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**Abstract**

The purpose of this study is to compare four translations of August Strindberg’s novel *Röda rummet* (*The Red Room*). The first English translation from 1913 was made from a German translation of the novel. The two other English translations were made in 1967 and 2009. The analysis will examine the translations of geographical names in the first chapter of the novel. These proper names are instances of cultural references that constitute translation crisis points for which there may be no obvious official equivalent in the target language. Thus the translator has to select one of a number of possible solutions. These solutions can be analysed as parts of superordinate translation strategies, which are in turn governed by translation norms. If the solutions indicate that the translator’s strategy is oriented towards the target language, e.g. by substituting a reference, or by omitting it, it can be described as a domesticating strategy, which is governed by norms in the target culture. Target culture norms may exert prescriptive influence on translation of foreign texts. If the translator retains the names in the original text, it is indicative of an orientation towards the source language, and to norms in the source culture. The results of the analysis in this study show that the translations of 1967 and 2009 are to a greater extent oriented towards the source culture, as regards the transfer of cultural references in chapter one, since the names are to a greater extent kept in their original form, occasionally with small adjustments. This is an example of foreignization, a strategy which resists domesticating norms in the target culture, rather aiming at signalling the differences between languages and cultures. In contrast, domestication aims at the assimilation of foreign elements into the target language and culture, which is somewhat more indicated by the two early translations.
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1. Introduction

_Röda Rummet (The Red Room)_ was August Strindberg’s first novel, published in 1879. It inaugurated the realism of the 1880s in Swedish literature (http://www.ne.se/august-strindberg). The novel was an immediate success and established Strindberg as a young contemporary writer. The first English translation was made in 1913, by Ellie Schleussner. Her translation was however based on a German version of the novel, translated by Emil Schering (Anderman 2000:581). It was not until 1967 that the novel was translated from Swedish, by Elisabeth Sprigge. A third translation was published in 2009, by Peter Graves. This paper gives a comparative analysis of these translations in relation to Strindberg’s original source text. Using mainly translation theories as the theoretical framework, the analysis will examine the first chapter of the novel, looking for differences in the translations of cultural references, as regards translation norms, strategies and solutions. This perspective embraces above all the translation behaviour of the translators, as the cultural references present translation problems, or crisis points, which require active decisions from the translators. This means that the translator have to select one of a number of possible solutions, because there is no obvious official equivalent in the target language (Pedersen 2005:1).

1.1. Aim

The purpose of the study is to compare four translations of _Röda rummet_, and to analyse the solutions made by the translators. The analysis is likely to reveal patterns, or at least tokens, of translation strategies that will say something about the underlying norms of translation that govern this behaviour. What seems to be the strategy of the translators when it comes to transferring cultural references, for instance geographical names? Have they aimed at foreignization or domestication? What norms have governed this behaviour? Have the translator’s decisions been governed by norms realised in the source text, or by prevailing norms in the target culture? Can these norms and strategies say anything about the purposes (skopoi) of the translations? Finally, if the translator is more or less subjected to prevailing target culture norms, who should decide what constitutes a successful translation: the translator as an expert or scholars, the commissioner, or the public?

The following research questions will guide the progress of this study:
2. Literature review

2.1 Translation theories
The theoretical framework for this paper is that of translation theory. When outlining this field, it is perhaps more accurate to talk about translation theories, since the “increasingly interdisciplinary nature of translation studies has multiplied theories of translation” (Venuti 2000:4). Throughout Western history, many scholars have made theoretical statements about translation and its applications. Furthermore, according to Venuti, these statements can be said to belong to “traditionally defined areas of thinking about language and culture: literary theory and criticism, rhetoric, grammar, philosophy” (2000:4). Thus, it might be difficult to produce a general description of translation theory. However, some scholars have tried to locate recurring themes in order to find common denominators among the various statements. Louis Kelly has argued that a “complete” translation theory “has three components: specification of function and goal; description and analysis of operations; and critical comment on relationships between goal and operations” (Kelly 1979, in Venuti 2000:4). Certain components have tended to be emphasized at the expense of the others, throughout time, and have also often evolved into “a recommendation or prescription for good translating” (Venuti 2000:4). Nevertheless, the components identified by Kelly have proved to constitute a useful scheme in translation research. However, the most important concept in translation research, according to Venuti, is that of the relative autonomy of translation; i.e. “the textual features and operations or strategies that distinguish it from the foreign text and from texts initially written in the translating language” (Venuti 2000:5). By this definition, autonomy seems to imply that a translated text is something else than the original text, a distinction which has caused scholars to argue that translation is impossible, because any alteration of form also changes the meaning (cf. Leech & Short 1981:20–26). According to Venuti, these features and strategies “are what prevent translating from being unmediated and transparent communication”, because they “both enable and set up obstacles to cross-cultural understanding by working over the foreign text”, thus
substantiating the arguments for the impossibility of translation (2000:5). Other scholars have argued that translating is “rewriting” (Lefevere 1992, in Munday 2001:128), and that a translation of a classic text, which this paper is about, is actually two texts (Heylen 1993:126). This is perhaps the most important and interesting aspect of translation as a phenomenon. If translating is “rewriting”, does this imply that it results in a different text, with a different meaning? A translation is of course, from a formal point of view, something else than the original. A translated text could consist of fewer words than the original, for instance, depending on the nature of the receiving language. Also, references to cultural items, such as geographical names, that are not part of the receiving language could be substituted or generalized, as this study will show. However, the discussion on form and meaning is too broad for the scope of this study, as is the question of the impossibility of translation. Suffice it to say that a translated text can somehow be distinguished from the original text, and that this study will discuss the distinctive features and strategies of translation without which “translation never emerges as an object of study in its own right” (Venuti 2000:5). This study mainly focuses on translation problems encountered in the transfer of cultural references, and the translation solutions to these crisis points (see section 2.1.3). These solutions show that it will somehow be possible to decide on a translation even of the seemingly unsolvable, that there are ways of getting round also quite difficult translation crisis points. These questions are no doubt a result of the duplicity of the translation phenomenon, a process which involves two languages and two cultures, although cultures may not always be clearly different. Translation may appear possible and impossible at the same time; cross-cultural understanding (Venuti) may seem both enabled and impeded. If transparency is prevented, it is at the same time possible to create an “illusion of transparency” (Munday 2001:146).

Because of this inevitable duplicity, one important aspect of translation theory has been the question whether the translated text should be oriented towards the target language, or towards the source language. Newmark expresses this in the following way: “the conflict of loyalties, the gap between emphasis on source and target language will always remain as the overriding problem in translation theory and practice” (1981, in Munday 2001:44). In the 19th century, the German translator Schleiermacher argued that the strategy of the translator should be to move the reader towards the writer. This means that the translator should focus on transferring the foreign into the target language. A strategy like this entails
“giving the reader the same impression that he as a German would receive reading the work in the original language” (Schleiermacher 1813/1992, in Munday 2001:28). The translator should not aim at writing as the author would have done in the target language.

In *Introducing Translation Studies* (2001), Jeremy Munday provides an overview of important contributions to translation studies. Many of the observations mentioned in this paper are from that book, as well as from the anthology *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti (2000).

### 2.1.1. Toury: Descriptive translation studies (DTS) and translation norms

The translation process involves the changing of the original text, the source text (ST) in the source language (SL) into the target text (TT) in the receiving, or target, language (TL) (Munday 2001:5). A methodology for descriptive translation studies has been developed by Toury (1995). For Toury, the employment of translation strategies is determined by the position occupied by translations in the social and literary systems of a target culture (Munday 2001:112). For systematic DTS, Toury proposes a three-phase methodology:

1. Situate the text within the target culture system, looking at its significance or acceptability.
2. Compare the ST and the TT for shifts, identifying relationships between ‘coupled pairs’ of ST and TT segments, and attempting generalizations about the underlying concept of translation. Draw implications for decision-making in future translating.

(Toury 1995, in Munday 2001:112)

Translation shifts are “small linguistic changes occurring in translation of ST to TT” (Munday 2001:55). By the use of this methodology, it is possible to build up a “descriptive profile of translations according to genre, period, author etc.” (Munday 2001:112). This profile, then, is a tool for the identification of translation norms and, ultimately, the stating of laws of translational behaviour in general. Toury aimed at distinguishing trends of translation behaviour. He wanted to make generalizations about the decisions made by translators, and he wanted to reconstruct the norms in operation in translation. He defined norms as:

the translation of general values or ideas shared by a community – as to what is right or wrong, adequate or inadequate – into performance instructions appropriate for and applicable to particular situations.

(Toury 1995:55)

These norms are acquired from education and socialisation. According to Toury, the
translation process, or activity, is governed by these norms. They “can be expected to operate not only in translation of all kinds, but also at every stage in the translation event” (Toury 1978/2000:202). So, by analysing the translation product, it is possible to make statements about the translation process; to identify the translator’s decision-making processes. Although Toury used norms as a descriptive category “to be studied through regularity of behaviour, they appear to exert pressure and to perform some kind of prescriptive function” (Munday 2001:113). There are two sources for the reconstruction of translational norms, according to Toury. The textual source is the translated text itself; i.e. the product of this norm-governed activity. The extratextual source consists of e.g. “statements made about norms by translators, publishers, reviewers and other participants in the translation act” (Munday 2001:113). As mentioned, norms operate at many different stages of the translation event; they are reflected at every level. Translation is an activity which “inevitably involves at least two languages and two cultural traditions, i.e., at least two sets of norm-systems on each level” (Toury 1978/2000:200). Toury identifies different kinds of norms in the translation process. The basic initial norm can be regarded as the choice between the norm-system of the source culture and that of the target culture; subjection to source norms, realized in the ST, or subjection to target culture norms. This will have consequences for the relationship between ST and TT. The translation will be either ST-oriented or TT-oriented. If the translator subscribes to the norms realized in the source text, s/he subscribes to the norms of the source culture and language. This is sometimes referred to as “the pursuit of adequate translation” (Toury 1978/2000:201). This means the adequacy of the translation as compared to the source text. Reversely, adherence to norms in the target culture or language is said to determine the acceptability of the translation. The poles between adequate and acceptable translations “are on a continuum since no translation is ever totally adequate or totally acceptable” (Munday 2001:114). This means that translation shifts are inevitable; they are a “true universal of translation” (1978/2000:201) and are also norm-governed. Even the most ST-oriented translation involves shifts from the source text. Toury points out that the initial norm should not be “overinterpreted”. An overall choice between norm-systems does not necessarily imply that decisions at lower levels are made in full accordance with it. “Actual translation decisions” involve an “ad hoc combination [...] between the two extremes implied by the initial norm. This is because it is “unrealistic to expect absolute regularities [...] in any behavioural domain” (Toury 1978/2000:201).
Toury also distinguishes between *preliminary* and *operational* norms. Preliminary norms consider the existence and nature of a definite translation policy; i.e. those factors that govern the choice of text type to be translated into a particular language or culture at a particular time. These choices are affected by e.g. agents and publishers. Preliminary norms also consider the *directness of translation*. This consideration involves “the threshold of tolerance for translating from languages other than the ultimate source language” (Toury 1978/2000:202); i.e. whether translation through an intermediate language should be accepted. This is an important consideration for the present study, since it involves one translation made from Swedish to English via German. Toury raises questions about the tolerance to this practice asking if we should mark the translated work as mediated, or if we should ignore/camouflage it. How important is the identity of the mediating language? Should we supply it? (1978/2000:202) Operational norms, then, “may be conceived of as directing the decisions made during the act of translation itself” (Toury 1978/2000:202).

They affect the matrix of the text (modes of distributing linguistic material), and govern the relationship between ST and TT as to what will change or not during transformation. Operational norms are divided into *matricial* and *textual-linguistic* norms, where the former have to do with “the completeness of the TT” (Munday 2001:114), involving additions, omissions, relocation, distribution and segmentation of the text. The textual-linguistic norms govern the *selection* of linguistic material with which to replace the original ST-material, involving e.g. lexical items, phrases and stylistic features (Munday 2001:114). Toury stresses that each of these norms is a “graded notion”, since “a translator’s behaviour cannot be expected to be fully systematic” (Toury, in Munday 2001:115). They also differ in “intensity”, from “mandatory” to “tolerated” behaviour (Munday 2001:115). By this, he seems to say that some norms exert stronger influence than others, such as perhaps education norms and dominant target culture values. As will be shown, these are important factors to consider.

### 2.1.2 Venuti: Domestication and Foreignization

The question of which language and culture translators should focus upon made Venuti distinguish between two types of translation strategy: *domestication* and *foreignization* (Venuti 1995, in Munday 2001:146). Domestication is in fact what has been dominating Anglo-American translation culture, whereas foreignization was the preferred choice of e.g.
Schleiermacher. Following Schleiermacher’s description of translation, domestication moves the writer to the reader, whereas foreignization does the opposite. Another distinction, by Oittinen, is that “while domestication assimilates text to target linguistic and cultural values, in foreignization some significant traces of the original text are retained” (2006:42). These two strategies “concern both the choice of text to translate and the translation method” (Munday 2001:146). According to Venuti, domestication involves “an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values” (1995, in Munday 2001:146). This means that texts to translate could be chosen in accordance with these domestic values; texts that “are likely to lend themselves to such a translation strategy” (Munday 2001:147). Translators tend to translate ‘fluently’ into English, so that the target text becomes idiomatic and ‘readable’. This will give an illusion of transparency, as the foreignness of the target text is then minimized (2001:146). The translator is thus made “invisible”, whereas the foreignizing method makes the translator “visible”, because here the translator is more present; the foreignness of the source text is highlighted and protected from the dominant values of the target culture (2001:147). This appears to be somewhat contradictory, because how can a translator be “more present” if he, for instance, refrains from translating and retains e.g. a cultural reference exactly as it reads in the original? The foreignness may be highlighted, but the translator has not “done” anything. The answer seems to be that the foreignizing element makes the reader aware that s/he is reading a translation; the reader is, as it were, sent abroad by registering the “linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text” (Munday 2001:147). What the translator “does” is that s/he (visibly) resists the ideological dominance of the target culture by protecting the source text from it. Domesticating translation is more a matter of “concealing” partiality to the source text (2001:147), as foreign elements such as cultural references are translated into the target language; the translator makes himself “invisible” by not resisting target culture values. Furthermore, foreignization is a relative term that “still involves some domestication because it translates a ST for a target culture and depends on dominant target-culture values to become visible when it departs from them” (Munday 2001:148). Although they may seem to be contradictory and relative terms, domestication and foreignization are still useful to this study, because what does not change, according to Venuti, is that they deal with “the question of how much a translation assimilates a foreign text to the translating language and culture, and how much it rather signals the differences of that text” (1999, in Munday 2001:148).
2.1.3. Pedersen: Extralinguistic Cultural Reference (ECR)

Jan Pedersen has introduced the term Extralinguistic Culture-bound Reference, or ECR (2005:2). Extralinguistic Culture-bound Reference is defined as

reference that is attempted by means of any culture-bound linguistic expression, which refers to an extralinguistic entity or process, and which is assumed to have a discourse referent that is identifiable to a relevant audience as this referent is within the encyclopaedic knowledge of this audience.

(Pedersen 2005:2).

In his dissertation (2007), he modifies it into Extralinguistic Cultural Reference, defining it as “references to places, people, institutions, customs, food etc. that you may not know even if you know the language in question” (Pedersen 2007:91). They are “expressions pertaining to [...] cultural items, which are not part of a language system (Pedersen 2005:2); they are culture-bound and require encyclopaedic knowledge of the culture in question. Following Venuti’s distinction between foreignization and domestication, the strategies for rendering ECRs then range between the most foreignizing and the most domesticating strategies, according to Pedersen (2005:3). The SL-oriented, or foreignizing, strategies are retention, specification, and direct translation. The TL-oriented, or domesticating, strategies are generalisation, substitution and omission. These strategies “describe linguistically how ECRs are transferred from ST to TT” (Pedersen 2005:9), and they are symptomatic of the norms in operation in the translation process (cf. Toury), because they result in specific translation decisions that indicate what overall strategy and what norms the translator adheres to. These decisions are the solutions of translation problems, crisis points, encountered by the translator. When there is no obvious official equivalent, references to the source culture constitute one of the most revealing translation crisis points. Such a crisis point “reveals the workings of many norms, such as domestication vs. foreignization..., awareness of skopos etc.” (Pedersen 2005:1). Geographical names, a type of proper names, are instances of crisis points, forcing the translator to decide whether they should be translated at all. If they are translated, how are they rendered? Why are not all names translated? The translator may not be totally aware of all the decisions and choices that s/he makes, because parts of the process may be internalized and subconscious (Pedersen 2005:9). For example, the translator may not be aware at every stage of exactly which strategy, or even which combined strategies, s/he uses. Strong extratextual norms
may influence the translator unconsciously, such as internalized educational norms, or translation policies in the target culture. Since norms seem to appear at every stage in the translation process, the translator cannot be conscious of them all.

2.1.4 Vermeer: Skopos and translation
Vermeer has outlined the *skopos* (Greek: aim, purpose) theory as “part of a theory of translational action” (Vermeer 1989/2000:221). Translation is here regarded as an action which should lead to a result, and therefore requires an aim, or purpose. The result of the action is the target text, or *translatum* (the resulting translated text). According to Vermeer, “the aim of any translational action, and the mode in which it is to be realized, are negotiated with the client who commissions the action’” (1989/2000:221). Furthermore, the aim and mode are essential for the translator, and have to be specific; they have to be fully defined if the translator is to fulfil his task successfully. The translator is an expert in his field, and as such responsible for the commissioned translation. Therefore, according to Vermeer, it should be up to the translator, as the expert, to decide what status to assign to the source text; what the role of the source text should be in the translation action. A practical consequence of the skopos theory, according to Vermeer, is a “new concept of the status of the source text for a translation, and with it the necessity of working for an increasing awareness of this, both among translators and also the general public” (1989/2000:222). It is crucial that the translator knows why a source text is to be translated, and what the function of the target text will be (Munday 2001:79). The translator, as an expert, should be able to advise the commissioner on the possibility of achieving the goal.

The first ‘rule’ of the skopos theory is that the target text is determined by the skopos. There are two other ‘rules’ worth mentioning in relation to this study: the coherence rule and the fidelity rule. The first states that the TT must be internally coherent; it must be “translated in such a way that it is coherent for the TT receivers, given their circumstances and knowledge” (Munday 2001:79). The second principle says that the TT must be coherent with the ST. There must be coherence between the ST information received by the translator, the interpretation of this information, and the information encoded for the TT receivers (Munday 2001:79). These rules are given in hierarchical order, so that intertextual coherence (fidelity) is subordinate to intratextual coherence. This allows the same text to be translated in different ways, depending on the specific purpose and the given commission. If the TT fulfils the skopos, it is “functionally and communicatively adequate” (Munday
This use of the term *adequate* should not be confused with Toury’s notion of an adequate translation, which rather describes to what extent the TT is subjected to norms realized in the ST.

This survey has introduced the issues of norms, strategies and solutions as prominent features of translation. Norms are the most basic in that they are general values or attitudes concerning what could be done in translation. They seem to exert prescriptive influence on translators and govern their behaviour. Strategies could be regarded as general ways of selecting translation solutions, as Pedersen has shown. The solution is the actual result of the decision made by the translator. The strategies for transfer of ECRs should be regarded as descriptive categories rather than translation prescriptions, because they describe what happens linguistically in the transfer from ST to TT. As Pedersen points out, translators may not be aware of which strategy they use. Strategies range between domestication and foreignization. In relation to Pedersen’s strategies, domestication and foreignization should be regarded as overall strategies. For example, the decision to keep an ECR in its untranslated form could be analysed/described as a *retention* strategy, which in turn is symptomatic of the overall strategy of foreignization. The choice of overall strategy is then governed by the *initial* norm which is the choice between source culture or target culture norm-system.

3. Method and material

The analysis follows Toury’s methodology for descriptive translation studies (DTS) by comparing the ST and TT for shifts, by discussing the acceptability of the TT, and by making generalizations about the underlying norms that govern the behaviour. The four translations will be referred to as the target texts, TT1-4, and the original text as the source text, ST. The results are presented as a micro-level descriptive and comparative analysis of the ST and the four TTs. Consequently, the source language and the target language will be referred to as SL and TL. The TTs are compared with the ST for shifts to identify “relationships between ‘coupled pairs’ of ST and TT segments” (Munday 2001:112), and they are also compared with each other. A micro-level translation description is one of the sections in a scheme for translation description proposed by Lambert and van Gorp (1985).
This level of comparison between ST and TT identifies “i.e. shifts on phonic, graphic, micro-syntactic, lexico-semantic, [and] stylistic” levels, as well as the “selection of words”, the “dominant grammatical patterns and formal literary structures (metre, rhyme…)”, and the “narrative, perspective and point of view” (Lambert & van Gorp 1985:52). The comparative analysis also allows for the identification of the overall strategies domestication and foreignization.

Pedersen’s (2005) taxonomy of strategies for the rendering of ECRs into target solutions is also applied in the analysis. The terms for these strategies describe linguistically how ECRs are transferred, and they are symptomatic of overall strategies and underlying norms that govern translation behaviour (Pedersen 2005:1). By analysing the rendering of a specific kind of proper nouns, i.e. geographical names, in the first chapter of the novel, the solutions of translation crisis points will be highlighted. Since these geographical names could be regarded as cultural references (Pedersen 2005:2), they may occasionally be crisis points which require deliberate decisions from each translator. The analysis will then try to describe what strategies and norms are reflected in the translation solutions. In this study, geographical names are regarded as ECRs; cultural reference points that are not part of a language system. According to Pedersen, they may be regarded as such, though he also points out that the issue of language is a complex issue, “as, depending on your standpoint, everything, some things, or nothing is purely intralinguistic” (Pedersen 2005:2). In certain respects, proper names could be integrated in a language system, e.g. grammatically, as nouns. They could also be non-integrated as regards pronunciation, orthography and unique reference. Anyhow, they will be regarded as translation crisis points, because they have forced the four translators to make decisions that differ from each other; they are “turning points […] indicative of overall strategy and to what norms the translator professes” (Pedersen 2005:1).

The skopos theory outlined by Vermeer allows the same text to be translated in different ways, depending on the purpose of the TT and the given commission. The analysis will demonstrate this, as the examined cultural references are treated differently by the translators. The differing strategies and solutions that can be seen may therefore be due to different purposes of the translations. The analysis will try to outline possible purposes, as the purpose allegedly determines the translation method and strategies (Munday 2001:79).
The source text for the analysis is the 1981 National Edition of *Röda rummet*, edited by Carl Reinhold Smedmark. TT1 is Emil Schering’s German translation, *Das rote Zimmer*, from 1905. In turn, this German translation was the source text used by Ellie Schleussner for her 1913 translation into English. We will call this TT2. TT3 is Elizabeth Sprigge’s translation from 1967 from the Swedish original. TT4 is the translation from 2009 by Peter Graves using the 1981 National Edition as ST.

In the analysis, the terms ‘translate’, ‘render’, and ‘transfer’ are used alternately, mainly because a couple of the strategies suggested by Pedersen, retention and omission, do not involve actual translation (Pedersen 2005:3).

4. Historical background

4.1 Translations of *Röda rummet*

Published in 1879, *Röda rummet* was Strindberg’s first novel. According to Björn Meidal (1994), Strindberg did not pay much attention to the quality of translations of his works; the important issue was rather to decide which of his works should be translated. Less important was how they were translated. Apparently, Strindberg was not alone taking this position, as this seems to have been a time when the artistic skills of translators did not get much attention. Writing was considered nobler than translating. (Meidal 1995:21). At the time, Strindberg mostly corresponded with German translators. From 1897, he began to cooperate with Emil Schering, a translator who by and by would become not just the devoted translator of Strindberg into German, but who would also function as an impresario, an agent, and an accountant. This more or less ended Strindberg’s contacts with other translators, and Schering was to play an important role in Strindberg’s international career. It was from Schering’s translations that other translations were made, for instance into Russian, Italian, and English. (Meidal, p.19). However, Schering’s translations were criticized as being deficient, even by contemporaries (Meidal 1995:18ff). Helmut Müssener (1995) gives an outline as to the reasons for this. Apparently, Schering’s theoretical ambitions were never brought to praxis. His intentions were to stay as close as possible to the original, by e.g. “importing” Swedish words into German, and by directly connecting the reader with the author, i.e. a ST-oriented strategy. In reality, however, he changed the syntax, shortened long sentences, translated word-for-word, and omitted interjections typical of Strindberg. This was due to contemporary demands in German and Latin.
education, norms acquired through education (cf. Toury), which required absolute obedience. Such norms were e.g. word-for-word translation, short sentences, avoidance of foreign words, moderate and decent language. Thus, German versions of Strindberg’s works became more conventional, less drastic, and less alive than the Swedish original text, according to Müßener (1995:32f). However, he continues, even though the translation into German gravely affected the artistic style of Strindberg, as well as the irony and satire, and even the naturalism, Müßener argues that Germans in general probably liked the German version of Strindberg, despite the “erroneous” translations. What they liked was the subjects and the motives brought to light by Strindberg. Müßener questions the importance of academic hair-splitting on what constitutes a good translation. An “erroneous” translation does not necessarily imply that the translated work is negatively received by the target audience, or the broad public (Müssener 1995:32f). As already mentioned, Schering, whether an inferior translator or not, helped to push Strindberg’s international popularity forward. This can be connected to the discussion of skopos and translation (section 2.1.4). A translated work may be appreciated by and popular among people in general, even if the result of the translation somewhat deviates from the translator’s primary intentions. Critics of Schering’s translations seem to think that the mode of realisation (cf. Vermeer in 2.1.4) was not fully defined. It raises the question of who should be allowed to decide when a translation is successful.

The first translation into English was made by Ellie Schleussner in 1913, based on Schering’s German version. Schleussner translated several novels and plays by Strindberg. As there was a growing demand for Strindberg in England, the author himself commissioned Schering to send his German versions to Schleussner in England, so that they would be translated (Robinson 1995:116). Directness of translation is one of Toury’s preliminary norms, and the issue of translating from an intermediate language, as in this case, has been noticed by scholars. “Unfortunately, the translations by Emil Schering, Strindberg’s devoted German translator, were often less than perfect in their interpretation of the source text and their frequent failure to recreate Strindberg’s highly personal use of style and syntax”, Gunilla Anderman argues (2000:581), thus pointing out the disadvantage of translation from another source than the original text.

Elizabeth Sprigge was a scholar who, besides writing a biographical work on Strindberg, also translated many of his dramas into “fluent and accurate English” (Anderman 2000:581). She translated The Red Room in 1967. The latest translation, by
Peter Graves, a scholar of Scandinavian studies and a translation researcher, came in 2009.

## 5. Analysis

### 5.1 Geographical names

In the first chapter of the Swedish ST, several geographical names, or cultural references, of places in Stockholm are given. 26 instances of them are listed in the order of appearance in the table below (and not alphabetically). The target texts are given chronologically from left to right. It is important to remember that TT1, Schering’s German translation, is the source text of TT2, Schleussner’s English translation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST (1879)</th>
<th>TT1 (Schering 1905), ST of TT2</th>
<th>TT2 (Schleussner 1913), TT of TT1</th>
<th>TT3 (Sprigge 1967)</th>
<th>TT4 (Graves 2009)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mosebacke</td>
<td>der Moseshöhe</td>
<td>“Moses Height”</td>
<td>Mosebacke</td>
<td>Mosebacke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skolan på Rosendal</td>
<td>die Baumschule im Tiergarten</td>
<td>the nursery in the Deer Park</td>
<td>the nursery at Rosendal</td>
<td>Rosendal nursery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liljeholmen</td>
<td>dem Lilienholm</td>
<td>the Lilijeholm</td>
<td>Liljeholm</td>
<td>Liljeholmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergsund</td>
<td>Bergsund</td>
<td>Bergsund</td>
<td>Bergsund</td>
<td>Bergsund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riddarfjärden</td>
<td>den Ritterfjärd</td>
<td>the Riddarfjörd [sic]</td>
<td>Riddarfjärd</td>
<td>Riddarfjärden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riddarholms-kyrkan</td>
<td>der Ritterholmskirche</td>
<td>the Riddarholms [sic] church</td>
<td>Riddarholm’s Church</td>
<td>Riddarholm Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stora Sjötullen</td>
<td>am großen Seezoll</td>
<td>the chief custom-house</td>
<td>the big Custom House</td>
<td>the customs building at Stora Sjötullen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lidingö (skogarne)</td>
<td>(die Wälder der) Lidinginsel</td>
<td>(the woods of) the Liding Island</td>
<td>(the woods on) Lidingö</td>
<td>(the forests on) Lidingö</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaxholm</td>
<td>Vaxholm</td>
<td>Vaxholm</td>
<td>Vaxholm</td>
<td>Vaxholm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siklaön</td>
<td>der Siklainsel</td>
<td>the Sikla Island</td>
<td>Sicklaön [sic]</td>
<td>Siklaön</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hästholmen</td>
<td>dem Pferdeholm</td>
<td>the Hästarholm</td>
<td>Hästholmen</td>
<td>Hästholmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danviken</td>
<td>dem Krankenhaus Danviken</td>
<td>the hospital Daniken [sic]</td>
<td>Danviken</td>
<td>the bay at Danviken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(törnade mot) Stadsgården</td>
<td>(stieß gegen) den Stadthofkai</td>
<td>(came dead against) the city quay</td>
<td>(bumped against) the City dockyard</td>
<td>(bumped into) the slope at Stadsgården</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadsgårdshamnen</td>
<td>im Hafen</td>
<td>the harbour</td>
<td>the harbour</td>
<td>the Stadsgården dock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeppsbron</td>
<td>der Schiffsbrücke</td>
<td>the pontoon bridge</td>
<td>the quayside</td>
<td>the quay at Skeppsbron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kungsbacks-omnibussarne</td>
<td>die Omnibusse</td>
<td>the omnibuses</td>
<td>the Kungshack omnibuses</td>
<td>the Kungsbacken omnibuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeppsholmen</td>
<td>vom Schiffsholm</td>
<td>the dockyard</td>
<td>Skeppsholm</td>
<td>Skeppsholmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(gevärswop från) Södermalmstorg</td>
<td>dem Platze</td>
<td>(the turning out of the guard)</td>
<td>(military commands from) Södermalmstorg</td>
<td>(military commands from) the square in Södermalm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasbruksgatan</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td>Glasbruksgatan</td>
<td>Glasbruksgatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katrina [sic]</td>
<td>Katharina</td>
<td>St. Catherine’s</td>
<td>Santa Katrina</td>
<td>St Katarina’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>Santa Maria’s</td>
<td>St Maria’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storkyrkan</td>
<td>die Großkirche</td>
<td>the great church</td>
<td>the Abbey</td>
<td>Storkyrkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyskan</td>
<td>die Deutsche church</td>
<td>the German Church</td>
<td>the German Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klara kyrkogård</td>
<td>dem Klarakirchhof</td>
<td>the churchyard of St. Clara’s</td>
<td>the Santa Klara churchyard</td>
<td>St Klara’s churchyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strömgatan</td>
<td>die Stromstraße</td>
<td>River Street</td>
<td>Strömgatan</td>
<td>Strömgatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladugårdslandet</td>
<td>im nordöstlicher Stadtteil</td>
<td>the north-eastern part of the town</td>
<td>Ladugård</td>
<td>Ladugårdslandet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table demonstrates the solutions to 26 ECRs given in the ST (in the first chapter). An attempt at categorisation, following Pedersen’s six strategies for transfer of ECRs, shows that the solutions sometimes connect to more than one strategy, or translation category; i.e. the strategies tend to overlap. This will be further discussed later on. Retention and omission are at the extremes of the scale ranging from foreignization to domestication.
Retention can however be adjusted to the TL, as can be seen in the table above. TT4 has 14 instances of complete retention, and TT3 has 11 instances. Another 5 instances in TT3 are retained but slightly adjusted. 14 names, of which at least 5 are obvious word-for-word translations, are translated into German in TT1. Furthermore, 5 solutions in TT2 could be considered generalisations or substitutions – i.e. they are TL-oriented – and there are 2 omissions. TT3 has 2 typical generalisations. These instances are the ones that most easily lend themselves to categorisation. Others are more difficult, as they could be the results of combined strategies, following Pedersen’s categorisation. The solutions and strategies are analysed in the subsequent section, and further discussed in the final section.

5.2 Translation analysis
The first occurring name in the ST, Mosebacke, is translated into Moses Height by Schleussner (from Moseshöhe), and for some reason first given within double quotation marks: “Moses Height”. This is not a consistent strategy, since the name appears once more, this time without the quotes. Furthermore, none of the other translated geographical names are put within quotes when they first appear. Another strategic solution would be to retain the SL name “Mosebacke”, placed within quotes. Then it would be clear that the translator aimed at retention as well as foreignization of this cultural reference, thus highlighting the foreign and the extralinguistic culture-bound reference by using quotation marks. Quotes and italics are occasionally used to mark retained ECRs off from the rest of a TT (Pedersen 2005:4). However, this is not the case here, since the name is not retained. It is marked off by quotes, but also translated. Accordingly, a look into the 1905 translation from Swedish to German by Emil Schering is necessary. In his German translation, Schering translates Mosebacke into Moseshöhe (without quotes), which in turn corresponds to Moses Height in the English translation, i.e. a literal translation of the German cognate lexeme höhe (cf. Sw. höjd).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT1</th>
<th>TT2</th>
<th>TT3</th>
<th>TT4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mosebacke</td>
<td>der Moseshöhe</td>
<td>“Moses Height”</td>
<td>Mosebacke</td>
<td>Mosebacke</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned, this German translation was the ST used by Ellie Schleussner in 1913. The influence of (and fidelity to) the German ST is apparent also in her translation of die Baumschule im Tiergarten into the nursery in the Deer Park. Let us, however, start by
analysing the translation of the Swedish ST Rosendal into Tiergarten. Following Pedersen’s taxonomy of ECRs (section 2.1.3), this could be an instance of TL-oriented generalisation of a ST ECR, since the relationship between Rosendal and Tiergarten is meronymic (part-whole), as long as Tiergarten is understood as a translation of the geographical name Djurgården. Tiergarten, then, is the “direct” translation of Swedish Djurgården, and the place where Rosendal is situated; I have placed “direct” in quotes because the ST has Rosendal and not Djurgården. Thus, we may just assume that the German translator chose to translate the name of the larger area where Rosendal is situated. According to Pedersen, direct translation can be a strategy at the borderline between SL-oriented and TL-oriented strategies (cf. Pedersen 2005:4f). Here, we could say that it is somewhat more TL-oriented, since Tiergarten is well-known for most Germans as a park in Berlin. At the same time, however, it could refer to Djurgården (the place in Stockholm) through generalisation, as Rosendal is a part of Djurgården, in German rendered as Tiergarten. In short, this could be two cultural references: a direct translation of a Swedish proper name, as well as the German (domestic) Tiergarten, being a proper name in the German vocabulary, and therefore used as a reference point for the TL readers. Had Schering chosen the foreign Djurgården, it would have been more SL-oriented, and more exotic to the TL-readers. Instead, he chooses to translate (or substitute) Rosendal into something that the TL-readers may connect to. We could then also say that this is an instance of cultural substitution of an ECR (Rosendal), which makes the choice even more TL-oriented, following Pedersens taxonomy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT1</th>
<th>TT2</th>
<th>TT3</th>
<th>TT4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skolan på Rosendal</td>
<td>die Baumschule im Tiergarten</td>
<td>the nursery in the Deer Park</td>
<td>the nursery at Rosendal</td>
<td>Rosendal nursery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schleussner, then, translates Tiergarten into Deer Park, which could be considered a direct translation, or perhaps a substitution. The German lexeme Tier corresponds to the more general noun animal, although it could also mean ‘female deer’. Tier and deer and djur are cognates, i.e. of the same etymological (Germanic) origin. However, deer in English has undergone specialisation and no longer carries the sense of ‘animal’, while this sense is retained in other Germanic languages, e.g. in German Tier and Swedish djur.
Consequently, a *deer park* has the sense of ‘a park for (historically: hunting) deer’, whereas a *Tiergarten* means ‘a park for animals’, a more generic sense. Since Schleussner did not use Strindberg’s ST for her translation, she had to translate the choices of the mediating German translator or, she could translate on the basis of her possible encyclopaedic knowledge of Swedish proper names, such as *Djurgården*. The choice of *Deer Park* is nevertheless a choice that comprises the historical sense of a *Tiergarten* as a place for deer. (Indeed, Djurgården in Stockholm was initially a place for the keeping of deer, so *Djurgården, Tiergarten, and deer park* are etymologically linked, although the latter is less generic.)

If we then look at *Liljeholmen* and *Riddarfjärden*, Schering translates the first parts of the names into their German cognates; *Lilien, lilies*, and *Ritter, knight*, while retaining the second parts *holm, islet, holm*, and *fjärd, fiard, firth*, although they are formally adjusted to the TL: *dem Lilienholm* and *den Ritterfjärd*. The other TTs more or less retain the names in the ST, with small adjustments. When comparing the four TTs, one can see that the names *Liljeholmen* and *Riddarfjärden* are completely retained in TT4, and slightly adjusted in TTs 2 and 3. In TT2, the TL definite article is used, and *Riddarfjörd* is actually partly translated back to Swedish from *Ritterfjärd*, so it is again possible that Schleussner might have had at least some knowledge of the Swedish language (even though *fjörd* seems a little odd, and might even be a misprint) and/or the geography of Stockholm (cf. also *Riddarholms church*). In TT3, the definite article is dropped, perhaps to adjust the proper name to TL formal conventions, as many types of geographical names are in indefinite form in English (cf. e.g. *Easter Island* or *Lake Michigan*). In TT4, there is no adjustment; the name is completely retained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT1</th>
<th>TT2</th>
<th>TT3</th>
<th>TT4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liljeholmen</td>
<td>dem Lilienholm</td>
<td>the Liljeholm</td>
<td>Liljeholm</td>
<td>Liljeholmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riddarfjärden</td>
<td>den Ritterfjärd</td>
<td>the Riddarfjörd [sic]</td>
<td>Riddarfjärd</td>
<td>Riddarfjärden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A solution difficult to describe is the translation of *Stora Sjötullen* in TT2, from *Seezoll*, and TT3. In *The chief custom-house* and *the big Custom House*, the sense of ‘sea’ is lost in translation, whereas it is kept in TT1 through *Seezoll*, again a literal translation. In TT4,
Graves moves somewhat towards the TL audience: *the customs building at Stora Sjötullen* is an example of specification with explicitation. The name is retained, with the addition of explicit information that is latent in the ST ECR (*Sjötullen*), in order to “disambiguate an ECR for the Target Culture (TC) audience” (Pedersen 2005:5). The solutions of TT2 and 3 could perhaps be regarded as substitutions in that the ECR is removed, and specifications considering the noun *house*. One problem might be that the cognate *toll* could hardly be used here, as in the German solution. TT3 uses initial capitals to suggest proper name status, a solution perhaps better than ‘the big Sea Customs’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT1</th>
<th>TT2</th>
<th>TT3</th>
<th>TT4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Stora Sjötullen</em></td>
<td><em>am großen Seezoll</em></td>
<td><em>the chief custom-house</em></td>
<td><em>the big Custom House</em></td>
<td><em>the customs building at Stora Sjötullen</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Danviken* is another instance of a name to which a translator might need to add some information. TT1 and 2 has the *hospital* (*Krankenhaus* in TT1) as explicit information for the TT audience; that is specification. TT3 adds no information, while in TT4 Graves wants to make explicit that *Danviken* is a bay, ‘vik’, although Strindberg probably had the hospital in mind. In translation back to Swedish, the phrase *the bay at Danviken* becomes something of a pleonasm, but since Graves’ strategy seems to be to retain the names of the original, he apparently needs to add information so that the meaning of the phrase *in i Danviken* is fully transferred to the TT readers. Thus, retention of geographical names might involve expansion of the TT expression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT1</th>
<th>TT2</th>
<th>TT3</th>
<th>TT4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Danviken</em></td>
<td><em>dem Krankenhaus</em></td>
<td><em>the hospital Daniken</em></td>
<td><em>Danviken</em> [sic]</td>
<td><em>the bay at Danviken</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graves has a similar strategy for the phrase *törnade mot Stadsgården*, which he translates as *bumped into the slope at Stadsgården*. The name is retained, but he adds explicit information about (topographical) features of the ECR that the TT readers might not be aware of. (Even some ST readers may not be aware of these features, as they require
familiarity with Stockholm). In so doing he preserves the sense of the ST ECR, adjusting it for TT readers. This added information is more explicit than the solutions of TT2 and 3, which are *came dead against the city quay* and *bumped against the City dockyard*. *City quay* is roughly the transfer of German *Stadthofkai*, and *City dockyard* nearly a literal translation of *Stadsgården*. The capital letter suggests that this is a name rather than a generalisation. *Stadsgården* is roughly a transfer of German *Stadthofkai*, and *City dockyard* nearly a literal translation of *Stadsgården*. The capital letter suggests that this is a name rather than a generalisation. *Stadsgården*, on the other hand, is rather a subject of generalisation, since not even Schering translates it literally, even though he has done it before. *Hafen* is more generic, as is *the harbour* in TT 2 and 3. *The Stadsgården dock* has similar correspondence, although *harbour* would have been a more direct translation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT1</th>
<th>TT2</th>
<th>TT3</th>
<th>TT4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(törnade mot)</em></td>
<td><em>(stieß gegen)</em></td>
<td><em>(came dead against)</em></td>
<td><em>(bumped against)</em></td>
<td><em>(bumped into)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadsgården</td>
<td>den Stadthofkai</td>
<td>the city quay</td>
<td>the City dockyard</td>
<td>the slope at Stadsgården</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadsgårdenhamnen</td>
<td>im Hafen</td>
<td>the harbour</td>
<td>the harbour</td>
<td>the Stadsgården dock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Skeppsbron* is literally translated by Schering, and retained by Graves in TT4, although he adds *the quay* as specification. Schleussner’s solution is actually a literal rendering of *Schiffsbrücke*. Sprigge, in TT3, although rather keen on retention otherwise, calls it *the quayside*, a typical generalisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT1</th>
<th>TT2</th>
<th>TT3</th>
<th>TT4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skeppsbron</td>
<td>der Schiffsbrücke</td>
<td>the pontoon bridge</td>
<td>the quayside</td>
<td>the quay at Skeppsbron</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Södermalmstorg* is rendered as *dem Platze*, ‘the square’ (in dative) in TT1, which is a generalization. TT2 omits the name, or the decision is rather not to translate *dem Platze*. Here Graves chooses not to retain the name; *the square in Södermalm* is a more domesticating solution than full retention. The effect is partly generalization, because it could actually mean any square in Södermalm.
The most striking difference between the transfers of the church names is perhaps seen in *Storkyrkan*. It is literally translated into German, also as a name. *The great church* then, as transfer of *die Großkirche*, is not the name translated – although it is a literal translation of the noun phrase – since there are no initial capitals. The same goes for *the German church* in TT2, where TT3 and 4 has *the German Church*, the capital *C* suggesting proper name status. TT3 substitutes *the Abbey* for *Storkyrkan*, a cultural substitution (Pedersen 2005:6), while TT4 retains the name.

Substitution is also seen in the last example, *Ladugårdslandet*, which Schering and Schleussner rephrase. *The north-eastern part of the town* is a solution which removes the ECR and replaces it with a descriptive paraphrase (Pedersen 2005:8). There are no attempts at translating any parts of the ECR, as seen in other cases, e.g. *the harbour*. What is transferred is rather necessary information for the TT readers on the location of the ECR. TT3 has *Ladugård*, which is only partial retention.
6. Summarizing discussion and conclusion

The purpose of the analysis was to find answers to these research questions:

- What strategies can be seen in operation?
- What underlying norms do they suggest?
- What can norms and strategies say about the purpose of the translation?
- When is a translation successful?

When analysing the transfer of cultural references in the above table in section 5.1, it becomes apparent that the newer translations are keener towards retention of the names in the original, and this is an indication of foreignization. For example, TT2 (Schleussner) has River Street, translated from Stromstraße, whereas TT3 and TT4 keeps the original Strömgatan. TT4 has 14 instances of full retention, TT3 has 11, and 5 adjusted retentions. As Pedersen has pointed out, retention is the most common, and the most SL-oriented strategy in the transfer of ECRs (Pedersen 2005:4). Most common is to slightly adjust the ECR to meet TL conventions, as seen in TT3. The German translation, however, is more TL-oriented, as it translates parts of the proper names into the TL. Pedersen calls this direct translation, a strategy that, according to him, “could hardly be used on proper names” (Pedersen 2005:5). Other scholars refer to this as literal translation, or word-for-word translation (Vinay & Darbelnet 1958/2000:86ff). Pedersen points out that the result of direct translation may seem exotic to a TT audience. It is most common in translation between languages of the same family (Vinay & Darbelnet 1958/2000:86). The “semantic load” (Pedersen 2005:5) of the ST ECR is unchanged in the solutions Lilienholm and Ritterfjärd. From these examples, it is possible to say that TT4 is the most SL-oriented text in the rendering of geographical names, because most of the names are completely retained. TT1 is then the least SL-oriented translation, as 14 names are (at least partly) translated into German, e.g. die Ritterholmskirche, die Lidinginsel, der Pferdeholm, die Stromstraße. At least 5 names are direct translations (word-for-word), e.g. die Schiffbrücke. However, this is not a consistent pattern. Names such as Bergsund and Vaxholm are retained in the German translation, the latter being most probably an official equivalent, and the former perhaps not very suitable for literal translation, to follow Pedersen. Direct translation can be an in-between strategy, between “the exotic and the domestic” (Pedersen 2000:5). Occasionally, Schering refrains from this strategy: he translates Södermalmstorg into the
The analysis shows at least tokens of what could be behaviour patterns on the part of the translators. The strategies for transfer of ECRs can be seen in the solutions of the translation crisis points represented by the cultural references. The retention strategies of TT4 suggest foreignization, while the literal translation of TT1 suggests domestication. In a descriptive analysis such as the present one, it would appear satisfactory if the analytical findings form coherent patterns that agree with the theoretical framework of translation analysis. This may be taken to mean that the translator has been consistent in his/her strategies and solutions, so that it would be easy to state that the translator adheres to such and such a strategy. As discussed in section 2.1.1, scholars such as Toury wanted to make generalisations about the decisions made by translators, and to distinguish trends of translation behaviour. Then of course practice cannot always agree with theory, so one has to remember that in the search for trends of behaviour, by analysing translated texts, there is inconsistency and “counter facts” to be found everywhere. Toury points out that the initial norm is an “explanatory tool” that should not be overinterpreted. Actual translation decisions involve some compromise of the overall choice (1978/2000:201). As shown by
Pedersen’s taxonomy, the strategies for transfer of ECRs range between the “poles” of domestication and foreignization; between subjection to target culture norms and subjection to source culture norms. An important observation is that a specific solution can connect to more than one of these strategies. The strategies could be combined, e.g. retention and direct translation. Thus, the findings of the analysis of these translations are not a matter of precise categorisation, because the categories tend to overlap in some cases. Rather, there are elements and features in each translation that point towards a certain strategy. Or, rather than classifying these strategies as solution categories, we might describe them as strategical dimensions of solutions. There are examples of foreignization to be found in Graves’s translation strategies, but occasionally his solutions are somewhat more domesticating. A translation would perhaps be rather static in its appearance if the translator were too consistent in adhering to a certain “template”. If Schering were to translate all of the geographical names literally into German, e.g. Södermalmstorg, Ladugårdsladet or Glasbruksgatan, the result would perhaps be interesting to an etymologist, but maybe not to an ordinary reader. Possibly, Schering chose to translate only names that were more or less in etymological accordance with the target language, such as Schiffsholm or Stromstraße. Likewise, Graves’s new translation is prone to retaining the proper names, but occasionally he adjusts them in order to guide the TT reader. By writing the square in Södermalm, he makes sure that the reader is made roughly aware of the whereabouts of events (military commands). The translator has to keep the reader alert. In an analysis such as this, one may have expected Schering to have translated Kungsbacken into something like “Königshöhe” (cf. Mosebacke–Moseshöhe), because that would have been logical and consistent, and in accordance with the behaviour that seems to dominate his translation, but one has to accept that he has omitted this geographical name, perhaps because he found it redundant and not necessary in the context.

So, by comparing translation solutions such as these, one may find instances that somehow deviate from the emerging patterns. The pattern of TT3, for example, seems to be that Sprigge is somewhat more towards the middle of the foreignization – domestication scale, retaining eleven names while adjusting five. For instance, Hästholmen is retained, while Skeppsholm and Ladugård are adjusted. As Pederson shows, ECRs may be “adjusted slightly to meet TL conventions, by adjusting the spelling or dropping an article” (Pedersen 2005:4) She retains the name Södermalmstorg, but the name Storkyrkan, which is kept by
Graves, is replaced by the Abbey, which may be interpreted as a cultural substitution, because many TT readers (at least those in England) would probably associate it with Westminster Abbey, the great church in London. Thus, Sprigge’s strategy is not just foreignizing, as there are examples of other solution types. Like Graves, it seems that she wants to guide the TT reader, using well-known reference points. Since Graves kept the name Storkyrkan, perhaps he thought that the reader did not need any guidance here, because s/he would still figure out that it is a church, since lots of other churches appear in the context.

Emil Schering apparently had the intention to stay close to the original, or, one could say, following Toury, that the basic, initial norm for Schering was to adhere to the source culture norm-system, or adherence to source language and culture. However, due to prevailing extratextual norms in the German culture, norms that governed education, language and also translation into German, he seems to have subjected himself to those prevailing norms. As Toury has pointed out (section 2.1.1), the employment of translation strategies is determined by the position occupied by translations in the social and literary systems of a target culture. The translation policies at the time, factors that govern the choice of texts to be translated, seem to have been strongly ruled by the German domestic cultural norms. Also, translation as an art apparently was not so highly esteemed; it was considered subordinate to domestic novel-writing (cf. section 4.1).

It has been said that norms of translation govern translation behaviour. Norms are embedded in a cultural system, and can therefore have a prescriptive function in translation. In translation into English (and German), strong target culture values seem often to have exerted influence on the translators; i.e. more or less prescribed a domesticating strategy. Therefore, domestication and foreignization may also be regarded as norms of translation (cf. Pedersen 2005:1). As Toury points out, the basic initial norm of translation governs the choice between the norm-system of the source culture and the target culture. The overall impression, the attempt at “generalizations about the underlying concepts of translation” (Toury 1995, in Munday 2001:112), of this study would be that the TTs of Schering and Schleussner to a greater extent assimilate the foreign text into the target language and culture, whereas Sprigge and Graves, in their later translations, are signalling how the foreign text differs from target knowledge in the occurrence of geographical names.
(cf. Venuti, section 2.1.2). However, according to Toury’s explanatory model, Schleussner was also governed by the preliminary norm of directness of translation, since she was translating a translation. This conclusion follows from there being more instances of retention, or attempts at retention, in the later translations; retentions of geographical names that signal the difference between target and source text (and language). Again, this is a general impression, which may appear to be contradicted by some of the examples. It is also suggested by the seemingly dominant values of the German target culture in TT1; norms acquired through education that required e.g. literal translation. The reason for resisting domesticating target culture values by means of retention in TT 3 and 4 is perhaps a relative openness in the more recent English target culture towards foreign language and culture elements, compared to the target cultures of early 20th century Germany and England. This is a matter for further inquiry, which could look into the attitudes towards foreign literature in English culture in the last few decades. However, this will not be attempted here.

Then, what constitutes a successful translation? Who should be the judge of that? Toury seems to suggest that this depends on which cultural norm the translator is subjected to. The TT will be “adequate” if the translator adheres to norms of the source culture, realized in the ST, and “acceptable” when following target culture norms. As pointed out, both the English and German target cultures seem to have exerted influence on translations into their languages. According to Venuti, a translated text in the Anglo-American culture is “judged acceptable” by publishers, reviewers and readers when it “reads fluently”, when “the absence of any linguistic or stylistic peculiarities makes it seem transparent” (emphasis mine), so that it appears to reflect the author’s intention or the “essential meaning of the foreign text” without appearing to be a translation, but the “original” (cf. Venuti 1995, in Munday 2001:146). This brings us back to the somewhat confusing duplicity of translation as phenomenon. Venuti’s example here features the “invisible” TL-oriented translation; a text that conceals translation. The SL-oriented translation, one the other hand, flaunts the peculiarities. Then, both approaches claim partiality to the original text, but in somewhat different ways (Venuti, in Munday 2001:148). One could perhaps argue that ECRs do not represent linguistic peculiarities, if they are not part of a language system. However, given that they are at least part of the source language system, they ought to be considered foreign items if they are retained in the TT. Perhaps the supposed openness towards foreign
language elements goes hand in hand with a more respectful attitude towards translators and translation. Translation today is perhaps more highly esteemed than in the days of Schering and Schleussner. This would perhaps imply that translators such as Sprigge and Graves were/are more likely to be considered “experts” (cf. Vermeer, section 2.1.4) in their field, in contrast to Schering and Schleussner, who acted in a time when translation apparently was deemed inferior to authoring a text. As argued by Anderman (section 4.1), the translations of Schering were inferior in their interpretation of the source text, a failure that Schleussner was not likely to repair. However, the German public seems to have enjoyed the novel, as despite its translational flaws it was apparently a success. In England, it took time for Strindberg to be appreciated. The reasons for this could have been a combination of poor translations (from German) and cultural diversities that stood in the way for the appreciation of his authorship (Robinson 1995:110, cf. also Ewbank 1999:144ff). So, a successful translation seems to require at least a receptive target public. It also seems to require that any mediating source text does not fail to interpret the essential meaning of the source text. Then, today, Anglo-American culture is perhaps more open-minded towards foreign elements, or peculiarities, such as the cultural references left untranslated as “signals” by Sprigge and Graves.

From Vermeer’s skopos perspective, it can be seen that the same ST text elements have been translated in different ways; the translators have differing solutions to the translation crisis points consisting of geographical names in the first chapter of Strindberg’s novel. Of course, TT2 did not use the same text as did the other translations. However, the purpose of the translation might still be outlined from a skopos perspective. Its purpose was obviously to make Strindberg available for English readers. It is the way it was carried out that is interesting. As mentioned, Strindberg himself commissioned Schering to send Schleussner the German translations to be transferred to English. This procedure is interesting for at least two reasons. Firstly, the way that it enabled a translation to be performed using another source than the original. Secondly, because Strindberg himself apparently did not mind that his works were translated from another source than his own. This implies that the purpose of the translation could not have been primarily to produce a TT faithful to the original; the original ST was not even available. The purpose may therefore have been more commercial than artistic. The same might be said about Schering’s German translation(s); the purpose was to establish Strindberg abroad. The way this was executed
was of less importance. As for the purposes of the later translations, the considerable space in time between the three English translations (1913, 1967 and 2009) should be taken into account. The temporal span suggests that at a certain point in time there is a growing demand for a translated work, because the predecessors have grown too old. It also suggests that the cultural norms in a society might have changed; that prevailing norms have become less intense, which opens up for translators to behave in new manners, to perhaps bring foreign elements into the TT, which was previously banned. This allows for new interpretations of the ST, with new solutions. Until 1967, the authorized version of *The Red Room* was based on a German version. It is perhaps a surprising fact that it took almost a hundred years for Strindberg’s first, and successful, novel to be translated from the Swedish original; that the 1913 translation was authorized for such a long time. At least it is surprising from a source culture perspective.
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