

Translating Dane Zajc’s “Krokar”: A Commentary

Olivia Hellewell

List of Abbreviations

- SL: Source language
- ST: Source text
- TL: Target language
- TS: Translation studies
- TT: Target text
- TT1: Target text 1, “Raven,” translated by Sonja Krvanja (2000)
- TT2: Target text 2, “The Crow,” translated by Erica Johnson Debeljak (2004)

The contemporary Slovene poet Dane Zajc was born in 1929 in the remote Slovenian village of Zgornja Javoršica, which is situated in the mountains of central Slovenia. This remote and natural location had a profound impact upon his poetry, as did traumatic events which he witnessed as a young boy during WW II.

His first poems were published in 1948 in the literary journal *Mladinska revija*, and his list of published collections spans from *Požgana trava* (Scorched grass 1958), to *Dol dol* (Down down 1998), with five collections and several dramatic works in between.

One particular poem, entitled “Krokar,” from his ultimate collection demonstrates many of the features typical of Zajc’s work: concise language, natural imagery, and a strong sense of sound. Two English translations of “Krokar” already exist, the first of which (TT1) is by the native Slovene speaker Sonja Krvanja and was published in 2000, and the second (TT2) by native English speaker Erica Johnson Debeljak in 2004. “Krokar” presents an interesting translation challenge because the words operate on both conceptual and phonetic levels.

Simultaneous layers of meaning are also at play in terms of the poem’s themes. The key image is that of a large black bird; a solitary being, who is ambiguous in character and stance. The reader is unsure of the bird’s nature, as conflicting images of an ominous moral character (“he consumes | starry eyes”) and impression of greatness (“on his wings shines | black contempt of the kingdom | of mystery”) are simultaneously presented. The poem also centers on another key image of flight, which emphasizes the wandering nature of the bird as he journeys through the mysterious space. This flight then becomes key to the poem’s second layer of meaning, as it is through the bird’s flight that we experience his solitude. This notion of

solitude and loneliness alludes to a much greater experience beyond that of the bird, as it extends to general concepts of solitude, mystery, and the loneliness of man. This dual metaphor is enabled by the ambiguous nature of the poem's "voice," as described here by the poet and literary critic Boris A Novak:

[S]imbolno dvoumna pesniška govorica omogoča dve enako legitimni branji – da gre za podobe samih živali in za prispridobe človeškega bivanja – ki z vzporednim učinkovanjem razpirata kompleksno eksistencialno sporočilo.

(The symbolically ambiguous poetic voice enables two equally legitimate readings—metaphors of solitary animals and allegories of human nature—which with a parallel effect reveal a complex existential question. [Novak 2007: 254])

Thus the reader experiences not only the physical journey of the bird, but a metaphysical journey through human experiences. And the "complex existential question" to which Novak refers runs throughout many of Zajc's poetry collections. The manner in which Zajc succeeds in communicating existential ideas through natural imagery and relatively few words is reflected in this statement by the Slovene author and literary critic Aleš Berger: "Molčečnej si, a povedal si že toliko stvari. Samotnej, a se v toliko tisoč stihih razprl" (Being a silent man, you've told us so much. A man of solitude, yet you have disclosed yourself in thousands of lines) (Berger 1995: 383). This reference to Zajc's personal nature and the link to the theme of solitude in "Krokar" suggests how Zajc's personal experiences are woven into the fabric of his poetry and how they came to influence his style.

In terms of form, "Krokar" is (like many other poetic works from his later period) widely considered to be written in free verse form, although Novak claims that this is not necessarily the case:

Za pesmi iz zbirke Dol dol bi večina ljubiteljev poezije in celo strokovnjakov najbrž zatrdila, da so napisane v t.i prostem verzu. Vendar hipotično močni ritem tu zbranih Zajčevih pesmi nazorno kaže, da je stopnja ritmične in zvočne organiziranosti verza izjemno visoka."

(For the poems from the collection Down down, the majority of poetry aficionados and even professionals would assert that they are written in so called free verse form. Yet the strong hypnotic rhythm of this collection of Zajc's poetry explicitly shows that the level of rhythmic and sonorous organization is incredibly high. [Novak 2007: 261])

Despite Novak's claim that the level of rhythmic organization is high, in the case of "Krokar" this does not equate to the presence of a regular metric

pattern. For free verse is 'poetry in which the meter is variable' (Lennard 1996: 21). The metric analysis which I conducted on "Krokar" can be found as appendix 2. From this analysis it is possible to see that there are certain stress patterns which frequently repeat themselves (unstressed-stressed-unstressed), but never at regular intervals. This means that the poem is written in free verse, but demonstrates, as Novak has claimed, a high degree of "sonorous organization."

Structurally, the poem consists of thirty-four lines and seven stanzas. As the metrical analysis shows, the meter is irregular apart from the non-rhyming tercet of lines 7–9, all of which are ten beats each. The effect of this irregular meter, but with the repetition of certain stress patterns creates a sense of anticipation—a rhythm builds, but then changes. There is a sense of tension and expectation, not only due to the alternating beats of the words, but which is also reinforced in the poem's dark tone, through phrases such as "na posteljo nočno" (the bed of night) and "kraljestva skrivnosti" (kingdom of mystery).

Having analyzed the poem's form, it became clear that there was no single feature which demanded priority over any other when considering a new translation. That is to say, that there is no regular meter to recreate, and no fixed rhyme pattern by which to guide a new translation. To attempt to recreate the exact meter would be to create a 'marked word order' in English, a concept which is discussed by Nada Grošelj in her paper "Word Order and Markedness in a Slovenian Poem and Its English Translations." Grošelj states that "the preservation of the original function by employing structural devices congenial to the target language may obscure the original cohesive devices" (Grošelj 2004: 174). Thus in trying to recreate an exact structural replica of "Krokar" in English would be to distort what Grošelj calls the poem's "original function," by making a concerted effort to recreate an aspect in the TT which isn't marked in the ST.

Nevertheless, after having analyzed "Krokar," there was one non-structural element of the poem which appeared to be of utmost importance. This was the ST's sonorous qualities; its assonance, consonance, and rich phonetic texture.

Many secondary sources repeatedly use language which alludes to a strong association between Zajc's work and sound. Novak in particular has used language which links Zajc's poetry to a very sonorous realm, even going as far as to refer to Zajc's readers as "listeners": "In vendar se bralcu (točneje: poslušalcu, saj je izredna zvočnost te pesmi vsiljuje celo pri tihem, vizualnem branju) zdi, kot da vse razume. (And yet to the reader (or more accurately: listener, since the extraordinary sonority of this poem presents itself as a quiet, visual reading) it seems that he understands everything. [Novak 2007: 235]).

In this context Novak is referring to a specific poem, “Asskalla” (Rožengruntar 1974), but adds that “Zajčeve pesmi iz tega obdobja nas nagovarjajo s svojim magnetičnim ritmom” (Zajc’s poems from this period speak to us with their magnetic rhythm [Novak 2007: 234]), thus granting this statement relevance to a wider range of Zajc’s poetic oeuvre.

Of Zajc’s language it has also been said that “[i]t is expressive and rhythmical, colorful and conjuring, elementary and elliptical, clear and yet polysemous. In a paradoxical way it combines meaning with pure sound [...]” (Rakusa 2000: 44).

This discourse on the prominence of sound in Zajc’s work permeates almost all secondary literature which has been written about the poet. Further to this, evidence exists outside of academic writings in the form of audio recordings (Dane Zajc and Janez Škof 2008), musical adaptations (Chris Eckman, *The Last Side of the Mountain* 2008) and documentation of concerts and readings where Zajc performed his poetry. One such account comes from the Slovene author, poet and literary critic Aleš Debeljak, who speaks of a recital which Zajc performed to music with the accordionist Janez Škof:

Hovering above the squeaky wooden chairs of the front row, I see the faces of excited poets who have gathered to see the greatest of the great in our literary profession [...] It is April 1994 and finally evenings of live poetry have resumed at the Club. To describe this particular performance, the Slovenian language is most appropriate in its denial of a distinction between a song (that comes from a throat) and a poem (that lies written on a blank page). In English, the words sent up a barrier between the two notions: in Slovenian, it is the same word. (Debeljak 2004: 24)

This account documents another element to Zajc’s work, that of a performer, of an oral poet. It also highlights the fact that the word for “poem” and “song” are one and the same in Slovene, thus suggesting that the boundary between the written, silent word, and the spoken, sonorous one, was not as distinct for Zajc as the English language would define it.

Furthermore, Zajc himself once stated that “during my childhood I served as an altar boy. Rhythm, language and metaphor, the responses to prayers, were the first sounds of the world for me, the first whisperings of poetry” (Zajc 1997: 110).

All of these sources, which include testimony from the poet himself, affirm my own personal interpretation of the poem’s most dominant feature: its sonorous qualities. With such a wide variety of sources upholding this belief, it became of paramount importance to prioritize these features in translation. This is an aspect of the ST which was

not always successfully retained in both existing translations. This presented further reason to create a translation which upheld these features.

Sound within the field of TS is not a subject which has received much attention. This, one could posit, is due to multiplicity of challenges which arise when attempting to translate sound. A fact which, as with many other issues which arise when translating poetry, prevents any method other than the analysis of individual source texts being possible. This is something reiterated by Susan Bassnett, who has said "rarely do studies of poetry and translation try to discuss methodological problems from a non-empirical position, and yet it is precisely that type of study that is most valuable and most needed." (Bassnett 2002: 83). With a lack of non-empirical discussion surrounding poetry translation, it is not surprising that there is even less concrete analysis concerning sound in translation. Structural differences between languages, varying numbers of rhyming words, syllables, stress patterns, and endless other semantic discrepancies create an infinite number of impossible combinations of meaning and sound.

This lack of established theory specifically concerning sound in TS presented a challenge when looking for a theoretical framework with which to approach my own translation of "Krokar." To understand the issues present in sound translation, two discussions of the matter which have been contributed by prominent scholars of TS in the past fifty years were considered. These were made by James Holmes in his 1968 paper "Poem and Metapoem: Poetry from Dutch to English," and by Andre Lefevere in his 1975 *Seven Strategies and a Blueprint* model.

Holmes examines the issues faced when translating the Dutch poet Snoek's "Rustiek landschapje," in which there is a juxtaposition "of ganzen (geese) and onze tantes (our aunts), with such descriptive terms [...] [which are] reinforced acoustically by a complex system of alliteration and internal rhyme" (Holmes 1988: 16). He highlights how ultimately the translator is faced with the choice of "either reconstructing the acoustic qualities of the Dutch at the cost of shifting the nature of the poem's major images [...] or retaining the images [...] [and] failing to parallel the acoustic qualities of the poem" (Holmes 1988: 16).

Lefevere's approach moves away from this "either/or" dichotomy, by presenting a model which explores the different modes of translating poetry depending on which specific elements are present in the source text (ST). His starting point is that not all of these elements can be simultaneously achieved in one single translation, but by analyzing numerous translations of the same poem, Lefevere examined which translation approaches were most effective in the case of his chosen ST.

His chosen ST was the Latin epic “Poem 64” by Catallus. Despite his work being based in an entirely different literary context, Lefevere’s model comes closest to offering a model which is flexible enough to be applied to a different language, time period and poetic style, whilst still providing a level of detail in assessing what decisions must be made in order to retain sonorous qualities in poetry translation. Lefevere asserts that “if one is faced with an original work of literary art, one can translate it, because of the very nature of linguistic and literary conventions, only in a limited number of ways” (Lefevere: 1975: 4). This further supports the argument that my translation strategy should focus on one particular aspect of the poem, and due to the amount of primary and secondary evidence which outlines the prominence of sonorous elements, this further justifies the decision to prioritize sound when making translation decisions.

In the case of what Lefevere has termed “phonemic translation,” he claims that, “[f]idelity to the source text means, purely and simply, fidelity to its sound, to the near exclusion of all other elements” (Lefevere 1975: 19). But what he also points out, through analyzing what a phonemic translation of Catallus’ “Poem 64,” is that the translator cannot “render the source text ‘sound for sound’” (Lefevere 1975: 20) in any exact way, because the translation will only ever be an “approximation to the sounds of the source text as filtered through the ‘phonemic grid’ of the target language” (Lefevere 1975: 20).

Therefore whilst Lefevere provides a description of phonemic translation, and more importantly acknowledges it as a valid translation strategy in itself, he also acknowledges its limitations, which are that sticking too closely to the sound of the ST can obscure the meaning in the TT, and that any attempt to render the sonorous qualities of a text will only ever be an approximation.

Given that Lefevere’s methodology states that a phonemic translation will only ever create an approximation of the sound, my strategy will therefore strive to create an equivalent sonorous effect, approximating the sound of the Slovene ST as far as is possible in the English TT. This return to a notion of “equivalence” posits my strategy within the terms of Eugene Nida’s Equivalence Theory, which he outlined in his 1964 *Towards a Science of Translating*. Many of the terms previously used within the field of TS, “such as ‘literal,’ ‘free’ and ‘faithful’ [...] are discarded by Nida in favor of ‘two basic orientations’ or ‘types of equivalence’ (Nida 1964: 159): 1) formal equivalence; and 2) dynamic equivalence” (Munday 2012: 66). Nida defines these two types of equivalence as:

- 1) Formal equivalence: Formal equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content... One is concerned that the message in the receptor language should

match as closely as possible the different elements in the source language.

2) Dynamic equivalence: Dynamic, later "functional," equivalence is based on what Nida calls "the principle of equivalent effect," where "the relationship between receptor and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message." (Nida 1964: 159)

In the case of sound in translation, these two distinctions in equivalence present a considerable challenge. In acknowledging Lefevere's statement that a replication of the ST's sound is only ever an approximation, this sits within the definition of dynamic equivalence, as the translation will seek to create an equivalent effect for the receptor of the TT. However, the wish to not carry out a phonemic translation at the cost of completely distorting the original meaning of the ST, and therefore also "focus[ing] attention on the message itself" places this aim within the definition of formal equivalence. My strategy will therefore prioritize the sonorous elements of the ST throughout, but will retain an awareness of Nida's formal equivalence in order to prevent the prioritization of sound completely distorting the form of the ST.

My translation of "Krokar" is as follows:

Crow

He consumes

starry eyes at the break of day,

The most appetizing part of night's face,

which cools itself on tall pillows.

Upon it he lands, on the bed of night

and caws, caws.

When he flies, he flies through solitude.

As if through a cave within a cave,

which accompanies him, while renewing itself.

When he swoops

down, his wings mimic

the sound of the wind. Of a scythe.
As if the wind whisks down from the mountain.
As if the scythe slices through the sky.

Sometimes he flies in a pair.
Even then, his flight
spiralling into solitude.
She who follows,
keeps a quiet distance.
Their wings do not
touch. In the space of
two circles they both fly.

He sings in three ways
in three different tongues.
All are meant for himself.
For his own ear, for conversations with himself.

This hooked bird is no imitator.
If he is, it's of only himself
of his voices, the complex
language of winding calls.

When he flies low
on his wings shines
black contempt of the
kingdom of mystery.

The first point to note is the translation of the title. In the 1997 Grad Leeming Slovene-English dictionary, *krokar* is given as: 'crow; raven'. Krvanja's TT1 was entitled "Raven," and Johnson Debeljak's TT2 "The Crow." As both existing translations had opted for each variant, the option

of a third variant, "rook" was contemplated for the new translation. This option would reinforce the repetition of the 'k' sound which is present in the original, and also rhymes with "hook," which is alluded to in the Slovene *kljukast* 'hooked', which appears in the sixth stanza. However, whilst this decision would have arguably created an "equivalent effect," in line with Nida's dynamic equivalence, the option of "crow" manages to replicate a level of phonetic equivalence, whilst at the same time retaining the dictionary definition, and therefore a degree of formal equivalence. "Crow," therefore, manages to combine a degree of phonemic translation, without completely changing the meaning of the word. I opted to leave out the determiner in English, as "the Crow" implies a level of specificity.

As my analysis of the ST shows, the poem is anything but specific; its tone is created through ambiguous phrases and descriptions of non-specific places. Therefore "crow" could be any crow, just as the crow in Zajc's "Krokar" could stand for anyone, or any human experience.

The most contentious decision which had to be made concerns the final line of the first stanza. It reads, "in kljuje, kljuje" (and pecks, pecks). Here it can be seen that not only does the Slovene verb *kljukati* (to peck) echo the "k" in *krokar*, but it also has etymological links with the word *kljuka*, from Russian, meaning "palica z zakrivljenim koncem" (stick with a hooked/curved end [Snoj 2003: 281]). The repetition of what seems like a fairly regular bird-like action in English, also creates a layer of imagery in Slovene whereby the hooked beak of the bird complements the action that it carries out. Further to this, the word *kljukast* (hooked) carries strong connotations of the swastika, with *kljukasti križ* (hooked cross) being the Slovene translation of swastika. This added connotation reinforces the ambiguous moral nature of the crow.

On examination of the two previous translations of "Krokar" it is clear that neither TT1 nor TT2 are successful in retaining these layers of information. Sonja Krvanja's rendering of "a black bird rapping" is neither close in form nor content, and Erica Johnson Debeljak's "and pecks, pecks" retains the closest formal equivalence, yet the echo of the "k," "k" on the first syllable is lost.

It could be said that TT2 achieves the most successful level of balance between phonemic translation and formal equivalence, as my strategy set out to do. Yet because it is the first syllable in Johnson-Debeljak's translation of "pecks, pecks" which is stressed, it is the "p" that the reader hears, rather than the "k" at the end. The decision to translate "kljuje, kljuje" as "caws, caws," and thus prioritize sound over formal equivalence would not have been made if it were not for the substantial quantity of secondary material which upholds the importance of sound in such a fervent manner. Most importantly, the audio recording of "Krokar" read by Zajc himself revealed that the sound of "kljuje, kljuje" echoed the

call of the bird. This is of course a subjective interpretation, but in line with my strategy to produce a translation which prioritized the sonorous elements of the poem, it stands as the most successful solution in order to achieve this aim. It could also be argued that as formal equivalence theory advocates a focus on form, the mirroring of the “c” in “crow” and the “c” in “caws” create an equivalent effect in form for the English language receptor.

The third stanza demonstrates a particularly successful application of my translation strategy. The original line reads “kakor da kosa kosi zrak.” TT1 reads “As if the scythe cuts air,” whilst TT2 reads “Like scythes slicing the air.” In line with my strategy, it was decided that this example of consonance was a key sonorous element within the poem. Once again the ST is echoing the “k” of *krokar*, and whilst it was not possible to recreate the “k” sound without completely altering the meaning of the line, it was possible to recreate the consonance. My translation thus reads, “As if the scythe slices through the sky.” To change the content completely would not only have disregarded the notion of formal equivalence, but it would crucially have disrupted the continuation from the previous lines in the stanza. This decision has deviated from the literal meaning of *zrak* ‘air’, by replacing “air” with “sky,” but this has upheld the sonorous quality of the line, without straying from the imagery entirely. It has allowed the repetition of three consonants, which is present in the ST, and which hasn’t been achieved in either TT1 or TT2.

An interesting grammatical feature of the ST occurs in line 22. Here is an example of the Slovene Dual, a grammatical number which here expresses the actions of two birds, thus removing any ambiguity as to their number. This emphasis is not necessarily marked in the ST, but it is nevertheless a feature of the ST which clearly expresses that there are two, and only two, birds present in this line. A decision was therefore taken to translate *letita* as ‘they both fly’, so as to eliminate any ambiguity as the ST does, and to ensure that “the message in the receptor language [matches] as closely as possible the different elements in the source language” (Nida 1964: 159).

This line also demonstrates how my strategy has attempted to recreate the form of the ST as closely as possible. Unlike TT1 and TT2, my translation simultaneously retains the sole three syllables and the literal meaning that occur on line 22. TT1 has re-structured the information so that lines 21 and 22 read “They fly in the space of | two circles,” which retains the three syllables on line 22, but has re-ordered the information. This translation, it could be argued, is successful in that through the addition of “two circles” it has re-iterated the dual number, whilst retaining the number of syllables. Yet TT2 has altered both the form of these two lines, and though adding extra information has also increased the number of syllables.

It reads, "They fly each in the space | of their own circle." This restructuring of content appears to be unnecessary if it is not with the aim of upholding any metric aspect of the poem.

It may be said that my decision to prioritize sonorous elements in "Krokar," which originated in evidence beyond the ST itself, is problematic as these other features were not present in the ST, and therefore should not be present in a translation. This multiplicity of versions was a consideration when undertaking translation decisions, but they served to formulate an analysis of the ST, rather than to undermine the ST itself. As the American poet and theorist Charles Bernstein has stated:

There is often no one original written version of a poem. Even leaving aside the status of the manuscript, there often exists various and discrepant printings – I should like to say textual performances – in magazines and books, with changes in wording but also in spacing, font, paper and moreover, contexts of readership; making for a plurality of versions, none of which can claim sole authority. (Bernstein 1998: 8)

It is therefore illogical to claim that one version of the text—whether it be a printed version, or the audio recording performed by Zajc himself—has sole authority over any other. By accepting and utilizing this plurality of versions, it grants an equal status to the audio recording, which legitimizes the analysis gained from this format. Despite there being slight differences between the two forms of the poem, the recording was crucial to understanding the stress pattern in the ST, which to a non-native speaker of the TL is crucial to understanding the poem's rhythm.

In relation to TT1 and TT2, my translation of "Krokar" could be said to be, in broad terms, positioned between the two existing translations. This is because, as was outlined, TT1 often adhered very closely to notions of formal equivalence, and adhered to the Slovene syntax as closely as possible. For example the opening two lines of "Consumes | star eyes at the break of day" mirrors the single word of the first line in the ST, but in English sounds unusual without the presence of a third person pronoun. TT2, on the other hand, has in this case taken a much more dynamic approach, to use Nida's terms, having restructured the first two lines to read: "In the early morning | he gobbles down starry eyes." This creates a much more natural word order in English, but has lost the impact of the short first line, in which Zajc opens with an ambiguous, sinister-sounding statement. My translation of the opening two lines has therefore, as my strategy intended, focused on the form of the poem, but unlike TT1 has succeeded in doing so without distorting the syntactic structure of the TL. This is just one of several examples where my translation has attempted to position itself between what could be called the "two extremes" of the two

translations. This could not be applied as a formula throughout, as TT1 does not always adhere to principles of formal equivalence—there are also examples of a drastic restructuring of information, such as in line 18 which simply reads “She.” This word does not occur singularly in the ST, and so this translation decision does not match “as closely as possible the different elements in the source language” (Nida 1964: 159).

By intending to retain an awareness of Nida’s formal equivalence theory throughout my translation, this ‘guideline’ was never going to permit the creation of what Lefevere defined as a phonemic translation. There are not enough examples of where I have prioritized sound over content, with the exception of the aforementioned lines six and 14, to be able to claim that my translation of “Krokar” is a phonemic translation per se. However, in attempting to create such a translation, my approach has recognized and retained features which are central to the work of Dane Zajc and which were overlooked in previous translations.

University of Nottingham

Appendix 1

Krokar (Zajc 2008)

Požira

navsezgodaj zvezdne oči.
Najbolj slastni del nočnega obraza,
ki se ohlaja na visokih vzglavnikih.
Nanjo se spusti, na posteljo nočno,
in kljuje, kljuje.

Kadar leti, leti skozi samoto,
Kakor skozi votlino v votlini,
ki gre z njim in se sproti obnavlja.

Kadar se spusti nizko,
perutnice oponašajo
glas vetra. Kose.
Kakor da je veter planil z gore.
Kakor da kosa kosi zrak.

Včasih leti v dvoje.
Tudi takrat je njegov let
padanje v kroge samote.
Tista, ki jo spremlja
je v tihi razdalji.
Ne dotikata se s perutnicami.
V prostorih iz dveh kolobarjev
letita.

Poje na tri načine.
V treh različnih govoricah.
Vse so sebi namenjene.
Za lastno uho, za pogovor s sabo.

Ni oponašalec, ptič kljukasti.
Če oponaša, tadaj sebe,
tedaj svoje glasove, zapleteno
govorico iz vijugastih klicev.

Ko leti nizko
se mu na perutih lesketa
črno kljubovanje kraljestva
skrivnosti.

Appendix 2: Metric analysis of “Krokar” (u = unstressed syllable
x = stressed syllable)

uxu

uuxuu xu ux
xu xu u xuu uxu
u u uxu u uxu uxuu
xu u ux, u xuu xu,
u xu, xu.

xu ux, ux uuxu,
ux u uxu u uxu,
u u x u u xu uxu.

xu u ux xx,
uuxu uuxuu
u xu. xu.
ux uu xu ux uxu.
ux u xu xu x.

uxu ux uxu.
xu ux u ux u
xuu u xu uxu.
xu, u u xu
x u xu uxu.
x uxuu u u xuxuu.
u uxu u x uuxu
uxu.

xu u x uxu.
u x uxu uuxu.
ux u xu uxuu.
u xu ux, u uxu xu.

x uuxu, u xuu.
u uuxu, ux xu,
ux xu uxu, uu xu
uuxu uxuu xu.

xu ux xu
u x u uxu uux
xu uuxu uxu
uxu.

Appendix 3: Translation of "Krokar" by Sonja Krvanja (2000; TT1)

Raven

Devours

the star eyes at daybreak.
The ambrosial part of the night face,
cooling itself on high pillows.
He dives on it, the night bed,
a black bird rapping.

When he flies, he flies through solitude.
As through a hollow within a hollow,
that escorts him, perpetually recreating itself.

When he swoops down his wings imitate
the voice of the wind. Of a scythe.
As if the wind plunged down from a mountain.
As if the scythe cuts air.

At times he flies in twos.
Even then his sailing is but
falling into circles of solitude.
She
keeps a quiet distance.
Their wings don't touch.
They fly in the space of
two circles.

He sings in three ways.
In three distinctive tongues.
All three are meant for himself.
For his ear, for conversations with the self.

No imitator, this bird.
If he imitates, he echoes himself,
his voices, intricate
language of curved calls.

When he flies low
on his wings
glimmers
a black defiance
of the kingdom of
mystery.

Appendix 4: Translation of “Krokar” by Erica Johnson Debeljak (2004; TT2)

The Crow

In the early morning
he gobbles down starry eyes.
The most delicate part of night’s face
cooled on lofty pillows.
He lands on the bed of night
and pecks, pecks.

When he flies, he flies through solitude.
As if through a cave into another cave,
the cave is always going with him, eternally renewed.

When he flies low,
his wings imitate
the voice of the wind, of scythes.
Like wind rushing down from the mountain.
Like scythes slicing the air.

Sometimes he flies with another.
Yet even then his flight
plunges into orbits of solitude.
She follows him
in a quiet distance.
Their feathers don’t touch.
They fly each in the space
of their own circle.

He sings different ways.
In three different languages.
Each one only meant for himself.
For his own ear, for his own conversation.
He mocks not, bird of hooks.
If he mocks, he mocks only himself,
his own voices, the tangled
speech of his meandering calls.

When he flies low,
his feathers shimmer darkly.
The black defiance of a mysterious realm.

Works Cited

- Bassnett, Susan and Lefevere, Andre. 1998. *Constructing cultures: Essays on literary translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bassnett, Susan. 2002. 1st ed. 1980. *Translation studies*. London: Routledge.
- Bernardi, Adria. 2003. Whispered urgency: Translating sound and momentum in Raffaello Baldini's "E'Malan." *Translation Review* 66: 34–38.
- Berstein, Charles. 1998. *Close listening: Poetry and the performed word*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Debeljak, Aleš. 2004. The biography of solitude in the poetry of Dane Zajc. In *Barren harvest: Selected poems translated by Erica Johnson Debeljak*. Buffalo, NY: White Pine Press.
- Eckman, Chris. 2008. The last side of the mountain. Ljubljana: Sanje (Audio CD).
- Grošelj, Nada. 2004. Word order and markedness in a Slovenian poem and its English translations. *Elope: Studies in the English Language and Literature in Slovenia* 1(1–2): 173–94.
- Grošelj, Nada. 2005. Belletristic translation into English: What price the same order of Words? *Elope: Studies in the English Language and Literature in Slovenia*. 2(1–2): 255–68.
- Holmes, James S. 1988. *Translated! Papers on literary translation and translation studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Jackson, Richard, Grafenauer et al. 1995. *Dane Zajc*. Ed. Boris A. Novak. Ljubljana: Nova Revija.
- Lefevere, André. 1975. The translation of poetry: Some observations and a model. *Comparative Literature Studies* 7(4): 384–92.
- Lefevere, André. 1975. *Translating poetry: Seven strategies and a blueprint*. Amsterdam: Van Gorcum.
- Munday, Jeremy. 2012. *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Nida, Eugene. 1964. *Towards a science of translating*. Leiden: E J Brill.
- Pavlič, Darja. 2003. *Funckije podobja v poeziji K. Koviča, D. Zajca in G. Strniše*. Ljubljana: Slavistično Društvo.
- Robinson, Peter. 2010. *Poetry and translation: The art of the impossible*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Taufer, Veno, ed. 1995. *Vilenica 95: Mednarodna literarna nagrada*. Ljubljana: Slovene Writers' Association.
- Zajc, Dane. 1978. "Igra besed in tišin." In *Med tradicijo in modernizmom: Pričevanja o sodobni poeziji*, ed. France Pibernik, 158–64. Ljubljana: Slovenska Matica.
- Zajc, Dane and Jože Tisnikar. 1997. *Krokar*. Ljubljana: Edina.

- Zajc, Dane. 2000. *Scorpions: Selected poems*. Translated by Sonja Krvanja. Ljubljana: Slovene Writers' Association.
- Zajc, Dane. 2004. *Barren harvest: Selected poems translated by Erica Johnson Debeljak*. Buffalo, NY: White Pine Press.
- Zajc, Dane. 2007. *Kepa pepela*. Ljubljana: Mladinska Knjiga.
- Zajc, Dane. 2008. *V Belo: Zbrane pesmi*. Ljubljana: Študentska Založba.
- Zajc, Dane and Škof, Janez. 2008. "Ogenj v ustih." In *V Belo: Zbrane pesmi*. Ljubljana: Študentska Založba (Audio CD).

POVZETEK

KOMENTAR K PREVAJANJU KROKARJA DANETA ZAJCA

Članek se ukvarja z vlogo zvoka oz. zvena v pesmi Daneta Zajca Krokara iz zbirke *Dol dol* (1988). Razmišlja, kakšen prevajalski izziv predstavljajo zvočni elementi pesmi in kako uspešno so bili ohranjeni v obstoječih angleških prevodih. Kompleksnost ohranjanja zvočnosti v prevodu ni nov pojav v prevodoslovju, vendar je kljub temu teoretično manj podprt. Metodologija, ki se dotika problematike zvočnosti pri prevajanju poezije, je Lefevrejeva *Seven Strategies and a Blueprint* (1975), v kateri opisuje, kar sam definira kot 'fonemski prevod', in analizira odločitve, ki jih mora prevajalec sprejeti, če želi pri prevajanju poezije izpostaviti zvočne elemente. Pričujoči članek skuša ob Lefevrejevi metodologiji in Nidovem pojmovanju ekvivalence (1964) ter pregledu napisanega o Zajčevi poetiki priti do smernic za nov prevod pesmi, ki bi v ospredje postavil zvočne kvalitete Krokara. Članek se zaključi s komentarjem novega prevoda in razpravo o mestih, ki so se izkazala za posebej težka in zanimiva, ter premislekom, kako učinkovite so bile predlagane rešitve pri ohranjanju zvočnega vtisa aliteracij Zajčevega Krokara.