transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

Keyness, Context, and Cultural Specificity in Indirect Translation

Jan BUTS*, James HADLEY** and Mohammad ABOOMAR***

The translation of references specific to a given source culture has long been a prominent, and often problematic aspect of translation practice and research. In indirect translation, or the translation of already translated material, linguistic and cultural differences accumulate, meaning that the omission of cultural references (CRs) or culture-specific items (CSIs) might be a generally expected outcome. Yet before such hypotheses can be tested, research methods are needed that can account for broad patterns across whole texts, and preferably, across semantic categories, genres, time periods, and languages. A 'textual' approach, focused on the linguistic context in which CRs are likely to occur, should complement the currently dominant 'cultural' approach, which mainly relies on predefined categories and intuition for the selection of objects of study. This article illustrates that corpus research, and particularly keyness analysis, can aid in uncovering recurrent structural patterns and textual functions in which CRs are expected to pose translation difficulties. In this regard, it focuses on expressions of enumeration, or lists, and indicators of identification, or voice. Based on a trilingual (English, French, and Italian) corpus-assisted study of Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* (1726) and John Cary's *An Essay on the State of England* (1695), the article accentuates the productive complementarity of numerical operations and context-sensitive readings.
Keywords: culture-specific items; cultural references; indirect translation; corpus linguistics; *Gulliver's Travels*

1. Introduction

James Hadley proposes that indirect translations tend to omit "cultural references particular to their source cultures" (2017, 183). According to Hadley's hypothesis, this tendency results from a "concatenation effect," where the choices of a first translator constrain those of subsequent translators. This means that, regardless of an individual translator's potential efforts to the contrary, it is likely that cultural references may be lost somewhere along the translation chain (184). Yet, what exactly is meant by 'cultural references' (CRs)? As a central problem of lexical non-equivalence, cultural specificity has long been a staple of translation studies

---
* Assistant professor at Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
E-mail: jan.buts@boun.edu.tr; ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7657-804X.
** Ussher assistant professor at Trinity College Dublin.
E-mail: hadleyj@tcd.ie; ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1950-2679.
*** PhD student at Dublin City University.
E-mail: mohammad.aboomar2@mail.dcu.ie; ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1391-5061.

textbooks (e.g., Baker 2018, 19–20; Newmark 1988, 94–103). Taxonomies of culturally specific items and techniques to translate them are employed in a variety of scholarly publications, with topics ranging from children's literature to tourist brochures (Fernandes 2006; Turzynski-Azimi 2021). Nevertheless, systematic studies that do not rely on handpicked examples remain rare (Olk 2013, 344). Javier Franco Aixelá (1996) mentions complications that hinder the development of comprehensive approaches that can account for a broad range of languages and texts, as well as the culture-specific items (CSIs) found within them. Firstly, "cultural diversity" is deeply connected with "historical distance" (Franco Aixelá 1996, 53). The relationships between languages, and between linguistic expressions and their referents, change over time. Secondly, 'CSI' is a relational concept, as separate target cultures have distinct frames of reference (57). In sum, at different times and in different places, different items prove problematic for translators. Furthermore, how do we establish which linguistic elements are culturally specific, and which are specific to a given text or author? (Strowe 2021, 53).

Take, for example, the word 'yahoo,' meaning "a person lacking in cultivation or sensibility."[1] This usage stems from Jonathan Swift's satire *Gulliver's Travels* (1726). In the book, the term 'Yahoo' is used to refer to a breed of brutish humanoid creatures that roam the same island as the Houyhnhnms, a race of intelligent equine creatures. While originally an invention in an imaginary context, the term is now firmly embedded in the English vocabulary. Yet, at what point is the reference no longer restricted to Swift's work? At what point does the status of 'yahoo' shift from a fantastical name to a CSI? And which culture is it specific to? Authors and texts may inhabit hybrid cultural spaces. Swift was born in Dublin, and died there, but the book was first published in London. The English and Irish cultures are not homogeneous, and both contain a multitude of communities, histories, and environments. Furthermore, the English language is currently spoken as a first or second language by over a billion people across the globe (Eberhard, Simons, and Fennig 2020). It is unlikely that the word 'yahoo' will activate similar associations across this diffuse linguistic space. In principle, one could argue that readers in English-speaking countries where 'yahoo' does not occur in colloquial conversation are likely to experience something approaching Swift's original creativity when encountering the word, whereas readers previously exposed to the word might

---

[1] *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, s.v. "yahoo," accessed March 15, 2022, www.oed.com/view/Entry/231128.

miss out on the novelty for reasons of familiarity. One could, of course, sidestep those issues by claiming that 'yahoo' is not, in fact, a CR, but on what assumptions would this claim be based?

As this example illustrates, describing cultural specificity—let alone prescribing techniques for its manipulation—is not without its pitfalls and paradoxes. Classifications like Peter Newmark's (1988, 95) recognize very broad categories such as "social culture," which encompasses both work and leisure, meaning that different scholars and translators will not necessarily recognize the same items as culturally specific. It is unsurprising, then, that the handling of perceived CSIs, even within a single translation of a literary work, is often inconsistent (Davies 2003, 93). Consequently, the "thorny issue of subjectivity in the identification of CRs" has led to a situation where lexical items such as proper nouns and geographical terms, whose status as CSIs tends to be uncontroversial, have been studied disproportionately, at the expense of other potentially interesting items (Olk 2013, 344). Thus, while CSIs or CRs (the labels are often used interchangeably) form an intuitive and central problem of translation, they seem to resist systematic study. Nonetheless, to test hypotheses such as Hadley's (2017) suggestion that CRs are likely to be omitted in indirect translation, an approach to cultural specificity is needed that can account for broad patterns across whole texts, and preferably, across semantic categories, genres, and languages. In other words, a 'textual' approach, focused on the linguistic context in which CRs or CSIs are likely to occur, should complement the dominant 'cultural' approach, which mainly relies on intuition for the selection of objects of study. This article argues that corpus research can aid in uncovering recurrent structural patterns and textual functions in which CRs are expected to form an issue, and focuses, in this regard, on expressions of enumeration and identification.

2. Methods and Data

Corpus methods have previously been used to examine the translation of CSIs, notably of food-related items in literary corpora (Marco 2019; Oster and Molés-Cases 2016). In these studies, food was identified as a salient category at the outset. Consequently, the studies can be characterized as "corpus-based," since the data are approached by means of previously established categories (Tognini-Bonelli 2001, 67). A "corpus-driven" approach, on the other hand, is "more inductive, so that the linguistic constructs themselves emerge from analysis of

a corpus" (Biber 2015, 196). The distinction between corpus-based and corpus-driven research is typically invoked in relation to assumptions about grammatical structures rather than semantic fields, but one may well question whether this primary distinction between structure and content should be upheld in corpus research, which has amply demonstrated that patterns correspond to meanings, and that, for a range of purposes, "lexis and syntax must, ultimately, be described together" (Hunston and Francis 2000, 13). It should also be noted that corpus studies naturally tend to shift between corpus-driven and corpus-based orientations at various stages of analysis. Nonetheless, the distinction is useful to characterize different studies' methodological point of departure. In this article, it is argued that research into cultural specificity can greatly benefit from a corpus-driven footing, especially when dealing with texts that are not embedded in a restricted cultural setting.

Two texts are studied in this article: John Cary's *An Essay on the State of England, in Relation to Its Trade, Its Poor, and Its Taxes, for Carrying on the Present War Against France* (1695) (hereafter *Essay*) and Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*, originally published as *Travels into Several Remote Nations of the World* (1726). Drawing on data from WorldCat, Brian Lavoie and Lorcan Dempsey (2018, 11) show that *Gulliver's Travels* tops the list of global library holdings for works by an Irish-born author. The magnitude of the book's international success can be gauged from a focused example: in Turkey, more than 100 editions of the book have appeared since 1872, when it was first translated into Turkish via a French translation (Tahir Gürçağlar 2011, 44, 47). Its lasting popularity in Turkey and beyond has much to do with the broad range of adaptations the book has inspired: sometimes *Gulliver*'s *Travels* is edited and presented as a monumental classic of world literature, sometimes as an adventure story for children (52). Cary's *Essay*, on the other hand, is an economic treatise, and does not enjoy similar global popularity today, although it attracted considerable attention in the decades following its publication (Macdonell 1887, 244). Throughout the eighteenth century, several editions of the work were published in English, and the work spread across the European continent through a lengthy indirect translation chain. It was translated from English into French in 1755, from French into Italian in 1757, and from Italian into German in 1788.[2]

---

[2] The German translation is not studied in this article. In the context of this research, three English versions of the work (the 1695 [available at https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/61964], 1719 [available at https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/62353], and 1745 [available at https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/62299] editions) have been made available as e-books via the online Project Gutenberg library.

Gulliver's Travels initially follows the same trajectory, and does so more rapidly: in 1727, the book was translated from English into French, and in 1729 from French into Italian.[3]

Besides providing well-documented examples of indirect translation, these two texts were selected in response to the critical observations flagged in the Introduction. Swift's and Cary's works are separated from us by approximately three centuries, a broad enough interval for the boundary between cultural specificity and historical distance to blur. A priori expectations about cultural specificity are also hard to establish when faced with narratives set in alternative worlds (Strowe 2021, 53). This is the case for Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*, which describes invented lands, the creatures that inhabit them, and their customs. Cary's *Essay*, on the other hand, is not concerned with imaginative invention, but rather with systematically outlining principles for the generation of wealth through trade—and thus, ultimately, with the 'science' of political economy (Reinert 2011, 122). Developing fields of study rely on a tentative specialized vocabulary, meaning that the *Essay*'s lexical profile is challenging to speculate about. Finally, even though they belong to different genres, both texts provide representations of imperialism and colonialism (Hawes 1991; Reinert 2011). That is to say, they are outward looking, and foreground situations of intercultural exchange. Combined, all these factors complicate the examination of CRs by means of predetermined conceptual categories or selected semantic fields. The starting point for study, then, should be the texts themselves, rather than a presupposed notion of the 'cultures' depicted within them.

In line with this orientation, the following study is based on a keyness analysis, which identifies lexical items central to the *Essay* and *Gulliver's Travels*. For this purpose, both texts served as each other's reference corpus. To calculate keyness, a reference corpus "does not need to be larger than the study corpus" and does not need to be of a general nature to generate meaningful results (Gabrielatos 2018, 253). However, different reference corpora do make for different results, and some lists of keywords may mainly foreground conceptual items, while others may highlight elements pertaining to the structural organization of a text (Bondi 2010, 7). The keyword lists were drawn up using the AntConc software, using the standard settings for statistical significance, and Andrew Hardie's Log Ratio for effect size, with a threshold of 100 key items (Anthony 2020; Hardie 2014). From the lists generated, the 25 key items with

---

[3] The earliest translations to appear in French (vol. I [available at https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/61691], vol. II [available at https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/61733]) and Italian (available at https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/61921) have also been made available on Project Gutenberg.

the highest raw frequency were selected for each text, and patterns found within those lists form the basis of the discussion below. While the analysis initially takes its cue from the lexical differences between the Cary's *Essay* and Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*, the ultimate focus is on shared structural features found within, but also beyond both works.

3. Analysis

3.1 Enumeration

In Cary's *Essay*, the 25 most frequent key items are: 'trade,' 'manufactures,' 'd,' 'also,' 'product,' 'commodities,' 'wool,' 'plantations,' 'foreign,' 'ireland,' 'whilst,' 'thereof,' 'tis,' 'markets,' 'wealth,' 'woollen,' 'per,' 'quantities,' 'french,' 'encourage,' 'advance,' 'expense,' 'easie,' 'profitable,' and 'imploy.' One can spot words of encouragement ('advance,' 'encourage'), references to foreign lands ('ireland,' 'french'),[4] and peculiarities of spelling ('d,' 'tis,' 'imploy'). Clearly, there is a focus on the topics of industry (e.g., 'manufactures,' 'product'), trade (e.g., 'markets,' 'commodities'), and the accumulation of money (e.g., 'wealth,' 'profitable'). Within this broad domain of economic development, one item seems to attract considerable attention, as it appears twice among the 25 most frequent key items: 'wool(len).' One may surmise, then, that the textile trade is particularly important in Cary's *Essay*, but only a consideration of context can bear out whether this is the case, and how exactly 'wool' functions in the fabric of the text. Some examples, found using the AntConc concordancer, may provide clarification:[5]

> *1A*:
>
> These Manufactures as they Imploy Multitudes of People in their making, so also in Transporting them, and fetching several Forreign Materials used with our own, such as Oyl, Dye-stuffe, Silk, **Wool**, Cotten, Barrilia [soda ash], and many others, which are either Manufactured here of themselves, or wrought up with our Product.

---

[4] All data were treated as lowercase, meaning that the frequency counts for the word types listed include capitalized variants.

[5] As the examples were generated using corpus software, page numbers are not provided. Boldface is added for emphasis by the present article's authors. Information between square brackets is also added and serves to facilitate the interpretation of example passages. The English is always provided, and additional glosses are added where this may aid understanding of the argument. Examples are headed by a number and a letter. Different numbers (e.g., 1, 2) indicate different passages, whereas different letters indicate different languages (i.e., English, French, Italian).

2A:

The next Material for our Manufactures is Cotton-**Wool**, which is now become a great Imployment for the Poor, and so adds to the Wealth of the Nation; this being curiously pickt and spun makes Dimities [i], Tapes [ii], Stockings [iii], Gloves [iv], besides several things wove fit for use, as Petticoats [v], wastcoats [vi], and Drawers [vii], of different Fancies and Stripes, and I doubt not our Workmen would exceed the East Indies for Calicoes had they Incouragment;

3A:

Examples in our own Nation, where we find that Lemster **Wool** is the finest, next, part of Shropshire and Staffordshire, part of Glocester-shire, Wilts, Dorset, and Hampshire, part of Sussex, and part of Kent, Somerset, Devon, and Cornwall, these are most proper for Cloth,

These examples illustrate Cary's fondness for lists. The first list consists of raw materials. The second one consists of garments. Both categories constitute 'realia,' in the narrow sense of 'material items,' a central point of attention in the study of cultural specificity (Leppihalme 2011, 126). The example passages were selected because they occur not only in Cary's original text, but also in the 1745 posthumous edition of the work, and in the French and Italian translations. The *Essay* "grew to two volumes in French translation and three volumes in the subsequent Italian translation" (Reinert 2011, 3, 11). Nevertheless, as the text came to serve new purposes abroad, many passages were omitted, moved, or significantly altered. It is remarkable, then, that translators with little reverence for the macro-structure of the work sometimes show careful attention to the text's minutiae. Even though the French version—and in its turn, the Italian one—resort to paraphrase where needed, all the elements that make up the list of materials in the first example are retained, in the same order:

1B:

...matières nécessaires à la fabrique, telles que l'huile, les drogues propres à la teinture, la soye, la laine, le cotton, la barille & autres choses semblables

1C:

...le differenti materie necessarie alla di loro fabbrica; quali sono l'olio, le droghe proprie alla tintura, la seta, la lana, il cotone, la barille, ed altre simiglianti cose

The changes are noticeably greater in the translation of the second example, which contains numerous very specific references to clothing and textile styles. Of more importance in this article than whether or not the words 'petticoat' and 'juppe' truly refer to the same piece

of clothing is the fact that the list of specific items shortens slightly (from 7 to 6, and then to 5 items), and that the Italian translator is clearly constrained by the French one in this respect.

> *2B*:
>
> Avec le cotton on fabrique des bazins [i], des futaines [ii], des rubans [iii], plusieurs autres especes d'étoffes au metier qui servent à faire des juppes [iv], des camisolles [v], des robbes [vi].

> *2C*:
>
> Col cotone fabbricansi de' fustagni [i], delle tele [ii], dei veli [iii], e molte altre sòrti di stoffe che fabbbricansi al telaio, che servono a fare delle giubbe [iv], e delle vesti per casai [v].

In the translation of the third example, which concerns geographical information—a common feature of research into CRs—one can see that the translators mention each place name listed by Cary in the same order. The French translator initiates the omission of 'part of' in several instances and alters the spelling of 'Cornwall.' The Italian translator does the same.

> *3B*:
>
> Les laines de Lemster sont très-fines. Après elles celles de Shrop-Shire, de Stafford-Shire, de Gloucester-Shire, de Witls, de Dorset, de Hamp-Shire, de Sussex, de Kent, de Sommerset, de Devon, de **Cornoüailles**, sont les plus propres pour la Manufacture des draps.

> *3C*:
>
> Le lane di Lemster sono finissime. Doppo queste, le lane di Shrop-Shire, di Stafford-Shire, di Gloucester-Shire, di Wilts, di Dorset, di Hamp-Shire, di Sussex, di Kent, di Sommerset, di Devon, di **Carnovailles**, sono le più proprie per le manifatture de' drappi.

In general, then, a search for the item 'wool' in Cary's texts foregrounds the author's common use of lists, which tend to contain potential CSIs. But is this general pattern also attested in Swift's work? In other words, is enumeration a structural feature that allows for the identification of CSIs across texts and genres? In the keyword list for *Gulliver's Travels*, the 25 most frequent items are the following: 'of,' 'I,' 'a,' 'in,' 'my,' 'was,' 'me,' 'his,' 'he,' 'had,' 'were,' 'could,' 'an,' 'upon,' 'some,' 'him,' 'very,' 'two,' 'about,' 'country,' 'her,' 'after,' 'several,' 'three,' and 'majesty.' When looking for patterns of enumeration, three items stand out, namely the quantifiers 'two,' 'three,' and 'several.' A concordance search for those items indicates that they at times shape extensive lists, as in the following example:

4A:

For, instead of a long train with royal diadems, I saw in one family **two** fiddlers, **three** spruce courtiers, and an Italian prelate. In another, a barber, an abbot, and **two** cardinals.

In this passage, Gulliver is on the island of Glubbdubdrib, where the native sorcerers use magic to conjure up and parade generations of European royal blood. Gulliver is disappointed with the lack of noble display. The French translator copies the list entirely, but the Italian translator makes slight changes, including the omission of the adjective 'Italian,' which in the English modifies 'prelate.'

4B:

je vis dans une Famille deux Joueurs de violon, trois Courtisans fort bien mis, & un **Prelat Italien**. Dans une autre un Barbier, un Abbé & deux Cardinaux.

4C:

ravvisai in una Famiglia due Suonatori, tre Cortigiani in buona positura, e un **Ecclesiastico** [member of the clergy]. In un'altra, un Barbiere, un Abate, e due Ecclesiastici di prima sfera.

It is possible that the translator avoided mentioning his own country's Roman Catholic clergy in a mocking context. It is also possible that the specific image or connotation which the English text seeks to invoke was not readily accessible to an Italian readership. Other explanations may apply. In any case, we are confronted here with the observation that cultural specificity often has more to do with the difference in status of an item in each context than with its (non)existence in the receiving cultural system (Franco Aixelá 1996, 58). Surely, an 'Italian prelate' is conceivable in the Italian language, but the notion may have hit too close to home for the translator to comfortably convey it.

3.2 Identification

In the previous section, 'woollen' was identified as a key item in Cary's *Essay*. The AntConc software indicates that its strongest collocate at one position to the left is 'our,' and its strongest collocate at one position to the right is 'manufactures.'[6] Together, these words give rise to the phrase 'our woollen manufactures,' which occurs 10 times in the work. This

---

[6] The measure used is Mutual Information (MI), as per AntConc's standard settings.

expression also occurs in a listing context, as when Cary lists the various sorts of livestock important to the English trade. After discussing cows, he elaborates on sheep,

<u>5A</u>:

whose Golden Fleece being the Primum of **our** Woollen Manufactures, does thereby employ Multitudes of **our** People

In French, the passage about sheep reads as follows:

<u>5B</u>:

Sa précieuse dépouille est la toison d'or pour **les Anglois**; elle soutient **leurs** principales Manufactures qui occupent une multitude d'Ouvriers.

(Its precious coat is the golden fleece to the English; it supports their main Manufactures which employ a multitude of Workers.)

In Italian one reads:

<u>5C</u>:

La sua preziosa spoglia è come il vello d'oro per i medesimi. In fatti ella somministra la materia alle principali manifatture, in cui un gran numero d' Artefici è occupato.

(Its precious coat is like the golden fleece for them. In fact, it provides material to the main manufactures, in which a large number of Craftsmen are employed.)

Wool, so central to the *Essay*'s argument, points to a shift in perspective. Cary speaks of 'our' manufactures and 'our' people, whereas the French translation mentions 'the English' ('*les Anglois*') and decidedly opts for '*leurs*' ('their'). The Italian version, while shifting mention of the English to a previous sentence, broadly follows suit. In this case, the translators' context requires textual adaptation, while the 'Golden Fleece'—a classical European, rather than English CR—remains intact.

The relation between pronominal variation and the translators' context merits further attention. The pronoun 'we,' for instance, occurs in the *Essay* more than 300 times, and this is not simply a matter of guiding the reader, as is customary in some types of text today. Rather, Cary employs 'we' to establish a relation to his nation, its people, and its ruler, as in the following example:

transLogos 2022 Vol 5 Issue 1
Buts, Jan, James Hadley,
and Mohammad Aboomar, pp. 1–21
Keyness, Context, and Cultural Specificity
in Indirect Translation

© Diye Global Communications
diye.com.tr | diye@diye.com.tr

6A:

These are pressures our Trade hath long groaned under, whereby the Merchants abroad and Manufacturers at home have been much discouraged, and **the English Nation** hath been forced to truckle under the French in Foreign Parts (especially in Portugal, and the Islands belonging to it) only because that King sooner resented Injuries done to his Traders, and took more Care to demand Reparation, than our last Reigns have done; but blessed be God **we** have now both Power and Opportunity to do the same, and there is no cause to doubt **His Majesty**'s Royal Inclinations to make use of both for the Good of his Merchants when things are duely represented to him.

In the French translation, this passage lacks the final part, namely Cary's appeal to the sovereign. The French direct translation once again provides the blueprint for the Italian indirect translation:

6B:

Les Marchands Anglois ont essuyé autrefois des tracasseries si rebutantes, que les Manufactures de la Nation en ont souffert. Ils se sont vû forcés de céder aux François dans quelques pays seulement à cause que le Roi de France faisoit rendre raison des insultes qu'on faisoit à ses Sujets.

(In the past, English Merchants have encountered such repulsive harassments that the Nation's Manufactures have suffered. They were forced to yield to the French in some countries, only because the King of France redressed offences against his Subjects.)

6C:

Li Mercanti Inglesi hanno altre volte assaggiato delle inquietudini sì ributtanti, che le manifatture della nazione n'han patito. Sono eglino flati forzati a cedere ai Francesi in qualche Paese, perchè il Re di Francia si faceva render ragione degl' insulti fatti a' suoi sudditi.

(The English merchants have at times experienced such abhorrent pressures that the nation's manufactures have suffered. They were forced to yield to the French in some countries, because the King of France redressed offences against his Subjects.)

While the French translator omits a part that is directed at the English Crown, he does not pronominally stress his own relation to the French king and his subjects. This might be interpreted as indicative of a move towards increased scholarly objectivity in developing versions of the treatise, but it is also possible, among other explanations, that interpersonal distance is kept because of the accumulating historical distance to the events related. Of interest, in this respect, is that Cary's first edition of the work was explicitly dedicated to "The King's Most Excellent Majesty." In the 1719 and 1745 editions, only the Parliament and its Speaker are addressed. The French translation reproduces both dedications, the Italian neither. This can

be explained by the fact that while Georges-Marie Butel-Dumont, the French translator, aimed to thoroughly contextualize Cary's writing, Pietro Genovesi, the Italian translator, sought to use it as a university textbook (Reinert 2011, 11, 160). Yet, while Butel-Dumont reproduces the *Essay*'s dedications to give an intimation of the original *Essay*'s paratextual embedding, one can already find a change in the very first line: "To the King's Most Excellent Majesty" in the French becomes: "Au Roi." The term 'Majesty' has a complex cultural history, which can be traced back to Roman times. Usage varies across geographical space and historical time, and some forms, such as "His Most Excellent Majesty," are recognizably English.[7] Even though its pronominal realization ('his' majesty) is complex, the phrase is not difficult to translate per se. Nevertheless, in some situations of intercultural communication, foregrounding a rivaling monarch's majesty may be neither required nor recommended. More important, however, is the question of whether similarly expressed relations between authorial embedding and political context are relevant beyond Cary's *Essay*.

In *Gulliver's Travels*, the word 'majesty' is used more frequently than common English words such as 'came' and 'such,' and more than proper nouns such as 'Yahoos' and 'Houyhnhnms.' Importantly, it is applied to a range of different characters throughout the work, as can be derived from consulting the concordance plot for 'majesty,' as sketched by AntConc. A concordance plot indicates where in the text a particular word is used. The first person Gulliver honors with the royal form 'majesty' is the Emperor of Lilliput. Afterwards, it is applied to his wife—'her Imperial Majesty.' Later, it is used for the emperor of Blefuscu, the queen of Brobdingnag and her husband, the king of Laputa, and the king of Luggnagg. Gulliver relates the following about his encounter with Luggnagg's sovereign:

7A:

I pronounced the following words, as they had been taught me the night before, Ickpling gloffthrobb squutserumm blhiop mlashnalt zwin tnodbalkguffh slhiophad gurdlubh asht. This is the compliment established by the laws of the land for all persons admitted to the King's presence. It may be rendered into English thus: May **your Celestial Majesty** outlive the sun, eleven moons and a half.

---

7   *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*,   s.v.   "majesty,"   accessed   March   15,   2022, https://www.britannica.com/topic/majesty.

As may be expected, the French translation renders the expression into French, not English. However, the Italian translation curiously presents the following indirect translation chain:

7B:

Ickpling Glofftrobb squutserumm blhiop Mlashnalt, zvvin, tnodbalkguffh slhiophad Gurdlubb Asth. Questi si è il complimento prescritto dalle Leggi a tutti que'an l'onore di salutare il Re. Potrebbesi renderlo con questi termini Franzesi: Puisse **Votre Majeste Celeste** vivre plus long-temp que le Soleil, onze Lunes & demie; cioè: Possa **Vostra Celeste Maestà** sopravvivere al Sole per undici Lune e mezzo.

The Italian text makes no secret of its status as an indirect translation from the French—it is announced on the title page—but the inclusion of the intermediate language here is nevertheless surprising. In the Italian, Gulliver departs on his travels from England, just like he does in the source text. Furthermore, the king's reply to Gulliver's address is also in need of court interpreting, but here the Italian translator immediately delivers the Italian version, with no mention of the French. The accumulation of languages oddly on display in the passage perhaps inadvertently draws attention to an important characteristic of Gulliver, namely his ability to easily assimilate to foreign tongues, cultures, and environments. When entering a new realm, Gulliver's communicative ability is often reduced to gestures and mimicry, and misunderstanding is common (Kelly 1978). Nevertheless, he eventually adapts to his hosts, and more than once the "lightly sketched" character of Gulliver ends up playing the role of "court fool" (Carnochan 1964, 520, 522). However, his indiscriminate subordination to a sequence of kings and queens affects not only Gulliver's integrity, but also the stature of the rulers involved. Gulliver utters 'Celestial Majesty' without a second thought, and can be expected to do the same when novel shores are reached. Indeed, after his stay at Luggnagg, Swift heads for Japan, where once again an emperor awaits, and is quickly called 'His Majesty.' In the book, expressions of reverence are freely distributed, and therefore come to mean little.

A concordance plot shows that the distribution of the words '*majesté*' and '*maestà*' in the French and Italian translations conforms to the pattern found in the English *Gulliver*. The very last occurrence of the word in the source text refers not to the ruler of an imaginary nation such as Lilliput, or a very distant one such as Japan, but to the British sovereign. The French and Italian translators recreate the passage without having to think of adaptation or omission—strategies observed in some passages directed at the Crown in Cary's *Essay*—because the

protagonist and narrator of *Gulliver's Travels* remains decidedly English in origin, and arguably universal in his ironic depiction of human customs.

4. Discussion

The analysis started out from a basic keyness calculation, which identified 25 salient word types in Cary's *Essay*. Closer attention to the item 'wool' revealed the importance of lists in the text. A list is "a structural schema of enumeration in which particular items (e.g. attributes, objects or people, processes, actions) are arranged in a series." Lists are "a standard feature of arguments," "of instructional prose," "of narrative," "and of description" (Fludernik 2016, 309). In recent years, the list as a structural element has received increasing attention in the study of literature (von Contzen 2016). The catalogue of Greek and Trojan ships listed before the battle in Homer's *Iliad*, for instance, can be seen as a literary "Ur-catalogue" (247). This catalogue is rich in potentially opaque CRs, as it contains a variety of "place-names and epithets," whose origins are not always accessible (Edwards 1980, 82). In antiquity, lists were also a common feature of rhetorical exposition, and in the Middle Ages the list served as an important vehicle to intimate the many distinct "properties of God" (Eco 2009, 133). Jack Goody connects the use of lists to the earliest forms of writing, and suggests that "the very fact of listing may itself have contributed to the development of the alphabet" (1977, 84). Thus, listing is a structural feature of texts that occurs across languages and cultures, and that has accompanied the practice of writing throughout its historical development. Constructions such as catalogues, inventories, and descriptions are likely to draw upon a specific cultural repertoire, and can therefore be expected to contain CSIs. It is unlikely to be a coincidence, then, that Eirlys E. Davies (2003, 78–80), when discussing the translation of place names and culinary items in the *Harry Potter* book series, exemplifies some of her observations with reference to translated lists of counties and dishes. Structured lists may thus serve as a starting point for broad inquiries into the translation of culture-specific references from a 'textual' rather than 'cultural' point of departure. Ultimately, both approaches can complement each other.

In addition to enumeration, the above analysis has focused on structures of identification. As translations accumulate, so does the number of voices that combine to make up the text's enunciative position. In this respect, the issue of 'voice' in indirect translation is subject to a set of questions similar to those raised by Cecilia Alvstad and Alexandra Assis Rosa

(2015, 17–18) in relation to retranslation: for instance, how much time went by between subsequent translations, and how does one compare the function of the implied author across new editions and translations? The implied author is a narratological construct configured on the basis of a text's "stylistic, ideological, and aesthetic properties" (Schmid 2014). Thus, the implied author is intimately connected with, but also conceptually distinct from a text's narrator, and from a text's flesh-and-blood, "historical author" (Nelles 1993). The boundaries between those positions, and their relation to correspondent categories on the receiving side (e.g., the implied reader), are porous, and the subject of considerable debate (Richardson 2011). Genres such as satire often experiment with the relation between different textual voices and the extratextual situations referred to in the narrative, as is the case in *Gulliver's Travels*, a book that has invited many multileveled readings. Furthermore, separating a narrator's voice from that of the author—implied or otherwise—might be intuitive when analyzing fiction, but less so when concerned with nonfictional assessments of a country's economy, as in the case of Cary's *Essay*. The interrelation between textual voices and contexts of reading may shift considerably as texts travel through translation, and since subsequent incarnations of 'the narrator' or 'the implied author' do not allow for immediate comparison, the impact of such shifts needs to be approached through formal indicators of voice, such as pronouns and forms of address.

Pronouns, a central means of textual identification, can be studied systematically, as they form a closed word class. Forms of address vary, but frequency and keyword lists may give an indication of the forms relevant to a particular set of texts. The study of quantifiers, an important means of enumeration, can similarly be restricted after an initial exploration of textual patterns. This article has illustrated that research into cultural specificity could benefit from an increased focus on such recurrent formal features. This not only facilitates the testing of hypotheses in translation studies, but could also benefit translator education, which is in need of a more systematic approach to the issue of cultural reference (Yarosh 2013). Finally, focusing on textual structures that attract CSIs may foster increased communication between the translation profession, translation studies, and machine translation research. Machine translation research has progressed substantially in the last few years, and the field is paying increasing attention to aesthetic objects, such as novels (e.g., Toral and Way 2018). The complexities of narrative structures that operate beyond the sentence have thus begun to receive

transLogos 2022 Vol 5 Issue 1
Buts, Jan, James Hadley,
and Mohammad Aboomar, pp. 1–21
Keyness, Context, and Cultural Specificity
in Indirect Translation

© Diye Global Communications
diye.com.tr | diye@diye.com.tr

sustained attention (Castilho, Popović, and Way 2020). Translation scholars and professionals could contribute significantly to the conceptualization of such issues, and thus to the improvement of machine translation outcomes, yet only if they "identify and report patterns" rather than isolated difficulties or mistranslations (Läubli and Orrego-Carmona 2017, 68). A further alignment of interests between the various communities professionally involved with translation thus depends on investigations of structural features of language that focus not just on a text's representative qualities, but also on its interactive, communicative purpose.

5. Conclusion

This article has illustrated that the use of corpus tools, and specifically keyness analysis, can be a useful means of avoiding circular design and confirmation bias in the study of CRs or CSIs. If some words, phrases, or semantic categories are preselected as constitutive of a text's cultural frame of reference, and the translation of those same items or categories is then examined to gauge the influence of said frame of reference, there is little room for counterintuitive results that challenge the researcher's preconceived notions of what the relation between a text and a culture involves. Keyness analysis is a quantitative operation entirely based on the information contained in a given set of texts. Quantification is not neutral or free of bias, but may balance a researcher's intuitions, and highlight meaningful patterns that are not revealed as salient in a linear reading of textual material. In this study, it was revealed that patterns of enumeration and identification have the potential to prove highly relevant to the study of cultural specificity across genres, languages, and cultures. It was suggested that the sizable literature on listing practices and implied authorship may aid in conceptualizing further inquiries into the interrelation of textual structure, voice, and cultural reference.

While initially based on a corpus-driven, quantitative operation, the study has also shown the continued importance of contextual reading. For instance, the keyness calculation points towards the importance of pronominal reference in both Cary's *Essay* and Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*, but this feature cannot be uncritically approached through calculation alone. English requires explicit subject pronouns in positions where Italian does not. Pronominal usage in an English text and its Italian translation therefore does not allow for straightforward comparison. The issue is severely complicated by the fact that translators may heavily intervene in the macro-structure of a text. Differences in the size of the text are not simply resolved by

working with relative frequencies, since not all parts of a text's structure are expected to contain fully comparable information: patterns observed in an introduction or dedication may substantially differ from those observed in the body of a text. For this reason, the results of this study must remain tentative. Some evidence was found for Hadley's suggestion that indirect translations tend to omit "cultural references particular to their source cultures" (2017, 183). In the texts studied, the choices of a first translator demonstrably constrained those of subsequent ones in this respect. Yet, as Hadley (2021, 687–688) suggests, hypotheses about indirect translation phenomena are resistant to oversimplification. Whether or not CRs in indirect translation are omitted depends not only on linguistic and cultural asymmetries, but also on a text's shifting communicative functions as it moves between different historical and geographical environments.

References

Alvstad, Cecilia, and Alexandra Assis Rosa. 2015. "Voice in Retranslation: An Overview and Some Trends." *Target* 27 (1): 3–24. doi:10.1075/target.27.1.00int.

Anthony, Laurence. 2020. AntConc. Version 3.5.9. Tokyo: Waseda University. https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software.html.

Baker, Mona. 2018. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge.

Biber, Douglas. 2015. "Corpus-Based and Corpus-Driven Analyses of Language Variation and Use." In *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis*, 2nd ed., edited by Bernd Heine and Heiko Narrog, 193–223. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bondi, Marina. 2010. "Perspectives on Keywords and Keyness: An Introduction." In *Keyness in Texts*, edited by Marina Bondi and Mike Scott, 1–18. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Carnochan, W. B. 1964. "Some Roles of Lemuel Gulliver." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 5 (4): 520–529. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40753784.

Cary, John. 1695. *An Essay on the State of England, in Relation to Its Trade, Its Poor, and Its Taxes, for Carrying on the Present War Against France*. Bristoll: W. Bonny.

———. 1755. *Essai sur L'état du Commerce d'Angleterre* [Essay on the state of trade in England]. Translated by Georges-Marie Butel-Dumont. London: Guillyn.

———. 1757. *Storia del commercio della Gran Brettagna* [History of Great Britain's trade]. Translated by Pietro Genovesi. Napoli: Benedetto Gessari.

Castilho, Sheila, Maja Popović, and Andy Way. 2020. "On Context Span Needed for Machine Translation Evaluation." In *Proceedings of the 12th Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2020)*, 3735–3742. Marseille: European Language Resources Association (ELRA).

Davies, Eirlys E. 2003. "A Goblin or a Dirty Nose? The Treatment of Culture-Specific References in Translations of the Harry Potter Books." *The Translator* 9 (1): 65–100. doi:10.1080/13556509.2003.10799146.

Eberhard, David M., Gary F. Simons, and Charles D. Fennig, eds. 2020. "English." *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*. 23rd ed. Dallas: SIL International. https://www.ethnologue.com/language/eng.

Eco, Umberto. 2009. *The Infinity of Lists: From Homer to Joyce*. Translated by Alastair McEwen. London: MacLehose Press.

Edwards, Mark W. 1980. "The Structure of Homeric Catalogues." *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-2014)* 110:81–105. https://www.jstor.org/stable/284212.

Fernandes, Lincoln. 2006. "Translation of Names in Children's Fantasy Literature: Bringing the Young Reader into Play." *New Voices in Translation Studies* 2:44–57. https://www.iatis.org/images/stories/publications/new-voices/Issue2-2006/fernandes-paper-2006.pdf.

Fludernik, Monika. 2016. "Descriptive Lists and List Descriptions." *Style* 50 (3): 309–326. doi:10.5325/style.50.3.0309.

Franco Aixelá, Javier. 1996. "Culture-Specific Items in Translation." In *Translation, Power, Subversion*, edited by Román Álvarez and M. Carmen-África Vidal, 52–78. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Gabrielatos, Costas. 2018. "Keyness Analysis: Nature, Metrics and Techniques." In *Corpus Approaches to Discourse: A Critical Review*, edited by Charlotte Taylor and Anna Marchi, 225–258. London: Routledge.

Goody, Jack. 1977. *The Domestication of the Savage Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hadley, James. 2017. "Indirect Translation and Discursive Identity: Proposing the Concatenation Effect Hypothesis." In "Indirect Translation: Theoretical, Methodological and Terminological Issues," edited by Alexandra Assis Rosa, Hanna Pięta, and Rita Bueno Maia. Special Issue, *Translation Studies* 10 (2): 183–197. doi:10.1080/14781700.2016.1273794.

———. 2021. "The Concatenation Effect Hypothesis in Complex Indirect Translations: Translating the *Arabian Nights* into Gaelic and Japanese." *Perspectives* 29 (5): 676–690. doi:10.1080/0907676X.2020.1797131.

Hardie, Andrew. 2014. "Log Ratio – An Informal Introduction." *ESRC Centre for Corpus Approaches to Social Science (CASS)*. April 28. http://cass.lancs.ac.uk/log-ratio-an-informal-introduction/.

Hawes, Clement. 1991. "Three Times Round the Globe: Gulliver and Colonial Discourse." *Cultural Critique*, no. 18, 187–214. doi:10.2307/1354099.

Hunston, Susan, and Gill Francis. 2000. *Pattern Grammar: A Corpus-Driven Approach to the Lexical Grammar of English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kelly, Ann Cline. 1978. "After Eden: Gulliver's (Linguistic) Travels." *ELH* 45 (1): 33–54. doi:10.2307/2872450.

Läubli, Samuel, and David Orrego-Carmona. 2017. "When Google Translate is Better than Some Human Colleagues, those People are no Longer Colleagues." In *Proceedings of the 39th Conference Translating and the Computer*, 59–69. https://www.asling.org/tc39/wp-content/uploads/TC39-proceedings-final-1Nov-4.20pm.pdf.

Lavoie, Brian, and Lorcan Dempsey. 2018. *An Exploration of the Irish Presence in the Published Record*. Dublin, OH: OCLC Research.

Leppihalme, Ritva. 2011. "Realia." In *Handbook of Translation Studies*, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer, 2:126–130. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Macdonell, George Paul. 1887. "Cary, John." In *Dictionary of National Bibliography*, edited by Leslie Stephen, 9:244–246. London: Smith, Elder.

Marco, Josep. 2019. "The Translation of Food-Related Culture-Specific Items in the Valencian Corpus of Translated Literature (COVALT) Corpus: A Study of Techniques and Factors." *Perspectives* 27 (1): 20–41. doi:10.1080/0907676X.2018.1449228.

Nelles, William. 1993. "Historical and Implied Authors and Readers." *Comparative Literature* 45 (1): 22–46. doi:10.2307/1771304.

Newmark, Peter. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Olk, Harald Martin. 2013. "Cultural References in Translation: A Framework for Quantitative Translation Analysis." *Perspectives* 21 (3): 344–357. doi:10.1080/0907676X.2011.646279.

Oster, Ulrike, and Teresa Molés-Cases. 2016. "Eating and Drinking Seen Through Translation: A Study of Food-Related Translation Difficulties and Techniques in a Parallel Corpus of Literary Texts." *Across Languages and Cultures* 17 (1): 53–75. doi:10.1556/084.2016.17.1.3.

Reinert, Sophus A. 2011. *Translating Empire: Emulation and the Origins of Political Economy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Richardson, Brian. 2011. "Introduction. The Implied Author: Back from the Grave or Simply Dead Again?" *Style* 45 (1): 1–10. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5325/style.45.1.1.

Schmid, Wolf. 2014. "Implied Author." *The Living Handbook of Narratology*. May 16. https://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/node/58.html.

Strowe, Anna. 2021. "Radical Cultural Specificity in Translation." *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 16 (1): 41–60. doi:10.1075/tis.18021.str.

Swift, Jonathan. 1726. *Travels into Several Remote Nations of the World*. London: Benjamin Motte.

———. 1727. *Voyages du Capitaine Lemuel Gulliver en Divers Pays Éloignez* [Captain Lemuel Gulliver's travels in various remote countries]. Le Hague: Gerard van der Poel.

———. 1729. *Viaggi del Capitano Lemuel Gulliver in diversi paesi lontani* [Captain Lemuel Gulliver's travels into various distant countries]. Venice: Giovani Tevernin.

Tahir Gürçağlar, Şehnaz. 2011. "Gulliver Travels in Turkey: Retranslation and Intertextuality." In *Crossing Textual Boundaries in International Children's Literature*, edited by Lance Weldy, 44–58. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.

Tognini-Bonelli, Elena. 2001. *Corpus Linguistics at Work*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Toral, Antonio, and Andy Way. 2018. "What Level of Quality Can Neural Machine Translation Attain on Literary Text?" In *Translation Quality Assessment: From Principles to Practice*, edited by Joss Moorkens, Sheila Castilho, Federico Gaspari, and Stephen Doherty, 263–287. Basel: Springer.

Turzynski-Azimi, Angela. 2021. "Constructing the Image of Japan as a Tourist Destination: Translation Procedures for Culture-Specific Items." *Perspectives* 29 (3): 407–425. doi:10.1080/0907676X.2020.1758734.

Von Contzen, Eva. 2016. "The Limits of Narration: Lists and Literary History." *Style* 50 (3): 241–260. doi:10.5325/style.50.3.0241.

Yarosh, Maria. 2013. "Towards a Systematic Approach to Identifying Culturally-Specific Elements." In *New Prospects and Perspectives for Educating Language Mediators*, edited by Don Kiraly, Silvia Hansen-Schirra, and Karin Maksymski, 53–78. Tübingen: Narr Verlag.