Terminology in education and research: Honneth's *Anerkennung* from the perspective of Norwegian, Danish, and English

JENS HAUGAN

Abstract

The purpose of this article is to discuss potential challenges related to the introduction (import or translation) and use of terminology from another language. This is exemplified by a discussion on a single term, *Anerkennung*, from Honneth's (1992) recognition theory, which is either easily adopted because of an already existing linguistic heritage (Danish, Norwegian, and partly Swedish) or translated (English) with compromises and specifications of the suggested term. The need for such a discussion arises from the fact that the same/identical (morphological) form of the term cannot necessarily be used in Norwegian, since Norwegian has two official written varieties and certain standardization principles that may differ for each of the varieties. The article addresses metalinguistic reflection and the responsibility of translators, researchers, educators, curriculum developers and language authorities in connection with these issues. With reference to the Educational Role of Language network and perspectives like language-beliefs, language-activity, language-affects, and language-thinking, the article attempts to show that reflection on and standardization of terminology in education may be even more important because of the

possible implications for understanding and use, and the consequences it may have.

Keywords

Terminologia w edukacji i badaniach naukowych: Niemieckojęzyczne pojęcie *Anerkennung* z perspektywy języka norweskiego w porównaniu do języków duńskiego, szwedzkiego i angielskiego

Abstrakt

Niniejszy artykuł ma na celu omówienie potencjalnych trudności związanych z wprowadzaniem (pożyczaniem lub tłumaczeniem) i uży-waniem terminologii obcojęzycznej. Omówionym tu przykładem jest termin *Anerkennung*, pochodzący z teorii uznania Axela Honnetha (1992), który został bądź przyjęty z łatwością w językach mających wspólne dziedzictwo z j. niemieckim (duńskim, norweskim, częściowo szwedzkim), bądź przetłumaczony z pewnymi ustępstwami i uszczegółowieniem proponowanego słowa, jak w przypadku języka angielskiego. Potrzeba omawiania niniejszego tematu wynika z faktu, iż słowo mające tę samą formę pod względem morfologii językowej nie zawsze może być stosowane w języku norweskim, jako że obowiązują w nim dwie odmiany standardowe, mające niekiedy różne zasady dotyczące kodyfikacji (poprawnościowe). Artykuł porusza kwestie ref-leksji metajęzykowej i odpowiedzialności spoczywającej na tłumaczach, badaczach, dydaktykach, twórcach programów nauczania i instytucjach władnych w zakresie języka. Nawiązując do sieci instytucji Educational Role of Language (Roli Edukacyjnej Języka) i perspektyw takich jak opinie o języku, aktywność językowa, aspekt emocjonalny języka i myślenie o języku, niniejszy artykuł stara się wykazać, że refleksja nad terminologią i jej kodyfikacja w edukacji może mieć jeszcze większe znaczenie z powodu implikacji, jakie niesie w zakresie językowego rozumienia, używania i ich konsekwencji.

Słowa kluczowe

terminologia, standaryzacja, tłumaczenie, badania edukacyjne, badania językoznawcze, dydaktyka językowa, Axel Honneth, teoria uznania, *Anerkennung*

1. Introduction and background

This paper is a contribution to the overall task of the International Association for the Educational Role of Language (ERLA 2020) and the Educational Role of Language network (ERL Network 2020), the "main idea" of the network being "supporting cooperation between academics working on issues at the intersection of pedagogy and language" (ERL Network 2020).

The ERL research areas are organized in four topics or "premises" (ERL Research 2020):

Considering the fact(s) that every school determines
– what students think OF language and – conversely – how language determines their views, i.e.; LANGUAGE(-)BELIEFS (incl. students' views on listening, speaking, reading, and writing)
– what students do WITH language and – conversely – how language determines their actions i.e.; LANGUAGE(-)ACTIVITY (incl. students' actions consisting in listening, speaking, reading, and writing)
– how students feel ABOUT language and – conversely – how language determines their emotions, i.e.; LANGUAGE(-)AFFECT (incl. students' emotions concerning listening, speaking, reading, and writing)
– how students understand THROUGH language and – conversely – how language determines their thinking, i.e.; LANGUAGE(-)THINKING (incl. students' world image as shaped by listening, speaking, reading, and writing)
– on the level of an individual, society, culture and reality, the point of this initiative consists in:
– carrying out GLOBALLY COORDINATED STUDIES within and across various countries and their educational systems (assumed to differ within and across the four areas shown above), and

- systematising research problems and methodologies applied in pedagogically-linguistic studies, and
- engaging academics falling into the four areas wishing to cooperate within and across them, and
- bringing the world of language and the world of educational science closer together.

With my personal background from teaching Norwegian linguistics and didactics in teacher education, I joined the ERL network in 2016 when it was established. During recent years, my focus has been on investigating aspects of the role of written languages in the Norwegian educational system. Relating to the ERL topics of language-beliefs, language-activity, language-affect and language-thinking, I have argued that it may be fruitful to apply perspectives from second-language teaching and learning when trying to understand the challenges that are mainly associated with the lesser used Norwegian written language Nynorsk (Haugan 2017). Nynorsk was legally recognized in 1885 when it was awarded equal rights to Danish. However, the subsequent revisions of Danish to Bokmålare are still – after more than one hundred and thirty-five years – a topic of great debate in Norwegian education and society.

In attempts to find theories that may be able to explain why most Norwegian pupils (and adults) claim that Nynorsk is difficult to learn or find it a cause for hatred, I found support in the approaches of Norton (2013) with concepts such as *motivation* and *investment* (Haugan 2019), and in Dörnyei (2009) with concepts like, for instance, *the ought self* on the one side and *the ideal self* on the other side (Haugan 2020a). Having reached a greater understanding of the mechanisms that may create learning challenges, I wanted to direct my attention to the didactic field, the main question being how we can facilitate better teaching methods in Nynorsk as an alternative written language.

Approximately 85 % of Norwegian pupils learn Nynorsk as their so-called second or alternative written language. By the end of lower and upper secondary school, these pupils are then

graded separately on this alternative written language. This has structural consequences in the way that formal teaching, especially of Nynorsk as the alternative written language, is postponed until and concentrated upon during lower and upper secondary school. Furthermore, the focus is mainly on formal grammar instead of less formal ways of language learning. The formal teaching of grammar is already a controversial topic where some researchers claim that it has little or no effect at all (Andrews et al. 2004, Braddock et al. 1963, Hillocks 1984), while others may be more positive with an appropriate approach or concrete goals for the tasks (Hertzberg 2007, Tonne and Sakshaug 2007; see also Hertzberg 1995 for a historic perspective in Norwegian). This is, however, not a topic for the present paper. Given the fact that there is a great deal of focus on grammar exercises in the teaching of Nynorsk as an alternative written language, and the fact that the majority of pupils already have little motivation to learn Nynorsk and may even 'hate' it, their investment (cf. Norton 2013) is usually low and, subsequently, the results are often not very good. Consequently, the pupils receive a lot of negative feedback from their teachers concerning their Nynorsk skills. This again compounds the pupils' negative attitude towards Nynorsk with the result that their motivation and investment might become even lower than before. This is obviously not the best situation for learning – or teaching. Low achievement and negative feedback are transformed into negative feelings and attitudes. There must be found, therefore, some alternative didactic approaches to improve this situation.

In connection with this, Jordet (2020) has applied Axel Honneth's (1992) social theory of recognition to learning in school and this may be fruitful when trying to develop better teaching didactics in Nynorsk as an alternative written language as well as other subjects. However, when trying to negotiate the theoretical world of Honneth and Jordet in order to find practical solutions for teaching didactics, as a teacher and researcher, I faced challenges in relation to terminology that made me realize that I would have to first of all negotiate issues related to the

theoretical or terminological basis for my work before I could try to apply the theory to my own field of teaching and didactic research.

Jordet (2020) has worked on applying and adapting Honneth's (1992) theory to the Norwegian school system. As a teacher of Norwegian grammar in Norway, I may feel this is satisfactory and try to use the relevant parts of Jordet's work in my own work. However, as a researcher, I am obliged to talk about this topic and publish in English. Additionally, the theory that Jordet's work is based on, is written in German within the field of social philosophy. Hence, as a researcher, I have to deal with terminology in (at least) three different languages, Norwegian, English and German. Furthermore, I would have to distinguish between Norwegian Nynorsk and Norwegian Bokmål in certain cases.

The goal of this paper, therefore, is to discuss the central theoretical term *Anerkennung* and its translations and adaptations, and possible interpretation(s) in order to create a platform for future didactics and research based on Honneth's (1992) theory of recognition and Jordet's (2020) application of this theory. The premise being that terminology is a very important role of language in education (and research).

The general question that is asked is to what degree it is unproblematic to more or less directly transfer or adapt a scientific term from German to the linguistically closely related Scandinavian languages Norwegian, Danish and Swedish. The more specific question I also want to ask is whether there should be more linguistic awareness and collaboration in the translation and adaption of terminology when it comes to the two official Norwegian languages, Bokmål and Nynorsk, in order to avoid unnecessary confusion within a given professional field. These questions are more rhetorical than concrete. I will try to show that the direct adaptation of the German term *Anerkennung* to Norwegian Bokmål *anerkjennelse* comes with certain challenges that are related to the close relationship between the Scandinavian languages and German, and that the strict standardization norms for Norwegian Nynorsk represent an extra challenge. The

translation of terminology should not only be an object for professional translators but also for terminologists representing the target language, researchers, educators and language policy makers. This is because translation of terminology is not only relevant within translation studies but also within cognitive linguistics, psycholinguistics, language learning and linguistics in general.

2. Problem and method

As mentioned above, the 'problem' that arises from having to deal with a theoretical model in several languages, lies in language itself. While it may feel more or less unproblematic to use a theory or method written in one language and apply it to contexts in the same language, it may be more challenging to use terminology from another language. Thelen (2015), for instance, distinguishes between *Translation* in general and *Translation-oriented Terminology*. It is easier to achieve broad "equivalence" (cf. Catford 1965, El-dali 2011) between a text in a source language (SL) and the translated text in the target language (TL) than on the level of single words and terms. Quite often, terms from the original language, at least when the source language is English, are transferred directly when it is thought to be difficult to find a term in the target language that covers the whole content of the original term (see e.g., Vikør 2007: 121-124). For instance, even though several more transparent Norwegian terms, like e.g., *tekstkompetanse* ('text competence') have been proposed for the English term *literacy* (see e.g., Skjelbred 2010), it has been rather difficult to manage without the English term (see also Haugan 2020b in this context). Even the almost identical Norwegian form *litterasitet* has not been widely adopted. As a consequence, one often has to explain the whole content of the term in certain contexts. For instance, Fjørtoft (2014: 71-99) spends a whole book chapter on discussing *literacy* in Norwegian as a school subject.

Obviously, precise terminology is important in research. When it comes to teaching and didactics, however, one often

needs to compromise and find more transparent terms that teachers and pupils are able to understand and relate to. One important part of language teaching and learning is not the language itself but the language about the language, i.e., the *metalanguage*, understood as "Second-level language (also called language of description) by which natural language (object language) is described" (Bussmann 1996: 303). Instead of the formal terms *noun* and *verb*, one might, for instance, use more transparent expressions like *thing-word* and *doing word,* at least in primary school, even though a noun does not have to refer to a thing and a verb is not necessarily a 'doing word' since verbs also may denote states and events, not only actions. While *subject* and *noun* are clearly different words in English, many Norwegian pupils (and students) have problems distinguishing between non-transparent terms like *substantiv* ('noun') and *subjekt* ('subject') that look and sound similar in Norwegian.

The Norwegian curriculum recently underwent a major revision (2020). In the draft for the new curriculum, the authors proposed, for instance, formulations like "bruke metaspråk om setningsstruktur, tekststruktur og sjanger" ([the pupil is expected to be able to] 'use metalanguage about sentence structure, text structure and genre') (Udir 2019). This was changed to "bruke fagspråk og kunnskap om grammatikk, tekststruktur og sjanger" ('use professional language and knowledge about grammar, text structure and genre') in the final version of the curriculum (competence goals and assessment after 10th grade, lower secondary school) (Udir 2020). Apparently, the term *metalanguage* was considered too difficult to understand for teachers and pupils to be used in the final, official curriculum. This is an example of a conscious choice of terminology by the curriculum developers.

Whether it is called metalanguage or professional language, the importance of learning to understand and use central terms in Norwegian as a school subject is explicitly expressed in the curriculum. It may here be mentioned that the Norwegian term *fagspråk* can be translated into English as *professional language,* while the corresponding Norwegian term *profesjonelt*

språk does not necessarily mean the same as (is not equivalent to) *fagspråk,* which should rather be translated as *domain language.* This illustrates one aspect of the challenges related to working with terminology in different languages. A reader with some knowledge of German might also have noticed that the Norwegian word *fagspråk* is a loan from German (*Fachsprache*). Even though German, Norwegian and English all belong to the family of the Germanic languages, English was heavily influenced by French during the Middle Ages, while Norwegian was heavily influenced by Low German through the time of the Hansa, making Norwegian and German even more 'compatible' (see e.g., König and Van der Auwera 1994). Furthermore, Norwegian academic language (actually Danish, since Danish was the only written 'Norwegian' language at that time) was more influenced by German scholars during the nineteenth century before English took over as the main provider or influencer of academic terminology after World War II. For instance, terms related to computer technology and social media are mainly English or translated directly from English.

I have tried here to illustrate the 'problem' when a switch has to be made between different languages to get the full understanding of certain domain-specific terms. Below, I will discuss the central term *Anerkennung* in Axel Honneth's (1992) theory of recognition, in order to demonstrate further how challenging translation of terminology may be, and also how terminology may play a role in language-beliefs, language-activity, language-affect, and language-thinking, to use perspectives from the Educational Role of Language initiative. I must emphasize that English is a foreign language to me and that my attempts to find English translations or synonyms may be a topic of discussion in itself. However, this only demonstrates the importance of the overall discussion on terminology across languages. Meanings, interpretations, synonyms, contexts etc. are all important parts of terminology in research and education and may influence language-beliefs, language-activity, language-affect, and language-thinking.

The discussion below concerns a small-scale case study since it deals with one single term, *Anerkennung*, from Axel Honneth's (1992) theory of recognition, compared to its translations into four other Germanic languages, English (*recognition*), Swedish (*erkännande*), Danish (*anerkendelse*) and Norwegian Bokmål (*anerkjennelse*) and the Norwegian written language Nynorsk (*anerkjenning*). As such, the study might fit the description of Gerring (2004: 341) (quoted in Schwandt and Gates 2018: 342) in that it is an: "In-depth study of a single unit (a relatively bounded phenomenon) where the scholar's aim is to elucidate features of a larger class of similar phenomena." One could also apply Stakes (1995: xi, 4) definition (quoted in Schwandt and Gates 2018: 342): "The study of a particularity and complexity of a single case. […] Case study research is not sampling research. We do not study a case primarily to understand other cases. Our first obligation is to understand this one case."

This discussion about the term *Anerkennung* does not aim at generating hypotheses, developing theories, or testing hypotheses or theories (cf. Schwandt and Gates 2018: 346). Instead, it is, first and foremost, descriptive. To some degree, one could say: "The research objective is to develop a complete, detailed portrayal of some phenomenon, 'to get the story down for the possible benefit of policy makers, scholars, and other citizens' (Odell 2001: 162)" (Schwandt and Gates 2018: 346). From this perspective, the discussion may have an impact on professional or political decision making and language planning by raising awareness around the process of adapting terminology from another language and potential challenges in different professional fields.

The present discussion on the term *Anerkennung* is also a contribution to the field of translation studies. As El-dali (2011) shows, *translation* is a difficult term in itself. Attempts to define translation have varied over time, but most definitions are based on a form of "equivalence" between the source language (SL) or source text (ST) and the target language (TL) or target text (TT), e.g., as simply put as "[…] the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by the equivalent textual

material in another language (TL) (Catford 1965: 20, quoted in El-dali 2011: 31). The translation of a single term is not necessarily always a great challenge compared to different kinds of texts and genres. According to El-dali, (2011: 31) "Jakobson (1959) declares that all poetic art is, therefore, technically untranslatable. That is, the translator has to take the question of interpretation into account in addition to the problem of selecting a TL phrase which will have a roughly similar meaning. Exact translation is impossible." The discussion below will show that exact translation may, in fact, seem impossible – or at least challenging – in certain cases (also depending on the definition of 'exact'). However, the challenge may be even greater when certain target languages have grammatical restrictions that go beyond the ability to express equivalence of meaning.

Bassnett (1996) divides translation studies into four general areas of interest. Of these, translation and linguistics is the most – or only – relevant approach when it comes to a discussion on translations of the German term *Anerkennung* into other languages, since the practical and possibly partly philosophical challenge may be purely technical, i.e., limited by purely linguistic elements, at least when it comes to the relationship between Norwegian Bokmål and Nynorsk. Due to the "heritage" of a rather purist language view that dates back to the 18th century and the history of Nynorsk as a "new" Norwegian written language, Nynorsk is – from a morphological perspective – less flexible when it comes to word formation. The original goal was to, more or less, completely avoid prefixes and suffixes of German origin (e.g., *an-, be-, er-, -heit*). However, this has proved to be difficult because Nynorsk has not been adopted as the only written Norwegian language and Bokmål remains the dominant written form. Bokmål has, therefore, been a premise supplier in many ways when it comes to accepting word forms in Nynorsk that include German affixes. This paper is not about the history of Bokmål and Nynorsk, so it will not be discussed here further (see e.g., Haugan 2017, 2021), however, Nynorsk does have certain morphological and lexical limitations that a translator would have to deal with, and that do not apply to Bokmål in the

same way. Additionally, to my knowledge, this technical aspect of translation is not a frequent or typical topic in translation studies, as can be seen in e.g., El-dali (2010: 34), while Bell (1991: 13) writes:

> The relevance of linguistics to translation should never be in doubt. But it must immediately be made clear that we are referring in particular to '[…] those branches of linguistics which are concerned with the […] social aspects of language use' and which locate the ST and TT firmly within their cultural contexts.

Linguistic purism may be a cultural phenomenon, but the consequences and the impact on the act of translation is usually purely technical and not (necessarily) a "social aspect of language use". Toury (1978: 200), quoted in El-dali (2010: 37), stated that "Translation is a kind of activity which inevitably involves at least two languages and two cultural traditions". This statement, although quite clear, may still be blurred when it comes to the situation between Bokmål and Nynorsk. When a foreign term is translated into Norwegian Bokmål and only afterwards into Norwegian Nynorsk, one may ask whether we are still talking about different languages and different cultures. Has the Nynorsk term been translated/transferred from Bokmål or from the original language? Bokmål and Nynorsk have traditionally been considered two written varieties of the same language, Norwegian. And from this perspective, one might also question the notion of different cultures. This is not the place to discuss these aspects since the discussion on a single term (*Anerkennung*) would not be enough to problematize this. However, the concept of different cultures may still apply if we accept the premise that that language norm (linguistic conventions) can also be said to be a cultural aspect, cf. El-dali (2010: 38) referring to several researchers from the late 1970s onwards:

> […] translation is always controlled by the target culture; rather than arguing over the correct type of equivalence to strive for and how to achieve it, they insisted that the belief structures, value systems, literary and linguistic conventions, moral norms, and

political expediencies of the target culture always shape translations in powerful ways, in the process shaping translators' notions of "equivalence" as well.

Since I will be discussing the translation of one single German term into other Germanic languages and not the translation of Axel Honneth's works in general, it is useful to delimit this perspective within the field of translation studies, precisely because the cultural aspect is less important. Thelen (2015) distinguishes between *Translation*, *Translation-oriented Terminology* and *Theory-oriented Terminology*. Axel Honneth has coined a certain theoretical term in German that has to be translated into other languages. Hence, translators must deal with this challenge beyond the general act of translation, understood as "the actual practical translation work done by a translator who transfers source text into a target text" (Thelen 2015: 349). Thelen also describes Translation-oriented Terminology as:

> [...] the kind of terminology work done by translators, either monolingually (in order to analyse the meaning of a term in the source language and/or the meaning of an equivalent term in the target language) or bilingually or multilingually (in order to compare the results of the monolingual analyses to see if there is equivalence between them), but always with a view to translation, where effectiveness and efficiency of the translation process and speed are most important. (Thelen 2012: 132)

Translation of terminology is in many respects more challenging because "the professional specialist (non-literary) translator has less translation freedom when encountering a term than when dealing with a general language word" (Thelen 2015: 352). "[I]n the case of a word with more shades of synonymous meanings, he may choose a meaning to his liking in his translation, provided it fits in the context" (Thelen 2015: 352). According to Thelen, the object of Translation-oriented Terminology is translation and not terminology per se. Thelen's perspective is, first of all, on translation as a profession, i.e., a relatively neutral work process as the result of a professional assignment. This may, for

example, be the case for the translations of Honneth's books where a foreign publisher assigns the translation work to a professional translator who does not necessarily have any personal interest in or agenda linked to the topic of the text, cf. also Neubert's (2000: 9) definition of "subject knowledge", quoted in Thelen (1015: 374):

> Subject knowledge, i.e., encyclopaedic as well as highly specialist knowledge, is, of course, not necessarily active knowledge for them [i.e., translators (MT)], and available all the time, but they must know the ways and means of how to access this when they need it. Translators don't know everything and they need not know everything but they must know where to look for it and where to find it.

However, when a researcher adopts a theory with a certain set of terms coined in another language, the border to Theory-oriented Terminology may be crossed. Whereas there are some similarities between the different approaches, there are some small differences as regards aspects to be taken into account, cf. Thelen (2015: 359), whose ideas are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Thelan's table showing aspects of Theory-oriented Terminology and Translation-oriented Terminology and Translation

Theory-oriented Terminology	Translation-oriented Terminology & Translation
Aspects of language planning & policy	Translation brief (specific requirements of the commissioner of the translation)
When more languages are involved in one and the same area: options for correspondence on the points of domain-specific register (communication level, audience, [cognitive] linguistic & cultural specifics) and style	Options for correspondence between domain-specific register (communication level, audience, [cognitive] linguistic & cultural specifics) and style of Source language Text (SLT) and Target Language Text (TLT)

When there are two official written languages that are linguistically very close to each other and that partly or mostly can be said to belong to the same culture, like, for example, Norwegian Bokmål and Nynorsk, there may (or should) be aspects of language planning and policy involved. As regards the Scandinavian (mainland) languages, which share linguistic and cultural features with each other and also with German, one might also want to consider "correspondence". Terminological differences between Bokmål and Nynorsk and potentially the other Scandinavian languages due to a lack of meta-perspective and collaboration in the translation process is not necessarily a problem but it is also not a desirable situation. This meta-perspective on shared terminology is not an easy task. Obviously, it cannot be expected that a single professional translator can be responsible for taking terminology correspondence and potential language policy into account. Indeed, Martin (2006: 92), quoted in Thelen (2015: 363) states that:

> **The** [bold by author (MT)] (ideal) terminologist as an individual does not exist. The (ideal) terminologist is a team. In that team, actors such as domain experts, IT-developers, translators etc. play an important role. However, the most important role is that of the Sublanguage Expert who co-ordinates the several team members and acts as a catalyst being able to understand needs, to anticipate them and to see to it that they can be solved.

In connection with this, a further purpose of this article is to contribute as a member of a "team" to a discourse and a meta-perspective on the translation of terminology from other languages. This is in addition to the two questions posed in the introduction that form the basis of this research, which I will repeat here: To what degree is it unproblematic to transfer or adapt a scientific term from German to the linguistically closely related Scandinavian languages Norwegian, Danish and Swedish? What level of linguistic awareness and collaboration is necessary in the translation and adaption of terminology when it comes to the two official Norwegian languages Bokmål and

Nynorsk, in order to avoid unnecessary confusion within a given professional field?

3. Discussion

As mentioned above, I became acquainted with Axel Honneth's theory through its application to the Norwegian school system (Jordet 2020). Therefore, I believed this would be directly transferrable to Norwegian language didactics. From a pedagogical and didactic point of view, the most appealing term is the one central to the whole theory, *recognition*. Overall, I use the English term *recognition* more or less without hesitation. However, it was at the point when I discovered that the 'official' English term actually was *recognition*, that the 'trouble' began for me as a researcher. As long as I was trying to understand and apply the theory from a (general) Norwegian speaker's point of view, it was not too complicated. But when I had to think about how I would present my work within the *Educational Role of Language* network or other international forums, I struggled, not only because English is a foreign language to me, but also because it is much more complicated to transfer German terms into English and maintain their precision.

The main title of my colleague's book is "Anerkjennelse i skolen" (Jordet 2020), which translated into English means 'recognition in school'. For a native speaker of English, when the 'official' term *recognition* is used in the translation it may not be immediately clear what 'recognition in school' actually means. For a Norwegian speaker (or a speaker of German), the meaning of *anerkjennelse* (or *Anerkennung*) would probably be much more transparent with fewer possible interpretations of the term than in English. Nevertheless, one would still have to read and understand Honneth's (1992) or Jordet's (2020) approach to fully grasp the meaning of the term in a social or pedagogical context. But let us make the situation even more complicated. Jordet's book is written in Norwegian Bokmål, while I am a user of Nynorsk, the alternative official written variety of Norwegian. While Bokmål developed from Danish into Norwegian by gradual

changes to the Danish over time, Nynorsk was established based on Norwegian dialects and initially also with the ideal to remove as many non-Norwegian influences as possible, for instance, those from German (see Haugan 2017 for a short history and references). Therefore, affixes like *an-, er-, -else* do not necessarily represent 'good' Nynorsk (see e.g., Vikør 2007: 215-216). In modern Nynorsk, some words with typical German affixes are 'allowed' or 'tolerated' (Nynorsk became a little more 'tolerant' towards loans from Bokmål/German after 2001), while others are still 'banned' as violating the essence or ideal of Nynorsk. However, this 'system' is not consequential or easily predictable. On the one hand, Bokmål *beskrivelse* (Eng. *description*, via Danish from German *Beschreibung*) may have its Nynorsk counterpart *beskriving* with the prefix *be-* but without the suffix *-else* (or possibly/preferably some other lexical form/synonym like e.g., *skildring*). On the other hand, one could use *følelse* (Eng. *feeling*) with the suffix *-else* in both Bokmål and Nynorsk (even though some would avoid *følelse* and use the word/synonym *kjensle* instead). The Bokmål word *anerkjennelse* with as many as three (historically) non-Nordic affixes (*an-, er-, -else*), for Honneth's *Anerkennung* is, definitely, not a very good candidate when trying to apply or develop Norwegian terminology in Nynorsk teaching didactics. As a consequence, there are two different word forms in Bokmål and Nynorsk, *anerkjennelse* and *anerkjenning*, the Nynorsk form representing a hybrid and compromise. Furthermore, the two different derivational morphemes *-else* and *-ing*, despite their main function to build a noun from a verb, may have a slightly different semantic content which will be discussed later.

To someone who does not know Norwegian and the two official written varieties of Norwegian it may seem implausible, but it is possible to say almost anything in oral speech may violate official standards of written Norwegian, since most Norwegians speak their local or regional dialect and most dialects would not conform to the written standards in every aspect. The word *anerkjennelse* would pass in more or less any Norwegian dialect as a Norwegian word, but it would not necessarily be approved

as an official written Nynorsk word. The most obvious way to check this, would be to consult a dictionary and, fortunately, there is an officially approved online dictionary for Bokmål and Nynorsk (Bokmålsordboka | Nynorskordboka). Before taking a closer look at the dictionary and various meanings of the central term of Honneth's theory, however, I would like to draw the reader's attention to the different titles of Honneth's (1992) book in German, Norwegian, Danish, Swedish and English.

The original (main) title of Honneth's (1992) book is "Kampf um Anerkennung" ('struggle for recognition'). The first Danish book with some of Honneth's texts about the topic had the title "Behovet for anerkendelse" ('The need for recognition') (Honneth 2003a), while the official translation of Honneth's (1992) book had the title "Kamp om anerkendelse" (Honneth 2006a) (cf. the German title). This is basically also the title of the Norwegian translation from 2008, written in Bokmål: "Kamp om anerkjennelse" (Honneth 2008). While one would still have to study Honneth's definition and use of the German term *Anerkennung*, it is reasonable to believe that Danish (*anerkendelse*) and Norwegian (*anerkjennelse*) readers would have the same or a similar perception of the word/term (cf. also the ERL perspectives language-beliefs, language-activity, language-affect, and language-thinking). This is also in accordance with one of the simplest definitions of translation mentioned earlier: "[…] the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by the equivalent textual material in another language (TL)" (Catford, 1965: 20, quoted in El-dali 2011: 31). Interestingly, the Swedish translation (Honneth 2003b) of Honneth (2000) had the title "Erkännande". Readers with knowledge of German (or Danish/Norwegian) might question the idea that *Anerkennung / anerkjendelse / anerkjennelse* is absolutely the same as *Erkennung / erkendelse / erkjennelse*, i.e., "equivalent textual material". In Swedish, for example, *erkännande* can have both meanings and one would need to explain the actual meaning and use of the term in greater detail. It is the same for the English term *recognition*, which is chosen for the English translation (Honneth 1995) and which could have even more and different meanings depending

on the context. It is clear, therefore, that translators, whether professional translators or researchers who want to adopt foreign terminology, need certain competences, cf. e.g., the list of competences given in table form in Thelen (2015: 360-361).

I will now return to my original 'problem'. In order to understand the meaning or concept of *Anerkennung*, which has its direct counterpart *anerkjennelse* in Norwegian Bokmål ("equivalent textual material"), I consulted the Norwegian dictionary. The online dictionary Bokmålsordboka | Nynorskordboka which is a dictionary for both Norwegian Bokmål and Nynorsk. As a result, it makes it relatively easy to check whether a word exists in the same form in both standardized varieties of written Norwegian. As mentioned above, the form *anerkjennelse*, with the affixes *an-*, *be-* and *-else*, is normally not a preferred form in Nynorsk. Therefore, I was not surprised that it is not listed in the Nynorsk version of the dictionary. The Bokmål version lists three synonyms for *anerkjennelse*: *heder, ros, bifall* ('honour, praise, applause'). None of these synonyms are appropriate for the concept of *Anerkennung* in the sense that Honneth suggests. The Bokmål dictionary also has two examples of the use of *anerkjennelse*: "vinne anerkjennelse / arbeidet fortjener anerkjennelse" ('to win recognition / the work deserves recognition'). As a noun, *anerkjennelse* is here defined or described as having the main meaning 'recognition' or possibly 'appreciation'. After I started my investigation of the meaning of *anerkjennelse* in Norwegian in August 2020, the dictionary entry was edited (due to an ongoing revision process (Revisjonsprosjektet 2018-2023) and a second meaning was added: "det å anerkjenne noe; forståelse, aksept, samtykke (II) anerkjennelse av tegnspråk som eget språk" ('the action of recognizing something, understanding, acceptance, to consent; [example of use] recognition of sign language as a separate language').

This leads to another interesting fact about Norwegian and the relation between the two written varieties. As mentioned above, *anerkjennelse* would not be a good candidate for an official Nynorsk word. Changing *-else* into *-ing* would make it a 'better' candidate (i.e., *anerkjenning*), even though it would

still not fit entirely with the ideal of Nynorsk. When I first started to look up these words in the official online dictionary in August 2020, there was no entry for *anerkjenning*, although it did appear as a second meaning under another German loanword *bekrefting* ('confirmation, affirmation', German: *Bekräftigung,* Bokmål: *bekreftelse*). The description was then: "verdsetjing, barn treng bekrefting og oppleving av meistring" ('appreciation, children need confirmation and experience of mastery'). A short time after this initial search, *anerkjenning* appeared as a separate entry with two meanings: "1 ros (I), heider, vyrdnad, hauste internasjonal anerkjenning for boka si / få anerkjenning for arbeidet sitt; 2 det å anerkjenne (2) noko; medhald, aksept, forståing anerkjenning av at elevar har kunnskap som læraren manglar" ('praise, honour, respect, receive international praise for his/her book / receive appreciation for his/her work; 2 to recognize something; approval, acceptance, understanding, recognition of the fact that pupils have knowledge that the teacher lacks'). It is perhaps not that remarkable, but it may be noticed that 'pupils' and 'teacher' are used to illustrate the meaning of *anerkjennelse*, i.e., a pedagogical context. Indeed, this could signal the fact that the noun *anerkjennelse/anerkjenning* is about to be perceived as a term that is related to pedagogy due to the impact of Honneth's theory in the field of pedagogy during the recent years.

The Norwegian term *anerkjennelse/anerkjenning* is, like the German and English term, a derivation from a verb. The verb can be used in both Bokmål and Nynorsk in the same form: *anerkjenne* (German: *anerkennen,* with the root *kennen,* cf. (northern English *ken,* 'to know'). However, from a normative point of view, the verb is not a 'good' Nynorsk word because of the two prefixes *an-* and *er-*. The definition/description of the verb is similar in Bokmål and Nynorsk in the dictionary. The Nynorsk version is given below:

anerkjenne verb (gjennom bokmål, frå tysk *anerkennen*)
1 sjå som rett eller gjeldande, samtykkje i
anerkjenne ein stat / anerkjenne eit argument / anerkjenne eit krav

> **2** godkjenne, godta; akseptere
> *anerkjenne realitetane / anerkjenne dugleiken hennar / opposisjonen anerkjenner ikkje nederlaget*
> **3** akte, setje høgt, rose, hylle
> *anerkjenne framifrå forskingsresultat*

The dictionary entry states that *anerkjenne* is a loanword from German with three meanings: '1 see as correct or valid, approve; recognize a state, acknowledge an argument, accept a demand; 2 approve, accept; accept the realities, recognize her ability, the opposition does not acknowledge the defeat; 3 honour, appreciate, applause, pay tribute; recognize a great research result'. [my attempt to find suitable English translations for the Norwegian synonyms]

As mentioned previously, *anerkjennelse*, hence also *anerkjenne*, is not a 'good' word in Nynorsk from a purist point of view because of the non-Norwegian affixes, even though the verb has only two foreign affixes instead of three like the noun. However, when an older non-official dictionary with Nynorsk synonyms for Bokmål words (Rommetveit 1993) is checked, both *anerkjenne* and *anerkjennelse* are actually only listed as Bokmål words (Nynorsk became more 'tolerant' to loans from Bokmål after 2001). Trying to find a suitable Nynorsk term that covers Honneth's term and that can be used in Norwegian didactics is, therefore, a difficult task, while there are too many suggested Nynorsk synonyms for *anerkjenne* and *anerkjennelse* in Rommetveit (1993) to be cited here. However, the variety of uses listed in this dictionary may be a way to illustrate the whole concept of *anerkjenne/anerkjennelse* in Honneth's sense, while working with such synonyms in class may actually be a didactic way to make it easier for pupils and students to grasp the meaning of *anerkjenne/anerkjennelse* in social/pedagogic theory.

When I started to consider whether Honneth's (1992) theory (with Jordet's (2020) adaptation) would be a suitable approach in my quest for a better Nynorsk didactics, I not only had to think about what I would call the theory's main term in Nynorsk, I also had to think about how to translate the term into

English which would be the language of publication for my research. Before I went to other sources, my immediate intuition, as a non-native speaker of English, was that *appreciation* and *confirmation* (or possibly the more or less directly corresponding *acknowledgement*) might be the most suitable English terms for *Anerkennung / anerkjennelse / anerkjenning*. However, there is an English translation of Honneth's (1992) book: "The Struggle for Recognition" (Honneth 1995). The use of the English term *recognition* was at first surprising in the same way as the use of the Swedish term *erkännande*, which both may have the alternative meaning 'to identify something as already known' (and several more), which would make no sense in the context of giving a form of positive feedback to someone for something he or she has tried to achieve. I also spent a lot of time consulting English dictionaries (e.g., Oxford English Dictionary; Oxford Learner's Dictionaries) which led me to many different meanings and many synonyms with even more and different meanings. It is apparent, therefore, that the seemingly simple term *Anerkennung* is a linguistic and semantic challenge across languages when it comes to being precise and finding "equivalent textual material" in a target language. When checking the English translation (Honneth 1995), I was not surprised that the translator had found it necessary to write a fourteen-page long note and introduction to the book (Anderson 1995) (see e.g., also Munday, 2016: Ch. 9, *The role of the translator*). Anderson (1995: viii) starts his contribution with:

> Although most of the cases in which the original German terms defy easy translation are indicated within square brackets in the text, four cases deserve special attention here. In English, the word 'recognition' is ambiguous, referring either to 're-identification' or 'the granting of a certain status'. The former epistemic sense translates the German '*Wiedererkennung*', which is distinguished from the practical sense with which Honneth is concerned here, expressed in the word '*Anerkennung*'. Throughout the present translation 'recognition' and 'to recognize' are used in this latter sense, familiar from such expressions as 'The PLO has agreed to recognize the state of Israel'. It is perhaps useful for understanding Honneth's

claim that love respect, and esteem are three types of recognition to note that, in German, 'to recognize' individuals or groups is to ascribe them some *positive* status.

Due to the nature of the assignment, a translator always has to make a choice and 'land' on a specific translation of a term. Through this action, it can be said that the translator has a certain amount of power to shape the future discourse in a scientific field. "The notion that translators shape the text they translate, no matter how invisible or powerless they would like to be, has been the most ground-breaking insight to emerge from translation studies in the last few decades." (Arrojo 2017: 126). Therefore, Arrojo (2017: 126), referring to Nietzsche and Derrida, notices the meaning and concept constructing and transformative power of translation.

In certain cases, it may be especially difficult to decide the 'right' translation for a term. Honneth (2018) himself found it necessary to write a whole book of more than two hundred pages about the history and development of the term *Anerkennung*. And, of course, Honneth (2018: 10) himself is aware of the cross-linguistic and semantic challenges that are attached to the term *Anerkennung*:

> Wie schwierig die Aufgabe ist, die ich mir damit vorgenommen habe, ist schon an dem Umstand zu erkennen, dass die Idee der Anerkennung heute in verschiedenen Kontexten ganz unterschiedliche Assoziationen weckt.
> 'How difficult the task is that I have given myself, can already be seen by the fact that the idea of recognition today arouses very different associations in different contexts.' [my translation]

And Honneth (2018: 10):

> Einige dieser Differenzen hängen, wie sich noch zeigen wird, mit semantischen Eigenarten des Anerkennungsbegriffs in den jeweiligen nationalen Sprachkulturen zusammen.

'As will be shown later, some of these differences are related to the semantic characteristics of the term recognition in respective national language cultures.' [my translation]

Since recognition theory has gained some ground in social philosophy and pedagogy, the term *Anerkennung* has become more frequent. Even though I knew *Ankennung/anerkjennelse* as a common German and Norwegian word previously, (reveal-ing my ignorance of Fichtel's and Hegel's writings) I never associated it with philosophy or pedagogy before I was introduced to Honneth's theory. In addition to consulting Honneth's books I also consulted the internet to find out why I had not been aware of Honneth's theory and *Anerkennung* as a scientific term. I will refer to Wikipedia entries below to illustrate my point. It is not the content of these Wikipedia articles that is interesting, but the fact that there are entries on Wikipedia, which I take as a sign of familiarity with Honneth or the term *Anerkennung* and its corresponding translations, since the content of Wikipedia is generated by users who find it useful to publish online about certain topics that occupy or interest them.

When searching for the term *Anerkennung* on German Wikipedia (de.wikipedia.org), an extensive entry can be found that among other things tells the reader that the term has its own meaning or definition within at least five different domains: Law, Social and State Philosophy, Logic, Psychology, and Theology. Honneth is referred to under Social and State Philosophy and the article says that "In der Gegenwartsphilosophie wird Honneth mit dem Begriff Anerkennung eng verbunden" ('in contemporary philosophy, Honneth is mostly associated with the term Anerkennung'). Searching directly for the term *Recognition* on the English Wikipedia site (en.wikipedia.org) is much more complicated since one is led to a disambiguation page that lists many different uses of the term. The easier way is, therefore, to go via the German page and choose the corresponding English page, which leads us to "Recognition (Sociology)". The entry on this page is rather short and the only central name referred to

in the text is the philosopher Charles Taylor. However, Axel Honneth is listed under "See also".

Interestingly, the only other Germanic/Western language with an explicit entry about *Anerkennung* (*anerkendelse*) is Danish (da.wikipedia.org). The other two languages that can be chosen are Arabic and Farsi. As a meta comment, Wikipedia states that there are too few sources on the Danish page. However, the point is that the whole article is written on Danish Wikipedia because someone saw the need to document Honneth's theory. Also, we get to know that the Danish sociologist Rasmus Willig has had a central role in the intro-duction of Honneth's theory to Danish sociology.

In general, therefore, for the term *Anerkennung, anerkendelse, recognition*, there are only three Germanic entries on Wikipedia, which may show that the term is not, as yet, well-established in research and the educational system. Axel Honneth is, according to the German Wikipedia entry, considered one of the most important and well-known philosophers of today ("Er wird weltweit rezipiert und gehört zu den wichtigsten und bekanntesten Philosophen der Gegen-wart."), a formulation not found on the English page about him (the English entry is rather short). At the time of writing, Wikipedia has pages in twenty-one languages about Axel Honneth, among others, an entry written in Norwegian Bokmål (no. wikipedia.org) (it may be mentioned that Wikipedia also has pages in Norwegian Nynorsk: nn.wikipedia.org). The Norwegian text opens with the sentence: "Axel Honneth (født 18. juli 1949 i Essen) er en tysk professor og filosof og er først og fremmest [*sic*] kjent for sin aner-kjennelsesteori.» ('Axel Honneth (born 18. July 1949 in Essen) is a German professor and philosopher who is first of all known for his recognition theory.'). The form "fremmest" in the Norwegian entry is not correct, and it is obvious that the Norwegian entry is based on the Danish entry: "Axel Honneth (født 18. juli 1949) er en tysk professor og filosof og er først og fremmest kendt for sin anerkendelsesteori." Both the Danish and the Norwegian Wikipedia entry suggest a link to Honneth's 'recognition theory' (*anerkendelsesteori, anerkjen-*

nelsesteori). However, up to this time, there is no Wikipedia entry for this. Interestingly, the term *Anerkennungs-theorie* or *Recognition theory* associated with Honneth is not a Wikipedia entry at all, not even in German (although it is used with reference to Fichte, Hegel, and Honneth in other entries). As a term on the Danish and Norwegian Wikipedia pages it might stem from publications such as Knirsch (2013) and other publications, where it is used as a name for Honneth's approach.

I will now return to my initial 'problem', which was how to deal with the theory in Norwegian and how to find an appropriate term in Nynorsk to use in my further research and application in language didactics. As a personal user of Nynorsk and with Nynorsk as the alternative written language in a Norwegian context as my field of research, my first reaction to the Norwegian (Bokmål) term *anerkjennelse* was that this would definitely not work in a Nynorsk context due to normative restrictions (because of all the German affixes). To some extent, this is a somewhat artificial 'problem' and a result of Norwegian language policy and standardization routines (see e.g., Vikør 2007, Omdal and Vikør 2002). After all, it is not necessarily in itself more difficult to understand *anerkjenning* (Nynorsk) than *anerkjennelse* (Bokmål), the only difference being the derivational suffixes (*-ing, -else*) that transform the verb *anerkjenne* into a noun. Both forms of the word would be possible in Bokmål (with separate dictionary entries, cf. Jackendoff, 2015:31), while only the *ing*-form would be proper Nynorsk, or at least acceptable to some degree. In Bokmål, there would be a potential semantic difference between *anerkjennelse* as a term for the concept, and *anerkjenning*, which would be a verbal noun, cf. the parallel difference between *recognition* and *recognizing* in English. In Nynorsk, no such distinction is possible with *anerkjenning*. This form would have to serve both purposes/meanings.

To a user of Bokmål, the form *anerkjenning* may be perceived as (*das*) *Anerkennen* (versus (*die*) *Anerkennung*) or (*the*) *recognizing* (*of*) versus *recognition*. Cf. also Traxler (2012: 80): "The analysis of a word form starts with an analysis of

subcomponents." Even though Bokmål and Nynorsk can be treated as different languages in certain contexts or discourses, the picture is much more complicated since both written varieties are Norwegian and represent the Norwegian language as a whole and/or parts of the Norwegian culture. While some lexical or morphologically different Nynorsk word forms may be unfamiliar to a Bokmål user, most Nynorsk users would generally be familiar with the vocabulary and grammar of Bokmål since Bokmål is the dominant written variety in Norwegian society. A Nynorsk user would not necessarily start to actively 'analyse' the word form *anerkjenning* in the same way as a Bokmål user since the Bokmål user might be tempted to look for semantic differences between the form with the suffix *-ing* and the possible form with the suffix *-else*, since the *ing*-form would usually focus more on the action/process and share semantics with the verb (cf. Hatch and Brown 1995: 220) while the *else*-form, even though it is abstract, would be more like a prototypical noun, cf. Langacker (2008: 103): "For nouns, the archetype functioning as category prototype is the conception of a physical object. For verbs, it is the conception of participants interacting energetically in a 'force-dynamic' event (Talmy 1988a)." As opposed to the form *anerkjennelse*, the form *anerkjenning* would, therefore, be potentially polysemic (cf. Evans and Green 2006: 329) and, therefore, ambiguous (see e.g., Gaskell 2005: 217). Hence, even though a discussion on the Norwegian forms *anerkjennelse* versus *anerkjenning* may look somewhat artificial it is something that a translator or terminologist would have to consider at some point. Both morphemes/suffixes, *-else* and *-ing*, can be used in Bokmål and Nynorsk in word-formation, but not necessarily in the same way. Word-formation can be seen as a semantic extension, cf. Ungerer (2007: 652):

> Just like additional meanings of simple lexical items, word-formation items can be understood as encoding extensions, based on category judgments, from a profiled linguistic unit. The only difference between simplex and word-formation items is that in the

latter, additional meaningful components, both lexical items and affixes, are added.

In the case of -*ing* as an affix in *anerkjenning* where it may result in two different meanings in Nynorsk, -*ing* would be a homonym, cf. Marslen-Wilson (2007: 183):

> The underlaying claim here is that the choice between "storage" and "computation" – i.e., between whole-form or decompositional access – is tipped towards storage by any characteristics of the complex derived (or inflected) form which would make it relatively slower to access in decomposed format (Bertram, Laine, et al., 2000). One such factor is affix homonymy, which would introduce additional competition into a decompositional access process, since the ambiguous morpheme would need to be evaluated against two sets of grammatically different possibilities – is the {-er} in *slower*, for example, agentive or comparative?

One could also look at this from the perspective of frequency since the form *anerkjennelse* is much more frequent in Norwegian in general (written and oral Norwegian) than the verbal noun *anerkjenning*. Referring to Forster & Taft's *frequency ordered bin search* (FOBS) model (Forster 1989, Forster and Bednall 1976, Taft and Forster 1975), Traxler (2008: 101) states:

> According to Taft and Forster's model, lexical access involves people using auditory (or visual) cues to search their long-term memories for a matching stimulus. This search process is organized so that people do not need to search the entire lexicon every time they need to look up a word. Instead, lexical (word from) representations are organized into *bins*. The bins are organized according to word frequency. High-frequency words are stored toward the "front" of the bin and are searched first; lower frequency words are stored toward the "back" of the bin and are searched later.

Traxler (2008: 102) also discusses the importance of morphemes. Applied to Norwegian, the suffix -*ing* would be more frequent in Nynorsk than in Bokmål and the suffix -*else* would be much less frequent in Nynorsk than in Bokmål. Even though

both -*ing* and -*else* belong to a so-called closed-class category, one could also look at this from the cognitive perspective of cognitive *attention*, (see e.g., Naish 2005). For instance, Talmy (2008: 29) mentions the properties of a morpheme as one factor that might set the strength of attention. The frequency approach could also be extended to include the perspective of *visual word recognition* where the difference between the two morphemes -*else* and -*ing* and their frequency may – potentially – be a cause of recognition challenges (see e.g., Rastle 2007).

The word *anerkjennelse* is well established in Bokmål and in Norwegian in general because of the shared (written) language history with Danish which has existed for several hundred years (mainly from ca. 1500-1900). According to Kluge (1995), the German word *erkennen* dates back to the 8th century whereas the form *anerkennen* came into use in the 16th century, which means during the time when there was only Danish as an official written language in Denmark and Norway. Even though *kjenne* (Old Norse *kenna*) was a common form in older versions of German, English and Norwegian, the forms *anerkjenne* and *anerkjennelse* are loanwords from German in Danish and subsequently in Norwegian. Since *ankendelse* is already an established word in Danish and hence Norwegian (*anerkjennelse*), the adoption of the word as a term and concept for Honneth's approach is seemingly uncontroversial and unproblematic. Even though the Danish translation of Honneth's (1992) book also has an introduction (Willig 2006), cf. the obvious need for an introduction to the English translation (Anderson 1995), there are no linguistic/metalinguistic reflections about the term *anerkendelse* in the Danish introduction (nor are there such reflections in the introduction to Honneth (2003a) (Willig 2003). Neither are there such reflections in the introduction to the Swedish translation of Honneth (2003b) (Heidegren 2003), apart from references to Honneth's own reflections. The Norwegian translation (Honneth 2008) has no introduction at all. Apparently, no-one saw any need to place Honneth's terminology in a Norwegian context, not to mention the perspective of term banks (cf. e.g., Thelen 2015) and language planning.

Jordet's (2020) approach is not a translation of Honneth's (1992) theory, instead it is an application/adaption to the Norwegian school system. Consequently, Jordet must – to some degree – deal with the term *anerkjennelse* itself in order to lay the ground for his own approach (Jordet 2020: 86-88). However, Jordet's approach is not based directly on Honneth (1992), but on the Norwegian translation (Honneth 2008). The Norwegian translation has no introduction; therefore, nothing is known about possible considerations given to the translation process. As mentioned above, the word *anerkjennelse* is already an established word in Norwegian Bokmål since Bokmål is a modification and development of/from Danish. Since the Danish translation was published in 2006 while the Norwegian translation came two years later, in 2008, it might be thought that the Norwegian translator had used the Danish translation as a guide. However, the Norwegian translation appears to be more independent and truer to the German original since it often deviates from the Danish translation.

To reiterate, the German term *Anerkennung* is translated, or rather transferred/adapted, directly from German to *anerkjennelse* (Bokmål) and *anerkendelse* (Danish), respectively. In contrast, the three differentiations of the concept *Anerkennung* are different (at least in the foreword). While the Danish translation (Honneth 2006a: 21) has *kærlighed*, *ret* and *respekt* for Honneth's terms *Liebe*, *Recht*, and *Wertschätzung* (Honneth 1992: 8), the Norwegian translation is closer to the German terms with *kjærlighet*, *rett*, and *verdsetting* (Honneth 2008: 7). The English translation has the terms *love*, *rights*, and *esteem* (Honneth 1995: 1). The Danish word *respekt* is, of course, a possible synonym for the Norwegian word *verdsetting* (one could also have used *respekt* in Norwegian), but the Danish translator could actually have used the Danish word *værdsættelse* here (cf. chap. 5 in Honneth 2006a) instead of the Latin loan word *respekt*. *Respect/respekt*, on the other hand, would be the only word that would work in all of these languages (German, English, Danish and Norwegian). That being said, Honneth himself explicitly thanked the Danish translator for his effort when translating

the Hegelian terms into Danish (Honneth 2006b: 19-20). Interestingly, Honneth (1992) uses the term *Wertschätzung* in his foreword as the third differentiation of the concept of *Anerkennung* while he uses *Solidarität* in his heading for chapter 5 where he discusses his terms (1992: 148). All the other translators also use the same Latin loan word (English: *solidarity*, Danish: *solidaritet*, Norwegian: *solidaritet*). Despite the use of *Solidarität* in the heading of chapter 5, Honneth uses *Wertschätzung* and *soziale Wertschätzung* in his discussion, as do the Danish and Norwegian translators (*social værdsættelse* and *sosial verdsetting*, respectively).

When I noticed the translation of Honneth's term *Wertschätzung* to Bokmål *verdsetting*, I believed that perhaps *verdsettelse* would have been a more appropriate term (cf. the discussion on the derivational suffixes -*else* versus -*ing* in Bokmål above). And, of course, *verdsettelse* would be a direct loan from Danish *værdsættelse*, which in its turn is a loan/transfer from German *Wertschätzung*. Surprisingly, neither *verdsettelse* nor *verdsetting* are actually listed in the official dictionary for Bokmål (Bokmålsordboka) authorized by the Language Council of Norway (Språkrådet). *Verdsetting* is only listed in the Nynorsk dictionary (Nynorskordboka). Both *verdsettelse* and *verdsetting* are, however, entries in non-official dictionaries for Bokmål, like e.g., Det Norske Akademis Ordbok (NAOB).

Jordet (2020: 86) starts his chapter on the theoretical framework with the subheading "Begrepet anerkjennelse – langt mer enn ros" ('the term recognition – way more than praise'). By opening his introduction to Honneth's theory in this way, Jordet already presupposes that the word *anerkjennelse* could be associated with praise and not some other possible meanings/synonyms that have been discussed above (e.g., *accept*). This may be natural in the context of pupils, school and pedagogy. In spite of this, Jordet actually tries to explore the linguistic root of the German word *anerkennen*. Additionally, for some reason, Jordet also used a Danish dictionary (Ordbog over det danske sprog) to define the meaning of the Norwegian word *anerkjenne*. This is somewhat strange, although it makes no

difference since Danish and Norwegian use the word in the same way. However, even though it looks as if Jordet is trying to discuss the terms *anerkjennelse* and *anerkjenne*, his purpose is merely to widen the concept of the term in Honneth's (1992) sense and to differentiate it from the more 'traditional' use in pedagogic contexts which, according to Jordet and others, is often characterized by superficial praise (Jordet 2020: 86). There is no sign, therefore, that Jordet is questioning the term *anerkjennelse* as equivalent to or appropriate for the German *Anerkennung* itself. Indeed, why would he? Jordet is not a linguist nor a professional translator, and he is building his approach on the established use of the term in pedagogy and psychology (e.g., Schibbye 1996).

It is a matter of perspective whether *anerkjennelse* in Norwegian Bokmål should be considered a loanword or not. On formal grounds, the word is definitely 'inherited' via the shared history with the Danish written language. And on formal grounds, it is easy to identify, the German affixes giving away the origin of the word. However, the word has been in use for a very long time in Norwegian and one would normally not react to it unless one is occupied with linguistic purism, e.g., if one belongs to the minority of politically conscious/active users of Nynorsk that try to avoid non-Norwegian words as far as possible.

Now that the word *anerkjennelse* has come into focus as a term within social philosophy and consequently the pedagogic field, it also must be discussed as a term that might find its way into the curriculum and didactic theory and practise. Obviously, standardization of terminology is important within a professional domain, and, eventually, it is also a matter that official language institution(s) would want to comment upon and perhaps regulate (cf. chap. 7 in "Retningslingjer for normering", Språkrådet ('Guidelines for standardization'; The Language Council of Norway)). According to Vikør (2007: 216), standardization has the aim of avoiding (first of all) English terminology in Norwegian by trying to find appropriate Norwegian terms. Also, one would try – as far as this is possible – to find terms that are the same or similar across the Nordic languages, and,

obviously, be as alike as possible in the two written varieties Bokmål and Nynorsk. One background for the standardization policy and the need to develop Norwegian terminology is the fact that English, as the main 'supplier' of terminology in today's global society, did not have the same status in the school system previously. Today, Norwegian pupils learn English at school for twelve/thirteen years, and English is more or less ubiquitous in Norwegian society, so one should expect that the majority of Norwegian citizens can understand English. Hence, terminology work and standardization does not necessarily have to do with understanding, but to some degree with linguistic protectionism.

As has already been mentioned, *anerkjennelse* is an established word in Bokmål and in Norwegian in general. The word also seems to have become established in recent publications based on Honneth's term *Anerkennung*. Due to the standardization principles for Nynorsk, *anerkjennelse* is not a good candidate for a Nynorsk term, and *anerkjenning* is the official Nynorsk form of the word. As has already been discussed, some users of Bokmål may feel or perceive a semantic distinction between *anerkjennelse* and *anerkjenning*, the latter preferably being a verbal noun with focus on the action. But this is a general challenge in the relation between the two written varieties of Norwegian and not isolated to this term alone. From a common Nordic perspective, one could say that the terms *anerkendelse* (Danish), *anerkjennelse* (Bokmål), *anerkjenning* (Nynorsk) and possibly *erkännande* (Swedish) are 'acceptable' as Nordic representatives for the German *Anerkennung*. Some users of Nynorsk might still not feel comfortable using the term *anerkjenning*, but that will probably change over time when/if the term is used more often in educational contexts and in the professional literature. From an overall semantic perspective, one might wonder why Honneth chose the term *Anerkennung* for his approach. Obviously, he was bound by the history and tradition of Fichte, Hegel and others, so there was a century-long established discourse on the term *Anerkennung*. Therefore, Honneth (1992) found it necessary to differentiate between the three forms of

Anerkennung: Liebe, Recht, Solitarität/soziale Wertschätzung.
Personally, I am first of all a linguist and a teacher of Norwegian
linguistics and language didactics, and not a philosopher. But
one might wonder whether the term *Wertschätzung* ('esteem'),
possibly with modifying adjectives, could suffice to cover those
differentiations, e.g., 'affectional esteem', 'legal esteem' and 'so-
cial esteem': if not in social philosophy of the dimensions that
Honneth represents, at least from a practical and didactic point
of view, different forms of esteem would be easy to understand
and apply in the classroom. Nordic/Scandinavian pedagogic ap-
proaches also have much in common and the terms *verdsetting*
(Bokmål and Nynorsk), *værdsætning* (Danish), and *värdsättning*
(Swedish) would be possible choices. However, since *Wert-
schätzung* is used by Honneth as one of the three different forms
of *Anerkennung*, it is probably not possible to influence the fu-
ture development and implementation of the term in pedagogic
theory and practise.

4.   Conclusion

When introduced to Honneth's (1992) theory of recognition by
a Norwegian colleague of mine (Jordet 2020), my initial reaction
was that I found the application to pedagogy and didactics very
promising. Since my field of research focuses on Nynorsk as an
alternative written Norwegian language and I am a user of Ny-
norsk myself, I needed to reflect upon the fact that the Norwe-
gian Bokmål term *anerkjennelse* with three non-Nordic affixes
is – from a morphological perspective – not an 'appropriate' term
in Nynorsk. In my investigation of the term in German and in
this context related languages like English, Danish and Swe-
dish, I found it necessary to lift the discussion to a metalevel
dealing with terminology connected with translation and stand-
ardization in general. From a formal linguistic and semantic/et-
ymological point of view, one might question the choice and use
of certain translations in different languages. However, the use
of words and terminology also has a social-practise component,
i.e., when a word or term is established, it is not always neces-

sary or possible to change it; for instance, the English term *literacy* has proved to be rather resistant in Norwegian professional language despite numerous attempts to find 'better' or corresponding Norwegian terms. The term *anerkjennelse* is different to the term *literacy* in the way that *literacy* is a rather new term loaned from English academic language characterizing the discourse on teaching and learning in the new millennium, whereas *anerkjennelse* has been a well-established non-domain-specific Norwegian word for a long time, even though it has its origin in Danish and German. From a semantic point of view, the Bokmål version *anerkjennelse* and the Nynorsk version *anerkjenning* may have a slightly different interpretation or semantic focus. From a standardization point of view, on the other hand, one can say that these two spellings or forms are just different morphological representations of the same word in accordance with the general orthographic and morphological rules for Bokmål and Nynorsk. However, since 85 % of Norwegian pupils learn Bokmål as their main written language and Bokmål is the dominant language in all public communication, the Nynorsk term *anerkjenning* will probably still struggle and live its life in the shadow of the Bokmål version *anerkjennelse*. Seen from the perspective of the Educational Role of Language network, the pupils' *language-beliefs* could be affected in the way that they might believe that *anerkjennelse* and *anerkjenning* are not exactly the same; at least they might wonder why these terms do not have the same orthographic/lexical form. It might also have an effect on the pupils' *language-activity*, e.g., they might use the Bokmål term in their Nynorsk writing, or they might demand even more direct feedback from the teacher when seeing the term as a verbal noun with focus on the activity more than on the concept. This again may have an effect on the pupils' *language-affect*. The counter-term of *Anerkennung* ('recognition') has not been discussed in this paper. This term is *Missachtung* ('disrespect'), which may lead to different forms of 'violations' (Honneth 1992: chpt. 6). Hence, if the pupils feel disrespected, they may feel violated in some way. 'Violation' may potentially happen solely because of the terminology and

expectations associated with this terminology. As for the ERL perspective *language-thinking*, the use of terms like *Anerkennung* and *Missachtung* in itself creates a 'reality' that may affect the thinking of the pupils (without implying the whole of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis (Sapir 1949, Whorf 1956)). The pupils may think that recognition (in Honneth's sense) should always be there and be 'visible' through explicit actions. If they do not 'see' explicit recognition in the classroom, they may automatically think this is a sign of disrespect. The so-called Generation Z is often already perceived as feeling more easily 'violated' for different reasons than previous generations. The concrete understanding and use of the term(s) for *Anerkennung* and Honneth's (1992) terminology and their consequences will have to be subject to future studies in the classroom.

Underlying the considerations presented above, the general question I tried to answer in this paper was to what degree it is unproblematic to more or less directly transfer or adapt a scientific term from German to the linguistically closely related Scandinavian languages Norwegian, Danish and Swedish. I have tried to show that it would be useful if translators, researchers and language planners thought of themselves as members of a 'team' and have a meta-perspective when it comes to the translation and the use of certain scientific terms. The more specific question I asked was whether there should be more linguistic awareness and collaboration in the translation and adaption of terminology when it comes to the two official Norwegian languages Bokmål and Nynorsk in order to avoid unnecessary confusion within a given professional field. An investigation of the two morphemes -*else* and -*ing* revealed challenges that are not necessarily dealt with on a meta-level and that may be especially challenging for translators, researchers and language planners.

References

Anderson, Joel (1995). "Translator's Note", "Translator's Introduction". In: *The Struggle for Recognition. The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts.* Trans. Joel Anderson. Cambridge: Polity Press, viii–xxi.

Andrews, Richard, Carole Torgerson, Sue Beverton, Terry Locke, Graham Low, Alison Robinson, Die Zhu (2004). "The effect of grammar teaching (sentence combining) in English on 5 to 16 year olds' accuracy and quality in written composition". In: *Research Evidence in Education Library.* London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education.

Arrojo, Rosemary (2017). "The relevance of theory in translation studies". In: Carmen Millán, Francesca Bartrina (eds.). *The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies.* London – New York: Routledge, 117–128.

Bassnett, Susan (1996). *Translation Studies.* London: Routledge.

Bell, Roger T. (1991). "Translation theory; where are we going?" *META* 31/4: 403–415.

Bertram, Raymond, Matti Laine, Harald Baayen, Robert Schreuder, Jukka Hyönä (2000). "Affixal homonymy triggers full-form storage, even with inflected words, even in a morphologically rich language". *Cognition* 74: B13–B25.

Bokmålsordboka | Nynorskordboka (n.d.). "Språkrådet og Universitetet i Bergen". Available at <https://ordbok.uib.no/>. Accessed 25.11.2020.

Braddock, Richard, Richard Lloyd-Jones, Lowell Schoer (1963). *Research in Written Composition.* National Council of Teachers of English. Illinois: Campaign.

Bussmann, Hadumod (1996). *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics.* Trans. Gregory Traut, Kerstin Kazzai (eds.). London – New York: Routledge.

Catford, John C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay on Applied Linguistics.* London: Oxford University Press.

Dörnyei, Zoltán (2009). "The L2 Motivational Self System". In: Zoltán Dörnyei, Ema Ushioda (eds.). *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 9–42.

El-dali, Hosni M. (2011). "Towards an understanding of the distinctive nature of translation studies". *Journal of King Saud University – Languages and Translation* 23: 29–45.

ERLA (2020). International Association for the Educational Role of Language. Available at <http://educationalroleoflanguage.org/>. Accessed 25.11.2020.

ERL Network (2020). Educational Role of Language Network. Available at <http://educationalroleoflanguage.org/>. Accessed 25.11.2020.

ERL Research (2020). Educational Role of Language research. Available at <http://www.educationalroleoflanguage.ug.edu.pl/erl-research>. Accessed 25.11.2020.

Evans, Vyvyan, Melanie Green (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics. An Introduction.* Mahwah, NJ – London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Fjørtoft, Henning (2014). *Norskdidaktikk.* Bergen: LNU/Fagbokforlaget.

Forster, Kenneth I. (1989). "Basic issues in lexical processing". In: William D. Marslen-Wilson (ed.). *Lexical Representation and Process.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 75–107.

Forster, Kenneth I. Elizabeth S. Bednall, (1976). "Terminating and exhaustive search in lexical access". *Memory & Cognition* 4: 53–61.

Gaskell, Gareth (2005). "Language processing". In: Nick Braisby, Angus Gellatly (eds.). *Cognitive Psychology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press/The Open University, 197–230.

Gerring, John (2004). "What is a case study and what is it good for?" *American Political Science Review* 98: 341–354.

Hatch, Evelyn, Cheryl Brown (1995). *Vocabulary, Semantics and Language Education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haugan, Jens (2017). "Language diversity in Norway and the question of L1 and L2". *Beyond Philology* 14/1: 181–204.

Haugan, Jens (2019). "When the first language feels like a second language: Challenges for learners of Norwegian Nynorsk". *Beyond Philology* 16/1: 141–164.

Haugan, Jens (2020a). "Nynorsk and the L2 self". *Beyond Philology* 17/1: 123–157.

Haugan, Jens (2020b). "Literacy and the L2 self as a pedagogical challenge in teaching and learning Norwegian – First, second or foreign language?" In: Michał Daszkiewicz, Anna Dąbrowska (eds.). *In Search of a Language Pedagogical Paradigm.* Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza "Impuls", 103–113.

Haugan, Jens (2021). "Norwegian linguistic identity through history: From national identity to linguistic individualism". *Educational Role of Language Journal* 4: 42–56.

Heidegren, Carl-Göran (2000). "Inledning". In: Axel Honneth, *Erkännande. Praktisk-filosofiska studier*. Göteborg: Bokförlaget Daidalos AB, 7–19.

Hertzberg, Frøydis (1995). *Norsk grammatikkdebatt i historisk lys*. Oslo: Novus.

Hertzberg, Frøydis (2007). "Grammatikk?" In: Mette E. Nergård, Ingebjørg Tonne (eds). *Språkdidaktikk for norsklærere. Mangfold av språk og tekster i undervisningen*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 17–26.

Hillocks, George (1984). "What works in teaching composition: A meta-analysis of experimental studies". *American Journal of Education,* November: 133–170.

Honneth, Axel (1992). *Kampf um Anerkennung. Zur moralischen Grammatik sozialer Konflikte. Mit einem neuen Nachwort*. Suhrkamp Taschenbuch Wissenschaft. 10. oppl. 2018. Berlin: Suhrkamp.

Honneth, Axel (1995). *The Struggle for Recognition: The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts*. Trans. Joel Anderson. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Honneth, Axel (2000). *Das Andere der Gerechtigkeit. Aufsätze zur praktischen Philosophie*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Honneth, Axel (2003a). *Behovet for anerkendelse. En tekstsamling*. Rasmus Wiik (ed.). Trans. Mogens Chrom Jacobsen. København: Hans Reitzels forlag.

Honneth, Axel (2003b). *Erkännande. Praktisk-filosofiska studier*. Trans. Carl-Göran Heidegren. Göteborg: Bokförlaget Daidalos AB.

Honneth, Axel (2006a). *Kamp om anerkendelse. Sociale konflikters moralske grammatik*. Trans. Arne Jørgensen. København: Hans Reitzels forlag.

Honneth, Axel (2006b). Forord til den danske utgave. In: *Kamp om anerkendelse. Sociale konflikters moralske grammatik*. Trans. Arne Jørgensen. København: Hans Reitzels forlag, 19–20.

Honneth, Axel (2008). *Kamp om anerkjennelse: Om de sosiale konfliktenes moralske grammatikk*. Trans. Lars Holm-Hansen. Oslo: Pax Forlag.

Honneth, Axel (2018). *Anerkennung: Eine europäische Ideengeschichte*. Berlin: Suhrkamp.

Jackendoff, Ray (2015). *A User's Guide to Thought and Meaning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jakobson, Roman (1959). "On linguistic aspect of translation (2002/2004)". In: Lawrence Venuti (ed.). *The Translation Studies Reader*. Second edition. London – New York: Routledge, 138–143.

Jordet, Arne N. (2020). *Anerkjennelse i skolen. En forutsetning for*

læring. Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

Kluge, Friedrich (1995). *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache. Bearbeitet von Elmar Seebold. 23., erweiterte Auflage*. Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Knirsch, Gregor (2013). *Axel Honneths Anerkennungstheorie. Die Bedeutung sozialer Anerkennung für die Identitätsentstehung*. München: Grin Publishing.

König, Ekkehard, Johan van der Auwera (eds.) (1994). *The Germanic Languages*. London – New York: Routledge.

Martin, Willy (2006). "In quest of a profile: Portrait of a terminologist as a young sublanguage expert". In: Pius ten Hacken (ed.). *Terminology, Computing and Translation*. Tübingen: Narr, 73–94.

Langacker, Ronald W. (2008). *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Marslen-Wilson, William D. (2007). "Morphological processes in language comprehension". In: Gareth M. Gaskell (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Psycholinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 175–193.

Munday, Jeremy (2016). *Introduction to Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. Fourth Edition. London – New York: Routledge.

Naish, Peter (2005). "Attention". In: Nick Braisby, Aangus Gellatly (eds.). *Cognitive Psychology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, The Open University, 37–70.

NAOB – Det Norske Akademis Ordbok (n.d.). Available at <https://naob.no/>. Accessed 25.11.2020.

Norton, Bonny (2013). *Identity and Language Learning: Extending the Conversation*. Second edition. Bristol – Buffalo – Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Odell, John S. (2001). "Case study methods in international political economy". *International Studies Perspectives* 2: 161–176.

Omdal, Helge , Lars Vikør (2002). *Språknormer i Norge. Normeringsproblematikken i bokmål og nynorsk*. Second edition. Oslo: Landslaget for norskundervisning (LNU), Cappelen Akademisk Forlag.

Ordbog over det danske sprog (n.d.). Available at <https://ordnet.dk/ods>. Accessed 25.11.2020.

Oxford English Dictionary (n.d.). "The definite record of the English language". Available at <https://www.oed.com/>. Accessed 25.11.2020.

Oxford Learner's Dictionaries (n.d.). "English". Available at <https://

www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/>. Accessed 25.11.2020.

Rastle, Kathleen (2007). "Visual word recognition". In: Gareth M. Gaskell (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Psycholinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 71–87.

Revisjonsprosjektet (2018-2023) (n.d.). Språkrådet og Universitetet i Bergen. Available at <https://www.uib.no/lle/121561/revisjons prosjektet-bokm%C3%A5lsordboka-og-nynorskordboka>. Accessed 25.11.2020.

Rommetveit, Magne (1993). *Med andre ord. Den store synonymordboka med omsetjingar til nynorsk*. Oslo: NKS-forlaget. Available at <https://www.nb.no/items/a695eac09caaa00cf5a97d11333593a a?page=27>. Accessed 25.11.2020.

Sapir, Edward (1949). *Selected Writings in Language, Culture and Personality*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Schibbye, Anee L. L. (1996). "Anerkjennelse: En terapeutisk intervensjon?" *Tidsskrift for Norsk psykologiforening* 33/6: 530–537.

Schwandt, Thomas A., Emily F. Gates (2018). "Case study methodology". In: Norman K. Denzin, Yvonna S. Lincoln (eds.). *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research.* Fifth edition. Los Angeles – London – New Delhi – Singapore – Washington DC – Melbourne: Sage, 341–358.

Skjelbred, Dagrun (2010). *Fra Fadervår til Facebook. Skolens lese- og skriveopplæring i et historisk perspektiv*. Bergen: LNU/Fagbokforlaget.

Språkrådet (n.d.). The Language Council of Norway. Available at <https://www.sprakradet.no/>. Accessed 25.11.2020.

Språkrådet (n.d.). The Language Council of Norway. *Retningslinjer for normering*. Available at <https://www.sprakradet.no/Sprakavare/ Norsk/normering/retningslinjer-for-normering/>. Accessed 25.11. 2020.

Stake, Robert E. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Taft, Marcus, Kenneth Forster (1975). "Lexical storage and retrieval for prefixed words". *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 14: 638–647.

Talmy, Leonard (1988). "Force dynamics in language and cognition". *Cognitive Science* 12: 49–100.

Talmy, Leonard (2008). "Aspects of attention in language". In: Peter Robinson, Nick C. Ellis, (eds.). *Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*

and Second Language Acquisition. New York – London: Routledge,

27–38.

Thelen, Marcel (2012). *The Structure of the Lexicon: Incorporating a Cognitive Approach in the TCM Lexicon, with Applications to Lexicography, Terminology and Translation*. Ghent: Academia Press.

Thelen, Marcel (2015). "The interaction between terminology and translation: Or where terminology and translation meet". *Transkom* 8/2: 347–381.

Tonne, Ingebjørg, Laila Sakshaug, (2007). "Grammatikk og skriveutvikling. Didaktiske eksemper". In: Mette E Nergård, Ingebjørg Tonne (eds): *Språkdidaktikk for norsklærere. Mangfold av språk og tekster i undervisningen*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 129–144.

Toury, Gideon (1978 [1995]). "The nature and role of norms in translations". In: Lawrence Venuti (ed.). *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, 198–211.

Traxler, Matthew J. (2012). *Introduction to Psycholinguistics: Understanding Language Science*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

Udir 2019. *Læreplan i norsk*. (Høring). Utdanningsdirektoratet. Available at <https://hoering.udir.no/Hoering/v2/347?notatId =741>. Accessed 25.11.2020.

Udir 2020. *Læreplan i norsk* (NOR01-06). Kompetansemål og vurdering. Kompetansemål etter 10. trinn. Utdanningsdirektoratet. Available at <https://www.udir.no/lk20/nor01-06/kompetanse maal-og-vurdering/kv111>. Accessed 25.11.2020.

Ungerer, Friedrich (2007). "Word-formation". In: Dirk Geeraerts, Hubert Cuyckens (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 650–675.

Vikør, Lars (2007). *Språkplanlegging. Prinsipp og praksis*. Oslo: Novus forlag.

Wikipedia - Accessed 25.11.2020.
de.wikipedia.org
Anerkennung. <https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anerkennung>.
Axel Honneth. <https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Axel_Honneth>.
da.wikipedia.org
Anerkendelse. <https://da.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anerkendelse>.
Axel Honneth. <https://da.wikipedia.org/wiki/Axel_Honneth>.
en.wikipedia.org
Axel Honneth. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Axel_Honneth>.
Recognition. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Recognition>.
Recognition (Sociology) <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ Recognition_(sociology)>.
nn.wikipedia.org (Norwegian Nynorsk)

no.wikipedia.org (Norwegian Bokmål)
   Axel Honneth. <https://no.wikipedia.org/wiki/Axel_Honneth>.
Whorf, Benjamin L. (1956). *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings.* Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Willig, Ramus (2003). "Indledning". In: Axel Honneth. *Behovet for anerkendelse.* København: Hans Reitzels forlag, 7–23.
Willig, Rasmus (2006). "Indledning". In: Axel Honneth. *Kamp om anerkendelse. Sociale konflikters moralske grammatik.* København: Hans Reitzels forlag, 7–17.

Jens Haugan
ORCID iD: 0000-0001-9708-2038
Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences
Campus Hamar
2318 Hamar
Norway
jens.haugan@inn.no