southern Germany would say "Mausle". A person speaking one of the northern dialects would say "Mausken" whereas a Swiss person would say "Mausli". This is an example of geographical or regional variation of language. It is exceptionally difficult to define "standard" language because of all these variations and because language is always influenced and determined by geographical boundaries. Idioms and expressions of any type are especially prone to geographical influences.

The social class category refers to the apparent social standing of the speaker. A person making use of the expression "Du Schwein!" is probably rude, vulgar and non-conformist, and the selected English equivalent should convey this to the reader.

The time category which may vary in the case of a text, but not in the expressions we are concerned with, will almost invariably signify the fact that the relevant terms are modern and contemporary, for this project is not concerned with archaic terminology.

In B, the category of medium refers to whether the text or expression is written to be read, or said to be heard. For instance the term "Du bist 'n olles Schwein" is representative of the spoken language and signifies the colloquial style of a text or a dialogue. It would be
unacceptable to translate it as "You are an old pig", but would be better rendered as "You're an ol' pig".

Participation refers to the extent to which the speaker directly or indirectly addresses or involves the recipient. Terms of affection or abuse always address the hearer, be it directly or indirectly by their very nature: "Du Esel!", "Esel!", or "You ass!" or "Ass!". This renders the function of such terms as highly interpersonal. Terms of affection or abuse are necessarily a means for involving the addressee, even if he or she is not aware of this. One person sitting in a car may call someone in another car an idiot. The person who was called an idiot has thus contributed to evoking unfavourable emotions with the other driver, but has not been aware of this.

The social role relationship refers to the role of the addresser vis-à-vis the addressee. The relationship can be either symmetrical or asymmetrical. The former implies that the addresser is on the same level as the addressee, whereas the latter often implies that the addresser is on a level superior to that of the addressee. E.g. Mother to her young son: "Du kleines Ferkel!", but the reverse also occurs: Pupil to teacher: "Sie dumme Sans!". In most cases the distinction between role relationships will become unclear when the term is translated into English due to the absence of an equivalent polite form in English for the
German polite form "Sie", which is always translated as "you" in English, constituting a covertly erroneous error because it is an interlanguage difference. Another element which indicates the social role relationship between the addressee and the addresser is the choice of words e.g. "Schwein" (abusive) or "Schweinchen" (affectionate).

Social attitude normally refers to the stylistic features present in the utterance indicating degrees of social distance or proximity. These stylistic features such as the frequent use of complex noun phrases, the completeness or incompleteness of phrases to suggest formality or informality, interjections, passivization etc. are absent because of the out-of-context nature of the phrases. In the case of vocatives therefore, the only indicators of social attitude are the actual words themselves. "Mein kleines Schweinchen" signifies that the addresser is favourably inclined towards the addressee, and this feeling must be conveyed to the addressee in the words of the TL. Terms of affection and abuse naturally give rise to a close social attitude even if they are uttered by enemies or strangers. They always evoke a certain rapport between two people even if the addresser curses to himself without saying the word(s) out loud. Another interesting point is that all commonly used terms of affection and abuse are on a very low level of formality.
Province refers to the sphere of the social, i.e. occupational and professional function of the term in question. When analysing terms of affection and abuse, province can be applied merely to signify conversation, whether a person is being favourably or unfavourably spoken about. "Komm mal mit du kleines Schweinchen!" could indicate a teacher speaking to her young pupil or a parent speaking to his or her child, but not a boss speaking to his secretary or a bank manager to his client. Each expression we are concerned with, could only be applied to a limited possible number of social relationships, with the majority of the remaining possible relationships being automatically excluded by virtue of the words and tone chosen by the speaker.

Another important aspect of House's model to be borne in mind by the translator, is what House terms "illocutionary force" and "propositional content". This refers to the difference between the literal meaning and the intended meaning of what has been said. Propositional content refers to what the addressee intended to say i.e. "Maus". Was the speaker saying that the child resembled a mouse (which is the literal meaning), or was he expressing his affection towards the child? (See Section B (e)). According to Halliday (1970) and expounded by House (1976), every text or term has an interpersonal function. The interpersonal function of a term is the function which conveys a certain
relationship between the addresser and the addressee. This interpersonal element is inherent in every text because every text or utterance is addressed to someone. The ideational function of an expression is its propositional content e.g. the ideational function of the expletive "Sie Schwein!" is to compare a certain individual to a pig, (by comparing him to a pig) but the interpersonal function is to insult that individual by expressing profound disgust about him. The ideational function points to a literal meaning, but the interpersonal function has a pragmatic, connotative element, which is based on common usage within a language. In German and English, reference to someone as a pig, suggests not only that a person may have dirty habits but also that he may have a bad character, sub­standard morals, no scruples etc.

Finally, a good translation requires a match which is dimensional and functional (according to House), and any errors made in this respect are called covertly erroneous errors, implying that the translator has not grasped the function of what he was translating i.e. the function of the text or term. Overtly erroneous errors are made when there is a mismatch of the literal meaning of an expression. Where pragmatic meanings are changed, this constitutes covert errors or "recoding" as opposed to simple transliteration. House (1977:29) defines a translation as "the replacement of the text in the source
language by a semantically and pragmatically equivalent text in the target language."

This is a brief and somewhat simplified summary of House's model for translation assessment, but it is sufficiently detailed for the purpose of this project. Various other elements such as theme dynamics, clausal linkage, iconic linkage and textual profile have been omitted because they cannot be applied to out-of-context expressions.

(1) Problems with cross-cultural differences

Within one culture there may be many differences in religion, customs, emotions and language. When people do not share the same culture, values, knowledge and assumptions, mutual understanding becomes difficult and unintended misunderstanding common. (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:231). A need arises to become aware of and to respect inherent cultural differences as well as to negotiate meaning, and for the translator problems are often as much bicultural as bilingual. (Osgood et al 1975:17) For a translated expression to fulfil its function a translator should be familiar with the socio-cultural and psychosocial values of the people who will read his translation. He must understand their mentality and know whether they experience the same emotions in the same intensity as the original author. Osgood et al (1975:6) further claim that
irrespective of language or culture, individuals employ similar qualifying or descriptive frames of reference in giving affective meaning to concepts. Kainz (1941 in Reiss 1971:125) however, has certain reservations about this postulation. "Zweifellos gibt es eine allgemein menschliche Lebens- und Weltweisheit, ebenso eine unmittelbare Natur- und Menschenbetrachtung... und Äquivalente für sprichwortliche Redensarten, Bilder und Metaphern lassen sich aufweisen... aber daneben finden sich weit kenntlicher hervortretende charakteristische Differenzen." Indeed, the qualifying frames of reference do not vary to any major extent between the German and the English cultures, possibly because they are both Westernised cultures and adherents of Christianity. For example in both cultures a lamb is seen as a small, docile, cute, adorable creature. But if we look at the Eskimo culture, they tend to describe their young as little seals rather than as little lambs, simply because lambs play no part in their culture. Terms of affection and abuse in the Eskimo culture are centered more around dogs, bears, fish etc. than is the case in German or English.

"Linguistic instruments" (Osgood et al 1975:6) are devised within a culture for giving meaning to concepts. These instruments often appear in the form of metaphors which create realities, because words alone cannot create reality but metaphors paint images e.g. "a tear with a sore head".
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These images often lead to changes in our conceptual system and hence a change in our perception of our reality world. Human perceptions of reality vary slightly from culture to culture because different cultures have different conceptual systems. In both German and English people are often compared to cows. In India however, this would be completely unacceptable because cows are sacred, even more sacred than man, and it would be tantamount to blasphemy to compare a cow to a human (pers. comm. Prof. Masing-Delic).

Over centuries each culture has developed a decoding method in order to establish reality (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:145). Corder (1981:79) talks of "conventional and institutionalised codes" within a community, and for the translator the main difficulty lies in dealing with these codes, which have become unconventional and destandardised when taken out of one culture and placed into another. The only way in which the cultural traits of one culture can be shared with people of another culture, is by circumventing the language barrier. For Nida (1964 in Reiss 1971:81) this can only be successfully achieved by placing the ST, which will be translated into the target language, into an appropriate "cultural context". Reiss (1976:101) terms this process "recoding" ("umkodieren" or "überexten"). She posits that a translator must recode the ST in such a way that the target language addressee is able to place the text within a cultural context familiar to him, and under-
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stand the text or phrase. Examples for this are quoted by Heiss (1976:25 and 1971:123) where (1) in a Bible for Indians from the arid Mexican Highlands, Jesus does not walk over a lake but over a marsh; (2) in the Eskimo version of the 'Our Father' the words go "Give us today our daily fish" and (3) the sheep which appear so frequently in our Bible are transposed into seals. In the examples given above, not only words but also realities and concepts have been changed. Fortunately for the translator, translation theorists have digressed from the classical word for word transliterations, to more feasible and realistic free translations, and over time the paraphrasing, adaptation and modification of a text, have acquired a widely accepted degree of legitimacy, as long as the translator does not stray too far from the confines of convention.

For anthropologists language is not a thing in itself but forms the basis of one or more culture (Leach 1964:24). From their point of view, verbal communication from an interpersonal level, is essential to the maintenance of society and culture (Allen and Guy 1974:33). It provides the basis for common meaningful conceptualisations (Hertzler 1965 in Allen and Guy 1974:33), and communication without which cultures would be isolated from one another. This illustrates the indispensable role and task of the translator for it is his prime duty to propagate communication.
The difficulty in achieving perfect translation equivalence is only possible to the extent that equivalences exist between languages on the level of "langue" (the language as a whole). When translating, the optimal equivalent on the level of "parole" must be chosen. The equivalence required between two texts must be functional on the levels of both style and content (Kade 1965 in Reiss 1976:29). An equivalent can only be regarded as optimal if it has been selected in accordance with the linguistic and situational context, in accordance with the linguistic and stylistic level of the SL and in accordance with the author's intention.

In the light of what was discussed in (1) concerning cultural differences (in this case between the German and the English cultures), translation equivalence is a goal to be sought, but is seldom, if ever achieved (Osgood et al 1975:17) because of what they refer to as "cultural intangibles" (p.10). Because certain aspects are culture-specific, they become devoid of all meaning when they are removed from the bounds of their native culture and placed into an alien one. Cultural intangibles have no equivalents in any other languages and the translator is left with the option of substituting the alien concept with one which is familiar in the TL, or leaving the concept as it is, and adding a footnote. Sometimes the semantic spheres of trans-
lation substitutes or potentially suitable equivalents, do overlap partially and they become acceptable in translation. Questions which constantly surround the translator are: When is the same really the same? When is the same really different? When is different really different? When is different really the same? (Osgood et al. 1975:5). The distinguishing lines of these four questions are often obscured and the translator will have to reach a decision by sorting out one nuance from another at his own discretion. He must remember that words can convey "meanings of every shade and import" (Anderson 1969:3) and the incorrect substitution of suitable equivalents constitutes covertly erroneous errors and impairs proper communication. Let us assume for instance, that a father saying "Komm mal her Du Ferkelchen!" to his young son, is quoted as saying "Just come here you piglet!" in the translation. The reader, who in all likelihood does not have access to the ST, will be seriously mislead, as to the rapport between the father and his son. A better translation to capture the intended mood would be "Just come here you dirty little pig!"

The necessity of finding equivalents for words is just as great as finding appropriate equivalents for phrases, idioms, metaphors, puns, proverbs and similies. Many of these elements of speech do in fact have word for word (isomorphous) equivalents in the TL concerned, but many do
not, and this being the case, they simply cannot be translated literally. A mere transliteration would result in a loss of meaning e.g. in German it is quite in order for a thin person to be referred to as “ein mageres Huhn” but in English the term “a thin chicken” only has a literal meaning. Another example would be “Du dummes Küken!” which means something entirely different if translated as “You silly chick!”. Under the circumstances, the translator must find a metaphor (for example), which, although it may be denotatively quite distinct from the metaphor in the ST, it may very well be employed affectively in the same way, thus representing a "common evaluative factor" (Osgood et al 1975:33). An idiom or expression specific to one particular culture can be translated by translating or recoding the concept if there are no suitable equivalents available e.g. "ich habe einen Hunger bis unter beide Arme" can be recoded as "I could eat a horse" or "I am starving/ravenous/famished". Therefore we must support theorists such as Partridge and Corder, who posit that there is more to a language than a knowledge of its structural rules, or of its syntax or vocabulary (Corder 1981:48), or declinations and that one of the most essential prerequisites for a good translation is the translator’s near-native SL and native TL speaking ability i.e. knowing when to use what, how to use it and how and when not to use it. This is what Corder aptly terms “communicative competence” (p.48) and what is
covered by Partridge's term of "Sprachgefühl" (1938:163). Communicative competence also refers to the knowledge of the rules for politeness and tact, to the recognition of an insult and to knowing where praise is due.

Nida and Taber (1969 in Reiss 1976:125) claim that the major downfall of translation is that too few translators are adequately familiar with the possibilities of idiomatic ways of expression in the target language. Their shortcoming results in a dilution of the metaphorical power of the target language, because the loss of certain idioms etc. is not sufficiently compensated for in the substitution of others which are not optimal equivalents.

In the case of the translator having to render a dialect across a language barrier, he will more often than not, find his attempts at substituting equivalents futile. The only feasible solution would be to recode the entire dialogue. In so doing however, the translator, for want of suitable equivalents, runs the risk of either degenerating or elevating the status of a word or term unintentionally, e.g. it is reasonably common for Germans to refer to people who are irritating them or being insidiously stupid, as "Du Rindvieh!" The term is bisexual and has no English equivalent. It could be translated as "bitch", which also refers to a woman of inconsiderate personality, (but which is on a lower level than "Rindvieh") or it could be
translated as "ass", which would increase the level of respect toward a blatantly stupid person. These are some of the major problems related to equivalence, and it depends to a large extent on the translator himself as to how he is best able to deal with them.

(3) The language aspect

Language is the medium in which most human emotions are expressed. It is an integral part of any human relationship, be it formal, informal, intimate, hostile, sarcastic, witty, disapproving or competitive etc. The essential element in language is not its physically overt medium, in which emotions are aired, but its purpose (Révész 1956:85), and this coincides with House’s ideas of the function of whatever is imparted by person A to person B. Especially in the translation of vocatives, the translator may never for an instant be oblivious of the purpose and function of an utterance, for in these lie the means for the exchange of thoughts and the transfer of will. Thought and speech are inseparably associated with one another, and the existence of the one presupposes the existence of the other. It therefore follows that a mistranslation or a mismatch across the language barrier will not generate in the addressee, the thoughts which the speaker intended to generate in him, thus distorting the function and purpose of the words used for the utterance.
Through the medium of language the social space between two or more individuals is bridged and each verbal emission signifies an exchange of information. It is the translator's duty to work in close co-operation with the function and purpose of what is said, in order not to deprive the expression, and hence the recipient, of any meaning.

Partridge (1938:191) has quoted Greenough (1962) as saying "every educated person has at least two ways of speaking his mother tongue. The first is that which he employs in his family, among his friends...and on ordinary occasions. The second... is the language which he employs when he is on his dignity... and the difference between these two forms consists in great measure, of a difference in vocabulary". Here it is interesting to note that upon analysing what was said by Greenough it is possible to further subdivide the private language into "secret" and "private", where the secret language is spoken between lovers or criminals for example, (as opposed to the jargon used by jailbirds or computer experts) which outsiders cannot understand, and where the private language can also be spoken by lovers or even strangers i.e. between a cashier and a customer at a supermarket. In other words, secret versus private versus public language, where the
first way is often the unconventional, non-standard, idiosyncratic, marked way of speaking English (which has been termed an idiolect or "idiosyncratic dialect" by Corder amongst others), where the second is usually the more normative unmarked style, and where the third represents a stilted, above-standard, learned style. Idiolects or personal dialects are subject to specified rules which are unique to the individual using the lect, and often also to people sharing his cultural background and linguistic history. Idiolectic expressions are hence not readily interpretable or translatable, since the ability to interpret an utterance depends largely on the knowledge of the generally accepted conventions underlying that utterance. According to Saussure (1974) "parole" (speech) is the individual element ("un acte individuel de volonté et d'intelligence"), whereas "langue" (language) constitutes the word pictures and references which reside in the minds of people coming from compatible backgrounds, and hence sharing similar values. On taking a closer look at Chomsky’s theory (Chomsky 1964:10) "parole" may be equated with "performance" which he further subdivides into the actual performance and the potential performance of a language, meaning that which is achieved by an utterance and that which could be achieved by the same utterance, depending upon the tone of the utterance and the situation in which it is uttered. Potential performance depends largely on the listener’s reaction to the utterance because
if the same thing is said to ten different people all speaking the same language, it could happen that all ten responses are different "depending on personality, beliefs and countless other extra-linguistic factors". Furthermore the Saussurian "langue" may be equated with what Chomsky terms "competence", which represents the grammar of a language. It is the listener's problem "to determine the structural description assigned by his grammar to a presented utterance (or, where the sentence is ambiguous, to determine the correct structural description ... and using the information in the structural description, to understand the utterance". Jespersen (1946:17) has subsequently interpreted Saussure as having said that every man is master of his own speech, that he is at liberty to distort words as he sees fit, and to coin neologisms for his own use, and indeed today many individuals take full advantage of this freedom. This however, when carried out to its fullest extreme, can no longer be called "parole" in the Saussurian sense of the word, because conventionally all speech is socially conditioned with a socially linking element in every utterance, and an idiolect sometimes does not even marginally conform to the norm, thus isolating the individual.

The study of idiolects acquires a more definitive meaning when analysed within the boundaries of a unit far smaller than a culture, namely in a family situation. In many ways