Twisting the standard
- Non-standard language in literature and translation from English to Swedish -
Abstract
Non-standard language, or dialect, often serves a specific purpose in a literary work and it is therefore a challenge for any translator to recreate the non-standard language of the source text into a target language. There are different linguistic tools an author can use in order to convey non-standard language, and the same is true for a translator – who can chose from different strategies when tasked with the challenge of translating dialectal features. This essay studies the challenge of recreating dialectal, non-standard speech in a work of literature and compares four different translations of that same piece of literature into another language. With this purpose in mind, the novel *Oliver Twist* by Charles Dickens is analysed using samples of non-standard language which have been applied to indicate a character’s speech as dialectal. The same treatment is given to four different Swedish translations. The method consists of linguistically analysing four text samples from the original novel, to see how non-standard language is represented and which function it serves, and thereafter, comparing the same samples to the four Swedish translations in order to establish whether non-standard features are visible also in the translated novels and which strategies the translators have used in order to achieve this.

It is concluded that non-standard language is applied in the source text and is represented on each possible linguistic level, including graphology, morphosyntax, and vocabulary. The main function of the non-standard language found in the source text samples was to place the characters in contrasting social positions. The target texts were found to also use features of non-standard language, but not to the same extent as the language used in the source text. The most common type of marker was, in all five of the texts, lexical items. It was also concluded that the most frequently used translation strategy used in the target texts were the use of various informal, colloquial features.
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1 Introduction
Translation can be considered as an art form, just as much as writing the original literary work is considered to be one. Every target text is individual as there is no specific formula for achieving the ‘perfect’ translation – it is instead a process of constant choices and compromises. A translation is the result of an individual translator’s personal interpretation and professional choices (Ingo, 2007:18) – no translators can without input from each other produce the exact same end product. This is especially true when a translator is challenged with translating non-standard grammar and spelling (Newmark, 1982:17), i.e. dialect and culture specific words/concepts, i.e. words that lack a direct translation or bear little meaning to the readers of the target language. In literature, dialectal language can be defined as “non-standard speech represented orthographically in fiction” (Bådagård, 2012:6).

Non-standard language in the source text (ST) rarely has one correct equivalent in the target language (TL), hence here translation becomes an art or a craft, and moves beyond science (Newmark, 1982:16-17).1 It is however important to note that the dialectal markers in a literary source text often serve an important purpose in the story as it can be used to mark differences between the characters. Dialectal markers can for example indicate a character’s geographical origin, social class and/or level of education (Ramos Pinto, 2009). Therefore it would be ill-advised for a translator not to take the function of the non-standard language of the ST into consideration when creating the target text (TT).

How to go about this challenge is up the individual translator but there are theories detailing the different strategies, or solutions, from which a translator can choose when encountering features that are non-standard and/or culturally specific to the universe of the source language (SL). The translator can, for example, choose to create a dialect of their own, use dialectal features of an already existing dialect in the target language, translate a culture specific word in to something more relevant to the target language, and/or completely ignore using any dialectal markers in the target text. A translator often uses a combination of strategies when translating (Ramos Pinto, 2009:296).

Since non-standard language can play such an important part in a literary work it is interesting to first consider how an author can choose to recreate dialectal speech and which linguistic resources can be used to accomplish such a task. This essay will also

---

1 In translation studies source refers to the original work and language, while target refers to the translated text or language (Munday, 2016:8).
investigate what type of functions non-standard language can serve in a work of fiction. As mentioned previously, no translation will be the same as the other, especially when the ST contains non-standard language, and it is for that reason interesting to see and compare how different translators have translated the same non-standard source text.

This study explores how non-standard, dialectal language has been recreated in a literary work, English novel *Oliver Twist* by Charles Dickens, and how four different translators have tackled the challenge of translating that same non-standard language into Swedish. In Section 2 the theoretical background of previous research relevant to this study is recounted and discussed. Section 3 details the aim and research questions upon which this essay relies on and in Section 4 the material and method is described. In Section 5 the analysis is carried out, on both the ST and the four different TTs. The findings are then discussed in Section 6 in relation to the previously discussed theoretical background and the results are finally concluded in Section 7.

### 2 Background

#### 2.1 Translation – introduction and definition

There are many different problems, theoretical and practical, associated with translation and throughout the years this has led to the creation of many different theories in the field of translation studies (Munday, 2016:11). Rune Ingo (2007:11) even goes so far as to assert that there is a real ‘theory pluralism’ with in the field. Many of these theories only focus on a specific and limited problem with translation studies, e.g. linguistics, sociology or the role and influence of the individual translator (Ingo, 2007:12-13). The field has also seen a shift from having mainly normative and prescriptive attitudes, to today’s more modern approach of explicative attitudes where the focus is on explaining why translators make certain choices instead of dictating which those choices should be (ibid.).

With so many different theories on what translation is and how it should be approached, creating one coherent definition of translation serves a challenge. One of the arguably more inclusive definitions comes from Ingo who creates the following definition: “translation is to, in the target language, express what has been expressed in the source language in a pragmatic, stylistic, semantic and structural well-functioning and as far as possible equivalent manner, even with regards to situational factors” (2007:15, my translation).

Situational factors are of more importance than one might think of at first glance, and they can be present not just in connection with the source language and the target
language and their respective cultures, but also in connection to the conditions surrounding the translation process (Ramos Pinto, 2009:302). Some of these situational factors might be in regards to linguistic varieties and cultural differences. For example, there might be an imbalance between accessible linguistic varieties between a SL and TL - meaning that if a ST uses a range of different linguistic varieties, the TL might not be able to provide the same range of varieties and thus making it impossible for the translator to recreate the same linguistic variation in the TT (Ingo, 2007:15-16). It is also important for a translator to take into account what the cultural differences are between the two languages. The ST takes on a new cultural environment when translated and some concepts which are not widely known in the target culture, i.e. the culture of the community where the TL is spoken, might have to be explained to the new readers in order to achieve legibility (Ingo, 2007:16). Translators need to be bridge-builders, not just between two languages, but also between cultures, environments and life-styles etc. (Ingo, 2007:29).

2.2 Non-standard vs. standard language
Standard language is the language variety which is recognised and accepted as the norm. Standard language has high prestige and has been recorded in dictionaries with a fixed orthography, i.e. has a set way of appearing in written form, and has been codified in terms of syntax (Lung, 2000:268). A dialect can be defined as a regional variety of a language and can differ from the codified standard at all linguistic levels (pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, and/or syntax) to a greater or lesser extent (Dimitrova, 1997:51). Dialects are rooted in time and space, i.e. with its vocabulary and pronunciation a dialect will always give the reader an association with a certain geographical space or chronological period (Landers, 2001:117).

A dialect is a form of non-standard language use (Lung, 2000: 268). However, Landers notes that even though dialects can differ from the often more high-status standard language in grammar, vocabulary or pronunciation, all varieties of a language are dialects, even the standardised variation (2001:116). Colloquialism, language which is considered to be informal and conversational, will be regarded as a form of non-standard language even though some researchers, for example Dimitrova (1997:52), believes that colloquial and dialectal language should be distinguished from each other. Here, Landers’ view that all variations of language is a form of dialect will be applied, with the exception of what is considered to be standard language. This study will not consider standard language as dialect, as it will instead serve as a point of reference to
contrast with non-standard language. Only non-standard language will ever be referred to as dialectal.

In this essay, all types of dialectal language (geographical dialects, sociolects, idiolects, colloquialism and archaic varieties) will be referred to as non-standard language. The word dialect may also be used, but is most often used in reference to geographical dialect. Even though non-standard language is rarely used in writing (Rosa, 2015:212), fictional literature can be regarded as an exemption from the norm. In literature dialectal language can be defined as “non-standard speech represented orthographically in fiction” (Bådagård, 2012:6). How non-standard language is used and what functions it serves will be examined in the following section.

2.3 Non-standard language in literature

2.3.1 Form

Dimitrova (1997) discusses the problems of translating dialect in a work of fiction. She emphasises that regional dialects usually only exist in oral form and that any written forms of them often are restricted and/or created anew every time they are used (Dimitrova,1997:52). This problem is also noted by Ramos Pinto (2009:303) who states that non-standard discourse is associated with oral discourse and often lacks an established written norm which poses difficulty for the translator. This evasive nature of dialects makes it hard for the author of the source language to fairly record a dialect into written form and has to choose which kind of features will be used for a character which speaks with a dialect (Rosa, 2015:212). Furthermore, it is important for the author to still leave the text comprehensible to the readers (Dimitrova, 1997:52). According to Dimitrova, dialectal markers can be used on three different linguistic levels:

- The most commonly used features translations are lexical markers (choice of words, vocabulary) as they often are most easily identified as dialectal (Dimitrova, 1997:52). Some lexical markers can pose a challenge for translators if they lack a direct translation and/or bear little meaning to the readers of the target language if directly transferred.

- Phonological/orthographic markers in the form of alternative spellings to indicate deviation in speech from standard pronunciation, often by using colloquial (informal, conversational) spellings, e.g. using non-standard spelling of the Swedish personal pronouns mig, dig, sig ‘me, you, them(self)’ as dej, mej, sej. These types of colloquial spellings may be accepted as variant spellings, which in turn mean that they are not necessarily perceived by the reader as
dialectal. They will only be seen as dialectal if the context clearly states that they are. A more distinct dialectal variant of the same pronouns would be däj, mäj, säj as these spellings are not accepted variants in Swedish (Dimitrova, 1997:52). These type of markers can also be called eye-dialect, i.e. they visualise otherwise non-visible deviant pronunciation, as non-standard spelling is used to indicate dialectal speech where, for example, parts of words are left out or the intonation or pronunciation of a word changes from the standard (Rosa, 2015:219).

- Changing the syntax of the language, i.e. how the words are arranged in sentences. However, these markers are often hard to distinguish from colloquial speech and are thus, according to Dimitrova, the least effective dialectal marker (Dimitrova, 1997:52). In this study, as previously established, colloquial speech will be regarded as non-standard language. An example of a dialectal morphosyntactic marker is inverted word order in a noun phrase such as bror din ‘brother your’ instead of din bror ‘your brother’ which reads as obsolete and dialectal (Dimitrova, 1997:57).

Dialect in literature is thus an artistic device and the reader must be able to differentiate it from standard language usage (Dimitrova, 1997:52). Every difference between standard and non-standard dialectal language cannot be represented in writing, the author must make a choice between the available markers and use them selectively – otherwise there is a risk of ending up with a completely incomprehensible text (ibid.). Several researchers (Dimitrova 1997:62; Bådagård 2012:20-21 etc.) found in their studies that authors tend to use dialectal markers from all linguistic levels when recreating non-standard language on the written page.

2.3.2 Function
Newmark (1988:195) and Lung (2000: 268) both state that a translator’s main job is to consider and to decide on what functions a dialect has in the specific literary work he or she is translating. It is a common notion within translation theory that a translator’s treatment of non-standard features is dependent upon said translator’s interpretation of their ascribed functions and the effects they are intended to have in the source text (Szymańska, 2017:62). Newmark also states that, in most cases, it would be inappropriate to replace a dialect in the ST with a specific dialect of the TL, the only exception being if the translator is completely at home in the intended dialect of the TL (Newmark, 1988:195). In addition, Lung (2000:267) asserts that the translator should
always strive to achieve a TT which is as equivalent to the ST as possible, as non-standard language conveys important extra-lingual contextual information about the users. Such contextual information can be in regards to time, space, sociocultural group and individuality (Rosa, 2015:210).

Dialect can help introduce the reader to the characters and the world they live in (Leppihalme, 2000:250). Dimitrova (1997:52) states that the function of dialect in fiction often is a device of characterisation. It is used to differentiate a character from those around him/her or to identify him/her with a group on regional or social basis. Dialect can also be used for localisation, i.e. marking a contrast in space and, consequently, also in time (Dimitrova, 1997:57-58). According to Hejwowski (2010, cited in Szymańska, 2017:62-63) non-standard language in literature can serve one, or a combination, of different functions. Hejwowski also concludes that researchers tend to focus on the role of literary dialects in distinguishing protagonists (ibid.). After summarising all of the functions non-standard language can serve in literature, the following list was created and adapted in relevance to findings in this essay:

- To give the character, or characters, a sociocultural profile where the reader can develop a sense of the text’s social culture and how the characters’ placement, high or low, within that culture (Rosa, 2009:210; Dimitrova, 1997:57 etc.). Readers often associate standard language with high social status and non-standard language with low social status (Ramos Pinto, 2009:291).
- To signal a difference in the characters’ educational background. A function which is closely related to social status (Hejwowski, 2010, cited in Szymańska, 2017:62-63).
- To identify a speaker’s physical space, i.e. what geographical place the person comes from (Dimitrova, 1997:57-58; Rosa, 2009:210). This function can either include a character in a certain geographical community, or put them in contrast to an already existing local community (Leppihalme, 2000:256).
- To place the characters in a certain time period (Dimitrova, 1997:57-58).
- To give the character an additional sense of individuality (Rosa, 2009:210), in order to help inform the reader of which character is speaking and to make it easier to differentiate between different characters in a dialogue (Ramos Pinot, 2009:291).
2.4 Translation of non-standard language

According to Ingo (2007:21-22), when we encounter a non-standard linguistic variety in literature we also have to assume that the author of that literary work has deliberately chosen the best way to express themselves in the source language in regards to the existing literary situation. The translator faces the same challenge, but instead has to work with the tools given to them by the target language. It is the translator’s job to make the text feel as natural as possible in the TL (Ingo, 2007:22; Newmark, 1982:17). However, translation of dialect is almost always seen as problem for the translator which proves how inseparable a language is from its cultural context and knowledge (Szymańska, 2017:61). According to some researchers (Newmark, 1988; Landers, 2001; Leppihalme, 2000; Brodovich, 1997) translation of dialect may even be seen as an impossible task by members of the translation community.

According to Dimitrova (1997:62), a common general strategy for translators faced with a ST using mainly phonological/orthographic as dialectal markers, is to instead shift towards using morphosyntactic and/or lexical markers to denote dialect in the TT. This is in line with Brodovich’s (1997:30) result where she finds that lexical items are the most commonly used dialectal marker in translation. Further, Dimitrova (1997:62) notes that most research points to a tendency for translators to either completely omit using dialectal markers in the TT or to replace them with markers of colloquial speech/language. The explanation for this phenomenon rests on two factors; the translators’ perception of the intension of dialects and the translators’ own perception of their role as text producers (ibid.).

Ramos Pinto (2009) highlights the problems of translators when they are faced with translating dialect. The translator must first decide whether recreate or not to recreate the non-standard linguistic variation. If the translator chooses to not recreate the dialect at all, it results in normalisation (if the standard variety of the TL is used), though it is rare to find target texts were complete normalisation has occurred (Ramos Pinto, 2009:293). However, if an attempt is made to reconstruct some, or all, of the dialect and a non-standard form of the TL is used, dialectisation is achieved (ibid.). Both Dimitrova (1997:62) and Leppihalme (2000:252) find that translations tend to be more normative in terms of language use in comparison to their source texts.

After deciding on dialectisation, the translator must choose whether to preserve the spatial and/or time coordinates of the ST or not (Ramos Pinto, 2009:294-296). This means that a translator wishing to reduce the strangeness of a specific regional or social
dialect from the ST can chose to, for example, reallocate the plot to another time period (by removing the time coordinates) and/or to another location (by removing the spatial coordinates). This can be regarded as a rather extreme measure by the translator in order to avoid problems connected with recreating outdated language or having characters speaking a TT dialect in a ST location (Ramos Pinto, 2009:294). A text where spatial and/or time coordinates have not been preserved tend to be recognised as adaptations in the target culture, while texts where time and space have been preserved are identified as translations (Ramos Pinto, 2009:293). The more accepted option is to preserve both time and space in the translation.

If the translator has chosen to preserve both of these coordinates and makes use of familiar non-standard features of the TL to indicate the TT as dialectal, they can chose from the six translation strategies listed below. They are listed in a continuum from more to less normalised discourse (Ramos Pinto, 2009:295):

- The use of standard language in direct discourse followed by in-text written indications informing the reader that the character was speaking using a non-standard variety. This is a strategy where the lack of dialectal markers in the TT is compensated with the introduction of explicit indications denoting which variety is being spoken by the character.

- The reduction of linguistic variation to only forms of address and honorifics. This strategy excludes non-standard features from the TT and the power relations between the characters are only maintained in form of how they address each other.

- To upgrade the level of formality in the standard discourse. Here, the linguistic variation comes from the fact that the TT’s standard discourse is more formal in comparison to the same discourse found in the ST rather than from the use of non-standard features.

- The use of oral discourse features, such as using the informal, colloquial version instead of the formal one of a word. Characteristics of oral discourse are often less prestigious and thus portray the discourse as non-standard.

- The use of features from different non-standard varieties. Choosing to not use markers from a particular variety promotes the identification of the discourse as sub-standard and creates a noticeable difference between the standard (correct, higher status) variety and the non-standard (incorrect, lower status) variety.
- The use of features (lexical, morphosyntactic, graphic or phonetic) from a specific non-standard variety. This means that the translator adapts the dialect of the SL into a specific dialect of the TL. The dialect of the TL most likely has a social meaning attached to it, not only a regional one (Ramos Pinto, 2009:295).

The translator also has the option to use features that are not familiar to the reader in the target culture. This can be motivated by the fact that the ST already has features which are non-familiar to the reader or that the translator wishes to avoid using any nationally recognised non-standard varieties as this may feel unnatural to the target culture. The following three translation strategies can be used for introducing non-familiar features in the TT (Ramos Pinto, 2009:295-296).

- To directly import certain lexical features from the ST into the TT, i.e. leaving some lexical features untranslated. This strategy is most commonly used when the lexical items of the ST are already foreign to the reader in the source language culture, e.g. where the author of the ST has introduced French lexical items like *monsieur* ‘mister’ to create a ‘French tone’ to a character’s speech. The translator may also deem some vocabulary from the source language as already familiar to the target culture, and in choosing to transfer them into the TT they introduce a ‘foreign tone’ in the character’s speech.

- To use lexical features from the ST, but introduce them according the spelling norms of the TL. This is similar to the previous strategy, but the imported lexical item is rewritten in the target language graphological form. This would require that the TL and SL share the same alphabet, otherwise adaption of the word would have to be made by the translator, e.g. if translating from the Cyrillic alphabet into the Latin one.

- To develop a ‘virtual dialect’. If the author of the ST has created a completely new dialect in the SL, the translator might be forced to use the same linguistic device and create a new dialect based on the TL. The translator might even feel forced to use lexical and syntactic markers which are strange to the reader of the target text in order to create the same linguistic tone as in the ST (Ramos Pinto, 2009:256).

Ramos Pinto clearly states that a translator’s choice of which strategies to apply is often influenced by a number of different circumstances and that thereby no strategy can be seen as better, or worse, than the other. She also concludes that it is common
for a translator to use several different strategies within the same translated text (Ramos Pinto, 2009:296).

2.5 Summary
This section has presented the theoretical background relevant for the analysis that will be carried out later in Section 5. The concept of translation and what non-standard language is has been defined in order to create a foundation for the coming analysis. The two lists in Section 2.3, which specifies how non-standard language can appear in terms of form and function in a literary work, will model the analysis of the ST extracts in Section 5.1. These two lists, with the addition of the list of translations strategies presented in Section 2.4, will also influence the analysis and discussion of the TTs in Sections 5.2 and 6. The aim, and subsequent research questions, of this essay will be presented in the following section.

3 Aim and research questions
The aim of this essay is to study the challenge of recreating dialectal, non-standard speech in a work of literature and to compare different translations of non-standard speech into another language. The languages which will be examined in this essay are English and Swedish. This essay will consider the original and four translated versions of a novel originally written in English. The translated versions will all be in Swedish but have been created by different translators at different points in time, spanning from the early 20th century until present day.

As has been established, the aim of this study is twofold. This first aim of the essay is to explore how dialectal speech has been adapted into written literature, that is, to explore on which linguistic levels non-standard language use has been reflected. The non-standard language will be analysed on the linguistic levels of phonology/orthography, vocabulary and morpho-syntax. Here, the function which the author intends the non-standard language to serve is also of interest.

The second aim of this study is to compare and contrast the differences and similarities between the translations of the same novel into Swedish. The purpose of this investigation is to find out how the different translators have approached the non-standard language found in the source text. The different target texts will be analysed for which type of linguistic means the translators have chosen use to reflect non-standard language. The discussion will seek to determine which translation strategies these translators have used, and in case a translator has chosen to not replicate non-
standard language where it is present in the ST, the following discussion will also seek to find reasoning for this irregularity.

In order to achieve these aims, the following research questions will be addressed:

- Which type of dialectal markers has the author used to convey non-standard language in the source text?
- What function does the non-standard speech serve in the source text?
- How is non-standard language represented in the target texts?
- Which translation strategies have the translators used when translating?

4 Material and method
In this section, the material and method of the essay will be presented. In Section 4.1 Material, the primary sources for the analysed data will be presented briefly. In the following section, Section 4.2, the method for how the data was chosen and then analysed will be described.

4.1 Material
The primary sources for the analysis in this essay consists of one novel originally written in English and four of the available translated versions into Swedish. The novel *Oliver Twist*, authored by Charles Dickens, was first published in 1837-39 and has since been translated many times into the Swedish Language. The translated versions have been chosen to cover a wide range of time, from the early 20th century to present day. The four target texts are as follows:

- Oliver Twist (1913) translated by C. J. Backman
- Oliver Twist (1929) translated by Einar Ekstrand
- Oliver Twist (1975) translated by Margareta Ångström
- Oliver Twist (2016) translated by Erik Björkbro

*Oliver Twist* was chosen for this essay because of Charles Dickens’ widely recognised commitment to recreating spoken language. Dickens uses a wide range of non-standard language in his novels. In this particular novel, *Oliver Twist*, the spoken dialogue is marked for both place, in this case the lesser prestigious London dialect Cockney, but more notably it is marked for social class. Time is also a factor in the language of the novel, as much of the language used is a stark contrast to the language used in present times. Charles Dickens is one of the most translated, and re-translated, authors of his
time, both world-wide and, more specifically, in Sweden. *Oliver Twist* is one of his most popular novels.

In the novel we can follow the orphaned boy Oliver Twist on his journey from the workhouse where he was born, to being apprenticed as an undertaker and to, eventually, making his way out of the criminal underworld of 19th century London. We meet characters from all walks of life: from the highly regarded members of the parochial board to the most marginalised people on the streets, and everyone in between. The story of Oliver Twist is generally considered to be, although humorous, rather bleak and dark, and paints a rather unflattering image of London in the first half of the 1800’s. This was however, very much intentional by Dickens, as he at the time was highly critical of the social deprivation in the city and the newly adopted Poor Law which forced many people into unwarranted hard labour. Therefore *Oliver Twist* can be considered to be more than just a highly beloved and popular novel. It was, and is, a champion of social justice for mistreated children and the most poor and vulnerable members of society.

4.2 Method
This could be considered to be a comparative study, as a novel has been analysed in both its original language and in four of its translated versions. The four different TTs were also compared to each other, as well as to the ST. The method used in this essay was inspired by the ones used by Bådagård (2012). Bådagård (2012) studied how dialectal language is reflected in written literature and how it is translated into one target text. The method for how she analysed ST and TT excerpts is similar to the one used in this study, as presented below.

In terms of data collection, the first four chapters of the original version of *Oliver Twist* were deemed as an acceptable scope for this limited study. Every utterance, i.e. every stretch of uninterrupted dialogue uttered by the same character, containing features of non-standard language were marked and afterwards a number of them were selected to be used as examples and for further analysis. In total 61 utterances were identified as containing markers of non-standard language. Any features identified as non-standard, concerning non-standard language on the linguistic levels of pronunciation (graphology/phonology), morphosyntax and vocabulary, were then marked in bold in the ST. Any words identified as culturally specific to the source culture was of an additional interest for later analysis in connection to the translated texts, and they were marked similarly in bold.
Four ST utterances were chosen for analysis. The selection process started with excluding any utterances that contained less than three different types of non-standard language features – 21 of the 61 utterances fit this criterion. This selection criterion was used in order to limit the number of utterances for the final selection and in order to exclude any utterances which were deemed to not have enough material for analysis – i.e. any utterance with less than three non-standard features was excluded. The following selection of the final four utterances, out of the remaining 21, to be used for analysis was random in order to avoid any assumed or directed results in terms of variations of non-standard features.

The marked words and phrases were then contrasted with standard forms of the languages (Standard British English), as represented in dictionaries, in order to determine which features of non-standard language were used to convey non-standard, dialectal speech. Words that appear to be non-standard in terms of spelling have been checked in Oxford Dictionaries Online (ODO) for previous recording. If the word appears in ODO in the same spelling as in the sample, they have been tagged for lexical choice. If the spelling of the word does not appear in ODO, it has instead been marked as an orthographical representation of deviant pronunciation. The non-standard features were tagged for belonging to one of the three available linguistic levels.

The same treatment was then given to the selected utterances’ target text counterparts. The marked words or phrases were however, naturally, contrasted with Standard Swedish and compared to the online dictionaries of the Swedish Academy (Svenska Akademiens ordböcker). One of the dictionaries of the Swedish Academy, the SAOB, contains historical recordings dating back to the early 16th century, which was of additional help when analysing the older TTs. Words in the older TTs that were considered to be archaic or unusual in today’s language use have been marked and discussed for consideration, but generally they were not included as real dialectal markers. The findings of the analysis of the Swedish translations were then discussed in relation to the different translation strategies, which are presented in this essay’s background section, as well as in relation to each other. The findings in the ST were also discussed in connection the possible functions they serve. In the following section the four ST utterances will be analysed, followed by an analysis of their target text counterparts.
5 Analysis
5.1 Non-standard language in the source text (ST)

In this section, the dialectal markers found in the four selected utterances from *Oliver Twist* will be analysed in regards to form and function. Four examples, in form of extracts from the novel, will be presented and then analysed. In the examples, any words or phrases of particular interest have been marked in bold.

(1) **Lor** bless her dear heart, no! [...] **Lor** bless her dear heart, when she has lived as long as I have, sir, and had thirteen children of her own, and all **on 'em** except two, and **them** in the **workus** with me, she'll know better than to take on in that way, bless her dear heart! (Dickens, [1837-39] 1994:3)

The utterance above, in sample (1), is spoken by Mrs Thingummy, a secondary character in *Oliver Twist*. The language used here is non-standard on all available linguistic levels: lexis, orthography/phonology and syntax. Regarding non-standard lexical choices, there are two of them in this sample. The first one is the use of **Lor** which, according to ODO, is an informal, British abbreviation of the more standard word *Lord*. The second lexical item is **'em**, an abbreviated variant of the third person plural pronoun **them** which is featured heavily throughout the novel. Although both of these lexical items appear in ODO in this spelling, they are marked as informal and are clearly used to mark the character’s speech as non-standard. Leaving out consonants, as well as vowels or whole syllables, is also regarded as a common feature of the Cockney dialect (Rosa, 2015:219). **Wurkus** is an orthographic representation of non-standard pronunciation of the word *workhouse*. This orthographic representation presents a rougher and simpler pronunciation of the word where, for example, the diphthong [aʊ] in *house* [haʊs] has been replaced by a simpler vowel sound [ʌ]. This spelling has not been lexicalised in ODO and is thus an example of a dialectal marker on a phonological level.

Moving on to non-standard syntax, there is an obvious use of the wrong preposition in the phrase *all on 'em*. The correct preposition in this instance would be *of*. There is also a case of the character confusing the grammatical function of pronouns with the use of **them** in the phrase *and them in the wurkus with me*. Here the character uses the object form of the pronoun instead of the subject form **they**. This is most likely an indication of the character’s low social standing and poor education, than it is of dialect as this particular feature has not been elsewhere noted as specifically Cockney. The same phrase is also missing a verb; a proposed standard phrasing would be *and they are in the workhouse with me*. Overall, it can also be determined that the utterance is marked by a
very colloquial sentence structure. There seem to be a never ending succession of added clauses coordinated by and which confuses the initial subordinative clause introduced by when.

(2) Susan, take Oliver and them two brats up-stairs, and wash 'em directly. [...] My heart alive! Mr. Bumble, how glad I am to see you, surely!

In (2), uttered by the secondary character Mrs Mann, we again encounter the lexical marker 'em. Another lexical marker is brats which can be argued to be an informal, negative word choice for badly behaved/spoilt child (ODO). Brats is thus an indication of the character’s disregard for formality. Concerning orthography, there is an example of the word surely spelt with a hyphen between the main word and the suffix sure-ly. There is no graphological need for a hyphen here as surely is a single word (ODO). This is also present in up-stairs where the prefix has been hyphenated to the main word. There can be two different reasons for the use of hyphen in this way. First, that at the time of publishing this was the norm of spelling when adding prefixes or suffixes – this is most likely the case for up-stairs. The second reason, that the hyphen is used to indicate misplaced stress in the pronunciation of the word, places the stress in a different place than the standard. The second reason could be an explanation for the presence of a hyphen in sure-ly – i.e. the hyphen used here indicates deviant pronunciation.

In terms of syntax, the phrase them two brats is an example of non-standard syntax. The plural determiner those has been replaced with the third person plural pronoun them. According to ODO, them can never be used as a determiner, but is often used as such in dialectal and informal language and is, according to Rosa (2015:218), a common feature of the Cockney dialect. Moreover, the phrase My heart alive! is incomplete as a sentence as it does not include a copular verb. The correct structure of this phrase would be my heart is alive. Zero copula is unusual in English and no correlation to Cockney or English in the 19th century could be found. This is thus considered as marking non-standard syntax in terms of informality and colloquialism.

(3) Why, it's what I'm obliged to keep a little of in the house, to put into the blessed infants' Daffy, when they ain't well, Mr. Bumble. [...] It's gin. I'll not deceive you, Mr. B. It's gin. (Dickens, [1837-39] 1994:8)

Sample (3), also uttered by Mrs Mann, has one instance of ain't which is a common informal and colloquial syntactical contraction of am/is/are not or has/have not. Today the contraction is a normal presence in many dialects, including Cockney, and informal
English; however it should not be regarded as standard (ODO). There is also an interesting change in terms of address. In the first sentence Mrs Mann calls Mr Bumble by his full surname, and in her next address to him she changes it to just Mr. B. This further cements the speech as informal and non-standard. Daffy is here used as a proper name, whereas it according to ODO only exists as an adjective. Here Daffy is a shortened version of Daffy’s elixir which at the time were a type of medicine for children often mixed with gin (Perdue, 1997-2017). Daffy can be regarded as a culturally specific word.

(4) If the parish would like him to learn a right pleasant trade, in a good 'spectable chimbley-sweepin' bisness, […] I wants a 'prentis, and I am ready to take him. (Dickens, [1837-39] 1994:20)

In example (4), Mr Gamfield’s speech is represented by many non-standard features on all linguistic levels. In terms of vocabulary, there is the choice of using the adverb right as a pre-modifier in the phrase a right pleasant trade. To use right in this way, instead of very, is both dialectal and archaic (ODO) – it is however difficult to determine whether or not this was the case at the time of the novel’s publishing. The use of chimbley instead of the standard chimney is also considered to be dialectal by ODO. Non-standard syntax is in this utterance expressed by the subject and verb not agreeing in the phrase I wants. I is a first person singular pronoun and thus the following finite verb should not, using standard syntax, be marked with the third person singular form – s (Greenbaum and Nelson, 2009:34). This is a known feature of Cockney according to Rosa (2015:220).

There are also several non-standard spellings and orthography which further indicates the character’s speech and pronunciation as dialectal. For instance, a common feature of Cockney according to Rosa (2015:219) is, when recreated in written literature, the switching of v and w, as is illustrated here in the word would. Dickens uses this particular marker frequently throughout the novel. Another common dialectal marker on level of orthography is the replacement of –ng with n’ in words ending with the suffix –ing as in sweepin’ – this indicates a shift in the pronunciation of the final velar consonant [ŋ] into the alveolar sound [n] (ODO). As recognised in the first example, the elision of parts of words is a well-known feature of Cockney. This feature is applied to ‘spectable (respectable) and ‘prentis (apprentice) where the initial syllables have been replaced by apostrophes. In ‘prentis the standard suffix –ice is represented as the simpler –is. This does not change the pronunciation in a clear direction, possibly
from [1s] to [1z], but is more of a device for establishing the character’s non-standard language. The word ‘business’ has also been represented in the simplified spelling ‘bisness’, which again does not necessarily change the phonology but is a device for making the reader understand the non-standard language. These are all examples of the so-called ‘eye-dialect’ (Rosa, 2015:219).

To conclude this section, we can establish that the ST contains several non-standard language markers on all linguistic levels. In total, 25 instances of non-standard markers were found in the four utterances presented above. The author appears to be inclined to use non-standard lexical items (nine instances) most frequently, but the other categories are not far behind with orthographic/phonological markers and syntactic markers, both having eight markers respectively. If, and how, these features where in some way incorporated into the four target texts will be examined in the following section.

5.2 Non-standard language in the target texts (TTs)
In this section, the findings in the ST utterances will be put in relation to the four Swedish translations. The year of publishing of the Swedish translations range from 1913 to 2016. The comparison will analyse the same samples as chosen in the previous section in order to be able to determine if non-standard language has been applied to the target texts in accordance with the observations made earlier in regards to the source text. Again, any words or phrases of particular interest have been marked in bold.

(1)  **Lor** bless her dear heart, no! […] **Lor** bless her dear heart, when she has lived as long as I have, sir, and had thirteen children of her own, and all on 'em except two, and **them** in the **workus** with me, she'll know better than to take on in that way, bless her dear heart! (Dickens, [1837-39] 1994:3)

(1a) Nej, **Gud välsigne** henne, **hjärta lilla**! […] Gud **välsigne** henne, när hon har **levat** så länge, som jag har, sir, och **haft** tretton egna barn, och alla av dem döda, utom två, och de på fattighuset med mig, skall hon veta bättre än att tala på det viset, **Gud välsigne** henne! (Dickens, 1913:6)

(1b) Nej, **Gu' signe** den beskedliga stackarn! […] Nej, **Gu' signe** henne, när hon har fått leva så länge som jag, doktorn, och fått tretton barn, som alla **ä döa**, utom två, som också **ä här** på **fattighuse**, då ska hon nog veta bättre än att tala så. (Dickens, 1929:6)

(1c) Nej, **Gud signe** henne! […] Gud **signe** henne, när hon har **levat** så länge som jag har, sir, och har **framfött** tretton egna barn, och alla är döda utom två, och de har jag med mig här på fattighuset, så kommer hon minsann att ha bättre förstånd än att ta det på det viset, Gud **signe** henne! (Dickens, 1975:6)
(1d) **Gud välsigne** det stackars barnet! [...] När du en dag har levt så länge som jag och fått trettton barn, som alla är döda med undantag av de två som jag har med mig här i fattighuset, kommer du att ha mer förstånd än att säga så! (Dickens, 2016:14)

This utterance, which in the source text contains some non-standard features affecting pronunciation, vocabulary and syntax, has different levels of non-standard language use in the target texts. In (1a) there are a few instances of non-standard syntax, such as reversed word order in *hjärta lilla* instead of *lilla hjärta* ‘little heart’, or leaving out the main verb of a clause as in *och de på fattighuset med mig* where the verb *är* ‘is’ is missing in a similar manner to the original clause in the ST. Punctuation in form of comma characters are also used in a non-standard, almost erratic, way. The phrase *hjärta lilla* could also be interpreted as being intended as *hjärtat lilla*, with the noun *hjärtat* ‘the heart’ in its definite form, which in Swedish is an expression of familiarity. This phrase would be classified as non-standard orthography, but as the character uttering these words, Mrs Thingummy, have just met the woman she is referring to, it would be unlikely for her to express a sense of familiarity with her already. Therefore, the initial interpretation of the phrase as an example of non-standard syntax is preferred. Some non-standard vocabulary choices include *haft* instead of, for example, *fått*, as well as using the subjunctive *välsigne* instead of *välsigna* ‘bless’ (Swedish Academy). A better phrasing of the expression would be *må Gud välsigna henne* ‘may God bless her’. Although the conjunctive form *välsigne* does not appear in the Swedish Academy dictionaries, it is well-recognised in biblical contexts and is therefore here regarded as a lexical choice rather than an orthographic one. There were no other potential orthographic markers found in this sample. The final lexical item is *levat* instead of the preferred use *levt* ‘live’ (Swedish Academy), it is however difficult to discern whether or not this was the preferred use in 1913 as well.

Example (1b) mainly contains various alterations to standard orthography to indicate that the character’s speech is non-standard and dialectal in regards to pronunciation. Several words, such as *Gud* ‘God’, *döa* ‘dead’ and *fattighuse* ‘workhouse’, have lost their final consonant in a manner similar to *Lor* in the ST. *Signa* ‘bless’, an archaic form of *välsigna*, is represented as *signe*. None of these orthographic representations appear in the Swedish Academy dictionaries. *Stackaren* ‘poor creature, wretch’ has been reduced to the colloquial and informal form *stackarn* and is regarded as a lexical item. The somewhat deviant punctuation from the original text is also replicated into this translation. In regards to sheer number of non-standard features, this
example marks the character’s speech as more non-standard than what the original text does.

In (1c) the translator has, similarly to in (1b), chosen to use the spelling of *signa* as *signe* which was determined to be an orthographic marker. Non-standard vocabulary is represented by, as in (1a), using *levat* instead of *levt*, as well as using *framfött* ‘give birth to’ in reference to a person whereas the word is more frequently used in reference to animals (Swedish Academy). *Framfött* is thus regarded as an unusual, informal lexical item. The same style of punctuation as in the ST is also used here which affects the syntax. In example (1d) the only non-standard features is the use of *välsigne*, previously established as a lexical item. Otherwise, the language and punctuation is deemed to be in accordance with standard language usage.

Finally, another noteworthy observation is that the ST form of address *sir* is transferred into two of the target texts, while translated to *doktorn* ‘doctor’ in one example and removed in any form in the last one. *Sir* is, according to the Swedish Academy Dictionaries, a formal English form of address or title, which generally is not used in the Swedish language. In conclusion, example (1b) is the only TT utterance containing a larger number of non-standard markers than the ST utterance. All examples, except (1d), contains markers from at least two of the three linguistics levels and can be said to make an effort to replicate the non-standard language found in the ST.

(2) Susan, take Oliver and them two *brats up-stairs*, and wash 'em directly. […] *My heart alive!* Mr. Bumble, how glad I am to see you, sure-ly! (Dickens, [1837-39] 1994:7)

(2a) Susan, hämta upp Oliver och de andra *ungarna*, och tvätta dem genast! *Kära hjärtandes!* Mr Bumble, så glad jag är att se er! (Dickens, 1913:10)

(2b) Susan, hämta genast upp Oliver och de två andra *ungarna* och tvätta dem rena. Nej, men det var då lika kärt som oförmodat att se er idag, herr Bumble! (Dickens, 1929:9)

(2c) Susan, hämta upp Oliver och de *andra båda ungarna* ur källaren och tvätta dem genast - *du milde*, mr Bumble, det var då verkligen roligt att få se er! (Dickens, 1975:10)

(2d) Susan, hämta upp Oliver och de två andra *slynglarna* från källaren och tvätta dem genast. *Du milde*, vad det glädjer mig att se er, mr Bumble! (Dickens, 2016:19)

In the source text utterance non-standard language is again represented on all three of the available linguistic levels. In the previous section it was determined that the vocabulary choice of ‘brats’ was informal and indicated a negative attitude towards the
children in question. In three of the target texts the translators have chosen to translate ‘brats’ as *ungarna* which is an informal, but fairly common, version of *barnen* ‘the children’. *Ungarna* may carry some negative associations, but they are not as apparent as in the word *brat*. In (2d) the word *slynglarna* has been chosen and is much closer to the semantic meaning of the ST word as it is regarded as a strongly derogatory word for misbehaving young boys.

In (2a) the interjection *kåra hjärtanes* ‘good gracious’ the noun is spelt with an extra consonant, creating *hjärtandes*. This spelling has never been recorded by the Swedish Academy and is thus considered to be a case of non-standard orthography in the TT, perhaps indicating the character’s inability to properly use standard language. The exclamation *du milde*, used in the two latter examples, is today considered to be both informal and somewhat old-fashioned. This would indicate that, at least the translator of the TT from 2016 has made an active lexical choice to signal to the reader that the story takes place in past times. The only indication of non-standard syntax can be found in (2c) and in the phrase *de andra båda ungarna*. Here, the more standard word order would be *de båda andra ungarna* as *båda* (both) is a pre-determiner that should precede the adjective *andra* ‘other’.

Other notable features in the target texts include the use of the pronoun *er* instead of *du* (both translating as you) as form of address. *Er* is a formal pronoun when used to address only one person, and prior to the 1960’s it was used in any situation where a person outside of the family or the closest circle of friends was addressed. However, since the late 1960’s the objective case singular pronoun *du* has replaced *er* as the preferred form of address in any situation. *Er* is today mainly used as a plural pronoun in the objective case and is very rarely used as form of address. In the two target texts created after the 1960’s the translators can thus be thought to have consciously chosen this pronoun in order to replicate the social conduct of the past. It is also interesting to note that all but one of the translators have chosen to transfer the English title ‘Mr’ into their texts, while one has chosen to use the Swedish equivalent title *herr*. To sum up, none of the TTs recreates the same level of non-standard language found in the ST. Examples (2a), (2c) and (2d) all have at least three non-standard markers while (2b) only has one. Neither of the TT utterances applies all of the three types of linguistic markers as the ST utterance does.
(3) Why, it's what I'm obliged to keep a little of in the house, to put into the blessed infants' *Daffy*, when they *ain't* well, Mr. Bumble. [...] It's *gin*. I'll not deceive you, *Mr. B.* It's *gin*. (Dickens, [1837-39] 1994:8)

(3a) Åh, det är *blott*, vad jag är tvungen att *hava* hemma, *litet Daffy*, att ge de kära barnen, då de *ej må* bra, mr Bumble. [...] Det är *gin*. Jag vill *ej* bedraga er, mr Bumble, det är *gin*. (Dickens, 1913:11)

(3b) Åh, det är bara sådant, som jag är tvungen att ha hemma att *slå i* de små söta barnens *mixtur*, då de är förkylda, herr Bumble. [...] Det är bara enbärsbrännvin. (Dickens, 1929:10)

(3c) Jo, det är så att jag måste ha en smula av det hemma att ge de väl signade små *ungarna* när de blir sjuka, mr Bumble. [...] Det är *genever*. Jag lurar er inte, mr Bumble. Det är *genever*. (Dickens, 1975:11)

(3d) Åh, det är en sak jag måste ha lite av hemma för att kunna ge de fina barnen när de inte är riktigt krya, mr Bumble. [...] Det är *genever*. (Dickens, 2016:20)

As this ST example has a very limited number of non-standard features, it was expected that the TTs would reflect this in a similar manner. In (3a) there are a few lexical choices that would be considered to be archaic or non-standard today, but would likely not be regarded as such in the time the translation was created. These words are *blott* ‘merely’, *hava* ‘have’ and *ej* ‘not’. The first two were almost certainly considered to be standard in 1913, but in 1920 the word *ej* was already thought of as dated when used in everyday speech. *Litet* is regarded as an informal, variant form of the standard form *lite* ‘little’, the latter which is the form recommended for usage by the Swedish Academy. The verb *må* ‘to feel’ appears here in its infinite form even though the situation calls for it to be used in its finite, present form *mår*. This could either be regarded as a non-standard syntactical feature, or as an orthographic representation of the character not pronouncing the last consonant of the word. The excessive use of commas is a non-standard syntactic feature.

In (3b) there are some vocabulary choices that would be considered unusual to use in today’s language. The word *mixtur* ‘mixture’ is used for liquid medicine, and the verb *slå*, in the verb phrase *att slå i*, would normally be associated with the meaning ‘hit’, but is here used to convey the lesser known meaning ‘pour’. However, this translation was written in 1929 and these words may very well have been used in a, for that time, standard fashion. In both (3c) and (3d) *genever* is used for the ST word ‘gin’. *Gin*, also used in Swedish, as in (3a), is an abbreviation of *genever* and is the more common word to use when referring to the alcoholic beverage. The word *genever* would therefore be an unfamiliar word to many readers, and is hence here deemed to be a non-
standard lexical choice. The only other non-standard marker is found in example (3c) where the translator again uses the informal word *ungarna* instead of *barn*.

In the previous section, ‘Daffy’ was established as a culture specific word and it is therefore also interesting to take a look at how it has been translated in the target texts. First, it is important to note that the word ‘Daffy’, or any version of it, has never been recorded in a Swedish dictionary (Swedish Academy) and is thus considered as a non-standard lexical item. In the first TT (3a) the word has been directly transferred without any extra contextual information and thus the reader has to deduce for themselves that, from the same information as available in the ST, the word must refer to some kind of medicine. It is possible that ‘Daffy’ was used in the Swedish language at the time, but if so it was never used frequently enough in order to be recorded. In (3b) it is translated as *mixtur*, while in (3c) and (3d) it is simply referred to in phrasings similar to ‘something to give to the children when they are ill’, and thereby the translators avoid having to translate the specific word. Additionally, no translator has followed the ST example where Mr Bumble has been shortened to just ‘Mr B’. In conclusion, there are some archaic lexical items that are difficult to determine whether or not they were regarded as archaic at the time of publishing. All TTs have words and phrases of interest, but no utterance stands out in terms of non-standard language use.

(4) If the parish *would* like him to learn a *right* pleasant trade, in a good 'spectable chimbley-sweepin' bisness, […] I *wants* a *prentis*, and I am ready to take him. (Dickens, [1837-39] 1994:20)

(4a) Om församlingen vill låta honom *lära* ett lätt och behagligt yrke, i det *spegliga och hedervärda* sotarskrået, […], så behöver jag en lärgosse och är beredd att *taga* honom. (Dickens, 1913:19)

(4b) Om styrelsen önskar att han *ska* lära sig ett bra och hederligt yrke, […], så skulle jag behöva en lärning och vara villig att ta honom. (Dickens, 1929:18)

(4c) *Jo*, om kommunen skulle vilja att han lärde sig ett riktigt trevlig yrke hos en bra och hederlig sotare, […], så behöver jag en läring och jag är villig att ta honom. (Dickens, 1975:21)

(4d) *Ifall socknen* vill låta honom lära sig ett lätt och behagligt hantverk i det aktningssvärda skorstensföjarfacket, så behöver jag en lärning och är villig att ta honom. (Dickens, 2016:30)

This sample, in its original version, contains several non-standard features on all available linguistic levels and the character’s speech is clearly non-standard and dialectal. However, the Swedish translations do not reflect this level of non-standard language in anywhere near the same extent as the source text does. The oldest translation, example (4a), is one of two targets texts which contains more than one non-
standard marker. The first one is a syntactic one, where the verb *lära* ‘learn’ is used without a reflexive pronoun. When this verb, as it is here, is used in the meaning of ‘a person learning something’ it needs to reflect back on the subject by being followed by a reflexive pronoun. In this case the appropriate phrasing in Swedish would be *lära sig*. The second one is the lexical choice *sotarskrået* ‘chimney-sweep guild’. The word *skrå* ‘guild’ is a medieval term that in Sweden was used to refer to a gathering of craftsmen up until the middle of the 19th century (Swedish Academy). Using this term in 1913 would most likely be considered as archaic and non-standard. The word *taga* ‘take’ would today be deemed as being an archaic lexical item when contrasted to the currently used shortened version *ta*. However, in the early 20th century, *taga* was most likely still regarded as the standard form to use.

The second TT which contains more than one non-standard marker is (4d), published in 2016. In this example two lexical items of interested were found: *ifall* ‘if’ and *socknen* ‘the parish’. To use the conjunction *ifall* instead of the more preferred equivalent word *om*, is considered to be colloquial and highly informal. *Socknen* is today an unusual and archaic word for *the parish*, a more up-to date word would be *församlingen*. By using *socknen*, the translator has made an obvious effort to place the character in the original time period.

In target text (4b) from 1929 there is one lexical item of interest, namely the modal verb *ska* ‘will’. *Ska* is a shortened version of the modal verb *skall* ‘shall’ in the present tense, and is today the more common version to use in most contexts. However, according to the Swedish Academy dictionaries, *ska* was still considered to be informal and colloquial as late as in 1972. This indicates that the use of *ska* in the TT could be a deliberate effort to make the character’s speech appear as, to a limited degree, non-standard. In (4c) the utterance is started with the interjection *jo* ‘yah’ which, when as here, is used as a response to a question could be regarded as an informal and/or dialectal lexical item. Overall, the TT utterances in this section do not replicate the non-standard language of the ST to nearly the same degree. The ST is here filled with dialectic orthography, but none of the translations use this non-standard marker.

To conclude this section, it can be determined that the most frequently used non-standard marker in the translations were informal or archaic lexical items. The only example which contained more non-standard markers than the original was utterance (1b), which primarily had orthographic markers where the final consonant were missing, like in *fattighuse* instead of *fattighuset* ‘the workhouse’. Example (1b) also had
lexical and syntactical markers. Otherwise, the TT utterances contained slightly less or almost no non-standard markers compared to the ST. This could indicate certain reluctance, on part of the translators, to recreate non-standard language. Which translations strategies these findings can be linked to will be discussed, among other things, in the section below.

6 Discussion
There are several interesting conclusions that can be draw from the findings of the analysis carried out in Sections 5.1 and 5.2. This section first discusses the findings of the analysis of the form and function of non-standard language in the source text *Oliver Twist* and then moves on to discussing the non-standard features found in the four target texts. To finish, the discussion will consider how the findings in the TTs correlate to the various translation strategies presented in the Background section and if there are any noticeable similarities or discrepancies between the choices made by the different translators.

The analysis of the non-standard markers representing dialectal speech in *Oliver Twist* generated several interesting observations. The non-standard features that were identified in the utterances could be discerned to consist of orthography/phonology, lexis and syntax, which means that non-standard, dialectal language is displayed on all possible linguistic level. This finding is in agreement with the findings made by both Dimitrova (1997:62) and Bådagård (2012:20-21) in their respective studies. However, it is important to note that the dialogue in Oliver Twist is, despite the presence of non-standard features, still legible to the average reader which was a possible concern voiced by Dimitrova (1997:52) in relation to her research on translations of the Swedish novel *Din stund på Jorden* by Vilhelm Moberg.

In the ST, the most common non-standard marker is, by a small margin, lexical items. According to Dimitrova (1997:52) lexical markers are the type of marker most easily identified as dialectal and/or non-standard by the reader. This might be an explanation for why lexical markers are the most frequently used form of non-standard language in the ST. To name an example, two reoccurring non-standard lexical item in *Oliver Twist* is ‘em and Lor which both appear in examples (1) and (2). Both words are abbreviations of their longer original form, and while Lor is considered to be colloquial, ‘em is an example of the regional dialect Cockney. ‘em can also be said to be an example of how an orthographic elision of the first consonant has become so established that the word now appears in dictionaries. Several orthographic markers were also
present in the ST utterances in order to represent non-standard pronunciation, or so called eye-dialect. Deviant spelling of certain words marked the elision or alteration of certain sounds, and most of the markers can be derived to Cockney. In terms of non-standard syntax, there are, for example, occasions of the informal, colloquial zero copula, in examples (1) and (2), and the dialectal subject-verb disagreement as in I wants (Dickens, [1837-39] 1994:20). According to Dimitrova (1997:57), syntactical markers should be the least frequently used type of marker, but the findings of the analysis in Section 5.1 disputes this by finding non-standard syntax to be just as common as non-standard orthography and only slightly less frequent than non-standard lexis. The non-standard markers which were identified in the ST were a combination of informal, colloquial features and ones that could be derived to the London dialect Cockney. Features commonly associated with the Cockney dialect were identified in all of the four utterances.

Moving on, the function of non-standard language in the source text will be discussed. There is a clear sense of high vs. low status in the language used by different characters. Some characters in the novel have an almost completely standardised language use while others speak while using a language filled with non-standard linguistic markers. As established by Ramos Pinto (2009:291), readers will associate standard language use with persons belonging to a higher social class while characters that use non-standard language will be perceived as being of a lower social status. This function is well used in Oliver Twist as there is sometimes a sharp contrast between the types of language used by different characters. Closely related to the social status of a character is also their educational background (Hejwowski, 2010, cited in Szymańska, 2017:62-63). Non-standard features in the ST which were deemed as informal and colloquial would be excellent indicator of a character being of a lower social status and, most likely, also having a limited level of education. If we, for example, take a look at the character Mrs Thingummy’s speech in sample (1), she uses a very colloquial sentence structure which is combined with other syntactical and lexical informal markers. This, in combination with the other character taking part in the dialogue having a close to standard language use, gives the reader the necessary information in order to indicate Mrs Thingummy as a marginalised and uneducated woman. However, colloquialisms are often used in combination with markers of the Cockney dialect which gives the impression that using a strong dialectal language should also be associated with a lower social status. Dickens seems intent on playing with the contrast
that language use can create between characters. Not only is language an indicator of social class or geographical space – it is also used to give the characters an individuality. If comparing Mrs Thingummy’s speech in example (1) to the language used by Mr Gamfield in example (4), they both use a combination of colloquial and dialectal markers on all available linguistic levels. It is however easy to differentiate the two utterances from each other as the distribution of the non-standard features differ; where Mr Gamfield uses mainly orthographic/phonological markers, Mrs Thingummy speech is more focused on syntax and lexis. As a result, even though the characters share the same social and reginal background they each have their distinct way of speaking, giving them an individuality that would not be achieved had they not been using non-standard language. In addition, some of the markers found in the ST would today be considered to be archaic, for instance *up-stairs* in example (2), but was most likely standard to use in the time of the novels release. So, even if these markers place the characters in a past time period, a function discussed by Dimitrova (1997:57-58), they did not have this function when Dickens authored them. This is an unintentional function that has been created by the passing of time and the inevitable evolution and change of what is considered as standard language usage. The main function of the non-standard speech in the ST is to place the characters in contrasting social positions.

Following the discussion of form and function of non-standard language in the ST, the findings of the analysis of the translations will now be put into focus. To begin with, one of the first choices a translator faced with non-standard language must make is whether or not the preserve the time and spatial coordinates (Ramos Pinto, 2009:294-296). In the samples, it can be determined that all of the translators have chosen to preserve the spatial and time coordinates which identifies the target texts as translations, not adaptions. This means that the translations strategies presented in Section 2.4 are relevant to the analysis of all of the TTs. The most commonly used type of linguistic marker is, in all four of the TTs, lexical items. Non-standard lexical items include the use of *ungarna* instead of the more standard word *barnen* as in examples (2a-c). This finding is in accordance with results previously noted by both Dimitrova (1997:62) and Brodovich (1997:30), who both established that lexical items often are the most commonly used type of non-standard feature for marking a translated text as non-standard and dialectal. Lexical items were also found to be the most common feature in the ST which indicates that the translators may have tried to replicate this into the TTs to some extent. There are also a few markers of non-standard orthography/phonology
and syntax in the targets texts, but in general there are fewer non-standard markers in the TTs compared to the ST. This is in agreement with observations by Dimitrova (1997:62) and Leppihalme (2000:252), who both find that a translation almost always is more normative, i.e. more standardised, in terms of language use in comparison with the original text. One noteworthy exception to this ‘rule’ was found in the analysis in Section 5.2. Utterance (1b), from 1929, is the only TT that has more occurrences of individual markers of non-standard language and is thus perceived as more dialectal and non-standard than the corresponding utterance in the ST. This is also the only utterance which relies most of its indications of non-standard language on orthographic markers, such as *Gu’* and *döa* (Dickens, 1929:6).

The most common strategy for indicating the presence of non-standard language seems to be the use of oral discourse markers, i.e. features that were determined to be colloquial and informal in the TTs. All of the translators tend to use informal lexical items, instead of the formal version of a word, and this corresponds to one of the translations strategies identified by Ramos Pinto (2009:295). As mentioned previously, one example is the use of *ungarna* (2a-c) or *slynglarna* (2d) instead of the standard word *barnen* in the target texts translation of the word ‘brats’. One could further argue that *slynglarna* is a better semantic choice than *ungarna* as it is closer in semantical meaning to *brats* – semantics is also important to take into consideration when translating according to Ingo’s definition (2007:15). Some of the non-standard syntax used where also colloquial, as in examples (1a-c) where to punctuation is erratic and deviant in accordance with the ST. It is interesting to note that the punctuation used in (1d) is of a more normalised nature. In terms of the non-standard orthographic markers used in the TTs, most prominently featured in utterance (1b), it is difficult to determine if they are representations of a colloquial or dialectal pronunciation. From my own perspective, they could be intended by the translator as representation of dialect. Ramos Pinto (2009:295) has two different strategies concerning the use of dialectal markers; the use of features from different non-standard varieties or the use of features from a specific non-standard variety. Since dialects in literature, as Dimitrova (1997:52) points out, are restricted or often created anew every time they are used, it is hard to determine if the markers in question can be derived from a particular Swedish dialect, or a mix of several Swedish dialects, or if they have been created with no particular dialect in mind. The only other use of a potential dialectal marker in the TTs were the use of *jo* instead of *ja* ‘yes’ in response to a question in sample (4c). On some occasions non-standard
language has been expressed by archaic or unusual lexical items, such as *socknen* in (4d) and *genever* in (3c-d). None of the researchers mentioned here indicates this as a translations strategy, but it is used enough in the TTs that it should be regarded as a way for the translators to stay true to a ST which was written in a different time period.

Even though there is general lack of non-standard features in the TTs, in comparison to the ST, the form of address has been preserved by all four translators. This preservation maintains at least a notion of the power relations between the characters as noted by Ramos Pinto (2009:52) in one of her strategies. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that only the TT from 1929, all examples marked by (b), has translated the various forms of address, in the ST samples represented by *sir* and *Mr*, into their Swedish counterparts, e.g. *herr ‘Mr’*. The other translators have chosen to directly import these lexical items in to their translations. These translators may have had the intention to give the translations an ‘English tone’ and deemed the items to be understandable to the readers of the TL (Ramos Pinto, 2009:295-296). Another lexical item that was directly transferred into the TT was *Daffy* in sample (3a). In the TTs where non-standard language has not been replicated to any or the same degree as in the ST, there are no other textual indications of the character having a less than close to standard language usage. There is a general tendency by all of the translators to omit using the same level of non-standard language as used in the ST – this is a tendency previously noted by Dimitrova (1997:62). Does this mean that the translators regard the non-standard language in the ST, and its pertaining functions, as unimportant? Or is it simply a result of the translators underestimating their roles as text producers?

Nonetheless, the result is four target texts that are more standardised in its discourse than the original work. A true sense of dialectisation is only achieved in a few TT utterances, most prominently in (1b), but also in (1a) and (1c). All other utterances have at least one word or phrase that could be interpreted as intentionally non-standard, but it would be difficult to argue that this is enough to achieve a sense of non-standard language, especially if the corresponding ST has a high degree of colloquial or dialectal language. Furthermore, it is important to note that this study had a limited scope of only four analysed utterances from ST to TT. It is entirely possible that any of the translators have used other means for indicating non-standard language in other places of the novel. The study is limited and should not be generalised to the entirety of the of the studied target texts.
One of the challenges in this study was how to properly define non-standard language, i.e. should both dialect and colloquialisms be part of the analysis. After deliberation, both have been regarded as non-standard language. This in order to be able to analyse the target texts to their full extent as they heavily relied on colloquial features to indicate non-standard speech. One even bigger challenge was the old age of some of the translations, the two from 1913 and 1929 in particular – this because age makes it hard to be certain when trying to differentiate between markers considered to be archaic in the present day, and if they were regarded as standard or non-standard language at the time of publishing. Even after researching the particular words in the Swedish Academy historical dictionary it was hard to know for certain when a particular word started to be regarded as archaic or informal. I have been forced to resort to make an as informed guess as possible, without any kind of certainty. It is also important to note that all of the targets texts were created and published by different translators and publishers. This, factored in with the difference in time, most certainly means that the choices made by the translators were influenced by different situational factors. What these situational factors were and how they may have factored in the target texts is hard to say, but in light of observations made by both Ramos Pinto (2009:302) and Ingo (2007:15-16), context and other situational surroundings may have played a very important role in the translation process. As a final point, no target text is the same as the other, but there is no clear right or wrong either as every translation will be the result of an individual translator’s effort and choices.
7 Conclusions

The overall aim if this study was to study the challenge of recreating dialectal, non-standard speech in a work of literature and to compare different translations of non-standard speech into another language. To better help define the overall objective, the aim was divided into two ‘sub-aims’ and four different research questions were posed in order to achieve the aim stated above. The first sub-aim, to study how non-standard language has been recreated in literature and which functions it serves a source text, was investigated in Sections 5.1 and 6. The source text was found to use markers of non-standard language on all three available linguistic levels: phonology/orthography, lexis and syntax. Lexical items were the most common feature used in the ST, but the other two types of markers were used to almost the same extent. The main function of the non-standard discourse in the ST was to place the characters in contrasting social positions – a function closely related to educational background and, in this novel, it could also be argued to be connected to regional origin.

The second part of the aim was to establish how the four translators had incorporated non-standard features into their translations and which translations strategies they had utilised. This was achieved in Sections 5.2 and 6. The type of marker most frequently used in all of the TTs was lexical items, just as in the ST findings. In the discussion, it was determined that the most frequently used translations strategy in all TTs was to incorporate informal, colloquial features. Some translators, one in particular, also used some features that could be interpreted as dialectal to indicate the discourse as non-standard. The dialectal markers could not be derived to any particular Swedish dialect. Every TT utterance, except one, was found to contain fewer markers of non-standard language than the ST and there seemed to be a general reluctance to include non-standard language in the TTs to the same degree as in the ST. The statement in the introduction is conformed – no translation will ever be the same. There is no ‘perfect’ translation.

In regards to future research on the subject of non-standard language in literature, it would be interesting to carry out a study were the function of non-standard language in literature is further investigated as the main focus - there seems to be a lack of research were this is the main point of the investigation.
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