



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

# Rendering Register in Children's Literature: A Comparative Analysis of Register in the English and Dutch Translations of Cornelia Funke's Tintenherz

Janssen, Chelsea

## Citation

Janssen, C. (2023). *Rendering Register in Children's Literature: A Comparative Analysis of Register in the English and Dutch Translations of Cornelia Funke's Tintenherz*.

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [License to inclusion and publication of a Bachelor or Master thesis in the Leiden University Student Repository](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3619518>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

# RENDERING REGISTER IN CHILDREN'S LITERATURE

A Comparative Analysis of Register  
in the English and Dutch Translations of Cornelia Funke's *Tintenherz*

Chelsea Janssen  
Master Thesis  
Drs K. L. Zeven  
Mr. Drs A. A. Foster  
MA Translation  
University of Leiden  
January 2022  
APA

# Table of Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Chapter One: Literature Review .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>1.1 Defining Children's Literature.....</i>	<i>6</i>
1.1.1 The Concept of Childhood .....	7
1.1.2 The Intended Reader.....	9
1.1.3 Asymmetric Communication.....	11
1.1.4 The Function of Children's Literature.....	14
1.1.5 The Place of Children's Literature in the Polysystem.....	17
1.1.6 Definition.....	19
<i>1.2 Translation of Children's literature .....</i>	<i>21</i>
1.2.1 Norms of Translating Children's Literature .....	21
1.2.2 Terminology on Degree of Foreignness .....	24
1.2.3 Strategies .....	24
1.2.4 Views on Approaches.....	27
1.2.5 Influence of Dominant Languages (Polysystem) .....	30
<i>1.3 Register.....</i>	<i>32</i>
1.3.1 Definition Register .....	32
1.3.2 Rendering of Register in Translation .....	34
1.3.3 Cultural Context and the Cultural Filter .....	36
1.3.4 Cultural Dimensions.....	37
<i>1.4 Conclusion.....</i>	<i>38</i>
<b>Chapter Two: Methodology .....</b>	<b>41</b>
2.1 Materials .....	41
2.2 Methods .....	44
2.2.1 Situational-Functional Text Analysis .....	44
2.2.2 Analysis of the Lexicogrammatical Realizations .....	47
2.2.3 Comparative Analysis Translation Approaches .....	49
2.3 Conclusion.....	50
<b>Chapter Three: Results.....</b>	<b>53</b>
3.1 Situational-Text Analysis.....	53
3.1.1 Dimension of the Language User .....	53
3.1.2 Dimensions of the Language Use.....	54
3.2 Lexicogrammatical-Text Analysis .....	56

3.2.1 Lexicogrammatical Realizations of Field.....	56
3.2.2 Lexicogrammatical Realizations of Tenor .....	60
3.2.3 Lexicogrammatical Realizations of Mode.....	62
3.3 <i>Comparative Register Analysis</i> .....	67
<b>Chapter Four: Discussion and Conclusion.....</b>	<b>69</b>
4.1 <i>Discussion</i> .....	69
4.1.1 Discussion of Lexicogrammatical Realizations of Field.....	69
4.1.2 Discussion of Lexicogrammatical Realizations of Tenor.....	74
4.1.3 Discussion of Lexicogrammatical Realizations of Mode .....	79
4.1.4 Discussion of Comparative Register Analysis .....	82
4.2 <i>Conclusion</i> .....	86
<b>References .....</b>	<b>89</b>

## Introduction

Within the field of translated children's literature, there have been multiple studies that examine the translation of cultural elements (e.g., food, brands, customs) in target texts (Åsman & Pedersen 2013; Liang 2007). These studies focus on the translation approach towards these cultural elements and examine the response of the target audience. The translation approach can be source-oriented or target-oriented. In the case of a source-oriented translation, the cultural elements have not been adapted to accommodate to the target culture. In a target-oriented translation, the cultural elements of the source text have been adapted to accommodate the target culture.

The studies on the translation approaches tend to focus on the cultural elements of a text. This thesis aims to examine the translation approach towards the rendering of register within the translation of children's literature. The translation approach towards the rendering of register has not been studied within the field of children's literature. Therefore, a research gap exists. This thesis aims to examine the translation approach towards the rendering of register in the translation of children's literature.

This thesis will examine this by analyzing the translation approach towards the rendering of register in the, originally German, children's novel: *Tintenherz* (2003) by Cornelia Funke. This novel has been translated into English, *Inkheart* (2005), and into Dutch, *Hart van Inkt* (2005). Within these three languages, and cultures, "there is a potential for differences between registers across lingua-cultures if the respective contexts of a situation (partially) differ" (Nuemann 2021, p. 65).

Register can be defined in systemic functional linguistics as "a certain kind of language patterning regularly used in a certain kind of situation" (Ure & Ellis 1997, p. 197 as qtd. in Nuemann 2021, p. 69). The three languages central in this study may demonstrate different manners in which a register is achieved through lexicogrammatical realizations

within a certain social context. Furthermore, it would be interesting to examine what translation approach the translator uses in instances where the target culture does not have similar lexicogrammatical realizations to those of the source culture, or in which the respective contexts do not warrant the same register in another culture.

This thesis will examine what translation approach the Dutch and English translations of *Tintenherz – Hart van Inkt* and *Inkheart* respectively – use in the rendering of register. The hypothesis is that the translation approach of the Dutch target text will be source-oriented, since it is closer to the German culture in the cultural dimensions and since it has a lower position in the polysystem of translation than German culture. The translation approach of the English target text is hypothesized to be target-oriented due to its dominant position within the polysystem and its difference in the cultural dimensions.

In the first chapter, this thesis will outline the theoretical framework relevant to this study. The literature review will focus on relevant theories in children's translation. It will aim to find a definition of children's literature by defining the intended reader, the function of children's literature, the asymmetrical relationships in children's literature and the position of children's literature in the polysystem.

Furthermore, the first chapter will provide a theoretical framework for descriptive translation studies, such as Toury's theory on translation norms and norms that are inherent to children's literature. It will furthermore discuss the different translation strategies that can be used to achieve a certain overall translation approach. It will discuss the views on source- and target-oriented translation approaches and the influence that the polysystem of a culture has on the translation approach.

The literature review will also define register in systemic functional linguistics and outline the Hallidayan model of discourse analysis. It will discuss the general translation

approach towards the rendering of register in translation and the influence that directionality and the polysystem have on the translation approach. Lastly, the literature review will discuss the importance of cultural context and the cultural filter. It will also outline Juliane House's (2009) and Geert Hofstede's (Dimitrov 2014) cultural dimensions.

This thesis will examine the translation of register through a comparative analysis of *Hart van Inkt* translated by Hanneke Beneden and Ab Bertholet, and *Inkheart* translated by Anthea Bell. The second chapter will explain the methodology and methods that were used to examine the register within the two translations. It will furthermore explain how a comparative analysis was conducted between the source text and the two target texts in order to determine what translation approach was used for the rendering of the register. The methodology chapter will do so by explaining why these methodologies and methods were selected for this study.

The third chapter will show the results of the register analysis and the comparative analysis. It will do so by providing figures of the results for each part of the register analysis. It will then also identify the translation approach towards the rendering of register in the two target texts.

Finally, in the fourth chapter, the results will be discussed in relation to the polysystem, functions of children's literature and the cultural dimensions of the three cultures. The fourth chapter aims to find an underlying cultural reason for the translation approach. In this chapter, the thesis will be concluded and there will be suggestions for future research.

## Chapter One: Literature Review

*This chapter will provide a theoretical framework to the contents of this study. This literature review will first aim to define what children's literature is. It does so by considering the concept of childhood within cultures, the intended reader of children's literature, the functions of children's literature and the place of children's literature within the polysystem.*

*This chapter will then discuss the translation of children's literature. It will discuss the norms within the translation of children's literature and the strategies that translators can use when translating children's literature. This chapter will furthermore discuss the terminology that will be used to discuss the orientation of a translation approach. Additionally, it will discuss the different views on source- and target-oriented approaches to the translation of children's literature. This chapter will also discuss the different languages and cultures within the polysystem and how directionality of translation may influence the translation approaches.*

*Finally, this literature review will define the term register. It will also discuss how register is generally rendered in translation. It will then discuss the importance of the cultural context and the cultural filter when considering the different approaches to the rendering of register.*

### *1.1 Defining Children's Literature*

In order to gain an understanding of what the term "children's literature" encompasses, the different aspects of children's literature must be discussed. Providing one definition of children's literature would fail to take into account the different influences that cultures have on the definition of children's literature: A culture's concept of what childhood is; the intended readership; the form of asymmetric communication; the function of children's literature; and the place that children's literature holds within the literature polysystem of a



culture, all influence the way in which the term “children’s literature” is defined. Defining the term “children’s literature” will aid in gaining a better understanding of what aspects need to be considered when translating children’s literature.

### 1.1.1 The Concept of Childhood

One of the aspects that influences the definition of “children’s literature” is the concept of childhood within that culture. The way that society views children and childhood does not only differ between cultures, but also between historical periods: “society’s present view of childhood is far removed from that which was held only two centuries ago” (Shavit 1986, p. 3). Peter Hollindale (1997) also emphasizes this temporality in *Sign of Childness in Children’s Books* in which he aims to conceptualize a definition of children’s literature: “Modern historians [...] have drawn attention to the historicity of childhood as a concept”, and even within the same contemporary culture there are differing views on childhood (p. 13).

Regardless of the different views, the way that childhood is generally perceived in contemporary society is a key part of the definition of children’s literature, as “it is society’s perceptions that determine to a large extent what actually lies between the covers” (Shavit 1986, p. 31). An integral part of the definition of children’s literature depends on contemporary society’s view on childhood<sup>1</sup>.

In literature on the definition of childhood, a distinction is made between natural childhood and artificial childhood. A child, and therewith childhood, in their natural state is often perceived to be “an innocent creature of nature” according to Richard Flynn (2021, p. 53). Due to globalization and the sharing of information through the internet, the image of the

---

<sup>1</sup> The discussions on the concept of childhood that are presented in this study are centered on Western culture. The reason for this is that the novel and its translations, on which this study focuses, are from a Western author and Western translators who depict the Western culture and the scope of this study does not allow to go beyond the Western culture.

child has changed to “a cultured person able to exercise individual agency” (Flynn 2021, p. 53). Originally, then, “childhood is equated with innocence and the primitive, while the socializing and ‘culturing’ aspect of child rearing and education are downgraded as artificial” (Flynn 2021, p. 51). Childhood can then be seen as a natural state of innocence, or it can be seen as a period in which children are educated and prepared for adulthood.

From this distinction between natural and artificial childhood, Ghesquiere (1982;1993) creates two categories, as explained by Desmet (2007) in *Babysitting the Reader*: “either children are seen as small adults and must be emancipated quickly to reach maturity [...], a developmental view; or they are considered to be living in their own world where everything is possible [...], an experiential view” (p. 33). The developmental view on childhood is closely related to the culturing of children during childhood mentioned by Flynn.

This developmental view is furthermore mentioned by Hollindale, who states that the way childhood is viewed influences how children are treated and what information is provided to them. In the case of a developmental view on childhood, “we shall emphasize the processes of learning and growing and acquiring which the early years entail” (Hollindale 1997, p. 12). Hollindale also rightly points out that, even though the early years of human life are often seen as a developmental stage, this view fails to recognize that this developing “is lifelong” (p. 44).

The perception of childhood as experiential influences society to “place less store by developmental usefulness of children’s activities and more by the help they give in enabling the child to be a child” (Hollindale 1997, p. 13). If childhood is viewed as experiential, it becomes an autonomous part of life rather than a cultivated one.

Whether a culture views childhood as developmental or experiential will influence the way in which stories aimed at children are presented. When childhood is viewed as developmental, stories for children are presented as educational with an aim to aid the develop

children into adults. When childhood is viewed as experiential, stories for children are presented as limitless with an aim to portray the world as children see it. Thus, this distinction between developmental and experiential will also influence the definition of what children's literature entails in their respective culture.

### 1.1.2 The Intended Reader

The term "children's literature" suggests the meaning of literature belonging to children. However, to merely state that children's literature means literature for children would be an oversimplification. The readership of children's literature is important to shaping texts belonging to children's literature. Therefore, this section will discuss the intended reader of the children's literature.

To say that the intended readership of children's literature are children, besides being an obvious statement, is also a parochial conclusion. One of the questions Hollindale (1997) poses is: "Who is the implied reader?" and "Is the implied reader consistently a child? Or consistently someone who will not regard him or herself as a child [...] yet is demonstrably pre-adult" (p. 94). The phrase "consistently" is an interesting one, as it implies that in every and all cases of "children's literature" there is only one intended reader. Either children's literature is only aimed at children or either it is aimed at adolescents. The possibility of children's literature being partially aimed at adults is not mentioned in these questions. Hollindale does mention that "[a]ll children's literature is accessible to adults", but diminishes this group to "immature adults or to those who read professionally on behalf of children" (p. 23).

Contrary to Hollindale's view, Zohar Shavit (1986) argues that certain children's literature has two different intended readers: "the dual structuring of the text [...] enables it to address deliberately two different groups of readers: adults and children" (p. 70). Shavit also

claims that “children do not realize the text in full and are not supposed to”, even claiming that the child reader “is much more an excuse for the text rather than its genuine addressee” (p. 67, p. 71).

While Shavit states that the adult is the main intended addressee, Hollindale believes the child to be the main intended addressee. The reason for this opposition may be that Shavit’s discusses “ambivalent texts” – which are texts that have started out as children’s literature, but have transferred into the sphere of adult literature by its status as a classic. Shavit’s statement can thus not be generalized for the whole of children’s literature, while Hollindale does discuss children’s literature in general. However, Shavit’s statement still indicates the presence of two intended readerships that influences the structuring of texts belonging to children’s literature. This is affirmed by Gillian Lathey (2016) in *Translating Children’s Literature*, where she also mentions the multiple layers in a text of children’s literature that address the child reader and the adult reader separately (p. 2).

The reason for this dual readership could be, as Hollindale stated, that there simply are adults who wish to read children’s literature as well as adults who read children’s literature professionally on the behalf of children. In the case of children’s literature turned classics, scholars are also readers of the text, although it could be argued that they are not the original intended readers. In addition, the reason for this duality in readership in children’s literature could be a result of adults reading aloud to children – this also depends on the age of the child. In order to appeal to these adults, layers are added to children’s literature that are aimed at this adult reader.

In general, the primary addressee of children’s literature are children with adults being the secondary intended reader. Despite the fact that Shavit’s quote regards ambivalent texts, there can be different layers within the text of children’s books for the sake of the dual

readerships outside of these ambivalent texts. In order to please both child and adult, there are multiple layers in the text of children's books.

This study will thus implement Shavit's dual structuring of the text in defining children's literature and will therefore rely on the fact that authors of children's literature will deliberately structure their texts on two levels; for the adult and child reader. Hollindale's view of the adult reader of children's literature as either immature or a professional, diminishes the status of children's literature as well as the competence of the adult reader of children's literature. Children's literature is not too immature for adults, nor are the adults who read children's literature for pleasure immature.

In this section, the implied child reader was established as the primary addressee of children's literature. The term "implied child reader" is often mentioned in literature on children's literature by for instance Gillian Lathey, Peter Hunt, Emer O'Sullivan, Peter Hollindale, Zohar Shavit and Mieke K.T Desmet. The "implied child reader" denotes a generalized readership of children, which is difficult to specify for the whole of children's literature. Childhood is a phase in which children go through different developmental phases, and the four-year-old child reader differs greatly from the ten-year-old child reader. The age of the intended reader is one of the ways in which books in children's literature are differentiated (Desmet 2007, p. 69). Furthermore, "[t]he gender constructions pertaining to the intended reader create the distinction between books for girls and books for boys" (Desmet 2007, p. 69). There is thus not one universal implied child reader, especially not when the different cultural backgrounds of the implied child reader are also taken into consideration.

### 1.1.3 Asymmetric Communication

In children's literature, there is asymmetric communication between adults and children.

Children are the primary intended readers for children's literature, but they often do not write,

promote, sell or even review those books (Desmet 2007; Lathey 2016). Since “[a] conventional printed literature by children for children [...] does not exist [, i]t is produced for them by adults” (Hollindale 1997, p. 12). Therefore, this “relationship between author and intended audience is, as a rule, asymmetrical: adult versus child” (Desmet 2007, p. 31). This asymmetry has an irrefutable influence on children’s literature, for it determines the language use as well as the thematic subjects of children’s literature.

Since children are conventionally not the authors of children’s literature, the adult author has to aim to imitate the language of children. Especially since the narrator in children’s literature is usually a child, these “child narrators have stylized voices that convince without actually being authentic” (Lathey 2016, p. 22). An adult author can attempt to fabricate the language of children through close affiliation with children around them or through imagination, but the voice of the child narrator cannot be authentic if it is written by an adult. Whether a child would need this authenticity is not clearly stated by Lathey.

It is not the stories of the intended child reader themselves that are written about, rather children’s literature contains “previously established adult assumptions about childhood” (Nodelman 1992 as qtd. in Desmet 2007, p. 35). Hollindale (1997) too highlights the fact that the adult author writes retrospectively of childhood from the point of adulthood (p. 12). The adult writer is influenced by an “acquaintance with contemporary children, and an acquired system of beliefs as to what children are, and should be, like” (Hollindale 1997, p. 12). Children’s literature is, as Holliday (1997) calls it “one-way traffic”, the adult author is doing the communication, while “[t]here is a gap of time, of maturity, along with separation generated by an ever-fluctuating culture” between the adult author and the implied child reader (p. 21, p. 22). This gap of time and the separation by culture creates an inauthentic voice that seeks to imitate that of children. As the asymmetry is an intrinsic part of children’s literature, this inauthentic narration is consequently also intrinsic to children’s literature.

Writers of children's literature must take multiple factors into account when attempting to reproduce an authentic child narrator. The adult author has to consider the difference between adults and children "in terms of their command of language, their experience of the world, and their position in society", and the author must then "adapt [...] language, subject matter, and formal and thematic features to correspond to the stage of development and the repertory of skills [children] have acquired" (O'Sullivan 2011, p. 191). According to O'Sullivan (2011), the author must attempt to "bridge the distance" by adapting the text in such a way that children's abilities, experiences and status are taken into account (p. 191). The extent of adaptation that is needed depends on the age group and the general developmental stage of that age group.

An example of an adaptation that authors will make to accommodate the child reader is "the 'chopping up' of longer sentences on the stylistic level" (Chambers qtd. in Lathey 2016, p. 4). Hollindale (1997) also quotes Myles McDowell's essay "Fiction for Children and Adults: Some Essential Differences" in which McDowell claims that children's books are shorter, contain more active sentence constructions, contain more dialogue, only have child protagonists, use conventions (such as the child protagonist going on an adventure on their own), contain morality messages, are more optimistic, have more child-oriented language, disregard probability and contain a lot of magic and adventures (p. 36).

At first glance, this list of differences between adult and children's literature seems plausible. However, Hollindale (1997) rightly argues that these are "expedient likelihoods [...] with numerous exceptions on both sides of the invisible line" (p. 37). It must then be noted that these characteristics do not apply, and can never apply, to all adult or children's literature. In spite of this, the differences between adult and children's literature are often generalized by the characteristics on this list. Therefore, this list should not be used as a

definite set of characteristics for children's literature, but it can be used as an outset for seeking the general differences between adult and children's literature.

Another feature of asymmetric communication in children's literature is that adults are the ones reviewing children's literature. This reinforces Hollindale's point of children's literature being one-way traffic. The asymmetry in the reviewing of children's literature can be linked back to the dual readership of the previous section, and also to the next section that will discuss the function of children's literature. It is relevant to this thesis, because the way that children's literature is viewed, also determines the way it is translated, as will be explained in more detail in section 1.2.

Reviews of children's novels are generally based on "the view that a children's writer should respond to the child's needs", which is a rather broad criterion (Shavit 1986, p. 37). It furthermore is a sentiment that is not centered around the literary quality of children's literature, but rather on its function. Additionally, the opinions of the child are completely ignored and the focus of the critique lies with the adults (Shavit 1986, p. 38). This asymmetrical manner of reviewing children's literature restricts children's literature to what adults deem appropriate and it furthermore influences the way in which children's literature is then translated.

#### 1.1.4 The Function of Children's Literature

The function of children's literature is also crucial to the definition of children's literature. The functions of children's literature influence the way in which texts for children are translated, because the translation has to conform the text to the target culture's functions.

As the concept of childhood changes throughout history, so do the functions that are imposed on children's literature with it. Desmet (2007) states that "[t]he didactic, educational and moralistic component is dominant in children's literature at the beginning of the



[nineteenth] century, although entertaining elements are added to make the lesson more palatable” (pp. 63-64). It must be noted that in this quote, Desmet discusses the situation for Dutch children’s literature, therefore it cannot be generalized to children’s literature as a whole. However, in this extract, she shows that at a certain point in time the functions of children’s literature were the didactic, educational and moralistic function.

Desmet (2007) also paraphrases Ghesquiere (1982;1993) by stating that “[c]hildren’s books always play a role in the socialization and acculturation process of children, and therefore also have a pedagogical function, which may be psychological, sociological, and cognitive” (pp. 111-112 as qtd. in p. 69). One of the functions of children’s literature nowadays is then a pedagogical function. This view is supported by Shavit (1986) who states that: “the idea that books for children have to be suitable from the pedagogical point of view and should contribute to the child’s development has been, and still is, a dominant force in the production of children’s books” (pp. 26-27). This quote also demonstrates that this is not a function that can merely be traced back to Dutch children’s books, but that it is a more general function – at least in the Western world.

The terms “didactic”, “educational”, “pedagogical” and “developmental” seem to all be closely related and it can be difficult to distinguish between these functions. In their introduction to *Children’s Literature in Translation*, Jan van Coillie and Jack McMartin (2020) state that “[d]idactic and pedagogic norms are linked to two functions unique to children’s literature: children’s books must educate children (didactic norms)” and “they must be adapted in such a way as to be understandable to children (pedagogic norms)” (p. 18). The difference between the didactic and pedagogic function would then be that the didactic function ensures that children become more educated and the pedagogical function ensures that children actually understand what they are reading. The terms “educational” and “didactic” are used interchangeably and both relate to the same function. The term

“developmental” also relates to the didactic function, as Hollindale (1997) links these together by stating that “[i]f we see childhood as essentially preparatory and developmental [...], then we shall emphasize the processes of learning and growing” and “[t]herefore, we shall value children’s books for their educative qualities” (p. 12, p. 13). The important functions identified are then: the didactic function – the purpose of the text is to educate children – and the pedagogical function – the purpose of the text is to be understood by children.

In addition to the pedagogical and didactic function, Lathey (2016) identifies the function of entertainment: “[adults] convey a world-view to the next generation that is either in line with the government-sanctioned investment in the education of the young, or goes against the grain and makes use of children’s literature as a subversive medium” (p. 5).

The entertainment function would then directly oppose the other two norms. Although, literature does not have to be subversive to be entertaining and neither does an entertaining function undermine the presence of an educational one. Desmet (2007) also names entertainment as a function of children’s literature, and even goes as far as to say that at the end of the nineteenth century “purely entertaining books are published” in the Netherlands (p. 64). The function of children’s literature is thus not only to be didactic and pedagogical, but also to be entertaining.

The functionalities of children’s literature can influence the translation norms underlying children’s literature. Norms will be discussed further in section 1.2.1 of this literature review. The most important norms in children’s literature, as Van Coillie and McMartin (2020) have already pointed out, are the didactic and the pedagogical norms. Desmet (2007) states that this “normative character of children’s literature is its main defining aspect” (p. 269). The norms, and the thereto related functionality, of children’s literature are thus an important aspect to take into account when defining what exactly children’s literature is.

### 1.1.5 The Place of Children's Literature in the Polysystem

This section will focus on the position of children's literature within the polysystem, which is also important in defining children's literature and which influences the translation of children's literature. In 1970, Itamar Even-Zohar developed the polysystem theory (Munday 2016, p. 170). The polysystem is defined by Even-Zohar (2005) as:

a multiple system, a system of various systems which intersect with each other and partly overlap, using concurrently different options, yet functioning as one structured whole, whose members are interdependent (p. 3)

The position of these systems varies within history and is thus a dynamic hierarchy (Munday 2016, p. 171). There is also a "dynamic process of evaluation" which relates to the dynamic "between innovatory and conservative systems" that are "in a constant state of flux and competition" (Munday 2016, p. 171). This means that when an innovative style of literature is situated high in the hierarchy, then conservative styles of literature are situated lower in the hierarchy and vice versa. The position occupied by translation in the polysystem will be discussed in section 1.2.3 of this literature review.

In *Poetics of Children's Literature*, Zohar Shavit (1986) explores the position of children's literature in the literary polysystem. This position is important as it determines how society perceives children's literature, and therefore it influences the definition which applies to it. In her preface, Shavit already states that the educational properties that are inherent to children's literature stem from the society's perception of childhood (p. ix). She also explains that the educational properties of children's literature are the reason that "children's literature could not be accepted by high-brow society as having a status equal to that of adult literature" and as a result of this, "children's literature suffered from an inferior status within the literary

polysystem” (p. ix). Shavit (1986) names external attitudes both as a contribution to the “poor self-image” of children’s literature as well as the reason for its existence (p. 38).

That external attitudes have a negative view of children’s literature can, according to Shavit, be deduced from the fact that “[m]ost children’s books are not considered part of the cultural heritage” and the fact that “[c]hildren’s literature has not been regarded as a subject of study at universities”, it was simply not deemed to be important enough (p. 35). Children’s literature is not valued for its literary qualities, but for its didactic qualities, which lowers its status in the polysystem.

Since children’s literature occupies a peripheral position in the polysystem, translators of children’s literature are less restricted in the translation of a text (Shavit 1986, p. 112). Some of the strategies that a translator of children’s literature is allowed to use, according to Shavit, are “changing, enlarging, or abridging it, or [...] deleting or adding to it”, but only if it follows the pedagogical and didactic norms (p. 112).

Additionally, Wen-chun Liang (2007) notes that the placement of the literary system of a certain culture is also of importance when it comes to translation: “The ‘preservation’ strategy is often adopted in situations where the literary system of the work under translation is at the centre of the literary polysystem” (p. 99). The inferior position of children’s literature within the polysystem, thus also influences the way it is translated.

The inferior position of children’s literature within the polysystem negatively influences the way in which children’s literature views itself, and this imposes various inflexible constraints on the text, such as the simultaneous (often contradictory) need to appeal to both the child and to the adult and the tendency to self-perpetuation, the acceptance of only the well known and extant and the reluctance of the system to admit new models (Shavit 1986, p. 63).

Shavit also mentions that there is a phenomenon called the diffuse state, which means that one literary text can fit “into more than one opposition of status within the same system” (Shavit 1986, p. 64). When a text has a dual readership, it “ensures the elite’s recognition of the dominant status of the text in the canonized children’s system” (Shavit 1986, pp. 67-68). Thus, the dual readership of a children’s novel aids in elevating its status in the system of children’s literature, which can in turn influence the translation of children’s literature. It must be noted that, although the dual readership is an important factor of children’s literature and it affects its status within the polysystem, the scope of this thesis does not allow to examine the effect of dual readership on the translation of children’s literature more closely.

#### 1.1.6 Definition

When defining the term “children’s literature”, various aspects must be taken into account, such as the concept of childhood within a society; the intended reader of the text; the asymmetric communication that occurs in the production of children’s literature; the function and therewith coming norms of children’s literature and the placement of children’s literature within the polysystem. Already, many proposed definitions of children’s literature exist, but it is difficult to find a definition that is all encompassing.

Peter Hollindale (1997) defines children’s literature as an event. His definition is based on the author, the text, and the child. By author he means: “a person with imaginative interests in constructing childhood (usually but not necessarily through creating child characters) and who on purpose or accidentally uses a narrative voice and language that are audible to children” (p. 29). He defines an individual text of children’s literature as: “one in which this construction is present”, and an implied child reader he defines as someone who: “is still in the business of constructing his or her own childhood, and aware of its presentness”

(p. 29). Then, where these three elements are all present, that is where the event of children's literature happens. He also proposes a final, summarized definition:

Children's literature is a body of texts with certain common features of imaginative interest, which is activated as children's literature by a reading event: that of being read by a child. A child is someone who believes on good grounds that his or her condition of childhood is not yet over (30)

This definition includes the importance of society's perception of childhood and the asymmetric communication between the adult author who is constructing childhood with a voice catering to children. It furthermore includes the implied child reader.

However, it fails to include the duality of the readership of children's literature, the functionality of children's literature and its position within the polysystem. It is difficult to define the functionality of every text within children's literature as pedagogical, educational or entertaining, but it is still an important aspect of a majority of children's books. In addition, the duality of the readership of children's literature is also important, in which this definition forsakes the adult reader. It implies that children's literature is just *literature* when it is read by an adult, when this is not the case. Children's literature read (aloud) by an adult is still classified as children's literature.

It is impossible to create one all-encompassing term for children's literature across all age-ranges, genres, times and cultures. However, this section will illustrate the definition of children's literature that will be used for the purpose of this thesis. The most important defining aspect of children's literature is its primary intended audience: children. For a book to be defined as children's literature, the main addressees must be children. Another important aspect of children's literature named in this section is the asymmetric communication in the production of children's literature. The majority of children's novels are written, produced, edited, reviewed and translated by adults. This then is also a defining aspect of children's

literature. Lastly, the three functions attributed to children's literature are also important in the definition of the term. Children's literature seeks to educate and/or entertain children while simultaneously seeking to be understood by children.

Thus, children's literature is literature aimed primarily at children that represents reciprocated aspects of childhood within a certain culture and that is produced by adults within that culture and which seeks to educate and/or entertain children while simultaneously seeking to be understood and related to by children.

## *1.2 Translation of Children's literature*

Having discussed the different aspects of children's literature, this next section of the literature will discuss the translation of children's literature. Important to the contents of this thesis are the norms present in (children's) literature. Some of the norms discussed apply to literature in general and some of the norms are inherent to children's literature. These norms all have an influence on the translation approach in children's literature. This section will also discuss source-oriented and target-oriented approaches to the translation of children's literature. Furthermore, the impact of dominant languages and culture on translation will be discussed in this section.

### 1.2.1 Norms of Translating Children's Literature

Gideon Toury's theory on norms aids in distinguishing "trends of translation behaviour" and in the generalization "regarding the decision-making processes of the translator" (Munday 2016, p. 176). Toury (2012) defines norms as:

the translation of general values or ideas shared by a community – as to what would count as right or wrong, adequate or inadequate – into performance 'instructions' appropriate for and applicable to concrete situations (p. 63)

This shared community refers to a certain culture within a certain society within a certain time-frame, and is therefore never homogeneous across all cultures or even across the history of one specific culture. These norms can be observed through “examination of texts” or from “explicit statements made about norms by translators, publishers, reviewers and other participants in the translation act” (Munday 2016, p. 178).

Toury defines multiple norms, the first one being the initial norm, which refers to the choice that translators make between – what Toury calls – an adequate or an acceptable translation. An adequate translation is a translation in which the source text culture norms prevail, while an acceptable one is a translation in which “the target culture norms prevail” (Munday 2016, p. 179). A translator can thus either choose to translate the text towards the norms of the source culture or towards that of the target culture. A translated text can never be completely adequate or completely acceptable, it exists on a continuum. The choice between translating a text through an adequate or acceptable translation strategy is called the initial norm. This choice is influenced by the directionality of translation and the position of the two cultures and languages within the polysystem.

Toury also identifies two other norms: preliminary norms and operational norms. Preliminary norms regard the “translation policy and directness of translation”, while operational norms refer to “matricial norms and textual linguistic norms” (Munday 2016, p. 170, p. 180). For the purpose of this study, the operational norms are of most importance. The matricial norms relate to how complete a target text is and whether anything was omitted, relocated, segmented or added. Textual-linguistic norms “govern the selection of TT linguistic material: lexical items, phrases and stylistic features” (Munday 2016, p. 180). For the purpose of this thesis, the most important aspects of these are how complete a translation is – was anything omitted or added – and what linguistic features are present in the translation. This study will explore the translation approach regarding the rendering of register in the target



text by comparing the completeness of a target text and the linguistic features to the content and the linguistic features of the source text.

Some norms that preside in children's literature were discussed in the previous sections. In "A Prototypical Approach within Descriptive Translation Studies? Colliding Norms in Translated Children's Literature", Isabelle Desmidt (2006) sets out norms specifically for children's literature. She does this because Toury's norms lack certain aspects that are inherent to children's literature. However, there is an overlap between Toury's norms and the norms which Desmidt lists for children's literature. The norms that she distinguishes are: "source-text related norms, literary aesthetic norms, business norms, didactic norms, pedagogical norms and technical norms" (qtd. in Van Coillie & McMartin 2020, p. 18).

The pedagogical norms and the didactic norms were previously discussed and related respectively to the ability of children to understand the text and the desire for children to be educated through literature. These two norms are inherent to children's literature.

Then, the source-text related norms and the literary aesthetic norms are similar to Toury's initial norms regarding adequacy and acceptability. Business norms are related to "the context of editing, publishing and distribution" (Van Coillie & McMartin 2020, p. 18). The business norms are similar to Toury's preliminary norms. Lastly, the technical norms "determine [...] the layout, including the relationship between text and image characteristic of (translated) children's literature" (Van Coillie & McMartin 2020, p. 18).

For the purpose of this study, the pedagogical norms and didactic norms have to be considered, as well as what Toury calls the initial norms and what Desmidt identifies as source-text related norms and literary aesthetic norms.

### 1.2.2 Terminology on Degree of Foreignness

There are multiple terms that are used to describe the degree of foreignness of a target text in relation to its source text. The purpose of this study is to determine whether the translation of register in children's literature is oriented towards the register of the source text or whether there is a shift in the register in order to resemble the register of the target text. In order to ensure that the terms used in this thesis is consistent, this section will briefly detail what terms will be used.

Terms that are often used to describe the degree of foreignness are: foreignization vs domestication, adequate vs acceptable, close vs free and source-oriented vs target-oriented (Desmet 2007, pp. 80-81). For the purpose of this study, the terms "source-oriented" and "target-oriented", coined by Hermans (1999) will be used, as these terms are at first glance the most transparent in indicating the type of orientation of a text towards either the source culture or the target culture.

### 1.2.3 Strategies

It must be noted that the strategies discussed in this section are considered to be local strategies rather than global strategies. The difference between global and local strategies is that global strategies are concerned with the overall translation approach to a text and local strategies are concerned with the translation of individual structures (Chesterman 2016, p. 88). Whereas global strategies are overarching of a whole text, the local strategies discussed in this section are more targeted towards individual sections of a text.

Whether a text is considered to be source-oriented or target-oriented depends on the different local translation strategies. In descriptive translation studies, the choices a translator makes when translating are used to determine whether a translation is adequate or acceptable. Here, the choices a translator makes are the local translation strategies that they use.

As previously stated, a text can never be completely source-oriented or completely target-oriented. Different translation strategies and procedures can be used for different elements in a translation. Desmet (2007) sums up strategies that she has gathered from Shavit, Klingberg and O'Sullivan. The strategies mentioned are: omission and deletion strategies, purification strategies, substitution strategies, explication strategies and simplification strategies (Desmet 2007, p. 81). At first glance, some of these strategies seem similar to one another. This is because they might use the same translation procedure in order to accomplish this strategy. The difference between these strategies lies within their purposes.

Omission strategies involve the omission of elements of a source culture, omitting words or whole chapters and can result in abridged versions of the source text and of elements of the source culture. Deletion strategies focus less on the cultural elements and more on the educational and pedagogical norms underlying children's literature. Deletion strategies thus remove inappropriate elements or elements that are deemed too difficult for children in the target text (Desmet 2007, p. 82). This interrelates to the omission strategies, as the omissions of source cultural elements can be used in order to conform to the educational and pedagogical norm.

Purification strategies are "used to bring the translated text in line with the values of the target culture" (Desmet 2007, p. 82). This strategy does not only involve omission or deletion, but also adapts the source text to a text that is more in line with the values of the target culture. The elements are then not necessarily omitted completely, but are merely adapted to fit into the target culture. This strategy is used to make ideological changes within the text. Therefore, it may be used to implement the ideology of the target culture onto the child reader.

The third category mentioned by Desmet (2007) are the substitution strategies. Instead of omitting cultural elements from the target text, as with the omission strategy, the cultural

elements are changed to cultural elements within the same category of the target culture (e.g., the name of a popular candy bar of the SC is changed to the name of a popular candy bar in the TC). Desmet (2007) names “localization” and “cultural conversion” as extreme procedures to accomplish this strategy. Localization is when a target text changes the locality of the text in order to be more recognizable to its readers. When using localization or cultural conversion, all the cultural elements of the source text are adapted into target culture elements.

Explication strategies are another set of strategies that concern the cultural elements of the source text. These strategies aim to explain the cultural elements of the source text to the target reader through the means of additional information (Desmet 2007, p. 83). Procedures used to accomplish this strategy named by Desmet (2007) are: “additional explanations, rewording or paraphrasing of the sense, and explanation outside of the text proper in the form of footnotes, prefaces and appendixes” (p. 83).

The final set of strategies mentioned by Desmet (2007) are the simplification strategies. Simplification strategies impact different areas of the text on both macro-structural and micro-structural level (Desmet 2007, p. 84). The aim of the simplification strategies is to simplify the information or even the structure of a text. It can thus affect the structure of the text and the plot as well as the syntactic features of the text and the narrative. A procedure that can be used to accomplish this is a simplification of the lexical choices.

These different strategies are ways in which a target-oriented approach can affect the text. For the purpose of this study, the most relevant strategies are the simplification strategies, the omission strategies, the deletion strategy and the substitution strategies. The reason for this is that these strategies involve the degree of complexness of grammar, syntax and lexis and also the omission, deletion or the substitution of certain register features on the

basis of either not having an accurate equivalent in the target text or on the basis of it being too difficult for the child reader.

#### 1.2.4 Views on Approaches

There are different views on what is most appropriate for the translation of children's literature: a source-oriented approach or a target-oriented approach. This differs per culture and is also influenced by a culture's position within the polysystem. The views on these approaches vary and are not agreed upon by experts on the translation of children's literature. Some of these different views will be discussed in this section.

Liang (2007) paraphrases Davies' (2003) view on source-oriented vs target-oriented by stating that he "argues that preserving of the Otherness of the source culture may lead to obscurity therefore a translator may decide to keep the original items but supplement the text with whatever information is judged necessary" (p. 77, qtd. in p. 99). Liang (2007) does note that the adding of information could stall the narrative (p. 99). Furthermore, his own study on the translation of foreign elements on children's literature in Taiwan found that "the readers' responses imply that although translations with foreign implantations are more adequacy-oriented, target readers did not find this approach acceptable" (p. 104). Foreign implantations are elements that are new and exotic to the reader, e.g., brands or dishes that are unknown to the target audience. This would then suggest that the readers appreciate a target-oriented approach more.

Riitta Oittinen (2000) agrees in *Translating for Children* that the translation of literature should be target-oriented: "Translators of children's literature should reach out to the children of their own culture" (p. 168, qtd. in Van Coillie & McMartin 2020, p. 19). In addition, "Oittinen [...] considers translation to be a goal-oriented dialogue that the translator undertakes with the text, author and reader" (Van Coillie & McMartin, 2020, p. 19). Oittinen

thus centers the child reader and “programmatically speaks of ‘translating for children’ rather than ‘translating children’s literature’” (Emer O’Sullivan “Translation” 2021, p. 185). Lathey (2016) reinstates this by saying that Oittinen “believes [...] that the translator should [...] reach out to children of the target culture by attempting to re-experience the dynamic intensity of childhood” (p. 16). Oittinen’s preferred approach can then be described as target-oriented.

Göte Klingberg (1986) is in favor of a more source-oriented approach to the translation of children’s literature. The reason for his view is related to the educational function that is valued highly within children’s literature: translation for children should be “bringing texts of literary merit to children, introducing the foreign to children, bringing children something they can understand and educating them in the right values” (Klingberg 1986, p. 10, qtd. in Desmet 2007, p. 20). Desmet (2007) lists two goals that Klingberg has for children’s literature, the first one being “to make works of literary merit available to children, which implies attention to and emphasis on the aesthetic character of the source text in its totality”, and the second one being: “bringing more knowledge and understanding of foreign countries and cultures to children, with the ultimate goal of creating solidarity and tolerance” (p. 79). These two goals are reasons for Klingberg to favor a source-oriented translation approach, as “the integrity of the original work should be violated as little as possible” (Klingberg 1986, paraphrased in O’Sullivan 2021, p. 185).

However, Klingberg too recognizes that there is always a degree of adaptation of the text to the intended readership: “the presumed limited knowledge of the intended target reader about the source culture means that in order to maintain a similar degree of adaptation a translator must provide a further adaptation of the source text which he calls ‘cultural context adaptation’ (Klingberg 1986, pp. 11-12, paraphrased in Desmet 2007, p. 80). A balance must be upheld between the introduction of foreign elements and accessibility to the text for the intended readers, and this is what Klingberg calls cultural context adaptation (Desmet 2007, p.

80). In “Children’s Literature and Translation”, Cecilia Alvstad defines cultural context adaptation as: “modifications that aim to adjust a text to the prospective readers’ frame of reference” (p. 22). This definition closely resembles that of Juliana House’s theory on “cultural filter”, which will be discussed in section 1.3.3. However, the difference between House’s “cultural filter” theory and Klingberg’s “cultural context adaptation” theory is that the cultural context adaptation theory puts more emphasize on finding a balance between the source and target culture. Klingberg’s strategy thus seems to be the more source-oriented approach. However, as Toury also states for his initial norm, a translation can never be exclusively source-oriented or target-oriented, and Klingberg too recognizes that a certain degree of a target-oriented approach is needed when translating children’s literature.

Anthea Bell, the English translator of *Inkheart*, has also shared her view on source- and target-oriented approaches. In “Only English Books”, Gillian Lathey (2020) quotes her as stating that what is foreign and interesting to an adult, may be dull for a child (Bell 1979, p. 50, qtd. in p. 46). However, Bell also suggests that a translation should not only be target-oriented, as this could result in a boring text deprived of all atmosphere. Instead “[w]ith each individual book, [the translator] must gauge the precise degree of foreignness, and how far it is acceptable and can be preserved” (Bell 1985, p. 7, qtd in Lathey 2020, p. 46; Lathey 2016, p. 37; Lathey 2009, p. 32). Bell’s view is more balanced between a source-oriented translation and a target-oriented translation. Both are needed in order to keep the child engaged with the text.

Finally, in *Keywords for Children’s Literature*, Emer O’Sullivan’s (2021) article “Translation” gives an overview on the debate on source-oriented and target-oriented translation. She recognizes that the discussion revolves around “the central tension between the ideal of preserving the artistic and cultural integrity of the source text [...] and adapting the text to the abilities of the child audience” (p. 185). She names “Roussaeau’s dictum that

children must be shielded from anything that may be culturally unfamiliar” as the reason that the child reader is underestimated (p. 185). In “Children’s Literature”, Lathey (2009) also pinpoints the underestimation of the child reader as a reason for a target-oriented approach and attributes this to the adult belief that children lack life experience (p. 32). O’Sullivan’s (2013) personal view on the matter is that the translation of children’s literature is always “a balancing act between adapting foreign elements to the child reader’s level of comprehension, and to what is deemed appropriate, preserving the difference that constitute a translated foreign text’s potential for the enrichment of the target culture” (p. 453, qtd. in O’Sullivan 2021, p. 185). Here, O’Sullivan does not take a stance that is weighed more towards either source- or target-oriented. As Bell, she emphasis the importance of a balance between the two orientations.

#### 1.2.5 Influence of Dominant Languages (Polysystem)

This section will consider the way in which the translation of children’s literature is influenced by the directionality of the language and cultures involved within the translation process, and how the dominant language can influence the translation approach.

Dominant languages, and the position of a certain language within the polysystem, influence the orientation of translation. Pascale Casanova (2013) states that “[a] language is dominant if (and only if) it is a second language used by bilinguals or polyglots around the world. It is not the number of speakers that determines whether it is dominant or not” (p. 380). Casanova (2013) ascribes to this the fact that the dominant language is “favored in all translations”: it is understood by many bi and plurilingual speakers, and many products are exported due to its status as a dominant language (p. 380).

In this contemporary globalized society, English has the status of a dominant language and “has been adopted nearly everywhere as the first-taught language” (Casanova 2013, p.



381). Desmet (2007) found that the dominant source language of children's books translated into Dutch "is English, with translation from German and Scandinavian languages following behind" (p. 5). She emphasizes this by stating that "translations from English are always dominant" in the time period (1946-1995) she has researched (p. 121). Especially the "[t]ranslations from the United States are dominant" (p. 127). In "Only English Books" Lathey (2020) confirms that English is considered a dominant language globally, since "research into global translation traffic indicates that there is a significant imbalance between translations into and from the English language" (p. 42). Lathey (2020) quotes Venuti (1998) as saying that "English has become the most translated language worldwide, but [...] it is one of the least translated into" (p. 160, Lathey 2020, p. 43). Venuti calls this an "unequal cultural exchange". A study done in 2012 by Jasmine Donahaye from Swansea University, confirms Venuti's statement: "just 3 percent of all publications is the likely figure for the proportion of translated books in the sample years of 2000, 2005 and 2008" (qtd. in Lathey 2020, p. 43). Thus, English language and culture have a dominant position within the polysystem of literary translation.

The status of English as a dominant language in translation influences the way in which literary texts are translated. Liang (2007) explains that "if a literary system holds the central position, translators and other manipulators will be more willing to adopt source repertoires encompassing a source-oriented tendency and leading to an adequacy translation" (p. 96). In "How Bert got into Ned's Head: domestication in the translation of literature for young readers", Thea Palm Åsman and Jan Pedersen (2013) also mention the influence of the directionality of the translation, saying that "translations from a small [source culture] to a dominant [target culture] are more likely to suffer domestication than vice versa" (p. 144). The dominant status of the English language, and the dominant status of the English and

American literary system within the polysystem, can result in a target-oriented translation approach when another language is translated into English.

For this study, it would be interesting to see whether the English translator of a children's book would then opt for a more target-oriented translation than the Dutch translator would when translating the register of the German source text.

### *1.3 Register*

Since this study is concerned with the translation of register in children's literature, this section will look at the definition of register, and at theories regarding the rendering of register in translation, such as Juliane House's ideas on cultural context/filtering and Geert Hofstede's ideas on cultural dimensions.

#### 1.3.1 Definition Register

In "Register and Translation", Stella Nuemann (2021) provides the definition of register within systemic functional linguistics: "Register is the theoretical construct that specifies the role of situational context in the systemic functional conceptualization of language" (p. 65). Jean Ure and Jeffrey Ellis (1977) define register as "a certain kind of language patterning regularly used in a certain kind of situation", and they emphasize that "[i]t is a social convention" (p. 197). Furthermore, they indicate that register "includes the association and combination of lexical and grammatical features in texts" and that it "changes along with other social changes" (p. 197). The situational context is thus a key element of register, as is the language patterning associated with that situational context (Nuemann 2021, p. 70).

The Hallidayan model of discourse analysis will be briefly outlined, because House's model for the analysis of translations that will be used in this study is based on the Hallidayan model. Furthermore, The Hallidayan model of discourse analysis will be used to analyze

*Tintenherz* and its translation in order to determine what choices were made within the wider socio-cultural framework of the target cultures.

The Hallidayan model is based on systemic functional linguistics, which “is geared to the study of language as communication” (Munday 2016, p. 142). Halliday’s model relates the grammar choices of the author to the function of the text “in a wider sociocultural framework” (Munday 2016, p. 143). Within this model, the sociocultural environment conditions the genre, and genre determines elements of register (Munday 2016, p. 144). Since this study is concerned with the rendering of register in translation, it is important to have the tools to examine the register and its sociocultural framework.

According to the Hallidayan model, register is divided into the three following variables: field, tenor and mode. The variable “field” consists of “what is being written about”, “tenor” of “who is communicating and to whom”, and lastly “mode” consists of “the form of communication” (Munday 2016, p. 144).

These three variables are then also linked to three metafunctions. Field is linked to the ideational metafunction, which “provides a representation of the world or an event” (p. 144). Tenor is linked to the interpersonal metafunction, which “enacts social relationships” (p.144). Finally, mode is linked to the textual metafunction, which “makes a text hang together in a coherent way” (p.144).

These three register variables each have different lexicogrammatical realizations within a text. As lexicogrammatical realizations of field, Munday lists subject-specific terminology and transitivity structures (p. 145). For tenor, he names pronouns, modality and evaluative lexis as lexicogrammatical realizations (p. 145). Lastly, for mode, cohesion and thematic and information structures are named as lexicogrammatical realizations (p. 145). These lexicogrammatical realizations are then the language patterns that are associated with a certain variable of register.

Register is not only concerned with the level of formality, although this is an inherent part of tenor. Register in systemic functional linguistics includes more language patterning than simply the use of address. The way in which a register analysis will be conducted in this study will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2: Methodology.

Besides an analysis of the lexicogrammatical realizations within a text, a study of register also requires an analysis of the situational context in order to be complete. Therefore, the situational context is also of importance to this study. In *Translation Quality Assessment*, Juliane House (2015) adapts and modifies a model from Crystal and Davy's (1969) for the purpose of a situational-functional text analysis. This model is divided into two different parts. The first part includes the dimensions of the language user, and the second part includes the dimensions of the language use (p. 27). The dimensions of the language user are divided into three separate categories: geographical origin, social class and time. The dimensions of language use are divided into five different categories: medium, participation, social role relationship, social attitude and province. The details of this model and how this model will be used in this study will be explained in further detail in Chapter 2: Methodology.

### 1.3.2 Rendering of Register in Translation

This section will explore the way in which register is rendered in translation.

Nuemann (2021) quotes Evert and Nuemann's (2017) study on the influence of directionality on the translation of register. Texts translated from German into English are similar to non-translated English text, while texts translated from English into German "display shining-through of English features" (p. 75). This can be due to the fact that English is a dominant language. Thus, when translating into English, the translation of register is more target-oriented, and when translating into German, the translation of register is more source-oriented.

Nuemann (2021) also highlights that “[p]art of translation expertise then is an active effort to make the translated text similar to comparable texts in the target language” (p. 75). Experienced translators translate register closer to the register of comparable texts in the target language. Instead of maintaining the register of the source text, it is rendered in a similar register within the target language. According to Reiss and Vermeer’s skopos theory, a target text “must be ‘functionally adequate<sup>2</sup>” (Munday 2016, p. 127). This means that the function of a text influences the way that a text is translated. Furthermore, Christine Nord emphasizes that a relationship between the source text and target text must be maintained, and “this relationship is determined by the purpose or skopos” (Munday 2016, p. 128).

House is critical of the skopos theory, as it fails to take into account the importance of analyzing a source text. A certain degree of loyalty must exist between the function of the source text and the function of the target text. However, in order to accomplish the same functionality in the target language, the register is rendered in such a way that it resembles a target text of that same genre, which might differ from the register in that same genre of the source text.

There is not “a general trend to conform to target language norms”, the degree in which a translated text conforms to the target culture norms depends on the situational context of a text (Nuemann 2021, p. 77). What is thus important in the rendering of register in translation is “the expertise to recognize differences between similar contexts of situation across cultures” (Nuemann 2021, p. 71).

---

<sup>2</sup> It must be noted that adequacy here “describes the relations between [source text] and [target text] as a consequence of observing a skopos during the translation process” and is thus different from the meaning of “adequate” meant by Toury (Munday 2016, p. 129).

### 1.3.3 Cultural Context and the Cultural Filter

The cultural context is of great importance in translation. The reason for this is that “[t]ranslation should be viewed as cultural transfer” (Liang 2007, p. 93). A translation must seek to transfer the cultural context. In “Moving Across Language and Cultures in Translation as Intercultural Communication”, Juliane House (2009) states that “culture as intimately linked with language” must be taken into account when translating, as is done within systemic functional linguistics (House 2009, p. 2).

House (2009) defines culture as “whatever a person needs to know or believe in order to operate in a manner acceptable to its (i.e. a society’s) members” (p. 9). In order to communicate this knowledge and believe, language is used as “the prime instrument” to share this information with youth. House (2009) states that “[l]anguage and culture are therefore most intimately (and obviously) interrelated on the levels of semantics, where the vocabulary of a language reflects the culture shared by its speakers” (p. 10). Therefore, when correctly translating the meaning, the translator must be knowledgeable of the cultural meaning attached to them (House 2009, p. 11). This also applies to the rendering of register in translation, the translator must be knowledgeable of the influence of semantics and grammar attached to certain registers.

House (2009) states that in order for a target text to be equivalent in function to that of the source text, “the function of a text [...] must be kept equivalent” (p. 12). This is a circular reasoning, as she states that the function of a text must be equivalent twice.

Bypassing this, from Halliday’s model of discourse analysis, which has been discussed in section 1.3.1, House (2009) concludes that there are two types of translations relating to the equivalence of function: overt translations and covert translations (House 1977, paraphrased in House 2009, p. 13). House (2009) defines overt translation as “very visible, very overtly a

translation [...], hence its target culture addressees are quite ‘overtly’ not being directly addressed”, while a covert translation “is a translation which enjoys the status of an original text in the receiving culture” (p. 15, p. 16). The term “overt” translation closely resembles “source-oriented” translation and the term “covert” translation closely resembles “target-oriented” translation. The main difference between House’s terms and Herman’s terms are that House’s terms focus on the visibility of the translation, while Herman’s terms focus on which culture the text is oriented towards.

House (2009) furthermore argues that in order to achieve a covert translation in which the function of the text is equivalent in the source and target language, a cultural filter must be applied (p.17). Through this cultural filter, “the translator **compensates** for culture specificity” (p. 17). According to House (2009), the translator achieves this by viewing “the source text, as it were, through the glasses of a target culture member” (p. 18). Especially the interpersonal metafunction is important, since social relationships and social attitudes are “phenomena that are difficult to diagnose, describe and translate” (p. 18). She emphasizes the importance of empirical cross-cultural research when applying this filter, otherwise the translation will be culturally inadequate (p. 18). Thus, through cultural filtering, a translator may achieve a covert (target-oriented) translation that holds a similar function in the target culture as the source text in the source culture. This cultural filtering is done within the register variables of field and tenor especially, and relates to the ideational and interpersonal metafunction.

#### 1.3.4 Cultural Dimensions

Cultural dimensions can be applied to determine in what way the source and target cultures differ from one another. In this section, two sets of cultural dimensions will be discussed.

House (2009) identifies five cultural dimensions. These cultural dimensions consist of: directness vs indirectness, orientation towards Self vs orientation towards Other, orientation towards Content vs orientation towards Persons, explicitness vs implicitness and ad-hoc-formulation vs use of verbal routines (p. 20). House's cultural dimensions are all cultural dimensions that can be traced back to linguistic features within a language.

Geert Hofstede furthermore identified six different cultural dimensions. These cultural dimensions consist of: individualism vs. collectivism, large vs. small power distance, strong vs. weak uncertainty avoidance, masculinity vs. femininity, long vs. short term orientation, indulgence vs. restraint (Dimitrov 2014, p. 32). These dimensions can also influence the politeness and the formality in certain situational-context. For example, a culture with a large power distance will uphold greater degrees of formality and politeness towards people with status than a culture with a small power distance will. These dimensions all determine the type of society present in a certain culture, but cannot necessarily be easily applied to linguistic features.

Although it is important to be aware of Geert Hofstede's cultural dimensions, the scope of this study unfortunately does not allow for both Hofstede's and House's cultural dimensions to be analyzed. Therefore, for the analysis of this study, House's cultural dimensions will be used as these relate more closely the aspects of register that will be discussed in this paper, such as politeness and formality. In addition, House's discipline is in translation studies, while Hofstede's is in social studies.

## 1.4 Conclusion

This chapter has defined children's literature as

literature aimed primarily at children that represents reciprocated aspects of childhood within a certain culture and that is produced by adults within that culture and which



seeks to educate and/or entertain children while simultaneously seeking to be understood and related to by children.

This chapter also explored the position of children's literature within the polysystem and found that its inferior position within the polysystem grants translators with more freedom when rendering a target text. However, as the discussion of the translation of children's literature showed, the translation of children's literature must adhere to the pedagogical and didactic norms. These norms can influence the translation strategies that a translator uses.

This chapter furthermore explored the different views on source- and target-oriented approaches. The source-oriented view is rooted in the believe that children must not be sheltered from the foreign and that they can even learn from it. The target-oriented view is rooted in the believe that children must understand what they are reading and they must be able to relate to it. However, a translation is not a dichotomy and both sides acknowledge the fact that a translation is a balancing act between a source-oriented and a target-oriented approach.

This chapter also defined register. Register is divided into the situational context of an interaction and its language features that are inherent to this situational context. This chapter discussed the Hallidayan model, which will be used to analyze the language features of a situational context. In addition, this chapter discussed that the rendering of register in translation does not conform to a general translation approach. There are multiple influences on the translation approach, e.g., the directionality of the translation and the place of the target culture in the polysystem.

Finally, this chapter has highlighted that the cultural context and the cultural filter are important aspects in this study, as it can explain the difference in the rendering of translation. It has furthermore discussed the cultural dimensions set out by House and the ones set out by

Hofstede. House's cultural dimensions will be used in explaining the difference in the rendering of register from a cultural filter.

## Chapter Two: Methodology

*This chapter will discuss how this thesis was conducted. It will discuss the materials used and it will explain why these materials were selected. Furthermore, it will explain what methods were used to analyze the register and why these methods were selected.*

### 2.1 Materials

The primary sources of this thesis are Cornelia Funke's (2003) German novel *Tintenherz* and its translations into Dutch by Hanneke Beneden and Ab Bertholet (2005) and English by Anthea Bell (2005), respectively: *Hart van Inkt* and *Inkheart*. The translated versions were directly translated from the German source text, and not through a pivot language.

*Tintenherz* is a children's fantasy novel that explores the possibility of entering the worlds of stories. Meggie's father, Mortimer, is able to conjure objects from stories through the use of his voice, but for everything that comes out of the story, something or someone must go in.

On Cornelia Funke's official website, the reading age of *Tintenherz* is classified as "age 9". The novel is aimed at a child reader that is nine years old, and is therefore a children's novel. The story is also focalized through Meggie, who is thus a child protagonist. The novel constructs the idea of childhood and details the experience of a young girl. It also portrays the asymmetric relation between adults and children in everyday life, as well as the important bonds children form with safe adults in their lives.

Although Meggie is the focalizer of the novel, the narrator is omniscient. It is also knowledgeable of the future, which becomes apparent in phrases such as: "Hoe goed ze zich dat na zoveel jaar nog kon herinneren" (p. 14). The narrator being able to describe exactly what Meggie was feeling from a point after the events indicates that the narrator could be Meggie retrospectively narrating her own story. This is what a lot of children's authors do,

according to Hollindale (1997, p. 12). They reflect on their own childhood in order to visualize a story for contemporary children, which always leaves an asymmetry between the child and the author.

This novel is thus a children's book, which can be gathered from the age of the main character and the focalizer, as well as from the events in the story. Furthermore, what also indicates that this is a children's novel is the fact that this novel is intended for children who are nine years old.

The aim of this thesis is to examine the translation approach for the rendering of register within children's literature. Children's literature occupies a peripheral position within the polysystem of literature. This peripheral position influences the way that translators approach its translation. In the literature review of this study, it was stated that this inferior position within the polysystem allows translators to take greater liberties with their translation approaches. Furthermore, its inferior position within the polysystem also creates a dual readership for this genre, which may also influence the approach of translators. Since *Tintenherz* is a children's novel, this study can also explore the influence that this peripheral position has on the translation approach.

Translator can take more liberties when translating children's literature due to children's literature peripheral position within the polysystem. However, the genre of children's literature itself adheres to specific functions which already influences the way the source text is written. In the literature review, the three main functions of children's literature were defined as the didactic, pedagogical and entertaining function. These three functions are inherent to the genre of children's literature and therefore may also influence the translation approach regarding the rendering of register. Since *Tintenherz* is a children's novel, this study can also explore the way that these functions influence the translation approach to the rendering of register in the target language and target culture.

Besides its established status of being children's literature, another important reason for the selection of this children's book is the different target languages it has been translated into. This study will focus on three Germanic languages; it will analyze the source text language, German, and two target text languages, Dutch and the English. Initially, the consideration of these languages focused on formality; *Tintenherz* was originally written in German, a language which expresses formality through the use of its pronouns. German has two forms of the second-person singular pronoun: the informal *du* and the formal *Sie*. The target language of English has no such distinction between formal and informal pronouns, while the target language of Dutch does have the distinction between *jij* and *U*. In the analyses of these three languages, it will be interesting to examine in what way the aspect of formality is rendered in the Dutch and English target texts.

Another reason for choosing *Tintenherz* is the position that the target cultures and languages occupy within the polysystem. The English language and culture are considered dominant in the polysystem of translation (Casanova 2013; Lathey 2020). Literature is often translated from English into another language, but translations into English occur less often. This is also the case for children's literature specifically (Desmet 2007). This means that there is an unequal cultural exchange between the English language and culture and other languages and cultures (Venuti 1998). Thus, English has a dominant status within the polysystem of translation.

The dominant status of the English language and culture influences translation approaches towards children's novels. When English is the target language, the translated text is more likely to be translated using a target-oriented translation approach. When English is the source language, translators may be more likely to use a source-oriented translation approach for the translation into a target language (Liang 2007; Åsman & Pedersen 2013). Thus, the directionality of translation may influence the translation approach that is adopted.

Since *Tintenherz* was translated to the dominant English target language, but also to the less dominant Dutch target language, it will lend itself well to explore the way in which directionality influences the translation approach. It is most likely that an analysis of the translation approach into the English target language will show that a more target-oriented approach was used. The analysis of the translation approach into the Dutch target language may show a more balanced approach that uses both source and target-oriented approaches. Thus, this study will use *Tintenherz* as primary source, because the source text and its two target texts allow for an examination of the effect of the position of (translated) children's literature and the languages and cultures within the polysystem on the rendering of register in the translation of children's literature.

## 2.2 Methods

In order to conduct this research, excerpts must be selected and an approach to the register analysis must be established. In the literature review, register was defined as having two important components: the situational context and the language patterning associated with that situational context (Nuemann 2021, p. 70). Therefore, it is important to first conduct a situational-functional text analysis, followed by a linguistic analysis of the language used in this situation. After the register analysis has been completed, a comparative analysis must also be conducted to compare the results and to determine the difference in translation strategy.

### 2.2.1 Situational-Functional Text Analysis

Since the scope of this study does not allow for a complete register analysis of three novels, excerpts will be selected to conduct a situational-functional and a register analysis. Excerpts consist of pieces of dialogue and are either selected at random (40) or have been selected due to the occurrence of an interesting register phenomenon that might have affected the

translation strategy (10). These excerpts are then submitted to a situational-functional text analysis based upon the revised model proposed by House (2015) discussed in the literature review. A brief overview of the dimensions House names are in table 1.

**Table 1.**

***Situational-Functional Dimensions based on House's Revised Model (2015).***

Dimensions of Language User	Dimensions of Language Use
1. Geographical Origin	1. Medium: simple/complex
2. Social Class	2. Participation: simple/complex
3. Time	3. Social Role Relationship
	4. Social Attitude
	5. Province

For every excerpt, the characters are defined in terms of their geographical origin, their social class and the time. Then, the medium participation, social roles, social attitudes and the province of the situation and the characters will be defined as well.

The situational-context analysis must be conducted in order to gain an understanding of the difference between the situational context within the source text and the target texts which might also affect the rendering of register across the cultures.

House's situational-functional dimensions are intended to be used as a tool to assess the quality of a translation by comparing the register and genre of a source text to a target text. This study does not aim to assess the quality of a translation, it is merely interested in comparing the register of a source text and two target texts. House provides the tools for conducting a situational-text analysis of the source text and the target texts that allows for a comparative analysis. Therefore, the situational-functional dimensions of House's quality assessment will be used. However, this study does not aim to do a quality assessment of the target text. This study aims to compare the situational-context – and the lexicogrammatical realizations of the register – of the source text and the two target texts.

Additionally, the cultural dimensions set out by Juliane House (2009) will also be used. House enumerates the following dimensions in which cultural notions are reflected in

language: directness vs indirectness, orientation towards self vs orientation towards other, orientation towards content vs orientation towards persons, explicitness vs implicitness and ad-hoc-formulation vs use of verbal routines (p. 20). These dimensions will be used to construct an image of the three cultures that are relevant to this study.

It would be especially interesting to explore these different cultural dimensions and its linguistic qualities between English and German. House (2009) states that the English and German cultures differ among these dimensions: “German subjects tend to interact in ways that are more direct, more explicit, more self-referenced and more content-oriented; they were also found to be less prone to resort to using verbal routines than Anglophone speakers” (p. 21).

Since the register of a text is constructed from lexicogrammatical realizations, these cultural dimensions also influence the overall register of a text. The lexicogrammatical realizations and the rendering of register may differ between English and German due to the cultural differences. By taking these dimensions into account during the register analysis, the cultural filter that the translator uses while translating becomes more visible. These cultural dimensions can be used to observe the cultural differences that may cause the shifts in lexicogrammatical features of the register. Therefore, it would be interesting to explore these different cultural dimensions and its linguistic qualities between English and German.

Due to geographical placing, the cultural dimensions of Dutch are more closely related to German than German to English. This similarity in cultural dimensions between Dutch and German can also be seen in certain linguistical qualities of these languages, such as: vocabulary, sentence structures and case systems. It would be interesting to consider in what way the translation strategy of a translation from German to Dutch might differ from that of a translation from German to English based on these cultural dimensions.



Furthermore, Geert Hofstede sets out six cultural dimensions. These six dimensions are discussed in section 1.3.4. These dimensions are: individualism vs. collectivism, large vs. small power distance, strong vs. weak uncertainty avoidance, masculinity vs. femininity, long vs. short term orientation, indulgence vs. restraint (Dimitrov 2014, p. 32). Although it would be interesting to examine the impact that Hofstede's cultural dimension have on the rendering of register within the translation of children's literature, the scope of this study does not allow for the analyzation of both House's and Hofstede's cultural dimensions. Since House's cultural dimensions can be linked to specific linguistic qualities within the German and the English language that influence the register, these cultural dimensions are better suited for the purpose of this study. In addition, House's cultural dimensions are situated in the theoretical framework of translation studies, while Hofstede's cultural dimensions are situated in the theoretical framework of social studies.

### 2.2.2 Analysis of the Lexicogrammatical Realizations

The second part of the register analysis consists of an analysis of the lexicogrammatical realizations. In the previous chapter, it was explained how the variables of field, tenor and mode relate to the situational dimensions. Field relates to the subject of the situation, tenor relates to the participants of the situation, and mode relates to the coherence of a situation. Furthermore, the previous chapter linked these to lexicogrammatical realizations, which table 2 will summarize.

**Table 2.*****Overview of Register Variables and their Lexicogrammatical Realizations based on Munday (2016), p. 145.***

<i>Register variable</i>	<i>Strand of Meaning</i>	<i>Lexicogrammatical Realization</i>
“Field: what is being written about”	Ideational: “provides a representation of the world or an event”	“Subject-specific terminology, transitivity structures (verb types, selection of active/passive, selection of grammatical subject, use of nominalization instead of verb”
“Tenor: who is communicating and to whom”	Interpersonal: “enacts social relationships”	Pronouns (I/we: exclusive or inclusive, you: formal or informal), modality (modal verbs and adverbs) and evaluative lexis
“Mode: the form of communication” p. 144	Textual: “makes a text hang together in a coherent way	Cohesion (the way a text holds together lexically through lexical repetition, use of pronouns in place of nouns, collocation) and thematic and information structures (word order and placement elements in the text)

For each register variable, the defining lexicogrammatical realizations will be recorded in an Excel sheet. For the register variable of field, the following lexicogrammatical realizations will be noted: subject-specific terminology – jargon, transitivity structures; the verb type, classification of the verb as active or passive, the grammatical subject and occurrences of nominalization. For the register variable of tenor, the lexicogrammatical realizations that will be recorded are: pronouns, modality, and evaluative lexis used. Finally, for the variable of mode, the following lexicogrammatical realizations will be noted: cohesion; instances of lexical repetition, pronouns that replace nouns, instances of collocation – and thematic and information structures; the word order and the placement of elements within the text.

The lexicogrammatical realizations that are analyzed for the purpose of this study are taken from Halliday's model of discourse analysis that is based on systemic functional linguistics. The Hallidayan model and theory of systemic functional linguistics were chosen, because this model provides a clear link between the register variable and the linguistic features which can be applied to this study about the rendering of register in translation. Furthermore, SFL seeks to "prioritizes language from the perspective of systems of meaning" (Bowcher, Fontaine, Schönthal 2019, p. 1). This means that the language used is analyzed within the meaning of its context. Since this study aims to analyze the linguistic features of a text in relation to its situational context in order to determine how register is rendered in translation, the Hallidayan model (and SFL) was chosen to conduct this research.

The situational-functional and linguistic analysis of each extract will be examined as a whole in order to create a complete overview of the register of a text. The lexicogrammatical language used within a certain situational context may vary between the languages. Therefore, this part of the study will consider the register of each language individually.

### 2.2.3 Comparative Analysis Translation Approaches

After the situational-functional text analysis and the register analysis, a comparative analysis will be carried out. This analysis will take the situational-functional and register analysis of the original German novel *Tintenherz* as a base for the comparative analysis of the translation strategies. The register of the Dutch and the English target text are individually compared to the register of the German source text. This comparative analysis aims to determine the translation strategy of the Dutch and English translators.

The main translation approach can be classified as either a source-oriented approach or a target-oriented approach. However, a translation approach to a text is not a dichotomy. It is likely that the translation approach is a continuum. A translation approach can be both source-

oriented and target-oriented. This study acknowledges that a translation approach is never a dichotomy. Therefore, this study will look at the predominant translation approach used.

When the rendering of register of the target text resembles that of the German original more closely, it will be classified as source-oriented, if it is closer to the register of an original target text, then it will be classified as target-oriented approach.

During the comparative analysis, the culture dimensions set out by House (2009) will be used to determine the possible reasons within the cultural sphere of the target languages for the difference in translation approach. This comparative analysis is essential to this study, because it aims to examine the difference in the rendering of register in translation between two Germanic languages – which are situated differently within the polysystem of translation – while also considering the cultural filter.

### 2.3 Conclusion

This methodology chapter has outlined the approach to the study of translation approaches towards the rendering of register in the translation of children's literature. It is important to gain knowledge of the translation approaches used in children's literature, because there are varying prescriptive views of what approaches should be used in this genre (see section 1.2.3 views on approaches). However, there is a gap in the research about translation approaches that are used by translators of children's literature, especially when it comes to the rendering of register in translation. Therefore, this study can contribute to research on the translation approaches that are used for the rendering of translation within children's literature.

The scope of this study is limited. The scope of this study does not allow for an analysis of multiple children's novels and their translations. It also limits the quantity of excerpts that can be analyzed within *Tintenherz*. Furthermore, it limits the set of cultural dimensions that can be examined within the three cultures. Only House's cultural dimensions

will be used. Therefore, the results that will be yielded from this study are not significant enough to allow for a general conclusion across the genre of children's literature. Further research into the rendering of translation in children's literature will have to analyze a range of children's literature across multiple languages and cultures in order to collect data from which a significant conclusion can be drawn. For future research, it would also be interesting to see an analysis of the cultures through other cultural dimensions, such as Hofstede's cultural dimensions.

The methods used in this study also have limitations. The situational-functional dimensions used in the register analysis were adapted from House's theory on quality assessment. This study is not concerned with assessing the quality of a translation and therefore these dimensions were not intended to be used in the context of this study. However, House's situational-functional dimensions were utilized in this study, because they provide the tools for conducting a situational-text analysis. This study adapts the intended use of the situational-functional dimensions in order to be utilized for the situational-context analysis of a register analysis without assessing the quality.

The scope of this study also limits the indepthness in which the comparative analyses of the translation approaches of the Dutch and the English target text can determine the overall translation approach. Translation approaches are not a clear dichotomy. Instead, they exist on a continuum. A translation approach is rarely completely source-oriented or target-oriented. This study acknowledges this. However, a generalization of the overall translation approach must be made in order to discuss the reasons for this approach. The scope of this study does not allow for every nuance in the translation approach to be addressed. In this generalization of the translation approaches, this study loses nuance. However, through this generalization it also gains insight into the overall translation approaches regarding the rendering of register in the translation of *Tintenherz*.

This study aims to examine the way in which register is rendered in the translation of children's literature. It will examine the rendering of register in the translation of children's literature by conducting an analysis of the situational-context and the lexicogrammatical realizations for the German source text and the Dutch and English target texts. From this register analysis, this study will determine the overall translation approach of the Dutch and English target text utilized in the rendering of translation in *Tintenherz*. The translation approaches of the two target texts will then also be compared. The comparative analysis of the translation approaches of the target texts aims to examine the differences in the translation approaches through a cultural filter. It will furthermore aim to consider the effect that the status of English as a dominant language and culture has on the translation approach as opposed to the status of the Dutch language and culture that is situated lower in the polysystem than the English language.

The register analysis of the German source text and the Dutch and English target texts combined with the comparative analysis of the register of the two target texts and the source text will determine the overall translation approach that the two target texts used regarding the rendering of register in the translation. The register analysis and the comparative analysis are vital steps in this study, as these steps aim to determine what the translation approach is to the rendering of register in the Dutch and English target texts of *Tintenherz*. These steps furthermore aim to examine the reason for this difference in the translation approach from a cultural filter.

## Chapter Three: Results

*This chapter will discuss the results of the situational-text analysis and the register analysis. Furthermore, the results of the comparative analysis of the register between the target texts and the source text will be discussed. From these results, a translation approach will be attributed to the English and the Dutch texts.*

### 3.1 Situational-Text Analysis

In the situational-text analysis the dimensions of the language user and the language use was analyzed according to House's revised model for situational-functional text analysis.

#### 3.1.1 Dimension of the Language User

First, the dimensions of the language user were filled in for all of the relevant characters in the book. Throughout the process of the lexicogrammatical-text analysis, two more were added. This resulted in eleven language users. The dimensions of the language users did not differentiate between the source and the target texts.

The geographical origin and time could be divided into two main categories. Either a character's geographical origin was from "our" world, or their geographical origin was from the Ink World, which is a fantasy-like world that mimics the medieval time-period. The geographical origin from "our" world could be furthermore divided into specific countries, e.g., Italy or Germany.

Then, the analysis of the category "time" found that all the characters were currently in contemporary time (circa 2000). However, the characters who originated from the Ink World grew up in a fantasy world in which the time period could be described as similar to medieval time in our world.

The category “social class” could be divided into upper class, middle class and working class. Meggie’s aunt Elinor could be considered upper class, as she lives in a large house and has a big collection of (expensive) books. Meggie and her father Mortimer could be considered middle class. They are not as rich as Elinor, but her father earns enough money for them to be comfortable. Staubfinger was considered to be of the working class. In the Ink World, he was an entertainer on fairs and markets. It is not clear where Staubfinger lives in the contemporary world, but it is implied that he travels and earns his money by entertaining on the streets. Capricorn and his men are low criminals and belong in a low social class of society. However, within their organizations, hierarchies also exist. For example, Capricorn is a king amongst thieves and Basta is his most trusted, right-hand man. Mortola is Capricorn’s head of maids. This was also taken into consideration for the category of social class.

### 3.1.2 Dimensions of the Language Use

For every excerpt, the dimension of the language use was established. Firstly, the medium was decided and whether this was simple or complex. Then, the participation was determined and whether this was simple or complex. Then, the social role of the relationship between the characters as well as the social attitude was determined. Lastly, for province, the speaker’s occupation was stated and the context of the situation was briefly explained.

Most of the excerpts were a form of communication between two characters and could therefore be classified as complex dialogue (46 of the 50 excerpts). All of these excerpts were classified as being complex, because the author of the story wrote the dialogue down as if it was to be spoken by the characters. The reader of the novel is reading it in their head as if it was to be spoken.

There were also some instances of monologue, in which a character’s utterance was not aimed at another character and is not part of a conversation. These two excerpts were



classified as complex monologue. There was also one excerpt which conveys Meggie's internal monologue. Even though this was not uttered, the novel describes Meggie's thoughts as being whispered to her by her own brain. This excerpt was classified as being simple monologue. One of the excerpts was classified as written dialogue that was simple, as it was meant to be read.

The category of participation used the following classifications: dialogue (simple), dialogue (complex), monologue (simple), monologue (complex) and written dialogue (complex). Dialogue and monologue were classified as simple when an excerpt did not refer to a tertiary participant. There were 25 instances of simple dialogue and 2 cases of simple monologue. The participation was classified as complex when the excerpts contained indirect participation, i.e., when a tertiary person was mentioned using pronouns or when there were switches between interrogative and imperative sentences. There were 21 instances of complex participation in dialogue and 1 instance of complex participation for monologue. One other instance of complex participation was in the written dialogue.

The nature of the social role between two characters could be classified as symmetrical or asymmetrical. There were 11 instances of symmetrical relationships in the situational-text analysis. A relationship was classified as asymmetrical in cases where one of the characters had more authority in a certain situation, either the character had more power (Capricorn – Mortimer) or one character possessed knowledge that the other one needed (Mortimer – Staubfinger). There were 39 instances of an asymmetrical social relationship between characters. This means that for 78 percent of the excerpts analyzed, the relationship of the characters within the situational context was asymmetrical.

The social attitude of a language use was classified as either formal or informal. This depended on the language that was used. The main indicator of a formal social attitude in German and Dutch was the use of formal second-person pronouns. However, the use of

formal or informal lexis also determined whether or not the social attitude was classified as formal or informal. There were 8 instances of a formal social attitude and 43 of an informal social attitude. Two excerpts contained an overlap between formal and informal language. One excerpt will be discussed in section 4.2.1. Furthermore, the excerpts could not always be classified with the same social attitude, as there was one instance in which German and English were informal, but the Dutch translation was formal. This too will be discussed in section 4.2.1. of the Discussion.

The results for the category of province cannot be generalized, as the context of the excerpts widely varied.

### *3.2 Lexicogrammatical-Text Analysis*

The lexicogrammatical realizations of field, tenor and mode were analyzed in the German, Dutch and English excerpts. The lexicogrammatical-text analysis showed how register was realized within the three languages. This section will show the results from the lexicogrammatical text-analysis.

#### 3.2.1 Lexicogrammatical Realizations of Field

Table 3, 4 and 5 provide an overview of the data from the analysis of the lexicogrammatical realizations of field.

The overall data of the lexicogrammatical realizations of field show that the type of verbs that are used in German and Dutch are similar. The most used verb is a transitive verb. For German and Dutch, the analysis of the excerpts yielded 48 transitive verbs. The analysis of the English excerpts showed that the transitive verb is also most frequently used in the English translation. However, the frequency is much lower than the frequency of transitive

verbs used in German. In the English excerpts, 37 transitive verbs identified. This means that there are eleven fewer transitive verbs than in the German source text.

**Table 3.**

*Lexicogrammatical Realizations of Field, German.*

<i>Verb types</i>	<i>Frequen- cy</i>	<i>Active / Passive construct- ion</i>	<i>Frequen- cy</i>	<i>Grammati- cal subject</i>	<i>Frequen- cy</i>	<i>Nomaliza- tion</i>	<i>Frequen- cy</i>
Transitive	48	Active	49	Ich	21	Yes	3
Imperative	18	Passive	0	Du	13	No	47
Interrogative	9	Neither	1	Sie (formal)	5		
Intransitive	9			Er/sie/es	8		
Linking	11			Wir	3		
Auxiliary	8			sie (plural)	4		
Modal	20			Noun phrase	16		
Infinitive	6			Das/dieses	6		
Ditransitive	0			None	8		
None	1						

The analysis of the lexicogrammatical realizations of field also showed that almost all the excerpts from German, Dutch and English were active constructions, respectively 49, 47 and 48. Multiple excerpts did not contain a verb construction. In these instances, the construction was classified as being neither active nor passive. The excerpts that were analyzed did not contain passive verb constructions.

The analysis of the lexicogrammatical realizations of field also found that the most used grammatical subjects in the German source text were: ich (21), du (13) and noun phrases (16). The German excerpts also contained 5 instances of the formal singular second-person pronoun Sie.

The analysis of the lexicogrammatical realization of field found that the most used grammatical subjects for the Dutch target text were ik (18), jij/je (17), hij/zij/het (11) and

noun phrases (13). This is slightly different than the German source text. The German source text contained fewer third person pronouns *er/sie/es*; it had 8 instances of the third person pronoun as a grammatical subject. Furthermore, the German excerpts had a higher frequency of noun phrases as grammatical subject.

**Table 4.**

*Lexicogrammatical Realizations of Field, Dutch.*

<i>Verb types</i>	<i>Frequen- cy</i>	<i>Active / Passive construct- ion</i>	<i>Frequen- cy</i>	<i>Grammati- cal subject</i>	<i>Frequen- cy</i>	<i>Nomaliza- tion</i>	<i>Frequen- cy</i>
Transitive	48	Active	47	Ik	18	Yes	4
Imperative	18	Passive	0	Jij/je	17	No	46
Interrogative	10	Neither	3	U	7		
Intransitive	3			Hij/zij/het	11		
Linking	12			We	3		
Auxiliary	8			Ze (plural)	2		
Modal	26			Noun phrase	13		
Infinitive	6			Dat/die	3		
Ditransitive	0			None	10		
None	3						

For both the German and the Dutch excerpts, there were instances in which there was no grammatical subject. This was either due to a lack of a verbal construction or due to the grammatical subject being implied rather than explicitly stated. The latter was usually found in verb constructions with an imperative verb as main verb.

The most used grammatical subjects in the English source text were: I (27) and you (21). It must be considered that English does not distinguish between a formal and an informal second-person pronoun, therefore both instances of formal and informal second-person pronouns in the English text were likely to be translated with “you”. This explains why “you” has a higher frequency in the English text than “du” does in the German text. The total of second-person pronouns used in the German text is 18. This is a lower frequency than the

21 second-person pronouns used in English. It is also notable that the English text contains six more uses of the first-person pronoun as a grammatical subject.

**Table 5.**

*Lexicogrammatical Realizations of Field, English.*

<i>Verb types</i>	<i>Frequen- cy</i>	<i>Active / Passive construct- ion</i>	<i>Frequen- cy</i>	<i>Grammati- cal subject</i>	<i>Frequen- cy</i>	<i>Nomaliza- tion</i>	<i>Frequen- cy</i>
Transitive	37	Active	48	I	27	Yes	3
Imperative	15	Passive	0	You	21	No	47
Interrogative	8	Neither	2	Second- person pronouns (formal)	N.A.		
Intransitive	3			He/she/it	9		
Linking	15			We	5		
Auxiliary	17			They/them	3		
Modal	17			Noun phrase	10		
Infinitive	15			That	3		
Ditransitive	2			None	7		
None	2						

The English text also contained fewer null-subjects than the German text. This could be partially explained by the fact that some of the English verb constructions containing an imperative verb were governed by a subject, while none were governed by a subject in the German source text. These sentences will be discussed in more detail in section 4.1.1.

Neither the source text nor the two target texts had a high frequency of nominalization within the text. The German and the English excerpts contained only 3 instances of nominalization. The Dutch excerpts only had one more instance of nominalization.

### 3.2.2 Lexicogrammatical Realizations of Tenor

Table 6, 7 and 8 show the data from the analysis of lexicogrammatical realizations of tenor in the German source text and the Dutch and English target texts.

For the lexicogrammatical realizations of tenor, the German source text showed that the pronoun that had the highest frequency usage was “ich (exclusive)” with 41 usages. In the excerpts analyzed from the German source text, a total of 22 second-person pronouns were used. Seventeen of these second-person pronouns were informal and five instances used the formal second-person pronoun. Most of the language used was thus informal. This will be discussed in more detail in section 4.1.2.

**Table 6.**

***Lexicogrammatical Realizations of Tenor, German.***

<i>Pronouns<sup>3</sup></i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Modality</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Evaluative Lexis</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
Ich (exclusive)	41	Modal Verbs	20	Yes	11
Wir (inclusive)	1	Adverbs	64	No	39
Wir (exclusive)	3	Adjectives	23		
Du (informal)	17				
Sie (formal)	5				

The Dutch excerpts also had a high frequency of “ik (exclusive)” pronouns. However, the Dutch excerpts contained fewer first-person pronouns than the German excerpts did. Also striking is that Dutch excerpts contained more second-person pronouns overall. In total, the excerpts from the Dutch text contained 28 second-person pronouns, six more than the excerpts from the German text contained. Of these second-person pronouns, 21 were classified as informal and 7 were classified as formal. Furthermore, the Dutch text used

<sup>3</sup> For the purpose of the analysis of the lexicogrammatical realizations of tenor, all forms of the first-person were recorded. The tables also include pronouns that were in an object position.

substantially more modal verbs and adverbs than the German text. The Dutch excerpts also had two more instances of evaluative lexis than the German excerpts did.

**Table 7.**

*Lexicogrammatical Realizations of Tenor, Dutch.*

<i>Pronouns</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Modality</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Evaluative Lexis</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
Ik (exclusive)	38	Modal Verbs	26	Yes	13
We (inclusive)	1	Adverbs	80	No	37
We (exclusive)	3	Adjectives	19		
Jij (informal)	21				
U (formal)	7				

The excerpts from the English target text contained slightly more instances of “I (exclusive)” than the German source text. Furthermore, the English target text also had a higher frequency of second-person pronouns compared to the German source text. Since English does not distinguish between formal and informal second-person pronouns, the instances of a second-person pronoun are all classified into one category. Furthermore, the English excerpts contained slightly fewer modal verbs than the German source text. The English excerpts contained strikingly fewer adverbs than the German source text; the English excerpts only contained 39 adverbs while the German excerpts contained 64 adverbs.

**Table 8.*****Lexicogrammatical Realizations of Tenor, English.***

<i>Pronouns</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Modality</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Evaluative Lexis</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
I (exclusive)	44	Modal Verbs	17	Yes	13
We (inclusive)	1	Adverbs	39	No	37
We (exclusive)	4	Adjectives	21		
You	28				
Second- person pronoun (formal)	N.A.				

## 3.2.3 Lexicogrammatical Realizations of Mode

Table 9, 10 and 11 show the results from the analysis of the lexicogrammatical realization of mode in the German, Dutch and English texts respectively.

There were 43 German excerpts that did not contain lexical repetition. The type of lexical repetition found most frequently in the German source text were phrases (containing a subject, a verb and an object if applicable). There were 7 instances of phrases being repeated in the German excerpts. This number also contains phrases that were repeated more than once in one excerpt.



**Table 9.*****Lexicogrammatical Realizations of Mode, German.***

<i>Lexical Repetition</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Pronouns in Place of Nouns<sup>4</sup></i>	<i>Frequency<sup>5</sup></i>	<i>Collocation</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Word Order</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
None	43	Yes	24	Yes	8	SV(OV)	44
Du	1	No	30	No	42	SOV	8
Sie	1					VSV(O)	7
Verb	2					VS(O)	14
Verb phrases	0					VO(S/V)	18
Phrases	7					V	0
Articles	1					OV(S)	7
Nouns	1					None	1
Adverbs	0						
Interjection	0						
Two different classes	0						

Furthermore, there were 30 German excerpts without pronouns in the place of nouns. There were 24 instances of a noun being replaced by a pronoun in the German excerpts. In addition, there were only 8 uses of collocation within the excerpts.

Lastly, the most used word order in the German excerpts was Subject-Verb(-Object-Verb). Since this is the most used word order in West-Germanic languages, this was expected. The second-most used word order within the German excerpts is Verb-Object(-Subject/-Verb) with 18 instances, closely followed by a Verb-Subject(-Object) word order with 14 instances. There was one instance in which no word order could be detected due to lack of verbal construction. There were also no instances of (verbal)phrases consisting of only a verb.

<sup>4</sup> Instances where a first- or second-person pronoun replaced a name were not counted, since the name would not commonly be used in place of the pronoun. If a pronoun clearly referred to a third party and the pronoun could be replaced with a noun (or name) without losing fluidity or normalcy, the instance was classified as a pronoun in place of a noun.

<sup>5</sup> The total of the frequency does not equal 50, since instances where excerpts contained more than one pronoun in place of a noun were each counted separately.

There were 43 Dutch excerpts that did not contain any repetition. This is similar to the results for the German excerpts. There is a difference between German and Dutch in the repetition of verb phrases. Dutch had 4 instances of verb phrases being repeated, while German had 0 instances. The most striking difference between the German and Dutch excerpts was the repetition of full phrases. In German, there were 7 instances of full phrases being repeated, while in Dutch there were 0 full phrases that were repeated.

**Table 10.**

*Lexicogrammatical Realizations of Mode, Dutch.*

<i>Lexical Repetition</i>	<i>Frequen- cy</i>	<i>Pronouns in Place of Nouns</i>	<i>Frequen- cy</i>	<i>Collocation</i>	<i>Frequen- cy</i>	<i>Word Order</i>	<i>Frequen- cy</i>
None	43	Yes	20	Yes	2	SV(OV)	39
Jij	1	No	32	No	46	SOV	12
U	1					VSV(O)	3
Verb	1					VS(O)	20
Verb phrases	4					VO(S/V)	16
Phrases	0					V	2
Articles	2					OV(S)	6
Nouns	1					None	3
Adverbs	1						
Interjection	0						
Two different classes	1						

The frequency of pronouns in place of nouns is slightly lower in the Dutch excerpts. The German excerpts contained 24 instances of pronouns in place of a noun, while the Dutch excerpts contained 20 instances. There were two more Dutch excerpts that contained no instance of a pronoun in the place of a noun than there were in the German excerpts. The main reason for this difference is that the Dutch excerpts had two instances where the sentence type was changed. For example, in excerpt 28, the German excerpt contained a verb construction:

“Na wenn das keine Überraschung ist!” (p. 43). The Dutch excerpt removed the verb and used an adverb + noun phrase: “Wat een verrassing!” (p.43). Since the verb construction was removed, the Dutch excerpt did not need a dummy subject in the form of a pronoun that replaces a noun.

Furthermore, the Dutch excerpts only contained 2 instances of collocations. It must be acknowledged that the resource utilized for this part of the analyzes might have influenced this low frequency. The resource that was used only identified nouns and its collocations. However, in order to be consistent, it was still chosen to continue using this resource.

The most used word order in the Dutch excerpts was SV(OV). This is similar to the German excerpts. However, the Dutch excerpts contained five fewer instances of the SVO word order. The second-most frequently used word order was VS(O) with 20 instances. This was followed by the word order VO(S/V) with 16 instances and the word order SOV with 12 instances. There were also 3 instances in which there was no established word order in the Dutch sentences. When these results are compared to the frequencies for word orders in the German excerpts, it is found that the Dutch excerpts allowed for more fluidity in word order.

There were also 43 English excerpts that did not contain any lexical repetition. This was the same for the German excerpts. The English excerpts had a slightly lower frequency of lexical repetition than the German excerpts did. The English excerpts contained a total of 11 repetitions and the German excerpts contained a total of 13 repetitions. Verb phrases were repeated the most with 3 instances. English thus contained fewer repetition.

**Table 11.*****Lexicogrammatical Realizations of Mode, English.***

<i>Lexical Repetition</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Pronouns in Place of Nouns</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Collocation</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Word Order</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
None	43	Yes	22	Yes	9	SV(OV)	56
You	2	No	31	No	41	SOV	0
Formal SP	0					VSV(O)	5
Verb	1					VS(O)	7
Verb phrases	3					VO(S/V)	18
Phrases	2					V	1
Articles	0					OV(S)	4
Nouns	1					None	2
Adverbs	0						
Interjection	2						
Two different classes	0						

The English excerpts also contained 22 instances of pronouns in place of nouns and 31 excerpts without the occurrence of pronouns in the place of nouns. It thus contained two fewer instances of pronouns in place of nouns than the German excerpts, while having only one more null occurrence

Furthermore, the English excerpts also had one more instance of collocations than the German excerpts.

The word order of the English excerpts was the most striking difference in the analysis of the lexicogrammatical realization of mode. Out of the three sets of excerpts analyzed, the English excerpts contained the most instances of SV(OV) as word order. There were 56 instances of an SV(OV) word order in the English excerpts, while there were 44 instances in the German excerpts. This means that the register of the English text prefers to use SV(OV). The second-most used word order in the English excerpt was the VO(S/V) word order, which

was mainly used in sentences that contained an imperative verb. Examples of imperative sentences will be given in section 4.1.1. There were 2 instances without any observable word order. Interestingly, the SOV word order was never used in the English excerpts. The English text was more rigid in the established word order.

### 3.3 Comparative Register Analysis

Table 12 and 13 show the results of the comparative register analysis that compared the register of the German source text and the Dutch and English target texts.

The comparative register analysis showed that the Dutch excerpts tended to render the register in a source-oriented way; 88 percent of the Dutch excerpts rendered the register in a source-oriented manner. When the three components of register are examined, mode showed the highest frequency of a source-oriented approach. Field contained the most instances of a target-oriented manner of rendering register. The relation of the translation approach and the lexicogrammatical realizations to the cultural dimensions will be discussed in greater detail in section 4.1.4. Therefore, the overall translation approach for the rendering of register in the Dutch excerpts is source-oriented.

**Table 12.**

***Comparative Register Analysis Dutch Excerpts.***

<i>Field</i>	<i>Frequen- cy</i>	<i>Tenor</i>	<i>Frequen- cy</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Frequen- cy</i>	<i>Overall of the Excerpts</i>	<i>Frequen- cy</i>
Source-oriented	38	Source-oriented	41	Source-oriented	46	Source-oriented	44
Target-oriented	12	Target-oriented	9	Target-oriented	4	Target-oriented	6

The comparative register analysis between the German and the English excerpts showed that the English text rendered the register predominantly in a source-oriented manner. However, even though 58 percent of the register in the English excerpts was rendered in a

source-oriented manner, 42 percent of the register was rendered in a target-oriented way. This means that English target texts maintains a balance between a source-oriented and a target-oriented approach. In this case, the balance tips towards a source-oriented approach towards rendering register. For the component of field, the approach could be described as slightly more target-oriented with 26 instances of a target-oriented approach. This is connected to the lexicogrammatical realizations of field that were found. This will be discussed in greater detail in section 4.1.4. The translation approach towards the rendering of the components tenor and mode were both predominantly source-oriented. Overall, the approach to the rendering of register in the English text can be classified as source-oriented.

**Table 13.**

*Comparative Register Analysis English Excerpts.*

<i>Field</i>	<i>Frequen- cy</i>	<i>Tenor</i>	<i>Frequen- cy</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Frequen- cy</i>	<i>Overall of the Excerpts</i>	<i>Frequen- cy</i>
Source-oriented	24	Source-oriented	32	Source-oriented	34	Source-oriented	29
Target-oriented	26	Target-oriented	19	Target-oriented	15	Target-oriented	21

## Chapter Four: Discussion and Conclusion

*This chapter will discuss the results of the previous chapter in relation to House's cultural dimensions, the function of children's literature and the three language's position in the polysystem. In doing so, this chapter aims to explain the reason for the difference in the rendering of register. In addition, this chapter will also conclude the thesis and provide suggestions for future studies.*

### 4.1 Discussion

This section will include a discussion of the lexicogrammatical realizations of field, tenor and mode. It will furthermore discuss the results of the comparative register analysis. Since the situational-text analysis did not greatly differ between the German, Dutch and English excerpts, it will only be discussed in relation to relevant excerpts.

#### 4.1.1 Discussion of Lexicogrammatical Realizations of Field

The first category that was analyzed for any excerpt were the verb types. Section 3.2.1 showed the results of the lexicogrammatical realization of field.

The most used verb type were transitive verbs. The German and the English excerpts had different frequencies of the use of a transitive verb. The English excerpts contained 11 fewer instances of a transitive verb than the German excerpts. This difference can partially be explained by the omittance of whole sentences within the English text. The omittance of these will be further discussed in section 4.1.2.

Table 14 shows an instance in which the English text uses one less transitive verb than the German text. The reason for this is that the transitive verb "erinnere" takes on the reflexive pronoun "mich" in the German excerpt. In the English text, the intransitive verb "to remember" does not need an object. Instances such as these were the reason that the English

excerpts contained fewer transitive verbs. This isolated data is not sufficient enough to explain the translation approach through the cultural filter.

**Table 14.**

*Excerpt 29 in the German, Dutch and English novel.*

<i>German</i>	<i>Dutch</i>	<i>English</i>
“Und soweit ich mich erinnere, habe ich weder dich noch deine Tochter in dem letzten Jahre zu Gesicht bekommen” p. 44	“En voorzover ik mij herinner heb ik de laatste jaren jou noch je dochter te zien gekregen” p. 43	“As far as I remember, it’s been some years since I last set eyes on either you or your daughter” p. 40

The Dutch excerpts contained the same number of transitive verbs as the German excerpts. However, the Dutch excerpts contained a higher number of modal verbs than the German excerpts did. In excerpts in which the German text only used one modal verb, the Dutch text used two modal verbs. An example of this is excerpt 2. The source excerpt and the two target excerpts are shown in table 15. The German text only contains one modal verb: “würdest”, while the Dutch text contains two: “zou” and “moeten”. The English text also contains two modal verbs, “d” and “would”. However, the latter has been classified into the category interrogative verb because of its function in the text. The Dutch text thus showed more modality than the original Dutch text. This will be discussed in greater detail in section 4.1.2.

**Table 15.**

*Excerpt 2 in the German, Dutch and English novel.*

<i>German</i>	<i>Dutch</i>	<i>English</i>
“[...] würdest du vermutlich weinen, nicht wahr?” p. 34	“[...] zou je misschien moeten huilen, toch?” p. 34	“[...] I expect you’d cry, wouldn’t you?” p. 31

The analysis of the lexicogrammatical realizations of field showed that there were no instances of the passive construction being used. A reason for this could be the inherent function pedagogical function of children’s literature. In 1.1.4 it was explained that the pedagogical function ensures that children understand what they are reading. By using an



active construction for dialogue, it is clearer to the child reader who the agent of an action is. The target texts did not alter the use of the active voice during the translation process. Therefore, this could be considered to be a source-oriented approach towards the rendering of the passive – active constructions within field.

In the German excerpts, there were 8 instances of an excerpt without a subject. Dutch had 10 of these instances and English only 7 instances. This can be partially explained by the lack of a verb construction. Such was the case with interjections or utterances that contained only a noun phrase. Other reasons for the occurrence of null subjects were imperative sentences that only took implied grammatical subjects. An example of this is excerpt 11, shown in table 16. The speaker, Flachnase, does address Cockerell, but there is no grammatical subject in these sentences. This was similar in all three of the novels.

**Table 16.**

*Excerpt 11 in the German, Dutch and English novel.*

<i>German</i>	<i>Dutch</i>	<i>English</i>
“Lass das, Cockerell!” p. 172	“Laat dat, Cockerell!” p. 151	“Don’t do that, Cockerell” p. 163

Notably, there were also instances in which imperative verb constructions did take a grammatical subject. Those were only found in English excerpts with one particular phrase. For the purpose of this study, three excerpts containing this construction were analyzed. These are shown in table 17. There were also three English excerpts that used the imperative verb “believe” without taking on a grammatical subject. These are shown in table 18.

**Table 17.***Excerpts 4, 6 and 18 in the German, Dutch and English novel.*

<i>German</i>	<i>Dutch</i>	<i>English</i>
“Glaubt mir, auf so etwas verstehen sie sich.” p. 117	“Geloof me maar, dat kun je gerust aan hen overlaten.” p. 105	“Believe you me, I understand these things.” p. 111
“Natürlich wirkt so ein Zauber nicht gleich, so etwas dauert eine Zeit, aber glaub mir, wenn er erst mal wirkt...” p. 442	“Natuurlijk werkt zo’n betovering niet meteen, het duurt een tijdje, maar geloof me, als het eenmaal werkt...” p. 384	“Of course that kind of charm doesn’t work instantly, but believe you me, when it does start to take effect...” p. 421
“Du hast nur dein gemeines Mundwerk, und das, glaub mir, wird dir jetzt gar nichts nützen.” p. 549	“Je hebt alleen je gore grote mond, en die zal je niet verder helpen, neem dat maar van mij aan.” p. 476	“You have nothing but your filthy tongue, and believe you me, that’ll be no use to you now.” p. 526

The situational context of these excerpts does not differ substantially. Most of the excerpts in table 17 and 18 are of an informal social nature. The exception is excerpt 4, which contains a mix of formal and informal language features. In addition, most of these excerpts contain an asymmetrical social role between participants. Only excerpt 5 was considered to be symmetrical, since Mortimer is talking to Meggie and Elinor as fellow captives. Furthermore, the dimensions of the language user vary widely. The phrase “believe you me” is used by both characters from the Ink World and characters from “our” world. Albeit that in table 17, the speakers who use that phrase are all adults. In table 18, excerpts 20 and 21 are spoken by Meggie and in excerpt 5 an adult (Mortimer) addresses Meggie. From the excerpts in table 17, only excerpt 4 is being partially addressed to Meggie. The only significant difference in the situational context is the participation of a child.

**Table 18.***Excerpts 5, 20 and 21 in the German, Dutch and English novel.*

<i>German</i>	<i>Dutch</i>	<i>English</i>
“Eine spitze Zunge kann hier gefährlich sein, glaubt mir.” p. 172	“Een scherpe tong kan hier levensgevaarlijk zijn, geloof me maar.” p. 152	“A sharp tongue can be dangerous here, believe me.” p. 163
“Wir retten euch. Alles wird anders kommen, als Capricorn erwartet! Glaub mir!” p. 475	“We zullen jullie redden. Alles zal anders gaan dan Capricorno verwacht! Geloof me maar!” p. 413	“We’re going to rescue you. It won’t work out the way Capricorn expects, believe me!” p. 454
“Glaub mir, meine Geschichten gehen immer gut aus.” p. 510	“Geloof me maar, al mijn verhalen lopen goed af.” p. 443	“Believe me, my stories always have happy endings.” p. 489

According to the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, the phrase “believe (you) me” is “used to emphasize that something is definitely true”. Both of these phrases are thus used to emphasize the truth of a statement. In order to examine the reason for the presence of both forms of the phrase in the English target text, the cultural dimensions must be examined. The two variations of the phrase are both part of a verbal routine. Anglophone speakers are more prone to resorting to verbal routines than German speakers. The difference between these two phrases, is the insertion of a second-person pronoun as the grammatical subject. This can be applied to two cultural dimensions.

Since the phrase “believe you me” adds a reference towards an “other”, the first cultural dimension that can be applied is orientation towards self vs orientation towards other. The other cultural dimension that can be applied is orientation towards content vs orientation towards persons, since there are now more references towards persons rather than to content.

In order to determine which cultural dimension might have influenced the decision, the grammatical subjects must be examined. The cultural dimension of the English texts that influences the grammatical subjects is orientation towards person rather than content. This can be concluded from a comparison of the high frequency of the first- and second-person

pronouns as grammatical subject in the English text to the lower frequency of this lexicogrammatical realization in the German text. Simultaneously, English only contained 10 instances of noun phrases as a grammatical subject, while German contained 16 instances of noun phrases as a grammatical subject. Thus, the English translator applied a cultural filter between the cultural dimension of orientation towards content vs orientation towards persons. This cultural filter made the register of the English target texts more orientated towards persons rather than the content.

Field consists of what is being spoken about (Munday 2016, p. 144). It is linked to the ideational metafunction, which “provides a representation of the world or an event” (p. 144). The representation that the German source text gives of the world was more content oriented than the Dutch and the English text. The rendering of field in the Dutch target text was overall source-oriented, but in some instances, it was slightly more person-oriented than the source text. The rendering of field in the English target text was target-oriented. The representation of the world in the English target text was more oriented towards persons than in the German source text.

#### 4.1.2 Discussion of Lexicogrammatical Realizations of Tenor

An important aspect of tenor is the formality of the second-person pronouns. The Dutch target text contained two more instances of a formal second-person pronoun. The excerpts can be found in table 19.

**Table 19.***Excerpts 32 and 34 in the German, Dutch and English novel.*

<i>German</i>	<i>Dutch</i>	<i>English</i>
“Ich hoffe, Sie beherzigen diese Regel auch” sagte sie, “Denn offenbar bleibt uns Ihre Gesellschaft noch eine weitere Nacht erhalten.” p. 71	“Ik hoop dat u deze regel ook ter harte wilt nemen,” zei ze, “want kennelijk gaat u ons nog een nacht langer met uw gezelschap verblijden.” p. 67	“I hope you’ll take that rule to heart,” she said to him. “Since we’re obviously going to have the pleasure of your company another night.” p. 66
“Warum hast du mich festgehalten?” p. 86	“Waarom hield u me tegen?” p. 80	“Why did you hold me back?” p. 80

In excerpt 32, the reason that the Dutch text contains one more formal second-person pronoun is related to field rather than tenor. In the second part of the utterance, the German excerpt does not include the second-person pronoun as a grammatical subject, while the Dutch excerpt does reiterate the second-person pronoun as the agent in the second part of the utterance. The English text also does not use a second-person pronoun as a grammatical subject.

In excerpt 34, the German excerpt contains the informal second-person pronoun “du”, while the Dutch excerpt contains the formal second-person pronoun “u”. English does not distinguish between informal or formal second-person pronouns. The reason that German uses the informal second-person pronoun lies in the situational context. Meggie’s father has just been taken away by criminals and Elinor has stopped Meggie from aiding her father. In this excerpt, Meggie is experiencing strong negative emotions. Therefore, she might not be bothered with formality.

In the Dutch translation, the formal second-person pronoun is used. This could be explained by the situational context of the recent events. Meggie has referred to her aunt with the formal second-person pronouns since she first met her and it is not until later that she consciously decides to stop using formal pronouns for her aunt. When a cultural filter is applied to these excerpts, it shows that the German text is more direct in this instance than the

Dutch text is. The German texts is more direct due to the situational context of the excerpt, while the Dutch text is more indirect in order to adhere to the previously established situational context.

English does not distinguish between informal and formal second-person pronouns. The English language only uses the singular second-person pronoun “you”, which is also reflected in the text. The English text does not compensate for this lack of formality by substituting the formal pronouns with other formal addresses, e.g., formal titles such as “mister” or “madam”. Any discussion of the use of formal second-person pronouns are omitted. An example of the omission of this discussion is showcased in table 20.

**Table 20.**

*Excerpt 7 in the German, Dutch and English novel<sup>6</sup>.*

<i>German</i>	<i>Dutch</i>	<i>English</i>
“Aber sagen Sie mir erst, warum –” “Sie?” Staubfinger lachte auf. “Herrgott, demnächst sagst du noch Herr Staubfinger zu mir. Ich kann dieses Siezen nicht leiden, also lass es, ja?” [...] „Also gut, warum hast du Gwin die Hörner angeklebt [...] Und was weißt du über das Buch?“ p. 64-65	“Maar zegt u me eerst waarom...’ ‘U?’ Stofvinger lachte. ‘Tjonge, straks zeg je nog meneer Stofvinger tegen me. Ik kan daar helemaal niet tegen, dus wil je daar alsjeblieft mee ophouden?’ [...] “Goed dan, waarom heb je Gwen die horens aangeplakt? [...] En wat weet je over dat boek?” p. 61	“But first, tell me why you stuck those horns on Gwin! And tell me what you know about the book!” p. 60

In the German and the Dutch text, Meggie refers to Staubfinger with the formal second-person pronouns. Staubfinger asks her to stop doing this. In the English text there was no compensation for the use of the formal second-person pronoun, and therefore there was no

<sup>6</sup> Omitted parts in the German and Dutch texts were narrational and not relevant to the dialogue or the formality aspect.

need for a discussion between the characters. Instead, the English text omits the discussion on formality and Meggie demands Staubfinger to give her more information.

In the German and Dutch texts, Meggie initially uses an imperative construction, but changes it to an interrogative one after the discussion on formality. In this regard, the German and the Dutch texts are more polite than the English text. Due to the omission of the formal second-person pronoun and the use of an imperative construction rather than an interrogative one, the English excerpt is more direct than the German and Dutch texts. According to House, German speakers tend to be more direct than Anglophone speakers. Therefore, this is a remarkable instance. However, in other instances the English text is less direct. The tone of the lexis is often less direct than that of the German text. An example of this is provided in section 4.1.4 in table 25. It can thus not be said that the overall language of the English text is more direct than the German source text.

The Dutch text had a higher frequency of modality in its excerpts. The results showed that the Dutch excerpts contained 16 more adverbs than the German text does. An example of an excerpt in which the Dutch text contained more adverbs than the German source text is shown in table 21.

**Table 21.**

*Excerpt 27 in the German, Dutch and English novel.*

<i>German</i>	<i>Dutch</i>	<i>English</i>
“Das sieht nach reicher Verwandtschaft aus, nicht wahr?” p. 40	“Dat ziet er echt uit alsof hier een suikertante woont, vind je niet?” p. 40	“Looks like you have rich relations” p. 38

The German excerpt only contains the adverb: “nicht”, while the Dutch excerpt contains the adverbs “echt”, “hier” and “niet”. The English excerpt does not contain any adverbs. The adverb “echt” in the Dutch excerpt emphasizes the statement. In addition, the adverb “hier” makes the locality of the statement more explicit. If the cultural dimensions are

considered, this would mean that the reason for the addition of adverbs in Dutch is that the Dutch speaker tends to interact in a way that is more explicit than the German speaker.

The English excerpts contained fewer adverbs than the German ones. There are multiple reasons for this lower frequency of adverbs in the English target text. In some instances, the German excerpts contained a sequence of adverbs, while entire sentences were omitted from the English target text as with excerpt 7. Due to the omission of these sentences, the adverbs present in those excerpts were simultaneously omitted.

Another reason that the English target text contained fewer adverbs is the difference in classifications. Similar words that the German dictionary classified as adverbs, such as “bitte”, were classified as an interjection in the English dictionary, such as “please” (Dikke van Dale, Macmillan Dictionary).

Then, there are also excerpts in which the English text simply omits adverbs or reduces the use of adverbs. This is also the case in excerpt 27. This omission may have a technical reason; it makes the text more compact or more fluid. However, adverbs are meant to provide the reader with more information. Applying a cultural filter can explain this difference in frequency of adverbs through a cultural dimension. Omitting a high quantity of adverbs from the text will provide the reader with fewer cues. Once there are fewer adverbs in an excerpt, this excerpt will become more implicit. House also showed that German speakers interact more explicitly than English speakers do. Therefore, the English translator applied a cultural filter to the cultural dimension of explicit vs implicit in order to make the English text more implicit.

Tenor consists of who is communicating and to whom (Munday 2016, p. 144). The change that occurred in the realization of tenor is that the Dutch text was slightly less direct than the German text. Furthermore, through the addition of adverbs, the Dutch text was more explicit than the German text. The most notable difference between the tenor of the English



and the German text was that the English text tended to be more person-oriented and more implicit. In general, the rendering of tenor in the Dutch and English excerpts was predominantly source-oriented.

#### 4.1.3 Discussion of Lexicogrammatical Realizations of Mode

The first lexicogrammatical realization that was analyzed for mode were the lexical repetitions. A majority of the excerpts of all three languages did not contain repetition. In the German excerpts, the most repeated category was phrases. This is different from the Dutch excerpts, which contained no repetition of complete phrases. Rather, the Dutch excerpts contained more repetition of verb phrases. In addition, the Dutch text also contained an instance of repetition within two different lexical word classes. This example can be found in table 22.

**Table 22.**

*Excerpt 31 in the German, Dutch and English novel.*

<i>German</i>	<i>Dutch</i>	<i>English</i>
“Ich danke dir, Elinor! Ich danke dir wirklich sehr.” p. 56	“Dank je wel, Elinor! Ik ben je echt heel dankbaar.” p. 54	“Thank you, Elinor! I really am most grateful.” p. 52

Excerpt 31 shows a repetition of the verb phrase “Ich danke dir”. The Dutch extract does not imitate this repetition of the verb phrase. Instead, the Dutch excerpts acquires repetition by the repetition of “dank” in the verb phrase “dank je wel” and the “dank” in the adjective “dankbaar”. The repetition is maintained in a manner that is more suited to the conventions of the Dutch target language. For the English novel, excerpt 31 does not contain any repetition. Instead of “thankful” the translation uses “grateful”, thereby losing the lexical repetition.

Furthermore, English also repeated interjections. The German excerpts did not contain repetition of interjections. Table 23 shows excerpt 41 in which the English added repetition of an interjection.

**Table 23.**

*Excerpt 41 in the German, Dutch and English novel.*

<i>German</i>	<i>Dutch</i>	<i>English</i>
“Verflucht noch mal, ich komm mir vor, als wäre ich in einem dieser gottverdammten, unerträglich schlecht geschriebenen Abenteuerromane gelandet, wo die Schurken Augenklappen tragen und mit Messern werfen.” p. 147	“Verdomme nog aan toe, het lijkt wel of ik in een van die klere, ondraaglijk slecht geschreven avonturenromans terecht ben gekomen, waar de schurken een ooglap dragen en met messen gooien.” p. 130	“Oh, to hell with it, I feel as if I’ve fallen into some fat-fetched adventure story where the villains wear black eye-patches and throw knives. Damn, damn, damn!” p. 140

In excerpt 41, the English excerpt inserts three interjections at the end of the statement. The German excerpt does not include this. However, in this excerpt the German contains more informal expletives such as: “verflucht” and “gottverdammten”. The English excerpt has translated this with “to hell with it”, which is informal but not a strong expletive. The lexical repetition of “damn” ensures that the expletives are returned to the text, but in a way that is oriented towards the target language.

Since the lexical repetition does not differ greatly between the source text and the two target texts, it is difficult to relate this to the cultural dimensions. A higher frequency of lexical repetition would mean that there is more emphasis in the text, which relates to the cultural dimension of explicitness and implicitness. However, since there is not a high difference in the frequency of lexical repetition, it cannot be concluded that this shows that one text is more explicit or more implicit than the other culture. The manner in which the Dutch and the English texts render the lexical repetition can, in instances such as the two examples above, be classified as target-oriented.

The German excerpts also included more pronouns in place of nouns than the Dutch excerpts. In some instances, the use of a pronoun in place of a noun was omitted due to a change in the sentence construction. In some instances, Dutch did not include a pronoun, for example in excerpt 14. The German used the pronoun “das” to indicate the teasing that Fenoglio is doing to make Meggie smile. The Dutch excerpt does not contain a pronoun to indicate this, it only contains the imperative verb. The English excerpt does contain the pronoun “it” to indicate the teasing. English also adds an interjection that makes the imperative statement less direct.

**Table 24.**

*Excerpt 14 in the German, Dutch and English novel.*

<i>German</i>	<i>Dutch</i>	<i>English</i>
“Lass das!” p. 510	“Hou op!” p. 444	“Oh, stop it!” p. 489

Between the German and the English excerpts, the difference in pronouns replacing nouns is less pronounced. Excerpts such as the one shown in table 24 demonstrate that in cases where the target text omitted the pronoun, it was not replaced by the noun. Therefore, this difference in pronouns in place of nouns does not disclose anything about the cultural dimensions of the texts. One text is not more explicit or implicit than the other. It could be said that the presence of a pronoun in imperative statements such as the one in excerpt 14 are less direct. However, this would not disclose anything about the lexicogrammatical realization that is pronouns in place of nouns.

The English excerpts only contained one more collocation than the German excerpts. The Dutch excerpts contained fewer collocations than both the German and the English excerpts. The fact that English contained more collocations combined with the fact that English highly favors one word order (SVO) indicates that English speakers are more prone to using verbal routine than the German speaker is. The Dutch excerpts contained fewer collocations and were more fluid in the word order than the German excerpts. The Dutch speaker uses fewer verbal routines and more ad-hoc formulations than the German speakers.

Mode consists of the form of communication (Munday 2016, p. 144). It is linked to the textual metafunction, which “makes a text hang together in a coherent way” (p.144). The form of communication for the Dutch text differed from the German text mainly in the fluidity of the word order. While the word order in the English text was more rigid than that in the German text, the Dutch text showed more fluidity in the word order. The English language is more prone to resorting to verbal routine than the German. The Dutch language is less prone to resorting to verbal routine than the German language. Besides this, there were slight variations in the rendering of mode. However, for both Dutch and English, the rendering of mode was source-oriented. The Dutch text contained only four excerpts in which mode was rendered in a target-oriented manner. The English text contained fifteen excerpts in which the mode was rendered in a target-oriented manner. Thus, overall mode was rendered in a source-oriented manner in both the Dutch and English excerpts.

#### 4.1.4 Discussion of Comparative Register Analysis

The comparative register analysis showed that the Dutch text had an overall source-oriented translation approach. The rendering of field, tenor and mode were all predominantly source-oriented. There are multiple reasons for this.

One reason is that the German and Dutch culture and language are similar in certain aspects. German and Dutch speakers are similar in the cultural dimensions of directness vs indirectness, orientation towards self vs orientation towards others and orientation towards content vs orientation towards persons. This study found that the cultural dimensions that had a cultural filter applied, were those of explicitness vs implicitness and ad-hoc-formulation vs verbal routines. The Dutch translator used more explicit language than the German writer by increasing the frequency of lexicogrammatical realizations of modality. In addition, the Dutch

target text expressed more fluidity and fewer verbal routines in its word orders and use of collocations.

Another reason for the source-oriented approach of the Dutch target text is its place in the polysystem of literature. As Desmet's (2007) study has shown, German is one of the languages that is translated from most in translated Dutch children's literature. This means that in the polysystem, German children's literature has a higher status than Dutch children's literature. According to Liang (2007), if the source text has a higher position in the polysystem, the target text will be more likely to adopt a source-oriented approach. Therefore, the imbalance between the German and Dutch culture in the polysystem also causes the Dutch target text to adopt a source-oriented approach.

It is difficult to examine the pedagogical and didactic norms in the German and Dutch texts. In the Dutch excerpts that were examined for the purpose of this study, there were no instances of omission, purification, substitution, explication or simplification strategies in regards to culture specific elements. The German source text is an active cause for this, as there are no mentions of cultural elements, e.g., popular brands, in the excerpts. The Dutch excerpts also did not contain explication or deletion strategies. The absence of these strategies makes it difficult to observe the pedagogical and didactic norms in the Dutch target text, because it cannot be determined if the two cultures have a different understanding of what is appropriate for children and what (cultural) elements children can understand and what children can and cannot be exposed to in children's literature.

The Dutch target text approached the rendering of register in a source-oriented manner. In relation to Toury's theory on the initial norm, this means that the Dutch translators of *Hart van Inkt* chose an adequate translation of register in which the norms of the source text prevail.

The comparative register analysis showed that the English text used a predominant source-oriented approach to the rendering of register in its translation. However, the English text demonstrated more target-oriented translation approaches than the Dutch source text did.

The hypothesis of this study was that the English text would demonstrate a target-oriented approach towards the rendering of register. This hypothesis is not completely confirmed. The English target text demonstrates a balance between a source-oriented and target-oriented approach. When the rendering of register in the English target text is compared to the rendering of register in the Dutch target text, it is apparent that the English target text is more target-oriented than the Dutch target text. There are multiple explanations for this.

The English language and culture take on a dominant position in the polysystem. This dominant position provides English translators of children's literature with freedom regarding the translation of the text. It furthermore heightens the probability that an English translator will adopt a target-oriented translation approach. Since English holds the central position in the polysystem of children's literature, it is expected that the English target text has a more target-oriented approach than the Dutch target text. However, the overall approach to the rendering of register in the English target text is source-oriented.

The cultural dimensions also show that the English text is more removed from the German text in terms of language and culture than the Dutch text is. According to House, German speakers are usually more direct, more explicit, more self-referenced, more content-oriented and less likely to use verbal routines than the Anglophone speaker. In the English target text *Inkheart*, cultural filters were applied in the dimensions of: orientation towards content vs orientation towards persons, explicitness vs implicitness and ad-hoc-formulation vs use of verbal routine. The dimension of directness vs indirectness sometimes had a cultural filter applied that made the English text less direct. However, in other instances the English text was more direct than the German text, especially in the rendering of tenor.

In the English target text, the pedagogical and didactic norms were visible due to the use of omission strategies and the lack of substitution strategies. The English target text omitted the use of the formal singular second-person pronoun. This is because the English language does not distinguish between a formal and informal singular second-person pronoun. Therefore, English children do not know of this lexicogrammatical feature of language. Instead of a formal second-person pronoun, the English text used the second-person pronoun “you”, because the target audience is familiar with this. However, since there was no substitution of formal features, the formality of the German register was lost in translation. This also resulted in the omission of dialogue in which the use of formal singular person pronouns was discussed or disputed.

Furthermore, the English translator applied purification strategies in order to make the text more appropriate to the English target audience. One example of this is excerpt 44, which is shown in table 25.

**Table 25.**

*Excerpt 44 in the German, Dutch and English novel.*

<i>German</i>	<i>Dutch</i>	<i>English</i>
“Dein Vater würde dich übers Knie legen, wenn er wüsste, was du vorhast.” p. 384	“Je vader zou je over zijn knie leggen als hij wist wat je van plan bent.” p. 334	“Your father would be furious if he knew what you were planning.” p. 367

The idiom that is used in German and Dutch means that that Meggie can expect to be spanked by her father if he hears of her plan. The English language does not have an idiom with a similar meaning. The word that is used in the English text, “furious”, does not convey a similar meaning to the idiom in the German and Dutch texts.

Additionally, in excerpt 9, the English excerpts adjusts the age range by one more year. This is also rooted in what the English translator deemed to be appropriate and inappropriate for the target audience.

**Table 26.*****Excerpt 9 in the German, Dutch and English novel.***

<i>German</i>	<i>Dutch</i>	<i>English</i>
“Zwei, drei Jahre noch und sie ist ein brauchbares, hübsches Ding.” p. 140-1	“Nog een jaar of twee, drie en ze is bruikbaar, knap ding.” p. 125	“Three or four more years and she’ll be a pretty little thing, useful to have around the place” p .133

These omission and purification strategies make it apparent that the pedagogical norms and didactic norms that exist in children’s literature are different between German and English with regards to appropriateness.

The overall translation approach to the rendering of register in the English text is source-oriented. This means that the English translator has opted for an adequate translation of the German source text. However, it must be emphasized that the English target text is more balanced between a source-oriented and a target-oriented approach to the rendering of register.

## *4.2 Conclusion*

This thesis examined the translation approach towards the rendering of register in the German children’s novel: *Tintenherz* by Cornelia Funke (2003) and its translations into Dutch, *Hart van Inkt* translated by Hanneke Beneden and Ab Bertholet, and into English, *Inkheart* translated by Anthea Bell. The hypothesis was that the rendering of register in the Dutch target text would be predominantly source-oriented and that the rendering of register in the English target would be predominantly target-oriented.

In order to examine this, a register analysis was conducted in two phases. The first phase was a situational-context analysis to determine that the context of the excerpts was similar. The second phase consisted of an analysis of the lexicogrammatical realizations of field, tenor and mode.



The results from this register analysis proved that the hypothesis was partially right. In the Dutch target text, the rendering of register was predominantly source-oriented. The results furthermore added nuance to the second part of the hypothesis; the English target text applied more target-oriented renditions of register than the Dutch target text did, but overall, the approach of the English target text was also source-oriented. Only the rendering of field in the English target text used a predominantly target-oriented approach. Thus, the approach to the rendering of register in the Dutch and English translation was predominantly source-oriented for both target texts.

Due to the limited scope of this thesis, there are some interesting aspects that are still unexamined. The limited scope of this thesis did not allow for an in-depth discussion of the influence of the dual readership on the rendering of register. Future research can dictate what the influence of the dual readership of children's literature has on the rendering of register in translation.

The scope of this thesis also did not allow for a more in-depth discussion on the difference between the translation approaches of the Dutch and the English target texts. It would be interesting to further examine the influence of the difference in pedagogical and didactic norms within the Dutch and German culture. Future studies could also examine the difference between the translation approach of Dutch and English translated children's literature in regards to the cultural dimensions, norms and their positions in the polysystem of translation.

This thesis lacked a thorough examination of the cultural dimension of orientation towards self vs orientation towards others. This flaw was inherent to the chosen Hallidayan method that was used for the lexicogrammatical realization analysis. The lexicogrammatical realizations of the Hallidayan method did include the category of grammatical subjects and the inclusivity of the first-person pronouns and the formality of the singular second-person

pronouns, but it did not examine the full scope of references towards others. Future studies should recognize this issue and possibly resolve this issue by including an additional category in their lexicogrammatical realization analysis for all references towards others. Another additional category that would be interesting to examine in future studies is that of interjections and how it relates to the (in)directness of the cultural dimensions.

In addition, future research can also acquire more knowledge on the cultural dimensions that are vital when rendering register in translation by examining the rendering of register through other sets of cultural dimensions, such as Hofstede's cultural dimensions.

This thesis recognizes that more research is needed to gather a generalized conclusion on the rendering of register within the translation of children's literature as a whole. This thesis has examined one children's novel and two of its target text. Future research should examine the rendition of register in an array of children's novels in order to come to a more general conclusion. This thesis has provided a start to a theoretical framework for further research into the rendering of register in the translation children's literature.

## References

### Primary Sources

Funke, C. (2003). *Tintenherz*. Cecilie Dressler Verlag.

Funke, C. (2005). *Hart van Inkt*. (H. Beneden & A. Bertholet, Trans.). Em. Querido's Uitgeverij. (Original work published 2003).

Funke, C. (2005). *Inkheart*. (A. Bell, Trans.). Scholastic. (Original work published 2003).

### Secondary Sources

Alvstad, C. (2010). Children's Literature and Translation. In L. Van Doorslaer, Y. Gambier (Eds.), *Handbook of Translation Studies* (Vol. 1). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Åsman, T. P. & Pedersen, P. (2013). How Bert got into Ned's Head: Domestication in the Translation of Literature for Young Readers. *Perspectives*, 21(2), 143-155. DOI: 10.1080/0907676X.2011.592202.

Bell, A. (1979). Children's Books in Translation. *Signal*, 28, 47-53.

Bell, A. (1985). Translator's Notebook: The Naming of Names. *Signal*, 46, 17-26.

Bowcher, W. L, Fontaine L. & Schönthal, D. (2019). Introduction. In G. Thompson, W. Bowcher & L. Fontaine (Eds.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Systemic Functional Linguistics* (pp. 1-8). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
DOI:10.1017/9781316337936.

Casanova, P. (2013). What is a Dominant Language? Giacomo Leopardi: Theoretician of Linguistic Inequality. (M. Jones, Trans.). *New Literary History*, 44(3), 379-399. URL: [www.jstor.org/stable/24542566](http://www.jstor.org/stable/24542566).

Chesterman, A. (2016). *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*. Revised Edition. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Davies, E. (2003). A Goblin or a Dirty Nose? The Treatment of Culture-Specific References in Translations of the Harry Potter Book. *The Translator*, 9(1), 65-100.
- Desmet, M. K. T. (2007). *Babysitting the Reader: Translating English Narrative Fiction for Girls into Dutch (1946-1995)*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Desmidt, I. (2006). A Prototypical Approach within Descriptive Translation Studies? Colliding Norms in Translated Children's Literature. In J. Van Coillie & W. Verschueren (Eds.), *Children's Literature in Translation: Challenges and Strategies* (pp. 123-139). St. Jerome.
- Dimitrov, K. (2014). Geert Hofstede et al's Set of National Cultural Dimensions – Popularity and Criticisms. *Economic Alternatives*(2), 30-60. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.1434882.
- Donahaye, J. (2012). *Three Percent? Publishing Date and Statistics on Translated Literature in the United Kingdom and Ireland: Literature Across Frontiers*. Mercator Institute for media, Languages and Culture, Aberystwyth University.
- Even-Zohar, I. (2005). Polysystem theory revised. In I. Even-Zohar (Ed.), *Papers in Culture Research* (pp. 38-49).
- Flynn, R. (2021). Culture. In P. Nel, L. Paul & N. Christensen (Eds.), *Keywords for Children's Literature* (2nd ed., pp. 51-53). New York University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (2nd. ed.). Arnold.
- Hermans, T. (1999). *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and System-Oriented Approaches Explained*. St. Jerome.
- House, J. (1977/1981). *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment* (1st & 2nd ed.). Narr.
- House, J. (2009). Moving across Languages and Cultures in Translation as Intercultural Communication. In K. Bührig, J. House & J. Ten Thije (Eds.), *Translational Action and Intercultural Communication* (pp. 7-40).
- House, J. (2015). *Translation Quality Assessment: Past and Present*. Routledge.

- Hunt, P. (2021). Children's Literature. In P. Nel, L. Paul & N. Christensen (Eds.), *Keywords for Children's Literature* (2nd ed., pp. 51-53). New York University Press.
- Klingberg, G. (1986). *Children's fiction in the hands of the translators*. CWK Gleerup.
- Lathey, G. (2009). Children's Literature. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (pp. 31-34). Routledge.
- Lathey, G. (2016). *Translating Children's Literature*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Lathey, G. (2020). Only English Books: The Mediation of Translated Children's Literature in a Resistant Economy. In J. Van Coillie & J. McMartin (Eds.), *Children's Literature in Translation*. Leuven University Press. DOI: 10.1353/book.78563.
- Liang, W. (2007). A Descriptive Study of Translating Children's Fantasy Fiction. *Perspectives*, 15(2), 92-105. DOI: 10.1080/13670050802153830.
- McDowell, M. (1973). Fiction for Children and Adults: Some Essential Differences. *Children's Literature in Education*, 4, pp. 50-63. DOI: 10.1007/BF01135994.
- Munday, J. (2016). *Introduction Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. Fourth Edition. Routledge.
- Nodelman, P. (1992). The Other: Orientalism, Colonialism, and Children's Literature. *Children's Literature Association Quarterly*, 17(1), pp. 29-35.  
DOI:10.1353/chq.0.1006.
- Nuemann, S. (2021). Register and Translation. In M. Kim, J. Munday, Z. Wang & P. Wang (Eds.), *Systemic Functional Linguistics and Translation Studies* (pp. 65-82). Bloomsbury Academic.
- Oittinen, Riita. (2000). *Translating for Children*. Garland.
- O'Sullivan, E. (2011). Comparative Children's Literature. *PMLA*, 126(1), 189-196. URL: [www.jstor.org/stable/41414091](http://www.jstor.org/stable/41414091).

- O'Sullivan, E. (2021). Translation. In P. Nel, L. Paul & N. Christensen (Eds.), *Keywords for Children's Literature* (2nd ed., pp. 51-53). New York University Press.
- Shavit, Z. (1986). *Poetics of Children's Literature*. The University of Georgia Press.
- Toury, G. (2012). *Descriptive Translation Studies--and Beyond. Revised Edition*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ure, J. & Ellis, J. (1977). Register in Descriptive Linguistics and Linguistic Sociology. In O. Uribe-Villegas (Ed.), *Issues in Sociolinguistics* (pp. 197-244). The Hague: De Gruyter Mouton. DOI: 10.1515/9783110806687.197.
- Van Coillie, J. & McMartin, J. (2020). *Children's Literature in Translation: Texts and Contexts*. Leuven University Press. DOI: 10.1353/book.78563.
- Venuti, L. (1998). *The Scandals of Translations: Towards an Ethic of Difference*. New York/London: Routledge.

### Resources Analysis

- Collins Dictionary*. <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/>. Last accessed: 17-12-2022.
- Combinatiewoordenboek. <https://combinatiewoordenboek.nl/>. Last Accessed: 17-12-2022.
- Dikke van Dale*. <https://uleiden-vandale-nl.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/>. Last accessed: 18-12-2022.
- Fox, C. & Combley, R. (2014). *The Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. 6<sup>th</sup> Edition*. Pearson Educated Limited.
- Inkheart*. Cornelia Funke. Last Accessed: 03-11-2022, from <https://corneliafunke.com/en/books/inkheart>.
- KollokationWoerterbuch*. <https://kollokationenwoerterbuch.ch/web/>. Last Accessed: 17-12-2022.
- Online Collocation Dictionary*. <https://www.freecollocation.com/>. Last Accessed: 17-12-2022.