family life has a powerful unifying effect within its boundaries, and a highly separative effect with respect to non-members. Most families have a natural inclination to acquire an idiosyncratic private language of their own, with its own expressions, pet names (hypocoristica), and nick-names, all of which bear little meaning for outsiders, thereby excluding them. This certainly has a bearing on the fact that there may be "sublanguages" within one particular culture, which diverge from one another ostensibly in their verbal idiosyncracies. Often these idiolects manifest themselves in the form of neologisms and are very difficult, if not impossible to translate.

The translator tries to substitute the linguistic idiosyncracies of the ST by equivalent linguistic idiosyncracies in the TT. He is faced with an analogy, namely trying to bring to effect, something expressed by the potential in one language (SL), using the potential of the TL. In so doing he finds himself forced to create new associations in the TL, while he is forced to dispose of certain, if not all, associations of the original. (Reichert 1972 in Reiss 1976:53). Often this is the only solution available to the translator, but whereas in theory he has a freedom of choice as to which approximate equivalent he chooses in order to realise the situational meaning, in practise he must remain within the loosely defined boundaries of conventional usage ("Gebrauchsnorm").
The translator is often forced to draw on his creative powers, to attempt coining an expression in the TL which conveys the same information or emotions. Some examples of family idiolects which are yard to terms of affection recorded in actual family situations, would be: Schnuckelbär, Schnuckelhäschen, mein heissgeliebtes Knubbelhäschen, Mausekatze. Wackelente. Examples of non-conventional terms of abuse would be: aufgepapptier Penguin, dreischwänzige Muttersau, Böckfuss, Schlange mit gebrochenem Rückgrat, Dreckbiest. Faul wie ein satter Kater.

Corder (1981:67) makes a very logical, but unfortunately unrealistic suggestion for solving the problems created by idiolects. He proposes institutionalisation and standardisation "to establish accepted norms of behaviour in a language community, thereby keeping within certain bounds the variability of individual idiolects. This is clearly necessary if a language is to serve as a means of communication within a society". It is true that this should be considered necessary, but it would be as good as denying a family or an individual its or his basic human right to speak as it or he wishes. It would be preposterous to prescribe to a family what it may or may not call its children. Thus, if a translation is in question, the problems are left in the (capable) hands of the translator to pass the information on in terms of how it was interpreted by him. Every translation is necessarily also
an interpretation (Reiss 1971:107). As a translator he has various "resource expansion strategies" open to him (Corder 1981:105). These are methods of overcoming difficulties, particularly in the above-mentioned areas. In the first place he can take an educated guess as to what the author or speaker intended to say, but this can be dangerous as it could lead to a total communication breakdown if he guesses incorrectly. Secondly he can paraphrase, circumlocate or recode. Finally he can resort to "borrowing" which amounts to the use of a linguistic resource not classified as conforming to the norms of the TL. Borrowing is usually a form of transliteration where the translator simply borrows the word he cannot translate, and inserts it as such into the TL text. This is considered as a short cut and is not condoned by translation theorists.

(5) The translator and the translation

The speech-usage of the translator must be flexible, constantly registering what is stated in the ST and being put to practical use to determine how best to rewrite what has been said, so that it can be correctly grasped by the addressee. When translating expressions of abuse or affection the translator must possess a certain natural feeling of "Zeitgeist" - the ability to interpret an expression in relation to its time and context. Corder
Ms terms this "referential appropriateness". He distinguishes this from "social appropriateness" which refers to the choice of a suitable register for the social situation at hand ("Sprachgefühl").

When in difficulty, a translator may be able to either opt for an authoritative interpretation or for a plausible interpretation. The former is only possible when the addressee is present and can be asked what he meant, but in many cases translators must settle for the latter option, basing their interpretation on the basis of its "form and its linguistic and situational context," (Corder 1981:38), and aiming at a "plausible reconstruction". Furthermore the translator has at his disposal various "resource expansion strategies", to assist him in getting around problems. Only one of the three strategies requires further discussion, namely that of borrowing. It appears, according to Corder (1981:96), that translators have "clear cut beliefs about what is similar in two languages and therefore borrowable". Material and intangible elements of two or more separate languages must never be assumed to be similar and therefore readily interchangeable if this cannot be presumed with absolute certainty. This constitutes an inexcusable overt error and points to the translator's incompetence. It also shows his tendency to what Taylor (1975 in Corder 1981:99) terms "beg, borrow or steal".
Another common source of error is that resulting from source language interference, or the persistence of firmly established mother tongue habits in the TL. The translator must constantly be aware of these possible interferences which often occur without his knowing.

The translator himself constitutes a very important aspect of any translation. If the same text were to be translated by three different people, all three translations would be different. This can be accredited to the individual personality of each translator. He may have a dominant nature with a strong desire to air his own creative talents, thereby suppressing those of the original author, he may also have a submissive nature, and be content in his total or partial subordination to the intention and style of the original author. Some translators indulge too much in their concomitant roles as interpreters, and read too much into the original text. Others however, are "theoretical translators" (Reiss 1971:111) characterised by their unaffectioneness and objectivity. Translations could also be tainted depending on the political or religious affiliations of the translator, where emphasis is laid on aspects different to those of the ST. All these factors can influence a translation and should be borne in mind by the TL addressee.

Everything that has been argued or stated in this section
on the theory of translation has been stated with reference to translating in general, as well as with reference to translating terms of affection and abuse in particular. The following part of this project, section B, will take an in-depth look at the practical aspect of the study i.e. the actual contemporary use of such expressions as revealed by the research undertaken with the aid of dictionaries, periodicals, popular literature and live situations. Some attention will also be focussed on metaphors and proverbs which are based on animals.
B. Empirical aspect

a) The contemporary use of terms of affection and abuse based on the ideas postulated by Leach (1964), Whaley and Antonelli (1983) and Abrahams (1975 in Whaley and Antonelli p.220).

The use of terms of affective expression is almost certainly as much a part of antiquity as love and swearing, for this is presumably how it originated. Of course, approval and disapproval may first have been shown by gesticulations which then evolved into voracious onomatopeic type ejaculations, which, with time have developed into the forms we are familiar with today. They have been converted by means of an "inner linguistic sense" (Révész 1956:24).

Both affection and abuse can be classed as culturally conditioned responses likely to occur under specific circumstances such as happiness or elation and hatred or frustration. Both forms of behaviour are an effective means of giving expression to emotions which require airing. Montagu (1967:55) poses the question whether swearing (and praising) is an instinctive action, or a habit which an individual acquires owing to his close proximity to the society he lives in. He concludes that "swearing is a purely artificial urge, culturally acquired, and is not in any sense part of the human constitution (p.81). The truth
of this statement may be disputed because most people would agree that frustration is a very prominent characteristic of the human constitution and frustration gives rise to the often involuntary outburst of words expressing emotions, which may be referred to as swearing. It may be more accurate to say that the way people swear varies from culture to culture and is thus culturally determined. Expletives are closely associated with cultural taboos, which imply immorality, dirtiness (with reference to excretion), vulgarity, promiscuity, lechery, sexual abuse, all of which are undesirable in a sound society. Taboos often also protect that which is sacred or too elevated to mention without being blasphemous. Because sex constituted one of the most forcefully implemented taboos, animals which over-indulged in sexual activity, such as bulls, cocks and goats, were used to describe people who did the same. Many abusive expressions originated in this way, but have evolved and acquired slightly different meanings.

Swearing and praising is a learned but spontaneous behaviour and is employed by some people all of the time, and by some never, depending entirely on the individual and the situation concerned. The hypothesis thus follows that whereas purely instinctive traits in animals and man (the few he has retained) do evolve, although very gradually over the centuries, non-instinctive actions have a tendency to undergo rapid change in accordance with the trend of the
day. This is one of the reasons for languages such as English and German expanding literally before our eyes—a natural and inevitable phenomenon wherever there is contact between two or more individuals. Languages are in a constant phase of transition, receptive to ever increasing bursts of new expressions, coined by the conscious initiative of individuals who speak those languages, and who feel restricted within their boundaries. They react by unleashing their inventive powers, (defined as a voluntary creative force by Révész 1956:69) until they feel that they can transform with perfection, their emotions into words regardless of whether these words conform to common usage. This creation of language is guided by conscious intention. No institution can halt the perpetual verbal coining of expressions and terminology and hence no one person can capture them in his mind, and least of all in a book. The extremely widespread use of terms of affection and abuse is undoubtedly one of the translator's greatest dilemmas, for even the most competent translator will be largely incompetent in this field. It is important for the translator to analyse the affective content of an expression in such a way as not to lose its original nuance.

One of the more interesting and most informative everyday uses of language involves either disparaging or elevating an individual or group of individuals, by comparing the
implicitly and explicitly to animals and animal behaviour. The Jacobean and Elizabethan period was the "heyday of animal name calling" (Rowland 1980:205) and the most extensive use of animal imagery occurs in the secular writers of that period.

"Since the Western mind generally elevates humans over animals, most of these animal comparisons express negative attitudes towards the person so compared" (Whaley and Antonelli 1983:219). The research which has preceded this project substantiates the point made above, but there are numerous, if not countless, cases where humans are favourably compared to animals. They are nevertheless in the minority and perhaps this can be ascribed to human nature...

Greek, Roman and Egyptian mythology is studded with incidents revealing the transformation of badly behaved human beings into animals. The idea of humans being punished by being degraded to animal status is still common today throughout the East and West. During the Middle Ages (the Middle High German era, the Crusades and the Minnesang), as in Antiquity, political and social figureheads were satirised in the form of animals, and animal poetry reached its climax in the Roman de Renart, a collection of French fables dating back to the twelfth or thirteenth century, describing the war between Reynard the Fox and
Iseglym the avaricious but brave wolf. Even though in epic poetry, animals were only used as an instrument to caricature humans, they began to acquire personalities making them analogous to definite human natures, to which they bore no more than a hint of external resemblance in shape or movement. Contrary to the subject of this project, where the human resemblance to animals is being investigated, animals, especially those which featured in Aesop’s Fables more than two and a half thousand years ago, used to be judged by human standards e.g. quick or slow reactions symbolised intelligence or stupidity respectively (Lewinsohn 1954:94). Nowadays this is relatively uncommon and humans are compared to animals instead (see also Orwell 1984).

Returning once again to the modern usage of animal metaphors in expressions of affection and abuse, it appears that the members of the female sex bear the brunt of the abuse which is bandied about. Few animal references are used positively for women, a fact which Whaley and Antonelli (1983:22) ascribe to the “deep-seated bias against females in our patriarchic culture” (which is however changing gradually with the woman’s liberation ideology coming to the fore. It may therefore well be that in the next few decades a host of positive terms will make their mark on German and English). These intrinsic inequities in the use of animal metaphors should not merely...
be seen as an example of sexual discrimination and prejudice evident in our society, but it should encourage us to examine how animal metaphor usage reveals the truth of sex-role relationships, and to find out exactly how people sharing our culture generally conceive of themselves in relation to animals.

The theory expounded by Whaley and Antonelli overlaps considerably, although not completely, with that of Abrahams and Leach, who in turn derive their theory from Radcliffe-Brown, Douglas and Levi-Strauss. The theories constitute a method of establishing the connection between groups of animals and verbal affection and abuse. The animals are categorised according to what they eat, what their relationship is to humans, what their ritual value is and what their food value is to humans. Similarly, we relate to animals firstly depending on whether they are pets, pests, cattle or wild animals, and according to the following four interrelated factors (Whaley and Antonelli 1983:220):

- PROXIMITY or their location in or outside of our homes
- DOMESTICITY or our level of control over them
- COMPETITION FOR RESOURCES or food
- SUITABILITY FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION

In general women are seen as pets, and not only as pets in their own right, but as pets for males. Men are the independent, strong, domineering, wild animals; children
are the harmless, cute small or naughty animals.

Looking at the four basic animal categories we have established, we can say the following about each:

Pets live in close proximity and even intimately with humans. They are tame, domesticated and subservient and as they are often fed on left-overs, they do not compete for human resources as do wild animals. In general people do not eat their pets. The thought of eating the family cat for dinner, as Whaley and Antonelli aptly put it, is abhorrent to most people. Leach (1964:32) claims that man and food are antithetical categories. "Man is not food, so dog cannot be food either". Although this postulation only holds true for animals regarded as true pets, the precept amounts to man's being conditioned to think like this by the Western culture of which he forms an integral part. We are of course alluding this in terms of the German and English speaking cultures, for it is not universally applicable. In most Far Eastern cultures, for instance, dogs and cats are bred for the sole purpose of human consumption. But other cultures aside, let us now attempt to draw some parallels between the animal-human and male-female sex-role relationship. An adult woman, for argument's sake, could be a man's mother, daughter, sister, aunt or first cousin. She therefore represents a "strongly incestuous category" (Leach 1964:43). The proximity of the family relatedness can be paralleled to the proximity of
pets in relation to their owners. From a moral and legal point of view, women belonging to this category are sexually inaccessible to their sons, fathers, brothers, uncles and first cousins. This sexual taboo can be equated with the inedibility of pets. Even today in Western civilisations the role of the woman is largely associated with domestic chores, and women are often referred to as domesticated. This traditionally servile, obedient, weak, mindless nature, rated as being typical of women, is comparable to very similar traits displayed by pets. Just as it is traditionally the male's right to dominate the woman, it is the owner's right to control his pet. Bearing in mind the above, it becomes clearer why women are sometimes called what they are i.e. bird, kitten, chick (which could, at a stretch of the imagination, be regarded as pets). In general these terms express affection. As pets do not pose a threat to humans, there is no need to be abusive about them. What must be added however, is that if women are abused they are usually sexually abused i.e. "pussy", "bitch" and "sex-kitten".

In the second category which Leach calls farm animals and which Whaley and Antonelli call cattle, further interesting parallels may be drawn. Farm animals are only partially tame and domesticated, they live in relatively close proximity to their masters, they do not compete for food, but are fed, and on a reciprocal basis they supply their master.
with food. They are useful and edible. The men and women featuring in this category can be compared to farm animals in the following ways. They are the distant relatives of a family, but are nevertheless related, and this corresponds to the relative proximity of farm animals to their masters. Marriage with this category is normally disapproved but not prohibited and sexual relations are legally and morally usually unacceptable. This corresponds to farm animals usually being fit for human consumption. The privilege of being allowed to eat animals, when farm animals are not allowed or able to eat their masters, is often interpreted as a mark of human superiority. Owing to man's superiority, there is a strong tendency to employ farm animals in terms expressing abuse, even though man should show gratitude towards them because they supply him with food. Farm animal expressions frequently used as expletives are: cow, bull, ox, horse, goat, sheep, ram, cur, cock, rabbit, pig, piglet, sow, swine.

In the wild animal category, contact with humans is only ever really made when they invade human territory or when their territory is invaded by humans for hunting purposes. They are seldom domesticated, are very independent of human care and are usually but not always considered to be edible. They do compete for human resources, thereby posing a threat to them which often results in mutual hostility. In comparing humans with animals we can draw a parallel
between the relations humans have with their neighbours or friends. These can be friendly or hostile, sexual relations or marriage may or may not take place between these categories, which corresponds to the possible edibility of wild animals. The proximity factor corresponds to that of two strangers becoming friends, marriage partners or enemies. Strangers also remain strangers unless regular contact is kept up to establish a bond between the individuals i.e. domesticity must be created just as with wild animals, over which humans have no control unless they are physically constrained or killed. Due to the contrasting elements of friendship versus hostility within this group, depending on the circumstances, there appear to be countless terms expressing both positive and negative animal tendencies in humans. But at a glance, hostility appears to be expressed with far more ease than amicability e.g. fox, vixen, wolf, bear, snake, ape, vulture, stag, tiger, eagle and doe.

The final category is that of pests (for the purposes of this project the category of pests does not conform to the conventional definition of "pests". It is used simply as a collective term to name a category of miscellaneous animals), which in most cases live near humans but cannot be domesticated, not that there would be any desire to do so. They destroy, contaminate or eat human food and do not serve as a source of food themselves. In general the only
rapport existing between humans and pests is one of extreme hostility and even revulsion. Distance between pests and humans is desirable and often even essential for survival. Parallels may be drawn between people and pests where one individual strongly detests another. It may be assumed that the individuals are not complete strangers to one another because they will have had dealings together to find out that they do not like each other. Due to this intense, mutual dislike it is highly unlikely that any sort of sexual relationship or friendship will exist between the individuals. Animal metaphors involving pests are: rats, rodents, flies, fleas, lice, crabs, leeches, ticks etc. and usually express the negative feelings of one human being about another.

A category not dealt with by Leach or Whaley and Antonelli is beasts of burden, perhaps because it overlaps with the category of farm animals. They too are subservient and therefore man is regarded as being superior to them, supposedly giving him the right to use and abuse them at his discretion. Consequently animal metaphors using the names of beasts of burden are often used to degrade and defame individuals e.g. ass, donkey, ox, horse, camel, elephant.

Countless other animal categories (e.g. reptiles, birds, scavengers, beasts and birds of prey, insects, animals of
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