

Translating Children's Literature: Case Study of "Ježeva kućica" by Branko Ćopić

Jakšić, Mirta

Master's thesis / Diplomski rad

2012

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku, Filozofski fakultet**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:142:100411>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#) / [Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-08-19**



Repository / Repozitorij:

[FFOS-repository - Repository of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Osijek](#)



Sveučilište J.J. Strossmayera u Osijeku

Filozofski fakultet

Diplomski studij povijesti i engleskog jezika prevoditeljskog usmjerenja

Mirta Jakšić

**Translating Children's Literature:
Case Study of "Ježeva kućica" by Branko Ćopić**

Diplomski rad

Mentor:

izv. prof. dr. sc. Marija Omazić

Komentor:

Romana Čačija, viši lektor

Osijek, 2012.

ABSTRACT

The subject of this paper is children's literature and the translation of literary works written for children. Various aspects of these two subjects are discussed in order to give an overview of the field. The development of the literature for children is described and its definition attempted. Some general guidelines for translation of children's literature, including poetry, are given. A case study of the translation of "Ježeva kućica" by Branko Ćopić into English is included as an example.

KEY WORDS: children's literature, formal and dynamic equivalence, translation of children's literature, adaptation, translation of poetry, "Ježeva kućica"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. CHILDREN'S LITERATURE	2
2.1. The Notion of Childhood and Texts for the Child	2
2.2. The History of Childhood	2
2.3. The Status of Children's Literature	4
2.4. Literature Written for Children	6
3. SEMANTICS AND TRANSLATION	9
3.1. Translation and Meaning	9
3.2. Equivalence and Meaning	9
3.3. Different Types of Translation	10
3.4. Two Basic Orientations in Translating	12
3.4.1. Formal Equivalence	12
3.4.2. Dynamic Equivalence	13
4. TRANSLATING CHILDREN'S LITERATURE	14
4.1. Norms of Translating Children's Literature	14
4.2. A Child-Centered Theory of Translation	15
4.2.1. Adaptation	16
4.3. Covert Translation	17
5. TRANSLATING POETRY	20
5.1. The Linguistic Basis of Translation of Poetry	20
5.2. The Theory of Translating Poetry	21
6. "JEŽEVA KUĆICA" BY BRANKO ĆOPIĆ	24
6.1. Biography	24
6.2. Short Summary	24
6.3. Language Issues	24
6.4. Case Study	25
6.4.1. The Title	25
6.4.2. The Names	25
6.4.3. Translation Analysis	27
7. CONCLUSION	42
8. REFERENCES	44

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper deals with the issue of children's literature and its translation. Children's literature includes books, stories and poems which are enjoyed by or aimed primarily at children. Books are an important part of children's lives, both at school and at home. For that reason, they can significantly influence children's lives and way of thinking.

Translation of children's literature is not a simple matter. Both the limited experience of children and the cultural differences need to be taken into account when translating for children. Therefore, the issue of children's literature and its translation is a complex one. This paper explores different topics associated with children's literature. Its main objective is to show the state of affairs in the field of children's literature in translation and to provide some guiding principles for translating literary works for children.

Chapter 2 deals with the notion of childhood and children's literature. It describes the history of childhood as a social construction and the emergence of literature written for children. Furthermore, it deals with the issue of the status of children's literature with regard to adult literature.

The issue discussed in Chapter 3 is the relationship between semantics and translation, with a special focus on equivalence. Different types of translation are briefly explained. The emphasis is put on Nida's formal and dynamic equivalence.

Chapter 4 explores the issue of translation of children's literature. The methods which are usually employed when translating for children are discussed, with emphasis on adaptation. It is shown how children's literature tends to be translated covertly and how foreign elements are usually avoided.

The translation of poetry is discussed in Chapter 5. Given that form and context are inseparable in poetry, there are distinctive problems in its translation and they are being dealt with in this chapter.

The final chapter, Chapter 6, deals with the verse fable "Ježeva kućica" by Branko Ćopić. It includes the author's biography, followed by a short summary and some specific language issues regarding the story. In the case study, the process of translation is explained with examples in both languages.

2. CHILDREN'S LITERATURE

2.1. The Notion of Childhood and Texts for the Child

Today's society views childhood as the most important period of life and tends to give an explanation for most of adult behavior on the basis of childhood experience. Society is so used to its understanding of what childhood is, as well as to the existence of books for children, that it forgets that the concepts of childhood and books for children are relatively new phenomena; that is, society's present view of childhood is very different from that which was held only two centuries ago. Furthermore, children's literature began to develop only after adult literature had become a well-established institution. Books specifically for children were rarely written until the eighteenth century, and the industry of children's books began to flourish only in the second half of the nineteenth century. The creation of the notion of childhood was a crucial precondition for the production of children's books and it determined the development of children's literature. (Shavit 3)

Before children's literature could begin to develop, a total reform in the notion of childhood was necessary and it surfaced in the nineteenth century. The society's view of childhood began to change in the seventeenth century. Before children's needs were recognized as distinct and different from adults' children's literature could not have existed. (Shavit 3-4) As Townsend states: "Before there could be children's books, there had to be children – children, that is, who were accepted as beings with their own particular needs and interests, not only as miniature men and women" (qtd. in Shavit 4).

2.2. The History of Childhood

In medieval society and in the following centuries, because of the prevailing theological approach and the conditions of life there was no room for the extravagance of childhood. The framework of society ignored the characteristics distinguishing a child from an adult. The differences existed, of course, but they were simply not recognized. From the theological point of view, it was believed that the cycle of life consisted of birth, life and death. Therefore, there was no room for the stage of childhood. Furthermore, the conditions of life, including a high rate of child mortality and a short life span, contributed to the unawareness of the concept of childhood. The period of childhood was too fragile and those who survived it had to enter manhood early because the life span was so short. For that reason, once the children left their swaddling clothes,

they were considered an integral part of adult society. However, by the beginning of the seventeenth century, a new concept of childhood emerged. (Shavit 5-6)

This new concept emerged in society because of the changes in the current ideas of the time. Surprisingly, they preceded the changes in social conditions usually linked with the emergence of childhood, such as the Industrial Revolution, the emergence of the bourgeois class, and the drop in the child mortality rate. Even though these things undoubtedly played a role in the development of the notion of childhood, the changes in the ideological sphere in which a different view of the child began to develop came more than a century before the material changes. (Shavit 6)

For the first time, children were seen as having distinctive characteristics, such as innocence, sweetness, and other angelic qualities. These new ideas of children can be seen in the late sixteenth century religious paintings that used the child for religious purposes. As paintings of children took on nonreligious themes and started to dominate art and iconography, the idea of childhood as a stage in life was more and more accepted in the society. These paintings expressed the special qualities children were now seen as possessing, like sweetness and innocence. And that led to the child slowly becoming a source of amusement and relaxation for adults. Children were no longer seen merely as small adults. (Shavit 6)

This new view of the child was first propagated within the family circle, but soon parents would no longer hesitate to admit the pleasure they obtained from their children. In addition, they also started pampering their children. They were seen as a constant source of amusement and treated like pets in a way. Not long after this idea of childhood as a source of amusement was accepted by society, a new view began to develop, especially among moralists and pedagogues within the church. They agreed that children were different from adults, but they thought that innocent children, as creatures close to God, should be isolated from the corrupting company of adults. Consequently, a second notion of childhood appeared, which was mainly focused on the spiritual well-being of the child and held that children should be educated and disciplined. It also prescribed a new role for adults who now became responsible for the spiritual well-being of the child. For the first time, a serious psychological interest in the child emerged, as well as demand for an organized educational system. Children were now regarded as delicate creatures who had to be reformed and protected and the way to reform them was through education and through books issued primarily as pedagogic vehicles. This new perception of childhood created for the first time the need and the demand for children's books. (Shavit 7)

2.3. The Status of Children's Literature

Social psychology has been dealing with the connection between social status and self-image, that is, the way a particular group regards itself as a result of internal and external points of view. Zohar Shavit examined the status of children's literature in culture by focusing on the self-image of children's writers. She demonstrated how the poor self-image of the whole system of children's literature seems to result from the attitudes of various literary and social factors in culture. (Shavit 33-4)

Children's literature has always been regarded by other systems as inferior. Most children's books are not considered part of the cultural heritage and most national histories of literature barely mention children's books. Children's writers and books usually do not appear as items in encyclopedias or lexicons, unless they are specifically devoted to children's literature. That is how a distinction was made between "real" literature and children's literature. Children's literature has not been regarded as a subject of study at universities, because it was considered not to have importance in culture and the recent change in the attitude toward children's literature in curriculum only reinforced its inferior position. Although it is taught in courses in many universities, for the most part, it has not gained recognition as a subject for departments of literature. Usually only departments of education consider it to be a legitimate field of research and that is because they regard it as part of the educational apparatus, i.e. a major means of teaching children. (Shavit 35)

High status to writers is attributed by awarding prizes, but, so far, the children's writers were almost always excluded from the list. Nobel Prize, as well as any other less prestigious prize, has never been awarded to a children's writer. A special international award for children's literature was established and, even though it might have improved their position in society, it also reinforced their lower status. It implies that children's literature is something "different" and needs special criteria of its own. Most of the judges evaluating children's literature come from the field of education and it is the educational not the literary value of the book which deserves praise. (Shavit 36)

The poor self-image of a children's writer can best be seen when compared to the self-image of the canonized writer for adults. Writers for adults, unlike writers for children, are considered part of the literary establishment and enjoy the status of "serious" members of society. The writers for adults' views on societal issues are warmly welcomed while the children's writers are forced to constantly protect their status in society. (Shavit 37)

The children's writers are required to respond to the child's needs and this is not simple. They are the only ones who are expected to address one particular audience and at the same time appeal to another. Society expects them to be appreciated by both adults and children and this is very hard because children and adults have different tastes. (Shavit 37) The critic Rebecca Lukens (1978) claimed that "good literature is *good* literature; it satisfies both children and critics" (qtd. in Shavit 37). Unfortunately, in order for a children's book to be accepted by adults, it is not enough for it to be accepted by children. The positive evaluation of a children's book depends on its success in appealing to adults. Therefore, children's literature must simultaneously cope with contradictory criteria imposed on it by the need to please both children and adults and by the need to respond to what society considers to be "good" and appropriate for the child. (Shavit 38) As Jacqueline Rose suggested, despite the possessive apostrophe in the phrase "children's literature", it has never really been owned by children: "Children's fiction rests on the idea that there is a child who is simply there to be addressed and that speaking to it might be simple" (qtd. in Hunt 16). According to Lesnik-Oberstein, the "child" has no "voice" within the hierarchies of our society (qtd. in Hunt 17).

Historically speaking, the status of the writer for children has always been inferior to the status of the writer for adults, so for a long time writers for children would not even sign their work. They were probably writing for children because of the commercial success or ideological beliefs, but they published anonymously or under a pseudonym because writing for children was not respected by society. The situation with women was different. They already had a subordinate position in the society and writing could only improve their status. Besides, women were considered as being "closer" to children anyway. Consequently, most of the official writers in the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century were women. Today, children's writers do sign their work and there is an equal share of women and men writing for children, but they still seem to be unsatisfied with their position in the society as children's writers. (Shavit 38-9) Ivan Southall has questioned this belief that writing for children is a less important activity:

The viewpoint mystifies me – that works for children must necessarily be minor works by minor writers, that deliberately they are generated and projected at reduced voltage, that they evade truth, that they avert passion and sensuality and the subtleties of life and are unworthy of the attention of the serious artist or craftsman ... Adult scaling down of the intensity of the child state is a crashing injustice, an outrageous distortion of what childhood is about. (qtd. in Hunt 190)

2.4. Literature Written for Children

Children's literature is often seen as marked significantly by its subjects – it is about children and/or childhood. Even though children's books are said to be about the experiences of childhood, they also deal with a very diverse range of other subjects beside childhood. One of the common qualities of children's books is also a child protagonist and an issue that concerns children. But not all stories are about children. Some of them are about animals or, as it is the case with many fairy tales, about young adults. And children's nonfiction deals with all aspects of reality, not just childhood, but with the specific needs of child readers in mind and thus encouraging a childlike view of the generally unchildlike topics. (Nodelman 190)

According to Riitta Oittinen, children's literature can be seen in two ways – as literature written and intended for children or as literature read by children (61). It can also be considered as an issue of intentionality – if the author intended the book to be read by children, it is a children's book (Oittinen 62). Arthur Ransome suggested an answer to the question of who children's authors write for, inspired by W. E. Henley, the author of *Treasure Island*:

That, it seems to me, is the secret. You just indulge the pleasure of your heart. You write not *for* children but for yourself, and if, by good fortune, children enjoy what you enjoy, why then you are a writer of children's books ... No special credit to you, but simply thumping good luck. Every writer wants to have readers, and than children there are no better readers in the world. (qtd. in Hunt 191)

If we look from a wide perspective, children's literature could be anything that children find interesting (Oittinen 62). Nodelman suggested a definition by which children's literature characteristically describes things from a childlike point of view. This is based on the assumption that childlike and adult perceptions differ, but adults can keep their perception and use it. (Nodelman 191) Therefore, C. S. Lewis said: "We must write for children out of those elements in our own imagination which we share with children" (qtd. in Nodelman 191). Similarly, Oittinen suggests that when writing or translating for children, it is necessary to find the child in yourself, through your childhood memories, and your own image of childhood, because it is through your child images that you see children (43-4). Many writers assume that childlike perception is something that can survive the maturing process and that adults can continue to think in childlike ways at least part of the time (Nodelman 191). The continuation of childlike thinking in adults could simply be a matter of memory: "Writing about and for children, one should have a view almost from the inside, to re-create – not what childhood looks like now – but what it felt like then" (qtd. in Nodelman 191). Betsy Byars, an American author of children's books, disagrees:

Now I know that there's a theory today that we must never write for children and, after all, we're all just big kids, but I don't believe that. It's partly because I refuse to think of myself as a large wrinkled child, but also because, through my children, I have come to see that childhood is a special time, that children are special, that they do not think like adults or talk like adults. And even though we adults sometimes feel that we are exactly the same as when we were ten, I think that's because we can no longer conceive of what ten was really like, and because what we have lost, we have lost so gradually that we no longer miss it. (qtd. in Hunt 192)

It is often believed "that what appeals to the child the authors once were will appeal to the children they hope for as an audience, that childlike perception is a universal experience" (Nodelman 192). On the other hand, Meindert DeJong, author of children's books, does not believe that it is possible to "recreate" the childlike perception:

You may try to go back [to childhood] by way of memory, but that memory is an adult memory, an adult conception of childhood for adults – and not for children ... When you write for children from adult memory, you satisfy only the other adults who have also forgotten their inner childhood, and have substituted for it an adult conception of what the child needs and wants in books. (qtd. in Hunt 192)

Nodelman concludes that "Childhood and a childlike point of view are constructs of adult minds that adults work to impose on children, in part by means of children's literature" (193).

It is usually believed that the main distinction between children's literature and other texts is that children's literature is simple (Nodelman 198). The view that "the serious novel is one that children cannot read" is generally accepted by writers and critics. According to this, children read books in a different way and special books have to be written for them. (Nodelman 215) But, according to the psychologist Lev Vygotsky, "children have many abilities, even if they are not aware of them" and he regards "the child as a thinking, evaluating, learning, social human being, from the day he/she is born" (qtd. in Oittinen 48). Therefore, writers should not be concerned with the complexity of the plot or their vocabulary, because that would be "writing down":

Anyone who writes down to children is simply wasting his time ... Some writers deliberately avoid using words they think the child doesn't know. This emasculates the prose, and, I suspect, bores the reader. Children are game for anything. They love words that give them a hard time, provided they are in a context that absorbs their attention. (qtd. in Hunt 198)

Adults often lose their ability to fantasize and make decisions for their children on an adult level. They tend to censor and purify children's stories for their own purposes. By understanding

child behavior from an adult perspective, they sometimes, especially in fairy tales, label scenes as “unsuitable”, even though the children usually regard them differently. (Oittinen 48) They forget that “a child, after all, is not a miniature grown-up but a human being in a magical world of talking animals” (qtd. in Oittinen 49). It is hard to identify the line between protecting the child and censorship, but it is often believed that censorship and overprotection can be harmful. Protecting children from painful feelings actually prevents them from experiencing something useful. (Oittinen 51) When people write or translate for children, they do it on the basis of their own and of the whole society’s image of childhood. Similarly, when people censor, they do it on the basis of their child concept. (Oittinen 53) The censorship of children’s books forces the writer to compromise between two addressees who are very different (Shavit 93).

3. SEMANTICS AND TRANSLATION

Ever since people have translated, they have been concerned about whether what they were doing and what they were getting was in fact a rendering of the original. The question of doing justice to the source had always been something that preoccupied translators, but it was also something that authors expected from a translation of their work, as well as those who had commissioned the translation. In the same way, the readers of the translation were taking for granted that what they were offered was indeed a rendering of the original. (Neubert 330)

3.1. Translation and Meaning

Translation, broadly speaking, is the rendering of a message or information formulated in one language (Source Language) into another language (Target Language), to be precise, establishing meaning equivalence between a fragment in a SL and a fragment in a TL. (Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 301) According to Keenan's Exact Translation Hypothesis, "anything that can be said in one natural language can be translated exactly into any other language" (qtd. in Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 309). A variant of this hypothesis is found in Nida and Taber: "Anything that can be said in one language can be said in another unless the form is an essential element of the message" (qtd. in Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 309). Translation deals with the preservation of the meaning of the original SL message in the TL. Cases where priority is given to the way the message is expressed include instances of 'phonemic translation' of poetry. In such cases the sound, syntax, rhythm, melody or rhymes of the verse are taken to be the components of the 'literal meaning' rather than the semantic representation. (Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 302-3)

3.2. Equivalence in Meaning

The concept of equivalence is one of the most basic yet disputed notions in translation practice and studies. Translators have always tried to present their audiences with texts originally produced in other languages. Their work is essentially based on the claim that a translation is an equivalent or, at least, an equivalent rendering of the original. Since the original was unintelligible to the intended readers of the translation, the translated product was looked upon as if it served 'in place of the original'. (Neubert 329)

The notion of equivalence, crucial to any theory as well as to the practice of translation, has a number of possible interpretations. ST oriented theories assume 'faithfulness to the original'

to be the main parameter of translational equivalence. This criterion has been replaced in some contemporary translation theories by the requirement of TL oriented equivalence. An approach to equivalence in terms of function has been proposed by Nida (1964) in the form of 'dynamic equivalence'. His approach involves the identification of similar functions of SL and TL texts within the broad context of SL and TL cultures. (Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 309)

Bearing resemblance to the source text is the reason for existence of any translation. The target text has to be consistent with the original. At least that is what is normally expected from the translator. (Neubert 330) In spite of all the difficulties, the term 'equivalence' along with its synonyms 'faithfulness' and 'fidelity', has remained the dominant term for the underlying relationship between the original text and its translation (Neubert 331). On the one hand, equivalence can never be given up because it naturally reflects an indisputable, if vague relationship between source and target texts. On the other hand, this term has so many interpretations that it practically cannot be used as a tool for describing and judging translations. Consequently, it is evident that equivalence has never been and can perhaps never be an entirely objective concept, because it has always functioned in relation to the translator's perspective. (Neubert 334)

It is true that the notion of equivalence, and especially the term itself, rarely appears literally in the texts. But what other notion can describe more realistically the subtle interrelationships between source and target texts? (Neubert 332)

3.3. Different Types of Translation

No two languages are identical, either in the meanings assigned to the matching symbols or in the way these symbols are arranged in the text. Therefore, there can be no absolute correspondence between two languages and no fully exact translations. The effect of the translation produced may be fairly close to the original, but there can be no identity in detail. The process of translation has to have a certain degree of interpretation by the translator. (qtd. in Nida 126) As D. G. Rosetti stated back in 1874: "A translation remains perhaps the most direct form of commentary" (qtd. in Nida 126).

There are many different types of translations. Traditionally, only two contrasting types of translation were recognized: free or paraphrastic and close or literal translation. In fact, there are many more grades of translation besides these two extremes. (Nida 126) The older focus in translating was directed at the form of the message and reproducing the stylistic specialties like

rhythm, rhyme, play on words and so on. The new focus has shifted from the form of the message to the response of the receptor to the translated message. (Nida and Taber 1)

It is important to recognize that each language has certain distinctive characteristics which give it a special character. Each language uses certain vocabulary for the area of cultural focus and the specialties of the people, some languages are rich in modal particles, some use a lot of figurative language and many are rich in literary resources. Instead of complaining about the lack of certain characteristics in a language, it is necessary to respect the characteristics of the receptor language and make use of the potentialities of the language to the greatest possible extent. Instead of forcing the formal structure of one language upon the other, a successful translator should be prepared to make all the necessary changes in order to properly reproduce the message in the receptor language. But no message, even within the same language, is ever absolute because people never understand words in exactly the same way and, therefore, we cannot expect a perfect match between languages. In the cases where the form of the message is an essential part of the meaning, it is usually impossible to reproduce the meaning in another language. Therefore, to preserve the meaning of the message, the form must be changed and the extent to which it must be changed depends on the linguistic and cultural distance between the two languages. (Nida and Taber 3-5)

Obviously, the easiest transitions, which do not acquire a lot of formal change, occur when translating between closely related languages and cultures, like English and German. On the other hand, languages may not be related, even though they share a cultural setting. This is the case when translating from English into Hungarian, since English belongs to the Germanic branch of the Indo-European family of languages and Hungarian to the Finno-Ugrian family. But the cultures are similar and therefore the shifts are not so extreme. In the case of translating from English into Hindi, on the other hand, the formal changes are greater. Even though these two languages belong to the same Indo-European family of languages, the two cultures are so different that the formal structure must be changed more extensively in order to preserve the content. Finally, in the case of translating from English into Zulu, which belongs to the Bantu family of languages and represents a completely different culture, the formal modifications are even more extreme. (Nida and Taber 6) Clearly, the differences between cultures cause more problems for the translator than differences in language structure (Nida 130).

3.4. Two Basic Orientations in Translating

The primary aim of translating is to reproduce the message, but in order to do that, the translators must make many grammatical and lexical adjustments. They must strive for equivalence rather than identity, meaning that the reproduction of the message is more important than preserving the form of the message. The best translation does not sound like a translation. Even though meaning must be given priority over style, the style is still important. However, when trying to reproduce the style, the translators must be careful not to produce something that is not functionally equivalent. (Nida and Taber 12-4)

Since there are no identical equivalents, it is necessary to find the closest possible equivalent, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style. There are two fundamentally different types of equivalence: formal and dynamic. (Nida 129)

3.4.1. Formal Equivalence

Formal equivalence is focused on the message itself, in both form and content. The translator attempts to reproduce the message in the receptor language that matches the different elements in the source culture as literally and meaningfully as possible. This is called “gloss translation”. (Nida 129) Such a translation is source-oriented and it attempts to reproduce the following formal elements:

- (1) grammatical units,
- (2) consistency in word usage, and
- (3) meaning in terms of the source context. (Nida 134)

The reproduction of grammatical units consists in translating parts of speech by the same parts of speech, keeping all phrases and sentences intact, and preserving the formal indicators, like punctuation and paragraph breaks. Consistency in word usage implies the concordance of terminology between the source-language and the receptor-language text. In order to reproduce meaning in terms of the source context, the translator tries not to make changes in idioms and to reproduce them as literally as possible, so that the reader could see how local cultural elements were used in the original text. This is often impossible to reproduce and explanations are necessary because some expressions have significance only in terms of the source language or culture. The formal equivalence translation is often entirely suitable for translating certain types of messages for certain types of audiences. (Nida 135)

3.4.2. Dynamic Equivalence

Dynamic equivalence is based upon “the principle of equivalent effect” (qtd. in Nida 129). Such a translation is not so concerned that the receptor-language message matches the source-language message, as it is concerned with the dynamic relationship. This means that the relationship between the receptor and the message should be basically the same as it was between the original receptor and the original message. The aim of dynamic equivalence is to achieve complete naturalness of expression, so that the receptors can comprehend the message within the context of their own culture. (Nida 129)

In the dynamic-equivalence translation the focus of attention is directed toward the receptor response. When reading such a translation, a bilingual and bicultural person should be able to say “This is just the way we would say it.” But the message is still a translation, not just another message which is similar to the source message. It has to clearly reflect the meaning and intent of the source. (Nida 136)

A dynamic-equivalence translation can be described as “the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message.” This definition encompasses three important terms:

- (1) *equivalent*, which points toward the source-language message,
- (2) *natural*, which points toward the receptor language, and
- (3) *closest*, which binds the two orientations together on the basis of the highest degree of approximation. (Nida 136)

The word “natural”, in relation to the dynamic-equivalence translations, is applied to three areas of the communication process because a natural rendering of the original must fit:

- (1) the receptor language and culture as a whole,
- (2) the context of the particular message, and
- (3) the receptor-language audience. (Nida 136)

The translation has to be in accord with the receptor language and culture in order for the rendering to be stylistically acceptable (Nida 136). A truly natural translation can more easily be recognized for what it avoids than what it actually states, because the reader immediately notices the presence of serious anomalies in the context. (Nida 138) The “linguistic appropriateness” is, in fact, usually evident only when it is absent. (Nida 136)

4. TRANSLATING CHILDREN'S LITERATURE

There is an inconsistency regarding the translation of children's literature. It is believed that books are translated for the purpose of enriching children's literature of the target language and introducing them to foreign cultures. But at the same time, the foreign element is frequently eliminated from translations which are greatly adapted to their target culture, supposedly because young readers will not understand it. Therefore, the translation of children's literature is a balancing act between the adaptation of foreign elements to the child reader's level of understanding, and keeping the differences from the foreign text which have a potential to enrich the target culture. (O'Sullivan 64)

In the field of translation, research into translations of children's books, with few exceptions, has mostly been neglected. This is unfortunate because, in a social context, assessing translations of children's books is a very important task since children are not capable to take a clear stand themselves. They are not very familiar with books and media and, therefore, are subject to influences by the suggestive forces of a text. In addition, the translation of children's literature is suitable for the linguistic analysis of cross-cultural differences in communication, because this genre usually reflects the everyday life and culture of the community in which it was created. (House 683)

4.1. Norms of Translating Children's Books

According to Zohar Shavit, the translator of children's books, unlike translators of adult books, has enormous liberty regarding the text because of the marginal position of texts for children within the literary polysystem. Therefore, the translator is free to manipulate the text in different ways by changing, expanding or shortening the text, or by deleting or adding to the text. These methods are allowed only if the translator adheres to the following guiding principles:

- (1) adjusting the text to make it appropriate and useful to the child, in accordance with what society thinks is educationally "good for the child"; and
- (2) adjusting the plot, characterization, and language to what the society regards as the child's level of comprehension and reading abilities. (Shavit 112-3)

As long as the children's literature was regarded primarily as an educational instrument, the first principle was dominant. Nowadays, the second principle of adjusting the text to the child's level of comprehension is more dominant. (O'Sullivan 67)

Here is how Göte Klingberg, who has written extensively about adapting for children, classifies the types of discrepancies between the original text and the translation of children's literature:

- (1) omissions
- (2) additions for reasons of
 - (a) adornment
 - (b) logical explanation
 - (c) pedagogic consideration
 - (d) sentimentalization
- (3) mistranslations. (qtd. in House 686)

4.2. A Child-Centered Theory of Translation

Translation is in many ways a covenant. Translators of children's literature should reach out to the children of their own culture. Translators should dive into the carnivalistic children's world, reexperience it. Even if they cannot stop being adults, to succeed they should try to reach into the realm of childhood, the children around them, the child in themselves. (...) When translating for children, we should listen to the child, the child in the neighborhood and the child within ourselves. (Oittinen 168)

Riitta Oittinen perceives children's literature as literature read by children and read aloud to children, and translators as readers who are always translating for their readers. In her opinion, adaptation and equivalence are not separate issues. All translation includes adaptation and translation always involves change and domestication. Changing the language brings the story closer to the target-language audience. (4-6)

Attitudes are slowly changing in translation studies and the concepts such as equivalence and faithfulness are increasingly questioned. Yet, in translating children's literature, equivalence, in the sense of sameness, is still accepted. Scholars specializing in children's literature still believe that a good translation is an equivalent, that a good translator is invisible, and that the function of a translation is identical to that of its original. Oittinen, on the other hand, believes that even Nida's dynamic equivalence is not possible. Translations cannot have the same effect on their readers as the original had on its readers because situations differ. A translation is written in a different time, place, language, country and culture. (9)

Oittinen believes that a text is not a fixed object because it produces a different reaction at every reading, so it can be seen as a never-ending chain of interpretations (15). Translations are

usually read in the same way as any other books. When children read a story, they do not care whether it is a translation or not. They simply experience it, interpret it, and new meanings arise. (34)

4.2.1. Adaptation

Ever since there has been literature, there have been adaptations. Nevertheless, they are usually seen as something negative and, in comparison with the original, they are of little value. (Oittinen 76) Translation is considered to be faithful to the original, whereas adaptation is not, because it is altered (Oittinen 77). Some scholars are completely opposed to adapting, because they see it as “denaturing and pedagogizing children’s literature”. Their negative view results from understanding translation as producing sameness. Oittinen, on the other hand, sees translating as rewriting and claims that it is hard to make a clear distinction between translation and adaptation. (74-5) She believes that all translators need to adapt their text according to the readers (78).

Adaptations are often associated with the status of children’s literature in which shortened or otherwise altered versions are much more common than in adult literature. Writers often emphasize that translating for children should be as accurate as translating for adults and that children’s literature should not be adapted, abridged or altered. (Oittinen 80-1) “The original text must be accorded just as much respect as in the case of adult literature, therefore the endeavor should be a translation as faithful, as equivalent as possible” (qtd. in Oittinen 81). To sum up, only a “poor” translator “distorts” the original author’s face, but a good translator is an “invisible man”. Oittinen disagrees with such statements because, in her opinion, this implies that translation is repetition. (82)

Even though she believes that the concern about adapting children’s literature is reasonable because for a long time children’s books have been adapted solely to match the adult pedagogic ideals, she does not think that adaptation and translation are separate issues. Translators always adapt their texts for specific purposes and specific readers. Therefore, the process of translating brings the text closer to the target-language readers by using a familiar language. (Oittinen 82-4) A successful translation, according to Oittinen, is the one in which the reader of the target text, the author of the source text, and the translator are engaged in a dialogue, that is, the one in which ‘the “I” of the reader of the translation meets the “you” of the translator, the author, and the illustrator’ (84).

According to Oittinen, the translator has to be loyal to the author, not to the source text. If the readers accept and enjoy the translation, this shows that the translator has been loyal to the author (O’Sullivan 68):

As a whole, the “rights” of the author of the original and the “rights” of the readers of the translation need not conflict; quite the contrary, authors have also thought of their future readers—children—and have written, adapted, their texts for them. Translators in turn complement, adapt the texts on the basis of their viewpoint of their own culture and language. When translating for children, taking into consideration the target-language children as readers is a sign of loyalty to the original author. When a text lives on in the target-language, by which I mean that it is accepted and loved through the translation, the translator of such a text has achieved loyalty to the author of the original. Loyalty implies respect for more than a text in words as such, or a certain form or content; it implies respect for an entire story-telling situation where a text is interpreted *for* new readers, who take the story as it is, who accept and reject, who react and respond. (Oittinen 84)

Therefore, Oittinen reduced the possible functions of children’s literature to one – the target text, no matter in which form, must appeal to readers (O’Sullivan 68).

4.3. Covert Translation

Even though translation of children’s books is widespread, usually nobody perceives them as translations, which is a clear sign that children’s books are generally translated “covertly”. This means that in the process of translation the source text goes through “cultural filtering” to be adapted to the expectation norms in the target culture. The main reason for using this strategy is of financial nature. Keeping the cultural characteristics of the original text is simply not cost-effective. This is very unfortunate, given that overtly translated texts could help children get acquainted with other cultures. In covert translation, on the other hand, by manipulating and imposing the target culture values, the text can lose its foreignness and its potential for broadening the children’s horizons. Changing the form and content of these texts only shows lack of respect for children’s literature. (House 684) This would not be accepted in translating books for adults, but when it comes to translating children’s books “too much is altered, and unnecessarily adapted to local conditions, where the strange and exotic in particular would have been of charm, interest and not least of all of educational value” (qtd. in House 684).

Adult literature is usually perceived by its readers as “national literature” or as “literature available in translation”, while translated children’s literature is commonly not recognized as

translation at all and therefore is not perceived as “coming from a different place” linguistically and culturally. Precisely for that reason translators find children’s literature so suitable for change by using distinctive cultural filters disguised as adapting the text to the children’s needs, or as imposing educational values on the text. These changes are the result of adults’ opinions about what children like and appreciate. Adults often underestimate children, as we can see in the case of the translations of Astrid Lindgren’s books. (House 685)

Her books have been translated into 60 different languages, so she often found herself in a situation when translators falsified her work. For example, a passage in one of her books in which an argument between two little girls ends up with one girl saying to the other that her nose is “so filled with snot that you couldn’t squeeze a pea in there!” has completely been omitted in the American translation. Lindgren rightfully claimed that this is the case with many noses of children around the world, even though the American translator obviously begged to differ. In another of her books, a little girl who wanted to grow up fast stood in the middle of a dung heap in the rain to speed up the process, but the American translator changed the dung heap into a pile of withered leaves. Lindgren replied that American agriculture cannot be successful if American children do not know that there is a better way to hasten growth than withered leaves. (House 684) Lindgren also cancelled her contract with the publisher in France because the translator completely changed her Pippi by turning her into a well-adjusted uninteresting little girl. The translator was obviously worried that the real Pippi might be a bad influence on the French children. (House 685)

Another reason for the modifications in the translations of children’s books is that children do not have sufficient knowledge of the world and different cultures. Therefore, translators tend to adapt and explain more than when translating for adults. (House 685) Everything the children encounter for the first time is strange or foreign to them. In the context of children’s literature, “foreign” actually refers to something the child readers are not yet familiar with in the process of learning and experiencing the world around them, so initially it has nothing to do with cultural difference. (O’Sullivan 80) Foreign culture elements can be fascinating, they can make readers curious and they can learn from them. But usually they require at least some kind of explanation. Some elements like names or locations can easily be recognized as foreign, while for others like references to events or situations we can only assume that children are unfamiliar with. (O’Sullivan 81) Some cultures are more tolerant regarding the foreign elements than others. This is often the case with cultures in which children start learning foreign languages in school early and the TV programs and movies are aired in the original language with subtitles. As a result, foreign-sounding names and elements in literature are more easily accepted. (O’Sullivan 84)

Children do not focus on the name of the author, nor do they understand that the text is actually a translation. In reading, they are confronted by things they do not know and cannot understand all the time. Therefore, while learning to read, they learn to deal with such things. They skip the things they do not understand or do not allow minor things to disrupt their reading. Technically, children read foreign texts in the same way they read texts from their own culture. (O'Sullivan 82) Astrid Lindgren is sure that "children have an extraordinary ability to adapt, that they are able to experience the most unusual things and situations given a good translator to help them" (qtd. in O'Sullivan 81).

Translating children's literature is the concern of adults. They translate what was written by other adults for children. Therefore, children are only indirectly the addressees of a translation. Translators are often found under a lot of pressure from parents, teachers, editors and publishers who want the educational purpose to be fulfilled and the cultural taboos omitted. (House 685-6) Children do not care whether they are reading a translation or not, because they see the language of the text as integral to the story. That is why adults' interfering with the texts translated for children can easily be overlooked. (House 687)

5. TRANSLATING POETRY

Readers usually expect that reading poetry in translation would be experienced in the same way as reading poetry originally written in their own language. They look for the poetic techniques that normally distinguish poetry from prose, such as metaphors, suggestive language, meter and rhyme, rhythm, alliteration, pun and form. Unlike prose, form is just as important as the content of the poem. Whereas prose can be summarized, poetry cannot. The translator is supposed to enable the communication between the poet and the reader, regardless of the language, place, time or tradition in which the original text was written. (Attwater 122)

5.1. The Linguistic Basis of Translation of Poetry

Thomas Mann wondered “who would wish to discourage the peoples of the world from translating, merely because it is fundamentally impossible” (qtd. in Raffel 11). Clearly, if all the languages differ in structure, sound and vocabulary, and have specific features, it is basically impossible to fully render what is written in one language into another language. But if it is impossible to “fully” render something, it does not mean that it is impossible to satisfactorily translate it, i.e. to translate most of the meaning and to do it well. (Raffel 11)

When translating, the linguistic characteristics of the target language are more important than the linguistic characteristics of the source language. The source language is, of course, significant because the literary work has been created within its linguistic system. But the translation has yet to be produced by re-creating the original in the target language and the translator can work only with what he gets from the original text. (Raffel 11) Because of the unavoidable differences between languages there are always certain aspects of the original text that cannot be reproduced in the translation. They are the following:

1. No two languages have the same phonology, therefore it is impossible to re-create the sounds in the target text (Raffel 12). The phonological differences usually have the physical bases which underlie the human sound production. The knowledge of the organs of speech and the way they are used by the speakers of different languages enabled all sounds to be classified. (qtd. in Raffel 13) Different sound systems are a given fact and the translator must deal with them; they cannot be avoided (Raffel 14).
2. No two languages have the same syntactic structure, therefore it is impossible to re-create the syntax in the target text (Raffel 12). Syntax governs the structure into which the sounds

used in a language must fit and no two languages are organized in the same way (Raffel 14-5).

3. No two languages have the same vocabulary, therefore it is impossible to re-create the vocabulary of the source text in the target text (Raffel 12). Even words which are very closely related can have a very different impact in different languages (Raffel 16).
4. No two languages have the same literary history, therefore it is impossible to re-create the literary forms of one culture in the language and literary forms of the other (Raffel 12). Literary forms are deeply rooted in the culture of a language (Raffel 17). The poet has a pattern into which the words and phonemes must fit, in order to be qualified as a particular variety of a poem (qtd. in Raffel 18). Some poetic forms are easier to be reproduced in a different language than others (Raffel 18).
5. No two languages have the same prosody, therefore it is impossible to re-create the prosody of a work in another language (Raffel 12). The rhythm of the utterance of syllables differs from one language to another. The rhythm in English poetry is the result of the arrangement of the stressed and unstressed syllables. (Raffel 22)

Raffel deliberately framed these five statements in absolute terms. Even though the phonology of languages from different families is dissimilar, still there are individual resemblances, and there are approximations. These resemblances are even more common between languages from the same language family. The same can be said of syntactic and vocabulary differences, and even of differences in literary forms and prosody. Therefore, a good translation of poetry relies on approximation. (Raffel 12-3)

5.2. The Theory of Translating Poetry

In poetry, unlike prose, more attention is given to formal elements. It is extremely hard, and therefore rare, to be able to reproduce both content and form in a translation of poetry. (Nida 127) Form and content, as well as formal and dynamic equivalence, are always in conflict (Nida 131). Therefore, the form is usually sacrificed for the sake of the content. On the other hand, if a lyric poem is translated as prose, it may reproduce the content, but it cannot reproduce the emotional intensity and flavor. (Nida 127) It seems that strictly adhering to the form does kill the spirit of a poem (Nida 131). Thus we can assert that a poem is a type of text in which content and form cannot be separated. Moreover, the translation of poetry requires skill in both reading and writing. (Bassnett and Lefevere 69) Translators have to work with the fixed language of a poem and they have to compose a similar text in another language. Therefore, translators are firstly

readers who become writers. Consequently, the original poem comes to exist inside another poem. (Bassnett and Lefevere 66) Here is how Jackson Mathews, a poet and a translator, described proper translation of poetry:

One thing seems clear: to translate a poem whole is to compose another poem. A whole translation will be faithful to the matter, and it will ‘approximate the form’ of the original; and it will have a life of its own, which is the voice of the translator. (qtd. in Nida 131)

Translation of poetry involves some distinctive problems, because the form of expression, including rhythm, meter, verse and rhyme, is a vital part of the message. But translation must also take into account the response of the receptor. (Nida 131) When it comes to translation of poetry, it seems that literalness of form gives way to equivalence of response:

We expect approximate truth in a translation.... What we want to have is the truest possible feel of the original. The characters, the situations, the reflections must come to us as they were in the author’s mind and heart, not necessarily precisely as he had them on his lips. (qtd. in Nida 132)

It is by no means simple to create a completely natural translation. It is even harder if the original text is good writing, because this means that it has already exploited all the language has to offer. (Nida 133) If a translator wants his readers to experience the writing in the same way as the original receptors, it is essential to choose an easy and natural form of expression: “The test of a real translation is that it should not read like translation at all” (qtd. in Nida 133).

An ideal translation should fulfill four conditions:

- (1) It has to make sense;
- (2) It has to convey the spirit and the style of the original;
- (3) It has to have an easy and natural form of expression; and
- (4) It has to produce a similar response in its readers.

Obviously, the conflict between the form and content is bound to occur at some point and one of the two has to be given up. Usually, meaning has priority over style. (Nida 134) A translator should try to produce a successful combination of meaning and style. If a translator only sticks to the content and ignores the form, the result will probably be a mediocre translation without the original charm. If the translator sacrifices the meaning in order to reproduce the style, the original message will probably not be conveyed. However, changing the form has less influence on the effect upon the target reader. For that reason, correspondence in meaning is more important than correspondence in style. (Nida 134) After all, translation of poetry is “a re-creation, not a reproduction” (qtd. in Nida 134).

No matter how good a translation is, its meaning differs from the original. Therefore, a successfully translated poem is always another poem. It is not possible to produce a general theory of translating poetry. So, a translation theorist can only indicate the different possibilities of translating poetry and point to successful practice. Afterward, a translator has to decide what is more important – the expressive or the aesthetic function of language. (Newmark 165-6)

6. “JEŽEVA KUĆICA” BY BRANKO ČOPIĆ

6.1. Biography

Branko Čopić was born on 1 January 1915 in the village Hasani near Bosanska Krupa in Bosnia and Herzegovina. His father died when he was 4, so he was raised by his mother Sofija, his grandfather Rade and his uncle Nikola in a loving home. He spent his childhood herding cattle at the foot of the mountain Grmeč. He finished elementary school in his village and afterward went to a boarding school in Bihać. He graduated from the School for Teachers in Karlovac and returned home. Later on he decided to enroll in the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade just before the Second World War. In 1941 he joined the Partisans and soon became a political commissar and a news correspondent. After the war he moved to Belgrade. At first, he worked as the chief editor of the newspaper “Pionir”. Soon he started a career in writing. He was a poet, short-story writer, novelist and writer of children’s books. His life ended tragically. On 26 March 1984 he jumped off a bridge across the river Sava in Belgrade. (nasa-jugoslavija.org, own translation)

6.2. Short Summary

“Ježeva kućica” is a verse fable written by Branko Čopić. It is divided into thirteen subheadings. The verses rhyme in couplets and each verse has ten syllables.

The main protagonist is a proud and brave hedgehog called Ježurka Ježić. Other characters include a vixen called Mica, a wolf, a bear and a wild boar. The story takes place in a forest. Ježurka leads a quiet life in his little house, until the three noisy visitors, incited by the clever vixen, come to disturb him. Led by curiosity, they come to find out why hedgehog loves his house so much. Since hedgehog’s house is not as luxurious as they expected, they start to make fun of him. But, in the end, they learn that there really is no place like home.

6.3. Language Issues

Croatian linguist Stjepan Babić wrote an article explaining the problems regarding “Ježeva kućica” by Branko Čopić. This literary work was first issued in 1949 and it was titled “Ježeva kuća”. Originally it was written in Serbian literary language. In spite the fact that it was changed and adapted to Croatian language, Babić explains that no edition was actually issued in Croatian language. Even though Croatian and Serbian have many similarities, they are still two different

languages. When reading the original text of “Ježeva kuća” readers cannot perceive it as their language and they also have trouble understanding it, especially children. (Babić 141, own translation)

Several adapted versions were issued in Zagreb by the publishers “Mladost” and “Naša djeca”. These have been somewhat adapted to Croatian language and dialect, some rhymes have been changed by using Croatian spelling instead of Serbian (*gluva – gluha*), First Future Tense has been written with two words instead of one (*biće – bit će*), but many features have not been changed. So, the literary work did not remain genuine, but it also was not Croatianized. The result was a some kind of unusual mix, perhaps a Serbo-Croatian language. (Babić 142, own translation)

6.4. Case Study

The aim of this translation was to bring this wonderful story closer to English-speaking children without losing its entire original flavor. Hopefully, the end result is a delightful, readable and catchy story, from which children can learn a thing or two.

Before translating, it was necessary to carefully read the whole text several times to get acquainted with the style and characteristics of the source text. Both the rhyming pattern and the number of syllables in each line was something that was decided to be preserved in order to stay as close to the original as possible. At the same time, re-creating these two characteristics was recognized from the start as something that would require a lot of effort and creativity.

6.4.1. The Title

Every literary work, naturally, starts with a title. The title should be able to catch the readers’ attention and it usually gives a hint about the topic. Even this seemingly straightforward title “Ježeva kućica” has several possible versions in English. For that reason, translating the title was left for the very end (see page 41).

6.4.2. The Names

Another problem that was obvious from the start is related to the characters of the story and their names. Obviously, all of the characters are animals, but some of them have personal names and others are only referred to with the name of the species they belong to. Therefore, it is best to analyze them in two categories.

(1) Characters with personal names

The main protagonist Ježurka Ježić has both his first and last name, but is also sometimes referred to only as “jež”, meaning “hedgehog”. Clearly, his personal name is a derivative of the name of his species. Therefore, his name is translated as Hedgy the Hedgehog. The first letters are capitalized since this is the character’s name. When he is referred to as “jež”, on the other hand, it is translated only as “hedgehog” and the first letter is not capitalized because this only suggests his species and distinguishes him from the other species in the story.

The second protagonist is a female fox and has only a first name Mica. She is sometimes referred to as “lisica”, which literally means “vixen”, or “lija” which is a derivative name that can often be found in children’s stories and it also has a connotation of cunningness that is usually associated with foxes. The word “mica” in Croatian is normally associated with female cats and it also implies a certain degree of familiarity; a pet name for cats. Therefore, the closest equivalent in English would probably be “pussy”. Since this word can in no way be associated with foxes or vixens, it was immediately discarded. The word “mica” can also be understood as a slang word meaning a young girl. In that case, the equivalent would be “Missy”. Since she is either referred to as vixen or by her first name, never both, the name “Vixy” was chosen instead of “Missy”. That way it is clear that she is a vixen. Besides, “Vixy”, as a derivative from “vixen”, suggests a cunning and even shrewish character that she will prove herself to be.

(2) Characters named after their species

There are three protagonists who are named after the species they belong to and they are “vuk”, “medo” and “divlja svinja”. There were almost no dilemmas regarding the translation of their names, especially with the former and the latter. “Vuk” is translated as “Wolf”. “Divlja svinja”, which is a noun of feminine gender in Croatian, is translated as “Wild Boar”. Obviously, the gender is changed in the translation into masculine. This was done for the purpose of rhyme. The word “medo”, on the other hand, is a pet name for a bear, both an animal and a toy. It is not possible to translate it as “Teddy” or “Teddy Bear” since this implies a stuffed toy bear. Therefore, he is named simply “Bear”.

What is easily noticeable here is the fact that the names in translation are capitalized unlike the original names. Even though their names in Croatian are not capitalized, they still act as personal names and there is only one of each species in the story. That is why their names in the translation are capitalized and there is no definite article before each name. This is the case with some minor characters as well.

6.4.3. Translation Analysis

The translation of “Ježeva kućica” advanced gradually over a period of time. It was done line by line in an attempt to re-create the rhyming pattern and the equal number of syllables in each line. The tools used for this translation include general online dictionaries, a rhyming dictionary, a dictionary of synonyms, the Croatian Language Portal and, of course, a search engine for browsing different terms, phrases, collocations and sentence structures. The final version of the translation was afterwards examined by a native speaker of English who does not speak Croatian nor was familiar with the story. The goal was to adapt the text in such a way that it does not read like a translation.

Some lines were, naturally, re-created more easily than others. But certain lines posed a real challenge and had to be rewritten over and over again in order to qualify as a satisfactory translation. Such lines are singled out and listed hereafter to show the specific problems that had to be dealt with in the translation of this literary work. They are all numbered and analyzed in pairs because of the rhyming pattern.

- Lines 1.4.

*Jastreb ga štuje, vuk mu se sklanja,
zmija ga šarka po svu noć sanja.*

*Hawk respects him, Wolf gets out of his way,
Snake dreams of him every night and each day.*

The second line is somewhat odd, although it may not be grammatically incorrect, but a native speaker would say “each and every day”. Moreover, this translation is rather literal, even bland. In the following version the meaning does not really differ much from the original and, at the same time, sounds more appealing:

*Hawk keeps his distance, Wolf guards his behind,
Snake, while sleeping, has Hedgy on her mind.*

Moreover, when the words “snake” and “sleeping” are pronounced so close to each other, they imitate the hissing sound and alliteration helps recreate the tone.

- Lines 1.5.

Pred njim, dan hoda, širi se strava,

njegovim tragom putuje slava.

A very unusual problem occurred in the translation of these two lines. A comma was missing in the first line after the word “njim” and that led to a false understanding of the meaning of that line. As a consequence, it was translated as follows:

*The day walks before him, the horror spreads,
In his footsteps the glory its way treads.*

The second line, on the other hand, is very difficult to understand for a native speaker of English which leads to the conclusion that it was probably translated too literally. After realizing these two mistakes, the translation was changed:

*Where he goes, horror travels far ahead,
Exciting stories of him quickly spread.*

- Lines 2.1.

*Jednoga dana, vidjeli nismo,
Ježić je, kažu, dobio pismo.*

In the first draft, these two lines were translated as:

*One day, if we'd been there, we would've known better,
Hedgy the Hedgehog, they say, received a letter.*

This is a rather literal translation and there were a couple of problems here. The obvious one is the length of the lines. Each line has twelve instead of ten syllables. Besides, this if-clause in the first line, in fact, suggests a different meaning. Originally, the line says simply “we did not see” that he received a letter. Therefore the first line had to be changed. The second line was just shortened by omitting “they say”, since this does not affect the meaning at all. The word “better” in the first line was preserved because it rhymes perfectly with “letter”. The result was the following translation:

*One day, after the weather got better,
Hedgy the Hedgehog received a letter.*

The clause “after the weather got better” was inserted because it fitted perfectly in both the number of syllables and rhyme. The meaning is completely different, but it makes sense. It is reasonable to assume that Vixy could have waited for spring or nice weather to invite Hedgy for lunch.

Further down the line, these two lines had to be changed again in order to indicate who sends the letter. Lines 2.8. are the last lines of Vixy’s letter, which ends with her signature. Whereas these two lines could not be translated in a way to keep this form of the letter and

the signature in the end, it was necessary to point out the sender. Therefore, Vixy's name was inserted here:

*One day, after the weather got better,
Hedgy the Hedgehog got Vixy's letter.*

- Lines 2.2.

*Medeno pismo, pričao meca,
stiglo u torbi poštara zeca.*

The problem with these lines has already been partly explained in the subheading "The Names". Both names are capitalized because they act like personal names and there is no definite article. "Zec" was translated as "Bunny" instead of "Rabbit" only for the purpose of rhyme.

*That letter, Bear said, was sweet as honey,
And came in a bag of mailman Bunny.*

- Lines 2.3.

*Adresa kratka, slova k'o jaja:
"Za druga Ježa na kraju gaja."*

*Address short, letters round in color mauve:
"To Sir Hedgehog at the end of the grove."*

In the first line, the shape of letters is compared to eggs, whereas in the translation they are simply described as round. This way, the concept of shape was preserved, but not in so many words and there was enough "space" left to insert something that would rhyme with "grove". For that reason the letters were described as being mauve. Moreover, this is a very feminine color and therefore, in a way, it accentuates Vixy's feminine side. Not only is she the only female character in the story, but she also uses her feminine charm and wit in an attempt to manipulate the other characters.

In the second line, Hedgehog is addressed as "drug". The equivalent translation would be "comrade" and there is nothing unusual about it if one thinks of the time and the circumstances in which this literary work was created. But, in the translation, this was deliberately avoided because otherwise it might have been seen as politically marked or, even worse, as promoting communist beliefs. Therefore, "drug" was translated simply as "Mister" and afterwards as "Sir". Not only is "Sir" adequate because it is monosyllabic,

but it is also a very respectful form of address and Hedgehog is portrayed as a very fine gentleman.

- Lines 2.7.

*Sa punim loncem i masnim brkom
čekat ću na te, požuri trkom.*

Word “moustache” does not have an adequate synonym; therefore it was necessary to find a word that rhymes with it. The expression “in a flash” seemed perfect for the second line because it implies speed and Vixy is rushing Hedgey to come to lunch. “Flash” and “moustache” form an end rhyme, but the latter has one syllable more. For that reason the slang word “stache” was used instead:

*“With a full table and a greasy stache
I’ll be waiting for you, come in a flash.”*

- Lines 2.8.

*Nježno te grli medena lica
i pozdrav šalje lisica Mica.*

At first, these two lines were translated as follows:

*“Vixy the Fox sends her loving greeting(s),
Hurry up; don’t be late for our meeting.”*

The problem was that the word “greeting” should be used in plural when expressing good wishes, but then it would not rhyme with “meeting”.

It was very hard to come up with a translation in which Vixy’s name would be signed at the end, as is the case with the original lines:

*“A smile I’m sending and hugs with my paws.
Signed: Miss Vixy the Fox, sincerely yours.”*

The reference to Vixy’s paws is suitable as a foreshadowing in a way. Unfortunately, this is only a near rhyme and therefore it is in contrast to the rest of the text.

Finally, her name was completely omitted:

*“To you, my darling friend, I send my best,
And I’d like you to be my special guest.”*

- Lines 2.11.

Ježurka Ježić lukavo škilji,

pregleda bodlje i svaku šilji.

The second line literally means that Hedgy is examining his spines and sharpening them. The verb “to whet” seemed appropriate here because his spines are actually ‘blades’ which he uses for defense. If one thinks of a really sharp blade, probably the first association would be the reflection of light off its surface and therefore the translation reads as follows:

*Hedgy the Hedgehog is slyly squinting,
And whetting his spines till they are glinting.*

- Lines 2.13.

*Sunčani krug se u zenit dig'o
kad je Ježurka do lije stig'o.*

The word “zenith” is tricky because there is hardly any adequate word in English that rhymes with it. Given that zenith is the highest point the sun reaches in the sky, it was compared to a burning flame:

*The sun was high up, burning like a flame,
When Hedgy to her house finally came.*

- Lines 3.1.

*Pred kućom-logom kamenog zida,
Ježurka Ježić svoj šešir skida,*

*Outside Vixy's lair that's made of stone wall
Hedgy takes off his top hat, standing tall.*

The first line did not pose a problem and the whole meaning was successfully transferred into English. The word “tall” rhymes perfectly with “wall” and therefore the phrase “to stand tall” was inserted in the second line. It means to exhibit courage and confidence, so it is suitable for describing the brave and proud Hedgy the Hedgehog. Moreover, “šešir” was translated as “top hat” instead of just “hat” because it is something a true gentleman would wear and Hedgy’s manners are impeccable.

- Lines 3.2.

*klanja se, smješka, kavalir pravi,
biranom frazom lisicu zdravi:*

Rhyming the words “cavalier” and “dear” seemed like the most obvious solution for these two lines:

*Takes a bow smiling, such a cavalier,
Carefully choosing words, greets the vixen dear:*

Unfortunately, these lines are too long. Besides, the second line sounds rather awkward. The most logical solution was to find a synonym for “cavalier”, so it was replaced by the word “gentleman”. Both lines were a little bit changed and shortened to ten syllables each:

*He bows with a smile, such a gentleman,
He greets her as politely as he can:*

- Lines 3.5.

*Guskino krilo lepeza tvoja,
a jastuk meki patkica koja.*

In the beginning, there were two variations for translating these lines, but both were flawed:

- (a) “*A goose wing may be your fan,
To use a soft duck as a pillow you can.*”
- (b) “*A goose wing may you use as a fan,
A soft duck as a pillow is the plan.*”

The first one involves an inversion in the second line which sounds odd. In the second version, the same line does not make a lot of sense and it is far removed from the original meaning. The first lines, on the other hand, are perhaps too literal. Moreover, neither of these two versions has the appropriate number of syllables.

Therefore, these lines required more poetic freedom. The key elements, such as the images of a “goose wing” and a “soft duck”, were retained:

*“May a goose wing fan cool your lovely face,
May you sleep in a duckling’s soft embrace.”*

- Lines 3.8.

*Otpoče ručak čaroban, bajni.
I jež, i lija od masti sjajni.*

*The lunch started, magical and yummy.
Both ended up with a swollen tummy.*

In the second line, it might have been better to use plural “swollen tummies”, but then there would be no rhyme. Another possibility was to use the word “tasty” instead of “yummy” and then rhyme it with “eating hasty”. But “yummy” and “tummy” are expressions typically used by children or by adults when communicating with children and they sound appropriate. For that reason, it was decided to keep this charming baby-talk.

- Lines 3.9.

*Jelo za jelom samo se niže,
Ježurka često zdravicu diže:*

*Each course following the other,
Hedgy proposes a toast yet another.*

Obviously, these two lines differ in the number of syllables. Moreover, the word order in the second line is unusual. It seemed much better to put the word “toast” at the end of the line. To get the two lines to rhyme, it was necessary to make some changes in the first line. Since “jelo za jelom” means “course after course”, it was decided to list the courses one after the other. This does not change the meaning. What is more, it contributes to the image of a great and delicious feast.

*Beef stew after pie, followed by a roast,
Hedgy proposes yet another toast:*

- Lines 3.10.

*u zdravlje lije i njene kuće,
za pogibiju lovčeva Žuće.*

The most important task in this example was to find an idiom related to death that can rhyme with the first line. The notion of death in children’s literature is normally portrayed in a less harsh way, if not avoided altogether. Using an idiom, therefore, serves to mitigate the effect of his death on children.

*“To vixen’s health and to her gust,
That hunter’s Yeller bites the dust.”*

The idiom “to bite the dust” does rhyme with “gust”, meaning “keen delight”, but this is an obsolete word and both lines lack two syllables. It seemed more appropriate to find another solution:

“To Vixy’s good health and also her charm

And to hunter's old hound buying the farm."

The phrase "to buy the farm" is even a better choice because there is a link between animals and farms. The dog's name was omitted in the end because, even though "Žučo" literally means "Yeller", this name is inevitably associated with Fred Gipson's novel or Walt Disney Productions movie "Old Yeller".

- Lines 4.1.

*Evo i noći, nad šumom cijelom
nadvi se suton sa modrim velom.*

*The whole big forest is shrouded by night.
The dark blue nightfall veils all of the light.*

The verb "to veil" was deliberately used here to depict how the night falls upon the forest because the original lines contain an image of a dark blue veil.

- Lines 4.5.

*A sova huknu svoj ratni zov:
– Drž'te se, ptice, počinje lov!*

In the first draft the following lines read:

*The owl hoots, far is dawn:
"Birds, beware, the hunt is on!"*

The rhyme is present, obviously, but the number of syllables is insufficient. Therefore, it was necessary to alter these two lines:

*Silence is broken when Owl starts to hoot:
"The hunt begins and you birds better scoot!"*

The image of Owl's "call to war" was lost, but the phrase "silence is broken" is menacing enough and Owl is portrayed as a predator warning the prey to run, or in this case to fly, for their lives.

- Lines 5.3.

*– Zahvaljujem se pozivu tvom,
al' mi je draži moj skromni dom!*

"Thank you for inviting me to your dome,

But I surely prefer my humble home.”

There was a dilemma here between adjectives “modest” and “humble” in the second line. It was decided to use “humble” because of the alliteration. Vixen’s house is referred to as “dome”, meaning a stately building in a poetic sense, but it just does not quite fit. When that word was omitted, both lines had to be changed:

“Thank you for sending me a nice letter.

Now I must go, I like my home better.”

- Lines 6.1.

Ostade lija, misli se: – Vraga,

što mu je kuća toliko draga?

Vixen’s thinking to herself: “What the hell?

I’m sure his house is a place really swell.”

Even though in the original text the expression meaning “what the hell” is used, it was decided to replace it with something more appropriate for children, namely a euphemism “heck”. Of course, the second line also had to be changed because of the rhyme.

Vixen’s thinking to herself: “What the heck?

His house is definitely not a wreck.”

The issue of purifying and adapting children’s literature has been discussed earlier in this paper. Even though it is usually regarded as something negative, it was applied in this particular line. It can be rightfully presumed that adults, especially parents, would mind the use of the expression “what the hell”.

The expression “what the heck”, on the other hand, is an archaic expression and it is in contrast with the rest of the text. So, the lines were re-written in order to avoid it:

Vixen is thinking: “What in blue blazes?

Why does hedgehog keep singing it praises?”

- Lines 6.6.

Dok juri tako uz grobni muk,

pred njom na stazi, stvori se vuk.

Racing through forest quiet as the grave,

Out of the blue, Wolf pops out of his cave.

The expression “quiet as the grave” perfectly conveys the meaning of the original since both contain a reference to a grave. The notion of “cave” was added here because of the rhyme, but it is entirely suitable given that wolves, just like some other animals, do sometimes live in caves, which can be ideal natural shelters.

- Lines 7.3.

– *Eh, kuća, trice! – veli vuk zao.*

– *Ta ja bih svoju za janje dao!*

The situation here is related to the one in the lines 6.1. above:

Mean Wolf says: “His house is enchanting? Damn!

I’d give mine gladly for a juicy lamb!”

But there is one exception. In the lines 6.1. the expression “what the hell” was in fact used in the original text, whereas in this example there is no reference to “damn”. The equivalent of “trice” is “trifle”. Therefore, the first line was adapted in order to avoid using the word “damn” because it did not seem age-appropriate and it would be an unnecessary insertion:

Wolf says: “An enchanting house? That’s a sham!

I’d gladly give mine for a juicy lamb!”

The word order in the second line was changed for the purpose of alliteration.

- Lines 7.4.

Poći ću s tobom jer volim šalu,

hoću da vidim ježa – budalu!

These two lines repeat two more times – lines 8.5. and 9.6. They were translated as follows:

“I’ll come with you ‘cause I like a good joke.

I want that silly hedgehog to provoke!”

Even though a native speaker understands these lines, they sound a bit unusual. For that reason, two more versions were created:

(a) *“I’ll come with you ‘cause I like a good trick.*

I want on that silly hedgehog to pick!”

(b) *“I’ll come with you ‘cause I like a good prank.*

I want to pick on that silly old crank!”

Version (b) was chosen mostly because the word order in the second line is more natural. The meaning is more or less the same. Moreover, from the other characters’ point of view,

Hedgy is weird and therefore it is suitable to address him as “crank”, meaning an annoyingly eccentric person.

- Lines 8.3.

*– Kućica, glupost! Moje mi njuške,
svoju bih dao za gnjile kruške.*

The pears are described as being rotten, but that would most likely cause a feeling of disgust among the readers. For that reason, the adjective “juicy” was used instead.

*“I’ve never heard of such nonsense! Who cares?
I’d gladly trade mine for some juicy pears.”*

- Lines 8.4.

*Za satić meda dat’ ću je svakom! –
govori medo na jelo lakom.*

The word “satić” is in fact a small honeycomb (Babić 144, own translation) and therefore the translation reads:

*“For a single honeycomb I’ll give mine,
Food is something I can never decline.”*

- Lines 8.6.

*Sve troje jure k’o divlja rijeka,
odjednom – evo – kaljuga neka.*

To describe how fast they are running, in the original text they are compared to a wild river. In the translation, on the other hand, they are “running like being chased by a dog” which also implies speed. Dogs are normally used for hunting wild animals and, what is more, the hunter’s hound was previously mentioned in the story.

*They are running as if chased by a dog,
Suddenly before them appears – a bog.*

- Lines 9.2.

*– Hr-nji junaci, sumnjiva trka,
negdje se, valjda, bogovski krka?!*

“Hr-nji” is in fact an attempt to reproduce a sound that wild boars make. It is impossible to reproduce it in English. It would make no sense whatsoever. Therefore, it is translated as “oink” which is a characteristic grunting sound of a pig:

*“Oink, oink, my forest fellows, what’s the rush?
Is there a feast you’re keeping on the hush?”*

- Lines 9.4.

*– Tražimo razlog, blatnjava zvijezdo,
zašto jež voli rođeno gnijezdo!*

Wild Boar is addressed as “blatnjava zvijezda”, which literally means a “muddy star”. This is an attempt to butter him up. It suggests admiration and importance, just like the word “king”:

*“We are on our way, my dear king of mire,
Why hedgehog loves his nest to inquire.”*

- Lines 11.1.

*Medvjed i svinja i s njima vuja
grmnuše gromko prava oluja:*

In the second line there is an image of the three shouting loudly. The sound is compared to that of a storm. In the translation the storm is replaced by thunder:

*Both Bear and Wolf, together with Wild Boar,
Started shouting like the thunder of Thor:*

The second line also contains a reference to the mythological character Thor. In Norse mythology, he is a god associated with thunder, lightning and storms. Specifically for that reason, this character seemed to fit perfectly into the second line. The comparison to Thor’s thunder faithfully depicts the loudness of their shouting.

The main concern here was the issue of foreignness, especially because the target readers are children. But if Thor, as a mythological character, is regarded as part of the general knowledge of the world and other cultures, then there is no reason to omit this reference from the text. Moreover, this would be, as it was explained above, “writing down” to children. Children have more abilities than people usually think. They are curious by nature, hungry for knowledge and incredibly imaginative. They ask questions all the time and learn from answers. It would be a shame to omit “Thor” from this line, because this is something that would definitely attract children’s attention and spark off their imagination.

Furthermore, a Hollywood blockbuster “Thor” was recently released, so even more children got a chance to get acquainted with this mythological character.

- Lines 11.3.

*Koliba tvoja prava je baba,
krov ti je truo, prostirka slaba.*

These lines were translated as follows:

*“That hut of yours is just like an old hag,
Its roof is rotten and your bed a rag.”*

In the original text, hedgehog’s hut was compared to an old hag indeed, but this comparison does not make sense in English. There were a few more versions of these two lines:

*“That hut of yours is nothing but a wreck,
Its roof is rotten and your bed a dreck.”*

The word “dreck” means rubbish or trash, but no one uses it anymore and therefore this translation simply does not work. In an attempt to avoid it, the following three versions were created:

- (a) *“That hut of yours is nothing but a mess.
You better move to another address.”*
- (b) *“That hut of yours is all in disarray.
The roof could collapse when you hit the hay.”*
- (c) *“That hut of yours is all in a jumble,
Its roof is rotten and it might crumble.”*

The last version (c) was chosen as the most suitable.

- Lines 11.5.

*Kućicu takvu, hvališo mali,
za ručak dobar svakom bi dali!*

*“A house like this, you braggy little hunch,
We’d give to anyone for a good lunch!”*

In the first line of the original text Hedgehog is addressed as a little braggart. This was translated as “braggy little hunch”. Obviously, the original meaning was preserved and “hunch” was added. It seemed appropriate because hedgehogs have a round back. Besides, in the picture book, Hedgehog was illustrated as having a slightly bent-over posture.

- Lines 11.6.

*Rekoše tako njih troje, ljuti,
dok mudra lija po strani šuti.*

For the sake of rhyme, their “anger” was translated as if they were “causing a riot”. It seems appropriate because this was an organized disturbance of Hedgy’s peace indeed.

*The three of them are causing a riot,
While clever vixen is being quiet.*

- Lines 12.9.

*To reče, klisnu jednom ćuviku,
a ono troje, digoše viku:*

These two lines posed a rather specific problem because they are almost completely incomprehensible for an average Croatian reader. It was necessary to find an explanation for the first line. The word “ćuvik” is in fact a (steep) hillock or a summit (Babić 143, own translation) and “klisnuti” means to disappear from sight. After deciphering the meaning of the first line, the stanza was translated as follows:

*Having said that, vixen runs up the hill,
And the three start of hedgehog to speak ill:*

For the sake of rhyme, in the second line an idiom was used, but its meaning is close enough to that of the original.

- Lines 13.3.

*Trapavog medu, oh, kuku, lele,
do same smrti, izbole pčele.*

“Oh, kuku, lele” is an exclamation of distress or disappointment, meaning “poor me”. It is translated as “my oh my”. This is an expression of surprise, not only joy, but also dismay at a situation, as is the case in the following lines:

*After that, poor clumsy Bear, my oh my,
Got stung by a swarm of bees – said bye-bye.*

The phrase to “say bye-bye” is used to express farewell. In this case it is a euphemism for getting killed. The hyphen had to be inserted instead of “and” because of the number of syllables. Since it interrupts the flow of the line, the whole line was changed in order to avoid it:

*After that, poor clumsy Bear, my oh my,
Got stung by hundred bees and said goodbye.*

- The Title

Ježeva kućica

There were three possible versions of the translation:

(1) *Hedgehog's House*

The title literally means “Hedgehog’s Little House”. The word “kućica” is a diminutive in Croatian, but in this context it does not only suggest that his house is small. It is a way of showing affection. If it were translated only as “house”, this meaning would not be conveyed.

(2) *Hedgehog's Mansion*

The word “mansion”, on the other hand, would imply wealth or even a stately building. Even though Hedgy might believe that, it is obvious that his house is nothing of the sort.

(3) *Hedgehog's Home*

There is a certain kind of warmth associated with the word “home” and for that reason this title was chosen.

7. CONCLUSION

Childhood is a truly important stage in people's lives, a stage in which people learn about themselves and different aspects of life. Children's identity begins to shape and they acquire social and cultural values, in which reading plays an important role. Therefore, children's literature is seen as an educational means. Although this literature is intended primarily for children, it actually has double audience – children and adults. Adults, especially parents and teachers, are the ones who decide which texts are appropriate for children. Since children's books are in fact purchased by adults and then presented to children, authors and publishers try to produce texts that would appeal to adult customers. Translators, too, are forced to somewhat manipulate the original text with the intention of serving different purposes.

Children's literature and adult literature do not differ much when it comes to translation theory and approach. However, it is necessary to bear in mind that children have a limited world view and life experience. Another thing that should not be overlooked is culture, because every text contains characteristics of the culture from which it originates. When transferring a text to another culture, it has to be adapted in some way. The necessity for adaptation varies depending on the text and the age of the target reader. Even though some translation theorists strongly oppose adaptation, it can never be completely avoided. This is especially evident in verse translation, where form and content are interdependent, even more so if verses rhyme, as is the case with "Ježeva kućica".

In the process of translating "Ježeva kućica", it was attempted to transfer the rhyme of the original poem into the translation, that is, to preserve the rhyming structure as well as the meaning of the original poem. In order to achieve this, different methods had to be employed. Naturally, the possibility of poetry translation does not mean that each and every aspect of the text is translatable in practice. Every language has its own lexical and structural patterns which are hard or even impossible to imitate in a different language. In addition, there are also cultural differences which cannot be ignored. What our society considers acceptable, or at least what it considered acceptable at the time when the story was written, does not mean that it is acceptable in the Anglo-American culture today. Therefore, some things had to be omitted, some were added and others simply adorned. Even though it was attempted to stay as close to the original meaning as possible, there were instances when the letter and the spirit of the text collided. In such cases, the spirit of the text was given priority.

The children do not care if what they are reading was originally published in a language that they cannot understand. Through translations they get an opportunity to familiarize themselves with stories of other nations and to share experiences with children from different parts of the world. Some brilliant examples of poetry translations can be found and this shows that, even though translating poems is more difficult than other types of texts, it does not mean that it is impossible.

8. REFERENCES

- Attwater, Juliet. "Cadernos de Tradução." *Perhappiness: The Art of Compromise in Translating Poetry or: Steering Between Two Extremes*. Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina. Florianópolis, Brasil. 20 September 2012. <<http://www.periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/traducao/article/view/6585>>
- Babić, Stjepan. "Ježeva kućica kao pedagoški i jezični problem." *Jezik: časopis za kulturu hrvatskoga književnog jezika* 53rd vol. 4, Oct. 2006: 139-146. *Hrčak: Portal znanstvenih časopisa Republike Hrvatske*. Srce, Zagreb. 1 October 2012. <<http://hrcak.srce.hr/16955>>
- Bassnett Susan, and André Lefevere. *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Cleveland/Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, 1998.
- Ćopić, Branko. *Ježeva kućica*. Zagreb: Naša djeca, 2007.
- House, Juliane. "Linguistic Aspects of the Translation of Children's Literature." *Übersetzung – Translation – Traduction. An International Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2004.
- Hunt, Peter, ed. *Understanding Children's Literature*. 2nd edition. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Lewandowska – Tomaszczyk, Barbara. "Semantics and Translation." *Übersetzung – Translation – Traduction. An International Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2004.
- Neubert, Albrecht. "Equivalence in Translation." *Übersetzung – Translation – Traduction. An International Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2004.
- Newmark, Peter. *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall, 1988.
- Nida, Eugene A., and Charles R. Taber. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1982.
- Nida, Eugene. "Principles of Correspondence." *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2000. 126-140.
- Nodelman, Perry. *Defining Children's Literature*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008.
- O'Sullivan, Emer. *Comparative Children's Literature*. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Oittinen, Riitta. *Translating for Children*. New York: Garland Publishing, 2000.
- Raffel, Burton. The Unavoidable Linguistic Bases of Translation. *The Art of Translating Poetry*. The Pennsylvania State University, 1988. 13 September 2012. <http://books.google.hr/books?id=B5On3RPazFsC&pg=PA3&hl=hr&source=gbs_toc_r&cad=3#v=onepage&q&f=false>

Shavit, Zohar. *Poetics of Children's Literature*. Athens and London: University of Georgia Press, 1986. 8 August 2012. <<http://www.tau.ac.il/~zshavit/pocl/index.html>>

Udruženje Naša Jugoslavija. *Branko Ćopić*. 20 September 2012. <http://www.nasa-jugoslavija.org/Branko_Copic.htm>

9. APPENDIX (Translation)

JEŽEVA KUĆICA

HEDGEHOG'S HOME

1.

SLAVNI LOVAC

FAMOUS HUNTER

1.1.

Po šumi, širom, bez staze, puta,
Ježurka Ježić povazdan luta.

Across the forest, though he is no stray,
Hedgy the Hedgehog roams around all day.

1.2.

Lovom se bavi, često ga vide,
s trista kopalja na juriš ide.

He can be seen hunting; that is his trade.
His three hundred spines as sharp as a blade.

1.3.

I vuk, i medo, pa čak i – ovca,
poznaju ježa, slavnog lovca.

Ask both Wolf or Bear, or faint-hearted Ewe,
Hedgy the hunter is known by his crew.

1.4.

Jastreb ga štuje, vuk mu se sklanja,
zmija ga šarka po svu noć sanja.

Hawk keeps his distance, Wolf guards his behind,
Snake, while sleeping, has Hedgy on her mind.

1.5.

Pred njim, dan hoda, širi se strava,
njegovim tragom putuje slava.

Where he goes, horror travels far ahead,
Exciting stories of him quickly spread.

2.

LIJINO PISMO

VIXEN'S LETTER

2.1.

Jednoga dana, vidjeli nismo,
Ježić je, kažu, dobio pismo.

One day, after the weather got better,
Hedgy the Hedgehog got Vixy's letter.

2.2.

Medeno pismo, pričao meca,
stiglo u torbi poštara zeca.

That letter, Bear said, was sweet as honey,
And came in a bag of mailman Bunny.

2.3.

Adresa kratka, slova k'o jaja:
"Za druga Ježa na kraju gaja."

Address short, letters round in color mauve:
"To Sir Hedgehog at the end of the grove."

- 2.4. U pismu piše: "Ježurka, brate,
sanjam te često i mislim na te. The letter says: "Hedgy, my dear brother,
I dream of you and think of no other."
- 2.5. Evo ti pišem iz kamenjara
guskinim perom. Divno li šara! "I am writing from this outcrop of mine
With a goose feather. It scribbles just fine."
- 2.6. Dođi na ručak u moju logu,
požuri samo, ne žali nogu. "Why don't you join me for lunch in my den?
Come on, get ready, and shake a leg then."
- 2.7. Sa punim loncem i masnim brkom
čekat ću na te, požuri trkom. "With a full table and a greasy stache
I'll be waiting for you, come in a flash."
- 2.8. Nježno te grli medena lica
i pozdrav šalje lisica Mica." "To you, my darling friend, I send my best,
And I'd like you to be my special guest."
- 2.9. Jež se veseli:
– Na gozbu, veli, Hedgy the Hedgehog is so delighted.
Going to a feast, he's all excited.
- 2.10. tu šale nema,
hajd' da se sprema. There's no time for joking, he's well aware.
He should get moving; it's time to prepare.
- 2.11. Ježurka Ježić lukavo škilji,
pregleda bodlje i svaku šilji. Hedgy the Hedgehog is slyly squinting,
And whetting his spines till they are glinting.
- 2.12. – Ako bi usput došlo do boja,
nek bude spremna obrana moja. "If battle should happen along the way,
My defense must be ready, come what may."
- 2.13. Sunčani krug se u zenit dig'o
kad je Ježurka do lije stig'o. The sun was high up, burning like a flame,
When Hedgy to her house finally came.

3.
KOD LIJINE KUĆE

AT VIXY'S HOUSE

- 3.1.
Pred kućom- logom, kamenog zida, Outside Vixy's lair that's made of stone wall
Ježurka Ježić svoj šešir skida, Hedgy takes off his top hat, standing tall.
- 3.2.
klanja se, smješka, kavalir pravi, He bows with a smile, such a gentleman,
biranom frazom lisicu zdravi: He greets her as politely as he can:
- 3.3.
– Dobar dan, lijo, vrlino čista, "Good afternoon, Vixy; your virtue shines.
klanjam se tebi, sa bodlja trista. Before you I bow my three hundred spines."
- 3.4.
Nek perje pijetla krasi tvoj dom, "May rooster feathers adorn your dwelling,
kokoš nek sjedi u loncu tvom! May a hen roast always smell compelling!"
- 3.5.
Guskino krilo lepeza tvoja, "May a goose wing fan cool your lovely face,
a jastuk meki patkica koja. May you sleep in a duckling's soft embrace."
- 3.6.
Živjela vječno u miru, sreći, "May you always live in peace and delight,
nikada lavež ne čula pseći. Never should you hear the dog bark at night."
- 3.7.
I još ti ovo na kraju velim: "Let me tell you one more thing in the end:
ja sam za ručak trbuhom cijelim! I'm set to fill up my belly, dear friend!"
- 3.8.
Otpoče ručak čaroban, bajni. The lunch started, magical and yummy.
I jež, i lija od masti sjajni. Both ended up with a swollen tummy.
- 3.9.
Jelo za jelom samo se niže, Beef stew after pie, followed by a roast,
Ježurka često zdravicu diže: Hedgy proposes yet another toast:
- 3.10.
u zdravlje lije i njene kuće, "To Vixy's good health and also her charm
za pogibiju lovčeva Žuće. And to hunter's old hound buying the farm."
- 3.11.
Niže se ručak četverosatni, Following full four hours of delight,
zategnu trbuh k'o bubanj ratni. Like war drums their bellies are stretched real tight.

NOĆ

Evo i noći, nad šumom cijelom
nadvi se suton sa modrim velom.

Promakne samo leptirić koji
i vjetar noćnik listove broji.

Utihnu šuma, nestade graje,
mačaka divljih oči se sjaje.

Skitnica svitac svjetiljku pali,
čarobnim sjajem putanju zali.

A sova huknu svoj ratni zov:
– Držite se, ptice, počinje lov!

Ježić se diže, njuškicu briše.
– Ja moram kući, dosta je više.

Dobro je bilo, na stranu šala,
lisice draga, e, baš ti hvala.

RASTANAK

– Moja je kuća čvrsta k'o grad,
prenoći u njoj. Kuda ćeš sad? –

tako ga lija za konak sladi,
a jež se brani, šta da se radi:

4.

NIGHT

4.1.

The whole big forest is shrouded by night.
The dark blue nightfall veils all of the light.

4.2.

A few butterflies get caught in the breeze
While the night wind is heard and rustling leaves.

4.3.

Silence. Not a sound disturbs the cool air.
Only bobcats' eyes can be seen to glare.

4.4.

A wandering glowworm turns on his light,
His magic transforms his path, burning bright.

4.5.

Silence is broken when Owl starts to hoot:
“The hunt begins and you birds better scoot!”

4.6.

Hedgy rises and gently wipes his snout.
“The time has come for me to leave, no doubt.”

4.7.

“The lunch was delicious, I kid you not.
Vixen, you've been a good host, thanks a lot.”

5.

FAREWELL

5.1.

“My house is safe and I'm a host upright.
Don't hurry. Why don't you stay for the night?”

5.2.

That's how clever vixen lures him to stay
And hedgehog resists her thinking, no way:

- 5.3.
– Zahvaljujem se pozivu tvom,
al' mi je draži moj skromni dom!
“Thank you for sending me a nice letter.
Now I must go, I like my home better.”
- 5.4.
– Ostani, kume, lija sve guče,
moli ga, zove, za ruku vuče.
Vixen coos: “Stay the night, precious Hedgy,
Give me your hand, dear, don’t be so edgy.”
- 5.5.
Al' jež, tvrdoglav, osta pri svom.
– Draži je meni moj skromni dom!
But hedgehog is stubborn and starts to foam:
“Vixen, I still prefer my humble home!”
- 5.6.
Šušteći šumom jež mjeri put,
kroz granje mjesec svijetli mu put.
Quickly rustling through forest in the night,
Down the path that’s shining in the moonlight.
- 5.7.
Ide jež, gundā, dok zvijezde sjaju:
– Kućico moja, najljepši raj!
There goes hedgehog mumbling while the stars shine:
“My house, the sweetest paradise of mine!”
6.
POTJERA
THE CHASE
- 6.1.
Ostade lija, misli se: – Vraga,
što mu je kuća toliko draga?
Vixen is thinking: “What in blue blazes?
Why does hedgehog keep singing it praises?”
- 6.2.
Kad Ježić tako žudi za njom,
bit' će to, bogme, bogati dom.
“To get there if Hedgy’s in such a rush,
It surely must be a home very lush.”
- 6.3.
Još ima, možda, od perja pod,
pečene ševe krase mu svod.
“Feathers might be spread all over the floor,
Baked larks might serve as a ceiling decor.”
- 6.4.
Ta kuća, vjeruj, obiljem sja.
Poći ću, kradom, da vidim ja.
“That house, I am sure, is full of great wealth.
To see for myself I must move with stealth.”
- 6.5.
Požuri lija, nečujna sjena,
paperje meko noga je njena.
Like a shadow, vixen’s in a hurry,
Quickly moving her feet soft and furry.

6.6.
Dok juri tako uz grobni muk,
pred njom, na stazi, stvori se vuk.
Racing through forest quiet as the grave,
Out of the blue, Wolf pops out of his cave.

7.
VUK
WOLF

7.1.
– Grrrr, kuda žuriš, kaži-der lovcu;
možda si, negdje, pronašla ovcu?
“Grrrr, tell Wolf the great hunter what’s the rush;
Have you found a sheep with fleece nice and plush?”

7.2.
– Idem da doznam – lija sve duva –
zašto jež kuću toliko čuva.
“I want to find out”, says vixen panting,
“What makes hedgehog’s small house so enchanting.”

7.3.
– Eh, kuća, trice! – veli vuk zao.
– Ta ja bih svoju za janje dao!
Wolf says: “An enchanting house? That’s a sham!
I’d gladly give mine for a juicy lamb!”

7.4.
Poći ću s tobom, jer volim šalu,
hoću da vidim ježa – budalu!
“I’ll come with you ‘cause I like a good prank.
I want to pick on that silly old crank!”

7.5.
Dok jure dalje brzo k'o strijela,
srete ih medo, prijatelj pčela.
Moving on ahead as quick as a flash,
Into bee-loving Bear they almost crash.

8.
MEDO
BEAR

8.1.
– Sumnjiva žurba – medo ih gleda –
možda ste našli jezero meda?
“What’s the rush?” Big Bear looks at them funny.
“Maybe you’ve found a lake full of honey?”

8.2.
– Ne, nego maštu golica moju,
zašto jež voli kućicu svoju.
“There’s no lake, I just really need to know
Why Hedgy the Hedgehog loves his house so.”

8.3.
– Kućica, glupost! Moje mi njuške,
svoju bih dao za gnjile kruške.
“I’ve never heard of such nonsense! Who cares?
I’d gladly trade mine for some juicy pears.”

- 8.4.
Za satić meda dat' ću je svakom! – govori medo na jelo lakom.
“For a single honeycomb I’ll give mine,
Food is something I can never decline.”
- 8.5.
– Poći ću s vama, jer volim šalu,
hoću da vidim ježa – budalu!
“I’ll come with you ‘cause I like a good prank.
I want to pick on that silly old crank!”
- 8.6.
Sve troje jure k'o divlja rijeka,
odjednom – evo – kaljuga neka.
They are running as if chased by a dog,
Suddenly before them appears – a bog.
9.
DIVLJA SVINJA
WILD BOAR
- 9.1.
Divlja se svinja u njojzi banja,
pospano škilji i – jelo sanja.
Bathing lazily in it lies Wild Boar,
Squinting and dreaming of eating some more.
- 9.2.
– Hr-nji, junaci, sumnjiva trka,
negdje se, valjda, bogovski krka?!
“Oink, oink, my forest fellows, what’s the rush?
Is there a feast you’re keeping on the hush?”
- 9.3.
Poskoči svinja uz mnogo graje,
a vuk joj nato odgovor daje:
With lots of noise suddenly Boar leaps high,
And after that Wolf gives him a reply:
- 9.4.
– Tražimo razlog, blatnjava zvijezdo,
zašto jež voli rođeno gnijezdo!
“We are on our way, my dear king of mire,
Why hedgehog loves his nest to inquire.”
- 9.5.
– Rođeno gnijezdo! Tako mi sala,
za pola ručka ja bih ga dala!
“Loves his nest? Baloney! What’s the big deal?
I’d give mine in exchange for half a meal!”
- 9.6.
Poći ću s vama, jer volim šalu,
hoću da vidim ježa – budalu!
“I’ll come with you ‘cause I like a good prank.
I want to pick on that silly old crank!”
- 9.7.
Svi jure složno ka cilju svom,
kuda god prođu – prasak i lom!
Running as one to their destination,
In their wake it’s complete devastation!

	10.	
PRED JEŽEVOM KUĆICOM		AT HEDGEHOG'S HOUSE
	10.1.	
Pristigli ježa, glede: on stade kraj neke stare bukove klade.		As they finally catch up with hedgehog, They see him standing by an old beech log.
	10.2.	
Pod kladom rupa, tamna i gluha, prostirka u njoj od lišća suha.		Under it a hole that fills you with dread, In it a floor bedding of dry leaves spread.
	10.3.	
Tu Ježić uđe, pliva u sreći, šušti i pipa gdje li će leći.		Hedgy enters, his face without a frown, He's rustling and looking where to lie down.
	10.4.	
Namjesti krevet, od pedlja duži, zijeknu, pa leže i noge pruži.		He makes his bed, long as one hand span, Yawns, lies down and stretches like an old man.
	10.5.	
Sav blažen, sretan, niže bez broja: – Kućico draga, slobodo moja!		He's very happy and feeling divine: "My dearest house, the sweet freedom of mine!"
	10.6.	
Palačo divna, drvenog svoda, kolijevko meka, lisnatog poda,		"Wonderful palace with wooden ceiling, With a leafy floor, soft and appealing."
	10.7.	
uvijek ću vjeran ostati tebi, nizašto ja te mijenjao ne bi'!		"To you I promise to always stay true, There's not a chance I would ever trade you!"
	10.8.	
U tebi živim bez brige, straha i branit ću te do zadnjega daha!		"Here I live carefree, with no fear of death, And I will defend you till my last breath!"
	11.	
TRI GALAMDŽIJE		THREE LOUDMOUTHS
	11.1.	
Medvjed i svinja i s njima vuja grmnuše gromko prava oluja:		Both Bear and Wolf, together with Wild Boar, Started shouting like the thunder of Thor:

	11.2.	
– Budalo ježu, bodljivi soju, zar tako cijeniš stračaru svoju?!		“You foolish hedgehog of the sort spiny, That much you love your shack old and tiny?!”
	11.3.	
Koliba tvoja prava je baba, krov ti je truo, prostirka slaba.		“That hut of yours is all in a jumble, Its roof is rotten and it might crumble.”
	11.4.	
Štenara to je, tijesna, i gluha, sigurno u njoj imaš i buha!		“A kennel in which you can barely squeeze, And it is probably swarming with fleas!”
	11.5.	
Kućicu takvu, hvališo mali, za ručak dobar svakom bi dali! –		“A house like this, you braggly little hunch, We’d give to anyone for a good lunch!”
	11.6.	
Rekoše tako njih troje, ljuti, dok mudra lija po strani šuti.		The three of them are causing a riot, While clever vixen is being quiet.
	12.	
JEŽEV ODGOVOR		HEDGEHOG’S REPLY
	12.1.	
Diže se Ježić, oči mu sjaje, gostima čudnim odgovor daje:		Hedgy rises with a glow in his eye, To these strange guests he gives a quick reply:
	12.2.	
– Ma kakav bio moj rodni prag, on mi je ipak mio i drag.		“No matter what kind of home I have got, I still cherish it and love it a lot.”
	12.3.	
Prost je i skroman, ali je moj, tu sam slobodan i gazda svoj.		“It is simple and modest, but it’s mine, Here I am free and I like it just fine.”
	12.4.	
Vrijedan sam, radim, bavim se lovom i mirno živim pod svojim krovom.		“I am hardworking, hunting is my trade, I live in peace, without anyone’s aid.”
	12.5.	
To samo hulje, nosi ih vrag, za ručak daju svoj rodni prag!		“Only such scoundrels, may they go to hell, For some lunch give the home in which they dwell!”

	12.6.	
Zbog toga samo, lude vas troje, čestite kuće nemate svoje.		“That is why just the three of you alone Don’t have a house that you can call your own.”
	12.7.	
Živite, čujem, od skitnje, pljačke i svršit ćete – naopačke!		“I hear that you live off stealing, sadly, And you’ll surely end up really badly!”
	12.8.	
To sluša lija, pa sudi zdravo: – Sad vidim i ja, jež ima pravo!		Vixen’s listening and then sees the light: “I understand at last; hedgehog is right!”
	12.9.	
To reče, klisnu jednom ćuviku, a ono troje, digoš viku:		Having said that, vixen runs up the hill, And the three start of hedgehog to speak ill:
	12.10.	
– Jež nema pravo, na stranu šala; a i ti, lijo, baš si – budala!		“Hedgehog’s surely wrong, it’s no time for jokes; You too, vixen, are one of stupid folks!”
	13.	
KRAJ		THE END
	13.1.	
Šta dalje bješe, kakav je kraj? Pričat ću i to, potanko, znaj.		What happened next and how did it all end? I will tell you all the details, my friend.
	13.2.	
Krvnika vuka, jadona mu majka, umlata brzo seljačka hajka.		Wolf the hungry butcher, he’s such a clown, Very soon the farmers hunted him down.
	13.3.	
Trapavog medu, oh, kuku, lele, do same smrti, izbole pčele.		After that, poor clumsy Bear, my oh my, Got stung by hundred bees and said goodbye.
	13.4.	
I divlja svinja pade k'o kruška, smače je zimus lovačka puška.		And Wild Boar definitely had no fun, He soon got shot down by the hunter’s gun.
	13.5.	
Po šumi, danas, bez staze, puta Ježurka Ježić lovi i luta.		Across the whole forest, even today, Hedgy the Hedgehog hunts and roams all day.

13.6.

Vještak i majstor u poslu svom,
radi i čuva rođeni dom.

In his profession he is very skilled,
Working and guarding his home makes him thrilled.