Translation of Terms of Address in Postcolonial Novels in English

Nina Grahek Križnar, University of Ljubljana

Povzetek
Izrazi naslavljanja, torej besede in fraze, s katerimi ljudje naslavljajo drug drugega, razkrivajo družbeni status govorcev in odnos med njimi. Postkolonialni romani z upodabljanjem dihotomije med kolonizatorji in koloniziranimi v kolonialnem kontekstu oziroma med privilegiranimi belimi in podrejenimi temnopoltnimi prebivalci v postkolonialnem kontekstu spodbijajo diskurze, ki podpirajo kolonializem. Ta dihotomija se pogosto manifestira v dialogih, v katerih podrejeni *Drugi* »gospodarja« naslavlja s specifičnimi izrazi naslavljanja. Slovenski prevajalci pri prevajanju teh kulturno specifičnih izrazov posegajo po dveh strategijah: nekateri jih podomačujejo z izrazi iz slovenskega kulturnega okolja, drugi jih pustijo v izvirniku. Raziskava je pokazala, da podomačevanje izrazov naslavljanja bralca prevoda prikrajša za predstavo o kompleksnih družbenih odnosih med udeleženimi v (post)kolonialnem okolju, ki ga literarno delo upodablja.

Ključne besede: izrazi naslavljanja, postkolonialna književnost, *Drugi*, podomačevanje in potujevanje.

1 INTRODUCTION

Terms of address are words and phrases people use to address others and are addressed by them in return. As such, terms of address reveal the social rank of the speakers and the relationship between them.

Colonial society was marked by a clear-cut division between the dominant white colonizers and the subordinate colonized, and this divide resulted in a specific type of discourse wherein the subordinate colonized (the *Other*) used specific forms of address when speaking to their "masters". In postcolonial times, such communication is represented in postcolonial novels, which, through portrayal of the colonial past or postcolonial present, examine the colonial relationship and resist colonialist perspectives (Boehmer 2005: 3).

The most obvious attribute of the *Other* portrayed in postcolonial novels is the specificity of the language they use. Postcolonial literature has accepted the language of the Centre, i.e. standard English, and inserted it into a new discourse: the languages that the *Other* speak are the representations of "englishes" (Ashcroft et al. 2002: 7-8) into which, as the result of colonization, standard English developed through language contact. Embedded in the non-standard discourse are terms of address that further accentuate the social division between the white colonizer, owner of the land etc., and the subordinate *Other*.

Based on the Slovenian translation of four postcolonial novels, I will discuss the ways in which Slovenian translators tackle the problem of translating terms of address that in the colonial/postcolonial context denote the relationship between the dominant white and the subordinate *Other*, arguing that domestication is not the most appropriate strategy, as it fails to preserve the complexity and specificity of the colonial/postcolonial reality.

2 POSTCOLONIAL LITERATURE

Postcolonial literature has emerged as a response to the experience of colonialism, which shaped the lives of more than three-quarters of the people living in the world today (Ashcroft et al. 2002: 1). It aims to resist colonialist perspectives by undercutting, "thematically and formally the discourses which supported colonization – the myths of power, the race classifications, the imagery of subordination" (Boehmer 2005: 3) and by giving voice to the "subaltern"[1], the subordinate members of colonial society – the *Other*.

[1] The term "subaltern" was introduced by the Italian Marxist, Antonio Gramsci; in the postcolonial theory it defines those social groups which are subordinate on the basis of their social class, caste, race etc.

Colonialism caused certain kinds of behaviour, imposed new models of identity, and re-codified cross-cultural relationships of both Europeans and the colonized (McLeod 2007: 3). In order to confirm their superiority, the colonizers needed someone to whom they could attribute the lack of power, self-confidence and ability to think and rule (Boehmer 2005: 21).

The crucial means of representation of colonial and postcolonial reality in postcolonial literature is language. The language framework is normally standard English, whereas the language spoken by the (former) colonized – the *Other* – is influenced by local vernacular and speech customs (Ashcroft et al. 2002: 37-38). Non-standard language varieties symbolize cultural distinctiveness, whereas the combination of standard and non-standard/postcolonial English expresses the cultural tension between the "centre" and the "periphery" (ibid.).

3 TERMS OF ADDRESS

Terms of address are vocative expressions that refer to the collocutor and thus contain a strong element of deixis (Braun 1988: 7), i.e. their meaning depends on the context in which they are used. Yang (2010), discussing the difference between English and Chinese terms of address from the cultural perspective, argues that terms of address are used to attract people's attention, to show the difference in social class, the relationship between the speaker and the hearer, and to express politeness and a particular degree of respect. Terms of address have been especially important in English since the breakdown of the 'thou/you' pronoun system in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and have had a greater grammatical importance in English than in other languages that retain separate pronouns *you* for singular and plural/deference (Dunkling 1990).

Slovenian has preserved the distinction between the second-person pronouns *ti* and *vi*, i.e. "vikanje" and "tikanje", which denote the levels of formality, politeness, but also respect and power (Onič 2013). Therefore, in translation from English into Slovenian, the relationship between the speaker and the addressee can, in addition to the use of the forms of address, be expressed by either of the two second-person pronouns, i.e. *ti* or *vi*.

There is always a social meaning encoded in an address variant, and this social component consists of the speaker-addressee relationship, the speaker's evaluation of the addressee and of the speaker's social background (Braun 1988: 258). The nature of terms of address can only be defined when we know the overall relationship between the speaker and the hearer (Dunkling 1990).

In postcolonial novels, the dichotomy between the *Other* and the white colonist is often depicted through a dialogue wherein the *Other* reveal their subordinate position by addressing the dominant white person through terms of address. The address relationship is asymmetrical, meaning that the two speakers address each other differently; "masters" normally do not use any form of address, which further confirms the social inequality. While some terms of address used in postcolonial literature are geographically neutral and may occur in any colonial setting (e.g. *sir, master*), others are regionally specific (e.g. *baas* in South Africa, *sah* in Nigeria, *sahib* in regions with Indian population: India, Trinidad etc.). The latter appear in postcolonial text as untranslated words – often in italics. Inserting untranslated words into the English discourse is one of the techniques for expressing cultural distinctiveness in postcolonial writing (Ashcroft et al. 2002: 63).

4 POSSIBLE STRATEGIES IN TRANSLATING TERMS OF ADDRESS IN POSTCOLONIAL LITERATURE

Given the sociocultural background that provides the conditions for the use of particular terms of address by the *Other* in postcolonial literature, it seems understandable that a translator will find it difficult to think of a Slovenian equivalent, a word or an expression, that would contain the same implications and undertones as the original. A complete homology is impossible (Tymoczko 1999: 55; Snell-Hornby 1988: 13-22), and in moving between languages and cultural discourses something will inevitably be lost.

Discussing translation between cultures, Wolf (1995: 131) advocates that the knowledge of ethnography, i.e. "the culture-specific and social phenomena of the societies involved", is "indispensable for the perception of the structure and the meaning of language". An informed translator is therefore more susceptible to the asymmetries between different cultures and this can result in more deliberate decisions.

Baker (1995) suggests a number of strategies for translating words with culture-specific meaning: cultural borrowing, calque, transliteration, cultural substitution, translation by a more general expression, paraphrase, a note and omission. Similarly, Yang (2010), taking into consideration the differences between Chinese and English terms of address, suggests four translation methods from Chinese to English to make readers understand the difference between Chinese and English addressing terms: literal translation, flexible translation, specification or generalization, domestication and alienation.

In this article we use the notions *domestication* and *foreignization*, drawing on Venuti's definition of the terms (1995, 1998). Both approaches are employed by the four Slovenian translators, whose translation of terms of address denoting social relations between the underprivileged *Other* and the white colonizer in the colonial context, or the privileged landowner in the postcolonial context, is presented in the case study.

Domestication or translation by cultural substitution wherein "the source language expression is replaced by a reference that is more in accordance with the norms of the target culture" (Baker 1995) may render a translated text more acceptable in the target culture, since it makes it more fluent and requires less effort on the side of the reader. While the propositional meaning of the source language expressions and their translated forms may not overlap, a translator's aim is to achieve the same or similar impact on the target reader. According to the findings of cognitive science, people tend to assimilate new and unknown information to patterns that they can recognize and they are familiar with (Tymoczko 1999: 48).

Venuti (1998: 67), however, stresses the problem of the formation of cultural identity with rewriting foreign texts in domestic dialects and discourses. In his opinion translation has power in constructing representation of foreign cultures. By domesticating notions that carry a specific cultural meaning in the source culture – in our case the colonial/postcolonial context – a translator creates a false representation of colonial/postcolonial reality. Venuti further refers to Berman (1992) who argues that a bad translation is ethnocentric in that it systematically denies *Otherness* in a foreign work, whereas in a good translation this ethnocentric negation is limited and the source language and culture differences (*Otherness*) of the foreign text are preserved.

Baker (1995: 254) sees the translator's challenge in his/her ability to assess the target readers' range of knowledge and assumptions about various aspects of the world, and to strike a reasonable balance between fulfilling their expectations and maintaining their interest by offering them new and alternative insights. In her view, readers of translated texts are prepared to take a view different to their own, if they are properly motivated.

5 CASE STUDY

The study is based on extracts from four postcolonial novels. Two of the authors come from South Africa, one from the Caribbean and one from Nigeria. A different translator translated each novel. All extracts contain dialogues between a

subordinate *Other* (a black servant, a black farm-labourer, a black farm overseer etc.) and a white master.

South African writers J.M. Coetzee (1940-) and Nadine Gordimer (1923-2014) placed their postcolonial novels in an apartheid setting, problematizing land ownership through the relation between white landowners and black farm workers.

1. The novel ***In the Heart of the Country*** (1976) by J.M. Coetzee is a first-person narrative by a white woman Magda living with her father on an isolated Afrikaans farm. The monotonous life is shaken up by the arrival of a work-seeking black man, Hendrik. The following scene depicts the moment Hendrik appears on Magda's father's door.

> […] Hendrik arrived one afternoon, a boy of sixteen, I am guessing, dusty of course, with a stick in his hand and a bag on his shoulder, stopping at the foot of the stairs and looking up to where my father sat smoking and staring into the distance: that is our wont here, that must be the origin of our speculative bias, staring into the distance, staring into the fire. Hendrik doffed his hat, a characteristic gesture, a sixteen-year-old boy holding his hat to his breast, men and boys all wear hats here.
>
> "**Baas**," said Hendrik, good day, **baas**. I am looking for work."
>
> My father hawked and swallowed. I render his words; I cannot know whether Hendrik heard what I heard besides, what I perhaps did not hear that day but hear now in my inner ear, the penumbra of moodishness or disdain about the words.
>
> "What kind of work are you looking for?"
>
> "Anything – just work, **baas**."
>
> "Where are you from?"
>
> "From Armoede, **my baas**. But now I come from **baas Kobus**. **Baas Kobus** says that **baas** has work here."
>
> "Do you work for **baas Kobus**?"
>
> "No, I do not work for **baas Kobus**. I was there looking for work. Then **baas Kobus** said that **the baas** has work. So I came." (Coetzee 1982: 19-20)

The two people involved in the dialogue are Hendrik, a young black man looking for a job – the *Other* – and a white farmer. English here is just representation of Afrikaans. Expressions *my baas* and *baas* are used in the vocative case by Hendrik alone when addressing the white man. The white man does not use any term of address in return, however, he refers to another white farmer as *baas*. This corresponds to the definition of the word *baas* in the Dictionary of South African English on Historical Principles which states that the term *baas*, meaning "master", is of the Dutch origin and was in the past "used of or to a white male, indicating the speaker's perception or acknowledgement of the other's superior social status", usually "the owner or master of a home, farm, or business, and employer of the servants or labourers who work there". As such it can be used as a form of address, often in a phrase *my baas*, as a deferential form of address in the third person, and also by one white person of another, when speaking to a black or 'coloured' person (2014). In the passage the term is used in all three functions.

The novel was translated into Slovenian in 2001 by Jure Potokar.

> […] Hendrik je prispel nekega popoldneva, ugibam, da šestnajstleten fant, seveda prašen, s palico v roki in torbo na rami, se ustavil pri vznožju stopnic in pogledal navzgor, kjer je sedel moj oče, kadil in strmel v daljavo: taka je naša tukajšnja navada, gotovo je vir našega spekulativnega nagnjenja, strmeti v daljavo, strmeti v ogenj. Hendrik je snel klobuk, značilna kretnja, šestnajstleten fant, držeč klobuk na prsih, možje in fantje tukaj nosijo klobuk.
>
> »**Gaspud**,« je rekel Hendrik, dober dan, **gaspud**. Delo iščem.«
>
> Moj oče je zakrhal in pogoltnil. Povzemam njegove besede. Ne morem vedeti, ali je Hendrik slišal, kar sem jaz slišala poleg, kar morebiti nisem slišala tistega dne, ampak slišim zdaj s svojim notranjim ušesom, pridih muhavosti in prezira v besedah.
>
> »Kakšno delo pa iščeš?«
>
> »Karkoli – delo pač – **gaspud**.«
>
> »Od kod si?«
>
> »Iz Armoeda, **moj gaspud**. Ampak zdaj prihajam od **gaspuda Kabusa**. **Gaspud Kabus** pravi, da ima **gaspud** tukaj delo.«
>
> »Ali delaš za **gaspuda Kabusa**?«

> »Ne, ne delam za **gaspuda Kabusa**. Tam sem bil, ko sem iskal delo. Potem mi je **gaspud Kabus** rekel, da ima **gaspud** tukaj delo. Pa sem prišel.« (Coetzee 2001: 26)

In the translation the word *baas* is domesticated as *gaspud*, the vowel alternation resembling the Dolenjska dialect pronunciation. The translator's attempt was obviously to contribute to the simplicity of Hendrik's speech. The problem here is twofold: on the one hand, a dialect version of the term "gospod" leaves the impression that the worker comes from the periphery (since the Dolenjska dialect variant was chosen, a Slovenian reader might imagine the character coming from the Dolenjska region), while it does not suggest the social inferiority of a black worker in relation to a white farmer in the specific South African milieu. In addition, considering that the term *baas* is/was not used only by black people, it seems illogical why both the black man and the white, more articulate farmer should pronounce it in the same way. Only the persistent repetition of the word as a term of address, i.e. in the vocative case, indicates the inferior and dependent position of the black speaker. The novel does not contain much dialogue, and even though Hendrik's speech consists of short, elementary sentences, it is not marked by other non-standard features. Therefore, the regionalized equivalent of the significant term *baas* seems even more inappropriate. A neutral "gospod" or even untranslated *baas* would be more acceptable.

2. Nadine Gordimer's novel ***The Conservationist*** (1974) portrays a rich white businessman who in an attempt to fulfil his empty life buys a farm. He knows nothing about farming and visits the place only during weekends while in the meantime a black foreman, Jacobus, looks after the farm for him. In the following extract Jacobus informs the farmer about events on the farm while he was away.

> […] – **Master** – he pleads – **Master**, it's very bad down there by the river. I'm try, try phone you yesterday night. What is happen there. The man is dead there. You see him. – And his hand, with an imperious forefinger shaking it, stabs the air, through chestlevel of the farmer's body to the line of willows away down behind him.
>
> – A man? –
>
> – There – there – The herdsman draws back from his own hand as if to hold something at bay. His forehand is raised in three deep wrinkles. (Gordimer 1983: 12)

Jacobus speaks creolized South African Black English. Embedded in his speech is the term of address *master* (one meaning of the word *master* in Oxford Diction-

ary, defines the term as "chiefly historical: a man who has people working for him, esp. servants or slaves"), indicating the social and professional relation between the white landowner and his black foreman.

Boris M. Verbič, who translated the novel into Slovenian in 1979, preserved the term of address in its original form:

> [...] »**Master**« – se brani – »**master**, tam spodaj ob reki je zelo hudo. Skušal sem, ti skušal zares sinoči telefonirati. Kaj se tam dogaja. Mož tam je mrtev. Ti ga videti.« – In njegova roka, z ukazujočim kazalcem, ki jo trese, se zabode v zrak, v višini farmarjevih prsi proti vrsti vrb za njim.
>
> »Človek? –«
>
> »Tam – tam.« – Pastir se umakne svoji lastni roki, kot da bi hotel nekaj držati v šahu. Njegovo čelo se izboči, vanj so zarezane tri globoke gube. (Gordimer 1979: 16)

On another occasion Jacobus, when talking about a sick calf, addresses his master as *baas*.

> – But is it taking the milk, now? –
>
> – Yes, **baas**, she's eat now. –
>
> – But why does it still lie down all the time? Doesn't it walk about? –
>
> – Yes, **baas**, she's walk. – (Gordimer 1983: 56)

Here too the translator left the term in its original form.

> »Ampak zdaj pije mleko, ali ne?«
>
> »Da, **baas**, zdaj piti.«
>
> »Ampak zakaj pa ves čas mirno leži? Ali nikoli ne teka okoli?«
>
> »Da, **baas**, že hoditi.« (Gordimer 1979: 71)

Baas or *master* as the terms of address are in most cases preserved in their original form in translation. However, when not used in the vocative case the translator

on some occasions translates them as "gospod". In the following case Jacobus speaks of Mehring's son Terry:

> Jacobus says – That nice jersey the young **baas** he gave it – you know that one? Very, very nice jersey – they's take it. Everything … You know that one jersey? – (Gordimer 1983: 96)

> »Lepi pulover,« reče Jacobus, »mladi **gospod**, on mi ga dati – veš, katerega? Zelo zelo lep pulover – vzeli so ga. Vse ... veš, kateri pulover?« (Gordimer 1979: 124)

Nevertheless, the translator never translates the word *master* or *baas* when Jacobus talks of his own master.

> – Yes, was no trouble. They say to me I know who is this man. I say – me, I don't know who is, the **master** tell you nobody here can know. The **master** tell you already. […] (Gordimer: 1983: 26)

> »Da, nič sitnosti. Rekli so mi, vem, kdo je mož. Rečem jaz, jaz ne vem, kdo, **master** vam že povedal. […] (Gordimer 1979: 33)

Keeping the two nouns – *baas* and *master* – in the original form when used as a term of address, seems like a deliberate translation strategy. Even though the two words are not translated, their meaning can be understood from the context, and especially *baas*, being specific for the South African master – servant relations, creates the culture-specific air that would be lost if the terms were simply rendered as e.g. "gospod". It also seems that the translator just as deliberately chose to translate the terms in those cases when they are not used as the terms of address, i.e. in a less marked position where they do not so clearly indicate the hierarchy between the landowner and his worker.

3. Nigerian writer Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie (1977-) set her novel ***Half of a Yellow Sun*** (2007) in post-independence time, more precisely in the context of the Nigerian civil war of 1967-70. The *Other* in the novel is portrayed through a number of black characters, among them Harrison and Jomo. Both work as servants for a British citizen, Richard Churchill, who came to Nigeria to explore traditional Igbo art. The first part of the conversation below is between Richard Churchill and servant Harrison, the second part between Churchill and gardener Jomo.

> 'By the way, Harrison, do you happen to know of any herbs for men?' Richard asked, hoping he sounded casual.

‘**Sah**?’

‘Herbs.’ Richard gestured vaguely.

‘Vegetables, **sah**? Oh, I make any of the salad of your country very good, **sah**. For professor Land, I am making many different-different salad.’

‘Yes, but I mean vegetables for sickness.’

‘Sickness? You see doctor in Medical Centre.’

‘I am interested in African herbs, Harrison.’

‘But, **sah**, they are bad, from witch doctor. They are devilish.’

‘Of course.’ Richard gave up. He should have known that Harrison, with his excessive love for all things non-Nigerian, was not the right person to ask. He would ask Jomo instead.

[…]

‘Oh, good morning, Mr Richard, **sah**,’ he said, in his solemn manner. ‘I want take the fruit to Harrison in case you want, **sah**. I no take them for myself.’ Jomo placed the bag down and picked up his watering can.

‘It’s all right, Jomo. I don’t want any of the fruit.’ Richard said. ‘By the way, would you know of any herbs for men? For men who have problems with ... with being with a woman?’

‘Yes, **sah**.’ Jomo kept watering as if this was a question he heard every day.

‘You know of some herbs for men?’

‘Yes, **sah**.’

Richard felt a triumphant leap in his stomach. ‘I should like to see them, Jomo.’

‘My brother get problem before because the first wife is not pregnant and the second wife is not pregnant. There is one leaf that the *dibi*a give him and he begin to chew. Now he has pregnant the wives.’

> 'Oh. Very good. Could you get me this herb, Jomo?'
>
> Jomo stopped and looked at him, his wise, wizened face full of fond pity. 'It no work for white man, **sah**.'
>
> 'Oh, no. I want to write about it.'
>
> Jomo shook his head. 'You go to *dibia* and you chew it there in front of him. Not for writing, **sah**.' Jomo turned back to his watering, humming tunelessly. (Adichie 2007: 73-74)

The speech of both Nigeria-born servants, probably Igbo, an ethnic group from southeastern Nigeria, has characteristics of Nigerian English. The repeating term of address *sah* is a phonetically deformed variant of 'sir', which is normally a polite and respectful way of addressing a man, especially one in a position of authority.

Gabriela Babnik (1979-), who translated the novel into Slovenian in 2008, rendered the term of address *sah* in both cases as *gospud*. Vowel alternation in the second syllable resembles a variant of Dolenjska dialect.

> »Mimogrede, Harrison, morda poznaš kakšno zelišče za moške?« je vprašal Richard in upal, da je zvenel vsakdanje.
>
> »**Gospud**?«
>
> »Zelišča?« Richard je pokazal z rokami.
>
> »Rastline, **gospud**? Oh, pripravim katerokoli solato vaše dežele, zelo dobro, **gospud**. Za profesorja Landa pripravljam zelo različno različne solate.«
>
> »Da, toda mislim rastline za bolezen.«
>
> »Bolezen? Ste videli zdravnika v zdravstvenem centru?«
>
> »Zanimajo me afriška zelišča, Harrison.«
>
> »Toda, **gospud**, saj so škodljiva, izdelujejo jih vrači. Vražja so.«
>
> »Seveda.« Richard se je vdal. Moral bi vedeti, da Harrison s pretirano naklonjenostjo do vseh nenigerijskih stvari ni prava oseba za tovrstna vprašanja. Raje se bo obrnil na Joma.

[…]

»Oh. Dobro jutro, gospud Richard, **gospud**,« je dejal resno. »Sadje sem hotel odnesti Harrisonu, če bi slučajno hoteli, **gospud**. Ne vzeti zase.« Jomo je položil košaro na tla in v roke vzel vedro.

»V redu je, Jomo. Nočem sadja,« je dejal Richard. »Mimogrede, poznaš kakšna zelišča za moške? Za moške, ki imajo težave, ko ... ko so z žensko?«

»Da, **gospud**.« Jomo je nadaljeval z zalivanjem, kot da gre za vprašanje, ki ga sliši vsak dan.

»Poznaš kakšna zelišča za moške?«

»Da, **gospud**.«

Richard je začutil krč zmagoslavja v trebuhu. »Rad bi jih videl, Jomo.«

»Moj brat je imel prej težave, ker prva žena ni noseča in druga žena ni noseča. Obstaja nek list, ki mu ga je dal *dibia*, in začel ga je žvečiti. Zdaj ima noseče žene.«

»Oh, zelo dobro. Mi lahko priskrbiš to zelišče, Jomo?«

Jomo se je ustavil in ga pogledal, njegov uvel obraz, poln prizanesljivega sočutja. »Ne delovati na belcu, **gospud**.«

»Oh, ne, pisati hočem o tem.«

Jomo je odkimal z glavo. »Greš k *dibiu* in prežvečiš tam pred njim. Ni za pisanje, **gospud**.« Jomo se je vrnil k zalivanju in vztrajno molčal. (Adichie 2008: 79-80)

The term of address *sah* is used throughout the novel by those black characters who work as servants to both black and white socially superior characters, and in all cases the translator rendered it as “gospud”. The novel abounds in untranslated words and expressions from Igbo, the native language of the Igbo people. They were clearly employed by the author to draw the reader closer to the sociocultural reality depicted in the book. The translator left those expressions in their original form, which is why the terms of address in the Dolenjska dialect stand out even more.

4. The novel, ***Wide Sargasso Sea*** (1966), was written by Jean Rhys (1890-1979) as an imagined prequel to Charlotte Bronte's *Jane Eyre*. Its takes place mostly in the West Indies. The main character is Rochester's first wife, the white creole, Antoinette Bertha Mason. The *Other* in the novel are former black slaves who after emancipation redefine their position in relation to the white colonizers. After the prohibition of slavery within the British Empire, many slaves fled the French lands, which is why many black servants are from the islands colonized by the French.

In the first extract, Rochester himself narrates the dialogue between himself and two of the black servants, Hilda and Amélie.

> In the afternoon Amélie brought me a second letter.
>
> Why you don't answer. You don't believe me? Then ask someone else – everybody in Spanish Town know. Why you think they bring you to this place? You want me to come to your house and bawl out your business before everybody? You come to me or I come –
>
> At this point I stopped reading. The child Hilda came into the room and I asked her, 'Is Amélie here?'
>
> 'Yes, **master**.'
>
> 'Tell her I wish to speak to her.'
>
> 'Yes, **master**.'
>
> (…)
>
> She leaned lightly against the veranda post, indifferently graceful, just respectful enough, and waited.
>
> 'Was this letter given to you?' I asked.
>
> 'No, **master**, Hilda take it.'
>
> 'And is this man who writes a friend of yours?'
>
> 'Not my friend,' she said.
>
> 'But he knows you – or says he does.'

> ‘Oh, yes, I know Daniel.’
>
> ‘Very well then. Will you tell him that his letters annoy me, and that he’d better not write again for his own sake. If he brings a letter give it back to him. Understand?’
>
> ‘Yes, **master**. I understand.’ (Rhys 2000: 75, 76)

Both servants address Rochester as *master* clearly implying their relation of a master and a servant.

Olga Šiftar (1945–)in her translation into Slovenian (1971) left the terms in their original form:

> Popoldne mi je Amélie prinesla drugo pismo.
>
> Zakaj mi ne odgovorite? Mi ne verjeti? Potem vprašati koga drugega – V Spanish Townu vsi vedeti za to. Zakaj, mislite, vas pripeljati v ta kraj? Hočete, da jaz priti v vašo hišo in pred vsemi izkričati zadevo? Pridite k meni ali jaz priti …
>
> Tukaj sem prenehal brati. V sobo je prišla Hilda in vprašal sem jo: »Je Amélie tukaj?«
>
> »Da, **master**.«
>
> »Povej ji, da želim z njo govoriti.«
>
> »Da, **master**.«
>
> (…)
>
> Narahlo se je naslonila na steber terase, nedoločno privlačna, ravno dovolj spoštljiva, in čakala.
>
> »So tole pismo dali tebi?« sem vprašal.
>
> »Ne, **master**. Hilda ga sprejeti.«
>
> »In je mož, ki mi piše, tvoj prijatelj?«
>
> »Ni moj prijatelj,« je dejala.

»Vendar te pozna – tako vsaj pravi.«

»Oh, da, poznam Daniela.«

»Zelo dobro. Bi mu hotela povedati, da me njegova pisma dražijo in da bo bolje zanj, če mi jih več ne bo pisal? Če še kdaj prinese pismo, mu ga vrni. Si razumela?«

»Da, **master**. Razumela.« (Rhys 1971: 108, 109)

Black servants in the novel no longer behave servilely towards their masters, as they must have done as slaves. When servants start leaving the household, Rochester observes how one of them, Baptiste, stops addressing him as he did before:

'Are you leaving too?'

'No,' said Baptiste. 'I am overseer here.'

I noticed that he did not call me '**sir**' or '**master**'. (Rhys 2000: 91)

»Ali tudi vi odhajate?«

»Ne, jaz biti tukaj nadzornik.«

Opazil sem, da me ne kliče niti »**gospod**« niti »**gospodar**«. (Rhys 1971: 131)

On this occasion the translator translated the two terms, which – when used as a term of address – she normally left in the original, thus explicating their meaning and the difference between the two. Referring to 'vikanje' in the above dialogue, it seems unlikely that a white man in the first half of the 19th century, immediately after emancipation, would show his black servant so much deference as is expressed in Slovenian by the use of the second person '*vi*'.

In the same novel the endearing term of address *doudou*, in English *little darling* (Rhys 2000: 144), which comes from French creole, *patois*, is used by a black servant from Martinique, Christophine, when recounting to Rochester her conversation with his wife and her mistress, Antoinette, who she has known since childhood.

[…] And what did you do before you brought her back in the present condition?'

> 'What did I do! Look! Don't you provoke me more than I provoke already. Better not I tell you. You want to know what I do? I say ***doudou***, if you have trouble you are right to come to me. And I kiss her. It's when I kiss her she cry – not before. It's long time she hold it back, I think. So I let her cry. That is the first thing. Let them cry – it eases the heart. When she can't cry no more I give her a cup of milk – It's lucky I have some. She won't eat, she won't talk. So I say, "Lie down on the bed ***doudou*** and try to sleep, for me I can sleep on the floor, don't matter to me." [...] (Rhys 2000: 97)

Here too the translator left the term of address in the original from. Since she capitalized it, it is not clear, though, whether she wrongly assumed it was a first name. Moreover, it again seems that the translator did not consider the use of 'tikanje' and 'vikanje' in Slovenian: on the one hand Rochester, a master, uses 'vi' when speaking to the servant, on the other Chistophine uses 'ti' when addressing her mistress Antoinette.

> [...] In kaj je bilo to, kar ste naredili, preden ste jo spravili nazaj v prvotno stanje?«
>
> »Kaj storiti! Poglejte! Ne me bolj izzivati, kot me že. Bolje ne, vam pravim. Radi bi vedeli, kaj narediti. Reči ji, ***Doudou***, če imaš težave, storiti prav, da priti k meni. In jo poljubiti. Šele ko jo poljubiti, ona zajokati – ne prej. Dolgo časa se zadrževati, sem pomislila. Zato jo pustiti, naj joče. To biti prvo. Pusti jim jokati – to olajša srce. Ko več ne mogla jokati, ji dati skodelico mleka – sreča, da ga imeti. Ona ne jesti, ne govoriti, zato ji reči: ‚Lezi na posteljo, ***Doudou***, in poskušaj zaspati, jaz lahko spati na tleh, ne skrbi zame.' [...] (Rhys 1971: 140)

6 DISCUSSION

The translations of terms of address when used by the *Other* in dialogues with the dominant white, either in colonial or postcolonial context, reveal two translating strategies: the terms of address are either left in their original form, their foreignness preserved, or adapted to the target culture and target audience, and therefore domesticated.

The translators of J.M. Coetzee's *In the Heart of the Country* and Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's *Half of a Yellow Sun* both domesticated the terms *baas* and *sah*: in *In the Heart of the Country baas* is translated as *gaspud,* while *sah* in *Half of a Yellow Sun* is translated as *gospud*, both resembling Dolenjska dialect variant of the word "gospod" (Engl. "sir").

Baas appears as an Afrikaans word within the English discourse, and a wider English-speaking readership, except perhaps the South African, may not be familiar with it. This is why it could easily be treated as an untranslated word and left in its original form. It is also not a non-standard variant hence no need to translate it into a dialect form. *Sah* on the other hand is a non-standard variant of the word "sir", used by two black people speaking non-standard Nigerian English. Here the choice of a non-standard translation seems more acceptable.

The problem, however, is the choice of a dialect variant. What parallels did the translator of *In the Heart of the Country* draw between a black farm-labourer in South Africa and a man from the Slovenian Dolenjska region? Likewise, how do black servants in post-independence Nigeria correspond to people from Dolenjska region? Having a black labourer in the South African complicated racial context and black servants in Nigerian postcolonial context speak with a Dolenjska accent may provide the reader with a misleading representation of the portrayed reality and interracial relations. Domesticating a term of address that indicates the speaker's social status through an expression from a target culture regional dialect may only imply that the character using it comes from the periphery, but does not say anything about the character's inferiority and dependence, it does not make him what he is – the colonial/postcolonial *Other*. It seems that translators who translate terms of address in culture-specific (post) colonial setting should instead opt for a neutral "gospodar", as it would not add inappropriate regional implications and would render more closely the hierarchy between the speakers.

A possible alternative to the above strategy is provided by translation of terms of address in the other two novels. The translators of Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea* and Nadine Gordimer's *The Conservationist* both left the terms of address in their original form – a strategy classified by Baker (1995) as *cultural borrowing*. *Master* and *baas* in apartheid South Africa in *The Conservationist* and *master* and *doudou* in colonial Jamaica in *Wide Sargasso Sea* are rendered without change in the target language. The Penguin Books 2000 edition is furnished with a glossary explaining the meaning of patois expressions; such appendices definitely help the reader with understanding untranslated words and so with interpreting the sociocultural situation in (former) colonies. More often than not, terms of address remain unexplained, but as the *Other* use them in almost every statement directed at their white collocutors, a careful reader may deduce their meaning – if not implications – from the context. And even if their entire meaning and implications are not grasped by a target reader, with cultural borrowing the impression of the reality portrayed in the text is not disrupted by the cultural allusions from the target culture, as is the case with cultural substitution.

The comparison between the four novels is interesting also in terms of the time when they were translated. The first, *Wide Sargasso Sea,* was translated in 1971, *The Conservationist* in 1979, *In the Heart of the Country* in 2001 and the last, *Half of a Yellow Sun,* in 2008. If such a small sample can indicate a tendency, then it can be concluded that older translations show preference for foreignization, whereas contemporary translators are more inclined towards domestication in translation of culture-specific items such as terms of address.

7 CONCLUSION

The terms of address used by the subordinate *Other* in the dialogues of postcolonial novels indicate the dichotomy between the privileged white and subordinate black in a colonial or postcolonial context. The Slovenian translators either domesticate them or leave them in their original form. With foreignization, readers may be deprived of the full extent of the meaning the untranslated words encompass, while rewriting the expressions in domestic dialects provides the target reader with a distorted representation of the colonial/postcolonial reality. As untranslated words are a common technique for expressing culture distinctiveness in postcolonial novels, this strategy can also be applied in the case of terms of address.

This study was performed on a rather small sample of four translations. More extensive research might reveal other translation strategies, e.g. translation by a more general expression. When comparing domestication and foreignization of the terms of address in postcolonial literature, the latter proves a better option as it preserves the true identity of those involved in colonial/postcolonial contact. Translations cause changes in the target culture by filling the cultural gaps (Toury 1995: 27), thus a translation that preserves the cultural and linguistic foreignness of the source texts, may – though perhaps requiring more effort on the side of the reader – enrich the target culture.

Sources

Adichie, Chimamanda Ngozi, [2006] 2007: *Half of a Yellow Sun*. Harper Perennial.
Adichie, Chimamanda Ngozi, 2008: *Polovica rumenega sonca*. Ljubljana: Sanje.
Coetzee, John Maxwell, [1976] 1982: *In the Heart of the Country*. Penguin Books.
Coetzee, John Maxwell, 2001: *V srcu dežele*. Cankarjeva založba.
Gordimer, Nadine, [1974] 1983: *The Conservationist*. Penguin Books.
Gordimer, Nadine, 1979: *Posestnik*. Pomurska založba.

Rhys, Jean, [1966] 2000: *Wide Sargasso Sea*. Penguin Books.
Rhys, Jean, 1971: *Široko Sargaško morje*. Murska Sobota: Pomurska založba.

Bibliography

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, 2002: *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-colonial Literatures*. London: Routledge.

Baker, Mona, 1995: *In Other Words. A Coursebook on Translation*. London: Routledge.

Berman, Antoine, 1992: *The Experience of the Foreign: Culture and Translation in Romantic Germany*, trans. S. Heyvaert, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Boehmer, Elleke, 2005: *Colonial & Postcolonial Literature*. Oxford University Press.

Braun, Friederike, 1988: *Terms of Address: Problems of Patterns and Usage in Various Languages and Cultures*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter .

Dunkling, Leslie, 1990: *Dictionary of Epithets and Terms of Address.* USA and Canada: Routledge.

McLeod, John (ed.), 2007: Intoduction: *The Routledge Companion to Postcolonial Studies*. London/New York: Routledge.

Onič, Tomaž, 2013: Vikanje in tikanje v slovenskih prevodih Albeejeve drame *Kdo se boji Virginije Woolf*? Primerjalna književnost, 36(1). 233-252.

Snell-Hornby, Mary, 1988: *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Toury, Gideon, 1995: *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Tymoczko, Maria, 1999: *Translation in a Postcolonial Context*. St Jerome Publishing.

Venuti, Lawrence, 1995: *The Translator's Invisibility: A history of translation*. London/New York: Routledge.

Venuti, Lawrence, 1998: *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London/New York: Routledge.

Wolf, Michaela, 1995: Translation as a process of power: Aspects of cultural anthropology in translation. M. Snell-Hornby, Z. Jettmarová, K. Kaindl (eds): *Translation as Intercultural Communication*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Yang, Chunli, 2010: Translation of English and Chinese Addressing Terms from the Cultural Aspect. *Journal of Language Teaching and Res*earch. Vol. 1, No. 5. 738-742.

A Dictionary of South African English on Historical Principles, 2014: Dictionary Unit for South African English. Associated Institute of Rhodes University. http://dsae.co.za/#!/searchword/443 (Access 12.10.2015)