 323); commonly found “headache” is occasionally replaced with ‘(a bit) headwark’ (Crystal, 1995, p. 321).

In the musical *Billy Elliot* more specifically, the following distinctive grammatical and lexical uses and variations appear: the extensive use of “like” at the end of questions (i.e. “What she done, like?”); the use of “bairn” to denote a child; the use of first person singular direct object pronoun “me” instead of first person possessive pronoun “my”; and first person singular object pronoun “me” is largely replaced with first person plural “us.” Finally, as was discussed in the second part of this analysis as well, an important aspect of the language spoken in *Billy Elliot* is the heavy use of swearwords throughout by both children and adults.

#### **4.3.2. The dialect in the Dutch translation of Billy Elliot**

An overview of the dialect spoken in the translation of *Billy Elliot*, which has largely been invented and compiled, will be discussed through an overview of its main characteristics. Perteghella argued that during translation of any dialect, there are always three tendencies showing: translators usually translate into dialects they are familiar with as this is the easiest choice, there are always parallels ‘between source nonstandard languages and idioms and target ones,’ and a translator should always take the immediate impact of stage dialogue into

consideration (2002, p. 46). Clearly, these three tendencies also hold true for the dialect spoken in the Dutch version of *Billy Elliot*: different linguistic features are incorporated from existent Dutch dialects, one clear parallel can be drawn in the form of the replacement of Dutch first person possessive pronoun “mijn” with “me” (“me”) (similar to the replacement in English of “my” with “me”), and self-evidently much care has been taken into the construction of the target dialect, with thorough consideration of on-stage usage.

### *Phonology and phonetics*

The distinctive phonological and phonetic, or accentual, features found in the dialect spoken in the Dutch version of *Billy Elliot* are largely reminiscent of the Amsterdam dialect. The following distinct features can be discerned both in Dutch *Billy Elliot* as well as the Amsterdam dialect: the standard Dutch diphthong /ei/, as in *rijst* /reist/ is pronounced as a monophthong, ranging between [æ] to [ɑ] (Chambers & Trudgill, 1998, p. 185); long front vowels tend to be realized as back vowels: in “raam,” for example, /a:/ is realized [ɑ:] while /o:/ in “school” is actually realized as [ɔ:] (Collins & Mees, 2003, p. 78).

Similarly, the certain consonant features found in Dutch *Billy Elliot* are also reminiscent of the Amsterdam dialect: while lenis/fortis distinctions are already practically fully lost in Dutch in general, /v, z, ʒ, x/ additionally become /f, s, ʃ, χ/, whereby “vijver” is pronounced as /ˈfɛifər/ (Collins & Mees, 2003, p. 189; Canepari & Cerini, 2013, p. 143). In addition, intermedial /t/ is realized in *Billy Elliot* as [s], whereby “politie” and “auditie” are realized as /po:li:si:/ and /audi:si:/, while similarly intermedial /d/ in between vowels is rendered as /j/, whereby “poeder” is phonetically realized as [pu:jəɔ]. Furthermore, while “r” is realized in standard Dutch in the onset as a uvular tap or trill [ʀ], here it is realized as an alveolar one instead, namely [ʀ] (Collins & Mees, 2003, p. 201), and consonant clusters in which an “r” is followed by any of the following plosives, nasals, and fricatives: /k, p, m, n, f, x/, a schwa is inserted. In the standard Dutch “ABN” variety, /ə/-insertion ‘only occurs in word-final position following a contoid /r/,’ but in the *Billy Elliot* dialect, it is also found in words such as “kerk,” “arm,” and “erg” which thereby become /kɛrək, arəm, ɛrəx/ (Collins & Mees, 2003, p. 201). Lastly, “r” is pronounced in all positions as a “dark /l/,” namely [ɫ], which is normally found in standard Dutch in word-final position only (Canepari & Cerini, 2013, p. 144).

### *Grammar and lexical categories*

The grammar and lexical particularities found in the Dutch *Billy Elliot* dialect are considerably less bound to the Amsterdam dialect, some of them belonging to or being reminiscent of other Dutch dialects and others having been invented. With regard to the grammar found in *Billy Elliot*, there are a few particular tendencies that show. First of all, first person possessive pronoun “ons” (“our”) is used instead of the standard Dutch first person subject pronoun “we” (“we”), despite being followed by first person singular verbal inflections (i.e. “nou ben ons ’t zat” (“and now we’re done”). While it is common for the dialect spoken in the province of Brabant to replace “mijn” (“my”) with “ons” (“our”) when denoting an individual’s relative in particular, i.e. “ons mam” (“our mom”), the grammatical switch found in *Billy Elliot* is much more unusual in Dutch grammar. Secondly, as was noted before, first person possessive pronoun “mijn” (“my”) has been replaced with the first person reflexive pronoun “me” (“me”). Similarly, the Dutch third person singular subject pronoun “hij” is regularly replaced with third person singular object pronoun “hem,” resulting in phrases such as “Wat de fock doet ’m dan wel?” (“What the fuck does him do then?”). The frequent use of these evidently ungrammatical Dutch formulations might be to underline the “lower class” background of the miners.

The true distinctiveness of the Dutch *Billy Elliot* dialect is found in the vocabulary used; while these distinctive words are generally not used in standard Dutch, either because they are archaic or invented, their repetitive and recurring use make these words as a whole seem a dialectal system. These archaic or invented words principally comprise slang and swearing, consisting among others of: “nôh” instead of “nee” (“no”), “effe” instead “even” (“quickly”), “fier” instead of “trots” (“proud” – “fier” is regularly largely found Flemish), “viesnek” (“scum”), “miet” (“fag”), “klote van de bok” (±“worst of the whole lot”), “godsnakend” (“godforbid”), and “klaplul” (± “numskull”) (van Gelder, 2014). In addition to these rarely used Dutch words, stronger forms of lexicon foreignization can be found in the names: “Tracy Atkinson,” “Mister Braithwaite,” “Susan Parks,” and so forth, have not been domesticated into Dutch names while the English currency has also been retained: “Dat wordt dan 50 p.” (“That’ll be 50 p’s”).

### **4.3.3. From source dialect to target dialect: a comparison**

Following the five-fold categorization for theatrical transposition of the translation of dialect and slang – consisting of dialect compilation, pseudo-dialect translation, parallel dialect

translation, dialect localization, and standardization – as suggested by Perteghella, the approach taken in *Billy Elliot* is a clear case of “pseudo-dialectal translation” in which the translator ‘make[s] up a fictitious indistinct dialect, usually using non-standard language and idiomatic features of various target language dialects’ (2002, p. 50). Vandepitte defines this particular approach as “employing an artificial alternative,” and more specifically the variety in which the translator opts for the production of ‘an “intermediary” dialect, starting out from the standard, but introducing non-standard grammar, while at the same time, using a lexis that is [as] regionally unmarked as possible’ (2010, p. 106).

Taking the above-mentioned trends into consideration, the strategy adopted in *Billy Elliot* is certainly more strongly foreignizing than domesticating since, for example, approaches such as “standardization” and “dialect localization” have been discarded and rather, a new dialect was created – a dialect comprising existent accentual features from the Amsterdam dialect, grammatical features reminiscent of other Dutch dialect areas (i.e. Brabant “ons”), and archaic and fabricated Dutch words and grammar, ensuring that the dialect would feel foreign to the TT audience. Especially the incorporation of the distinctive lexicon makes the dialect feel unfamiliar and distant, causing some reviews of the Dutch version of *Billy Elliot* to evaluate the colloquial speech as giving a rather labored impression or affecting *Billy Elliot*’s authenticity in a particularly negative way (van Gelder, 2004; Bloemkolk, 2014). In addition, the use of archaic words can be considered as a compensation strategy as such that while the history of the mining strikes is an important part of England’s history in the 1980s, this part of history is not common knowledge in the Netherlands, which thereby emphasizes the fact that the story is set some thirty years ago. Another compensation strategy is found in the incorporation of the accentual features from the Amsterdam accent which, to a certain extent, compensates for the “Geordie”-connotations that were lost in translation. Within this context, Perteghella aptly noted that ‘there are several strategies for translating dialect (...) for the stage, and these strategies, together with choices in production, will manipulate the target reception of the play’ (2002, p. 46). As the Amsterdam dialect certainly contains similar working class-like connotations, the Dutch audience will experience a comparable reception to the ST audience, at least on an accentual level.

All in all, it is evident that the dialect in the translation of *Billy Elliot* was assembled in such a way that the translated dialect leans heavier towards the SL and SC by incorporating compensation strategies and foreign-feeling elements into a fabricated, “new” Dutch dialect.

## 5. Discussion

### 5.1. Introduction

In this thesis, the use of foreignizing and domesticating strategies and their role in achieving translatability have been examined in the context of the Dutch translation of the musical *Billy Elliot*. Material was taken from the songs *Shine* (“Schijn”), *Solidarity* (“Solidariteit”), *Merry Christmas Maggie Thatcher* (“Vrolijk Kerstfeest Maggie Thatcher”), and *Deep into the ground* (“Diep onder de grond”). Relevant examples in the categories of culture and class were provided in addition to an overall comparative evaluation of the dialect spoken in both the original English version and the translated Dutch version in order to gain a broader understanding of the role of foreignization, domestication, and translatability in cultural-historical musicals.

### 5.2. Main findings and comparison with earlier studies

#### 5.2.1. The translation of culture

Aside from a few exceptions – “pizzazz,” “Rudolph the Reindeer,” “Santa on his sleigh” – the majority of cultural references found in the examples provided in the first section of the analysis showed an overall “non-foreignizing” approach. In the case of “pizzazz” – a borrowing – the ST item was retained in order to fit the sung line; ‘foreignizing strictures such as (...) rhyme schemes or to match source-language sounds’ are retained whereby foreignization is incorporated (Apter & Herman, 2016, p. 34). Aside from this exception, in most cases either a generalizing translation procedure was applied whereby a cultural ST reference was replaced by a rather neutral TT word, such as “effe” for “Christmas,” or a modulation took place causing a cultural loss in the TT, as found for example in the translation of ST “Trade Union Congress” into TT “ons bazen.” While Vandepitte stated that the translation of dialect in drama ‘usually requires an approach that is different from neutralization’ (2010, p. 110), by which she seems to refer to standardization of non-standard language, the opposite certainly holds true for the translation of cultural references in this study.

Other studies that have examined foreignization and domestication have resulted in similar conclusions: while McKelvey’s study is more heavily focused on the rhythmical aspect of the translation of *Les Misérables*, he concluded that due to the exceptional (rhythmical) constraints, the translation of a Broadway-musical ‘demands adaptation rather than translation’ (2001, p. 81). Not only is adaptation found in a number of instances in *Billy*



*Elliot* – i.e. “hele dure school” – but occasionally, even more rigorously so, the ST cultural items have been plainly omitted: “want kijk haar nou toch zijn.” Though Matielo and Espindola and Yılmaz-Gümüş all found an overall foreignizing approach in their studies, they also drew conclusions that agree with the findings in this study; the former stressed that domestication was used to adjust SC context into TC context in order to diminish the impact of otherness regarding cultural elements, similar to “stockings” and “Christmas pud” in Examples 12 and 13 while Yılmaz-Gümüş noted that substitution procedures were used in ‘compulsory situations’ (similar to McKelvey’s (2001) findings) which holds true for the rhythmical restrictions that are found in the translations of “pizzazz” and “Trade Union Congress.” The conclusion that can be drawn from the trends found in the translation procedures and strategies used in this particular field is that cultural translatability cannot be achieved without any use of domestication, though be it to different extents and with the use of different procedures.

### **5.2.2. The translation of class (and swearing)**

In the second part of the analysis, regarding the translation of class (and swearing), similar trends are found as in the first section: primarily “non-foreignizing” approaches are applied through procedures of generalization, explicitation or even full loss of the ST item. Regarding the translation of class, or in this case more specifically the translation of ethnonyms, most translations experienced a loss. A trend that is particularly interesting and worth mentioning is found in the translation of swearing: there is a clear difference in the coarseness of swearwords between ST and TT items which are, as a whole, balanced out as such that compensation takes place in the form of the use of stronger or weaker swearwords in the TT. While this is most clearly found in Example 23 in which “tosser” is translated as “viesnek” (i.e. less coarse) and “wanker” as “huffer” (i.e. coarser), it is also visible in other examples: ST “cockney skulls” to TT “jullie dikke reet” and ST “moles” to TT “shits.” This is an interesting trend as such that both in the United Kingdom as well as in the Netherlands, the intended audience for *Billy Elliot* are not only adults, but also (smaller) children. Although the Dutch have been found to generally not be averse to the use of swearwords and hearing them, especially compared to Brits or Americans (Krouwels, 2014, p. 20; p. 24), it is interesting that overall the coarseness of the English swearwords has been retained.

Unfortunately, limited studies are available on the translation of class and swearing, especially within the context of foreignization, domestication, and translatability. In the case

of class, or more specifically ethnonyms, Bruti, Vald on, and Zanotti (2014) found that ethnonyms not only play a significant role in an ST in general but also that they were mostly calqued and that the most recent translation were least offensive, which can certainly be linked to the loss and explicitation found in the translated ethnonyms in this study (i.e. “tuig” and “politie”) (pp. 310-311). Regarding the translation of swearing, Fern andez Dobao (2006) concluded in her English-Spanish study that ‘English expletives may be rendered into Spanish with quite a satisfying degree of success’ (p. 240). Although the study at hand might show slightly different trends, the overall impression of swearing and coarseness is however conveyed due to the earlier-mentioned neutralizing, explicitizing, generalizing, and compensating strategies. Similar to Fern andez Dobao’s research, the examples provided in this study, too, ‘illustrate the range of translation strategies available for the translator in order to compensate for (...) problematicity’ (2006, p. 240). Lastly, Apter and Herman noted that in the case of slang – which is heavily intertwined with swearing as they are both commonly considered bad language (Lantto, 2014, p. 634) – any omission of it ‘smooths and domesticates a translation’ (2016, p. 48), which is certainly also relevant for the omissions in the examples above. Overall, it may be concluded that within this second subject area of class and swearing, too, a domesticating rather than foreignizing approach has been applied.

### **5.2.3. The translation of dialect**

While there remains a certain untranslatable aspect to dialects, it is however possible to discern whether a domesticating or foreignizing approach has been taken in the translation of a dialect. In the case of *Billy Elliot*, the strategy is clearly more foreignizing than domesticating as it opposes stronger domesticating strategies such as dialect localization (i.e. ‘localize a dialect or slang into another specific to the target-language frame’ (Perteghella, 2002, p. 50). In addition, it is much less generalizing than, for instance, a standardization strategy, which was found in the first two sections of the analysis. The pseudo-dialectal translation approach – an evident foreignizing approach – thereby juxtaposes the more domesticating, or rather “non-foreignizing,” approaches taken in the translation of culture and class. While certain properties may have been lost in the translation process, the pragmatic aspect of the dialect has remained intact: by incorporating Amsterdam accent features, the ST working-class connotations are largely retained and with the addition of uncommon grammatical and lexical features, the foreignness of the setting is accentuated. In the area of

lexicon, this trend is even stronger given the retention of English names and currency. Compounding a TT dialect thusly nevertheless requires caution; ‘if foreignizing devices are applied blindly and injudiciously, the resulting translations are incomprehensible or silly’ (Apter & Herman, 2016, p. 34).

Regardless whether a domesticating or foreignizing approach is applied to the translation of dialect, the actual translatability of a dialect remains problematic as inevitably many ST characteristics will be lost in the process – ranging from grammar to puns and from phonological properties to social status. Alternatively, Vandepitte described the translation of non-standard language as a two-fold problem: the translator first ‘needs to understand the utterances conveyed in the non-standard language and recognize the additional information that it conveys,’ i.e. the connotations, and secondly, he/she should understand that ‘non-standard language poses an essential problem with the range of alternative choices,’ causing an ‘impossibility of equivalence,’ and thereby untranslatability (2010, p. 103).

Halliday and Martin (2003) agreed with this view by stating that ‘we can translate different register into a foreign language [but] we cannot translate different dialects: we can only imitate dialect variation’ (p. 69). Especially the latter argument is visible in the invented dialect in *Billy Elliot* since it concerns a non-existent dialect (despite its Amsterdam region accent features); it not only dissociates itself from standard language but also, ‘by foreignizing,’ ‘a feeling of foreignness [is] created’ (Matielo & Espindola, 2011, p. 89). Sara Ramos Pinto (2009) reached matching conclusions in her study on the translation of *Pygmalion*: ‘the use of features from a specific regional variety are evident’ though the features do occur in a low frequency and only a single feature is used (p. 300) – similar to the incorporation of the phonology of the Amsterdam accent in *Billy Elliot*. Earlier studies and the findings in this study show that domestication and foreignization can be discerned in dialectal translation, and translatability is not unachievable as a whole, though a translator should keep in mind that concessions in one or more areas will need to be made. Ramos Pinto adequately discussed that this inclusion of non-standard features can be interpreted as ‘a consideration of accuracy with respect to the oral register of the [ST] as well as adequacy with respect to the [TC] oral discourse’ (2009, p. 301), a strategy that may be regarded ‘as an attempt to produce an accurate and adequate translation of the source text’ (Ramos Pinto, 2009, p. 302). Regarding the subject of dialectal translation, Federici noted that ‘translation of dialectal and regional voices regularly achieves successful rendering of what strictly linguistic perspectives would consider impossible, even untranslatable’ (2011, p. 2), which is

evidently the case in *Billy Elliot* too.

### 5.3. Answering the research question

In this thesis, an attempt has been made to gain a broader understanding of the role of foreignization, domestication, and translatability in cultural-historical musicals through the use of a three-fold analysis, as captured in the following research question: “*To what extent is translatability achievable in cultural-historical musicals and what role do Venuti’s notions of foreignization and domestication play in the translation process?*”

The findings of this study made clear that there is indeed a strong connection between translatability on the one hand and domestication and foreignization on the other hand; while cultural-historical musicals are translatable, a balance between foreignization and domestication in different subject fields, or aspects, is needed to both stay true to the ST and SC on the one hand and to obtain positive TC audience reception on the other. Fulfilling the hypothesis that was proposed in the methodology section, the findings in this study showed that while the subject areas of culture and class received an overall domesticating, or “non-foreignizing” approach, the dialect in *Billy Elliot* contrariwise underwent a foreignizing translation process. This difference in approach and the foreignness of the Dutch dialect used in *Billy Elliot* juxtaposed against the cultural and class-related losses, demonstrated a translational compensation within the musical as a whole. Lastly, the stricture of rhythm, stress, and music heavily influenced the translation choices made in *Billy Elliot* and could be applicable to any cultural-historical musical more generally, whether foreignizing or domesticating, and should be considered in any evaluation.

Regarding Venuti’s notions of foreignization and domestication, the results from this study made clear that these two strategies can certainly not be considered as a simple dichotomy. Though Venuti theorized already that domestication takes place to a certain extent in order to change the SL into TL in order to make it accessible, practice shows that the translation process is not thus clear-cut (2005, p. 21; Apter & Herman, 2016, p. 33). Alternatively, the results in this study strengthen Paloposki and Oitinnen’s argument that ‘every time we translate we necessarily domesticate, one way or the other’ – simply to a bigger or lesser extent (2000, p. 386). In line with this notion, I purposely referred to a fair number of translations in the analysis as “non-foreignizing” instead of domesticating since in some cases not *actual* domestication occurs but rather, because of a generalizing procedure for example, “non-foreignization” arises. Although Paloposki and Oitinnen presented a

considerably stronger line of reasoning, namely that ‘maybe foreignizing is an illusion which does not really exist’ (2000, p. 386), I do believe that borrowings and calques can be considered *true* foreignizing approaches and would suggest placing any other procedures, naturally depending on their use (as a modulation, for one, is not always domesticating), rather on a grading scale of domestication, ranging from light to heavy. Consequently, this model fits Paloposki and Oitinnen’s proposal to ‘only speak of different levels and dimension of domestication’ (2000, p. 386). Although Apter and Herman noted: ‘foreignization can range from extreme to slight’ (2016, p. 32), the findings in this study, and undoubtedly others as well, evidently show that this might hold true more for domestication than foreignization.

Lastly, the overall compensation found in *Billy Elliot* can be seen as an ‘ethical choice,’ one ‘not to expropriate a literary work by [completely] domesticating it’ through the incorporation of an invented dialect that (Apter & Herman, 2016, p. 34), despite the frequently domesticated culture-related and class-related ST items, takes the TC audience to a different time and place.

#### **5.4. Limitations, shortcomings, and further research**

As was noted in section 3.4, the absence of any official CD or DVD material of the Dutch version of *Billy Elliot* has impeded this study at times as such that certain episodes of warped audiovisual material has hindered obtaining a few number of possibly valuable culture-related or class-related references. While the majority of study material could be clearly understood, some references had to be omitted because the Dutch version of *Billy Elliot* was incomprehensible at certain points. Luckily, as it only concerned only a few instances, it is unlikely that their absence has influenced the general conclusions of this study.

For future research, it would be interesting to examine whether the tendencies that were found in the subject areas of culture, class, and dialect, correspond with the translation strategies used in other cultural-historical musicals such as *West Side Story*, *Miss Saigon*, and *Soldier of Orange*. Especially given the different SL, SC, TL, and TC of this last musical, though not having been translated yet, the translation strategies used may be different. In addition, research into these other cultural-historical musicals could show whether the overall compensation found in *Billy Elliot* is unique or a medium-wide translational phenomenon.

## 5.5. Conclusion

Although Lawrence Venuti – and many researchers following him – have proposed foreignization and domestication as a clear-cut dichotomy, this study and a growing number of other studies are showing that this distinction might not be thus black-and-white after all. Instead, the proposal made by Paloposki and Oitinnen to consider domestication in terms of different levels and dimensions might be more adequate, as every time a translation is made, domestication takes place, ‘one way or another’ (2000, p. 386; p. 387). Or, as was already claimed in the early days of the Manipulation School: ‘from the point of view of the target literature, all translation implies a certain degree of manipulation of the source text for a certain purpose’ (Snell-Hornby, 2006, p. 48; Hermans, 1985, p. 11).

Rather, the only two “true” foreignizing procedures would then arguably be borrowings and calques while other procedures are better to be placed on a grading scale of domestication, or “non-foreignization.” In addition, this DTS-based comparative study has demonstrated the clear correlation between foreignization and domestication on the one hand and translatability on the other; in order to achieve successful translatability of a cultural-historical musical, in the sense that the SC and SL are respected and at least remotely retained while the TL audience reception is positive, certain fields will require a domesticating strategy while others will require a foreignizing one. In the case of *Billy Elliot*, and possibly in any cultural-historical musical more generally, ‘a translator should construct a set of principles that are relevant to the translation, after which the translator has to decide which aspects deserve more priority than others’ (Apter & Herman, 2016, p. 17) – more specifically, a priority to foreignize. As discussed earlier, Apter and Herman’s priorities can be considered in relation to Gideon Toury’s more subjective norms; the *idiosyncrasies*. The results from this study demonstrate that the priorities these different fields are given ultimately need to balance each other out; the clearly foreignizing strategy that was found in the translation of the dialect in the Dutch *Billy Elliot* compensates for the losses that have occurred due to the domesticating or “non-foreignizing” strategies applied in the translation of culture and class. After all, ‘the impossibility of exact recreation does not preclude the possibility of *approximation* – and it is precisely on approximation that good lyric translation is built’ (McKelvey, 2001, p. 53). Every cultural-historical musical will, to some extent, contain a deeper layer that will only appeal to an ST audience due to its native familiarity; for *Billy Elliot*, ‘a British audience will (...) be profoundly aware of how the consequent destruction of Britain’s industrial base created an opposition between the devastated mining

and manufacturing regions of Wales and the north, and the wealthy south of England,' resulting in 'a legacy of class hatred that festered for decades' (Gordon, 2016, p. 420). Although this "real deal" may only be found in a cultural-historical musical's country of origin, this does not imply that any foreign audience should be denied a glimpse into this brief capture of a different language, different culture, and different way of life.

### References

- Aaltonen, S. (2000). *Time-sharing on stage: Drama translation in theatre and society*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Anderman, G. (2009). Drama translation. In *The Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (p. 71-74). London: Routledge.
- Apter, R., & Herman, M. (2016). *Translating for singing: The theory, art and craft of translating lyrics*. London & New York: Bloomsbury Advances in Translation.
- Bickel, B., & Nichols, J. (2013). Fusion of selected inflectional formatives. In M.S. Dryer & M. Haspelmath (Eds.), *The world atlas of language structures online*. Retrieved from: <http://wals.info/chapter/20>
- Benjamin, W. (2004). The task of the translator: An introduction to the translation of Beaudelaire's *Tableaux Parisiens*. (H. Zohn, Trans.). In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (p. 15-25). London & New York: Routledge (Original work published 1923).
- Berman, A. (1992). *The experience of the foreign: Culture and translation in Romantic Germany*. (L. Venuti, Trans.). Albany: State University of New York Press. (Original work published 1984).
- Berman, A. (2004). Translation and the trials of the foreign. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (p. 284-297). London & New York: Routledge.
- Bhabha, H.K. (1994). *The location of culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Bloemkolk, J. (2014, December 1). Ontroerende Billy Elliot is intiem en onverweldigend. *Het Parool*. Retrieved from <http://www.parool.nl/recensies/ontroerende-billy-elliott-is-intiem-en-overweldigend-tegelijk~a3801646/>
- Boase-Beier, J. (2011). *A critical introduction to translation studies*. London: Continuum.
- Bonvillain, N. (1993). *Language, culture, and communication: The meaning of messages*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Bradner, L. (2016, December 22). 'Soldier of Orange': It's the 'Hamilton' of the Netherlands, and it's immersive theater to an extreme. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.latimes.com/entertainment/arts/la-ca-cm-soldier-orange-theater-20161225-story.html>
- Bruti, S., Valdeón, R. A., & Zanotti, S. (2014). Translating Ethnicity: Linguistic and Cultural Issues [Special Issue]. *European Journal of English Studies*, 18(3), 233–338.



- Canepari, L., & Cerini, M., (2013). *Dutch & Afrikaans: pronunciation & accents*, München: LINCOM Europa.
- Catford, J.C. (1978). *A linguistic theory of translation* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). London: Oxford University Press.
- Chambers, J.K., & Trudgill, P. (1998). *Dialectology* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chambers, C. (2002). Musical theatre. In *The continuum companion to twentieth century theatre*. London [etc.]: Continuum.
- Collins, B., & Mees, I. M. (2003). *The phonetics of English and Dutch* (5th ed.). Leiden [etc.]: Brill.
- Crystal, D. (1991). Sociolinguistics. In *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Crystal, D. (1995). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language*. Cambridge [etc.]: Cambridge University Press.
- Culture [Def. 7]. (n.d.) *OED Online*. In Oxford English Dictionary. Retrieved April 14, 2017, from <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/45746?rkey=3RGERx&result=1&isAdvanced=false>
- Delabastita, D. (1993). *There's a double tongue: An investigation into the translation of Shakespeare's wordplay, with special reference to Hamlet*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- De Martino Cappuccio, A. (2011). Translating Neapolitan dialect in theatre: problems of cultural transfer. *Translation: A Translation Studies journal* 3(1), 47-63.
- Denecke, W. (2014). World without translation: Premodern East Asia and the power of character scripts. In S. Berman & C. Porter (Eds.), *A companion to translation studies* (p. 204-216). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Dryer, M.S. (2013). Order of subject, Object and Verb. In M. Dryer and M. Haspelmath (Eds.), *The world atlas of language structures online*. Retrieved from: <http://wals.info/chapter/81>
- Ellis, R., & Oakley-Brown, L. (2009). In *The Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (p. 333-346). London: Routledge.
- Even-Zohar, I. (1978). The position of translated literature within the literary polysystem. In J.S. Holmes, J. Lambert & R. van den Broeck (Eds.), *Literature and translation* (p. 117-127). Leuven, Belgium: Acco.
- Even-Zohar, I. (1971). *Introduction to a theory of literary translation* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Tel Aviv, Tel Aviv.

- Federici, F. (2011). *Translating Dialects and Languages of Minorities Challenges and Solutions*. Oxford: Lang, Peter, AG, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften.
- Fernández Dobao, A. M. (2006). Linguistic and cultural aspects of the translation of swearing: The Spanish version of Pulp Fiction. *Babel: Revue Internationale de la Traduction/International Journal of Translation*, 52(3), 222–242.
- Frédérique Sluyterman van Loo Fanpage. (2016, April 14). *Billy Elliot Schijn* [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mUzaurbyFNI>
- Gentzler, E. (1993). *Contemporary translation theories*. London [etc.]: Routledge.
- German, L., & Rees, J. (2012). *A people's history of London*. London: Verso.
- Gordon, R. (2016). Billy Elliot and its lineage: The politics of class and sexual identity in British musicals since 1953. In R. Gordon & O. Jubin (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of the British Musical* (p. 419-442). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gordon, R., & Jubin, O. (2016). Introduction. In R. Gordon & O. Jubin (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of the British Musical* (p. 1-28). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K., & Martin, J.R. (2003). *Writing science: Literacy and discursive power*. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis.
- Hermans, T. (1985). *The manipulation of literature: Studies in literary translation*. London: Croom Helm.
- Hermans, T. (2009). Dutch tradition. In *The Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (p. 390-397). London: Routledge.
- Holmes, J.S. (2004). The name and nature of translation studies. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (p. 172-185). London & New York: Routledge.
- Hughes, G. (2006). Class and swearing. In *An Encyclopedia of Swearing: The Social History of Oaths, Profanity, Foul Language, and Ethnic Slurs in the English-Speaking World*. (p. 80-84). Armonk, NY: Routledge.
- Huisman, A. [Alieke Huisman]. (2016, March 20). *Svenno van Kleij – Solidarity (Billy Elliot)* [Video file]. Retrieved from [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ga6TZdbNt\\_w](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ga6TZdbNt_w)
- Iser, W. (1994). On translatability. *Surfaces*, 4, 5-13.
- Jakobson, R. (2004). On linguistic aspects of translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (p. 113-118). New York: Routledge.
- John, E. (2005a). Deep into the ground. On *Billy Elliot: the original cast recording* [CD]. London, England: Polydor Ltd.
- John, E. (2005b). Merrie Christmas Maggie Thatcher. On *Billy Elliot: the original cast recording* [CD]. London, England: Polydor Ltd.

- John E. (2005c). Shine. On *Billy Elliot: the original cast recording* [CD]. London, England, Polydor Ltd.
- John, E. (2005d). Solidarity. On *Billy Elliot: the original cast recording* [CD]. London, England: Polydor Ltd.
- Judy, J. (2010). Better to be a dancer than a miner: Commonalities in 'Billy Elliot'. *Screen Education*, 59, 117-123.
- Kippers, L. [Lisa Kippers]. (2016, January 11). *Billy Elliot – Nederland* [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aWqyf-9wD6Q&feature=youtu.be>
- Krouwels, S. (2014, August 31). *The perceived rudeness of swearwords in English and Dutch* (Unpublished bachelor's dissertation). Leiden University, Leiden.
- Lantto, H. (2014). Code-switching, swearing and slang: The colloquial register of Basque in Greater Bilbao. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 18(6), 633–648.
- Lefevere, A. (1977). *Translating literature: The German tradition from Luther to Rosenzweig*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Lemmens, M., & Parr, T. (1995). *Handboek voor de vertaler Nederlands-Engels: Praktische tips*. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.
- Leon, R. (2010). *The sound of musicals*. London: Oberon Masters.
- Les Misérables (comédie musicale). (n.d.). Retrieved January 8, 2016 from Wikipedia: [https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Les\\_Misérables\\_\(comédie\\_musicale\)#Version\\_2010](https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Les_Misérables_(comédie_musicale)#Version_2010)
- Lewis, P. E. (2004). The measure of translation effects. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (p. 264-283). London & New York: Routledge
- Low, P. (2005). The Pentathlon Approach to Translating Songs. In Dinda L. Gorfée (Ed.) *Song and significance: Virtues and vices of vocal translation* (p. 185-212). Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.
- MacIntyre, A. (1988). *Whose justice? Which rationality?* Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Margaret Thatcher. (2017). In *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Retrieved from <http://academic.eb.com/levels/collegiate/article/Margaret-Thatcher/71950>
- Marinus, E., Nation, K., & Jong, P. de (2015). Density and length in the neighborhood: Explaining cross-linguistic differences in learning to read in English and Dutch. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 139, 127-147.

- Matielo, R., & Espindola, E. (2011). Domestication and foreignization: An analysis of culture-specific items in official and non-official subtitles of the tv series *Heroes*. *Cadernos De Tradução*, 1(27), p. 71-93.
- McEnery, A.M., & Xiao, R. Z. (2004, January 1). Swearing in modern British English: The case of fuck in the BNC. *Language and Literature*, 13(3), 235-268.
- McKelvey, M. (2001). *Translating the musical "Les misérables: " A polysystemic approach* (Master's dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses (304720866).
- Michael Heseltine. (2017). In *Oxford Reference*. Retrieved from <http://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/oi/authority.20110803095933728>
- Munday, J. (2012). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Musical. (2017). In *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Retrieved from <http://academic.eb.com/levels/collegiate/article/54431>
- Nida, E. (1964). *Toward a science of translating: With special reference to principles and procedures involved in bible translating*. Leiden: Brill.
- Paloposki, O., & Oittinen, R. (2000). The domesticated foreign. In A. Chesterman, N. G. San Salvador, Y. Gambier (Eds.), *Translation in context: Selected contributions from the EST Congress, Granada 1998* (p. 373-390). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pearce, M. (2015). The ethnonym Geordie in North East England. *Names*, 63(2), 75-85.
- Perteghella, M. (2002). Language and politics on stage: Strategies for translating dialect and slang with references to Shaw's *Pygmalion* and Bond's *Saved*. *Translation Review*, 64(1), 45-53.
- Pinker, S. (2008). *The stuff of thought: Language as a window into human nature*. London: Penguin Books.
- Pizzazz [Def 1]. (n.d.). *Van Dale Online*. In van Dale Woordenboeken. Retrieved April 14, 2017, from <https://www.vandale.nl/zoeken/zoeken.do>
- Pym, A. (1996). Venuti's Visibility. *Target*, 8(1), 165-177.
- Pym, A. (2010). *Exploring translation theories*. Routledge: London
- Pym, A. (2016). *Translation solutions for many languages: Histories of a flawed dream* (Bloomsbury Advances in Translation). London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Pym, A., & Turk, H. (2005). Translatability. In *The Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (p. 273-276). London: Routledge

- Ramos Pinto, S. (2009). How important is the way you say it? A discussion on the translation of linguistic varieties. *Target* 21(2), 239-307.
- Rassin, E., & Muris, P. (2005, January 1). Why do women swear? An exploration of reasons for and perceived efficacy of swearing in Dutch female students. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 38(7), 1669-1674.
- Reinhard, M. (2009). "Brave New World": The correlation of social order and the process of literary translation (Master's Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (MR54886).
- Shuttleworth, M., & Cowie, M. (1997). *Dictionary of translation studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Simmons, G. (2006). The Gloves are Off, Billy's Pumped: Gender and Class Politics in 'Billy Elliot'. *Screen Education*, 44, 119-123.
- Sinfield, A. (2006). Boys, Class and Gender: From Billy Casper to Billy Elliot. *History Workshop Journal*, 62(1), 166-171.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (2006). *Turns of translation studies: New paradigms or shifting viewpoints?* Philadelphia, PA, USA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Sorby, S., Bastin, G., Belle, M., Echeverri, A., Gagnon, C., & Vandaele, S. (2015). Translating Musical Libretto: A Dynamic Collaboration. *Meta*, 60(2), 371.
- Tang, J. (2008). A cross-cultural perspective on production and reception of Disney's *Mulan* through its Chinese subtitles. *European Journal of English Studies*, 12(2), p. 149-162.
- Telegraph Reporters. (2015, December 10). Billy Elliot to leave West End after 11 years. *The Telegraph*. Retrieved from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/theatre/what-to-see/billy-elliott-to-leave-west-end-after-11-years/>
- Tomaney, J. (2010). Contemporary Britain and its regions. In M. Higgins, C. Smith, & J. Storey (Eds.), *The Cambridge companion to modern British culture* (Cambridge Companions to Culture, p. 79-95). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Toury, G. (1984). Translation, literary translation and pseudotranslation. In E.S. Shaffer (Ed.), *Comparative Criticism*, 6 (p. 73-85). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Toury, G. (1985). A rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies. In T. Hermans (Ed.) *The manipulation of literature* (p. 16-41). London: Croom Helm.
- Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Toury, G. (2004). The nature and role of norms in translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (p. 198-211). London & New York: Routledge.
- Trudgill, P. (1999). *The dialects of England* (2nd ed.). Oxford [etc.]: Blackwell.

- Tymoczko, M. (1999). *Translation in a postcolonial context: Early Irish literature in English translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- United Kingdom. (2017). In *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Retrieved from <http://academic.eb.com/levels/collegiate/article/United-Kingdom/110750>
- Van den Bosch, A., Content, A., Daelemans, W., & de Gelder, B. (1994). Measuring the complexity of writing systems. *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics*, 1, 178–188.
- Van den Broeck, R. (1981). The limits of translatability exemplified by metaphor translation. *Poetics Today*, 2(4), 73-87.
- Van den Broeck, R. (1988). Translating for the theatre. In J.T. Ydstie (Ed.), *In honour of Patrick Nigel Chaffey on the occasion of his 50<sup>th</sup> birthday, 22 September 1988 with contributions from friends and colleagues*. Oslo: Centre for Applied Linguistics, University of Oslo.
- Van den Broeck, R., & Lefevere, A. (1984). *Uitmodiging tot de vertaalwetenschap* (2nd ed.). Muiderberg: Coutinho.
- Vandepitte, S. (2010). *Translating untranslatability, English-Dutch/Dutch-English*. Gent: Academia Press.
- Van Gelder, H. (2004, December 1). Overrompeld danstalent in *Billy Elliot*. *NRC*. Retrieved online from <https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2014/12/01/overrompelend-danstalent-in-billy-elliott-1443417-a466783>
- Van Hofwegen, R. (2015). *Borrowed profanity versus boundless purism: Native Dutch Swearwords and English-borrowed swearwords in Dutch* (Unpublished master's dissertation). Leiden University, Leiden.
- Van Oostendorp, M. (2002). *Steenkolen-Engels*. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij L.J. Veen
- Van Sterkenburg, P.G.J. (2008). *Krachttermen: scheldwoorden, vervloekingen, verwensingen, beledigingen, smeekbeden en bezweringen*. Schiedam: Scriptum.
- Venuti, L. (1986). The translator's invisibility. *Criticism: A Quarterly for Literature and the Arts*, 28(2), 179-212.
- Venuti, L. (2005). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Vermeer, H. (1994). Hermeneutik und Übersetzung(swissenschaft). *TextConText* 9.3(4), 163-182.
- Vinay, J., Darbelnet, J., Sager, J., & Hamel, M. (1995). *Comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation*. (J.C. Sager & M.J. Hamel, Trans.) Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Vinay, J., & Darbelnet, J. (2004). A methodology for translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (p. 84-93). London & New York: Routledge.
- West Side Story. (n.d.) Retrieved January 8, 2016 from Wikipedia:  
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/West\\_Side\\_Story](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/West_Side_Story)
- Williams, J., & Chesterman, A. (2002). *The map: A beginner's guide to doing research in translation studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing,
- Williams, R., 2011. *Keywords: a vocabulary of culture and society*. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis.
- Wong, L. K. P. (2014). *Dreaming across languages and cultures: A study of the literary translations of the Hong Lou Meng*. Newcastle upon Tyne, England: Cambridge Scholars.
- Xiao, R., & Hu, X. (2015). *Corpus-based studies of translational Chinese in English-Chinese translation*. Berlin: Springer.
- Xu, M., & Tian, C. (2013). Cultural deformations and reformulations: A case study of Disney's Mulan in English and Chinese (Critical essay). *Critical Arts*, 27(2), p. 182-207.
- Yılmaz-Gümüş, V. (2012). Translation of Culture-Specific Items in Self-Help Literature: A Study on Domestication and Foreignization Strategies. *ELOPE: English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries*, 9, p. 117-129.