LEVELS OF EQUIVALENCE IN THE TRANSLATION OF TWO POEMS.

FATIMA N. DO CARMO

A Translation Research Project Submitted to the Faculty of Arts, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Translation.

Johannesburg, 1991.

ABSTRACT

This research project examines the translations of two poems for translation equivalence and shifts in equivalence. After examining types of equivalence as applied to the translation of poetry, the aim will be to identify that, because the two poems chosen for analysis are of different types, they require equivalence on different levels. The practical analysis and assessment of the two poems and their translations will illustrate the issues raised and establish exactly which levels of equivalence are required and/or possible in the translation of each one of these poems.

DECLARATION

I declare that this translation research project is my own, unaided work. It is being submitted in partial fulfilment for the degree of Master of Arts (Translation), University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other university.

(Fatima N. do Carmo)

13 day of May, 1992.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Judith Campbell, my supervisor, for her support, advice and invaluable assistance during the writing of this research project. In addition, I wish to thank my parents for their encouragement, patience and understanding while I was completing the project.

CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

SL: SOURCE LANGUAGE

TL: TARGET LANGUAGE

TE: TRANSLATION EQUIVALENCE

ST: SOURCE TEXT

TT: TARGET TEXT

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this research project is to identify that poems of different types require translation equivalence on different levels. In order to illustrate this, two different poems and their translations have been chosen for analysis and assessment.

The first poem is Arno Holz's "Draussen die Düne" (German) and its English translation "Dune out There" by Burton Raffel. The second poem is Lewis Carroll's nonsense poem "Jabberwocky" (English) and its German translation "Der Jammerwoch" by Dr Robert Scott.

The first chapter of this research project deals with the general problems involved in the translation of poetry, and makes use of the relevant parts of certain theories and methodologies in order to ensure that all or most of the aspects of the process of poetic translations have been discussed.

Before establishing the levels of equivalence which should be maintained in the translations of the two poems chosen for analysis, one must identify the levels of equivalence as applied to the translation of poetry and to these two poems. Therefore, the second chapter of this project looks at levels of translation equivalence as applied to poetry specifically. The conditions for establishing translation equivalence proposed by Lotfipour-Saedi will be used to establish equivalence in

these two poetic translations in particular. The two original poems will be analysed for their most important poetic features to be retained in the translations. An analysis of the translations will be attempted in order to determine translation equivalence and shifts in equivalence, after having identified which levels of equivalence should be maintained in the translation of each one of these poems.

The final chapter aims to summarise the conclusions arrived at in this research project. Because only two poems of different types and their translations have been chosen for analysis, the observations made during the course of the study cannot provide guidelines for the translation of poetry in general. Although there are general theories of poetic translations, each poem will have individual problems for translation and the solutions to these problems will depend on the levels of equivalence required and/or possible for each individual poem.

CHAPTER 1: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON THE TRANSLATION OF POETRY

What is poetry? According to Novalis 'poetry is strictly personal and therefore indefinable. He who does not know and feel immediately what poetry is, cannot be taught any idea of it. Poetry is poetry' (in Erbe 1964:7). Savory claims that 'poetry is the art of employing words in such a manner as to produce an illusion on the senses: the art of doing by means of words what the painter does by means of colours' (1968:75). Erbe argues that one cannot distinguish between content on the one hand and form on the other because they are a solid unit where, at least in a good poem, 'one cannot alter a verse, a word, a syllable, even a letter without doing harm to the whole' (1964:7). Because poetry is a very specialized form of literature and 'probably the most complex genre of language in terms of both formal and semantic structure, (...) it involves many additional considerations of its own' (Jones 1989: 184) and poses many problems for translation. Jones claims that 'the process of translating poetry operates at a multiple level of attention: to text, to image and to individual item, often simultaneously, though with different concentrations at different stages' (1989:190).

Most people read poetry for poetry's sake. We read it for its sensuous effect and the message which it carries in a compact form - in contrast to prose. The messages which poetry has to offer make the translation of poetry worth-

while. A translated poem can be extremely significant for people who do not understand the language in which the poem was originally written. Rossetti once said: 'The only true motive for putting poetry into a fresh language must be to endow a fresh nation, as far as possible, with one more possession of beauty' (in Davie 1975:13). But, according to Alighieri, everybody knows 'that nothing which is harmonized by the bond of the Muses can be altered from its own to another language without destroying all its sweetness and harmony' (in Holmes 1970: 192). Dante maintained that poetry was absolutely untranslatable and Jakobson claimed that 'poetry (...) is "by definition" untranslatable' (in Steiner 1975:261). According to Fitts (in Brower 1959:33) 'when poets talk about translating poetry, it is usual to begin and to conclude by saying that it can't be done (because) a poem is a total complex.' But, Babler argues that 'poets can hardly be considered quite the most competent judges in this regard' (in Holmes 1970:193). It is true that many poems or parts of poems are (or seem to be) untranslatable, but modern theorists are more reluctant to state that poetry is absolutely untranslatable because poems can ultimately be translated. According to Savory, it is so tempting to admit that poetry is untranslatable and 'perhaps to use it as an excuse for not doing what may indeed be difficult, but which is therefore more satisfying when or if successfully attempted' (1968:86).

The old controversy as to whether a poetic translator

should be a poet or a linguist continues. Some would say that a good poet might impose his own style on a poem when translating it, thereby changing it considerably. It is rare to find a good poet who will be a good translator as well, and vice versa. Perhaps it is better to be a good translator rather than a good poet when translating poetry. The opposite point of view is that poetry cannot be translated by other than a craftsman, because 'none but a poet can translate a poet' (Woodhouselee 1813:111). According to Fitts, the translator 'must be a poet as well as an interpreter. (...) His interpretation must be an act of poetry' (in Brower 1959:34). However, the 'translator poet' should not impose his own style on the poem to such an extent that it resembles a poem by him. The original poem must always be respected. According to Barnstone, 'the translator should respect the intent of the first creator' (in Frawley 1984:50). The best solution is a compromise between the two, because a translator with no creative abilities would probably not produce a good poem. Since poetry is creative and translation is creative, it is evident that the translator of poetry should have some creative abilities. According to Kuic, the translation of a poem 'will be a new poetic work, and therefore creative; at the same time it will be a true reproduction of the original, as if the original were created anew, and therefore re-creative' (in Holmes 1970: 183). Because translation is the act of critical interpretation, the poetic translator should achieve a balance

between interpretation and creativity. Rabler claims that a translator should be enough of a linguist and a literary critic to be able to judge all the basic devices and patterns of an original poem (in Holmes 1970:193).

Another problem which translators of poetry are faced with is whether a translation should be faithful or free. Raffel claims that the 'literal' or faithful translator 'assumes that his job is to act as a kind of inverse mirror' and to keep 'as close to the original as may be possible, given linguistic, cultural, and personal differences. The "free" translator assumes that his job is to take the poem (...) from its original environment into the world of (...) whatever language he is translating into' (1971:11). According to Raffel, the literalist 'emphasizes the idioms and constructions, the sounds and rhythms' (1971:11) of the source language. He explains that the free translator emphasizes these aspects of the target language. Raffel argues that whether a translator is faithful or free is 'very much a matter of emphasis' (1971:11) and that extremely free translators 'are inspired but not in any way bound by the original' (1971:12).

In the eighteenth century, Breitinger said: 'Translation is like painting a portrait: the more it looks like the original, the more praise it deserves' (in Lefevere 1977:24). Davie explains that when we say that a version of a poem is "faithful", we cannot mean that it is "literal"

because a translation which is most free can also be the one which is most faithful (1974:20). He goes on to say that trying to be literal can prevent the translator from being faithful and that 'literality can be the enemy of fidelity' (Davie 1974:25). Davie argues that 'if the translator is too literal he misinterprets, and if he tries to find a parallel, he approximates' (1974:48). Dolitsky explains that for some translation theorists 'the best translations are those that read as smoothly as if they had originally been written in the target language. Others find that for the reader to get a feeling of the original, the translator should allow the target language to be "affected by the foreign tongue"' (1988:83).

According to Woodhouselee, 'freedom in translation is more allowable in poetry because it is an act of creativity: poetry is not factual' (1813:35). He explains that liberty in the translation of poetry is necessary because one needs ease of composition, but it is important to adhere strictly to the sense, force and spirit of the original poet. The translated version should be given both the ease of expression and harmony. The lyric (for example) allows for the greatest liberty in translation since freedom of thought and expression is agreeable to its character. This freedom has its limits - the translator should not add to the sentiment of the original poet, but keep the character of the original poem. The translator should not confine himself to a literal translation

but adapt the expression of the original text to the idiom of the target language. Woodhouselee claims that the translation should not be beneath the original and that the translator should 'never suffer his original to fall' (1813:123).

It is evident that there should be a balance between faithfulness and freedom. The translator chooses to what extent he will be faithful and/or free. According to Babler the word-for-word and line-by-line method of translation helps the translator to keep from straying off into too free a translation (in Holmes 1970:194). Muir explains that the verse translator must be allowed far more freedom than the translator of prose (in Brower 1959:94). Gorjan claims that translations cannot be perfect, 'but at best a reflection, a mirror image of the original. (...) Translators can strive to come as close to the original as possible, but they never can or will achieve complete identity in their translations' (in Holmes 1970: 201). Davie argues that 'the best translation is imperfect, in the sense that it can never bring over everything that is in the original' (1975:23).

According to Babler the translator is 'one of the most important and most effective agents of cross-cultural contact in our intellectual commerce with the literatures of other lands' (in Holmes 1970:193). He explains that the translator's task is to 'seek words which another writer has already found, formulate ideas which another

thinker has already formulated, shape verse which another poet has already shaped' (in Holmes 1970:193). The translator must reconstruct with as little loss as possible the sense, form, style and sound of the original. One or more elements of the original poem will have to be sacrificed because it is impossible to retain them all. Davie argues that 'every competent translation is in effect a piece of literary criticism; for every conscientious translator, since he knows from the first that he cannot bring over everything in his original, has to decide those features of the original which are so distinctive and important that they must be reproduced at all costs, and which other features he can, however reluctantly, agree not to try for' (1975:17). According to Rabassa, translation is a process of choice and consequently never a finished process. All translations are open and go on to infinity. He explains that 'translation is a disturbing craft because there is little certainty about what we are doing, which makes it so difficult' (Biguenet & Schulte, 1989:viii). Each translator will make different choices and formulate his own rules for the translation of poetry and he is likely to choose features which are important to him, but not necessarily to others. It is a known fact that different translations of the same original are generally not identical and that a translator will probably never approach a text twice the same way. There will always be a critic who disagrees with the choices made by others. The critic may find some

poor choices made by the translator because his taste and knowledge of the language will differ and he might succeed in finding better alternatives. This is inevitable, and only possible if the critic has a knowledge of both languages involved. It is difficult (or impossible) to retain all the meanings and possibilities which a source text offers, therefore, each translator determines a hierarchical sequence of choices. The translator of a poem must sacrifice certain elements of the original poem in order to keep others. Fitts claims that 'a translation must fail to the extent that it leaves unaccounted for whatever aspects of the original it is unable to handle' (in Brower 1959:33) and Mathews argues that 'the points of "departure" from the original are the points of interest' (in Brower 1959:72). According to Babler, however, the translator must 'be aware that no detail of the original is so slight that he can neglect it entirely' (in Holmes 1970:194), and Newmark argues that 'however good a translation, its meaning will differ in many ways from the original (...) and it will have its own independent strength' (1988:165).

It is impossible to achieve a perfect translation of a poem, because a poem in translation is different from an original poem. But, according to Wilss, the potential of a language for generating coincidences is undoubtedly much greater than translators can imagine, even though during the act of translation there may seem to be no satisfactory coincidences available. In principle, satis-

factory coincidences can always be generated even if it may not be possible within the limits of the time, energy, language competence and talent of an individual translator (1982:154). We tend to blame our problems and limitations as human beings on language and this is often not justified especially where English is concerned. According to Savory 'English has a large vocabulary, more varied and more extensive' (1968:86) and often the same idea can be expressed in many different ways. English tends to be a very flexible language: there is much room for moving words around and for shaping phrases. But, we as human beings are not capable of perfection and each person's idea of perfection differs. The translator can only try to overcome the difficulties imposed by the differences between languages.

Another aspect of the translation of poetry is whether it should be translated as poetry or prose. Is the translation of verse better in prose? Some theorists would claim that a poem's very essence is lost when it is translated into prose, because poetry and prose are different genres. Since poetry and prose are different modes of communication, the audience response is different. In poetry, form and content are inseparable, because the structure of a poem enables it to communicate more information than a non-poetic text can provide. Because verse style is associated with form, the form must be retained. Postagte argues that 'verse in itself is a more powerful engine than prose; it has a further range and its impact

is heavier' (1922:77). He explains that 'if you remove the form of verse, you strip off the only thing which distinguishes it from prose' (1922:80). According to Davie, 'the first and minimal requirement of the translation of a foreign poem (...) is that a poem be turned into a poem. If what you have before you, offering itself as the translation of a poem, does not hang together as a poem should, then you know that what you have before you is a mistranslation' (1975:13). For Davie, 'a translation of a poem should be at all events another poem' (1975:27). Raffel states that 'poetry in translation is either poetry born anew or it is nothing at all' (1971:115) and Newmark claims that the translation of poetry 'is the field where most emphasis is normally put on the creation of a new independent poem, and where literal translation is usually condemned' (1988:70).

Imagery and metaphors are necessary and essential in poetry, therefore, they must be maintained in the translation. Sometimes these figures of speech are unsuitable to prose and when they are found in a prose translation, they seem odd. Lyric poetry, for instance, has a great degree of irregularity of thought. These irregularities become unpardonable mistakes in prose, therefore, it is absurd to translate them into prose.

Poetry translated into prose was favourably received by some readers and critics because translators usually used fairly elegant language avoiding distortions and verbal

absurdities which are sometimes found in verse translations. Postgate argues that a prose translation has an advantage because 'in prose we may come nearer to the constructions and phrasing of the original' (1922:81) but verse is freer than prose because poetic licence allows for a freer use of language. At times, prose translations are closer to the original poem than a verse translation could ever be. But, because of its form, prose is unable to direct the reader's attention to certain words as poetry does. The French practice of translating poetry into prose was not copied by many, because in a verse form one can be more accurate and concise than in a prose form. Where the translation of a poem into prose becomes useful is for the purposes of scholars studying a language, who may need some help with a total understanding of the poem, but who are then able to study and appreciate the poem in its own language. The prose translation is then printed together with the original poem.

The translator, like a poet, is constantly translating thoughts into words. They both manipulate words. But, ultimately, the translator's task is more difficult than the poet's because he must subordinate himself to two different languages. The translator should master both languages, the emphasis lying on the mother tongue into which he translates. There should be a balance between his knowledge of the source language and his knowledge of the target language. If the translator's knowledge of the source language is better than his knowledge of the tar-

get language, it could be detrimental to his translation, but if his knowledge of the source language is not adequate, he could produce misinterpretations. What is important is that the poem should be able to stand adequately on its own in the target language. The translator needs to be able to maintain a balance between the source language and the target language because he is like a go-between who must satisfy everyone.

One encounters many problems in translating a good poet because he masters all (or most of) the tricks of his language. Another language will have different features and a different medium. The features, (for example rhyme, rhythm and metre) which the poet exploits, are never the same. The often peculiar interaction between the different features is difficult to reproduce in a translation because different languages have different characteristics. English and German are syllabic languages where the stress falls on certain syllables. Some languages (like English) allow for more deviations from metre. It is clear, then, that metres which are natural in one language are unnatural in another language.

It is evident that languages have different cultures, customs, verses, metres and styles. Naturally, cultural problems do not only occur in poetry, but in poetry it is far more problematic than in prose. No verse form in one language can be identical to a verse form in another language. According to Kochol, 'there are languages that

are rhythmically identical, languages that are rhythmically related, and languages that are rhythmically remote. (...) The translation of verse will usually involve the method of rhythmic substitution of the original' (in Holmes 1970:107-110). Because 'metres natural and appropriate to one language are unnatural in another' (Davie 1975:5), a rhythmic change does, however, not necessarily render a poem inadequate.

Rhyme is a big problem in the translation of poetry. Postgate explains that 'if rhyme hampers the composer, how much more the translator' (1922:89). Some theorists argue that if one translates a rhyming poem into a non-rhyming poem, it disrespects the original poet. But, translation into rhyme requires more skill and time. Lefevere claims that the 'rhyming translator fights a losing battle against the limitations he imposes on himself' (1977:61). Most translation theorists claim that where an original poem rhymes, the translation need not rhyme, especially when 'it is much harder to find rhymes in English than in most languages' (Davie 1975:5). The effect of rhyming words in a poem is that one's attention is focused on the rhyming words, therefore, it could be argued that a translated poem (without rhyming words) would lose this effect - but it is extremely difficult to rhyme exactly the same words in the translation which rhyme in the original poem. Perhaps other devices such as alliteration and the position of a word on a line, could be used to stress certain words in a poem. How-

ever, a poem which relies entirely on rhyme for its effect should probably rather be translated as a rhyming poem.

Some poems rely strongly on their aural effect, which is one of the most difficult things to preserve and reproduce in a translation. Often, in poetry, harmony exists between sense and sound, therefore, 'we cannot separate meaning from sound' (Erbe 1964:8). Erbe claims that 'no sound body can be carried over from one language to another. And poems living mainly or entirely by sound (...) will suffer most in the process or are practically untranslatable' (1964:8). He adds that sound symbolism often does not agree across languages. Aural poems are very difficult to translate because it is difficult to maintain a unity between sound and meaning - more time is required for this type of translation. Erbe argues that 'there will always remain untranslatable verses, stanzas, poems, and even whole poets - especially so when sound, rhythm and meaning form a solid unity. (...) Translation often depends on the right time or the right person or both' (1964:25).

Poetry focuses on language, words and the links between them. 'The language of a poem is continually making allusions (...). Poems are characteristically much shorter than novels, their language therefore has to be more densely packed with meaning, and allusiveness is a way of packing meaning in' (Davie 1975:6). Poetry is a concise

genre which uses deviations from normal language to foreground certain concepts and ideas - and these are difficult to maintain in a translation. Ilek argues that the 'language of poetry is a highly complicated [...] structure, and the complex structure of a poem enables it to communicate more information than a non-poetic text can provide. A great deal of this surplus information we owe to the symbolic character of poetic language (...). There is a close connection between an image and a specific language' (in Holmes 1970:135). Ilek explains that the poetic image, besides being connected with the structure of a specific language, 'is incorporated into a complex fabric of specific literary and aesthetic traditions and conventions. During the long development of a national culture, certain images become standard symbols' (in Holmes 1970:136). He claims that in the translation of symbolic expressions and images, the reader can still find many errors. Sometimes the image is simply left out or destroyed by explication, or a worn, banal image is often given in the place of a fresh and new one (in Holmes 1970:137). Each language has its own set of idioms which is exclusively proper to it, like prepositions which one automatically changes (when necessary). Where no corresponding idiom is available, the only solution is a paraphrase.

The text of a poem is highly unstable in that each reader completes the text in his own way. Since translation depends on the two activities of reading and writing,

each a variable, the translation will always vary with each translator. The skill of the translator lies mostly in how and with what form he will trap the content of the source text (Frawley 1984:49). Time demands new translators to produce new versions because tradition and taste change from generation to generation. According to Barnstone, an older text should be rendered into modern English because other factors, like the subject matter itself, will age it and convey the earlier period (Frawley 1984:51). Davie explains that when people translate or write about translation, it is mostly taken for granted that to translate is to modernize (1975:30). Since the original poem was presumably written in a language natural to its readers, that naturalness should persist in the target poem. Anything other than modern English would be unnatural to modern readers. Each generation needs its own translation because 'translations age more than original works' (Brower 1959:272). According to Bly 'The idea that a great poem should be translated freshly every twenty years is rooted in an awareness of how fast the spoken language changes' (in Frawley 1984:74). He says we need the energy of spoken language to keep a translation alive and successful.

But, what makes a translation alive and successful? How do we evaluate a translated poem? Does one need a knowledge of the original language first, in order to be able to judge the quality of a translated poem? According to Lefevere, translations can be judged only by

people who have no need for them, i.e., those who are bi- or multilingual (1977:3). The unilingual reader, who does not have the ability to judge and compare fine details, has to be satisfied with whatever is available. This should motivate the translator to be accurate and he should be able to establish what a good translation is in order to produce one. According to Breitinger 'A translator should (...) be more careful in his work, because he is faced with the disadvantage that the reader who knows both languages will put copy and original side by side and will be able to find out how closely he has hit his mark or how far he has fallen short of it' (in Lefevere 1977:26). Davie argues that 'whenever you compare a good translation with its original, you are in effect reading a critical essay on that original' (1975:17).

If one understands the language of the original poem, one does not need to read it in translation. Most people who read poetry in translation have no knowledge of the original language, but this does not necessarily make them incapable of judging a translated poem for quality on its own. Often, we can detect a bad translation without a knowledge of the source text. Obviously, it is much easier to evaluate the quality of a translated poem together with the original poem, but it has already been established that only bilingual people are able to do this. Unilingual people have to decide for themselves what they consider to be a good poem. Any evaluation will be subjective because people have different requirements

for a good poem. According to Peden 'the failures and successes of a translation reveal to us the strengths and weaknesses of the original poem as well' (in Blquenet & Schulte 1989:27).

Many theorists have tried to prescribe methods of translating poetry. Bly claims to "simplify" the process of the translation of poetry into eight stages. He says that the stages will often collapse into each other, or that a single line will suddenly go through all eight stages in a flash, while the other lines lie about looking even more resistant than before (in Frawley 1984: 67). Although his method may not seem as simple as he claims it to be, it is useful in preventing the translator from making too many mistakes, because each stage forces him to check on a different aspect of the poem. He explains that during the first stage we set down a literal version of the poem and during the second stage we ask ourselves the question: 'What does the poem mean?' (in Frawley 1984:68). In the third stage we return to our literal version and see where it lost the meanings just found (in stage two). We redo the literal version and try to get it into English and arrive at a new draft (in Frawley 1984:72-4). In the fourth stage we translate the poem into the spoken language. Bly explains that during the fourth stage we begin to need the ear and ask the question: '"Have you ever heard this phrase spoken?"' (in Frawley 1984:74-6). In the fifth stage we consider the mood and tone of the poem. We move to modify errors that

may have come in with the emphasis on the spoken (in Frawley 1984:81). In the sixth stage we pay attention to sound. Bly argues that no one can translate well from a poem he has not learned by heart and that only by reciting it can he feel what sort of oceanic rhythm it has (in Frawley 1984:81-3). During the seventh stage we ask someone born in the language to go over our version. Bly claims that none of us can learn a foreign language well enough to pick up all the nuances of that language (in Frawley 1984:85-6). The last stage is making the final draft. We read back over all our earlier drafts because perhaps a half line was said better in one of them. We have to make our final adjustments in this stage (in Frawley 1984:86).

Some guidelines for the translation of poetry like the ones suggested by Bly can be very useful, but one should remember that the act of translating a poem is never definite and that the solution to each individual problem depends on the circumstances because each poem has unique problems. According to Elagin, the translator of poetry 'does not always emerge victorious from these struggles, although there are occasional successes' (1987:181). Elagin argues that it is always 'possible to refer the reader to a footnote. But this disrupts the reading process and kills the poetic effect' (1987:181).

According to Raffel, translations 'cannot employ every device of rhyme, rhythm and language to achieve a new and

different effect. Some things must remain the same in order to sustain those things which vary' (1971:16). Some theorists have claimed that a translator of poetry should try to achieve equivalence of effect when translating a poem. Davie argues that as long as the translator reproduces an important effect in his work, he does not necessarily have to 'reproduce it in precisely equivalent places, for instance in the corresponding line' (1975:24) but, according to Fitts, 'a man may be able to describe the effect that a poem has upon himself; but no two persons will be moved in exactly the same way by any one work of art; and if this is true of persons sharing a common social and historical predicament, how will they respond to a work composed perhaps hundreds of years ago and in an entirely unfamiliar setting?' (in Brower 1959: 34). According to Raffel, anyone who is at all experienced in the task of translating poetry will realize that 'subjective considerations cannot be avoided; a translator can merely transmute into the forms of his own vision' (1971:5).

Rosenzweig claims that to translate 'means to serve two masters. Which is why nobody can do it. Which is why it is (...) everybody's task, like all other things nobody is able to do in theory. Everybody has to translate and everybody does. Whoever speaks translates from his opinion into the presupposed understanding of the other' (in Lefevere 1977:110). Benjamin made an accurate statement when he said that 'All translation is only a some-

what provisional way of coming to terms with the foreignness of languages ... There is no muse of philosophy, nor is there one of translation' (in Dolitsky 1988:80).

CHAPTER 2: EQUIVALENCE IN TRANSLATION; LEVELS OF EQUIVALENCE AS APPLIED TO POETRY

The use of the term "equivalence" in translation is a controversial one, because absolute equivalence - in the mathematical sense - is not possible in translation, and more specifically in the translation of poetry. Therefore, many theorists have tried to define "equivalence" as applied to the field of translation.

According to Snell-Hornby, 'equivalence is unsuitable as a basic concept in translation theory: the term "equivalence", apart from being imprecise and ill-defined (...) presents an illusion of symmetry between languages which hardly exists beyond the levels of vague approximations and which distorts the basic problems of translation' (1988:22), but there seems to be no better term to replace the problematic term "equivalence". Therefore, translators continue to use the term and try to define it adequately according to the circumstances.

According to Catford and the linguistic branch of translation 'A central task of translation theory is that of defining the nature and conditions of translation equivalence' (1965:21) since most translation theorists define translation in terms of equivalence. Beaugrande claims that 'differences in translations have long caused both theoreticians and practitioners of translating to seek for standards of equivalence' because 'such standards

could be used to guide the production of translations and to inform the evaluation of those already produced' (1978:94). He claims that 'despite the long-standing search, little agreement about these standards has been reached and that there is a 'lack of a comprehensive theoretical basis for these standards' (1978:94). For Beaugrande, the 'current status of translation criticism does call for clarification. Little consensus exists a-bout the aspects to be investigated or the standards of evaluation' (1978:121). He claims that many critics 'have no workable concepts of equivalence, rendering their evaluations totally subjective' (1978:121).

It seems that translators have favoured either 'form-based or content-based equivalence' (Beaugrande 1978:94) in the translation of poetry. Some poetic translators re-main absolutely faithful to the form of the original poem at the expense of the other aspects of the poem. Others concentrate on the content of the poem rather than on the form of the poem. Beaugrande claims that the 'old form-based notions of equivalence hindered rather than sup-ported the development of translation theory (...). While form-based procedures may appear orderly and scientific to some, they consistently fail to do justice to the re-alities of language use' '1978:100).

Catford defines translation as the 'replacement of tex-tual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL)' (1965:20) and he dis-

tinguishes between textual equivalence and formal correspondence. 'A textual translation equivalent (...) is any TL form (text or portion of text) which is observed to be the equivalent of a given SL form (text or portion of a text)' (1965:27) whereas a 'formal correspondent (...) is any TL category (unit, class, structure, element of structure, etc.) which can be said to occupy, as nearly as possible, the "same" place in the "economy" of the TL as the given SL category occupies in the SL' (1965:27). Catford claims that the 'SL and TL items rarely have "the same meaning" in the linguistic sense; but they can function in the same situation. In total translation, SL and TL texts or items are translation equivalents when they are interchangeable in a given situation' (1965:49). Catford's definition of translation equivalence is that 'both SL and TL texts must be relatable to the **functionally** relevant features of the situation' (1965: 94). It is clear that Catford is concerned with functional equivalence in translation.

Nida states that 'the potential and actual equivalence of languages is perhaps the most debated point about translation' because 'we certainly cannot expect a perfect match between languages' (Nida and Taber 1974:4-5). Nida distinguishes two types of equivalence viz. formal correspondence and dynamic equivalence. Formal correspondence 'focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content. In such a translation one is concerned with such correspondences as poetry to poetry,

sentence to sentence, and concept to concept' (Nida 1964: 159). According to Bassnett-McGuire 'Nida calls this type of translation a "gloss translation", which aims to allow the reader to understand as much of the SL context as possible' (1980:26). Nida's notion of dynamic equivalence is based on the principle of **equivalent effect** because 'the relationship between reception and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message' (1964: 159).

Many theorists claim, however, that it is not possible to establish what effect an original text had on its readers. According to Bassnett-McGuire, Nida's 'principle of **equivalent effect** which has enjoyed great popularity in certain cultures at certain times, involves us in areas of speculation and at times can lead to very dubious conclusions' (1980:26). Nida agrees that the response of readers of a text 'can never be identical, for the cultural and historical settings are too different, but there should be a high degree of equivalence of response, or the translation will have failed to accomplish its purpose' (1974:24). For Nida, translation 'consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source-language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style' (1974:12). Nida agrees with Catford that 'it is functional equivalence which is required, whether on the level of content or on the level of style' (1974:14) and that although

'style is secondary to content, it is nevertheless important. One should not translate poetry as though it were prose' (1974:13). Nida says that a translator is 'constantly faced by a series of polar distinctions which force him to choose content as opposed to form, meaning as opposed to style. In order to choose meaningfully between these opposing sets of defining features (...) one must establish a set of priorities, which can define translating from different perspectives: the perspectives of form and of comprehensibility' (1974:14). In Nida's system of priorities 'dynamic equivalence has priority over formal correspondence' (1974:14) because the reaction of the receptors is more important than a literal translation. However, Tymoczko looks at some reasons why formal correspondence could be preferred in translation. She claims that formal correspondence translations are 'logically direct or logically simple, and they are somehow more objective than dynamic-equivalence translations' and that 'the translator's role or input is minimized in formal-equivalence' (in Hermans 1985:63).

Bassnett-McGuire agrees with Jakobson's statement that 'while messages may serve as adequate interpretations of code units or messages, there is ordinarily no full equivalence through translation. Even apparent synonymy does not yield equivalence (...). Because complete equivalence (in the sense of synonymy or sameness) cannot take place, Jakobson declares that all poetic art is therefore un-

translatable' (Bassnett-McGuire 1980:29). This is obviously an extreme statement because we know that poetry can indeed be translated. What we have to accept is that equivalence in translation 'should not be approached as a search for sameness, since sameness cannot even exist between two TL versions of the same text, let alone between the SL and the TL version' (Bassnett-McGuire 1980:29). Bassnett-McGuire points out that Holmes 'feels that the use of the term equivalence is "perverse", since to ask for sameness is to ask too much', while Durisin argues that the translator of a literary text is 'not concerned with establishing equivalence of natural language but of artistic procedures. And those procedures cannot be considered in isolation, but must be located within the specific cultural-temporal context within which they are utilized' (Bassnett-McGuire 1980:28).

Toury defines inter-lingual translation as 'the replacement of one message, encoded in one natural language, by an equivalent message, encoded in another language' (1980: 63). He states that the concept of translation equivalence is a broad, flexible and changing one (1980:64) and that the 'abstract, theoretical category of translation equivalence should not be allowed to be divorced from the class of concrete, empirical translational relationships and to remain a mere speculative notion' (1980:66).

Because the properties of strict equivalence do not apply to translation, it is difficult to determine the measura-

bility of translation equivalence for practical purposes. Most theorists establish a set of priorities for equivalence in translation because equivalence cannot be achieved on all levels. According to Lefevere and Bassnett 'with the demise of the notion of equivalence as sameness and recognition of the fact that literary conventions change continuously, the old evaluative norms of "good" and "bad", "faithful" and "unfaithful" translations are also disappearing. Instead of debating the accuracy of a translation based on linguistic criteria, translators (...) are tending to consider the relative function of the text in each of its two contexts' (1990: 12).

Newmark's **communicative** translation 'attempts to produce the same effect on the TL readers as was produced by the original on the SL readers' and his **semantic** translation 'attempts, within the bare syntactic and semantic constraints of the TL, to reproduce the precise contextual meaning of the author' (1982:22). But, in his book A Textbook of Translation, Newmark states that it has sometimes been said 'that the overriding purpose of any translation should be to achieve "equivalent effect"', but as he sees it '"equivalent effect" is the desirable result, rather than the aim of any translation bearing in mind that it is an unlikely result in two cases: (a) if the purpose of the SL text is to affect and the TL translation is to inform (or vice versa); (b) if there is a pronounced cultural gap between the SL and TL text'

(1988:48). He says that he is sceptical about the idea that a translator of poetry is 'trying to create the same effect on the target language readers as was created by the poet or his own readers; his main endeavour is to "translate" the effect the poem made on himself. A translator can hardly achieve even a parallel effect in poetry - the two languages, since all their resources are being used here as in no other literary or non-literary medium, are, at their widest, poles apart. Syntax, lexis, sound, culture, but not image, clash with each other' (1988:165).

All translators agree that the perfect translation is impossible. Rabassa recognizes this when he claims: 'a translation can never equal the original; it can approach it, and its quality can only be judged as to accuracy by how close it gets' (Biguenet, Schulte 1989:vii) Rabassa claims that equivalences cannot be established between the semantic and cultural differences of two languages. 'An exact equivalence from one language to another will never be possible. (...) Not even on the level of individual words - either within the same language or from one language to the next - can exact equivalences be found. No two synonyms are quite the same' (Biguenet, Schulte 1989:vii). Biguenet and Schulte claim that 'a word approximates its synonym without ever replacing it. A cultural situation (...) never finds its exact equivalent in another country' (1989:xiv).

Schopenhauer claimed that one does not find the 'exact

equivalent of every word in one language in another. Not all concepts denoted by words of one language are exactly the same as those expressed by another. For the most part they are merely similar and related concepts'(in Lefevere 1977:98). Schopenhauer believed that one can almost never translate a sentence from one language into another 'in such a way that it would produce exactly (...) the same effect. One cannot translate poems, only transpose them (...). Even in mere prose the best translation will relate to the original at the most as a transposition of a certain musical piece into another key' (in Lefevere 1977:98).

According to Holmes 'no verse form in any one language can be entirely identical with a verse form in any other, however similar their nomenclatures and however cognate the languages (...). The translator taking his first approach will imitate the form of the original as best he can' (1970:95). Levy explains that 'when choosing from among several equivalents (...) for a foreign term, a translator inevitably tends to choose a general term, whose meaning is broader than that of the original one, and in consequence is devoid of some of its specific semantic traits' (in Italiaander 1965:78). Newmark claims that there are 'no absolutes in translation, everything is conditional, any principle (e.g. accuracy) may be in opposition to another (e.g. economy) or at least there may be tension between them' (1988:xii).

In an article entitled 'Discourse Analysis and the Problem of Translation Equivalence', Lotfipour-Saedi claims that the translator's task 'has usually been defined as the establishment of an equivalence between the source language (SL) and the target language (TL) texts' (1990: 389) but he feels that the nature of translation equivalence (TE) has not been carefully specified and that consequently 'translation studies have always lacked a sound scientific framework' (1990:389). His paper 'attempts to study the nature of TE within the framework of a comprehensive contrastive analysis of SL and TL (...) and suggests seven different components for TE' (1990:389). In his opinion translation studies have failed to characterize the conditions of TE and to provide a comprehensive framework for determining TE as well as evaluating the translated works (1990:389). Lotfipour-Saedi asks himself the question: 'what are the components of such an equivalence and when is it established?' (1990:390). He suggests seven conditions which should be taken into account in the process of establishing TE and that 'these conditions do not act in isolation from one another; but they rather interact with one another for establishing the TE. (...) What may be considered as a TE of an SL vocabulary element in isolation from the other six conditions may turn out to be a completely defective TE in relation to them' (1990:390). The seven conditions are: 'vocabulary, structure, texture, sentence meaning as opposed to utterance meaning, language varieties,

aesthetic effect and cognitive effect' (1990:390). All the conditions will be discussed below and the ones which are particularly relevant to the two poems chosen for analysis will eventually be used in this project.

Lotfipour-Saedi states that the "**vocabulary**" of every language 'can be characterized in terms of a set of interrelated nodes, each node standing for a single vocabulary item' (1990:390). He claims that the value of each vocabulary item derives 'mainly from its relationship with the other vocabulary items within the overall language system' (1990:390). His condition of "vocabulary" is concerned with the different layers of meaning which words can have. In his opinion, every vocabulary item can be seen as consisting of six layers of mearing and the translator in his attempt to establish TE should take care of all these layers (1990:390). The six layers of meaning are: denotative, connotative, collocative, contrastive, stylistic and implicative (1990:392).

The second condition which should be taken into account in the process of establishing TE according to Lotfipour-Saedi is called "**structure**". He explains that structure deals with the organizational aspects of the elements in a syntagm and refers particularly to literary texts other than poetry. It is, therefore, not particularly relevant to this project.

The third condition for establishing TE is what Lotfipour-Saedi calls "**texture**". He states that 'text (...)

is the surface realization of the discourse process and embodies a set of strategies for the presentation of the production discourse to the receiver (reader or listener)' (1990:393). He explains that text and 'textual strategies do not act as the mere "carrier" of the message but actively influence its nature and contents. (...) The way something is said is as important as the message itself' (1990:393). Lotfipour-Saedi divides "texture" into a feature called "**schematic structure**" which deals with genre. He explains that every discourse type or genre is associated with a certain schematic structure and that despite the fact that there may be differences between the rhetorical structures of various languages, the overall textual layout of the SL and its paragraph organization should be kept intact because any change in such structures and organizations would affect the cognitive processes and the textual message (1990:394). The other feature of "texture" which he calls "**paralinguistic feature**", includes 'certain suprasegmental elements (such as) (...), punctuation, italicization, capitalization' (1990:394).

The fourth condition for establishing TE is called "**sentence meaning versus utterance meaning**" and refers to literary texts other than poetry. This condition is, therefore, not relevant to poetry.

The fifth condition for establishing TE is called "**language varieties**". Lotfipour-Saedi explains that

numerous varieties of language may come to be classified under one language. 'Variations in language may be correlated with different geographical, temporal and social factors (...) but not all language varieties are equally significant for the translation process (because) it is not really possible to determine the TE of certain varieties' (1990:395). He explains that of all the language varieties it is 'mainly the interpersonal variety (or style) (...) which is of significance in translation' and that these stylistic variations 'are in surface realized as changes in both vocabulary and structure' (1990:395). According to Lotfipour-Saedi, the translator should examine the type of stylistic meaning of the SL 'and then decide what TL textual forms he can choose for conveying the same meaning/value' (1990:395).

According to Lotfipour-Saedi, the sixth condition for establishing TE is called "**cognitive effect**". By the cognitive effect of a text, he means 'the effect it may have on the cognitive processes of its recipient (...), for example, the degree of its comprehensibility and recallability' (1990:395). He explains that any change in the textual structure of a text (texture) would affect its cognitive effect (1990:396). This condition will not be considered when analysing the poems, because it is impossible to determine or measure the cognitive effect of the poems on everyone.

"**Aesthetic effect**" is the seventh condition for establi-

shing TE. Lotfipour-Saedi explains that this condition refers to the 'dimension of meaning added to a text by the literary patterns employed in it' (1990:396). He says what distinguishes literature from non-literature 'can be characterized in terms of a set of phonological (rhyming, poetic meters, alliteration, etc.), structural (...) and semantic (symbols, metaphors, irony etc.) patterns superimposed upon the linguistic segmental code' (1990:396). He explains that these patterns add a new dimension to the meaning of the text and that 'TE should be equivalent in terms of both the literary effect and non-literary meaning' (1990:396). According to Lotfipour-Saedi, 'a pattern in one language may either be absent from another one or have a function different from that of the original. So the translator, in his attempt to determine the TE of the SL literary patterns, should explore their function/value (...) first and then try to see what TL literary patterns he can employ for performing the same value' (1990:396). This is the most useful condition for the purposes of this project. Lotfipour-Saedi emphasizes that the nature of the TE should be viewed in terms of all these conditions interacting with one another but not in isolation from one another (1990:397).

The four conditions for establishing translation equivalence which will be used in this research project to establish translation equivalence in the translations of the two poems chosen for discussion are: vocabulary, texture, language varieties and aesthetic effect. These

four conditions for establishing TE together with three strategies for achieving equivalence in the translation of poetry (proposed by Jones) will form a basis for establishing translation equivalence in the translations of the two chosen poems.

In an article entitled 'On Aboriginal Sufferance: A Process Model of Poetic Translating', Jones argues that the translator 'derives his (...) notion of equivalence from the two texts rather than from the two languages in the abstract' (1989:191). This is a valid point since it has been mentioned before that each poem poses unique problems for translation, which can only be solved according to the particular circumstances of that poem. In the poetic translation Jones 'would characterise two items as equivalent if they possessed the same valency characteristics' (1989:191). By the "valency" of an item he means 'the number of marked "**valent features**"' (1989:190) which it possesses. Examples of valent features 'might be an item's literal meaning, associative meaning, ...; its concrete or metaphorical role in the image; its typical collocations and its actual collocations in the text; repetitions elsewhere in the text; style, register; sound-quality/length; syntactic function, morphological form; and so on' (1989:191). These are many of the features which Lotfipour-Saedi also points out in his paper and which most translators are aware of when translating a poem. Jones explains that an item 'may participate in one or more textual structures; (...) it

may be said to carry a number of marked valent features (...). Valent features may be weighted differently depending on the importance of their structure to the image or the text' (1989:183).

Jones and Lotfipour-Saedi look at translation equivalence from different perspectives. Lotfipour-Saedi looks at conditions for establishing TE, whereas Jones looks at different strategies for achieving TE in poetry. The strategies proposed by Jones are useful and relevant because they help one identify the different strategies used by the translator during his process of translation.

Jones suggests five main strategies of equivalence when translating poetry. His first two strategies deal with the achievement of semantic equivalence. The first one is called "**transference**" where there is 'a one-to-one whole-item equivalent (...) which conveys the whole valency-structure of the source item' (1989:191). The second strategy is called "**convergence/divergence**" whereby he means that the 'TT item covers larger/smaller semantic space than ST item, but valency remains constant' (1989: 183).

The third strategy of equivalence suggested by Jones is called "**improvisation**". According to Jones, this occurs when the 'TT feature is different from the ST feature but has a similar poetic role' (1989:183). He explains that 'if a particular source-text feature is not transferable, perhaps the emergent target text can provide a different

structuring device with similar effect. This (...) involves the target text moving away from the source text in the means it uses to generate poeticality' (1989:193). Jones says that if there is no room for improvisation, 'the least satisfactory strategy is that of "**abandonment**" of a low-weight feature in a particular item in favour of a high-weight one' (1989:193). He explains that 'weighting is not the only factor determining choice of transferable valent features: there may be no target-language item available which conveys even an acceptable number of high-weight features. This is especially the case (...) when dealing with semantic/pragmatic features' 1989:194). Jones is aware that "abandonment", like "improvisation" may shift aspects of the target text quite far from the source text. He claims that both texts 'affect which features have low weight and hence risk being abandoned; in both texts, therefore, we need to determine exactly what poetic devices are more important than others' (1989:194). This is an important aspect for the purposes of this project.

The final technique proposed by Jones is called "**estrangement**" which refers to the keeping of an '"untranslatable" feature or structure as a marker that the target text is still a communication of a foreign artefact and should be accepted as such rather than as a pseudo-native product' (1989:196). In other words the 'equivalent retains an "untranslated" ST feature' (1989:183). Many theorists might feel that this allows for an unacceptable

source text interference in the translation, but Jones feels that at times it is also necessary to accommodate "untranslatable' features in a translation.

Jones claims that because the translator is trying 'to construct equivalent networks of textual features in the target language, his (...) item-choices slowly build up a target text which (...) conditions subsequent choices and sheds a new light on previous choices; hence the generally-recognised necessity of recycling through drafting' (1989:197). He states that all translators of poetry agree that 'most later drafting involves improving the target text as a coherent poetic entity with relatively little direct reference to the source text, so as to avoid cross-language interference' (1989:197). Jones explains that compromises and choices make the target text 'subtly or greatly different from the source text in terms of poetic and semantic structures; hence the "polishing" stage is one of poetic composition' (1989: 197).

Jones agrees with Hartmann who says that literary translation is 'a process of "textual approximation"' (1989: 197). He claims that 'the ideal but unattainable aim of 100% textual equivalence conditions most of our choices' and feels that the translator's 'other aim - that of target text coherence in its own terms - is (...), not unattainable, though it may well pull the target text away from source-text equivalence' (1989:197). Jones argues

that the target text becomes more and more independent in the process of translation and that it is 'in these strategies and in the target-text choices (...) that the humble but creative freedom of the translator lies' (1989: 198). According to Jones 'the good translator of poetry stands out by dint of his (...) skills of incisive assessment of all the systems operating in the source text, his (...) control of the poetic devices appropriate to the target culture, and in the ability to mediate effectively between source and target text' (1989:198).

It seems that all the theorists who propose a model for translation equivalence set out to offer a comprehensive scientific model, but they soon find themselves stating that equivalence on all levels is totally impossible. According to Jones the translation of poetry 'could be called the art of compromise: easy solutions are rare' (1989:197).

In order to establish equivalence in the translations of the two poems chosen for analysis, the source texts will first be analysed for the most important poetic devices to be retained in the translation. The target texts will then be analysed in order to establish whether these poetic devices were in fact retained in the translation. The conditions for establishing TE proposed by Lotfipour-Saedi will be used to establish the TE of the translations and the strategies for achieving TE in poetry proposed by Jones will be used to identify the strategies

which the translators have used in their translations.

The following four conditions will be used in the next two chapters to establish equivalence in the translations of the two poems chosen for analysis:

1. Vocabulary: i.e. levels of semantic equivalence of the words.
2. Language varieties: i.e. American English versus British English; nonsense poetry; stylistic variations.
3. Texture: i.e. schematic structure (or textual structure of a text) and punctuation.
4. Aesthetic effect: i.e. devices used in poetry e.g. alliteration, rhyme scheme etc.

The following three strategies (taken from Jones) will be discussed in relation to Scott's translation of "Jabberwocky" because they are useful in describing his strategies for achieving equivalence:

1. Improvisation: i.e. equivalence of poetic role - translator moves away from the original in order to generate poeticality: the poetic role remains similar although the TT feature is different.
2. Abandonment: i.e. of a low-weight feature - e.g. in the translation of the "Jabberwocky", rhyme is more important than meaning.
3. Estrangement: i.e. retaining untranslated ST feature in the translation - occurs in the translation of "Jabberwocky".

Raffel makes a valid point when he states that 'poetic translation is an art, not a science, and much of the art is concerned with choosing (...) what to put in, what to leave out, and what shape to give the work as a whole' (1971:22). This is important to bear in mind when analysing the translation of poetry, because conditions for establishing translation equivalence tend to become rather scientific and we forget that there is personal involvement and choice in the translation of poetry.

CHAPTER 3: ANALYSIS OF SOURCE TEXT AND TARGET TEXT ONE: RAFFEL'S TRANSLATION OF HOLZ'S POEM "DRAUSSEN DIE DÜNE"

The following poem and its translation will be analysed in this chapter for equivalence and shifts in equivalence:

DRAUSSEN DIE DÜNE	DUNE OUT THERE
Einsam das Haus	Empty house
eintönig,	Dull
ans Fenster	Rain
der Regen.	On the window
Hinter mir,	Me
tictac,	A clock
eine Uhr,	In back
meine Stirn	Ticking
gegen die Scheibe.	My face
	On the glass
Nichts.	Nothing.
Alles vorbei.	Done, finished.
Grau der Himmel,	A grey sky
grau die See	Grey ocean
und grau	Grey
Das Herz.	Heart
Arno Holz (1863-1929) (in Raffel 1971:163)	Translated by Raffel. (in Raffel 1971:168).

This particular poetic translation was chosen for analysis because Raffel records his translation process of the poem. Since no one can reconstruct with certainty how the translator's mind worked while he did the translation, Raffel's notes are useful. Raffel gives a step by step account of his translation process and the reasons for his choice of words. His notes facilitate the analysis and criticism of the translation. He states im-

mediately that some loss is unavoidable and that 'some ideas, some alternatives, pass too quickly to be recorded' (Raffel 1971:163). He does, however, record much of the actual procedure which he follows as a translator.

The conditions for establishing TE proposed in the previous chapter (taken from Lotfipour-Saedi's paper) which are relevant to this particular poem and its translation are: "vocabulary", "language varieties" and "texture". "Vocabulary" (or semantic equivalence) is the most important aspect of this poem, because it is a short poem with a limited number of words. The poet has chosen each word very carefully, and since the maximum number of words per line is three, it is important that the translator should retain semantic equivalence as far as possible. There are no conspicuous poetic devices in this poem except for some internal rhyme ('Einsam das Haus/eintönig' - lines one and two; 'eine Uhr./meine Stirn' - lines seven and eight) and repetition (of "grau" in the final stanza), therefore, it is essential to retain semantice equivalence.

"Language varieties" (or stylistic variations) will be discussed in the translation of this poem because Raffel uses his personal style in his translation. He reduces most of the lines in his translation to monosyllabic words. Although this results in a shift from the original poem, it is not necessarily unacceptable. It is simply interesting to note that a shift does occur.

The condition of "texture" (which includes textual structure and punctuation) will also be discussed in relation to this poetic translation because the shifts are quite apparent in the translation. The formal structure of the poem helps to emphasize certain words in the poem. Holz starts the poem by listing a few things (e.g. "Haus", "Fenster", "Regen", "Uhr", "Stirn" and "Scheibe") and suddenly there is "nothing" ("Nichts") in line ten. The "Nichts" is centered and forms one whole stanza on its own. Although the "Nothing" in the translation (line eleven) also forms a stanza on its own, it does not stand out the way the "Nichts" stands out in the original poem because the line is not indented. All the lines of the translation start against the same margin (unlike the original poem).

The commas in the original poem help to avoid ambiguities and run-on lines, and they indicate where there should be slight pauses or breaks between the different parts of a stanza. These commas have been neglected in the translation. The full-stops in the original poem indicate that an idea has been completed and that a new one will follow - a new stanza follows after each full-stop. Although Raffel has retained the stanza division of the original poem, his omission of the full-stops at the end of the stanzas complicates the reading of the poem, and does not separate the ideas of each stanza from the other stanzas. The omission of the full-stops in the translation allow for run-on lines which do not exist in the original poem.

Since it has been established that "vocabulary" (or semantic equivalence) is the most important condition for establishing TE in the translation of this poem, it will be discussed first.

Raffel explains that 'it was the sound, and even more specifically the rhythmic movement' of "Draussen die Dune" which caught his attention and that he was intrigued by the 'almost Japanese obliquity of the title.' He points out that the 'sand dune is not mentioned at all in the poem: it is out there, the poet (or the persona) is inside, staring out' (1971:164).

Raffel starts with a literal translation of the poem: '"Lonely the house, /monotonous, /against the window/ the rain. /Behind me, /tick-tock, /a clock, /my forehead/ against the pane. /Nothing. /Everything finished. /Grey the sky, /grey the sea/ and grey/ my heart."' He says the title 'might literally be rendered: "Out there the dune" (1971:163-4). Most translators - including Raffel - start with a literal translation to ensure that the content of the source text is accurate in the translation. This is called the literal version which they begin to improve in order to make it a poem which will be able to stand on its own in the TL system.

Raffel's first decision is the title of the poem. He feels he must settle this before translating the poem proper 'because the title is so separate from the poem, at least in terms of its actual events' (1971:164). Ob-

viously Holz's word order works perfectly in German, but in English it has to be reversed to something like "The Dune out There" (1971:164). It is clear that the semantic equivalence of the title has been retained and that it is awkward to retain equivalence of word order in this case. We know that each word order is normal to each language. Raffel argues that "The Dune out There" stresses what English demands to be stressed viz. "dune" (1971:164). After completing the final translation of the poem, Raffel felt that this title no longer seemed right so he changed "The Dune out There" to 'a blunter "Dune out There"' (1971:169) because the definite article seemed unnecessary in the English and made no real difference to the translated poem. It does, however, change the meaning slightly because the German definite article "die" refers to a specific dune, whereas the translation does not refer to a specific dune.

Before tackling his literal translation of the poem, Raffel read through the German text several times sounding it to himself in order to get 'a clear sense of the sound proportions involved' (1971:164). He says he noted the shape of the poem 'in terms of its sound, and how the sound helped tie the whole together' (1971:164). He noticed a 'nice internal rhyme' in "Eine Uhr, /meine Stirn"' and that "tictac" was deliberately odd 'designed by the poet to accomplish some special purpose' He points out that "Einsam" is paralleled by "eintönig" and that there is also 'a strange sequence, "eine", "meine", "Scheibe",

interrupted by the monosyllabic "Nichts", and then resumed in the final vowel of "vorbei"' (1971:164). He says that the starkness of the word "Nichts" struck him 'as worth special note: so too did the rather obvious but nevertheless expertly handled repetitions of "grau" in the last strophe' (1971:164). He concludes that the reason why these things struck him as noteworthy is that these are approaches which are in one way or another like those which he himself employs as a poet. He says he is 'fond of internal rhymes, strings of vowel rhymes - assonance - stark lines, irregular metrics' (1971:165). Some theorists claim that although a translator of poetry should have some creative abilities, he should preferably not be a poet himself because he might tend to impose his own poetic style on the translation. Raffel seems to have fallen into this trap when translating this poem. He says he has been told that he sometimes has 'a tendency to excessive lyricism, even a tendency to improve on an original by translating it lyrically' (1971:165). Raffel claims that he is 'by turns "literal" and "free", depending on the poet, the poem, the language, the particular point of linguistic pressure' (1971:13).

Raffel starts improving his literal translation line by line. He feels that "Lonely the House" was 'too strained an effect' (1971:165) and he dislikes inversions, so he changes it. He opts for "Lonely house" for the time being, but comes back to it, circles "Lonely" and queries it. He then scribbles "empty" in the place of "lonely"

'noting that it was an extension of Holz's meaning' (1971: 167) but in his view a justifiable one. It is immediately obvious that "Empty" is not the semantic equivalent of "Einsam" and that the house is, in fact, not empty because there is a clock in it, and there is someone in the house ("Hinter mir", "meine Stirn - lines five and eight). Raffel realizes this when assembling a finished version of the poem, but he assures himself that "Empty" 'would be taken more figuratively than that' (1971:168). He is taking for granted that what seems obvious to him will be obvious to other readers of his translation. The "Nichts" (in line ten) indicates that the house is suddenly empty and that there is nothing left except a grey sky, a grey ocean and a grey heart (lines thirteen to sixteen). Raffel confuses the sequence of events by starting his translation with "Empty" when the house is in fact not empty yet, and by changing the denotative meaning of "Einsam". Since the word "Lonely" is the semantic equivalent of "Einsam" and since "Empty" contradicts what follows in the rest of the poem, this should have prevented Raffel from using the word "Empty". The word "empty" lacks the emotional connotations of the word "lonely". The word "lonely" has a different connotative meaning to the word "empty". Raffel gives no justifiable reason for using the term "empty" and has not retained semantic equivalence in this case.

The semantic equivalent of "eintönig" is "monotonous". This is the term which Raffel uses in his literal trans-

lation, but when revising his final translation of the poem, he circles "Monotonous" and replaces it with "dull" without giving any reason for it. He probably chose the term "Dull" because it is a monosyllabic word. He explains later that he prefers to use monosyllabic lines in a poem such as this one, but gives no reason for it and is not justified in doing so since the original poem has only one monosyllabic line (viz. line 10 "Nichts"), and the word "eintönig" is not a monosyllabic word. Raffel's use of far too many monosyllabic lines and the lack of either definite or indefinite articles in his translation have resulted in a poem which is abrupt and does not flow well when it is read. Once again there is a definite shift in equivalence in line two. Raffel's use of the "Dull" also loses the idea of the monotonous ticking of the clock and the monotonous rain on the window. There is a shift in the denotative and the connotative meanings of "eintönig", because although "Dull" adds to the whole atmosphere of a rainy day and the sounds of the rain on the window, it is not the semantic equivalent of "eintönig".

Raffel gives no reason for switching lines three and four in his translation, but it is probably because he dislikes inversions. "Rain/ On the window" definitely reads better than his literal version "against the window/ the rain" because inversions do not work as well in English. Although there is a shift in "line equivalence", Raffel explains that 'for this poem two one-word lines in

a row - "Dull/Rain" seemed better' (1971:167). "On the window" is the semantic equivalent of "ans Fenster". There is a semantic shift in line four, but Raffel points out that "on the window" 'permitted a fair delicate parallelism with "on the glass"' (1971:167) at the end of the second verse.

In the second verse Raffel rejects his literal rendering "Behind me" 'as flat and uninteresting English verse' (1971:165). This falls under the aspect of "language varieties" because it deals with Raffel's personal stylistic variation. Anybody else might find "Behind me" quite acceptable and have no problems with it at all. "In back" is very ambiguous, unclear and unlike the original "Hinter mir". "Behind me" is the semantic and syntactic equivalent of "Hinter mir", but Raffel changes it by adding an unnecessary extra line to this verse. He explains that his "Me/ A clock/ In back/ Ticking/" 'had the advantage of breaking up the syntactical flow, in English as in the German. (The German in turn is influenced by Japanese poetry's syntactical stasis, the omission of active function words - verbs and the like.)' (Raffel 1971:167). Raffel explains that if it meant 'using six lines where the German used only five, that did not much matter' (1971:167). He says that he considered it carefully since he prefers to keep formal patterns when he can, but that particularly in a very short poem 'it could not outweigh the gain in movement' (1971:167). The fact remains that "Me/ In back" is not equivalent to "Hinter mir" and

it adds an unnecessary extra line to the poem. The "In back" is an Americanism which indicates that Raffel is using a language variety which is most familiar to him. He is American and is presumably translating for an American audience, therefore, his use of American English is justified. He explains that he liked the /k/ repetition in "clock ...back ...ticking", but this repetition would have also been present in his literal rendering "tick-tock, /a clock". Both versions have three /k/ sounds. At least "tick-tock" would have been the English equivalent of "tictac". Once again there are semantic shifts in lines five to eight.

Raffel says he automatically substituted "My face" for "my forehead" and that he 'never considered using the lexical equivalent, "forehead" (because) (...) in a poem of such complexly irregular metre one prefers monosyllables; they are far more readily maneuverable' (1971:166). His monosyllables (use throughout the translation) make the translation far more staccato than the original poem. Since "forehead" is the lexical equivalent of "Stirn", his use of "face" indicates that there is a lexical shift. It has been determined that this poem requires lexical equivalence. Syllabic equivalence cannot take first priority because it would result in unacceptable semantic shifts (as is the case in this poem). This is obviously a subjective statement, because everybody's priorities differ. Raffel felt that the use of a monosyllable in this case was more important than the absolute semantic equivalent of the word.

Raffel does not explain why he substitutes "against the pane" with "on the glass" except that it permits 'a fairly delicate parallelism' (1971:167) with "on the window" in the first verse. But, once again "On the glass" is not semantically equivalent to "gegen die Scheibe". "Against the pane" is the equivalent of "gegen die Scheibe" and there is no reason why there should be any parallelism between this line and the fourth line of the poem in the English translation when no parallelism exists between lines three and nine in the original poem.

The translation of the term "Nichts" did not seem to pose any problems for Raffel since the lexical equivalent in English is "Nothing". He retains the word "Nothing" in his final translation without discussing it further.

Line eleven of the original poem did, however, pose some problems for translation. His literal version "finished" for "vorbei" was already a problem because although "finished" is one of the English equivalents for "vorbei", it could also mean "past" or "over", which have different connotative meanings. Therefore, he changes his "everything finished" to "All over" and changes this once again to "Done, finished" which he retains in his final translation. He explains that "Done, finished" seemed 'superior to "All over" (...) because although (it is) an extension of the lexical significance of the German, it is an extension which in effect sets out the two meanings of "vorbei", at the cost of dropping "alles", "all". On

the other hand, "alles" remained implicit in "Done, finished"' (Raffel 1971:167). The element of "everything" ("Alles") is important in the original poem because it emphasizes the "Nichts" in the previous line. The "Alles" emphasizes that all the things which Holz enumerates in the first two stanzas of the poem have become "Nothing". Raffel's translation has lost this important element of the original poem.

Raffel does not like "sea" for the German "See", which does, as he says, in fact mean "sea". He substitutes "ocean", which he feels is lexically close enough and here he felt he had the 'clear advantage of NOT being monosyllabic (because) two syllables seemed more open, in a strophe closely knit by the triple repetition of "grey"'. He says he noted that 'for the same reason, the alliteration of "sky" and "sea" would have been unfortunate' (Raffel 1971:166). One could argue that such alliteration would not make any difference in the English. Another translator might have used the words "sky" and "sea" especially because of the alliteration. The word order has been changed because as Raffel points out, inversions do not work as well in English. Therefore, he changes "Grey the sky" to "A grey sky" and "grey the sea" to "Grey ocean".

Raffel initially added three indefinite articles ("a"), to lines thirteen, fourteen and fifteen of his translation because they 'opened out the rhythm faintly but im-

portantly' and he felt that 'it was a rhythmic change in the direction of the German original' and that the "a" served a function 'vaguely like that of the German original's "der", "die" and "das"' in this verse. But, in his final revision of the translation the three indefinite articles become a single indefinite article because 'the parallelism seemed too mechanical with three "a"'s, especially in the presence of the three repetitions of "grey"' (1971:169). Raffel explains that there was also a 'rhythmic gain in stripping the strophe down, one word at a time - three words in the first line, two in the second, a single bare one in the third - to lead thereafter to "Heart", at the end'. He feels that this 'was more like the movement of the German, though not a perfect match' (1971:169) obviously realizing that he could have retained the format of the German. Although the definite article would not have worked in English, another translator might have retained the indefinite article in order to retain the structure of the original text and to make the poem flow easier in the English translation. Raffel discards the "und" in line fourteen of Holz's poem. An "and" in the translation would have given the poem a better rhythm.

The third aspect of the paper for establishing translation equivalence is "texture", which includes the physical structure of the poem and punctuation. When reaching the end of the poem, Raffel 'wondered (...) if perhaps all commas should be dispensed with, since that (...)

kept the movement jagged' (1971:167), so he removes them all from his translation. He went back to lines eleven and twelve of his translation and 'eliminated the periods' (1971:168) after deciding not to use any punctuation. But he 'restored the periods' (1971:169) almost at once because 'not only did it make no sense to practice such rigidity in trivial matters, but (he) needed the punctuation in "Don', finished"' (1971:169). One could argue that his insistence on using monosyllabic words has kept the movement of the poem jagged rather than the use of punctuation. It has already been established that the punctuation of the original poem serves some definite purposes. In the first verse of Holz's poem, the comma separates the two different ideas of a lonely, monotonous house and rain on the window. The first verse of Raffel's translation without the comma after "Dull", does not separate the "empty house" from the rain on the window and does not facilitate the reading process. Holz concludes his first verse with a full-stop. This indicates not only that it is the end of his first verse, but also that the content of the second verse is not conspicuously related to that of the first verse. Raffel's translation lacks this element. His first verse runs-on to the second. Raffel obviously felt that it was necessary to retain the verse divisions which Holz uses, but because he uses very little punctuation, he may as well have translated the poem into one verse. Raffel does not justify his unnecessary use of capital letters at the

beginning of each line. Although it is obvious that the English translation will not retain the capital letters of the German nouns (because the use of capital letters for nouns is peculiar to German but not to English - this is one aspect where equivalence will never be retained in English-German translations) there is no apparent reason why Raffel should compensate for the loss of these capital letters by beginning each line of his translation with capital letters.

The other aspect of the original poem which should have been equivalent in the translation is the physical shape of the poem because it serves to emphasize certain words in the poem. It is clear that Raffel decided to translate Holz's poem as another poem, but he gives no reason for not indenting the lines of his translation the way Holz does. When we look at Holz's poem together with Raffel's translation thereof, the immediate impression is that we are dealing with two different texts, because Raffel's lay-out is different to Holz's lay-out. The differences in the physical appearance of the two poems are immediately noticeable, because capitalization and punctuation are used completely differently. According to Schulz (1963:17) a poem 'is a work of art, and we will fail to understand its message if we look only at the content and forget its specific form, which makes it a poem. (...) The structure of a poem fully corresponds with its contents'.

It has been determined that Holz's poem requires equivalence of form (number of lines, verses and punctuation) wherever possible because all these devices help to structure the poem and its contents. According to Babler (in Holmes 1970:195) the 'rendering of a poem should be faithful (...) to the form (...) Why not try to imitate even its outward features, even its syntactical constructions, whenever it is possible?' Davie would agree with this statement since he claims that 'when you have the foreign original in front of you, though it be in a language of which you are quite ignorant, still there are ways in which you can measure up the origiral against what is offered to you as its English equivalent. You can note (...) that the original appears to be written in four-line stanzas, whereas the translation is in five-line stanzas or in irregular stanzas, or not in stanzas at all; (...) you can note that the original seems to be written in a longer, or a shorter, line than the translation; (...) you can scrutinize punctuation marks, to note that the original has a full stop or a semi-colon at points where the translation has not' (Davie 1975:14). Davie admits that these observations will not 'tell you how good the translation is; but they will tell you at least how close it is, how many liberties the translator has found it necessary or profitable to take' (1975:14). According to Davie punctuation is important 'because it reveals the poet's sentence structure, and (...) the relation between his sentence structure and his verse

structures. (...) By making the English sentence end as far as possible at the same places inside the stanzas as the original ST, one tries to bring out the features (physical ones) of the original' (1975:17). Davie argues that differences in punctuation between the original poem and its translation affect the pace of the poem. This has happened in Raffel's translation of Holz's poem

Raffel claims that he reread his translation several times and was 'not quite convinced that the overall sound of the German wasn't demonstrably superior', but he persuaded himself 'that the translation did at any rate have a viable poetic sound and shape of its own, and (he) left it at that' (1971:169). He has almost used the original as a starting point for creating a new poem. One reason why this happened could possibly be that Raffel is a poet himself. It seems that a translator with poetic abilities cannot be satisfied with a more literal translation because he is very much aware of all the different poetic devices which a poet employs when creating a poem.

Obviously the interpretation of a poem will vary considerably from person to person but the fact remains that the translator should respect the original poet's choice of words. According to Burnshaw, the instant the translator 'departs from the words of the original, he departs from its poetry. For the words are the poem. Ideas can often be carried across, but poems are not made of ideas' (in Raffel 1971:13), but Raffel claims that a good trans-

lator 'does not pretend to be the original from which it emanates' (1971:158).

The words used by Holz in his poem do not offer many problematic alternatives because Holz does not use many apparent poetic devices (except for some internal rhymes and repetition). In his translation of Holz's pome, Raffel could have retained equivalence on several levels which he did not retain. He could have retained equivalence of physical aspects such as form, punctuation and number of lines. He should have retained lexical equivalence throughout the poem in order to avoid imposing his own interpretation of the original poem on his translation of the poem. It is obvious that many of his arguments for choosing certain words and poetic devices could be argued against especially since most of them are not equivalent to those used in the original poem by Holz, but his priorities will differ from any other translator attempting to translate this poem. Equivalence cannot be retained on all levels. Each translator will make his own choices based on his own system of priorities. This makes translation and the evaluation thereof unavoidably subjective.

CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS OF SOURCE TEXT AND TARGET TEXT TWO. SCOTT'S GERMAN TRANSLATION OF CARROLL'S "JABBERWOCKY"

The second poem and its translation chosen to be analysed for equivalence and shifts in equivalence is the nonsense poem by Lewis Carroll, the "Jabberwocky", translated into German by Dr Robert Scott (pseudonym:"Thomas Chatterton"). The poem and its translation are found on the following page. Gardner explains that Lewis Carroll was the pen-name of the Rev. Charles Lutwidge Dodgson (1970:1).

Proetz explains that on a holiday at Durham in the summe of 1855, Dodgson was staying at Whitburn with his cousins. 'They were playing a rhyming game (...), composing nonsense poetry in a kind of imaginary Anglo-Saxon, for which they were inventing the vocabulary. Young Charles's contribution to the human race on that occasion was the first stanza of "Jabberwocky". He was twenty three that year' (Proetz 1971:118). Almost seventeen years later, 'he came upon the little quatrain in one of his scrapbooks, and made a ballad of it by adding five stanzas and the Jabberwock' (Proetz 1971:118). The whole poem appeared in "Through the Looking-Glass" in 1871 (Lennon 1947:225). Proetz explains that it was 'only a matter of weeks before a German version appeared in Macmillan's Magazine in a very funny letter to the editor from "Thomas Chatterton"' (1971:118). "Thomas Chatterton" was actually Dr Robert Scott, a distinguished classical scholar, 'who had produced the translation overnight on a wager' (Proetz 1971:118).

LEWIS CARROLL

Jabberwocky

'Twas brillig, and the slithy toves
  Did gyre and gimble in the wabe:
All mimsy were the borogoves,
  And the mome raths outgrabe.

"Beware the Jabberwock, my son!
  The jaws that bite, the claws that catch!
Beware the Jubjub bird, and shun
  The frumious Bandersnatch!"

He took his vorpal sword in hand:
  Long time the manxome foe he sought—
So rested he by the Tumtum tree,
  And stood awhile in thought.

And, as in uffish thought he stood,
  The Jabberwock, with eyes of flame,
Came whiffling through the tulgey wood,
  And burbled as it came!

One, two! one, two! And through and through
  The vorpal blade went snicker-snack!
He left it dead, and with its head
  He went galumphing back.

"And hast thou slain the Jabberwock?
  Come to my arms, my beamish boy!
O frabjous day! Callooh! Callay!"
  He chortled in his joy.

'Twas brillig, and the slithy toves
  Did gyre and gimble in the wabe:
All mimsy were the borogoves,
  And the mome raths outgrabe.

(in Proetz 1971: 115)

Der Jammerwoch

Es brillig war. Die *schlichten* Toven
  Wirrten und wimmelten im Waben;
Und aller-mumsige Burggoven
  Die mohmen Rath' ausgraben.

Bewahre doch vor Jammerwoch!
  Die Zähne knirschen, Krallen kratzen!
Bewahr' vor Jub jub-Vogel, vor
  Frumiosen *Bande, schnatzen*!

Er griff sein vorpals Schwertchen zu,
  Er suchte lang das manchsam' Ding;
Dann, stehend *unter'm* Tumtum Baum,
  Er an-zu-denken-fing.

Als stand er tief in Andacht auf,
  Des Jammerwochen's Augen-feuer
Durch tulgen Wald mit wifflen kam,
  Ein burblend Ungeheuer!

Eins, Zwei! Eins, Zwei! Und durch und durch
  Sein vorpals Schwert zerschniferschnäck,
Da blieb es todt! Er, Kopf in Hand,
  Gelaumfig zog zurück!

Und schlugst Du ja den Jammerwoch?
  Umarme mich, mein Bohm'sches Kind!
O Freuden-Tag! O Halloo-Schlag!
  Er chortelt froh-gesinnt.

Es brillig war. Die *schlichten* Toven
  Wirrten und wimmelten im Waben;
Und aller-mumsige Burggoven
  Die mohmen Räth' ausgraben.

Translated by Dr. Robert Scott
("Thomas Chatterton")

(in Proetz 1971: 116)

According to Heath, of all the translations of "Jabberwocky", 'the German "Der Jammerwoch" is easily the best. In no other language is elaboration of structure so readily compatible with entire absence of meaning' (1974: 139).

The German version given above was taken from The Astonishment of Words (Proetz 1971:116). Proetz claims that it is the 'original Macmillan version - with the exception of the italicized words, which are corrected mistakes. Williams and Madan (...) are responsible for changing "schlichte" in the first line to "schlichten", and "unten" in the seventh line, which is neither German nor nonsense, to "unter'm", which is both' (1971:118). But, Proetz points out that, somehow, 'Macmillan's "Banderschnätzchen" in the eighth line, which should have been "Banderschnatzen", seems to have been overlooked' (1971:118). He argues that, in the first place, 'the Bandersnatch is very big - almost as big as a dinosaur - and in the second, "Banderschnätzchen" does not rhyme with "kratzen", which it must have done in the manuscript since all the other rhymes are impeccable' (Proetz 1971: 119). According to Proetz it is difficult to imagine that any of these errors could have been made by the learned Dr Scott who was also a German scholar. Proetz feels that the mistakes were probably made by a 'muddled typesetter setting up the unfamiliar Gothic type in which the Macmillan version was printed' (1971:119). Apart from the errors in the German translation which Proetz has

pointed out, he feels that it is 'in the spirit in which Carroll wrote his poem in the first place', i.e., the poem was written 'for fun and for no other reason' (1971: 119).

Gardner has suggested that "Jabberwocky" is 'the greatest of all nonsense poems in English' (1970:192). According to Heath, the 'most curious thing about this poem is that, though everybody agrees that it is great nonsense, nobody is prepared to leave it that way. Carroll himself (...). and a host of succeeding commentators, have labored diligently to invent or discover meanings for its unfamiliar terms' (1974:139). Heath makes an interesting point when he says that once this is done 'it ceases to be nonsense (...) and becomes a mere philological puzzle' (1974:139). Heath claims that 'Alice's aesthetic reaction to it is deplorable, but at least she responds appropriately to the combination of clear structure with defective elements of reference and description. Unlike the critics, she does not attempt to supply the missing images, but indulges instead in a bout of "imageless thought"' (1974:139). Lennon points out that Carroll once wrote about "Jabberwocky": '"I'm afraid I didn't mean anything but nonsense! Still, (...) words mean more than we mean to express when we use them"' (1974:238).

According to Blake, Carroll is playing with the reader. '"Jabberwocky" could be considered a puzzle game for the reader as well as for Alice to figure out' (1974:36).

Although it is a nonsense poem and difficult to understand immediately, 'Alice insists that she gets the main point, which is that "somebody killed something"' (Blake 1974:133). Everybody agrees that apart from the 'obscure first stanza, there is in fact no difficulty in following the events of the poem - a sorry tale of the destruction of innocent wildlife' (Heath 1974:139). According to Blake, the poem is concerned with 'battle, beheading, a victory for the child, and a reward of praise from a parental authority figure' (1974:133). Ciardi explains that a 'beamish boy is warned about a monster called the Jabberwock. The boy is warned to shun it (...). Instead of shunning it, (...), the boy hunts it, slays it, and is welcomed back as a conquering hero. Clearly the tone of all this is mock-heroic' (in Phillips 1974:310). According to Ciardi, the poem 'is deeply indebted to the techniques of English ballads. Stanzas one and two of "Jabberwocky", (...) utter some sort of dark prophecy. In disregard of that prophecy, the hero goes forth to mortal combat. He succeeds in overcoming his dark fate and returns victorious to a hero's welcome' (in Phillips 1974: 310).

According to Eastman, the first stanza of "Jabberwocky" 'is superior to most rhymes (...). Every meaningless word is designed with inimitable skill to suggest those words most rich in meaning which the poets choose' (in Lennon 1974:255). Holiday explains that when nonsense 'seems most exuberant, we find an underlying order, a method in

the madness' (in Lennon 1947:237). Holiday claims that, at first, "Jabberwocky" looks like 'the wanderings of one insane, but as we read we find we have a work of creative genius (...). Whether the humour consists (...) in the conscious defiance of logic by a logical mind, or in the half unconscious control of its lovely and grotesque fancies, (...) the charm arises from the author's well-ordered mind' (in Lennon 1974:237).

In an article entitled 'The Translation of Nonsense', Dolitsky explains that nonsense does not mean "no sense", but that it is 'an imaginative way of playing the "language game" (...), and like all games, it has rules which for nonsense writers, are made to be broken' and that 'the nonsense writer has an exceptional command of language, for in order to break the rules successfully, one must know them thoroughly' (1988:80).

According to Dolitsky, 'studying nonsense as a literary genre means accepting two basic assumptions: (1) that the creator of a nonsense piece is fully aware that s/he is breaking linguistic rules and has made the choice to do so, and (2) that it is at the receiving end that meaning is most pertinent, and therefore it is the reader-listener's task to assign meaning to the text' (1988:80).

Dolitsky argues that works which are 'classified as nonsense are rule-governed; they most often follow the phonetic and syntactic rules of the language. What has brought this name upon their head is that certain seman-

tic rules have been somewhat ignored, and conventional knowledge of the world must be disregarded' (1988:80).

According to Dolitsky, there are four 'distinct, but not exclusive, types of semantic deviations that can be found in a nonsense text' (1988:81). The first is called 'lexical deviation, where no commonly accepted, or coded, meaning has yet accrued to a word or words being used, as found in Carroll's "Jabberwocky" (...), "Twas brillig, and the slithy toves did gyre and gimble in the wabe"' (1988:81). The second type of deviation is 'phonetic nonsense, where sounds are put together not so much to create meaning as for the amusement the sonority itself offers' (1988:81). The third type of deviation is the 'semantic contradiction, where coded signs combine in such a way that the relation of the given combination to the world as we know it is opaque and/or self-contradictory' (1988:81). The last type of deviation is called 'pragmatic nonsense where basic assumptions of speech acts do not hold' (Dolitsky 1988:81).

Dolitsky claims that nonsense 'is not so much concerned with communicating facts as it is with its pragma-rhetorical effect (...) on the reader/listener' and that it is this effect rather than the words themselves that must be translated. She claims that the translation of each type of nonsense 'will call for different emphasis: phonetic, semantic, pragmatic, etc.' (1988:81).

Dolitsky looks at lexical deviation in more detail, sta-

ting that 'at first view, this type of nonsense would seem to be the easiest literary genre to translate. As the text would have no sense, any translation would do' (1988:81). She explains, however, that when nonsense is looked at closely, 'it can be seen that while word-world and word-word relations do not hold, the text is highly structured and consistent with itself' (1988:81). Dolitsky explains that experimental work has been carried out on nonsense containing a high number of neologisms and that it was found that 'while an infinity of interpretations is possible for a given text, the number of possible strategies employed to arrive at these interpretations is limited' (1988:81). According to the findings of this experimental work, subjects used 'phonetic, macrocontextual or microcontextual strategies to find meaning in nonsense. In the first case, neologisms were assigned the meaning coded by a phonetically similar word already existing in the language. In the second case, the subjects assigned a superstructure to the text and neologisms were assigned meaning in accordance with the superstructure. In the third case, subjects assigned meaning to the neologisms in such a way that they agreed syntagmatically with the words around them' (1988:81). Dolitsky explains that these strategies could be used exclusively or combined or be further developed (1988:81).

According to Dolitsky, these findings are important to keep in mind when translating a text containing neologisms because this type of text '"tells" very little

(...). Its essential quality is not statement or the imparting of information. (...) It is not only words that must be accounted for, but micro-contextual, macro-contextual, phonetic and associational relations' (1988:82).

Dolitsky claims that while "Jabberwocky" 'contains a great number of nonsense words, these words are perfectly consistent with the phonetic patterns of English. English grammar is rigorously maintained and an over-all storyline can easily be discerned'. She claims that all the translations of the poem 'render the story that is told with ease (...). What is (...) interesting is the poem's potential to suscitate feelings, images and associations' (1988:82).

The conditions for establishing TE (taken from Lotfipour-Saedi) will be discussed in relation to the translation of "Jabberwocky". Although the most important condition for establishing TE in a nonsense poem is the "aesthetic effect" (devices used in poetry e.g. alliteration, rhyme scheme etc.) because the sound of the poem is the most important aspect of this poem, the condition of "vocabulary" will be discussed first because it is a lengthy analysis.

The following is a list of Carroll's neologisms (in the first stanza) as drawn up by Dolitsky (1988:83). The terms used in the German translation are given alongside the English ones.

Carroll	Scott	
Jabberwocky	Jammerwoch	
brillig	brillig	(line one)
slithy	schlichten	(line one)
toves	Toven	(lind one)
gyre	Wirrten	(line two)
gimble	wimmelten	(line two)
wabe	Waben	(line two)
mimsy	mümsige	(line three)
borogoves	Burggoven	(line three)
mome raths	mohmen Räth'	(line four)
outgrabe	ausgraben	(line four)

Dolitsky explains that neologisms 'are constructed so as to activate linguistic "remembrances" (...), and it is associated memories coming together that the reader (...) will draw upon to invest the text with meaning. The translator of nonsense, then, is not translating what the words of the text "mean", but what meaning(s) they may lead to' (1988:88). According to Beaugrande, neologisms are 'more typical of German than English' (1978:109), but in this case the German 'equivalents' of the English neologisms seem to be less gibberish than the English. In fact, five of the German terms used by Scott are not neologisms in German viz. "schlichten", "Wirrten", "wimmelten", "Waben" and "ausgraben".

The annotations found in Gardner's The Annotated Alice will be used to establish the degree of semantic equivalence of the German translation of "Jabberwocky". According to Gardner, Carroll interprets the neologisms as follows:

The word "brillig" was '(derived from the verb to "bryl" or "broil"), the time of broiling dinner, i.e. the close

of the afternoon' (Gardner 1970:191). Acc ding to Humpty Dumpty, who tries to explain the poem to Alice, "brillig" 'means four o'clock in the afternoon - the time when you begin broiling things for dinner' (Summerfield 1968:20). Although the German term "brillig" is also a neologism which would probably not have the connotations as explained by Humpty Dumpty, it is the same word which Carroll used in the English and, therefore, has the same sound as the English. Scott has used the strategy of "estrangement" (Jones 1989:183) because he has retained an untranslated feature in the translation as a marker that this is still a translated poem and that we are dealing with nonsense which does not have to have any particular meaning. According to Davie, 'it is not always and everywhere true that fidelity to sense (...) takes precedence over fidelity to sound' (1975:24). The translation of this poem requires equivalence of sound rather than semantic equivalence.

According to Humpty Dumpty (who is actually Carroll trying to give meaning to the neologisms), "slithy" 'means "lithe and slimy". "Lithe" is the same as "smooth and active". You see it's like a portmanteau - there are two meanings packed up into one word' (Summerfield 1968:20). Stewart explains that 'the portmanteau involves the simultaneity of two or more words within one meaning' (1978:163). The German term "schlichten" can also mean "smooth" (Collins 1980:575) and it is not a neologism. Scott has managed to achieve semantic equivalence and to use a word which has meaning for a German speaker.

Humpty Dumpty explains that "toves" 'are something like badgers - they're something like lizards - and they're something like corkscrews. (...) also they make their nests under sun-dials - also they live on cheese' (Summerfield 1968:20). The German word "Toven" is a neologism. Scott obviously took the English term and adapted it to suit German phonetic forms, since as Muir explains, the 'German language is supposed to be not unlike English, and word for word there are many resemblances' (in Brower 1959:94). Once again Scott has retained the sound of the original. Scott has used the strategy for establishing equivalence which Jones calls "abandonment" (1989:193). Scott has abandoned the meaning of the word for the sake of the rhyme scheme of the poem.

According to Humpty Dumpty, to "gyre" 'is to go round and round like a gyroscope' (Summerfield 1968:20). It seems that "gyre" was not a neologism after all, since 'The Oxford English Dictionary traces "gyre" back to 1420 as a word meaning to turn or whirl around' (Gardner 1970:194). Although the German term "Wirrten" refers to confusion or turmoil (Collins 1980:759), this association could be made with turning or whirling around. In line two of the translation, Scott has reproduced the alliteration successfully viz. "Wirrten und wimmelten" which is also present in the English viz. "gyre and gimble". Scott has used the strategy for achieving TE which Jones calls "improvisation", because altnough the target text feature is different to the source text, Scott has retained the

poetic role of the alliteration (Jones 1989:183).

Humpty Dumpty explains that to "gimble" 'is to make holes like a gimlet' (Summerfield 1968:20). The German term "wimmelten" is not a neologism and means 'to team' or 'to swarm' (Collins 1980:757). It is not the semantic equivalent of the English, but it was probably used to create the alliteration in line two. Equivalence of sound has to take priority over semantic equivalence because the most important feature of the poem is its sound.

According to Carroll, "wabe" is '(derived from the verb to "swab" or "soak"). The side of a hill (from its being soaked by the rain)' (Gardner 1970:191). In German a "Wabe" is a "honeycomb" (Collins 1980:737) which can be associated with "Wirrten und wimmelten". Although this is not equivalent to the English original, Scott has once again simply taken the English term and adapted it to a German phonetic form and retained equivalence of sound successfully in his translation. The meaning of the words is not as important as the sound of the poem. This is another example of Scott's use of "improvisation", where although the target text feature is different to the source text feature, Scott's main concern was to retain a rhyme scheme in his translation.

According to Humpty Dumpty, "mimsy" 'is "flimsy and miserable" (there's another portmanteau)' (Summerfield 1968:20). The German term "mümsige", is once again Scott's adaptation of "mimsy" to suit the phonetic

patterns of the German language. It is a nonsense word which means nothing, but retains the sound of the original poem.

Humpty Dumpty explains to Alice that a "borogove" 'is a thin shabby-looking bird with its feathers sticking out all round - something like a live mop' (Summerfield 1968: 20). According to Gardner's annotation a "borogove" is an 'extinct kind of Parrot. They have no wings, beaks turned up, and made their nests under sun-dials: lived on veal' (Gardner 1970:191). The German term "Burggoven" is a neologism formed from the English "borogove". Scott decided to retain equivalence of sound and rhyme since the word has no meaning in the first place.

According to Humpty Dumpty "rath" 'is a sort of green pig: but "mome" I'm not certain about. I think it's short for "from home" - meaning that they'd lost their way' (Summerfield 1968:20). The annotation given by Gardner is that "mome" means "solemn" or "grave" and "rath" is a 'species of land turtle. Head erect: mouth like a shark: forelegs curved out so that the animal walked on its knees: smooth green body: lived on swallows and oysters' (Gardner 1970:191). Once again the German "mohmen Räth'" is simply Scott's adaptation of the English words to suit German phonetic patterns.

"Outgrabe" is the 'past tense of the verb to "outgribe" (...) or to "squeak"' (Gardner 1970:191). Humpty Dumpty explains that '"outgribing" is something between bel-

lowing and whistling, with a kind of sneeze in the middle' (Summerfield 1968:20). The German term "ausgraben" is not a neologism and does not have the meaning given by Humpty Dumpty. Scott was obviously concerned with reproducing the sound and the rhyme rather than the sense of the original, since the original has no real sense.

There are other terms in the poem which are neologisms and were not listed by Dolitsky viz. "vorpal blade" (line eighteen), "tulgey wood" (line fifteen), "uffish thought" (line thirteen). "burble" (line sixteen) etc. In one of his letters Carroll wrote: 'I'm afraid I can't explain 'vorpal blade' (...) nor yet 'tulgey wood'; but I did make an explanation once for 'uffish thought' - it seems to suggest a state of mind when the voice is gruffish, the manner roughish, and the temper huffish. Then again, as to 'burble'; if you take the three words 'bleat', 'murmur', and 'warble', and select the bits I have underlined, it certainly makes 'burble': though I'm afraid I can't distinctly remember having made it that way' (Lennon 1947:239). Most of these words were simply adapted by Scott to suit German phonetic forms - e.g. "vorpal" became "vorpals"; "tulgey" became "tulgen" and "burbled" became "burblend" in the German translation. These are examples of the strategy of "estrangement" because Scott retained untranslated features in his translation as markers that the text is a translation and that it is nonsense. The German "tief in Andacht" (line thirteen) has a definite meaning unlike the English "uffish

thought". In line eleven there is another example of the use of the strategy of "estrangement". Scott retains the English "Tumtum" as the name of the tree. If it does not mean anything to the English reader except that it is the name of a tree (even if no such tree exists), the German reader will also accept it as such.

Dolitsky points out that the title of the poem is "Jabberwocky" and that in line 21 Carroll writes about the "Jabberwock". Most translations (including the German one) only use one term for both the English terms. She feels that this reduces the title to the name of the animal and dispossesses the poem's title as a quality. She claims that the 'possibility of interpreting the poem as the description of a quality rather than of an object has been diminished' (Dolitsky 1988:85). One could argue that this loss is quite a minor one and inevitable in the German, since there is no way of giving the term "Jammerwoch" a quality which Dolitsky finds present in the English "Jabberwocky". Ciardi explains that the word '"jabber" in the title, followed by "wocky" (...) is itself descriptive: if there were such a thing as a "wocky" this is the way it might "jabber"' (in Phillips 1974:309).

The second condition for establishing TE (taken from Lotfipour-Saedi's paper) is "language varieties", which includes stylistic variations or 'nonsense" in this case. Gardner argues that although the 'strange words have no precise meaning, they chime with subtle overtones' and

that Carroll 'takes care of the sounds and allows the sense to take care of itself. The words he uses may suggest vague meanings, (...) or they ma e no meaning at all - just a play of pleasant sounds' (1970:192). Scott has succeeded in reproducing this 'play of pleasant sounds' in his German translation of "Jabberwocky". He has translated a nonsense poem into another nonsense poem. Gardner feels that Scott's translation is 'magnificent' (1970:193).

The condition for establishing TE which Lotfipour-Saedi calls "aesthetic effect" (e.g. rhyme and sound) has been retained successfully by Scott. According to Newmark, in 'nonsense poetry, the sound effect is more important than the sense' (1988:42). Babler claims that the translator of nonsense poetry 'has the obligation to try to retain the sound of the original poem and to reproduce the effects that depend on the emphasis of sound, such as rhyme, sonority, alliteration, and assonance (...). Such translational techniques must, of course, entail some sacrifice of meaning' (in Holmes 1970:194). It is evident that Scott has succeeded in doing what Babler suggests above. Scott has been successful in retaining most of the rhyme scheme of the original poem. He only deviates slightly from the rhyme scheme in stanzas two and four where the English poem has an a b a b, c d c d rhyme scheme, but Scott only managed to rhyme the second and fourth lines of these two stanzas. Newmark explains that although the 'rhyming

scheme is part of the form, its precise order may have to be dropped' (1988:165) in the translation of poetry. If one considers that rhymes make up a special category of stumbling blocks in the translation of poetry and that it is extremely difficult to translate a rhyming poem into a rhyming poem, Scott's failure to rhyme every line of stanzas two and four becomes quite insignificant and even unnoticeable. What we notice when we read the translated poem is that the overall sound of the translation is equivalent to that of the original poem. Scott recognized the importance of retaining the sound of the original poem. If the original poem was written for fun, the translation must also be a fun poem, which it is.

The condition for establishing TE which Lotfipour-Saedi calls "texture" includes the physical lay-out of the poem and punctuation. Scott has retained the physical lay-out of the original poem in his translation. His translation is a poem and consists of seven quatrains of which every even-numbered line is indented. Like the original poem, the last stanza is a repetition of the first stanza. Scott has also retained most of the punctuation of the original poem. He did, however, not retain the quotation marks used by Carroll in stanzas two and six. There is no basis for such a change. In fact, the quotation marks indicate that there is direct speech; these quotation marks help the reader understand the poem more clearly, and if they had been retained in the German translation, they would probably facilitate the comprehension of the

poem. Since Carrol intended to indicate that someone was speaking and that someone was being spoken to, this should be retained in the translation.

The most important aspect, however, of the nonsense poem is its sound, and although Scott has not been able to retain equivalence on all levels, he has retained the most important aspect of this poem i.e. its sound. Newmark calls this the 'aesthetic function' (1988:166) of a poem, which takes priority over the 'expressive function' (i.e. the sense of the poem) (1988:166) in the translation of nonsense. Dolitsky explains that nonsense 'is the extreme case in literature where "meaning" as a denotation, has no meaning. The translator is not translating surface content, for in nonsense there is little to extract. What must really be translated is a surface form that will enable the reader to invest the target language text with associations and feelings similar to those of the reader of the original text' (1988:88). Dolitsky points out that the translation of nonsense 'brings out to the greatest extent how much more must go into a translation than just finding words in the target language that paraphrase the source language text' (1988:88).

CONCLUSION

In this research project, two poetic translations were compared with their source texts for translation equivalence and shifts in equivalence. The translations were assessed for translation equivalence using Lotfipour-Saedi's conditions for establishing translation equivalence, which were discussed in chapter two. Although any assessment of a poetic translation will remain subjective to a certain extent, the results of the analyses make it possible to draw certain conclusions concerning the translations of the two poems chosen for analysis.

The analysis of Raffel's translation of Holz's poem "Draussen die Düne" brought to light several shifts in translation equivalence. The most conspicuous shift was on the level of "texture" where, although Raffel translated Holz's poem into another poem (i.e. he retained equivalence of literary genre), the physical layout of the poem such as indentation of the lines and punctuation are quite different to that of the original poem. In fact, the immediate impression is that we are dealing with two different texts. It has been established that the indentation of the lines served to emphasize certain words in the poem, and that the punctuation served to structure the poem and divide it according to its content. These poetic devices used for the emphasis of different words, are lacking in Raffel's

translation of "Draussen die Düne".

A further investigation of Raffel's translation revealed that there are also shifts of equivalence on the level of "vocabulary" - i.e. there were numerous unjustified semantic shifts, which were unacceptable at times, particularly after having established that the choice of words is of particular importance in Holz's poem. Raffel has neglected the words of the original poem to a large extent.

On the level of "aesthetic effect", it cannot be argued that Raffel's translation does not represent a literary work and that it does not function as such for the target language reader. Raffel has produced a poem which does indeed stand on its own as a poem in the target language literary system.

An investigation of the level of "language varieties" revealed that Raffel uses American English. This is not necessarily a shift because Raffel is simply translating the German poem into the language variety with which he is most familiar, and his first target audience is probably American.

The discussion of Raffel's translation seemed to centre on those elements in the translation which differed noticeably from the original poem because of the numerous deviations.

A translator of poetry is generally obliged to sacrifice

certain elements of the source text in order to be able to preserve other elements. Therefore, he needs to identify a set of priorities in order to place the features of the poem in a hierarchy. It is inevitable that this is a very personal and subjective task which depends on the reader's perception of the source text and its translation. It is apparent that Raffel's system of priorities differs from the one which was established in this study. This results in an inevitably subjective assessment of the translation.

It is felt that in the translation of Holz's poem, which is a short poem made up of a very limited number of words carefully chosen by the original poet, the translator's first priority is to maintain semantic equivalence. The second priority, which is almost on the same level as the first one, is equivalence of lay-out and punctuation. Both of these aspects have been neglected by Raffel in order to achieve translation equivalence on other levels (such as metre and rhyme) which he felt were more important than the level of semantic equivalence. At times, the connotations and associations of the original poem are totally ignored in the translation. Raffel has translated Holz's ideas without translating the words themselves. Or, to put it in other words, he has used Holz's poem as an inspiration to produce his own poem.

For the purposes of this research project, it could be argued that because there are numerous shifts in

translation equivalence (based on the conditions proposed by Lotfipour-Saedi), Raffel's poem is not a translation of Holz's poem. Or, it would be more accurate to say that Raffel has been quite "free" in his translation of Holz's poem. Many theorists argue that a poetic translator with poetic abilities will impose his own style and technique on the translation of a poem - this is the case in Raffel's translation of "Draussen die Düne".

The second poetic translation chosen for the analysis of translation equivalence, revealed less shifts in equivalence than Raffel's translation of Holz's poem. An analysis of Scott's translation of Lewis Carroll's "Jabberwocky" revealed that Scott managed to preserve equivalence on several levels. Because "Jabberwocky" is a nonsense poem, semantic equivalence does not take first priority in the translation thereof (unlike the translation of Holz's poem). "Jabberwocky" was written for fun. The most important features of this poem are its rhyme scheme and its sound. Therefore, equivalence of rhyme and sound must take first priority in the translation of "Jabberwocky". Most poetic translators do not attempt to retain equivalence of rhyme when translating rhyming poems, but in this case, a rhyme scheme is absolutely essential in the target text, because it is the only way the translator can attempt to produce a sound in the translation which will have an equivalent function to the sound of the original poem. Scott has managed to retain equivalence of rhyme and sound quite admirably in his

translation of "Jabberwocky". He recognized that the particular sound texture of Carroll's poem is an essential feature of the poem.

It is evident that in order to preserve equivalence of rhyme and sound, Scott has had to sacrifice other elements such as semantic equivalence (i.e. on the level of "vocabulary"), which made no difference to his translation because he was translating nonsense. Scott could not be primarily concerned with semantic equivalence because many of the words used by Carroll in his poem have no meaning. Although "Jabberwocky" is a nonsense poem, it does tell a story which Scott has reproduced successfully in his translation (together with the nonsense words).

On the level of "language varieties", Scott has retained equivalence of "nonsense". He has created a nonsense poem which is a successful poem in the target language system.

On the level of "texture", Scott has retained equivalence of lay-out and punctuation (with some minor exceptions). One could state that, unlike Raffel, Scott has remained quite "faithful" to the original poem without betraying the target language system.

It is necessary to emphasize that a simultaneous equivalence of all the levels i.e. "vocabulary", "language varieties", "texture" and "aesthetic effect" (Lotfipour-Saedi 1990:389-397) will never be possible in the

translation of poetry. The translator must sacrifice some aspects in order to retain others. Once he has examined the original poem for its most important features and established a system of priorities, he can only translate it accordingly and accept the fact that a perfect translation is impossible and that the nature of poetry is overwhelmingly subjective.

The numerous problems involved in the translation of poetry will never have clear-cut solutions. The translator is not only limited by the constraints of his own language, but also by his incomplete knowledge and perception of his language and the language he is translating from. Although the poetic translator seems to fight a losing battle because a poem in translation can never equal the work of art of the original poem, people continue to translate poetry and tc read poetry in translation. If we consider that people who speak the same language often fail to communicate successfully we may begin to grasp the complexity and difficulty of the task of a translator - particularly the translator of poetry which is a very artistic and creative genre.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Apel, F. Literarische Übersetzung. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1983.

Bassnett-McGuire, S. Translation Studies. London and New York: Methuen, 1980.

Bassnett, S & Lefevere, A. (eds). Translation: History and Culture. London: Printer, 1990.

Bates, E.S. Intertraffic: Studies in Translation. London: Jonathan Cape, 1943.

Bates, E.S. Modern Translation. London: Oxford University Press, 1936.

Biguenet, J and Schulte, R. (eds). The Craft of Translation. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Blake, K. Play, Games and Sport: The literary Works of Lewis Carroll. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1974.

Brislin, R.W. (ed). Translation:Applications and Research. New York: Gardner Press, 1976.

Brower, R.A. (ed). On Translation. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1959.

Catford, J.C. A Linguistic Theory of Translation. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Collingwood, S.D. The Life and Letters of Lewis Carroll. London: Fisher, 1899.

Collins. German-English Dictionary. London and Glasgow: Collins, 1980.

Davie, D. Poetry in Translation. Open University Press, 1975.

de Beaugrande, R. Factors in a Theory of Poetic Translation. The Netherlands, 1978.

Dolitsky, M. 'The Translation of Nonsense' in Babel: International Journal of Translation, Vol 34/2: Amsterdam, 1988.

Elagin, I. 'Certain Difficulties in Translating Poetry' in The World of Translation. New York: Pen American Centre, 1987.

Erbe, H. The Violet in the Crucible: On Translating Poetry. Grahamstown: Rhodes University Press, 1964.

Frawley, W. Translation. USA: Associated University Presses, 1984.

Gardner, M. (ed.). The Annotated Alice. England: Fletcher and Son, 1970.

Gräs, Korlén and Malmberg (eds). Theory and Practice of Translation. Stockholm: Lang Druck Ltd, 1978.

Gutt, E. Translation and Relevance. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991.

Heath, P. The Philosopher's Alice. London: Academy Editions, 1974.

Hermans, T. (ed). The Manipulation of Literature. London and Sydney: Croom Helm, 1985.

Holmes, J.S. (ed). The Nature of Translation. Bratislava: Slovac Academy of Sciences, 1970.

Holmes, Lambert and Van den Broeck (eds). Literature and Translation. Leuven/Belgium: Acco, 1978.

House, J. A Model for Translation Quality Assessment. Tübingen: TBL Gunter Narr, 1977.

Italiaander, R. (ed). Übersetzen. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum Verlag, 1965

Jones, F.R. 'On Aboriginal Sufferance: A Process Model of Poetic Translating' in Target 1:2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1989.

Kelly, L. The True Interpreter. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979.

Kloepfer, R. Die Theorie der Literarischen Übersetzung. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1967.

Lefevere, A. Translating Literature: The German Tradition. Assen, Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1977.

Lefevere, A. Translating Poetry: Seven Strategies and a Blueprint. Assen, Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1977.

Lennon, F.B. Lewis Carrol. London: Cassell and Co, 1947.

Levy, J. Die literarische Übersetzung. Frankfurt am Main Bonn, 1969.

Lotfipour-Saedi, K. 'Discourse Analysis and the Problem of Translation Equivalence' in Meta: Translator's Journal, Vol 35 No 2, Montreal, June 1990.

Melby, A. 'The Mentions of Equivalence in Translation' in Meta: Translator's Journal, Vol 35 No 1, Montreal, March 1990.

Mounin, J. Die Literarische Übersetzung. Frankfurt am Main, Bonn: 1969.

Newmark, P. Approaches to Translation. Oxford, etc: Pergamon Press, 1982.

Newmark, P. A Textbook of Translation. London: Prentice Hall, 1988.

Nida, E. Toward a Science of Translating. Leiden: Brill, 1964.

Nida, E. and Taber, R. The Theory and Practice of Translation. Leiden: E.J. Brill. 1974.

Oettinger, A.G. Automatic Language Translation. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Phillips, R. (ed). Aspects of Alice. England: Richard Clay, 1974

Postgate, J.P. Translation and Translations. London: G. Bell and Sons Ltd, 1922.

Proetz, V. The Astonishment of Words. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1971.

Raffel, B. The Forked Tongue. The Hague: Mouton, 1971.

Reiss, K. Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Übersetzungskritik. München: Max Heuber Verlag, 1971.

Reiss, K. Texttyp und Übersetzungsmethode. Kronberg: Scriptor Verlag, 1976.

Savory, T.H. The Art of Translation. London: Jonathan Cape, 1968.

Schmähling, W. (ed). Naturalismus. Band 12. Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam, 1986.

Schulz, G. 'Poetry in an Unpoetic World' in Babel: Journal of the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teacher's Associations, Number 24: Melbourne, October 1963.

Sebeok, T (ed). Style in Language. New York: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1960.

Secker and Warburg. Aspects of Translation. London: Robert Cunningham and Sons Ltd, 1958.

Snell-Hornby. Translation Studies - An Integrated Approach. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Co, 1988.

Steiner, G. After Babel. London, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Steiner, T.R. English Translation Theory. 1650-1800. Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1975.

Stewart, S. Nonsense. London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.

Summerfield, G. (ed). Voices. London: Butler & Tanner Ltd., 1968.

Toury, G. In Search of a Theory of Translation. Tel Aviv: Porter Institute, 1980.

Wilss, W. The Science of Translation. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1982.

Woodhouselee, H.F.L. Essays on the Principle of Translation. London: J.M. Dent and Co., 1813.

Author Do Carmo F N
Name of thesis Levels of equivalence in the translation of two poems 1991

PUBLISHER:
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
©2013

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg Library website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the Library website.