אוניברסיטת בר-אילן

מעמדם של תרגומים-עצמיים ותהליך יצירתם: אפריקאנס-אנגלית כמקרה מבחן

שלמית ארליך

עבודה זו מוגשת כחלק מהדרישות לשם קבלת תואר מוסמך
במחלקה לתרגום וחקר התרגום, אוניברסיטת בר-אילן

תשס״ז רמת-גן

עבודה זו נכתבה בהנחיתה של פרופ׳ מרים שלזינגר מהמחלקה לתרגום וחקר התרגום, אוניברסיטת בר-אילן.

BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY

The Status and Production of Self-Translated Texts: Afrikaans-English as a Case in Point

Shlomit Ehrlich

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master's degree in Translation and Interpreting Studies, Bar-Ilan University

Ramat Gan, Israel 2007

This thesis was written under the supervision of Prof. Miriam Shlesinger of the Translation and Interpreting Studies Department, Bar-Ilan University.

Table of Contents

Abstract

The paper researches the status and production of self-translated texts using the Afrikaans-English self-translations of the novels *Kringe in 'n Bos* / *Circles in a Forest* and *Kennis van die Aand* / *Looking on Darkness* by Dalene Mathee and André Brink respectively as a case in point. The paper is based on the assumption that the self-translated text may constitute an important tool for the study of translation theory and translation practice, in that self-translations are less encumbered by any external "noise" or other distracting influences that might be present in conventional translations. Since this form of translation is carried out by the author him/herself, he or she enjoys a level of freedom rarely bestowed on other translators. The additional fact that self-translators are "privileged translators" in that they have complete access to the author's creative process and his/her original intentions also makes for a more suitable translation case study. Consequently, the examination of self-translated texts may well cast light on the translation process itself.

The questions posed in the study are:

1. Are self-translators authors or translators? In other words, do they follow conventional translation procedures, or is their translation distinctly different, and if so, in what ways?

2. If self-translators are, indeed, translators par excellence, and the self-translated text a quintessential translation product, what are the translation phenomena observed in the self-translated texts of Brink

and Matthee, and what do these tell us about the translation process in general?

3. How do self-translators transfer culture-specific items, which are usually highly challenging for any translator? What can we learn from the way they have chosen particular translation strategies over others for transferring such items?

4. Do Afrikaans-English self-translations possess any unique characteristics of their own, seeing that they are not "alien" to each other, rather **both simultaneously** claiming the status of mother-tongue of a great many?

Chapter One contextualizes the two works chosen (one by each of the said authors) in the broader framework of self-translation theory, in search of a definition that would best define their status as products of this unusual form of transfer. Using the various discrepancies noticed in the Afrikaans and English versions, it is shown how the self-translators in question have followed common translation procedures despite the fact that they enjoy an authority and a liberty that other translators usually lack. The point is then made that it is ultimately the fact that a transfer between two language systems has been made that determines the type of process followed, rather than the identity/status of the producer.

Following the examination of each of the author's texts, the two texts are compared and contrasted. The self-translations are found to be quite different in the strategies

employed by the self-translators, and the type of text produced. This further strengthens the point that self-translators are indeed translators, varying in their choice of translation strategies and the type of translation they produce, in much the same way as other translators. Focusing on various omissions, additions and explicitations noticed in the second versions of each of the self-translators, this chapter also makes the point that the reader of **both** texts, i.e. the bilingual reader, is best able to appreciate both versions as part of one bilingual work, in that the reading of both versions provides the reader with the broadest picture – of both the text and its creator.

Chapter Two complements Chapter One by elaborating on the translation strategies used by each of the self-translators to transfer particularly difficult items. Since self-translators cannot be suspect of misinterpreting their own work, strategy choice on their part cannot be arbitrary or stemming from ignorance or lack of comprehension of the source text. Using available theories pertaining to the transfer of culture-specific items and the strategy categorization thereof, strategy use for the various culture-specific items is outlined (as utilized by each of the self-translators). It is then demonstrated how strategy choice affects the type of text produced – in terms of adequacy, acceptability, foreignization and domestication, for example, and how this is directly linked to translation *skopos*. The fact that once again the two self-translators make use of very different strategies further emphasizes the point that the fact that an author translates him/herself does not necessarily make his/her text similar to that of other self-translators, or vouch for the fact that some strategies will be used more than others. Rather, self-translators differ from each other in the same way that

all translators do, and strategies are chosen or rejected strictly on the basis of how this will effect text production and translator *skopos*.

Chapter Three focuses on the Afrikaans-English bilingual text and introduces the concept of *intra-bilingual* writing i.e. a form of writing that takes the bilingual quality a step further, in that the "bilinguality" is manifest in one and the same text. Unlike the term "bilingual writing", which refers to two separate texts written by one bilingual writer, what is termed an *intra-bilingual* text would be a text written in language A but interspersed with language B. The point is made that *intra-bilingual* writing is not a form of mere codes-witching, a phenomenon not uncommon to both translated and original texts. Translations often utilize code-switching i.e. by retaining words from the source text in the target text, either because these are voids in the target language, or for the purpose of creating a "foreign flavour" in the target text, reminiscent of the source culture. *Intra-bilingual* writing, which is not uncommon among South African writers, is not a passive retention of words in language A in a text that is largely written in language B for linguistic or stylistic purposes; rather, it can be said that it is the most natural form of South African writing because it actively reflects a reality that is bilingual, and which is based on, and affected by, the power relations of two rival yet complementary languages. It is for this reason that South African reality might best be expressed bilingually. A comparison of Brink's and Matthee's English versions reveals that Matthee's writing is not *intra-bilingual*, but simply bilingual (in that she has created separate and distinct versions of one text). Brink's text, however, is *intra-bilingual* par excellence and the "intra-bilinguality" is carried to the level of the word. It is suggested that the differences noticed in the degree of "bilinguality", or rather "intra-bilinguality" in the

texts of these authors are related to differences in translator *skopos*, as was the case with the self-translators' choice of translation strategies, and perhaps the degree to which the text is a reflection of the writer's own reality in the dichotomy of Afrikaans-English culture.

תקציר

עבודה זו חוקרת את מעמדם של תרגומים-עצמיים ותהליך יצירתם, בהסתמכה על שני טקסטים באנגלית שתורגמו מאפריקאנס על ידי מחבריהם: *Circles in a Forest* מאת דלין מתיה, ו-*Looking on Darkness* מאת אנדרה ברינק. העבודה מתבססת על ההנחה כי תרגומים-עצמיים מהווים כלי חשוב בחקר התרגום והתהליך התרגומי, משום שבתרגומים-עצמיים אין הפרעות או "רעשים" הקיימים בתרגומים רגילים. המחברים המתרגמים את עצמם נהנים מחופש פעולה שאיננו מנת חלקם של מתרגמים/ות אחרים/ות. זאת ועוד, העובדה שהמתרגמים את עצמם קשורים באופן בלתי-מוגבל ובלתי ניתן לערעור לתהליך היצירה שאותו חווה המחבר הופכת את הטקסטים הללו למקרי מבחן ראויים. בדיקתם של תרגומים-עצמיים יכולה, אפוא, לשפוך אור על תהליך התרגום עצמו.

שאלות המחקר:

א. האם מתרגמים-עצמיים הם "מחברים" או "מתרגמים"? כלומר, האם הם משתמשים בתהליכי תרגום רגילים, או שמא התרגומים שהם יוצרים שונים בתכליתם מתרגומים אחרים, ואם כך – במה הם שונים?

ב. אם נכונה ההנחה שתרגום עצמי מקרה מובהק במיוחד של תרגום, אלו תופעות תרגום נצפו בטקסטים של ברינק ומתיה, ומה ניתן ללמוד מאלה על תהליך התרגום בכלל?

ג. באלו אסטרטגיות תרגום משתמשים אלה המתרגמים את עצמם כדי להעביר פריטים תלויי-תרבות, המהווים בדרך כלל אתגר לכל מתרגם/ת? מה ניתן ללמוד מן ההעדפות שלהם בכל הנוגע לאסטרטגיות תרגומיות?

ד. האם לתרגומים-עצמיים בשפות אפריקאנס-אנגלית מאפיינים ייחודיים בשל העובדה ששפות אלה אינן זרות זו לזו, והן נחשבות שפת-אם לרבים מתושבי דרום אפריקה?

הפרק הראשון מנסה למצוא הגדרה נאותה לתרגומים-עצמיים ומשתמש בתיאורית תרגום בכלל ובזו העוסקת בתרגומים-עצמיים בפרט. בדיקה אמפירית של הגרסה האנגלית והאפריקנית מגלה כי ההבדלים בין שתי הגרסאות אינם שונים מהותית מאלה המתגלים בכל תרגום באשר הוא, ואופייניים לתהליך התרגום בכלל. נראה, אפוא, כי למרות היותם בעלי סמכות יתר וחירות, לכאורה, לעשות בגרסה החדשה כרצונם, בחרו המתרגמים-העצמיים לנקוט אסטרטגיות תרגום קלאסיות. עוד מודגשת העובדה כי השינויים שנצפו בגרסה האנגלית אינם נובעים מכך שהטקסט נוצר בידי המחבר, או מתרגם בעל מעמד יוצא דופן, אלא מעצם העובדה שהתרחש מעבר בין שתי שפות, וכל התופעות שנצפו הן תוצאה של תהליך זה בלבד – היינו תהליך התרגום. במילים אחרות: השינויים תלויים בתהליך ולא תלויים במעמדו של זה האחראי לו.

לאחר שנבדקו הטקסטים באנגלית ונערכה השוואה למקור האפריקני, נערכה השוואה גם בין שני התרגומים לאנגלית. התברר כי המתרגמים משתמשים באסטרטגיות תרגום שונות זה מזו, ובכך גם מייצרים תרגומים שונים מבחינות רבות. שוב מודגשת העובדה כי מתרגמים-עצמיים הם מתרגמים ככל המתרגמים, ובוחרים באסטרטגיות תרגום שונות בהתאם למטרת התרגום. עוד עולה מפרק זה כי לאור ריבוי ההשמטות, ההוספות וההנהרות שנצפו בגרסאות השניות, רק הקורא את שני הטקסטים, כלומר הקורא הדו-לשוני, יוכל ליהנות ממכלול היצירה; במילים אחרות, רק קריאת הטקסט המקורי ותרגומו מציגה לקורא את התמונה המלאה.

הפרק השני עוסק בתהליך היצירה של תרגומים-עצמיים, ומתמקד באסטרטגיות התרגום אותן בוחר/ת המתרגם/ת כדי לתרגם פריטי לשון ותרבות קשים במיוחד. מאחר שהמתרגמים את עצמם אינם יכולים לטעות בפרשנות יצירתם שלהם, בחירת אסטרטגיות התרגום, כפי שזו נעשית על ידם, חייבת להיות פעולה מכוונת הנובעת מידע וממחשבה תחילה, ואיננה תוצאה של בורות או של אי-הבנת המקור. מבדיקת התרגומים עולה כי קיים קשר ישיר בין האסטרטגיות שנבחרו לבין

אופיו של התוצר התרגומי, דהיינו האם התרגום היה קביל או אדקווטי, והאם שימר את זרותו של המקור (foreignizing) או להיפך (domesticating), וכיצד מתקשר הדבר באופן ישיר למטרת התרגום, ה- *skopos*. לאחר שהוצגו האסטרטגיות השונות בהן השתמשו המתרגמים, נערכה השוואה בין שני המתרגמים. בדומה לבדיקה בפרק הראשון, נמצאו שני התרגומים שונים מאד גם בבדיקה זו. הסבר אפשרי לשוני ביניהם נובע מן הסקופוס השונה, ובחירת האסטרטגיות נעשתה בהתאם. מכאן, שאין לצפות שמתרגמים-עצמיים ישתמשו באותן אסטרטגיות תרגום דווקא; מתרגמים-עצמיים שונים זה מזה כשם שמתרגמים אחרים שונים אלה מאלה, וכל מתרגם/ת בוחר/ת את אסטרטגיות התרגום שבהן ת/ישתמש, בהתאם לסוג התרגום שהוא/היא רוצה ליצור ומטרתו.

הפרק השלישי מציג את המונח intra-bilingual writing (כתיבה תוך-דו-לשונית), המתייחס לכתיבה דו-לשונית, כאשר הדו-לשוניות קיימת בטקסט אחד ולא בשני טקסטים שונים – מה שמכונה bilingual writing (כתיבה דו-לשונית). כאשר מדובר בטקסטים מתורגמים, intra-bilingual writing עשוי להיראות כמו code-switching מצוי, היינו טקסט הכתוב בשפה ב׳ (שפת היעד) שבתוכו שזורות מילים בשפה א׳ (שפת המקור) שלא תורגמו. פעמיים נעשה שימוש ב-code-switching במקרים של מחסרים לשוניים ותרבותיים בשפת היעד, כאשר השימוש במילים בשפת המקור נמצא מתאים להשלמת החסר. שימוש ב-code-switching בטקסט מתורגם עשוי גם לנבוע מרצונו של הסופר ליצור ״ניחוח זר״ בתרגום, כך שהקורא יהיה מודע לעובדה שהוא קורא טקסט מתרבות אחרת. אך בשונה מאלה, כתיבה תוך-דו-לשונית – תופעה שאיננה נדירה בקרב סופרים דרום-אפריקניים – הינה תהליך המתרחש מכורח המציאות, וכתיבה מהסוג הזה היא טבעית ולא מלאכותית. כלומר, אין מדובר באי-תרגומם של מילים מסוימות בשפת המקור כדי ליצור ניחוח זר או להשלים ידע חסר, אלא בתהליך פעיל ומודע של כתיבה דו-לשונית אשר נמצא מתאים ביותר לשקף נאמנה את המציאות הדרום-אפריקנית על כל המורכבות, המאבקים והדו-לשוניות שבה. אפשר לומר שתיאור מציאות דרום-אפריקנית מחייב שימוש פעיל בשתי הלשונות, ולכן תיאור כתיבה זו כ- code-switching גרידא, יחטיא את מטרה. מבדיקת שני הטקסטים (של ברינק ושל מתיה), עולה כי כתיבתו של ברינק היא אכן דו-לשונית, במלוא מובן המילה (כלומר, אף הגרסה האנגלית היא דו-לשונית) ואילו זו של מתיה איננה דו-לשונית כלל. ההנחה שלפיה הדו-לשוניות מועצמת אצל האחד, והנעדרת אצל השנייה נובעת משני גורמים:

א. מטרות תרגום (skopoi) שונות אצל השניים (בדומה לאסטרטגיות התרגום השונות שנצפו בפרק השני).

ב. מידת היותו של הטקסט השתקפותה של המציאות האישית של הסופר/ת בתרבות האנגלו-אפריקנית המורכבת.

Preface

1. Self-translation

Self-translation refers to the act of translating one's own writings, and though it is a fairly common practice in scholarly publishing (Grutman, 1998), it is not very manifest among creative writers. The reason for this may be that it would be quite unlikely for a creative writer, who has presumably toiled over his/her work for many months, to start the creative procedure all over again. It is this "re-doing" or "re-creating" as is manifest in self-translated literary works that makes self-translation doubly intriguing.

We can, consequently, ask the question: why would an author rewrite a work once s/he has finished it? A few possibilities emerge:

a. **Mercantile interest**: It may be presumed that an author of any literary work wishes to be read by as many people as possible. Rendering a work into numerous languages naturally broadens the readership. If the author happens to be fluent in a language other than the one in which s/he had originally written a literary work, who better than s/he to go about translating it?

b. **The need for bilingual expression**: An author who is bi-cultural or bi-lingual may find that s/he can only best express him/herself in two languages rather than one. In this case the act of self-translation on

her/his part would not be one of mercantile interest or convenience, but rather an almost essential step in the creative process. It may be said that only once the text is expressed in both languages, is it termed complete and is the author satisfied.

c. **A political or ideological statement**: Language choice often has political or ideological connotations or intentions; all the more so when the writer chooses to rewrite a literary text. It might be argued that language choice is irrelevant and makes no statements, for the simple reason that any writer simply writes in the language s/he knows best. However, the same cannot be argued for a self-translation. For once a writer chooses to render an original work into yet another language, this choice is no longer the only one possible. When a writer consciously chooses a second language to say something s/he has already said in the language most natural to him/her, s/he must either be stating that the original language could not convey the message in the proper manner, and another language must therefore be used in its stead; or else that both languages simultaneously are better able to communicate the message. Since languages are always culture-bound, giving preference to one language over another, or rendering both equal, must be a statement regarding specific cultures and their inter-relationships. This almost always has to do with politics and/or ideology.

d. **Exile**: Most commonly, the act of self-translation is closely linked to exile. Writers forced to leave their native country had to make some adjustments in their writing in order to continue in their vocation in the new country/culture. Writers such as Beckett, Nabokov and Conrad were compelled either to write in a second language or to translate themselves in order to be understood and accepted in their new home. South African writers were often forced to publish abroad in English after their Afrikaans works were banned in South Africa on the basis of political ideology (see also Section 3 below).

This paper is based on the assumption that the self-translated text may constitute an important tool for the study of translation theory and translation practice, in that self-translations are less encumbered by any external "noise" or other distracting influences that might be present in conventional translations. Since this form of translation is carried out by the author him/herself, he or she enjoys a level of freedom rarely bestowed on other translators. The additional fact that self- translators are "privileged translators" in that they have complete access to the author's creative process and his/her original intentions also makes for a more suitable translation case study. The examination of self-translated texts may well cast light on the translation process itself, and illustrate "in what translation situation and by means of what strategies, the self-translator sometimes decides to follow the route which he himself carved out in the original work and sometimes decides to beat a different path" (Tanqueiro 1998, p. 58).

In my examination of the self-translated text, I have chosen to examine two South African self-translators: André Brink and Dalene Matthee, both of whom have originally written their works in Afrikaans and rendered them into English. One novel by each author was chosen for this purpose: *Kennis van die Aand* (*Looking on Darkness*) by Brink; *Kringe in 'n Bos* (*Circles in a Forest*) by Matthee. It must be noted, that both English versions are clearly **translations** of the Afrikaans (rather than new English novels), and were viewed as such by the writers themselves. Inside the front cover of Mathee's novel, Penguin Publishers clearly indicates that *Circles in a Forest* was **translated** from the Afrikaans by Matthee. Although Brink's English version boasts no such caption (at least not on the publication used for the purpose of this study), Brink (1976, p.45) refers to the writing of *Looking on Darkness* thus: "…intrinsic motives (the urge to attempt "saying" the novel [*Kennis van die Aand*] in a new language medium) as well as extraneous ones (censorship) combined to create the challenge". Furthermore, many internet sites publicizing his book clearly state that *Looking on Darkness* was translated by the author himself.

In addition to the fact that the two writers are self-translators, they have been chosen for the following reasons:

a. Both have consistently rendered all their Afrikaans works into English.

b. The works of both authors are well known in South Africa as well as abroad, and are thus appealing as case studies.

c. Notwithstanding the fact that both are self-translators, the two writers differ greatly in the following areas: style, settings of their novels, language use, themes and ultimately – translation strategies. This will help demonstrate how different self-translations are not necessarily similar to each other, nor can they be placed in one basket and categorized as "self-translations" rather than "translations".
d. The Afrikaans-English language pair is a fascinating one. Though both languages have co-existed in South Africa, and can both claim the status of mother tongue of a great many, there have been periods of rivalry and tension between the two on the basis of ideology, politics and racism.

This paper will attempt to answer the following questions:

1. Are self-translators authors or translators? In other words, do they follow conventional translation procedures, or is their translation distinctly different, and if so, in what ways?

2. If self-translators are, indeed, translators par excellence, and the self-translated text a quintessential translation product, what are the translation phenomena observed in the self-translated texts of Brink and Matthee, and what do these tell us about the translation process in general?

3. How do self-translators transfer culture-specific items, which are

usually highly challenging for any translator? What can we learn from the way they have chosen particular translation strategies over others for transferring such items?

4. Do Afrikaans-English self-translations possess any unique characteristics of their own, seeing that the languages in question are not "alien" to each other, rather **both simultaneously** claiming the status of mother-tongue of a great many?

2. The English-Afrikaans Language Pair

English and Afrikaans, two of South Africa's eleven official languages, share a long history of conflict on Africa's southern tip. Afrikaans, or South African Dutch, developed from Dutch dialects used by the settlers who arrived in the Cape in the middle of the 17th century. These, in turn, were influenced by the local Khoekhoe and Bantu languages. By the end of the 18th century, Afrikaans had become the lingua franca of the region and was spoken by 100, 000 persons of various colours and races.

When the British colonized the Cape in 1795, they attempted to anglicize all facets of public life and Afrikaans usage was repressed. Many Afrikaners, also known as Boers, fled the Cape colony in what was known as the Groot Trek (the Great Expedition) and founded Boer colonies in the Orange Free State and Transvaal further north. But these did not remain Afrikaner strongholds for too long and were annexed to the British Cape after the Anglo-Boer War in 1902. It was then that a bitter language conflict began. The English attempted to ban the use of Afrikaans in

schools and work places, and Afrikaans was looked down upon as the inferior "kitchen Dutch". It was during these oppressive times for the Afrikaner that organizations such as the Society of Genuine Afrikaners were formed, with the aim of preserving Afrikaans and fighting for its recognition as more than just a low-class dialect. It must be noted that for nearly three hundred years, Afrikaans existed in South Africa alongside Dutch, which retained an official status and was the language of the Scriptures, while Afrikaans acted as the vernacular. Afrikaans was finally recognized as an official language in 1925, and made its way into Parliament.

From 1925 to 1994, South Africa's two official languages were English and Afrikaans. In 1948 the Afrikaner National Party came into power and with it the Apartheid laws that discriminated against persons on the basis of skin colour. It was then that Afrikaans became identified with Apartheid, and so became distasteful to a great many. But one cannot overlook the fact that many writers opposed to the segregation laws of the Apartheid regime wrote in Afrikaans – André Brink, for one.

Though not all Afrikaans speakers were pro-Apartheid, and not all English speakers opposed that system, Afrikaans will probably always remain somewhat tainted in that respect. In today's democratic South Africa, and with globalization and the international economy, the use of English is once again on the increase while Afrikaans seems to be on the decline (Coetzee, 1993).

3. André Brink and Self-Translation

André Brink, a renowned South African novelist, was born in South Africa in 1935. He was educated in South Africa as well as in France. He writes in both English and Afrikaans and currently teaches at the University of Cape Town. In the 1960s Brink was politically active and was a member of the literary movement "Die Sestigers", which promoted anti-apartheid writing in the Afrikaans language, strove to introduce more liberal and inclusive styles into contemporary Afrikaans writing, and openly declared that its aim was "to broaden the rather too parochial limits of Afrikaner fiction." This meant openly dealing with moral and sexual matters, as well as the political system in a way that was liable to provoke the traditional Afrikaner reader[1].

In 1973 he wrote his book *Kennis van die Aand* (*Looking on Darkness*) that was subsequently banned in South Africa in 1974 under the new censorship laws of the time (the Publications Control Act), which aimed to exclude political writing, or writing that included sexual descriptions. In fact, Brink's work was the first Afrikaans work to be banned by the Afrikaner Apartheid regime. As a result of the ban, Brink translated his work into English and thus discovered what he termed to be "the new medium of the English novel." Having discovered himself as an English writer, he continued this practice, translating all his novels into English[2]. Besides translating his own novels, Brink translated many others including works by Graham Green, Henry James and Lewis Carroll.

---

1 http://web.bentley.edu/empl/c/rcrooks/courses/250f95/dry_white_season/brink.htlml . Accessed 28/10/05.

2 http://people.africadatabase.org/en/profile/2184.html#profile118983. Accessed 28/10/05.

4. Dalene Matthee and Self-Translation

Dalene Matthee (neé Scott) was born in South Africa in 1938 in the Cape province[3]. Her most famous trilogy deals with the Knysna Forest and the poor Afrikaner woodcutters living in the area in the latter part of the 19th century. The trilogy, for which she was most famous locally and abroad, comprises three novels; namely *Circles in a Forest*, *Fiela's Child* and *Mulberry Forest*. She wrote all her works in Afrikaans and translated them herself into English after completion. Matthee's writing is historical and often focuses on social injustice and exploitation. Unlike Brink's novels, however, some of her works emphasize Afrikaner exploitation by the British colonial regime in the Cape in the 19th century, rather than the exploitation of non-Whites by Afrikaners.

Matthee, unlike Brink, was not compelled to translate her works into English, but perhaps her reason for doing so was simply to broaden her readership. Furthermore, Matthee herself was not of Afrikaans descent but Scottish, being a direct descendent of Sir Walter Scott. Her rendering all her works into English was perhaps the need of an Afrikaans writer who was not a *ware Boer* (a true Afrikaner). Why then write in Afrikaans in the first place? The reason may be simply that the main characters in the novel are Afrikaners whose natural language is Afrikaans. It only makes sense that Matthee, who was fluent in Afrikaans, create authentic Afrikaans descriptions, spoken by typical Afrikaner characters in an Afrikaner forest in Afrikaans.

---

[3] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dalene_Matthee

Chapter One of this paper addresses the interesting status of self-translation and presents an empirical examination of the Afrikaans and English versions of the two texts by Brink and Matthee, in the hope of determining the true nature of these texts, and how these, in turn, might provide further insight into the translation process. This will be taken further in Chapter Two, which will outline the translation strategies used by each of the authors for the rendering of particularly difficult items: *realia*, dialect, proper names and the unique "double-structure" of Afrikaans. These features were specifically chosen as they often pose a challenge for the translator. This chapter will complement Chapter One in that it will outline the translation strategies used by the "privileged" self-translators, and will also demonstrate how self-translators make use of the variety of possibilities that are available to translators in general. An attempt will also be made to relate the choice of translation strategies to the *skopos* of translation. Chapter Three will focus on the singularity of Afrikaans-English self-translations, and elaborate on the relationship between these two languages, and how these affect the production of the Afrikaans-English bilingual work. Once again, the two authors will be compared and contrasted for the purpose of showing varying translation methods, and how these are directly affected by translator *skopos*.

Chapter One: The Status of the Self-Translated Text

Before attempting a theoretical examination of self-translated literary texts, it must be explained why this variant is of any consequence. For years translation theorists have broached the question of "What makes a good translation?" and "What is the role of the translator?" and though the questions are still relevant today, the answers have changed with time. The Classical Greek approach was that translations ought to be a perfect duplication of the meaning of the original (Chesterman 1997). The original text was seen as having superior status, hence the need to duplicate its meaning entirely. Modern translation theorists have long abandoned this model, and translation is no longer viewed as a duplication process. However, linguists such as Jakobson (1986) and Catford (1965) still viewed the translation process as one of primarily linguistic transference, and were consequently less concerned with extra-linguistic features. Nida speaks of transference of meaning, but still emphasizes that a good translation must produce "the closest natural equivalent to the message of the source language, first in meaning and secondly in style" (1966, p. 19). Clearly, Nida still regards the ST as superior, and believes the translator must not only transfer meaning, but must emulate style (linguistic features) as well.

Modern theories, however, have taken a different approach. "Today translation is not simply a product, a derivative second text, of parasitic value. To translate implies to interpret, to create" (Nord 1991, p 14). Or, similarly, José Lambert (1995) on translation: "…the original is never the only model for a translation" (cited in Tanqueiro 1998, p. 57). Similarly, translation philosophers (to distinguish these from formal theorists) now speak of translations as "complementary texts", i.e. those which

realize the potential hidden in the original (Steiner 2000), and the translator is seen as equal to author in status (Ozick 1983). Omissions, additions and explicitations and other shifts are seen as common procedures, and some are considered universals of translation i.e. linguistic features which typically occur in translated texts (Baker 1993). Venuti (1998) speaks of the importance of translator visibility in the text, and Vermeer (2000) suggests that what makes for a good translation is the fact that it has achieved its *skopos* or purpose. Clearly, faithfulness to the ST has been redefined, and it is no longer determined by the extent to which a translation has succeeded in duplicating the meaning and style of the original, or whether it has succeeded in echoing the voice of the author.

We have explained in the Preface that self-translations hold an unusual position in that their "faithfulness" to the source text will not be questioned in the usual way, if at all. They also, to say the least, echo the author's voice. It is for this reason that the study of a work translated by the author him/herself may help in shedding some light on the translation process itself, i.e. what happens when two languages and cultures meet, how the literary translator can deal with specific translation situations resulting from the above, and how translator *skopos* effects his/her decisions. However, the placing of self-translations in the paradigm of translations and not alternative original texts warrants further discussion.

1. Theory of Self-Translation

Schleiermacher (in Lefevere, 1977) outlines the making of a good translation, as he sees it. He criticizes Dryden, a well-known translator in his time, who claims that a

good translation is a projection of the author's voice had he himself written the work in the target language at the time of the translation. (Interestingly, a self-translation is the projection of the author's voice par excellence.) It is Schleiermacher's claim, however, that translations should aim to achieve a style that is deliberately marked and foreign, so that the reader feel there is an original behind the translation. It might be asked whether this is at all possible when it comes to self-translations, as self-translators never have to deal with a text that is foreign to them, both as far as the language and the content is concerned. However, this can be answered as follows: since self-translations, like other translations, transfer one language system to another, it can only be assumed that creating a marked or foreign style will not be impossible, but quite probable.

Citing Schleiermacher as his theoretical basis, Fitch (1988, p. 22-23) in his examination of Beckett's self-translations makes the point that one of the particularities of self-translation lies in the fact that the self-translator usually translates into a language that isn't his/her mother tongue, unlike translators – a point which might lead us to the assumption that self-translations are not translations but original texts. However, Schleiermacher (in Lefevere 1977, p. 82) makes the point that everyone produces original work in his mother tongue only. It follows then that self-translations cannot be defined as original works either.

One of the basic distinctions that emerges from writings on translation deals with text production versus text reception. One of the choices a translator must make is whether to "reproduce for his reader the creative process that gave birth to the original, or to seek to reproduce the effect of the latter on the reader" (Fitch 1988, p.

25). McFarlane (1953) explains these two options as follows: a semasiological approach would be one where the translator produces in another language the effect that the original text had on him; an onomasiological one would be reproducing in another language the meaning that the original writer wished to communicate. In other words, the latter would be "repeating the genesis of the utterance with the substitution of one linguistic medium for another" (Fitch 1988, p. 26).

It may appear that self-translations call into question this two-option model. If a semasiological translation constitutes both the original and the effect of the original on the translator, this would mean that the product or translation must constitute elements from both the author's reality/intention and the translator's. Put more simply, this would mean that the translation is not merely a reflection of the original, but also a reflection of the translator's relationship with the original i.e. the translator's reality; or to quote Popovič (1976, p. 223): "Translation, as a text, does not come into being merely as a reflection of the original, it is rather determined by the relation of the translator as creator to reality." It would appear that one reality (that of the external translator) would be missing in self-translation so that a semasiological approach would seem impossible, because the self-translator cannot add a new dimension of translator reception. But this need not necessarily be so. Seeing that the self-translator is a privileged translator, and enjoys a level of freedom that other translators often lack, and that the self-translation takes place after the creation of the fictional world - there is no reason to assume that the self-translator cannot add a new dimension. On the contrary, the fact that s/he often enjoys an additional freedom may well even foster this additional dimension.

Further still, translation is considered by many to be a form of commentary on the original work. To take one such example (e.g. Černák in Holmes 1970, cited by Fitch p. 29): "translation arises from interpretation and, to a different degree, in its result, it becomes the interpretation because translation can…help us attain a deeper understanding of the literary work…". The self-translator, from the authority that comes from authorship, might be the commentator par excellence.

It is Tanqueiro's contention (1998, pp. 58-59) that self-translators will always act more like translators than authors. She bases her claim on the fact that many self-translators confess to undertaking this process simply as a means of making their work available to other readers (Nabokov, for example), or the fact that some self-translators have deliberately kept a distance between the two roles (author and translator) by using a pseudonym (Milan Kundera, for instance). Samuel Beckett, perhaps the most renowned self-translator, clearly says "sick and tired I am of translation and what a losing battle it is always" (quoted in Fitch 1988, p. 9). Clearly Beckett himself saw his second versions as translations, so much so that he relates to the process as a losing battle, not one waged by a privileged or different translator.

As we have pointed out, even the self-translator will usually not feel at liberty in changing the established fictional world of his original work, but can still "move more confidently in constructing a new linguistic universe since he will not be conditioned by the linguistic universe of the source language and he will know with the utmost certainty when he is justified in departing from the original text and when he is not…" (Tanqueiro 1998, p. 59).

If indeed self-translators, in describing their role in relation to the translation, see themselves more as translators than authors, the study of self-translation "could bring up extremely interesting information for studies of the process of literary translation and […] cast light on some of the problems at the very centre of our discipline, many of which arise due to the difficulty of reaching any definite conclusions about a process which involves two different people" (Tanqueiro 1998, p. 59).

If self-translators are indeed translators (rather than authors) we would expect the former to follow standard translation procedures, and produce texts that boast typical translation features.

Baker (1993, p. 243) explains universal features of translation as being "features which typically occur in translated text rather than original utterances and which are not the result of interference from specific linguistic systems". Toury claims that non-obligatory shifts in themselves are universals of translated texts (1977, pp. 31-32). These shifts include, inter alia: **explicitation** - the translator adds information to express more clearly the progression of the characters' thought, to achieve greater transparency, or to fill a cultural gap in the target text (Laviosa-Braithwaite 1998, p. 289); **rationalization** - the translator "fixes up" the text to fit reality (Toury 1977); **intensification** - the translator alters the text in order to intensify it, especially in those passages that evoke emotion, by replacing neutral word combinations with more meaningful ones; **toning down** or using "cleaner language" (Toury 1977, pp. 30-31); **simplification** and **avoidance of repetition** is what Blum-Kulka and Levenston (1983) call the process of making do with less words; and **normalization** - various

shifts in punctuation, style and textual organization which contribute towards textual conventionality (Vanderauwera 1985).

In the following section, we will examine two self-translated texts. The English translation will be compared to the original Afrikaans texts on the micro-level, based on a sampling of parallel passages. The shifts noticed might help in identifying the true nature of the self-translated texts in question.

2. Comparison of the Afrikaans and English Versions

2.1 Brink's *Kennis van die Aand* and *Looking on Darkness*

Brink's novel *Kennis van die Aand* (1973) was translated into English as *Looking on Darkness* (1974). It is the story of Joseph Malan, a Cape Coloured, as he sits in a Pretoria prison awaiting execution, having been accused of murdering a white woman with whom he had had sexual relations. To make the days before his execution meaningful, and in an attempt to link his doomed fate to that of his ancestors, Joseph relates the history of his family. Joseph's personal story is interwoven with historical events from South African history such as slavery, white supremacy, the Anglo-Boer war, language conflicts and apartheid. His narration paints for us the pain of growing up as a non-White in South Africa and the injustice of segregation laws.

Much of the narration takes the form of the first person narrative as Joseph tells the story of his different ancestors in their own words. The lives of all were difficult, painful and impoverished. Almost all were uneducated, as "befit" their skin colour,

and Brink uses the Afrikaans dialect of the Cape for these characters, as opposed to Joseph's standard Afrikaans in his narration of the story. Joseph was the first of the Malan line to go on to higher education, and the first who might have had a chance to break free from that vicious circle of poverty, exploitation and racism. However, his ancestral line seems to be doomed forever. Like his ancestors before him, Joseph is imprisoned, both physically and socially. And his lot, too, is one of much pain, injustice and a tragic death. In the 1970s, when racial segregation was at its peak, Joseph knew he was doomed, as soon as he allowed his "black self" to fall in love with a white woman.

2.1.1 Motif of Darkness in Brink's Text

The first noticeable non-obligatory shift in Brink's English version is the title itself. *Kennis van die Aand* (gloss: Knowledge of Evening) was rendered by himself as *Looking on Darkness*. Although not completely dissociated from the Afrikaans title, the English one differs, in that it introduces the concept of darkness, only hinted at in the Afrikaans title through the word *aand* (evening). This motif appears elsewhere in the English version too, and is a clear case of explicitation. The following examples illustrate this:

Example 2.1.1.1

On the first page of the novel, Joseph Malan is reminiscing in his cell over his beloved Jessica Thomson, for whose murder he is to be executed. He remembers their lovemaking in this way:

Afrikaans version: …en met ‘n vel wat glad en wit afsteek teen my eie bruinheid wanneer ons liefde maak in die more. (11)

Gloss: …and with a skin that stands out smooth and white against my own brownness when we make love in the morning.

English version: …with a skin smooth and **starkly** white against my brownness, making love in the **dark light of the dawn**. (7)

Example 2.1.1.2

Afrikaans version: …in die min dae wat oorbly voor die dood my soos 'n diep vrou vat. (11)

Gloss: …the few days remaining before death comes and takes me like a deep woman.

English version: …in the days or weeks before I'm taken by the deep, **dark** lady, death. (8)

It will be noticed that the English version emphasizes this motif of darkness, and juxtaposes it with light. Dawn has a “dark light” and the brownness of Joseph’s skin stands out against Jessica’s white skin.

Another example where this juxtaposition is emphasized:

Example 2.1.1.3

Afrikaans version: …staan ek op en klim op my bedjie na die tralievenster bo, net om die nag te probeer snuif wat buite lê – nou al lank nie meer 'n Kaapse nag waarin mens jou die see kan verbeel nie, maar 'n Transvaalse. (33)

Gloss: …I stand up and climb on my little bed to reach the barred window above, only to try and sniff the night which lies outside – now no longer the Cape night where one can imagine the sea, but a Transvaal one.

English version: …I stop to get on my bunk and touch, with my fingertips, the high barred window, trying to sniff the night outside – no longer a Cape night with an imaginable sea, but the Transvaal **darkness where I'm now awaiting the dawn of the last day**. (30)

Once again, the element of darkness is added, and is further emphasized by its juxtaposition with dawn. Joseph's life is filled with light and shadows. The English version, it seems, further emphasizes his precarious situation. He is a brown man in love with a white woman. He has moments of love and joy; yet he is doomed. He is an educated man who hopes for a good life, yet the blood of his ancestors before him flows in his veins and has doomed his fate. South African reality itself is one of endless juxtapositions. Great beauty merges with injustice and cruelty. People of different skin colour share a common history and experience, yet they remain forever segregated. Every dawn has its darkness; yet there is a dawn after every evening.

Brink, it seems, not only inserts this motif of darkness in those parts of the text where it would be expected - i.e. when there is talk of death, or when difference of skin

colour is manifest – but attaches it to the most trivial of descriptions, as if to stress its omnipresence.

Example 2.1.1.4

Afrikaans version: …op die ou end steek ek net my hand uit en stoot die deur toe, sonder haas of spanning en selfs sonder drif. (13)

Gloss: …at the end I just stick out my hand and push the door closed, without any haste or tension and even without any enthusiasm.

Afrikaans version: In the end I simply lift my hand very calmly and push the **dark** door shut. (9)

Example 2.1.1.5

Afrikaans version: …het my ma gedreig, of Antjie Somers kom vang vir jou en sy draai jou knaterjies vir jou af… (86)

Gloss: …my mother threatened, or else Antjie Somers will come and catch you and twist your balls off…

English version: …or else the terrible **dark** woman Antjie Somers would come at night and wring my balls… (79)

It appears that Brink has purposefully added these "descriptions of darkness" to his English version, and perhaps his title choice was his way of pointing this out. Brink, in his second version, has clearly explicitated. Interestingly, change of title in translations is in itself a common translation phenomenon (see Toury 1977, p. 77).

The English title *Knowledge of Evening* creates associations of sadness, darkness, confusion and termination – all evoked by the word "evening". The word "darkness" renders the implicit explicit as if to say to the English reader (including non-South Africans): "I'm talking of darkness. There is a lot of darkness in this novel and much of it is emphasized through its juxtaposition to light and the colour white." This shift could either have been a result of a decision to emphasize this fact or of the assumption that the Afrikaans reader did not need this special focus, being naturally familiar with South African reality, and hypersensitive to themes of colour and dark versus light, so that s/he would "read the darkness between the lines" without further commentary.

2.1.2 Narrator Credibility in Brink's Text

Another discrepancy between the two versions relates to Joseph's narration of the two-hundred-year story of his family, in which he often dwells on the fact that the story is one he heard from his mother, who had heard it from those before her. But the concepts of history and narration, fact and fiction are not at all similar in the English and Afrikaans versions. Joseph begins the story of his family thus:

Example 2.1.2.1

Afrikaans version: Die verhaal van my herkoms het my ma my kleintyd gereeld saam met stories uit die Bybel vertel. (41)

Gloss: The story of my origin was often told me by my mother in childhood, along with Bible stories.

English version: The story of our family which my mother so regularly told me in my youth **with endless variations and additions and embroideries from her active imagination**, was usually interspersed with stories from the Bible. (35)

Whereas the Afrikaans does not cast any doubt on the story told by Joseph's mother, the English version undermines her credibility.

Example 2.1.2.2

Afrikaans version: Vir haar was ons verhaal eenvoudig die een bietjie trots waaraan sy kon vashou, haar enigste respektabelheid… (41)
Gloss: For her, our story was simply the one bit of pride that she could hang onto, her only bit of respectability…
English version: To her, our story, **despite the twists and turns she gave it in her manifold renderings**, was the one abiding thing of comfort and pride… (35)

Once again on the very same page Joseph emphasizes that his mother's story is not only embroidered, but often twisted and distorted.

Example 2.1.2.3

Afrikaans version: Telkens wanneer ek self die geskiedenis moes aankoor, is daar oor Jakob bygesê hoe feilloos hy die kleinste besonderhede kon onthou… (74)
Gloss: Often when I would have to recite the history, it would be said about Jakob how flawlessly he could remember the tiniest detail…

English version: Whenever my mother told me the story she insisted on Jacob's extraordinary faculty for remembering the smallest detail. **She, of course, compensated for the lack of this faculty in herself by relying on her equally extraordinary fantasy**. (68)

Joseph refers to his mother's poor memory, to the point where, much of what she says is fantasy, thus shedding a different light on the narration, and, in fact, on the entire reading of the text. While the reader of the Afrikaans text may find him/herself relating to the narration as an almost historical truth, the English reader is often forced to detach her/himself from the "historical" storyline and remember that much of it may be fantasy. This change is not limited to Joseph's mother. In fact, the English protagonist himself is not quite the same as the Afrikaans one. For example:

Example 2.1.2.4

Afrikaans version: Dit kan wees dat my ma, of haar voorgangers, groot gedeeltes van die oorlewering verdraai of uit die verbeelding aangevul het. Maak dit saak? Ek het dit vrywillig aanvaar soos dit aan my oorgelewer is, en 'n mitiese moontlikheid kan waarder wees as feite. (41)

Gloss: It might be that my mother, or her ancestors, twisted large parts of the narration, or filled these up with imagination. Does it make a difference? I accepted this naturally as it was told to me, and a mythical possibility could be even truer than facts.

English version: What has been delivered to me, distorted by retelling over many generations **reshaped and re-created by myself** through the years and through my

months of imprisonment, **is no longer history at all but mythology**. Yet how often in the course of time has mythical possibility not proved more valid than historical fact? (36)

In this example, Joseph, the narrator and protagonist, admits that he himself is guilty of reshaping and recreating parts of the story. Joseph of the Afrikaans text emerges as completely reliable and sincere and the account of his family history is perceived as accurate, at least as far as he knows it. Joseph of the English version, like his mother, becomes the storyteller who may also be prone to exaggeration and fantasy.

Interestingly, in his examination of Beckett's *Murphy*, written originally in English and later in French, Anthony Jones (cited by Fitch 1988, p. 48) finds that in the French version "there is a subtle shift in perspective which intensifies the distance separating narrator from protagonist" and that his shortcomings and inadequacies become more exposed (this is, in fact, a form of explicitation). Jones maintains that the French Murphy is presented in a somewhat less positive light, and he offers an interesting explanation. Perhaps it is the text's very status as a translation that causes this change of perspective. He further proposes that the act of self-translation is conducted in a climate of greater detachment than that involved in original creation, and that the self-translation may trigger off a more critical reevaluation of the primary text.

In keeping with our findings, perhaps Brink is making a statement about the very nature of his act of self-translation by rendering the narrating characters less reliable. He may be suggesting that this self-translated text is not as reliable as an original and

should not be read as one. Alternatively, by revising the second version, he may be making the statement that the first version should not be taken at face value. In keeping with modern translation theory, the texts seem to be offering commentary one on the other, and even complementing each other.

When it comes to the element of darkness then the reader who reads both versions will be aware of the differences; i.e. of the non-presence of explicit darkness in one version versus its elaborated presence in the other. Thus the bilingual reader, who reads the Afrikaans text after having read the English, will probably be hypersensitive to the element of darkness, which will now take the form of an "absent-presence" in the text. It follows that a bilingual reading of the text i.e. the reading of both versions may make for an enhanced understanding of the author's intention and dilemmas.

As for the difference in the narrator's credibility, the English reader reads the various narrations with some reservation, whereas the Afrikaans reader has more reason to accept what is said at face value. Brink may have found this necessary, seeing that he had very different readers in mind and may have wished to tone down the harsh reality for the English reader, by distancing the reader from the narrator and calling the narrator's credibility into question. Alternatively, making Joseph and his mother more prone to exaggeration and imagination may serve to make the characters more human and more likable. Thus, Joseph of the Afrikaans might be viewed in light of the English and vice versa, and the bilingual reader will have both versions in mind. If s/he compares and contrasts the two texts, s/he will be influenced by **both**. These observations appear to strengthen the assumption that the English version is indeed a translation i.e. inter alia, a complement of the Afrikaans that renders comment on it.

Brink has achieved this by applying common translation strategies: explicitation and rationalization. The further fact that the reading of both versions gives a clearer picture than each version can give on its own, fits in well with modern theories, such as Lambert (1995), which claim that the original is never the only model for translation. The fact that Brink often adds and explicitates in his second version illustrates that self-translators, like other translators, tend to make such alterations. It is even possible that as "privileged" translators they make even more use of these, taking advantage of the authority that comes with authorship.

2.1.3 Other Differences in Brink's Afrikaans and English Versions

In the previous section we discussed narrator credibility and the effect this had on the reader's perception of the character and his narration. Below are examples of other apparent discrepancies between the Afrikaans and English versions. Once again, these will be discussed in terms of common translation strategies, including universals, and what these tell us about Brink's self-translated text.

Numerous additions, omissions and other shifts are apparent in Brink's English version. Those pertaining to translation of proper names, dialect structures, *realia* and interesting Afrikaans constructions will be elaborated upon in the next chapter.

The first example refers to Joseph's description of his trial. Sitting in the dock, Joseph scans the white audience, which he views as malicious and biased.

Example 2.1.3.1

Afrikaans version: …een dame met 'n pers geblomde hoed vlak by die beskuldige bank wat telkens so heftig hoofknikkend op bepaalde sensusionele besonderhede gereageer het dat ek in haar die skare se kollektiewe stem as't ware kon hoor uitroep: "Hang hom!" (17)

Gloss: …one lady with a pink floral hat right next to the accused bench, who would violently nod her head at certain sensational details so very often, that I heard through her the collective voice, so to speak, crying out: "Hang him!"

English version: …a lady with a floral hat who regularly **interrupted the first days' proceedings by exclaiming very loudly and adamantly: Hang him!** Until she was escorted outside, with considerable difficulty, by two burly court sergeants. (13)

Joseph's interpretation of the lady's nodding in the Afrikaans version becomes reality in the English one. With narrator credibility reduced in the English version, the English reader might be prone to take some of Joseph's perceptions as exaggerations or imagination. However, in this case, it must have been important for Brink to emphasize the underlying prejudices; i.e. that the white people in the crowd were inclined against Joseph and had regarded him as guilty from the outset. Had the English version neglected to provide a description of the lady's nodding and her harsh utterance, and had it merely left it in the form of Joseph's commentary on the situation, this would have come across as less reliable. This might explain the shift in the English. In the English version the lady does in fact call out "Hang him!" It is as though Brink is offering his own commentary on the first version and saying: "Yes, Joseph was right in believing her to be against him! I am giving my seal of approval".

Example 2.1.3.2

Afrikaans version: Ek het self baie vriende wat nie blank is nie. (28)

Gloss: I myself have friends that are not white.

English version: I've got many **black** friends myself. (25)

The English is more explicit, and uses the derogatory "black", in keeping with the elaborated "darkness motif".

Example 2.1.3.3

Afrikaans version: "Lucy, julle maak die skepsel vir die verderf groot. Een van die dae ken hy nie meer sy plek nie." (86)

Gloss: Lucy, you're bringing up the lad spoiled rotten. One of these days he will no longer know his place.

English version: Lucy, if you go on like this, that *klonkie* is going straight to hell. One of these days he won't know his place any more, let me tell you. (79)

The English version portrays the situation in its most ugly form. The "lad" makes way for the very derogatory and racist *klonkie* (brown boy). This example, too, may indicate that the second version emphasizes certain elements that are not highlighted in the first version, to fill in knowledge that the English reader is lacking and sensitivities that the Afrikaans reader naturally has.

Example 2.1.3.4

Afrikaans version: Een somer het ons appels ook ontvang, toe daar ‘n groot surplus was en iemand gereël het dat dit nie alles vir die varke gegooi word nie. (110)

Gloss: One summer we also got apples, when there was a big surplus, and somebody had arranged that not all would be thrown to the pigs.

English version: One summer we received apples too, when there was a huge surplus and somebody suggested that we should be **allowed to share it with the pigs**. (103)

Joseph relates his childhood as a coloured boy growing up on a white farm. While the Afrikaans version points out (in a neutral tone) the fact that someone had thought about the poor coloured children, the English is very cynical, and focuses on the fact that the coloured children and the pigs are one and the same.

In this instance as well, Brink seems to have found it necessary to paint things more vividly for the English reader. Whether he does so because he thinks the English reader needs to be shocked when reading about South African reality (after all, this is a political novel), and assumes that this can only be achieved using more extreme descriptions, or whether the English text is once again a commentary on the Afrikaans – we have tried to show that the texts are complementary, i.e. each text in turn offers something that the other does not, and as implied by Steiner (2000) the reading of an original and its translation can provide a deeper understanding of the work as a whole.

The book begins with Joseph's description of his trial. An apparent difference between the two versions in this scene is the role of the judge versus that of Joseph's lawyer. While the judge is dominant in the Afrikaans version, taking charge of the proceedings and constantly interrupting with various remarks - often quite cynical – this role seems to be taken up by Joubert, Joseph's attorney, in the English version. In fact, some of the text spoken by the judge in the Afrikaans text is assigned to Joubert in the English**.**

In the following, Mr. Cole, a white man who had loved the murdered Jessica, and who was naturally jealous of her love for Joseph, is on the stand. The State is using him as a witness to implicate Joseph and substantiate the sexual relationship that existed between Joseph and Jessica, and, subsequently, Joseph's guilt in the murder. Mr. Cole is clearly not a very reliable witness and gives the impression of one very confused and emotional. Below are the remarks made by the judge (in the Afrikaans version) and those of Joubert (in the English version), after Cole explains that he had persevered with his attentions to Jessica in spite of her love for Joseph only because he wished to help her. It may be noted that in context the judge's remarks (and Joubert's in the English version) are extremely sarcastic, and present Cole in a non-complimentary light.

Example 2.1.3.5

Afrikaans version: Die regter: "En uit suiwer altruistiese oorwegings wou jy haar help?" (31)

Gloss: The judge: "And out of pure altruistic motives you wanted to help her?"

English version: "And your motives for helping her were completely altruistic?" [Said by Joubert as is indicated later on in the passage.] (28)

Example 2.1.3.6

Afrikaans version: "'n Goeie Liberal, mnr. Cole," het die reg onbewoë opgemerk. (32)

Gloss: "A good Liberal, Mr. Cole," commented the judge, unmoved.

English version: "A good liberal, Mr. Cole," **Joubert** said dryly. (29)

In attempting to account for the change, we suggest that Brink, "given a second chance", may have decided that it was not quite appropriate to have the judge make cynical remarks in the middle of a trial. While this may be less awkward to the Afrikaans reader (the Afrikaans judicial system consists of a judge with no jury), it might seem more awkward to the English reader abroad. This may be an instance of rationalization, where the translator attempts to smooth out "wrinkles" in the original. Alternatively, as we have tried to demonstrate, Brink's tone changes in the English, becoming more cynical, more realistic and less prone to toning down dubious aspects of South African reality. Inter alia, this was demonstrated by the fact that the white woman in the crowd, during the trial (see example 2.1.3.1), becomes much more menacing and racist in the English version, metamorphosing from one whom Joseph might view as wishing his death, to one who actually does.

On the whole, the trial in its English version attempts to create a harsher picture of the White South African court, highlighting the fact that Joseph was doomed from the

start. In the two examples above, the judge (in the Afrikaans version) seems unimpressed by Cole and his testimony. This serves to soften the situation: if the judge sees right through Cole, he is probably inclined towards Joseph. In the English version, however, the judge remains aloof, stern and disinterested. But the remarks are important to the plot and cannot be done away with altogether, so Brink puts them in the mouth of Joseph's lawyer, Joubert. Having Joubert portray Cole in a negative light does not necessarily suggest a more empathic attitude towards Jospeh. It is only to be expected that Joseph's attorney would do just that. This fits in with our assumption regarding the English version: Brink seems to want to paint a harsher reality, one less empathic towards non-Whites, and conveys the sense of helplessness that a victim of discrimination might feel.

Another discrepancy that recurs in Brink's second version is the shifts noticeable in sexual descriptions.

Example 2.1.3.7

Afrikaans version: …die donker goud van haar skaamhaar. (25)

Gloss: …the dark gold of her pubic hair. [Literally in Afrikaans: shame-hair].

English version: …the dark gold of her **love-hair**. (22)

Example 2.1.3.8

Afrikaans version: In die mite van ons stam is Lea ‘n klein maagd wat maar pas puberteit bereik het, dertien of veertien, **en haar borsies nog jong kwepertjies wat geen man gekneus het nie**. (42)

Gloss: According to the myth of our tribe, Lea was a small virgin barely past the age of puberty, thirteen or fourteen years old, **and her breasts were still young little quinces which no man had bruised**.

English version: …and the daughter of men was a young slave girl of thirteen or fourteen and presumably Malay. (36)

In the examples above, it will be noticed that the English softens or does away with sexual descriptions.

Example 2.1.3.9

Afrikaans version: Die baas se oudste seun was toe naasteby hubaar en sy pa wou hom graag, voor hy vrou vat, in die huwelikspraktyk inwy. Daarom het Claassen vir sy seun ‘n ervare vrou onder die werksvolk gaan uitsoek (44)

Gloss: The Boss’ oldest son was more or less of marriageable age and his father was eager that before he took a wife, he would be inaugurated in the ways of marriage. Therefore Claassen went to look for an experienced woman for his son among the working class.

English version: **The farmer's eldest son**, approaching the age of discretion, chose her as the **object of some experimentation** to prepare himself for matrimony. (38)

Example 2.1.3.10

Afrikaans version: Sy het probeer vlug maar is deur die bruilofgaste voorgeheer en platgetrek, en Moos is nader gepor. **Hy het hulle skaapagtig aangegryns en nie mooi besef wat daar van hom verwag word nie, maar dit is baie gou aan hom oorgedra. 'n Paar lanterns is aangedra en onder luide aanmoediging van al die gaste en die onaardse geweekluug van Sbongile** het Moos haar, aangehelp deur 'n sambok, stuiptrekkend verkrag. (48)

Gloss: She tried to escape but was prevented by the wedding guests and forced flat down, while Moos was lured forward. **He grinned at them sheepishly not quite realizing what was expected of him, but this was quickly conveyed to him. A few lanterns were hung up, and with the loud encouragements of all the guests**, and the unearthly sorrow of Sbongile, Moos, helped by the sjambok whip, raped her convulsively.

English version: Sbongile tried to flee, but was caught and forced to the ground amid great shouts of glee, and Moses, encouraged with a Sjambok, was forced to rape the loudly wailing Sbongile. (41)

The two examples above describe a very difficult scene in the book. One of Joseph's ancestors, Lea, a coloured slave-girl was raped by one of the coloured farm boys as part of the "fun and preparation" for the boss' son's marriage. Whereas the "sex party" in example 2.1.3.9 is the father's idea in the Afrikaans version, it is the son's idea in the English. Furthermore, in example 2.1.3.10 the English is shorter. Brink may have wished to concentrate less on the sexual, and more so on the racial issues,

injustice and segregation. He may have reread his original text and found the Afrikaans to be too crude, only to tone it down in the second version.

There are other shifts still. The following two examples illustrate significant omissions, of matters that foreshadow events that are yet to come in the Afrikaans. Brink seems to have decided to leave them out in the English, whether for narrative or stylistic reasons.

Example 2.1.3.11

Afrikaans version: Na wat tevore gebeur het, kan mens verstaan dat Adam bekommerd so gewees het. Dit verklaar stellig sy optrede, wat anders werklik buitensporig sou voorgekom het. (44)

Gloss: In light of what happened before that, one could understand that Adam would have been worried. This would certainly explain his actions, which would otherwise have seemed rash.

English version: Text is missing in English. (38)

Example 2.1.3.12

Afrikaans version: En ek rekent die moiete en verdriet, soos die woord sê, is nou klaar, allie jarre, nou kan die ouvrou bietjie genadebrood vriet. (61)

Gloss: And I thought that all the hardships and suffering, as is written in the books, are now over, all those years, now the old woman can enjoy a bit of kindness from others. [Written in dialect in the original.]

English version: En so he got married en' I can retire a bit in my old age. (55)

It was our purpose in the preceding sections to demonstrate that Brink makes use of common translation procedures in his self-translation. Notwithstanding the fact that Brink himself is a "privileged" translator, who enjoys a liberty not usually bestowed on all translators, the path he has chosen to follow is strictly a "translation path", featuring well-known translation phenomena: the English text focuses on the motif of darkness while the Afrikaans text does not, at least not explicitly; the narrator of the English text is presented as less reliable, which may make for a different perception of the character himself and his narration; the English version paints a harsher picture of South African reality as far as racial issues go; the English was less crude in relating sexual descriptions; the English version does away with foreshadowing and holds back information; and Brink appears to have introduced stylistic revisions in his second version.

From his own testimony about the translation process (Brink 1976, p. 46), we know that Brink, as a translator, found it necessary to omit, to add, to explicitate and to tone down. The reason he gives for this is that no two languages carry the same load. In an attempt to make this process of self-translation better understood, Brink makes the following comparison: Translating one's work into another language medium is similar to a painter who produces a work in a range of reds and then repeats it in hues of blue. The colours would most likely impose their different "logics" on the works, even to the extent of demanding a change in shapes or textures. Furthermore, after working with both colours, the painter will have probably discovered much about red through working with blue and vice versa (Brink 1976, p. 46). In other words,

translating one's work into another language often gives the author further insight into the original work. This holds true for all translations, and is in keeping with the notion of translations being complementary texts, and the assumption that every translation adds a new dimension to the original work. When an author translates her/himself (in much the same way as other translators do), s/he discovers certain things about the original text that were only implicit beforehand; e.g. the hidden darkness motif in the Afrikaans brought to the surface in the English, in Brink's text. S/he is then able to bring these across in the new version; i.e. the self-translation becomes a projection and elaboration of the first, just as any translation is. In other words, what has been noticed is that the identity of the translator is of less importance than the process itself. Various shifts, as they occur, are an inherent part of the translation process, and are not translator-dependent. This means that we can expect the self-translator to be performing the same procedures as other translators. The authority that s/he has as author does not effect the translation process as such, though it does serve to highlight it in the "noise-free" environment that has been created.

As has been demonstrated by the comparison of Brink's versions, translations are not inferior to the original texts; rather, they are often elaborations of the ST, provide insightful commentary on the ST and improve what is perceived as needing improvement. Of course, not every reader is aware of these embellishments and commentaries provided by the translation on the original text. Such awareness most often comes with some sort of familiarity with the original text, something that cannot be expected of all readers.

Fitch (1988, p. 127) distinguishes three types of readers. The first is the one who does not know the language in which the original was written. Although he is aware of the fact that the text is a translation, s/he reads it in the same way as s/he would read an original, simply because the reader believes the sole purpose of the translated text was to make the original available to him/her. In the present case, this would apply to most of the non-South African English readers of Brink's text. The second type of reader is the one who knows the language of the original but is not familiar with the text in that language. Such a reader would be able to read the translation with the missing original in mind, and may even attempt to reconstruct it. The absent original would be present in her/his reading, in the sense that s/he was aware of but would not know how different or similar it was to what s/he was reading. In the present case, the second reader would be the South African who was able to read Afrikaans but who considered English his/her first language. The third type of reader is the bilingual who has read both original and translation. While the second type of reader may try to reconstruct the original, the bilingual reader reads the translation in light of the original, comparing the two (ibid., p. 128). In the context of Brink's painting metaphor, the one who sees both paintings before him/her can become more aware of certain things in the other. Awareness of certain aspects through the colour red may bring to the surface certain aspects and elements in the blue that would have gone unnoticed without the juxtaposition.

2.2 Mathee's *Kringe in 'n Bos* and *Circles in a Forest*

Saul Barnard, the protagonist of *Kringe in 'n Bos* / *Circles in a Forest*, was born to a family of generations-old Afrikaner woodcutters, living in the Knysna forest in the 19th century. As he matures into manhood, he realizes that the woodcutters' lives are bitter and useless, and that they are like putty in the hands of the English wood-buyers of the village. He tries to make his family realize that they will forever be exploited at the hands of the wood-buyers if they don't stand up for their rights, and also warns them against the active role they are playing in destroying the forest and its wildlife - by felling without any restrictions and shooting at elephants - but they, uneducated and naïve as they are, refuse to listen, and banish him. He then finds a job as a yard-boy in the house of one of the wealthiest wood-buyers of the village, MacDonald. The world beyond the forest is a cruel one for the poor Afrikaner boy. He is constantly made to feel inferior by MacDonald and the other English townspeople. The woodcutters regard him as a traitor who has gone to work for the wood-buyers; the people of the town see him as wild and uneducated.

But his life changes when Kate, MacDonald's daughter befriends him. She brings him books and he learns how to read. He works hard, and though constantly exploited by the cruel MacDonald, saves enough money to break free.

Saul's story and the circles of his life (some of them vicious) merge with another creature – Old Foot, the oldest and most feared elephant of the forest. From a tender age, Saul has felt that there is a supernatural connection between himself and this majestic beast. He feels that the old elephant has always watched over him, and was

always there for him at the most crucial and painful of moments. So when Saul, on the verge of boarding a ship that will take him away to find a better future abroad, discovers that Old Foot is to be hunted down, he returns to the forest to pay his last respects and shoot Old Foot before anyone else does. This journey back into the forest, and the endless walking around in circles, in an attempt to find Old Foot, make Saul aware of the circles in his own life. He realizes his future is in the forest with his beloved Kate. He finally comes full circle and realizes there is still hope for a better future for his own people and for himself. There is yet hope to redeem the woodcutter from the misery and exploitation that are his daily bread, and there is yet hope for the forest itself.

Unlike in the case of Brink, the examination of Matthee's English versions did not reveal any thematic changes, or significant changes in plot. However, as was expected, there were numerous instances of explicitation, omissions, simplification and normalization (i.e. revisions in style, sentence structure and textual organization).

2.2.1 Additions in the English Text

While this text manifested fewer shifts, and no apparent change in character description, point of view or thematic focus – there were nonetheless numerous additions. All in all, 22 additions were noticed (excluding forms of explication relating to *realia*).

Example 2.2.1.1

Afrikaans version: - “Baas Saul?” - “Ek kom leen die geweer, Maska.” (1)

Gloss: - “Master Saul?” - “I’ve come to borrow the gun, Maska.”

English version: - “Master Saul?” **A thousand questions flash through his eyes**. “I've come to borrow the gun, Maska.” (9)

Example 2.2.1.2

Afrikaans version: Toe ‘n sweep dorp se kant klap, het hy geweet dis nog ‘n swaargelaaide wa met hout uit die Bos. (4)

Gloss: When a whip cracks from the direction of the village, he knew it was another wagon, heavily-laden with wood from the forest.

English version: When a whip cracked from the direction of the **little whitewashed, thatched-roof village on the shore**, he knew it was another heavily loaded wagon from the Forest. (12)

Example 2.2.1.3

Afrikaans version: “Tien ander is glo saam met hom deur die skerm. (5)

Gloss: “Ten others are believed to have walked with him through the shelter.”

English version: “Apparently ten others went with him through the shelter,” **the old man stammered**. (14)

Example 2.2.1.4

Afrikaans version: No text. (17)

English version: Saul could not yet believe that his mother and Sara were really dead. (29)

Example 2.2.1.5

Afrikaans version: Toe oom Anneries en Jozef fyn ruigte to loop… (30)

Gloss: When uncle Anneries and Joseph walked delicately into the underbush…

English versions: When the others walked into the underbush **to pee**. (44)

Example 2.2.1.6

Afrikaans version: So naby dat hulle die takke kon hoor breek. (34)

Gloss: So near him that they could hear the branches breaking.

English version: So near to them, **that when the elephants started breaking through the underbush**, they could hear each branch snap. (49)

Example 2.2.1.7

Afrikaans version: …slaan sy haar hande saam. (49)

Gloss: …folding her arms.

English version: folding her hands **over her flat breasts**. (67)

Example 2.2.1.8

Afrikaans version: No text. (214)

English version: If I had space, I would pitch ten more tents. As you know yourself, we already had to take down some of the interior walls twice to enlarge the dining room and the bar. (260)

Example 2.2.1.9

Afrikaans version: …volgende Sondag. (235)

Gloss: …next Sunday.

English version: …next Sunday **or Monday**. (285)

Example 2.2.1.10

Afrikaans version: Text missing. (278)

English version: He would keep watch over his feelings for Kate day by day, until it was no longer necessary. (335)

As shown in this selection of ten of the twenty-two instances, the following shifts of translation were manifest: explicitation, intensification and normalization. In examples 2.2.1.1, 2.2.1.4 and 2.2.1.10 the added elements give a more vivid picture of the character's emotions; examples 2.2.1.2, .2.2.1.3, 2.2.1.5 and 2.2.1.7 add detail; example 2.2.1.9. may be an attempt to make the conversation sound more natural and realistic.

2.2.2 Omissions in the English Text

In the entire English text, there were nine instances of omissions that go beyond single words. These are presented below.

Example 2.2.2.1

Afrikaans version: …was lig in oom Freek Terblans se huis. Die godsiekte het daar ook ingetrek. **By oom Stoffel Weyers-hulle ook**. (16)

Gloss: …there was light in uncle Freek Terblans' house. The godsickness had moved in there, too. **Also in uncle Stoffel Weyers' place**.

English version: …light burned in Fred Terblans's house; the godsickness had moved in there too. (27)

Stoffel Weyers is not mentioned again in the text, and perhaps that is the reason for the omission.

Example 2.2.2.2

Afrikaans version: "Ek het gekyk en daar is nie gal in sy kop nie." (26)

Gloss: I looked and there was no gall in its head.

English version: Text missing. (40)

One of the facts Saul has been taught by the elder woodcutters is that the Blue Buck's gall is situated in its head. When Saul catches a Blue Buck on his fourteenth birthday

and slits open its head finding no gall, he starts asking himself questions about the society in which he has grown up. Are there other lies circulating? How naïve are the woodcutters of the forest? Do they believe anything told them by those before them? In the Afrikaans text, Saul confronts his father and neighbour with the fact that he has found no gall in the head. In the English text, Saul simply asks his father's friend, who has often told him the story of the Blue Buck's gall, if he has actually seen the gall in the buck's head. He does not come straight out with the fact that he himself has checked and found it to be missing. This omission, too, does not seem to affect reader reception. We, as readers, are aware of the fact that Saul knows there is no gall in the Buck's head and that this fact has stirred up a restlessness in him about his people and their customs and beliefs. Mathee conveys this in the English by having Saul ask his father's friend if he has seen it for himself, and having the latter give no satisfactory reply. Perhaps she was trying to put things more subtly, after contemplating the first version and deciding that it was overstated.

Example 2.2.2.3

Afrikaans version: Sy regterbeen kramp van die inmekaarsit, maar hy kan dit nie waag om hom reguit te maak en in die donker teen 'n tak te skop nie. As die olifant, of hoeveel daar ook al is, nog nie agtergekom het dat hier iewers 'n vyand skuil nie, gaan hy hulle beslis nie rede gee om dit agter te kom nie. Om ligdag te moet besluit of die olifant nog daar is, gaan in elk geval soos die gooi van 'n dobbelsteen wees. Dit klink of die geluid weer stil is. Hy luister sy ore stomp… Die lewe is 'n skewe sirkel. In sy kajuit op die *Pictor* is daar van die Bos net een ding wat hy met hom saamneem: die skets wat Kate van Oupoot gemaak het. (95)

Gloss: His right leg was cramped from sitting on it, but he couldn't risk sitting up straight and bumping against a branch in the dark. If the elephant, or however many there were out there, had not yet realized that there was an enemy lurking about, he will definitely not give them reason to realize this. To decide at daylight whether the elephant was there or not, would in any case be like the casting of a die. It sounds like the noise is still again. He listens till his ears are stuffed… Life is a crooked circle. In his cabin abroad the *Pictor* there is only one thing he has taken with him from the Forest: the sketch Kate had made of Old Foot.

English version: Missing entirely. (120)

This is the longest omission in the English version. Saul is in the forest in search of Old Foot. The paragraph in the Afrikaans text follows a few similar paragraphs in which Saul is contemplating life and the wisdom of elephants. Matthee may have felt that this paragraph was indeed superfluous. However, the omission of the last sentence may be pointing to something else. Since the entire narration is circular, i.e. the story begins when Saul is about to leave on the *Pictor*, and then goes back time and relates all that has happened to him from childhood till that point (with occasional reversions to the present), the fact that Saul has a sketch drawn by Kate foreshadows the fact that they will develop a relationship in the future. Matthee may have rethought this foreshadowing, and decided that she does not want to let the reader know of the relationship at this point.

Example 2.2.2.4

Afrikaans version: Sy was verbode… soos die klipkerkie met die puntvensters. (107)

Gloss: She was forbidden… like the stone church with the pointed windows.

English version: Text missing. (132)

Saul, MacDonald's yard-boy is in love with Kate, MacDonald's teenaged daughter. But he knows she is forbidden to him. He is a low-class Afrikaner, uneducated and despised. In the Afrikaans text he compares her to the church building, which was also forbidden to him, being from the Forest and not of good English stock. Matthee apparently decided to do away with it in the English version. Perhaps she thought it would sound too offensive to the English reader, and that it would be unsettling to have the English Church itself shut its doors to those who were different.

Example 2.2.2.5

Afrikaans version: En MacDonald het net een bord laat inpak. Een mes, een vurk. Genadelik darem twee bekers, anders moes hy sy koffie seker uit sy hand drink. (123)

Gloss: And MacDonald gave orders to pack only one plate. One knife, one fork. Mercifully, there were two cups, otherwise he would have to drink his coffee out of his hand.

English version: Text missing. (151)

MacDonald had ordered Saul to accompany an Englishman into the forest. The Englishman was on the lookout for gold and Saul was his guide, taking care of all his needs. The Afrikaans text emphasizes MacDonald's cruelty in that he has sent Saul and the English guest into the Forest, but took care to provide utensils for the Englishman alone. These details serve to emphasize MacDonald's contempt for Saul, which the reader is already aware of. Perhaps Matthee, in her rewriting, felt that this description too was overstated.

Example 2.2.2.6

Afrikaans version: Teen 'n oopgekapte helling onderkant die tent-dorp het die hopies grond in die begraafplaas meer geword. (212)

Gloss: Against a clearing beneath the tent-village, the heaps of ground in the cemetery had become more.

English version: Text missing. (258)

After gold was found in the forest, more and more settlers are pitching up their tents and calling the forest their home in a frenzy of gold-searching. Saul is heartbroken as he watches the forest destroyed by strangers who fell trees, shoot elephants and other wildlife and litter the place that has always been his natural home. The gold-seekers aren't having an easy time in this new rough terrain, and many are dying from hunger, exposure and diseases. It appears that Matthee has decided to tone down her English description.

Example 2.2.2.7

Afrikaans version: "Luister, meneer, my man is die besturende direkteur van die Bendigo-goutmaatskappy en ek belower jou, hy sal hiervan hoor!" (218)

Gloss: "Listen, mister, my husband is the managing director of the Bendigo Gold Company and I promise you, he will hear of this!"

English version: Text missing. (266)

Saul is helping guide a fresh group of gold-seekers into the forest. He is sick at heart at the myriads of newcomers flocking into his forest, and doesn't spare an opportunity to mock them and tantalize them. The above is a remark from one of the "important ladies" after Saul has commented nonchalantly that there are plenty of elephants around and that they are the ultimate bosses of the forest. Once again, the omission does not affect the plot, nor does it detract from Saul's character or theme. On the other hand, it is a foreshadowing, and Matthee tends to do away with these in her second version. Note that Brink too, omitted instances of foreshadowing in the second version of the text.

Example 2.2.2.8

Afrikaans version: Ek sal wag. (247)

Gloss: I will wait.

English version: Text missing. (300)

Saul has taken Kate to his forest hideout, after she insists on joining him there. Since she hasn't told anyone in the village that she has gone, Saul suggests that he go to the village and make it known that she is okay and will be back in a few days. She wants to join him but he insists on going alone. He instructs her not to leave his hideout and roam around. She asks if he will return to her. He answers in the affirmative and then she replies, "I will wait." Here too Matthee seems to have eliminated information that might hint at things that are yet to be.

Example 2.2.2.9

Afrikaans version: Nadat sy weg is, het dit hom ure gekos om weer sy gevoelens oor Kate onder beheer te kry, om Beth nie agterna te sit en te sê hy sal Sondag daar wees nie. (283)

Gloss: After she had left, it took him hours to get his feelings for Kate under control, not to run after Beth and tell her he will be there on Sunday.

English version: Text missing. (341)

Beth, Kate's friend, makes her appearance in Saul's forest hideout to convince him to see Kate. Though Saul and Kate have loved each other for years, they have always repressed their feelings, Saul especially so. Reality has slapped him too many times in the face and he is determined not to make room for love in his life again. In the English version, Matthee has decided to leave out the fact that Saul was really very deeply moved by the fact that Kate wants to see him. While the Afrikaans reveals Kate still has a place in Saul's heart and he is far from getting over her, the English prefers to keep us in the dark. This seems to be another instance of deleting a foreshadowing element.

While the shifts in Matthee's case – contrary to Brink's – do not appear to create significant changes in the story line, the characters or the reader's reception of these, the discrepancies between the two versions are still numerous, and many are non-obligatory shifts. Her English additions illustrate her attempt to add vivid descriptions of setting and character emotion. It almost seems like Matthee, having a chance to rewrite her text, wants to provide a more detailed and pleasurable reading. As for the omissions, foreshadowing is done away with, as are such descriptive passages that are presumably perceived as overstated or as unnecessary. In this sense, Matthee reconstructs her text in such a way that the turn of events becomes more intense. Knowledge is withheld to intensify the element of surprise. Referring to Nancy Huston's self-translations, von Flotow (forthcoming) mentions Huston's contention that self-translation improves the text. Federman (1996) too claims that self-translation often enriches the original and embellishes it, for the reason that the self-translator can take liberties with her/his own work since it belongs to her/him. Then again, this is not a unique feature of self-translation (notwithstanding the enhanced "freedom" of the author/translator) and "improving" the text whilst translating is probably a tendency shared by translators, regardless of their affinity to the text.

As for the status of the second versions, we have established that Brink's English version is indeed a translation of the Afrikaans, and as such is also a commentary on the original, and may be termed a complementary text. We have also made the point that it is the reader of both versions who gets the broadest picture. With regards to Matthee's text, we have established that the second version consists of various

revisions of the first version (though not deviating from it significantly), at least as far as style and plot development are concerned. In other words, though no commentary is explicitly offered, Matthee has still taken the opportunity to revise the text. The reader may find her changes to be of interest, and might even gain insights (whether about the text or Matthee herself) that the reader of one version only would be missing. For example, the reader of both versions might find it interesting that Matthee has eliminated instances of foreshadowing, and be more aware of the foreshadowing in the Afrikaans (after the reading of the English); s/he might also develop a critical attitude towards these.

Both Brink's translation as a commentary, an extension and complement of the first version, and Matthee's translation as a stylistic revision of the first are in keeping with Federman's (1996) observation about the self-translated text. The author, by using another language, may have a better chance of getting where s/he wants to go, i.e. of saying what s/he wants to say, and having the possibility of correcting the errors of the original text. The metaphor Federman uses is of a creative process attempted in the dark versus a creative process attempted in the light. While the original is a creation attempted in the dark, in ignorance and often in error, the act of translating (and especially self-translating) is a creative act performed in the light (the light of the original). As such, a self-translation enlightens the original, but also reasserts the knowledge already present in it (ibid., p. 3).

We have attempted to show that self-translations are in principle no different from other translations, and it seems that the translation process as carried out by the self-translators examined (though the two differed greatly – and perhaps because of this

fact) is very likely no different from that of other translators. The main distinction is that self-translations are the author's own reading of his/her work.

Fitch (1988, p.106), however, does take this distinction further claiming that whereas any translation offers its own perspective on the original, and these commentaries are not binding because they can always be replaced by any number of perspectives provided by other translations, this cannot hold true for self-translations. According to Fitch, a self-translation has an authority **that other translations lack**. Contemporary theorists such as Lambert (1995, cited in Tanqueiro 1998) would contest this statement, no doubt, and point out that every translation carries an authority. It is perhaps the purpose of this thesis to bridge the two and say the following: It cannot be contested that self-translators are privileged and enjoy a liberty like no other translator, yet the question that remains is what they ultimately do with this authority of theirs. In our examination of the self-translations of Brink and Matthee we have attempted to show that both have followed the standard translation path, and that all of the phenomena observed are well-known translation procedures. What is intriguing about this observation is that it is ultimately the **process -** the fact that a text has been transferred from one language medium to another - that determines the status of the product, rather than the identity/status of the **producer**.

Another point of interest demonstrated by Brink's text is that it is not only the second version that offers commentary on the first; the first is also able to furnish commentary on the second. For example, one who first reads the English version in light of the Afrikaans might reach the conclusion that Joseph and his mother's narrations are more credible than they might seem from the English version alone.

This means that the first version is as much supported by the second, as the second is supported by the first, in keeping with its definition as a complementary text. Fitch (ibid., p. 107) refers to the original and self-translation as two *interdependent* versions, i.e. the two are dependent on each other.

To return to the question raised in the Preface - whether self-translators are more faithful to their originals than are other translators, or less so - in light of what was said above, this question may no longer be relevant, as self-translators are simply translators, and do what other translators do; i.e. some produce texts that are more adequate (Toury 1995) while others produce texts that are more acceptable, and "faithfulness" is a relative and norm-based term. Matthee seems to have produced a second version that is, to a great extent, an adequate one, though in many senses it is also a domesticating translation (Venuti 1998), marked by some "acceptable" features. Brink's second version, on the other hand, has a much lower degree of adequacy than Matthee's, in that the discrepancies between the Afrikaans and English versions are numerous and very significant; however, his text is adequate in the sense that it retains some of the foreign overtones of the Afrikaans text (these points will be elaborated upon in Chapter Two). As pointed out by Toury himself (1995, p. 57), and as illustrated above, any translation is a compromise between adequacy and accuracy. Thus, any attempt to define texts using binary oppositions doesn't seem to work. Translations may be adequate on some levels, yet still display acceptable features and vice versa.

This leads us to semasiological and onomasiological modes of translation (see section 1 above), another binary opposition, or so it seems at first. To recapitulate what was

said earlier, a semasiological approach is one in which the translator produces in another language the **effect** that the original text had on him/her; an onomasiological one would be reproducing in another language the **meaning** that the original writer wished to communicate. As was explained in section 1 of this chapter, a self-translation may never seem to be purely semasiological for the reason that such a translation would have to be produced by one other than the author, who has no absolute knowledge of the author's intention. Walter Benjamins (1977) touches on the concept of *intention*, and implies that any intention of a text or of an author will change when the language is changed. In other words, meaning is embedded in language, and the way in which a language expresses itself determines (at least in part) what the *intentio* will be. Applying this to self-translation would mean that although the self-translator has the advantage of being an authority on the author's original *intentio*, the change in language inevitably leads to a change in *intentio* (see von Flotow, forthcoming). Thus, Brink writing in Afrikaans cannot have the same *intentio* as Brink writing in English. It follows that even the privileged self-translator can still produce a semasiological translation because the very change in language makes this possible. This further emphasizes the point that it is not the producer that is important, but the process of language transfer.

In this chapter we have tried to demonstrate how self-translators are, in fact, translators par excellence, and follow normal translation procedures. Now that this has been established, we will examine the translation strategies used by the self-translators in this study in an attempt to learn how they have tackled the translation of particularly challenging items. Chapter Two, therefore, will outline the translation strategies used by each of the self-translators for culture-specific items, and will make

comment on what the different choices might say about each author and his/her reason for self-translation, and the effect these have on the translation product.

Chapter Two: Translation Strategies in Self-Translated Texts

1. Theoretical Background

1.1 Elementary Theory

One of the most difficult problems any literary translator must face is that of culture transfer. The cultural specificity of most literary texts manifest itself in descriptions of setting and of characters. The former entails a specific national/geographic backdrop, and the latter centers on such features as proper names; a particular language; a particular way of expression; and a reality familiar to themselves. These elements, inter alia, make up a single term – culture. To use Ivir's words (1987, p. 35): "…language and culture are inextricably interwoven…the transference – in its literal, etymological meaning – of the linguistic expression is precisely an attempt to integrate elements of one culture into another."

Consequently, when approaching the translation of a literary text, the translator not only faces the challenge of translating languages, but also that of translating culture. This is expressed using Pavel Toper's words (as cited by Roberts 1992, p. 2): "As a cultural phenomenon, genuinely creative translation is, in its essence, dialectally contradictory by virtue of the fact that it must produce a work of national literature out of a work belonging to another language, while at the same time retaining those qualities that made it a work of art for its mother nation of that language."

In other words, every work contains words and combinations of words denoting objects and concepts – the *realia* – of a certain way of life, and the social and historical development of a given society, which would, inevitably, be foreign to another society. These *realia* (from the Latin *realis*) often present a problem in translation (Rozhin 2000, p. 140), since they have no exact equivalents in other languages.

Of course, the translation of *realia* must involve some kind of transfer of cultural references, which have been described as "any reference to a cultural entity which, because of its distance from the target culture, is characterized by a sufficient degree of opacity from the point of view of the target reader to constitute a translation problem" (Mailhac 1996, p. 173).

The particular language pair upon which the present study is based – English translations of Afrikaans texts - is unusual. In sharp contrast to English, Afrikaans, spoken by no more than 15 million people worldwide, is the official language of only one country in the world: South Africa, where it is in fact the mother tongue of a minority group, and a language with nationalistic overtones (see Preface). Notwithstanding the above, Afrikaans and English do not necessarily represent foreign cultures. Most Afrikaans speakers are also fluent speakers of English (one of the official languages of South Africa) and both languages are part of the same reality. However, since English is the cultural reflection of so many different cultures, the translator must bear in mind that the new text may be read not only by English-speaking South Africans, familiar with "Afrikaans culture" so that there will presumably be need for the special attention to cultural references.

With self-translations it stands to reason that many of the translation strategies stem from the translator's understanding/knowledge of the source text which will serve his/her objective when carrying out the translation[4]. We have chosen to focus on four areas of interest: proper names, Afrikaans dialect forms, the Afrikaans "double-structure"(an unusual construction that is missing in the English), and *realia* (miscellaneous culture-specific items not subsumed under the former categories). The initial examination will focus on the shifts with a twofold objective: to establish a verifiable description of the differences between the translations and their source text; and to determine which strategies were adopted by the translator. The comparison will be limited to chosen passages which include proper names, dialect, the double-structure and *realia*.

In the specific cases of proper name translation, the following categories will be used to identify the translation strategies used (Vermes 2003): **transference**, **translation proper**, **substitution** and **modification**.

Strategies for dialect translation will include **standardization**, **substitution**, **standardization + explanation** (Sánchez 1999, 304-305).

As for the "double-structure" we will make use of the categories offered by the various theories that we will be using. E.g. **transference**, **translation**, **modification**, **substitution** and **lexical creation**.

[4] Alternatively, apparent differences in translation strategies may be the result of policy dictated by an external authority such as a publisher.

When examining *realia*, we will use the categories offered by Ivir (1987): **borrowing**, **definition**, **literal translation**, **substitution**, **lexical creation**, **omission** and **addition.**

Following the analysis on the micro-level, we will discuss how the strategies used affect the text on the macro-level, and connect the choice of specific strategies to the *skopos* of the self-translation (Vermeer 2000). As pointed out by van Leuven-Zwart (1989, p. 154), differences between a translation and its original – i.e. shifts – may provide insights into the translation process as well as into the intended function of the translation in the target-language culture.

The translations of the two authors will also be compared and discussed: similar items (e.g. proper names) will be examined in order to observe the differences in strategy in relation to the translators' objectives.

Jiři Levý (1967) viewed translation as a process of decision- making, and discussed how this process, in turn, was influenced by norms. Toury (1980) took this notion further and claimed that translational norms govern the decision-making process in translating, and the type of equivalence achieved between original and translation as well as the strategies used to achieve this. Toury (1995) uses the term "initial norms" to describe those norms that dictate the way the translator will approach the translation (and which are often dictated by the publisher). When tackling a culture-specific or culturally sensitive text, this would relate, inter alia, to determining the extent of changes in setting, proper names, cultural references etc. This would mean that the translator may aim to make the cultural references transparent for the target

reader, and thus unnoticeable. Or else, s/he may purposefully add information that s/he believes is needed to supplement the knowledge available to the target reader (Mailhac 1996, p. 174).

Venuti (1998) refers to domestication (making the text familiar to the reader by bringing the foreign culture closer to his/her own) and foreignization (letting the reader enter the foreign culture and making him/her feel the cultural and linguistic differences[5]). If target-cultural conventions are followed in the translation process, the text will be readily acceptable in the target culture, but will lose some of the characteristics that would have given it a foreign or even exotic feeling.

To some extent, these paradigms overlap: an "adequate translation" (Toury 1995) would be one that is more likely to preserve the foreign (Venuti 1998); an "acceptable translation" attempts a cultural transplantation (Mailhac 1996) or a domestication of the source text (Venuti 1998).

In this chapter it will be demonstrated how strategy choice on the micro-level affects the text on the macro-level and determines the general translation approach (whether "adequate" or "acceptable") as well as the type of text produced ("foreignizing" or "domesticating").

[5] It must be noted that while an "exoticizing" approach paints for the target reader an exaggerated (and often inaccurate) picture of the source culture in an attempt to retain a very strong foreign flavour in an almost superficial manner, a "foreignizing" approach simply retains the foreign elements found in the source text.

1.2 Theory Related to the Translation of Specific Items

1.2.1 Proper Names

The translation of proper names has often been considered a simple process – a mere transference from one language to another; in keeping with the view that they are no more than labels used to identify a person, a thing, a place (see Sciarone 1967, p. 86 or Vendler 1975, p. 117). It has been shown, however, that proper names do carry meaning beyond the external labeling - translating them involves a decision-making process (Vermes 2003, p. 90). Proper names may receive the following treatments in the process of translation: **transference, substitution, translation, modification.**

Transference is "the process of transferring a SL word to a TL text as a translation procedure" (Newmark 1988, p. 81). In simpler terms, this is when we incorporate the SL proper name unchanged into the TL text, either because it is a label and has no meaning beyond the thing it denotes, or because any change to it would be losing something else of importance (Vermes, 2003 p. 92).

Substitution is the translator's default option and is used when the source language name has a conventional counterpart in the TL. (ibid., p. 93-94).

Translation means "rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way that the author intended the text" (Newmark 1988, p. 5). In the case of proper names this would mean rendering the SL name by a TL name which gives rise to the same

(or almost the same) implications and connotations in the target text as the original name did in the source text (Vermes, 2003, p. 94).

Modification is the strategy of choosing a name for the target text that is logically unrelated (or only partially related) to the original. This, in fact, means that the original name is replaced by a TL name that involves a substantial alteration either in the form or in the implications that the name carries (ibid, p. 94).

Vermes' hypothesis is that names with an empty logical entry are mostly transferred, whereas those with at least some kind of meaning are largely translated (ibid, p. 106). This hypothesis is later confirmed after the results of his study. Further findings of his study show that the use of a conventional correspondent is clearly the solution that requires the least amount of effort from the audience and is therefore used in the majority of the cases. When the specific name in question contains some relevant information it may be translated or modified (ibid).

1.2.2 Dialect

Dialect can be seen as "…a self-contained variety of the language, not a deviation from standard language…" (Newmark 1988, p. 195). It seems that Newmark believes dialect to be standard language in specific kinds of context. This may be the case in certain social classes – dialect then reflects the standard and not the outstanding. By using dialect one is often able to show differences in social class, or to indicate local cultural features. Dialect in translation can be transferred as standard language (earlier referred to as **standardization**), which is the easiest solution but must involve

some kind of loss when adequacy is opted for. It can also be replaced with another existing dialect (**substitution**) that would act as a cultural equivalent[6].

The translator may attempt to create his/her own dialect by using contractions, slurring vowels and distorting the grammar. The risk of such a strategy may be in its uncommunicativeness.

There are times when the translator is wary of writing in dialect form (when the governing norm is to write in standard language, for instance), but still finds it important to indicate to the target reader that a dialect form was used in the original text. In such a case, he/she may choose to standardize the language yet add in the words "so said John in the particular dialect characteristic of his type" (**standardization + explanation**).

Brink's work is saturated with dialect. There are numerous figures in the Afrikaans version that speak the Cape dialect of Afrikaans. In the case of Brink's English translation, he converted his Afrikaans dialect into an English one, the reason supposedly being that those same Cape Colourds (as they are referred to in South Africa) using this dialect speak English in much the same fashion. Brink, South African born and bred and closely familiar with the dialect forms of different South African groups, could create an English dialect which strove to be as authentic as the Afrikaans.

[6] However, it must be noted that for an adequate translation the risk is that the dialect used in the target language might be archaic, or might denote a different social class from the one the original dialect denoted. The outcome is often comic.

1.2.3 Translation of *Realia*

"The ease or difficulty of translation depends on the degree of closeness (mutual similarity) of the cultures in question" (Ivir 1987, p. 36). As was explained, Afrikaans-English translations present a unique case. Afrikaans translated into a South African English for South African readers is a case of a culturally close translation. This fact would affect the strategies adopted by the translators. For example, there would be no need to explain certain South Africanisms; many Afrikaans words that have no English equivalents could easily be retained. However, international English readers may not be familiar with South African culture, and even less so with Afrikaans culture. Whereas American culture has infiltrated the consciousness of most English readers, this is probably not as true of South African or Afrikaans culture references.

Yet for translation to take place the translator must rely on procedures that enable him/her to convey to members of the target culture the content of the particular element. When the target culture lacks a given element (object, concept, social institution or pattern of behaviour), its language may lack a term or expression for it, and, as suggested by Ivir (1987, p. 36), it becomes the translator's task to find one in the target language, or create one, to convey the missing element.

Ivir (ibid, p. 37) names the following strategies available to the translator when facing differences in the extralinguistic reality of the two cultures: **borrowing**, **definition, literal translation, substitution, lexical creation, omission and addition** and expresses the view that translators tend to make a new decision for each element that

arises, and to enhance the transmission of cultural information by using a combination of strategies rather than one particular strategy. Ivir maintains that though not all of the procedures achieve cultural transfer in the sense of filling the voids that are inevitably created when two different systems of language and culture are mapped onto each other, they still serve the purpose of achieving communicative equivalence in translation (ibid).

Borrowing involves transferring a source-text/culture element unmodified into the target text. It is frequently used because it assures precise transmission of cultural information, yet this is only the case when the knowledge of the extralinguistic reality has been made clear to the reader in such a way that the borrowed item would not be incomprehensible. For this to take place, definition must often be combined with borrowing. Once the expression has entered the target text/culture, however, it may be used freely in the same way that it is used in the source language.

Defining the elements of culture that are to be transmitted from the source text to the target text is a strategy that relies on what the target reader knows in an attempt to make him/her aware of what he/she does not know (Ivir 1987, p. 38). Depending on how exhaustive the definition is, it can quite accurately transmit the necessary cultural information.

Literal translation is very often used to transfer culture, producing a text very similar to the source text. The items most suited for literal translation are those that can be easily copied into the target language. Though these items are usually different in the

lexical mapping of the reality of the two language/cultures, they do refer to a shared extralinguistic reality.

Substitution can be attempted when the two language/cultures share a common element; not wholly identical, but similar enough so that this similarity might be exploited. The advantage of this strategy is that the target reader has no difficulty in comprehension because the words and expressions chosen for the translation are familiar to him. The main drawback here is that the original terms are not transferred in their entirety and some of the meaning may be lost, this may lead to the fact that the foreign culture is not entirely preserved.

Lexical creation refers to new coinages which are extensions of the meaning of existing words. These take the form of complete lexical inventions, or of new collocations. Its main advantage is that the newly created item is culturally "empty" and is ready to receive and convey the content of the source culture item (ibid, p. 43-44).

Omission is usually used when the translation regards it as essential for the communicative situation.

Addition of cultural information may be seen as necessary when the original text, addressing the source audience that shares certain cultural knowledge, leaves some things unsaid. Since the target reader does not have that knowledge, he will not receive that which has not been said and requires explicit cultural information. Without this added information, the communication would be incomplete or defective

(ibid. p. 45). It may be added here that it is often difficult to distinguish between addition and defining since both add information that is not explicit in the target text.

Relating all the above to the general theories mentioned in section 5.1, a translator who opts to retain the foreign flavour of the text or to "exoticize" it will presumably use more borrowing or literal translation than a translator that wishes to domesticate the translation. In other words, the strategies used by the translators on the microstructural level will ultimately reflect which basic translational approach they choose: domesticating / transplanting, or foreignizing / exoticizing.

2. Comparison of Texts

For the purpose of our examination, specific items that present aspects of culture transfer have been chosen. These include translation of proper names, dialect, retention of Afrikaans words or structures, elaboration or explicitation of items that are culture specific.

2.1 Proper Name Translation

Below, are tables (one for each book) of fourteen proper names – about half of the total number of significant proper names in both novels - from the Afrikaans texts, and their English translations. The names, chosen at random from the first one hundred pages or so of each book, include names of both people and geographical locations. The third column provides a gloss or explanation of the Afrikaans names

when these are necessary in order to understand the strategy. The fourth column identifies the strategy used in translating each of the translated items.

2.1.1 *Kringe in 'n Bos/Circles in a Forest* by Dalene Matthee

	Kringe in 'n Bos	***Circles in a Forest***	**Gloss / Explanation**	**Strategy Used**
1.	Oom Wiljam (15)	Uncle Willjam (26)	Notice that the Afrikaans form of *Wiljam* has been transferred, an *l* was added to modify it into a more English form.	Transference with a form of modification
2.	Grootvaders Bosch (16)	Grootvaders Bosch (28)	Place name literally meaning *Forefathers Bush*.	Transference
3.	Freek Terblans (6)	Fred Terblans (14)	Male first name and family name. Freek is the nickname form of Frederik.	Substitution and Transference
4.	Andries van Huysteen (11)	Andrew van Huysteen (22)	*Andrew* is the accepted English version of the Afrikaans *Andries.*	Substitution and Transference
5.	Krisjan-se-Nek (8)	Krisjan's Neck (17)	Place Name. *Nek* is the Afrikaans for *neck*.	Transference and Translation

6.	Jan Snel (24)	Jan Fast (38)	Male first name and family name. *Snel* means *fast* in Afrikaans.	Transference and Translation
7.	Stoffel Blik (49)	Chris Can (67)	Male first name and family name. The Afrikaans *Stoffel* probably originated from*Christophel* (German origin). *Blik* means *tin/can*.	Substitution and Translation
8.	Witplekbos (11)	White Place Bush (21)	Place Name. *Wit* means *white*; *plek* means *place*; *bos* means *bush*.	Translation
9.	Louriebos-se-Eiland (36)	Louriebush Island (50)	Place name. *Lourie* is a name of bird.	Translation
10.	Witfontein (36)	White Fountain (51)	Place name.	Translation
11.	Gert Oog (3)	Jeremiah Eye (11)	Male first name and family name. *Oog* literally means *eye*.	Modification & Translation
12.	Koos Piets (74)	Jacob Whip (97)	Male first name and family name. *Koos* literally means to *caress*. *Piets* means to *hit*.	Modification and Translation
13.	Kleinkoos (22)	Charlie (35)	Diminutive form of the male name *Koos* given to a small child (*klein* means *small*).	Modification

14.	Ouma Johanna (17)	Grandma Anna (28)	*Anna* is often given as a name alongside *Johanna* and is considered the English version thereof.	Substitution

2.1.2 *Kennis van die Aand/Looking on Darkness* by André Brink

	Kennis van die Aand	***Looking on Darkness***	**Gloss / Explanation**	**Strategy Used**
1.	Willem (11)	Willem (7)		Transference
2.	Kloofnek (18)	Kloof Nek (15)	Place name.	Transference with very slight spelling modification
3.	Bainskloofpas (19)	Bain's Kloof Pass (16)	*Kloof* means *cliff*; *pas* means *pass*.	Transference and Translation
4.	Franschhoek (21)	French Hoek (18)	Place name. *Frans* means *French*; *hoek* means *corner*.	Translation and Transference
5.	Boland (21)	Boland (18)	Large geographical area (not a city), literally meaning *upper-land*.	Transference
6.	Antjie Somers (86)	Antjie Somers (79)	*Somers* literally means *summers*.	Transference

7.	Oom Koot (98)	Oom Koot (90)	*Oom* means *uncle*. The Afrikaans word is retained.	Complete Transference
8.	Melkbosstrand (98)	Melkbos Beach	Place name. *Strand* literally means *beach*; *Melkbos* literally means *milk bush*.	Transference and Translation
9.	Swartklaas (110)	Blackie (111)	Family name. *Swartklaas* literally means *black servant*.	Partial Translation with Modification
10.	Willem (58)	Hendrik (52)	Rather drastic modification. *Willem* is the Afrikaans for *William*.	Modification
11.	Oompie Jakoos (92)	Uncle Jakes (85)	*Oompie* is the diminutive form of *uncle*.	Modification
12.	Klipoog (110)	Baselisk (111)	Family name. *Klipoog* literally means *stone-eyed*.	Meaningful Modification (or Substitution)
13.	Dawid (73)	David (66)		Substitution
14.	Jakob (74)	Jacob (68)		Substitution

The tables above gives a picture of strategy use by the two authors when translating proper names. A closer analysis will reveal that Matthee has used *translation* as a strategy in 8 of the 14 cases, 3 of them *complete translations*. Brink, on the other hand, never uses the *translation* strategy alone. He usually uses it alongside *transference*. Whereas Matthee does translate place names, it seems Brink is wary of doing this. He never *translates* a place name (at least not in full). Some part of the place name is always *transferred*. As for people's names, Brink almost always *transfers* unless simple substitution is available (e.g. *Dawid* is the English *David*) or in the case of the names being highly meaningful (e.g. *Klipoog* becoming *Baselisk*. *Baselisk* was the name of a chameleon from the Greek mythology said to have killed with his stare) in which case he *modifies* the name but chooses names that convey (in some form) the underlying meaning of the originals (comprising a kind of *substitution*). These examples serve to demonstrate the greater differences between the writers (as demonstrated below). While Brink seems to strive for greater adequacy and attempts to retain the foreign flavour, Matthee tends to make the text more acceptable to the English reader by providing more English-sounding names.

2.2 Dialect Translation

Below are two tables presenting six instances of dialect translation from each of the texts. The third column provides a gloss of the Afrikaans text indicating how the dialect is formed.

2.2.1 *Kringe in 'n Bos / Circles in a Forest*

	Kringe in 'n Bos	***Circles in a Forest***	**Gloss and Explanation**	**Strategy Used**
1.	"Lyk vir my jy vergeet **lat** Oupoot Oupoot is! **Lat** al die slim van al die olifante…" (1)	"Seems to me you're forgetting that Old Foot is Old Foot! That all the cunning of all the elephants…" (9)	The English translation is a literal one and no gloss is necessary. The only difference is that while the Afrikaans is a dialect form, indicated by the use of the Afrikaans word *lat* which is the mispronounced (and thus dialectic) *dat* meaning *that*.	Standarization
2.	Hulle **gaat** hom Joram laat **backsize** (139)	They're going to call him Joram after your Pa. (171)	Gloss: They're going to backsize him Joram. The word *backsize* is used instead of *baptize* to indicate	Standarization

			dialect stemming from ignorance. Also the Afrikaans *gaat* (going to) is correctly pronounced *gaan*.	
3.	Ek het met die wa saamgekom en toe se baas Gert dit lyk na baas Saul hier op die Skip toe vra ek die man daar onder of ek net ‘n woord kan kom praat met baas Saul. Hoor of baas Saul gehoor het? (4)	“I came with Master Jeremiah's wagon…” **he continued in the strange Dutch dialect of the Cape Colony.** “Master Jeremiah said it looks like Master Saul here on the deck so I asked the man down there if I could just come up to have a few words with you…To hear if you've heard.” (13)	I came with the wagon and then master Gert said it looks like master Saul was here on the ship so I asked the man at the bottom if I could come and have a word with master Saul. To hear if master Saul has heard already. (Gloss) Though the Afrikaans is not proper dialect but rather informal	Standardization + Explanation

			discourse highlighted by means of a run-on sentence, Matthee emphasizes that the speaker was speaking in dialect though she hardly attempts to construct it.	
4.	Die **engels** het julle ma kom haal. (16)	The **angelings**º have taken your Ma. (28) º **Angelings: angels** (footnote)	*Engels* is the incorrect plural form of the Afrikaans meaning *angels*. The correct form is *engele*. This particular construction was used by the poor Afrikaans-speaking woodcutters.	Mild dialect construction following the Afrikaans method (using a non-standard plural form). Footnote added for explanation.
5.	**Oorle** Pa (47)	Pa - **may his soul rest** - was…(65)	*Oorlede* means *deceased* or *the late*. Some of the letters are missing to	Mild dialect construction following the pattern of the Afrikaans of

			indicate dialect.	omission (shortening the English expression *may his soul rest in peace*).
6.	Plat soos jou hand as jy ver van **hom**. (36)	Flat as your hand when you see **him** from far. (51)	The dialect here is once again indicated by ungrammatical forms. *Him* refers to the sea, which should be referred to as *it*. The English dialect is achieved in the same way.	Mild dialect construction following the pattern of the Afrikaans method.

2.2.2 *Kennis van die Aand / Looking on Darkness*

	Kennis van die Aand	***Looking on Darkness***	**Gloss and Explanation**	**Strategy Used**
1.	Jy moet jou kop hoog hou, Josef. Dink aan jou pa en sy mense. Ek is niks, ek is 'n	You must look up, Joseph. Remember your **Fa'rer** and his peoples. I'm	You must hold your head high, Joseph. Think of your father and his people. I'm nothing, I'm an orphan, but he –	Substitution

	weeskind, maar hy – hy't 'n geskiedenis nes enige witman. Onthou dit. (41)	nothing, I'm **a** orphan born and bred. But he's different, he's got a history **jus'** like **enny** white man. Don' forget that. (35)	he has a history like any other white man. Remember this. (Gloss) Though the original Afrikaans is standard language, Brink creates dialect in the English. This is achieved by letter omissions and misspelled words indicating mispronunciation.	
2.	"Dis alles weer reg. Slaap maar." (54)	"It's **awright**, **don'** worry." (48)	Everything is alright again. Just sleep. (Gloss) Though the Afrikaans is very informal, it can hardly be called dialect. Once again, Brink constructs dialect in the English when this is almost non-existent in the Afrikaans. Achieved by misspelling and	Substitution

			omission of letters.	
3.	Wil ek **ma'** sê. Om hom soe te **gelat** staan het. Ek moet mal **gewies** het, **ma'** is mos **soe**. So die liefde jou vat, wat maak jy **anners**? **Is** nie **lat** ek my pa nie gelief het nie, **ma'** mens is mos **ma'** net **ienmal swiet sixteen** en **de lot**, en Jirre die lewe was **ok** nie **moonlight en roses** nie. En toe die man nou kom, en wit **da'by**, wat het ek **gewiet** van nee sê? Dis **diékant** toe en daaikant toe, **ma'** ek **staat** vol **innie**	**As** what I'm saying **mos**. To leave him **jus'** like that. Must've been **med** I was, but what do you do when love **take** you? It's not, no, **as what I didn'** love my **fa'rer**, but **Jiss**, one's only **swiet sixteen** once in a lifetime hey, and it's not as if it was all roses and moonshine. So this **men come en'** he's white **en' oll**, so what could I say! **Thisaway en' thataway**, but there I was, full in the flower **en'** it's	A gloss is not necessary as just about everything is portrayed in the English version. Interestingly, the English dialect is quite authentic (as in the previous examples) i.e. an Afrikaans coloured of the Cape (as the speaker is) speaks both Afrikaans and English in just this manner. The Afrikaans is full of contractions and omitted letters. Some English words are mingled in the Afrikaans. Words are fused together into one. Likewise in the English dialect. There are plenty of misspelled words in order to indicate the Afrikaans accent in the	Substitution

	blom en is blom wat hy soek. **Iers** was hy gewies, 'n mooie so met sy rooi bakkebaard saam**. Ma'** my pa, sê ek **vi'** hom. Moenie worry nie, sê hy, ons **sil** jou pa regsien. Kom saam met my baai toe, dan vat ons die skippietjie, en as ons eers oorkant die water in Ierland sit, dan **stier** ons vi' jou pa geld **lat** hy nie **wiet** waterkant toe nie. (56)	**mos** flower what he's looking for. Irishman they **sed** he were, **en' suts** a nice **men** too with that red beard. But what about my **fa'rer**, I said to him. **Don'** worry **men**, he said, I'll fix **yo fa'rer. Jus'** come with me to Port **Lizbit en**' we take the **shippietjie beck** to Ireland, then we send **yo' fa'rer** money like he never **sawed befo'**. (50)	English. *A*'s are often replaced with *e*'s to indicate this heavy accent. Words are cut short and letters omitted. Afrikaans words are retained in the English narrative in the very manner that an Afrikaans speaker would use when speaking English. The word *shippietjie* is the diminutive form of *ship* in Afrikaans and is retained.	
4.	…mens het **ok** net soveel en dan nie meer nie. (60)	I mean, one's got so much here **en'** then it's **finish en' klaar.** (54)	…a person has just so much and then no more. (Gloss) Notice addition to	Substitution.

			English. This is a well-known South African expression meaning "it is finished and over". *Klaar* is Afrikaans for *finished*. Though this is not in the original, dialect is achieved by means of this addition to compensate for ungrammatical *ok* (also) which should be *ook*.	
5.	Vir goeie gedragte het ek **da'em** iets afgekry en so is ek toe **yt** voor die **jar** om is. (60)	They gave me some **pasella fo'** good behaviour **en'** so I got out **befor'** my year was out. (54)	For good behavior they took something off, and so I was out before the year was over. (Gloss) Afrikaans dialect is achieved by omission of letters and misspelled words to indicate mispronunciation. The English achieves this by omitting letters, misspelling words and	Substitution

			inserting a Bantu word (*pasella*), which means *pardon*.	
6.	Hulle'**t dieselle** aand nog gekom, die baas en 'n paar dieners. (60)	They came **nog** de same night, the Baas **en'** some **poellies**. (54)	They came on that same night yet, the boss and a few servants. (Gloss) Notice the retention of the Afrikaans *nog* (yet) and *baas* (boss) and the addition of the Afrikaans *poellies* (workers) instead of the *dienaars* (servants). Once again Brink has freely constructed or rather substituted authentic South African English dialect.	Substitution

Once again differences are apparent between the two writers/translators. Matthee has chosen to standardize three of the six items. In the other three, she has constructed some form of dialect, but one that is not very marked. She omits no letters, the sentences are grammatically correct except for very minor deviations e.g. creating a non-existent plural form (*angelings* instead of *angels*) and referring to an inanimate

noun as *he* instead of *it*. Even in the most extreme case of *angelings*, a footnote has been added, which diverts the reader's attention from the dialect construction to the explanation thereof. It must be noted that even in the original Afrikaans Matthee hardly uses authentic dialect constructions. The features hardly represent the real Cape Dutch Afrikaans dialect. She makes do with slight alterations of spelling, indicative of mispronunciations and elisions. On occasion, an Afrikaans or Bantu word is retained. The English is even more standardized, with the occasional ungrammatical form or explanation that this is indeed dialect.

Brink, on the other hand, uses dialect when the Afrikaans is in standard (or almost standard) register. His techniques vary but all, as was mentioned, result in the simulation of authentic dialect. Interestingly both Mathee and Brink create characters that speak the Cape Dutch dialect with the very distinct pronunciation (both in English and Afrikaans) and multiple letter omission. Since native South Africans are bilingual and use both Afrikaans and English in everyday conversation, the dialect is also characterized by code mixing (See also Chapter 3 of this work).

Notwithstanding the above, Matthee refrains from using this technique in her narrative, while Brink, it would seem, bases his novel on dialect conversation to a large extent. This once again serves to highlight the different translation approaches. Brink's retention of Afrikaans words, constructions and expressions in the English text is in keeping with his wish to be adequate and foreignizing, and to retain the overtones of the South African dialect, of the people speaking it and of the places where his story takes place. His text is a South African one and he appears to wish to bring it across as such to his international English reader.

Mathee seems to have something very different in mind. It would seem that her decision to make her Afrikaans book available to the English readership worldwide must have had some sort of influence on the translation strategies she chose. Afrikaans names are made English even when the name change is somewhat incongruous (*Kleinkoos* becomes *Charlie* which is a highly unlikely choice for an Afrikaans woodcutter); she avoids Afrikaans words or adds a footnote (there are numerous instances of this in the book). It seems that for Matthee, plot and theme are of more importance than creating that South African "flavour", which Brink has created in his text. This may be so because she wants to give her English reader an English text that is not uncomfortably foreign.

2.3 The Afrikaans "Double-Structure" / Reduplication

Afrikaans has a linguistic feature comprising the repetition of a word in succession, thus creating a new lexical item with a different meaning than the original single word. For example, notice the difference between "Ek kom **nou**" ("I am coming now) and "Ek kom **nou-nou**" ("I'm coming now-now"), which means "I will come in just a minute." This double-structure is picturesque and often humorous.

2.3.1 *Kringe in 'n Bos / Circle in a Forest*

In her entire novel, Matthee has only one instance of the Afrikaans double-structure, but her translation strategy is an interesting one. See the table below.

	Kringe in 'n Bos	***Circles in a Forest***	**Gloss**	**Explanation and Strategy Used**
1.	…hoenders wat jy kan staan **kiep-kiep**. (35)	…chickens you can **Chick! Chick! together and count.** (49)	…chickens which you can cluck-cluck.	Transference with Modification (Lexical Creation) The highlighted item is a South African expression used to count and call together fowls. *Kiep! Kiep!* is literally *cluck-cluck* and is the sound the fowl would make at your attempt to call them together. Due to its onomatopoeic value and repetitive effectiveness, Matthee probably felt it would be a pity to substitute it with a natural English item. She has created her own expression and has retained the double-structure.

2.3.2 *Kennis van die Aand / Looking on Darkness*

Brink, unlike Matthee, often uses this double-structure.

	Kennis van die Aand	***Looking on Darkness***	**Gloss**	**Strategy Used and Explanation**
1.	In die donker het ek voel-voel kaalvoet oor ontelbare lyke getrap. (34)	In the dark I **felt my way** barefoot over innumerable corpses. (32)	In the dark I stepped feeling-feeling my way barefoot over uncountable bodies.	Partial Translation Brink does away with the double structure, and in so doing provides a translation which loses out on the very intense and careful process of feeling your way slowly around in the dark.
2.	Kort na hy weer kreupel-kreupel op die been was, het die wending gekom, onverwags en sonder glorie. (78)	Soon after **he'd left** the field hospital the moment of destiny arrived, quite unexpectedly and without glory. (72)	Soon after he was crippling-crippling on his leg again, the turning point came, unexpected and without glory.	Modification Brink hasn't even attempted a translation, or partial translation of the Afrikaans. Instead he has modified his text and opted for a more general description – "he left the

				hospital".
3.	Ek hoor nou nog die egalige tieng-tieng van die rooi handvatsel se klokkie. (94)	I can still hear the **monotonous tinkling** of the little bell on the red handle. (86)	I can still hear the even ting-ting of the red handle's bell.	Translation By adding the word "monotonous", Brink has attempted to convey the sense of repetition and monotony portrayed by the double-structured.
4.	… 'n fris vrou met 'n man se laphoedjie op die kop en 'n roei-roei manier van stap (94).	… a fat woman wearing a man's hat and walking with a **rowing motion** of her heavy arms. (87)	… a healthy woman with a mans' cloth hat on her head and a rowing-rowing manner of walking.	Translation Brink has translated the meaning of the double structure i.e. has conveyed the meaning of the double-structure using other lexical terms – "rowing motion".
5.	Ons hol oor die omgedolwe grond tussen die druiwe deur, koes-koes dat sy ons nie moet	We ran over the ploughed earth along the narrow lanes among the trees, **ducking** so that she wouldn't	We race across the ploughed earth among the grapes, ducking-ducking so that she wouldn't	Partial Translation The element of ducking has been conveyed but not in the full sense of the double-structure: running and ducking; running and

	herken nie. (95)	recognize us. (87)	recognize us.	ducking.
6.	Ons trap-trap tussen die kluite rond. (95)	We **stood fumbling**. (87)	We tread-tread between the clods of earth.	Translation Brink has translated the meaning of the double-structure with the word "fumbling", which basically conveys the "trap-trap" which means to walk around aimlessly.
7.	Hy trek-trek aan sy pyp en druk die assies met flussies se dooie vuurhoutjie weg. (101)	He **pulled** at his pipe and used the dead match to press the top ashes into position. (94)	He pulls-pulls at his pipe and pushes away the ashes with a just-burned-out match.	Partial translation. The repeated movement of the man sucking (pulling) at his pipe is lost, but the general idea is conveyed.
8.	Ons het omgedraai en gly-gly begin ondertoe klim. (105)	We started the descent, **climbing and sliding and stumbling**. (98)	We turned around and slipping-slipping begin our climb down.	Substitution I call this substitution and not merely translation because Brink has attempted to convey the unstoppable sliding down

				the mountainside by creating an onomatopoeic effect similar to that of the Afrikaans by using alliteration. Though the double structure isn't retained, Brink introduces three words describing the action, two of which begin with the letter "s" in order to give us a taste of what the Afrikaans sounds like.
9.	In 'n onaardse stilte soek-soek ons verder, nou weg van die drans af. (106)	In unearthly silence we **went on groping**, away from the cliff. (98)	In unearthly silence we search-search further, now away from the cliff.	Translation The "search-search" of the Afrikaans is conveyed nicely by the word "groping" which is just that.

Interestingly, Brink never *transfers* the double-structure into English. For one who has recreated rich dialect in the English and has frequently retained Afrikaans words in the English text, this is somewhat surprising. Suprisingly, Matthee, the more conservative and less daring of the two, provides a lexical creation produced by the transference of the double-structure into English. In seven out of the nine examples,

Brink has attempted a translation. Some of these are *complete translations*, conveying the full meaning of the Afrikaans, while others are *partial translations*; i.e. part of the meaning of the double-structure was lost. On one occasion he replaced it with a different literary technique, alliteration; in another case, the structure was modified, and no attempt was made to convey the meaning of the double-structure. It must be noted that this double-structure does not exist in South African English.

2.4 *Realia*

In this section we will examine various cultural items (words, expressions or otherwise) and the strategies used for translating them (if at all). Nine items have been chosen at random from each of the texts and listed in the tables below.

2.4.1 *Kringe in 'n Bos / Circles in a Forest*

	Kringe in 'n Bos	***Circles in a Forest***	**Gloss/Explanation**	**Strategy Used**
1.	In een van Gouna se **klowe.** (7)	In one of Gouna's **kloofs*** *** a deep, steep-sided valley** (footnote) (16)	A *kloof* is indeed a steep-sided valley but the word in itself has entered South African English and has become a sort of cultural item because South Africa is	Borrowing and Defining

			full of such kloofs which are nothing like other valleys. Matthee wanted to retain the word though she does give it an English plural form by adding the *s*. The correct Afrikaans plural form is highlighted in the first column.	
2.	**kalander** (8)	**kalander - Outeniqua yellowwood** - … (18)	We have here the name of an indigenous tree with its commonly used Afrikaans name. It would be meaningless to translate this and the retention is important. But in keeping with her manner, Matthee has provided an explanation.	Borrowing and Defining/Addition
3.	Sy was a **meid**… (260)	She was a **meid - a coloured woman**. (315)	*Meid* is not a misspelling of *maid* but means a coloured woman who is usually a	Borrowing and Defining

			servant. It has very negative connotations and is avoided in modern discourse. In context it was important for Matthee to retain the word because of the connotations, but she had wanted to make sure it was understood by the English reader who would have seen it as a mere misspelling.	
4.	Jy leer die **grysbok** in die **kruppelbos** ken. (9)	You got to know the **grysbuck** of the **cripplebush*** *clearing, where all the trees had been felled (footnote). (19)	The grysbok is a type of buck found in the forest. This Afrikaans word literally means grey buck. Even by English-speaking South Africans it is referred to as grysbok. Matthee, it seems, wanted to retain the Afrikaans name but was still a little wary of how this might be	Borrowing Literal translation and Defining

			understood by the English reader. She has retained the *grys* (grey) but has translated *bok* into buck. As for the second highlighted item, *kruppelbos*, Mathee has translated this literally. But since it has no meaning in English, she has provided a footnote.	
5.	Saul het **kersgeblaas** (29)	Saul's **blown his candle** (44)	This is an Afrikaans expression meaning to "have no strength left". Matthee has translated it literally though there isn't an equivalent English expression.	Literal Translation
6.	Hulle sê hy was die koning se **Saterdagskind.** (174)	The people said George Rex was the **Saturday's child** of a king. (212)	The expression saterdagskind (Saturday's child) in Afrikaans means an illegitimate child i.e. once born out of	Literal Translation

			wedlock. It does not mean this in the English and it would be interesting to find out why Matthee has chosen to translate this particular item literally, when this is not one of her very common strategies.	
7.	…by **Groot Eiland** gaan huismaak. (11)	…moved to **Big Island** - **one of the natural openings in the Forest**. (21)	*Groot Eiland* (literally meaning Big Island) is a name of a place in the forest. But a local reader understands that this can only be a place situated in one of the forest's open areas and not in dense wood. A non-local reader might miss out on this and Mathee, though she has translated the name, feels this lacuna ought to be filled.	Translation and Addition

8.	Oorkant ly **oom Wiljam-hulle…** (15)	Over at **Uncle Willjam's house…** (26)	On the other side lay Uncle Wiljam-them. (Gloss) There is an Afrikaans construct: **proper name-hulle** (they/them) that means the specific person and his immediate family. E.g. **John Smith-them** means John Smith and his clan. It is often used in Afrikaans and is expressive in that it conveys closeness and family belonging. It cannot be borrowed without sounding somewhat awkward in English. Matthee has substituted it with "Uncle Willjam's house" which is a natural sounding solution though it does	Substitution

			not (and cannot) convey all the connotations.	
9.	My **Jirretjie** (46)	My **Jesusy.** (64)	Afrikaans has a diminutive form that the English lacks. The Afrikaans often makes use of this to express love, humour and irony. The most common diminutive suffix is *tjie* (pronounced *kie*), which is added to nouns. The highlighted item is a dialect form for Jesus, which would usually be referred to as *Here* and which became *Jirre* in the dialect. It is made here into the diminutive to emphasize the exclamation of an old woman who has suddenly seen someone she has not seen in years. It also adds	Translation with borrowed component / Lexical Creation.

			humour. Matthee has decided to borrow this diminutive form to try and convey the full flavour of the expression.	

2.4.2 *Kennis van die Aand / Looking on Darkness*

	Kennis van die Aand	***Looking on Darkness***	**Gloss / Explanation**	**Strategy Used**
1.	"**Sterkte**," het hy gesê. (36)	"**Good luck**," he said. (34)	*Sterkte* is an Afrikaans expression used to convey sympathy and give courage. It means "be strong". Brink has substituted it with something slightly different.	Substitution
2.	Agter in die vangwa, en later in die trein, het dit my bygebly… (37)	In the back of the police van, and soon afterwards in the train **to the North**, his words remained with	Brink has added information that he presumes the English reader is missing. The speaker is being taken	Addition

		me… (34)	from Cape Town to prison to await his hanging. Locals know that the famous prison where prisoners wait to be hanged is in Pretoria, which is in the North.	
3.	… ‘n klein **maagd wat maar pas puberteit bereik het**, dertien of veertien, **en haar borsies nog jong kwepertjies wat geen man gekneus het nie.** (42)	… a young slave girl of thirteen or fourteen and **presumably Malay**. (36)	…a young virgin which had barely just reached puberty, thirteen or fourteen, and her small breasts still young quinces which no man had touched. (Gloss) Brink has done away with the sexual descriptions and has left a neutral description of age. He has added on the information that she was probably Malay. This information can	Omission Addition

			probably be inferred from the text by the Afrikaans reader, who knows something of South African history. Many of the slaves were of Malay origin.	
4.	'n **Kompanjie** wat bankrot gaan…'n Engelse besetting... die danspartye van **Lady Anne…** (43)	The **Dutch East India** Company going bankrupt…and British Occupation **of the Cape**…the extravagant parties of Lady Anne **Barnard**… (37)	A company which went bankrupt… British occupation… the dance parties of Lady Anne… (Gloss) Brink has felt the English reader does not have enough information since he is unfamiliar with South African history.	Addition
5.	Die paar jaar saam met die **smous**. (46)	The few years spent in the company of this ***smous*** (39)	A *smous* is a pedlar. Brink has chosen to retain the Afrikaans. He does not footnote it and probably believes his readers can figure	Borrowing.

			it out. He does, however, italicize the word to indicate it is foreign.	
6.	Dit moet hier teen sy twintigste jaar gewees het dat hy **werfkneg** geword het op ‘n plaas duskant Klapmuts. (50)	He must have been twenty or so when he became ***mantoor*** **or overseer** on a farm in Klapmuts **district**. (44)	A *werfkneg* is a yard-boy or some kind of servant-foreman. Interestingly, Brink has used the word *mantoor* which doesn’t exist though it does sound Afrikaans. It seems Brink has made it up. He therefore chooses to give an explanation - *overseer*. Why Brink should do so is only to be conjectured. He could have used the Afrikaans *werfkneg*, but it is a wearisome word and hard to pronounce.	Lexical Creation Defining
7.	…in die Paarl het	…in Paarl a small	…in the Paarl the	Addition

	die **genootskap vir Regte Afrikaners** op dreef gekom; **Jan Brand** het 'n vaatjie druit aan Mosjesj present gegee.. (54)	**group of patriots** launched a movement **to promote a new language**; **in the Orange Free State a President** tried to placate King Moshesh with a barrel of gunpowder… (48)	association of True Afrikaners was established; Jan Brand gave a barrel of gunpowder as present to Mosjej… (Gloss) This is an interesting case of both addition and omission. Brink doesn't want to weary his English reader with too many details such as the names of specific associations. He'd rather provide a general description – patriots. On the other hand he adds the fact that they were promoting a new language (Afrikaans), something the Afrikaans reader would know. Also,	Omission

			the word *King* is added as title to Moshesh who was king of the BaSotho nation.	
8.	Net toe ek dag dis nou **yt met my saam,** toe kry Willem ‘n toeval en daar lê hy, en hy kan net sy een hand en voet so effentjies roer, en sy oë. (61)	Jus’ when I was now thinking **it’s tickets with the meid**, then Hendrik gets a stroke en he’s condemn'. He can move his foot **‘n bietjie**, en’ his eyes, thet’s all. (55)	And just as I thought my end was coming, then Willem gets an attack and just lies there, and he can only move his one hand and foot a little, and his eyes. (Gloss) *It’s tickets with (someone)* is a South African expression meaning *he’s done for/ it’s over for him.* Brink uses it in spite the fact that it is very localized and might not be understood. We also have the Afrikaans *meid* which we have come across	Borrowing Addition

			in Matthee's text. She explained it; Brink gives it to his readers raw. Brink has also retained the Afrikaans *'n bietjie* (a little) though in the original he uses the word *effentijies* which means the same. It must be noted that *'n bietjie* is used by many English speaking South Africans in their English discourse. So once again we see an attempt at constructing authentic dialect.	
9.	Wag net, so is daar glo stilswyend besluit, wag net dat die deurbraak êrens kom - by Ladysmith, by	Just wait for the great breakthrough, they resolved - Ladysmith, Kimberly or Mafikeng - then they'd rise up and	Both *rooineks* and *kakies* are derogatory expressions used by Afrikaners to describe the English. Though Brink uses kakies in	Borrowing

	Kimberly of Mafeking - dan wys ons die **Kakies** waar Boer se kind wortels gegrou het. (64)	chase the **Rooineks** back to where they belonged. (58)	the original, he substitutes the (also Afrikaans) rooineks. This may be so because though it was important for him to use an Afrikaans expression (it truly shows the contempt felt towards the British) he wanted to choose one that would sound better to the English reader. *Rooineks* might be associated with the English red-necks while *kakies* sounds completely meaningless.	

The comparison of the two tables above shows that while Brink borrows without defining and/or explaining the borrowed item, Matthee's borrowing item is accompanied by a definition or explanation. This once again fits in nicely with the strategies observed so far. Brink, who seems to opt for adequacy and foreignization

of the English text, borrows freely and does not seem to consider it necessary to make it easier for the English readers. On the contrary, it appears that he wishes them to feel that they are in a South African setting among Afrikaans speakers. Matthee's approach is very different. Her use of borrowing is confined to cases in which the lexical item is very specific and cannot be translated or substituted as such; e.g. a Kalander tree. Brink freely borrows lexical items that have counterparts in English. Words such as *'n bietjie* (a little), *nog* (yet), *mos* (indeed) are interspersed freely into the English text.

Interestingly, and not quite in keeping with her usual strategies, Mathee has on three occasions translated the Afrikaans items literally (see examples 3, 6 and 9 in table 2.4.1 above). For one of these she has provided a definition, but the other two have been left as such, though not likely to be understood by the English reader.

Brink's English translation is characterized by many additions and omissions (of historical/cultural/local information). Presumably, these are aimed at making the text more attractive to the reader and not too heavy. Brink seems not to want to burden the English reader with historical details with which he is not familiar, and thus inserts scores of Afrikaans words without explaining them. These foreignisms may serve to arouse the curiosity of the reader.

The above micro-comparison has included dialect forms, proper names, the Afrikaans double-structure and culture-specific items such as local expressions, historical allusions and local referents. We have examined strategies used by each of the writers/translators to render the Afrikaans items into English. We hope to have shown that the two writers differ greatly in their choices. Matthee's translation of proper

names and geographic locations, her abundant footnotes and definitions as well as her standardization of dialect forms tend to support the assumption that her objective in translation was that of rendering an English text which would not appear too foreign to her English reader. In other words, she was probably attempting the creation of an acceptable text rather than an adequate one. Though one could hardly call her translation domestication, it has domesticating elements and does not deliberately attempt to foreignize.

Though Brink does alter the original considerably, with numerous additions, omissions and changes in the English text, it seems that he is still striving to create a translation which, in many ways, is adequate. Our findings point to the fact that Brink probably wanted the English reader to feel, to hear and to know (as much as possible) what the Afrikaans reader naturally feels, hears and knows. His attempt at foreignizing is quite obvious, with the broad retention of Afrikaans words in the English text, almost total avoidance of name translation and an elaboration of South African dialect.

As was noted in Section 4 of the Preface, Matthee was not involved in contemporary politics and her books were largely read in South Africa. She was never compelled to translate her books. It seems that she did so simply to broaden her readership; i.e. she wanted to be read abroad so that more people would buy the books. This might explain why our analysis seems to show that there is very little foreignization on her part and very much "smoothing out" of cultural-specific "wrinkles". There was no ideological statement regarding the political situation of her own times. This may also explain why creating a smooth English plot/text was apparently her priority.

Brink, on the other hand, was an anti-apartheid activist and belonged to all the "wrong" groups in his day. His book was banned as soon as it appeared in South Africa in Afrikaans. He was forced into exile and found himself in London with an Afrikaans manuscript, which was published in 1974. This was not a historical novel detached form contemporary politics, as Matthee's was, but rather one that had in its power to cause ripples, both in South Africa and abroad, if published. It exposed some of the uglier aspects of the Apartheid regime. It stands to reason that he would have regarded a domesticating translation as unsuitable to his aims. This text was all about South Africa. Its power was in its foreignness and the statement it was making about this foreignness. It was describing a South African reality of which the reader is made aware through the text's foreign flavour. Afrikaans names remain Afrikaans in the English text whenever possible; place names are not translated as this would be altering the authentic South African setting. Dialect is not standardized; on the contrary, there is often a sort of exoticization in the English, which often elaborates on the dialect even more than on the original Afrikaans.

We have established that the objective or *skopos* of the translation (Vermeer, 2000) might affect the translation strategies selected by the translators. Both Matthee and Brink are self-translators, and though they may have had to abide by a superior authority (e.g. the publisher), it is more probable that each chose the various strategies deliberately with the purpose of serving a specific objective, confident in the knowledge that these would do most justice to their respective texts.

As we have seen, the two self-translators differ in their choice of strategies. Brink, for instance, prefers transference and substitution when translating proper names, while Matthee prefers translation (see Section 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 above). We attributed these different preferences to the translators' respective texts and the objectives of their translations.

Given the fact that self-translators cannot be suspected of misinterpreting their own work, it is noteworthy that each has used common translation strategies. Furthermore, the fact that each of the self-translators has used very different strategies further emphasizes the fact that self-translations cannot be thrown into one categorizing basket, and cannot be expected to boast similar features or make use of specific strategies. Self-translators, like other translators, make use of various available translation strategies, as best suits the translation *skopos* and they type of translation aimed at.

In the following chapter we will elaborate on this further, but from the perspective of the specific language pair – Afrikaans-English.

Chapter Three: Intra-bilingual Writing in Afrikaans-English Self-Translations

1. Introduction

While chapter one focused on the problematic of the status of self-translated texts, and chapter two highlighted the translation strategies used by the self-translators in question, the current chapter will focus on the Afrikaans-English bilingual text, and on how this specific language-pair makes possible a bilingual writing which is manifest not only on the macro-level but on the micro-level as well.

It can be said that the basic difficulty of any translation, self-translations not excluded, stems from the fact that a translation always involves a transfer from one language system to another. This means that almost no two words from two different languages will cover an identical semantic area, or have the same connotations, hence the difficulty. It was this that made it more difficult to determine the status of self-translated texts in chapter one. Hypothetically, if a writer had to "translate" a text s/he had written into the same language, or what is termed intralingual translation by Jakobson (1959), we would have less of a problem determining the status of the second text, and the relation between the original and self-translation would be less problematic. It is ultimately the fact that we are dealing with two language systems that creates the problem, since one is not certain whether the differences stem from a deliberate choice on the part of the author/translator, or from the fact that the process involves two languages that are different. Applying this to our case in point, the question we had asked in Chapter One was whether the discrepancies observed in Brink's and Matthee's texts the result of their being self-translations (producer-dependent), or whether these were simply a result of the fact that Afrikaans and

English are two very different language systems (process-dependent). Our conclusion was that the process of transferring from one language system to another language system was responsible for the shifts noticed, and not the status of the producer.

The issue of different language systems was also at the core of chapter two, which dealt at length with various translation strategies. Translation strategies revolve around the difficulty of transfer from one language system to another, and how one goes about transferring from one semantic system to another. Seeing that any language is defined as such by the fact that it is different from any other, a transfer between systems that are intrinsically different must involve some difficulty.

Like many before him, Walter Benjamins (1969) addresses the problem of languages being incompatible and focuses on how different languages may complement each other: "In spite, therefore, of the mutually exclusive relationship between systems of signifiers, there does exist a point of convergence between languages… Languages are not strangers to one another, but are, a priori and apart from all historical relationships, interrelated in what they want to express" (1969, p. 72). Benjamins is talking about all languages. If this is true of languages with little in common, it may also be assumed to apply to languages such as English and Afrikaans that can claim much to connect them.

Self-translators are by definition bilingual, as they write in two languages. Some are even able to produce texts reminiscent of the language of the original text, and in so doing highlight the fact that the "translated" text is part of a larger bilingual work. Beckett, for example, is the "Man-between" [sic] the English and the French (Fitch

1988, p. 156). This means that in whichever of the two languages he happens to be writing, there is always a presence of the other language with its different form of expression "hovering right next to him" (ibid.). It can be said that his texts are always both English and French because he himself thinks in English and French, and feels in English and French and writes as one who is both English and French. Again, this does not mean to say that his English versions sound French and vice versa, or that the English versions retain many French words. But the reader of both versions, as pointed out in chapter one, will feel the French-English connection and appreciate the work as bilingual. Not only is the bilingual writer aware of the other language when writing in one, but this awareness is actively present in his writing (ibid. p. 158). For the readers, the otherness of a foreign language may contrast with the familiarity of their mother tongue. Since most will be reading one of the versions only, they might miss out on the "bilingualism" of the work.

In the case of Afrikaans-English bilingual writing, the bilingual quality seems to take on a further dimension. An interesting variant of various Afrikaans-English bilingual works (this will be illustrated later on) is the concept referred to here as *intra-bilinguality*: the bilingual writing is manifest in one and the same text, unlike the term "bilingual writing", which refers to two separate texts written by one bilingual writer. What we term an *intra-bilingual* text would appear to be a text written in language A but interspersed with language B. It would seem that this is simply a form of written code switching. However, intra-bilingual writing is not "merely" code switching. While the latter may be said to be a passive retention of words in language A in a text that is largely written in language B for linguistic or stylistic purposes, *intra-bilingual*

writing is the process whereby a text is created using two languages. Both languages are equally important for expressing the reality it describes.

Intra-bilingual texts would presumably be possible only with two languages that are naturally connected. The connection need not be necessarily linguistic (e.g. languages that are similar to each other); it might be historical, social or geographical etc. In the case of Afrikaans and English, the connection is geographical and historical. They are two of the currently eleven official languages of South Africa, and when Brink's and Matthee's novels were written they were the only two. Furthermore, though both claim the status of mother tongue of about 15 million persons (Coetzee 1993, p. 38), they are, in many ways, rival-languages – historically and ideologically.

In the pages that follow we will discuss the connection between Afrikaans and English. This will include some history and will also make mention of various South African writers who wrote in both of these languages, and who produced English-Afrikaans intra-bilingual texts. Comment will be made as to the possible reasons for this phenomenon of intra-bilingual writing among South African writers. Following this, we will examine Brink's and Matthee's texts to determine whether their self-translated texts, too, may be called intra-bilingual.

2. Bilingual Expression in South Africa

In his article dealing with the English and Afrikaans writer, Brink (1976, p. 35) cites N.P. van Wyk Louw, a well-known South African poet: "If you [the young Afrikaans writer] have something to say, my boy, then write in English! And if you don't know

English well enough, then learn it like Jospeh Conrad: but write in English and save your soul!" Interestingly, van Wyk Louw was an Afrikaner whose mother tongue was Afrikaans, yet he seemed to see the importance of English even for Afrikaners writing in Afrikaans. It might be claimed that English, being the lingua franca that it is, is best utilized by all writers who wish to be read by as many readers as possible. However, there is more here than the simple dependence of a small language on an internationally spoken one.

As mentioned in the Preface, English was experienced by the Afrikaner as the language of the oppressor, beginning with the British takeover of the Cape in 1795 until 1925, when Afrikaans became an official language; however, it was still recognized as the linguistic window on the world. This meant that while it was seen as a threat to the survival of the small language, Afrikaans, it was still recognized as having the ability to provide a means of communication with the outside world. For this reason, many Afrikaans poets and novelists in the twentieth century wrote much of their work in English. In the 1930s, a short time after Afrikaans had become an official language, there was a tendency to promote puritanism, and attempts were made to eradicate anglicisms. But it was soon realized that if this continued, it would possibly mean the death of Afrikaans itself. Many Afrikaans writers then started writing in English alongside Afrikaans, writing their works in either English or Afrikaans and then translating these into the other language. Among them were: Uys Krige, Elisabeth Eybers, Jan Rabie, W. A. de Klerk and more recently Breyten Breytenbach, Antjie Krog, André Brink and Dalene Matthee.

One of the reasons for South African self-translations (at least before the collapse of apartheid) was South Africa's political agenda. Under the apartheid regime, many works, both in English and Afrikaans, were banned (e.g. Etienne Leroux's *Magersfontein, O Magersfontein* (1976), *And Death White as Words* by Breyten Breytenbach (1978), to name but two), and English was used as a form of escape for writers who could not publish in South Africa. Afrikaans writers also turned to English to complement the experience lived in Afrikaans, and used the Afrikaans expression to complement the English. "It becomes a dual exploration of a single experience – that of living in (South) Africa" (Brink 1976, p. 39).

In the Preface, four key reasons for self-translation were mentioned: mercantile interest, ideology and politics, the need for bilingual expression and exile. It was pointed out that all of these could apply to South African self-translators. Matthee, as was pointed out in chapter two, might be an example of an author who wished to expand her readership. She was never forced into exile, and her books were never banned. In fact, they were even promoted and were regularly chosen for the Afrikaans literature program of the matriculation examinations. This is understandable: her novels portray the Afrikaner as the oppressed and the English as the oppressor. She might have also enjoyed the act of self-translation, and/or may also have felt the need to express herself in both languages, especially because she was of Scottish descent, but had grown up among Afrikaans-speaking people.

Concerning self-translation as a form of political or ideological statement, as was explained previously – the strict censorship laws during the apartheid era were the reason for many Afrikaans writers to start writing in English - though not without difficulty. Although Afrikaans was considered to be the language of the oppressor by

a great many during the apartheid regime, English, too, had been an oppressor language for many years and was distasteful in its own way. In fact, even after the Afrikaans National Party came into power in 1948, Afrikaners still felt threatened by the English language and English-speaking persons. In his book of essays, Brink dedicates an entire chapter to the Afrikaners (1996, pp. 71-124), and elaborates on the feeling of animosity towards the English language and English people as such. Brink explains that even after the attainment of Afrikaner independence in the mid-twentieth century, Afrikaners were still looked down upon as non-cultured, ignorant and rough; they, in turn, felt an animosity towards English South Africans.

Notwithstanding the above, Afrikaners could not do without English. Many topics were simply "unexpressable" in Afrikaans, and writers belonging to "Die Sestigers" (a writers movement which promoted more liberal Afrikaans literature, see also Preface) were forced to use English if they wished to tackle, inter alia, racial discrimination and sex. Most, however, still wanted to write in Afrikaans.

Though in an ideological sense, Afrikaans had become tainted because it became the symbol of white supremacy and the official language of the white apartheid regime, it was still a far more "African" language than English, and therefore a language that could better describe the South African experience. As pointed out by Langenhoven (cited in Brink 1976, p. 41), Afrikaans is the only white man's language made in Africa, and the only one that was not imported from over-seas. The early writers of Afrikaans "experienced the joy and wonder of exploring and expressing themselves, their time and their land in a language not yet formalized but in all respects adaptable to the requirements of their experience…and as their tools were shaped and honed – a

literature evolved which proved an exciting and wholly satisfying blend of the European and the African experience" (ibid., p. 41). And indeed, even politically active writers such as Brink did not turn their backs on Afrikaans. They used English in addition to their own language, and in so doing contributed much towards the linguistic expansion of Afrikaans and its sophistication.

The fact that Afrikaans is such a young language, and that various topics could not be broached for many years under the Publications Act, made Afrikaans inadequate and lacking the vocabulary to express basic experiences that have been dealt with abundantly in twentieth century writing. Brink himself speaks of how difficult it was for him to translate the works of Graham Green, Henry James and Lewis Carroll into Afrikaans for the sheer lack of vocabulary (ibid., p. 43). Things did change, however, over the years, and by the time Brink wrote *Kennis van die Aand* in the seventies, Afrikaans had expanded and was advanced enough to describe universal experiences, while English, too, could express the African experience. In 1976 Brink was able to say that "both languages have reached a point where they are fully geared to the realities of Africa: both have become sufficiently Africanized to cope with Africa. Both have roots in Europe, but both have chosen Southern Africa for their operational area. If this is so…it would explain why Afrikaans authors may find it easier at this stage, than ever before, to communicate not only in Afrikaans but in English as well" (ibid.).

Not only is the South African experience best described bilingually, but the Afrikaner himself is a dual-being. As Breytenbach says (cited by Brink 1996, p. 123): "To be an Afrikaner is a schizophrenic experience. We belong to Africa, yet we cannot

escape the Europe in us. With everything we do, both halves of our personality are involved. Our very survival depends on trying to find peace within ourselves."

Another element that may induce self-translation is exile. Breyten Breytenbach, a leading Afrikaans poet and novelist, was sent into exile because of his political beliefs and anti-government action. He started writing in English and French and even announced that he no longer saw himself as an Afrikaner. For Breytenbach, the language switch was both a political and personal statement. His decision to relate his prison experiences in English (*The True Confessions of an Albino Terrorist*, 1984) rather than in his mother tongue, Afrikaans, represented a deliberate attempt to distance himself from a language that by the 1970s represented a brutal state apparatus (Lewis 2001, p. 440). However, *Confessions* is as much an Afrikaans text as it is an English one. It contains numerous Afrikaans words and expressions (*holpond, dagga, kak 'n baal*) and, more interestingly, there are times when the English is a literal translation of the Afrikaans, even though this often makes the English sound awkward (Lewis, p. 448). Breytenbach may have realized that if he wished to relate his South African prison experience in English, Afrikaans would still have to be part of the text.

Notwithstanding the above, Breytenbach continued to produce in Afrikaans alongside the English. Perhaps this fact was the best indication of his inner conflict: he no longer considered himself an Afrikaner as a political definition, hence his turning towards the English; yet he could not ignore the fact that being an Afrikaner was not only a political definition. An Afrikaner is one who speaks Afrikaans, the language that "most intimately interacts with the specific characteristics of South African life

and history, and enriches the land in a dialectic of mutual shaping" (Breytenbach cited by Lewis, p. 447).

André Brink's *Kennis van die Aand* was banned in South Africa because of its political agenda and blatant sexual descriptions. He went into self-imposed exile to Europe, where he translated the novel into English. Brink, like Breytenbach, continued writing in Afrikaans in addition to English during all his years abroad. Unlike many well-known bilingual writers (Conrad and Nabokov for example), he had not forsaken his mother tongue.

Similarly to what was said of Breytenbach, the reason for this continued bilingual writing might have been the fact that the South African experience is a dual one. It is an experience that is both European and African, and therefore best expressed in two languages. English-speaking South Africans will often code-switch as Afrikaans words can better describe the experience or even the specific South African referent. The opposite is also true, as South African experience is best expressed using both languages simultaneously. Antjie Krog said of the self-translation of her own work from Afrikaans into English that she wanted to retain the feel and the sounds of the original Afrikaans in the English translation (Viljoen 2006) and to keep the contact with Afrikaans when writing in English, and that is the reason she herself translates her own works (Krog 2000, p. 3). As put by Meyer (2002, p. 6): she wants "…to retain the echoes of the original in the translation since the target language can learn something from the source language."

It has been suggested in the preceding paragraphs that not a few South African writers are not only bilingual writers, but the producers of intra-bilingual texts, i.e. texts in which two languages co-exist. We have further explained that the reason for this is the cultural diversity of the South African experience, which might best be expressed bilingually. Interestingly, this phenomenon is becoming more frequent in places such as Canada, where there is an increase in the number and the quality of intercultural exchanges within a specific geographic area (Gagnon 2006). Writing in both languages, and creating intra-bilingual texts in particular, is both a means of connecting between (often opposing) cultures, and a post-colonial statement (for example, the Canadian-Quebec postcolonial context as well as the English-Afrikaans apartheid context). While intra-bilingual writing is a new form of creative writing, and allows the writer to explore new means of expression, it is largely a feature that highlights intercultural communication within a particular shared cultural and linguistic space. In the following sections we will examine how this is set into motion in the self-translations of Brink and Matthee.

3. An Examination of the Texts

3.1 Brink's *Looking on Dark*ness as an Intra-bilingual Text

As was touched upon in chapter two, Brink seems to opt for a foreignizing translation. One of the ways he does this is by retaining Afrikaans words, expressions and dialect forms, thus creating an intra-bilingual text. (See chapter two.) The examples that follow will focus on the retention of Afrikaans words and phrases in the English text.

Example 3.1.1

Afrikaans version: Die baas-hulle was die naweek weg… (34)

Gloss: The boss and his family were away for the weekend…

English: The **Baas** and his family were away. (31)

This example illustrates how South African reality might best be described bilingually. The word *baas* is not simply the Afrikaans word for boss, and Brink's choice for retaining the Afrikaans form is not arbitrary. *Baas* is a sort of cultural icon, and this may also be the reason for Brink's capitalization of it. In apartheid South Africa every non-white would use the title of *baas* when speaking to a white man. This was true for both conversations conducted in Afrikaans as well as those conducted in English. The English "boss" was hardly ever used. Whereas the English "boss" might highlight an employer-employee relationship, *baas* implies something beyond that. Baas has racial connotations, and denotes the relationship between a superior and an inferior person.

Example 3.1.2

Afrikaans version: …en as blyk van sy goeie gesindheid hom 'n dop brandewyn aangebied. (44-45)

Gloss: …and as token of his favourable disposition offered him a drop of brandy.

English version: …as token of his magnanimity, offered him a small ***sopie*** [italicized in text, and means "a small drop"] of home-made brandy. (38)

Interestingly, Brink does not retain the word *dop* (drop) from the Afrikaans text, but retains a different Afrikaans word meaning the same thing.

Example 3.1.3

Afrikaans version: Vir goeie gedragte het ek da'em iets afgekry en so is ek toe yt voor die jar om is. (60)

Gloss: For good behaviour I got something off and so I was out before the year was over. (The Afrikaans is written in dialect form expressed by misspelling and missing consonants.)

English version: They gave me some **pasella** fo' good behaviour en' so I got out befor' my year was out. (54)

Once again Brink inserts a non-English word into the English version, when this word was not present in the original Afrikaans. The word *pasella* is often used in English conversation, especially by speakers who are non-white (as is the case in this example). Pasella means a grant or "something extra", but translating it into English would be robbing it of its very South African flavour. A non-white South African speaking English, would very likely use this word which has its roots in Zulu.

Example 3.1.4

Afrikaans version: … loop hier met brood rond en ons moet krepeer! Slaat hom vrek! (73)

Gloss: … walking around here with bread and we have to rot away! Hit him dead!

English version: Got bread with you, hey, and we must ***vrek*** [italicized in text] of hunger. (67)

Brink has retained the Afrikaans *vrek* but has used it differently in the English. The word *vrek* (die, rot) is used sparingly in South African English conversation, but more in the metaphorical sense (e.g. "I'm starving") than in the literal sense.

Example 3.1.5

Afrikaans version: Of die beweging van haar hande as sy in die voorkamer by die klavier gaan sit en ek met my kloppende hart waag om oor die venster bank te loer. (84)

Gloss: Or the movement of her hands when she would sit in the living room next to the piano and I, with my thumping heart, would dare peep through the window-sill .

English version: Or the movement of her hands when she sat down at the piano in the **voorhuis** and with throbbing heart I dared to peep over the window-sill. (76)

Brink has chosen to use *voorhuis* (dining room/living room) for his English version rather than *voorkamer*, which he uses in the Afrikaans version and which means the same thing. It was noticed in other examples as well that Brink retains an Afrikaans word in the English, but not necessarily the word that appears in the original Afrikaans. Perhaps he is emphasizing the fact that the English translation offers commentary on and acts as a complement of the Afrikaans, rather than containing duplicating features.

Example 3.1.6

Afrikaans version: Ag, dis alles maar kammalielies. (108)

Gloss: Oh, **its all just make-believe.**

English version: It's all **sommer maar** make-believe, **man**. (101)

Once again, Brink is highlighting South African speech. *Sommer maar* is a void in English and is, therefore, often retained by South Africans in English conversation. It is similar to the Hebrew pragmatic void *stam* and can be translated as "just", which is a very lacking translation. Brink has also added in the word man (pronounced in Afrikaans *mun*), which is another "South Africanism", the equivalent of "chap", "dude" or the Australian "mate".

Example 3.1.7

Afrikaans version: Van die modderdam, van die boonste leidam, van die syferfontein, van elke klam kolletjie op die plaas is daar die aand paddas aangedra. (117)

Gloss: From the mud dam, from the uppermost irrigation dam, the seeping fountain, from every moist spot on the farm, frogs were brought that evening. (111)

English version: From the irrigation dam, from the fountain, from every stream and **vlei** on the farm, frogs were brought that evening.

Brink has inserted an Afrikaans word to describe the landscape. *Vlei* is a valley or a bog. It is once again noticed that Brink opts for words that are not in the Afrikaans

text, but are similar in meaning. Brink, it seems, wants the English text to have a South African flavour. Afrikaans words are retained both in direct speech and in description of setting.

Example 3.1.8

Afrikaans version: …maar hulle was almal stedelinge en het my terglustig as plaasjapie uitgelag. (128)

Gloss: … but they were all city boys and loved teasing me by mocking me as the country bumpkin**.**

English version: …but they'd all grown up in cities and regarded me not without condescension, as a **backvelder**. (122)

Brink has chosen not to use the English term "country bumpkin" to translate *plaasjapie*, but has opted for a South African expression. Perhaps "country bumpkin" is associated with the rural English person and Brink didn't want the reader to have a ruddy Englishman in mind. We have already said that Brink prefers to use Afrikaans words which do not appear in the Afrikaans text but which nevertheless mean the same. Another Afrikaans expression for *plaasjapie* is *agtervelder*, which literally means "someone from the back of the field". But Brink was probably aware of the fact that he was writing for an international English audience. We have also shown in the previous chapter that Brink doesn't like explaining. He retains Afrikaans words in such places where they are generally understood, and hardly create lacunae for the English reader. Brink may have felt that *agtervelder* would not have been understood without some kind of explanation. What he did to overcome this problem was to

translate half of the expression: the Afrikaans *agter* became "back" and the *velder* (fielder) was retained. Though the word "backvelder" does not exist in English, its meaning can still be guessed. **We can say that the bilingualism manifests itself at word level.**

From the examples above, it has been noticed that Brink's English text is saturated with Afrikaans words and expressions, some of which are used in everyday English, either because they are voids in English, or else because they simply what we call "South African talk". Brink does not limit these Afrikaans items to direct speech, but uses Afrikaans words to describe setting and character. Textual intra-bilingualism seems to be an inherent part of the text, and perhaps this is so because at the core of the text is the theme of duality and diversity in South Africa: oppressor versus oppressed, white versus black, English versus Afrikaans.

3.2 Matthee's *Circles in a Forest* as Bilingual Text

In chapter one, we spoke of the English and Afrikaans versions of Brink's and Matthee's texts, both of which make up the entire bilingual work. In that sense, Matthee's English and Afrikaans versions were just that. In this chapter, however, we have distinguished a different sort of bilingual text, which we have termed as intra-bilingual, and which is not one comprising two versions written in two different languages, but rather a text that is in itself bilingual. The previous section demonstrated how Brink's English version is intra-bilingual, and how two languages are interwoven to make up the "English" text.

In Matthee's entire text there are only three instances of complete retention of Afrikaans words (excluding proper names). In all of these, the Afrikaans word is followed by a translation (either in footnote form or in the text itself), as was mentioned in chapter two.

Example 3.2.1

In one of Gouna's **kloofs*** . Footnote: a deep, steep-sided valley. (16)

The word *kloof* is an integral part of South African English.

Example 3.2.2

You got to know the **grysbuck** of the **cripplebush***. Footnote: clearing, where all the trees had been felled. (19)

"Cripplebush" is not an Afrikaans word but it is a calque of the Afrikaans *kruppelbos,* and Matthee felt that an explanation was needed. "Grysbuck" is a "half-translation", similar to Brink's "backvelder" (example 2.1.8 above). The Afrikaans is *grysbok* which means "grey buck".

Example 3.2.3

…on the hotel's **stoep***… Footnote: a veranda. (255)

Similarly to *kloof* above, *stoep* is used in English conversation so abundantly, that it probably seemed natural for Matthee to retain it in the English version. However, in keeping with her style, she has added an explanation.

Example 3.2.4

She was a **meid** - a coloured woman. (315)

Interestingly, Matthee has given the explanation within the text and not in footnote form. Perhaps the explanation in this instance is a form of emphasis that the woman was a non-White.

There are no more Afrikaans words (except proper names) in Matthee's entire text, though there are two or three instances where there are literal translations of Afrikaans expressions.

It appears that Matthee's English version is nothing like Brink's. Matthee appears to avoid anything that is not English, and when she feels compelled to use the Afrikaans term, an English explanation always follows. It follows that although Matthee is a bilingual writer, and both versions make up a bilingual work, the bilingualism of the text remains on the macro-level, and does not penetrate the micro-level, as is the case with Brink.

This is in keeping with the conclusions of chapter two. Brink's text is a political one, and at its core lies the complexity of the South African reality, both generally and for

Brink personally. The concepts of duality and binary oppositions, as well as the attempt to merge things that seem "un-mergeable" are the very theme of the book. The protagonist is constantly in conflict: a brown man in love with a white woman; a brown man who carries a white Afrikaner name - Malan; a man who is educated and bright, yet doomed. It seems that these themes may be brought across to the reader by using bilingualism on every level of the text.

Perhaps it is also Brink's personal reality that has produced a bilingual work that is thoroughly bilingual on every level: a man in exile forced to use a different language, yet never abandoning his mother-tongue; a proud Afrikaner, yet one who opposes the Afrikaner government.

A possible explanation for the intra-bilingual text of the one and the (almost) monolingual text of the other may lie in the *skopos* of each of the translators, as elaborated upon in chapter two. Matthee's non-political agenda, as well as the fact that the act of self-translation was not a result of an external restraint as in Brink's case, leaves us with the assumption that the motive behind it was either mercantile or the fact that she enjoyed doing it. Though the text itself is South African, and even deals with such topics as supremacy and injustice, the fact that it relates events of long ago and is not a reflection of personal experience may have had an influence on its bilingualism/intra-bilingualism. It seems that the more the text is a reflection of the author's very self, his/her experiences, his/her ideology, the more the acts of writing and translating become an "act of the self" or an "act of self-translation", and the more so is the bilingual experience highlighted, thus producing a text which is not only bilingual - but intra-bilingual.

Conclusion

It is our belief that the preceding pages have shed some light on the status of self-translated texts by focusing on the production of two such texts. By comparing the various discrepancies noticed in the Afrikaans and English versions, Chapter One highlighted the fact that Matthee and Brink use common translation strategies and follow common translation procedures in spite of the authority that comes with authorship. Further research would do well to examine whether this holds true for other self-translations as well, and what can be learned about the translation process from such texts, which are less encumbered by external "noise" or other distracting influences that might be present in conventional translations. It would also be of interest to examine whether self-translators follow contemporary norms, or whether the benefit of authority and liberty that others do not have may induce them to produce translations that are different.

Chapter two focused on the translation process, and outlined the translation strategies used by each of the two self-translators for the translation of particularly difficult items. Their very different strategies highlighted the fact that self-translations do not appear to belong to a special category, in terms of the strategies used. Rather, self-translators, like other translators, choose those strategies (out of the many available) that will best serve their *skopos*, and help them produce the type of text they are aiming for.

Chapter Three concluded that Afrikaans-English self-translators often use a special form of bilingual writing, *intra-bilingual* writing, which refers to bilingual writing on

the micro rather than macro level. This was explained by the fact that Afrikaans and English are related languages, in that both are used on a daily basis in a specific geographical area. We further suggested that the South African experience is intrinsically bilingual and bi-cultural, and is therefore best expressed bilingually, or rather – intra-bilingually. Further research might do well to examine intra-bilingual writing as a phenomenon, and to determine whether it is more manifest among self-translations, and whether specific language-pairs – related languages, for example - are more prone to be used in intra-bilingual writing.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Brink, André (1973). Kennis van die Aand. Cape Town: Human & Rousseau, 1983.

_____ (1974). *Looking on Darkness*. London: Vintage, 2000.

Matthee, Dalene (1984). *Kringe in 'n Bos*. Cape Town: Tafelberg, 1988.

_____ (1984). *Circles in a Forest*. London: Penguin Books, 1984.

Secondary Sources

Baker, Mona (1993). "Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies- Implications and Applications." In: *Text and Technology*, pp. 233-250. Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Benjamins, Walter (1969). "The Task of the Translator". Translated by Harry Zohn. In: *Illuminations.* New York: Schocken Books, pp. 69-82.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana and Eddie A. Levenston (1983). "Universals of Lexical Simplification." In: *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*, edited by Claus Faerch and Gabriele Kasper. London and New York: Longman, pp. 119-139.

Breytenbach, Breyten (1978). *And Death White as Words: An Anthology of the Poetry of Breyten Breytenbach*. A.J. Coetzee ed. London: Rex Collings.

Brink, André (1976). "English and the Afrikaans Writer". In: *English in Africa* 3:1, pp. 35-46.

_____ (1996). *Reinventing a Continent: Writing and Politics in South Africa*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Zoland Books.

Catford, John C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 27-42.

Černák, Josef (1970). "La Traduction du point de vue de l'interprétation". In: *The Nature of Translation: Essays on the Theory and Practice of Literary Translation*, ed. James S. Holmes. The Hague, Paris: Mouton, pp. 41-42.

Chesterman, Andrew (1997). "The Evolution of Translation Memes." In: *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*. Amesterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 19-49.

Coetzee, Anna E. (1993) "The Maintenance of Afrikaans in a New South Africa." In: A*ILA Review* 10: *Case Studies in Minority Languages*, pp. 37-49.

Federman, Raymond (1996). "A Voice within a Voice". In: http://www.federman.com/rfsrcr2.htm. Accessed 01/06/2005.

Fitch, Brian (1988). *Beckett and Babel: An Investigation into the Status of the Bilingual Work*. Toronto Buffalo London: University of Toronto Press.

Gagnon, Daniel (2006). "Bilingual Translation/Writing as Intercultural Communication". In: *Sociocultural Aspects of Translating and Interpreting*, edited by Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger and Zuzana Jettmarová. Amstedam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 117-127.

Grutman, Rainier (1998). "Auto-translation". In: *Routledge*

Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. Edited by Mona Baker, assisted by Kirsten Malmkjær. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 17-20.

House, Juliane and Shoshana Blum-Kulka (eds.) (1986). *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication: Discourse and Cognition In Translation and Second Language Acquisition Studies.* Tübingen: Verlag Gunter Narr.

Ivir, Vladimir (1987). "Procedures and Strategies for the Translation of Culture". In: *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 35-46.

Jakobson, Roman (1959). "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation", Reuben Brower (Ed.), *On Translation*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 232-239.

Krog, Antjie (2000). *Down to my last skin*. Cape Town: Random House.

Laviosa-Braithwaite (1998). "Universals of Translation." In: *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Edited by Mona Baker, assisted by Kirsten Malmkjær. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 288-291.

Lefevere, André (1977). *Translating Literature: The German Tradition from Luther to Rosenzweig*. Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, pp. 67-89.

LeRoux, Etienne (1976). *Magersfontein, O Magersfontein*. Cape Town: Human & Rousseau.

Levý, Jiři (1967). "Translation as a Decision Process". In: *To Honor Roman Jakobson*, vol. 2, The Hague: Mouton, pp. 1171-82.

Lewis, Simon (2001). "The Treason and Translation of Breyten Breytenbach". In: *Poetics Today* 22:2, Duke University Press, pp. 435-452.

Mailhac, Jean-Pierre (1996). "Evaluation Criteria for the Translation of Cultural References". In: *On Translating French Literature and Film*. Edited by Geoffrey T. Harris. Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi, pp.173-188.

McFarlane, James (1953). "Modes of Translation". In: *Durham University Journal*

45:3, pp. 77-93.

Meyer, S. (2002). "'The only truth stands skinned in sound': Antjie Krog as Translator". In: *Scrutiny 2, Issues in English Studies in Southern Africa*, 7:2, pp. 3-18.

Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall.

Nida Eugene A. & Charles R. Taber (1969). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: The United Bible Societies.

Nord, Christiane (1991). *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis*. Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi.

Ozick, Cynthia (1983). "Prayer Leader". In: *Prooftexts* 3:1, pp. 1-8.

Popovič, Anton (1976). "Aspects of Metatext". In: *Canadian Review of Comparative Lieterature / Revue canadienne de littérature* compare 3:3.

Roberts, Roda. P. (1992). "The Concept of Function of Translation and Its Application to Literary Texts". In: *Target* 4:1, pp. 1-16.

Rozhin, Szczęsna Klaudyna (2000). "Translating the Untranslatable: Edward Redliński's *Cud Na Greenpoincie* [Greenpoint Miracle] in English". In: *Moving Target: Theatre Translation and Cultural Relocation*. Edited by Carol-Anne Upton. Manchester: St. Jerome Publication, pp. 137-149.

Sánchez, Mariá T. (1999). "Translation as a(n) (Im)possible Task: Dialect in Literature". In: *Babel* 45:4, pp. 301-310.

Sciarone, B. (1967). "Proper Names and Meaning". In: Studia Linguistica Vol. XXI, No. 2, pp. 73-86.

Steiner, George (2000). "The Hermeneutic Motion". In: *The Translation Studies*

Reader, ed. Lawrence Venuti. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 186-191.

Tanqueiro, Helena (1998). "Self-Translation as an extreme Case of the Author-Translator-Dialectic". In: *Investigating Translation*. Edited by Allison Beeby, Doris Ensinger and Marisa Presas, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp.55-63.

Toper, Pavel (1978). "The Achievements of the Theory of Literary Translation". In: *Translating, A Profession: Proceedings of the Eighth World Congress of the International Federation of Translators, Montreal 1977.* Montreal: CTIC, pp. 41-47.

Toury, Gideon (1980). *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Tel Aviv: Porter Institute.

_____ (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Vanderauwera, Ria (1985). *Dutch Novels Translated into English: The Transformation of a "Minority" Literature*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Van Leuven-Zwart, Kitty M. (1989). "Translation and Original: Similarities and Dissimilarities". In: *Target* 1:2, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 151-181.

Vendler, Z. (1975). *Singular Terms*. Steinberg, D. & Jakobovitx. L. (eds.), p. 115-133.

Venuti, Lawrence (1998). *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London/New York: Routledge.

Vermeer, Hans J. (2000). "Skopos and Commission in Translational Action," translated by Andrew Chesterman. In: *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 221-232.

Vermes, Albert Péter. (2003) "Proper Names in Translation: An Explanatory Attempt." In: *Across Languages and Cultures*, Vol. 4(1), pp.89-108.

Viljoen, Lettie (2006). "Body Bereft/Verweeerskrif by Antjie Krog". Review in the Sunday Independent 16/04/2006.

Von Flotow, Luise (forthcoming). "Self-Translation and Exile : Nancy Huston 'Passing' in Paris". In: *Nancy Huston, A Critical Collection*, edited by Frank Caucci.

טורי, גדעון (1977). נורמות של תרגום והתרגום הספרותי לעברית 1930–1945. מפעלים אוניברסיטאיים להוצאה לאור בע"מ.

יאקובסון, רומאן (1986, לראשונה ב-1959). "על כמה אספקטים בלשניים של התרגום." בתוך: סמיוטיקה, בלשנות, פואטיקה: מבחר מאמרים. ערכו איתמר אבן-זהר וגדעון טורי. תל אביב: מכון פורטר והקיבוץ המאוחד, עמ' 123–128.

Internet Sources

http://web.bentley.edu/empl/c/rcrooks/courses/250f95/dry_white_season/brink.htlml. Accessed 28/10/05.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dalene_Matthee. Accessed 28/10/05.