

Translation and Discourse

CHOOSE ONE OR MORE COHESIVE DEVICES (LEXICAL, GRAMMATICAL OR TEXTUAL) IN A SOURCE AND TRANSLATED TEXT, PREFERABLY IN SPECIFIC TYPE OF DISCOURSE. NOTE, FOR EXAMPLE, HOW PARTICIPANTS AND ENTITIES ARE REFERRED TO OR HOW LEXICAL ITEMS ARE REPEATED IN THESE TEXTS. COMPARE THE PATTERNS IN THE TWO LANGUAGES AND DISCUSS HOW THE TRANSLATER COPEDED WITH THE DIFFERENCES.

by

Jacqueline Denise Schnese

May 2001

1 Introduction

“There are many possible cohesive devices capable of relaying, say, a given relationship between propositions. And in a given language, some are likely to be preferred options.” (Hatim and Mason, 1990: 195)

Language specific cohesive devices may refer to participants or entities in a different manner and lexical items repeated with varying frequency. In the following discussion we will examine how cohesive devices are re-presented from a ST to TT and briefly highlight the semantic implications resulting from translation. At the core of this discussion are the difficulties the translator faces coping with differences in L1 (German) and L2 (English) conventions and how this affects the choice of cohesive devices in the TT. Methods for discussion include a comparative analysis of ST and TT coherence, specifically the role of reference chains and reiteration.

The relevance of cohesion in such a comparison is due to its integral function in text. As Halliday and Hasan (1976: 27) point out, cohesion itself is “part of the text-forming component in the linguistic system.” The significance of the cohesive devices used for data selection is what they regard as the ‘text-forming’ functional-semantic component, this being the ‘TEXTUAL.’ This component is made up of the resources for creating text in the sense that it is “operationally relevant and [coheres] within itself and with the context of situation” (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 27). It is this multi-function which is so important in the analysis of the following translation since ST semantics and context are equally pertinent to its interpretation.

The original text chosen for analysis is a monologue/dialogue excerpt from the novel, *Deutschstunde*, by Siegfried Lenz (Appendix 1) first published in Hamburg by Hoffman und Campe Verlag in 1968. It’s English translation *The German Lesson* (Appendix 2), by Ernest Kaiser and Eithne Wilkins was published by New Directions

Publishing Corporation in 1971. In this excerpt a speech/slide presentation is being given to members of the local folklore society of a northern German town called Glüserup by a character in the novel, Asmus Asmussen, who is in the German navy and a respected member of the community. During this talk a slight ‘verbal’ exchange takes place between Asmus and another character, the ninety-two year old photogenic Captain Anderson. The text consists only of this pseudo-spoken communication, leaving out the descriptive narrative elements of the slide presentation. This omission is a conscious one, so that the text for analysis takes the specific form of parochial discourse.

2 ST Contextualization and Description

The context of the ST excerpt not only clarifies the purpose of the utterances, but it also gives insight to the author’s intentions. In it’s entirety, *Deutschstunde* “ . . . is an investigation of the German past and its relationship to the present as experienced and narrated by a young boy, Siggie Jepsen” (Murdoch and Read, 1978: 55). The obvious presence of parochial discourse in *Deutschstunde* is a means for communicating the negative effects of such discourse on society. Murdoch and Read (1978: 56) state

Lenz has been criticised for the parochial nature of the work which tends towards the Heimatroman (Regional Novel), a genre that enjoyed particular popularity during the Nazi period precisely because of its insistence on the virtues of the natural life and local patriotism. But Lenz does not use the restricted horizon of this form to preach such virtues, but rather to illustrate the dangers of parochialism and the blind prejudice that stems from a restricted view of the world.

To clarify, methods of discourse as defined by Hatim and Mason are “modes of speaking and writing which involve social groups in adopting a particular attitude towards areas of socio-cultural activity” (Hatim and Mason, 1997: 216). Parochial discourse is discourse which is limited in scope.

The author's intent of illustrating the dangers of parochialism is apparent through his construction of dubious, yet visibly logical causal connections via the cohesive device of reference. Cohesion is therefore of utmost relevance to the ST since cohesion creates concrete forms (written words) out of intangible ideas. The author's use of cohesion is symbolic in a sense that he is attempting to communicate his own theoretical views of scientific truths and the nature of literary reality. Murdoch and Read explain Lenz's 'doubt of certainty' in a quotation from his essay entitled 'Difficulties in Writing the Truth' where he states that "[although] my life is verifiable, enclosed and even determined by such factual truths, I do not believe that the whole truth is contained in their sum" (Murdoch and Read, 1978: 59). There are other linguistic and stylistic features used by the author to communicate his intent, such as the use of the standard language and a local dialect (i.e., Hochdeutsch used by Asmus vs. the Platdeutsch dialect used by Captain Anderson) to show how education levels influence power over 'truth'. These features, however, enhance the author's intent rather than form its basis, revealing what Coulthard (1985: 37) describes as the linguistic options available to a particular speech community.

Hatim and Mason define context in terms of text focus. This model of context includes the general categories of genre, field, tenor and mode, as well as specific discourse classification and text type (Hatim and Mason, 1990: 138). Unlike Eggins' (1994: 112) context model which makes a distinction between register and genre, Hatim and Mason " . . . take into account the context of culture with its aspects of ideology and sets of values" (Caldas-Coulthard, 2000a: 2). Since the ST excerpts are contextually 'rich' with numerous layers of information, Hatim and Mason's model best describes the focus of this particular text and provides the most informative classification of its elements:

Genre:	first person narrative /interpolated account of the past
Discourse:	parochial
Field of Discourse:	speech/slide presentation in novel on the relationship between 'Sea and Homeland' (nature and patriotism)
Mode of Discourse:	written to be read as if spoken, alternately pseudo-monologue and dialogue
Tenor of Discourse:	semi-formal
Text Type:	example of parochial discourse highlighting views of nature and patriotism in Germany during the Nazi period

In this text Siggi (narrator) and his father, the local police chief, along with other members of the community with strikingly different views of their government are attending a slide presentation given by Captain Anderson, who is the head of the society. The expectations of the audience for a quiet evening, perhaps to discuss topics such as marine life, are thrown off as the element of guns and warfare are introduced. Their reactions are surprising; ranging from silence from those usually more vocally opposed to the regime's policies at that time (such as Nansen the artist who has been banned from painting) to outburst (in the form of a 'physic vision') by Siggi's father, Ole Jepsen, the most authoritarian figure in the novel. This event signifies through its context the breakdown of a social reality based on absolute authority, suggesting that even those in the highest positions of authority are fallible. Similarly, the role of cohesion in the text shows that the way they use language to structure their arguments is questionable.

3 Cohesion

Before examining the cohesive ties in the ST and TT it is necessary to have a general understanding of cohesion and its function in texts. Baker defines the function of cohesion as follows:

[cohesion] is the network of lexical, grammatical, and other relations which provide links between various parts of a text. These relations or ties organize and, to some extent create a text, for instance by requiring the reader to interpret words and expressions by reference to other words and expressions in the surrounding sentences and paragraphs. Cohesion is a surface relation; it

connects together the actual words or expressions that we can see or hear (Baker, 1992: 180).

The theoretical terms for the linguistics resources which link one part of a text with another are what Halliday and Hasan regard as; reference, substitution and ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion (Halliday and Hasan, 1985: 48).

Taking into consideration the content of the ST and TT, the focus of this discussion will be on the resources of reference and reiteration, the latter falling under the category of lexical cohesion. These types of cohesive devices were chosen for analysis due to their number of occurrences in the text and their relative distance in the texts. The criteria used for this selection of cohesion types is based on Stoddard's assumption that cohesive devices which ". . . might be expected to occur most frequently might also be expected to exhibit the most fruitful network patterns . . . [and the] types of cohesion which are global in nature (those which cross sentence and paragraph boundaries) might be expected to exhibit the most common patterns" (Stoddard, 1991: 32).

3.1 Reference

The methodology for analysis of reference chains consists of four stages: (1) identifying the cohesive semantic element (simply to show that it is a referent), (2) determining how this element refers to other entities within the text (anaphoric, exophoric, etc.), (3) comparing findings of ST and TT, and (4) interpreting how the referential relationship shows a causal connection to the context (of situation) in both texts.

3.1.1 Referent Identification

Reference is regarded by Halliday and Hasan (1976: 31) as

. . . the specific nature of the information that is signalled for retrieval. In the case of reference the information to be retrieved is the referential meaning, the identity of the particular thing or class of things that is being referred to; and the cohesion lies in the continuity of reference, whereby the same thing enters into the discourse a second time.

Signals for retrieval in a text may consist of personal pronouns, deictics, and comparatives (Caldas-Coulthard, 2000b: 5). These signals can refer to the context of the situation (exophorically) or entities mentioned within a text (endophorically) (Eggins, 1994).

3.1.2 Reference Chain Construction

In addition to exophoric reference there is a form of reference which refers to context of the text, this being homophoric reference where retrieval is “. . . from the shared context of culture . . . as members of a particular world” (Eggins, 1994: 96). Halliday and Hasan do not regard exophoric (or homophoric) reference in itself as cohesive, but do confirm its relation with reference within the text: they say that “anaphoric and exophoric reference are both derived from the general underlying notion of recoverability of meanings from the environment” (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 89).

According to Eggins (1994) endophoric reference can be further specified into the following categories; anaphoric, cataphoric, esophoric, bridging, comparative, and whole text referencing. Eggins (1994: 97) defines these forms of reference as follows:

Anaphoric reference occurs when the referent has appeared at an earlier point in the text. Cataphoric reference occurs when the referent has not yet appeared, but will be provided subsequently, and esophoric occurs when the referent occurs in the phrase immediately following the presuming referent item (within the same nominal group/noun phrase, not in a separate clause).

It should be noted that the distinctions between the reference/substitution or reference/lexical cohesion is not always clear-cut and are subject to interpretation. The remaining categories of reference defined by Eggins are perhaps more subjective since they may overlap with other forms of cohesion including substitution or even lexical cohesion, but her definitions are nonetheless suitable for the purposes of this discussion. Comparative reference occurs when “. . . the identity of the presumed item is retrieved not because it has already been mentioned (or will be mentioned) in the text, but because an item with which it is being compared to has been mentioned.” (Eggins, 1994: 97-98) Bridging reference is “. . . when a presuming reference item refers back to an early item form which it can be inferentially derived” (Eggins, 1994: 98). Finally, whole text referencing is when “[the] referent may be the ‘text up to this point’, or a sequence of actions or events mentioned previously” (Eggins, 1994: 98). Examples of a comparative and bridging reference can be found in the following sentences:

I have known Heather since high school. Last week her sister was diagnosed with breast cancer. Along with the fatigue from the treatment, the operation has left her distraught about her appearance. Unfortunately, she had more to worry about. Her other concern was the fact that she had no medical insurance.

Although not previously mentioned in the text, from the inclusion of the reference item *the* in *the treatment* and *the operation* along with the *breast cancer*--we can infer that her mother has had chemotherapy and a mastectomy. In addition, the comparative reference item *other* creates an association with *more* and *the fact that she had no medical insurance*.

Reference patterns chosen for analysis include the following items which have relatively high frequency rates and display far reaching network throughout both texts. They consist of: Das Leuchten/Phosphorescence, Eine Hecksee/A Ship's Wake,

and Die Geißeltierchen/ Flagellate. These items create chains of reference which are classified with the corresponding terms of reference mentioned above. Occasionally the items serve a dual function, such as those which are a comparative form of reference operating anaphorically, cataphorically or esphorically (Eggins. 1994: 97). In addition, items which recur and are co-referents are identified for clarification.

3.1.3 ST and TT Chain Comparison

Comparing these reference chains one-to-one indicates pattern differences such as the ST more frequent use of bridging reference and anaphoric ties occurring earlier in the text. This is particularly noticeable in reference chain Das Leuchten/ Phosphorescence. More importantly, however these chains indicate a discrepancy in the translation when all three ST and TT chains are compared with each other. Specifically two things indicate a problem in translation; the occurrence of a non-retrievable referent in the TT and variations in length of particular ST and TT chains. A substantial variation of length in chains is apparent when comparing reference chains Eine Hecksee and A Ship's Wake (see reference chain comparison 1 below) . The TT chain is over double in length with nine elements, while the ST version only has four. Here the ST compares referent 4, *leuchtenden Spur* (luminous track) with referent 3, *Die ganze Hecksee* (the whole wake). While the TT makes a comparison with equivalent referents 6, *one luminous track* and 5, *the whole wake*, it also refers cataphorically to referent 9, *a message*. Such a discrepancy is evidence of the translator comparing different elements than those in the original.

This brings up the next question of where the original comparative elements appear in the ST. The data indicates that the comparison occurs in the ST reference chain: Das Leuchten. Here there is a comparison which does not appear in the TT including

referents 9, *ein Gruß des Meeres* (a greeting of the sea) and 10, *Eine Willkommensbotschaft* (a welcome message) (see reference chain comparison 2 below).

ST			TT		
1	Ein Feuerwerk	exophoric	1	the fireworks display	exophoric
2	es	anaphoric	2	it	anaphoric
3	es	cataphoric	3	it	anaphoric
4	Meeresleuchten	comparative	4	the phosphorescence that we call sea glitter	comparative (anaphoric/esphoric)
5	Das	anaphoric	5	it	anaphoric
6	das	anaphoric	6	it's	anaphoric
7	das	anaphoric	7	it	anaphoric
8	Es	anaphoric	8	it	anaphoric
9	ein Gruß des Meeres	esphoric/comparative	9	that there phosphorescence	anaphoric/exophoric
10	Eine Willkommensbotschaft	comparative	10	the phosphorescence	anaphoric
11	dat Leuchten	bridging	11	it's	anaphoric
12	das Leuchten	bridging	12	it?	anaphoric/not retrievable
13	das eine	anaphoric			

The occurrence of a non-retrievable referent also appears in this chain, where the final TT pronominal referent *it* cannot be traced directly to a previous element in the text. When referring *it* to the nearest previous referent *it's*, there is still a high degree of ambiguity as to their relation in the text.

Additional evidence of this discrepancy is found when comparing reference chains *Flagellate* and *Die Geißeltierchen*. This is most subtle example found in the various

chains, but nevertheless indicates different comparisons have been made in the TT.

Here the additional bridging referent 11, *the one* appears in the TT but not in the ST.

Reference Chain Comparison 3: Geißeltierchen and Flagellate

ST			TT		
1	son lütten mist	homophoric	1	<u>the</u> little bugs	homophoric
	↑↑			↑	
2	Noctiluca	comparative	2	Noctiluca	anaphoric (co-reference)
	↙ ↘			↑	
3	wás bei entsprechender Reizung blitzt und funkelt	bridging/esphoric	3	<u>the</u> like	comparative (anaphoric)
	↑			↑	
4	mikroskopische Bewohner des Wassers	comparative	4	it's cause	comparative (anaphoric)
	↑			↑	
5	Geißeltierchen	comparative	5	microscopic inhabitants of the water	anaphoric/esphoric
	↓			↑	
6	es	anaphoric	6	flagellate	anaphoric (co-reference)
	↑↑			↑	
7	bescheidene Einzeller	anaphoric	7	they're	anaphoric
	↑			↑	
8	sie	anaphoric	8	modest unicellular animalculae	anaphoric (co-reference)
	↑			↑↑	
9	Teil des Merres	anaphoric	9	they	anaphoric
	↑			↑	
10	das andere?	anaphoric	10	part of <u>the</u> sea	comparative
				↑	
			11	<u>the</u> one	bridging
				↑	
			12	<u>the</u> other	bridging

This results in the TT comparing referent 10, *the sea* with referent 8, *modest unicellular animalculae* as does the ST, but with one less referent (see reference chain 3 above).

The discrepancy becomes most evident when comparing all three chains in the ST and TT as they interface. As can be seen in the table 1 below, in the ST, *Meeresleuchten* is linked with the comparative referent *eine Willkommensbotschaft* (a welcome message), while the equivalent TT element *The Phosphorescence* has no comparative link and is instead followed by an ambiguous pronominal reference. In addition, the ST element *Eine Hecksee* is linked with *leuchtenden Spur*, while the equivalent TT

Table 1: Link Comparison

ST	TT
<p>Kapitän Anderson: [Slide 2] Dat schallt woll'ne Hecksee sin . . .</p>	<p>Captain Anderson:[Slide 2] That'll be a ship's wake . . .</p>
<p>Asmus Asmussen: Draußen auf Vorposten, das heißt ja nicht nur Dienst, nicht wahr? Wer dem Meer widersteht, den liebt es, dem öffnet es sich mit seinen Stimmungen und Geheimnissen.</p>	<p>Asmus Asmussen: Being on patrol out there isn't just a matter of being on duty, of course. He who fights the sea earns the sea's love; to him she reveals herself in all her moods and mysteries.</p>
<p>Kapitän Anderson:Schallt dat ken Hecksee sin?</p>	<p>Captain Anderson:You mean it isn't a ship's wake?</p>
<p>Asmus Asmussen: Dem Außenstehenden, dem Fremden, wird sich die mannigfaltige Welt nicht öffnen, wer sich für ländliches Leben entschieden hat, wird die Zeichen des Meers nicht verstehen können. Bitte zu beachten, nicht wahr, daß auf diesem Bild ein Feuerwerk stattfindet – auch wenn es nicht gut rauskommt: wir nennen es Meeresleuchten. Das glimmt, das brennt, das wirft gelbe und grüne Blitze über Meer; in solchen Augenblicken schweigen die Geschütze. Die ganze Hecksee wird zur leuchtenden Spur, besonders nachts. Es ist wie ein Gruß des Meeres an die Männer, denen es Heimatrecht eingeräumt hat. Eine Willkommensbotschaft an das abgeblendete Schiff, auf dem niemand schläft, solange die Lichtblitze Bug und Heck umspielen.</p>	<p>Asmus Asmussen: To the uninitiated, the stranger, that manifold world will not open up. The landlubber cannot read the signs of the sea. Please notice the fireworks-display in this picture – unfortunately it doesn't come out very well. It is the phosphorescence that we call sea-glitter. It glimmers and gleams, casting its green and yellow flashes across the sea. At such times the guns fall silent. The whole wake turns into one luminous track, especially at night. It is as though the sea was saluting the men on whom she has bestowed the right of domicile. It is a message to the ships sailing without lights, in which no one sleeps so long as the flashes of light illuminate bows and stern.</p>
<p>Kapitän Anderson: Kümmt dat Leuchten nich von son lütten mist, Noctiluca, oder so ähnlich? Wi hebt dat oft hat.</p>	<p>Captain Anderson: Don't that there phosphorescence come from the little bugs, name of Noctiluca or the like? Many a time we met with that.</p>
<p>Asmus Asmussen: Selbstverständlich . . . hat das Leuchten seinen Grund: was bi entsprechender Reizung blitzt und funkelt, sind mikroskopische Bewohner des Wassers, Geißeltierchen sind es, wenn du's genau wissen willst, bescheidene Einzeller. Aber sind sie nicht Teil des Merres? Leuchtet nicht das eine im andern, durch das andere?</p>	<p>Asmus Asmussen: Certainly, the phosphorescence has it's cause . . . The flashing and sparkling is produced by microscopic inhabitants of the water, the reaction to an irritation. Flagellate they're called if you want the precise nomenclature – modest unicellular animalcules. But are they not part of the sea? Isn't it the one that shines in the other and through the other?</p>

element *A Ship's Wake* is linked with the two comparative referents; *one luminous track* and *a message*.

3.1.4 ST and TT Interpretation

Overall, the associations made in the ST, as previously indicated, are logically sound in terms of reference since the elements that are being compared with another are clearly linked together. On the other hand, the TT use of reference is often garbled and even confusing, making retrieval sometimes impossible. These findings indicate that the TT fails to identify potential problems and ambiguities and unfortunately results in the loss of communicating one of the major points that the author is trying to make: While on a purely semantic level the arguments being made by Captain Anderson may be accurate, his conclusions may not.

3.2 Reiteration

When we talk about REITERATION . . . we are including not only the repetition of the same lexical item but also the occurrence of a related item, which may be anything from a synonym or near synonym of the original to a general word dominating the entire class. Let us categorize these as above: any instance of reiteration may be (a) the SAME WORD (b) SYNONYM or NEAR-SYNONYM, (c) a SUPERORDINATE or (d) a GENERAL WORD (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 279).

The distinction between reference and reiteration made here is that the former is a type of grammatical cohesion while the latter is a form of lexical cohesion. . In Martin's (382-383) evaluation of Halliday and Hasan (Table 5.1 from Hasan 1985b: 82) he states that in their "classification of texture creating resources . . . lexical items are distinguished from grammatical items" (Martin, 1992: 382-383). In this discussion reiteration will be regarded as the occurrence where lexical cohesion " . . . [does] not depend on identity of reference; patterns of word occurrences which by

themselves give a separate, purely lexical dimension of internal cohesion of a text”
(Halliday and Hasan 1976: 282).

Repetition or “recurrence” is a phenomenon that creates a cohesive effect which is free of varied expression. However, even in its purest form, recurrence may be used together with pro-forms as Hatim and Mason (1990: 199) indicate

The repetition of items with the same referent in a text is known as recurrence. . . . Naturally, relative distance from a previous occurrence of an item may prelude the use of pro-forms (short substitute items of no independent status, such as pronouns . . . in which case recurrence is unavoidable. But it is the strict recurrence of the same items in the same form which creates the effect; there is no attempt to use co-reference, that is, to activate the same content by using varied expression.

To summarize, reiteration (including recurrence) is independent of reference since it is lexical in dimension, but it can be accompanied by forms of reference such as pro-forms while maintaining a separate cohesive effect.

This is the case in the TT where *the sea* recurs ten times (nine consecutively), creating a distinct cohesive effect throughout the text, yet is accompanied by the pronominal reference *she/her*. Since there is no effort on the translators’ part to vary the expression through the use of the synonym “ocean” or varied expression such as “the deep,” the example can be regarded as an instance of recurrence (or same word reiteration). In the ST however, reiteration does occur by using of related words as a means of content variation. Although *das Meer* does appear five times in the text, it is only consecutively repeated a maximum of three times, with the third occurrence followed by the use of the synonym *der See*. The remaining occurrences are characterized by varied definite article inflections such as the dative form *dem Meer*

and genitive forms *des Meers* and *des Meeres* (see table 1 below), along with the use of the pronominal reference items *es* and *seinen*.

Table 1: Reiteration Comparison

ST Clause		TT Clause	
1	dem Meer	1	the sea
2	Es	2	the sea's love
3	Es	3	she
4	Seinen	4	herself
5	des Meers	5	her
6	Meer	6	the sea
7	ein Gruß des Meeres	7	the sea
8	Es	8	the sea
9	des Meeres	9	the sea
10	Das Meer	10	the sea
11	Das Meer	11	the sea
12	Das Meer	12	the sea
13	Die See	13	the sea
14	Das Meer	14	the sea
15	Das Meer		

4 Translating Cohesion

Differences in L1 (German) and L2 (English) conventions affect the choice of cohesive devices in the TT. In this text the translator is faced with variations such as grammatical distinctions of gender and the accepted level of repetition of both languages. At the same time context must be taken into consideration when making cohesive choices for translation.

4.1 Gender and Ambiguity

Considering again the discrepancy indicated in the reference chains it becomes clear that the problem results from the grammatical distinction of German pronouns classified by gender, and the lack thereof in the English language. Baker explains the grammatical distinctions of gender in English and German as follows

Gender is a grammatical distinction according to which a noun or pronoun is classified as either masculine or feminine in some languages [and sometimes as

masculine, feminine, or neuter, as in the case of German]. The distinction applies to nouns which refer to animate beings as well as those which refer to inanimate objects Determiners, adjectives, and sometimes verbs . . . usually agree with the noun in gender as well as number” English does not have a grammatical category of gender as such; English nouns are not regularly inflected to distinguish between feminine and masculine (Baker,1992:90; footnote 5 inserted).

An example of such a distinction appears where the pronoun *es* in the ST is translated as *it* in the TT, causing the paths of reference to diverge (see table). The German pronoun here clearly refers to *Meeresleuchten* and not *Eine Hecksee*. Had the opposite been true, the pronoun *sie* would have been used instead. However in the English translation the pronoun *it* is used and the nearest referent (appearing two clauses earlier) is *the whole wake*.

Table 2 Pronoun Comparison

ST	TT
<p>Bitte zu beachten, nicht wahr, daß auf diesem Bild ein Feuerwerk stattfindet – auch wenn es nicht gut rauskommt: wir nennen es Meeresleuchten. Das glimmt, das brennt, das wirft gelbe und grüne Blitze über Meer: in solchen Augenblicken schweigen die Geschütze. Die ganze Hecksee wird zur leuchtenden Spur, besonders nachts. Es ist wie ein Gruß des Meeres an die Männer, denen es Heimatrecht eingeräumt hat. Eine Willkommensbotschaft an das abgeblendete Schiff, auf dem niemand schläft, solange die Lichtblitze Bug und Heck umspielen.</p>	<p>Please notice the fireworks-display in this picture – unfortunately it doesn't come out very well. It is the phosphorescence that we call sea-glitter. It glimmers and gleams, casting its green and yellow flashes across the sea. At such times the guns fall silent. The whole wake turns into one luminous track, especially at night. It is as though the sea was saluting the men on whom she has bestowed the right of domicile. It is a message to the ships sailing without lights, in which no one sleeps so long as the flashes of light illuminate bows and stern.</p>

The repetitive use of this pronoun results in a high level of ambiguity as the processing of the referents becomes difficult. An alternative translation would be to replace *It* with *The phosphorescence*. This would have maintained referential clarity as well as literary intent.

Hawkins (1978: 6) describes the role of L1 of gender marking pronouns as follows:

The pronoun identifies the semantically appropriate position of the NP with in the relative clause that is coreferential to the head, and so makes the relationship

between relative clause and head more semantically transparent. This in turn makes it easier to understand what the relative clause and head are being used to refer to.

In Hatim and Mason's explanation of how this gender distinction between German and English relates to L2 reference chains they state that "[the] marking of pronouns for gender (e.g. French and German) allows a density of anaphoric reference which has to be sorted out in English" (Hatim and Mason, 1990: 196). They go on to highlight strategies using an L2 resources which reduces the level of ambiguity of L2 pronoun referents and argue that "[coherence], once it has been retrieved from the ST, can easily be re-established in the TT (by using recurrence or co-reference), but not by the same pronominal means" (Hatim and Mason, 1990, 196).

Hawkins also stresses that English is generally more ambiguous than German due to the level of surface form mapping (such as the mapping of pronoun referents). He states that

[there] is greater ambiguity (and/or vagueness) of surface forms in English, i.e. greater collapsing of semantic distinctions and of different semantic types onto common surface forms. The result is more of a one-to-one mapping between form and meaning in German, with distinct forms carrying distinct meanings to a greater extent (Hawkins, 1986: 121).

Considering these L1 and L2 distinctions and the context of *Deutschstunde*, it is apparent that when faced with the challenge of re-presenting cohesive patterns the translator has to choose between cohesive pattern equivalence and the transparent mapping of reference.

4.2 Repetition Allowance

The decision to re-present the ST cohesive pattern of related-word reiteration for *das Meer* with same-word reiteration indicates that L1 and L2 conventions for repetition are dissimilar. Hervey Higgins and Loughridge (1995: 172) argue that “different textual genres in different languages have very different tolerances to repetition . . . and it is clear that German has in general a lower tolerance than English for the repetition of identical word-stems in parallel morphological compounds” The marked varied expression of *the sea* through the use of forms of the pronoun *she* (marked due to gender category) seems to allow an acceptable level of L2 recurrence. The decision to alter the original cohesive pattern may also be influenced by the fact that the interchangeable use of *the sea* and *ocean* is less frequent in English than *das Meer* and *der See* in German.

4.3 Context and Intent

In addition to communicating texture such as the re-presentation of reference chains, the translator has the issue of context and author’s intent to consider. Although translating the components of texture such as lower level features is paramount to quality translation, both meaning and form work hand in hand. Hatim and Mason (1997: 17) state that “[simultaneously] with bottom-up analysis, text users take contextual factors into consideration and assess them in terms of the way they impinge ‘top-down’ upon actual texts as these unfold in real time.” The *Deutschstunde* excerpts discussed are an excellent example of the vital role of context in translation. A clear understanding of the significance of this post-war novel as well as the features of the ST as a unit of discourse is necessary for translation accuracy.

5 Conclusion

Coping with differences of cohesive patterns in languages has an end result which is characteristic of translation on its most basic level, compromises are made between meaning and equivalence. In the case of the examples discussed, the translator is faced with either maintaining or altering the cohesive patterns used in the source text. Invariably s/he must decide whether the ST patterns can successfully be transferred into the target language or need to be altered in some form in order to adhere to the accepted norms of the language. At the same time the translator must consider the impact such re-presentation upon the transfer of intent of the ST.

While translating *Der Deutschstunde*, Kaiser and Wilkins chose same word reiteration over related word reiteration. Although the instance of same word reiteration is a marked case were English allows use of the pronoun *she* for an inanimate object, the repetitive use of the words *the sea* results in the successful transfer of effect of lexical cohesion where words instead of grammatical patterns create texture.

They also chose to use direct pronoun-for-pronoun translation instead of co-reference or recurrence. This strategy is less successful than the first in this case since the writer's intent has been sacrificed for strict pattern equivalence. This has negative implication on the TT. Because of the nature of the discourse the overuse of the pronoun *it* results in an ambiguous tone distorting the author's intent. Use of this strategy makes it seem as though the discourse is perceptibly manipulative, rather than communicating how clear logical reasoning leads to erroneous conclusions when it is based on a narrowed view of the world.

Appendix 1

Source Text (pages 120-124)

Asmus Asmussen: [Slide 1] Dies ist unser Boot . . . Unser braves Boot. Bitte zu beachten. . . daß es nur eins von vielen ist, ein Boot aus einer unendlichen Zahl von Booten, die tief gestaffelt auf dem heimatlichen Meer Denst tun.. Bei Tag und bei Nacht. Bei Regen. Bei Schneetreiben. In einer absolut sicheren Kette. Keinem gelingt es, durch diese Kette zu schlüpfen. Keinem Seehasen, erst recht keinem Engländer. So wie unser Boot hat der Führer unzählige andere Boote draßenhingelegt – er sagte hingelegt.

Captain Anderson:[Slide 2] Dat schallt woll'ne Hecksee sin . . .

Asmus Asmussen: Draußen auf Vorposten, das heißt ja nicht nur Dienst, nicht wahr? Wer dem Meer widersteht, den liebt es, dem öffnet es sich mit seinen Stimmungen und Geheimnissen.

Captain Anderson:Schallt dat ken Hecksee sin?

Asmus Asmussen: Dem Außenstehenden, dem Fremden, wird sich die mannigfaltige Welt nicht öffnen, wer sich für ländliches Leben entschieden hat, wird die Zeichen des Meers nicht verstehen können. Bitte zu beachten, nicht wahr, daß auf diesem Bild ein Feuerwerk stattfindet – auch wenn es nicht gut rauskommt: wir nennen es Meeresleuchten. Das glimmt, das brennt, das wirft gelbe und grüne Blitze über Meer: in solchen Augenblicken schweigen die Geschütze. Die ganze Hecksee wird zur leuchtenden Spur, besonders nachts. Es ist wie ein Gruß des Meeres an die Männer, denen es Heimatrecht eingeräumt hat. Eine Willkommensbotschaft an das abgeblendete Schiff, auf dem niemand schläft, solange die Lichtblitze Bug und Heck umspielen.

Captain Anderson:Kümmt dat Leuchten nich von son lütten mist, Noctiluca, oder so ähnlich? Wi hebt dat oft hat.

Asmus Asmussen: Selbstverständlich . . .hat das Leuchten seinen Grund: was bi entsprechender Reizung blitzt und funkelt, sind mikroskopische Bewohner des Wassers, Geißeltierchen sind es, wenn du's genau wissen willst, bescheidene Einzeller. Aber sind sie nicht Teil des Merres? Leuchtet nicht das eine im andern, durch das andere?

[Slide 3]Hier . . . ist eigentlich nicht viel zu sehen. Ein Abend, nicht wahr. Freiwache. Man erholt sich bei einem Lied, während die Steuerbordwache – das sind wir –unablässig den Horizont beobachtet. Die Waffen schweigen, wie man sieht. Bakken und Banken ist vorbei. Selbstgefangener Schellfisch, Dorsch und

Kabeljau, eine geschätzte Bereicherung des Speisezettels. Das Meer ernährt alle. Das Meer. Links oben , im Ausschnitt, unsere Vierlingsflak. Auf der Brückennock, allerdings nicht zu erkennen, der Kommandant. Aber dies Bild gibt nicht viel her. Hier, das ist vielleicht interessanter.

[Slide 4]Bitte zu beachten . . .daß die Bomben rechts oben in der Luft hängen. Vier Bomben, die jeden Augenblick. Gegen die Sonne sind sie nur schwer, aber bei genauem Hinsehen. Alle fallen an Steuerbordseite. Ein beliebiger Morgen . . . und trotzdem. Man muß bereit sein. Das Meer schweigt zu allem. Schade, daß es nicht gelungen ist, den Aufschlag festzuhalten, die blühenden Fontänen: in meinem Tagebuch habe ich vom Garten der Fontänen gesprochen, doch den das Boot unbeirrbar seinen Kurs halt, und so weiter.

Captain Anderson: Kümmt da nix hoch von unten?

Asmus Asmussen: Die See verwischt die Sur der Bomben schnell Sicher, zuerst treiben Alge auf, Rotalgen, Braunalgen. Grünalgen nicht. Seegras und tote Fische bedecken die Oberfläche, darunter Goldbutt, Strufbutt und Seezunge, viele Dorsche. Selten Seeskorpione. Noch seltener Knorpelfisch wie Rochen oder Dornhaie. Überhaupt nicht Krebs- und Schalentiere. Das Meer nimmt diese Verluste gleichgültig hin. Nach kurzer Zeit kann niemand mehr behaupten, daß da eine Bombe fiel. Das Meer tilgt alle Spuren.

Captain Anderson: Dropen het de woll näch?

Asmus Asmussen: Es gab keine Verluste, ween du das meinst.

Appendix 2 Target Text (pages 120-124)

Asmus Asmussen: [Slide 1] That's our boat, A fine little craft . . . Please bear in mind. . .that she's only one of an infinite number of boats doing deep-formation duty in our home waters. Day and night, in rain and drifting snow. Forming an unbreakable chain. Nobody succeeds in slipping through that chain, no sea-owl and certainly no Englishman. And there are countless other boats, the same as ours, that the Leader has put down out there

Captain Anderson:[Slide 2] That'll be a ship's wake . . .

Asmus Asmussen: Being on patrol out there isn't just a matter of being on duty, of course. He who fights the sea earns the sea's love; to him she reveals herself in all her moods and mysteries.

Captain Anderson:You mean it isn't a ship's wake? Many a time we met with that.

Asmus Asmussen: To the uninitiated, the stranger, that manifold world will not open up. The landlubber cannot read the signs of the sea. Please notice the fireworks-display in this picture – unfortunately it doesn't come out very well. It is the phosphorescence that we call sea-glitter. It glimmers and gleams, casting its green and yellow flashes across the sea. At such times the guns fall silent. The whole wake turns into one luminous track, especially at night. It is as though the sea was saluting the men on whom she has bestowed the right of domicile. It is a message to the ships sailing without lights, in which no one sleeps so long as the flashes of light illuminate bows and stern.

Captain Anderson:Don't that there phosphorescence come from the little bugs, name of Noctiluca or the like?

Asmus Asmussen: Certainly, the phosphorescence has it's cause The flashing and sparkling is produced by microscopic inhabitants of the water, the reaction to an irritation. Flagellate they're called if you want the precise nomenclature – modest unicellular animalculae. But are they not part of the sea? Isn't it the one that shines in the other and through the other?

[Slide 3]There isn't much to be seen here, actually Just an evening. The off duty watch. The men relaxing, listening to a song – while the starboard watch – that's us ceaselessly watches the horizon. The guns are silent, as you can see. The day's work is done. Mussels and cod, caught by the crew, are a valued addition to the menu. The sea feeds all men. Up there on the left you see our four-barrelled A.A. gun. On the bridge, close to the yard-arm, that's our captain, not that you can see his face. There isn't much to be seen in this picture, really. This one now is perhaps a bit more interesting.

[Slide 4]Please observe the bombs hanging in mid-air, top right . . . Four bombs falling – hardly visible against the sun, but if you look closely – they all hit the water to starboard Just one among many among many similar mornings Still . . . one has to be prepared. The sea keeps its own counsel, come what may. Pity it wasn't possible to get a picture of the impact, the flowering fountains. In my diary I speak of a garden of fountains through which the boat keeps on her course unwaveringly.

Captain Anderson:Don't they bring up anything from below?

Asmus Asmussen: The sea swiftly wipes out all traces of the bombs At first, of course, algae come to the surface, red and brown algae – no green. Seaweed and dead fish litter the surface. Plaice sole, a great many cod. Occasionally, a scorpion-shell. Rarely cartilaginous fishes like ray or dorn-hound. Never crabs or shellfish. The sea accepts these losses with indifference. In a short while it all drifts apart and sinks and vanishes. After a while there is no way of telling that a bomb ever fell. The sea erases every trace of it.

Captain Anderson:No hit, eh?

Asmus Asmussen: If what you mean is, did we have any losses, the answer is no.

References

- Baker, M. (1992) *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London: Routledge.
- Caldas-Coulthard (2000a) *Translation and Discourse*. Birmingham: The University of Birmingham.
- Caldas-Coulthard (2000b) *Written Discourse*. Birmingham: The University of Birmingham.
- Coulthard, M. (1985) *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman.
- Eggs, S. (1994) *An Introduction to Functional Linguistics*. London: Pinter Publishers.
- Haliday, M.A.K. & Hasan R. (1976) *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman Group Limited.
- Haliday, M.A.K. & Hasan R. (1985) *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Geelong, Vic.: Deakin University Press.
- Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1990) *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman Group.
- Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1997) *The Translator as Communicator*. London: Routledge.
- Hawkins, J.A. (1986) *A Comparative Typology of English and German*. London/Sydney: Croom Helm Ltd.
- Hervey, S., Higgins, I. and Haywood L.M. (1995) *Thinking German Translation*. London: Routledge
- Lenz, S. (1968) *Der Deutschstunde*. München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag GmbH&Co. KG, (2000).
- Lenz, S. (1971) *The German Lesson*. New York: New Directions Publishing Corporation.
- Martin, J.R. (1992) *English Text*. Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Murdoch, B.O. & Read M. (1978) *Siegfried Lenz*. London:Oswald Wolff Limited.
- Stoddard, S. (1991) *Text and Texture: Patterns of Cohesion*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Company.