

Translating poetry: Analysis of Croatian and German translations of Edgar Allan Poe's Selected Poems

Dimšić, Mia

Master's thesis / Diplomski rad

2017

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:142:207282>

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

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-12-27**



Repository / Repozitorij:

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



Sveučilište J.J. Strossmayera u Osijeku

Filozofski fakultet Osijek

Dvopredmetni sveučilišni diplomski studij engleskog jezika i književnosti -
prevoditeljski smjer i njemačkog jezika i književnosti – prevoditeljski smjer

Mia Dimšić

The Analysis of Rhyming Patterns in Edgar Allan Poe's Poem *The Raven* and Its German and Croatian Translations

Diplomski rad

Mentor: doc. dr. sc. Goran Schmidt

Osijek, 2017.

Sveučilište J.J. Strossmayera u Osijeku

Filozofski fakultet Osijek

Dvopredmetni sveučilišni diplomski studij engleskog jezika i književnosti -
prevoditeljski smjer i njemačkog jezika i književnosti – prevoditeljski smjer

Mia Dimšić

**Analiza rime u pjesmi *Gavran* Edgara Allana Poea i njezinih
prijevoda na njemački i hrvatski**

Diplomski rad

Znanstveno područje: humanističke znanosti

Znanstveno polje: filologija

Znanstvena grana: anglistika

Mentor: doc. dr. sc. Goran Schmidt

Osijek, 2017.

J.J. Strossmayer University of Osijek

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Double Major MA Study Programme in English Language and Literature –
English Translation and Interpreting Studies and in German Language and
Literature – German Translation and Interpreting Studies

Mia Dimšić

The Analysis of Rhyming Patterns in Edgar Allan Poe's Poem *The Raven* and Its German and Croatian Translations

Master's Thesis

Supervisor: Doc. dr. sc. Goran Schmidt

Osijek, 2017

J.J. Strossmayer University of Osijek

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Double Major MA Study Programme in English Language and Literature –
English Translation and Interpreting Studies and in German Language and
Literature – German Translation and Interpreting Studies

Mia Dimšić

The Analysis of Rhyming Patterns in Edgar Allan Poe's Poem *The Raven* and Its German and Croatian Translations

Master's Thesis

Scientific area: Humanities

Scientific field: Philology

Scientific branch: English Studies

Supervisor: Doc. Dr. Sc. Goran Schmidt

Osijek, 2017

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to analyse rhyme patterns in Edgar Allan Poe's poem *The Raven* and its selected German and Croatian translations. Its theoretical part deals with poetry translation in general, elaborates on various rhyme types and their translatability in different languages, explains the difference between analytic and synthetic languages and focuses on features of Edgar Allan Poe's poetry in general. Its practical part analyses 18 separate stanzas of the original poem's *The Raven*, together with their respective German and Croatian versions, and the aim of the analysis is to determine which rhyme patterns are chosen in these three languages and why.

Key words: poetry translation, rhyme, synthetic languages, analytic languages, Edgar Allan Poe, *The Raven*

Table of contents

1. Introduction	8
2. Defining poetry translation.....	9
3. Rhyme	14
3.1. Defining rhyme and its function	14
3.2. Types of rhyme	15
3.3. Rhyme in translation	17
4. Analytic vs synthetic languages	20
5. Poetry of Edgar Allan Poe	22
6. Analysis of <i>The Raven</i> and its German and Croatian translations.....	25
6.1. 1 st Stanza.....	25
6.2. 2 nd Stanza.....	28
6.3. 3 rd Stanza.....	30
6.4. 4 th Stanza.....	32
6.5. 5 th Stanza.....	34
6.6. 6 th Stanza.....	35
6.7. 7 th Stanza.....	37
6.8. 8 th Stanza.....	39
6.9. 9 th Stanza.....	41
6.10. 10 th Stanza.....	42
6.11. 11 th Stanza.....	44
6.12. 12 th Stanza.....	46
6.13. 13 th Stanza.....	47

6.14. 14 th Stanza.....	49
6.15. 15 th Stanza.....	51
6.16. 16 th Stanza.....	52
6.17. 17 th Stanza.....	54
6.18. 18 th Stanza.....	55
7. Conclusion.....	57
References.....	60

1. Introduction

Translation of poetry has always been a special topic of discussion among numerous translators, linguists and poetry lovers in general. Many find it untranslatable and deny its practical application, whereas others simply call it different names to fully grasp its distinction from every other literary genre. However, everyone agrees that it is a topic worth reflecting on and that its potential translators have a hard task ahead of them.

The factor that makes poetry translation even more complicated is rhyme; it is the most frequent device for establishing the poem's rhythm, yet at the same time the most complex one. This paper will shed light on poetry translation in general, on questions such as what makes this type of translation so complicated and how does one prepare him/herself for such translation challenges demanding more than solely linguistic knowledge. Furthermore, it will analyse the concept of rhyme, name its most frequent and most important types and try to determine the ways in which it gets translated, showing that it functions differently in different languages according to their features and classification. This paper also defines the distinction between the analytic and synthetic languages and sheds light on why belonging to one or the other group may largely influence rhyming patterns of a certain language.

Finally, this paper will use the poetry of Edgar Allan Poe, more precisely his poem *The Raven* to exemplify these statements by analysing its 18 stanzas with its selected German and Croatian translations. The aim of the analysis is to take a closer look at what each target language consists of and to which extent its features determine the type of rhyme used. In *The Raven*, the rhyme and rhythmic elements of the poem are paid attention to in great detail, and we will see that its stanzas develop both internal and external rhyme scheme with great precision, leaving the translator with numerous choices on how to adapt these elements to the target language and make them sound natural to the target readership.

2. Defining poetry translation

Among various kinds of translations, literary translation is often described as the most complicated and demanding one. It covers a very wide spectrum of subtypes in terms of different literary forms and their sometimes very diverse traits, but this paper will shed light exclusively on poetry translation, the kind that is even more unique and complicated than the rest due to its unusual form.

There are many ways to define a concept as vague as that of poetry and it is not an easy task, since this form combines ‘unilateral’ and clear language norms with artistic traits that may be very subjective, fluid and vague, and, for that reason, its definitions vary. In his *Biographia Literaria*, Samuel Taylor Coleridge defines it as “that species of composition which is opposed to works of science, by proposing for its immediate object pleasure, not truth” (poetryfoundation.org), and his contemporary William Wordsworth states it is “the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings” (bartleby.com). However, none of those definitions tackles the purely linguistic aspect of poetry which often is the primary guideline to translators trying to transfer the poem from one language to another.

Translation itself could be described as a tripartite process involving three participants, listed in the article *Translating Poetry. Contemporary Theories and Hypotheses* by Ovidiu Matiú as: transmitter (the original author), the translator (who receives the message of the transmitter, decodes, re-encodes it into another language different from that of the original message, and transmits it to an audience that uses language that is not identical to that of the original message), and the receiver. (Matiú 2008:130). If we apply this context to poetry translation, the translator receives an even greater role. He not only needs to adequately supply the target readership with semantic equivalents and convey the original author’s message, but also needs to respect the aesthetic function which may be the most important aspect of poetry and the one that makes it stand out among other literary subtypes. According to Hariyanto’s *Problems in Translating Poetry*, “the aesthetic function should emphasize the beauty of the words (diction), figurative language, metaphors, etc, while the expressive functions shall put forwards the writer's thought (or process of thought), emotion, etc” (Hariyanto, introduction). In this sense, the poetry translator is “an active *demiourgos* who creates, who uses the preexistent matter to create new forms, new ways of expression. He/she is supposed to possess an empathetic ability, to be able to live both in the time of the original, understanding the culture of that time, and in his/her present” (Matiú 2008: 129).

Pound (1991:36) states that “poetry is the most concentrated form of verbal expression” and lists three key aspects of the word: melopoeia (the musical property), phanopoeia (the visual property), and logopoeia (the most complex property that includes the "direct meaning" and the "play" of the word in its context), and poetry often relies on melopoeia as the most notable aspect vital to preserving the energy and flow of most poems through the process of translation (ibid: 37). Most poets and poetry translators adhere to similar guidelines and pay close attention to acoustic features of a poem, trying to transfer them to the target culture or at least find other means of achieving a similar effect in cases where source and target languages are too different and/or do not have any acoustic similarities. Duff (1981:95) also puts a great deal of importance on musicality of a poem, claiming that “it should never be assumed that no meaning is conveyed through the sound of a language”, which leads us to a conclusion that aesthetic and expressive function of a poem may be closely intertwined and musicality might be used in order to convey a message of a poem more effectively, and not merely to satisfy the reader’s visual and/or auditory sensors. Bearing this in mind, it is even more vital that the translator finds the most adequate way of transferring the original idea and sound play and it makes his/her task enormously difficult.

The easiest and most frequent way to achieve musicality in a poem is by using phonetic effects of some phonemes that are onomatopoeic, i.e. can evoke associations similar to natural sounds:

“For instance, the accumulation of the /r/ sound creates an image of toughness or terror. This effect was used by Johann Wolfgang Goethe, whose *Erlkönig* is an excellent example how language, German in this case, can imitate nature. When we close our eyes, we hear the sounds of a storm, thunder and the rustle of willow branches tossed by heavy wind” (Matiu 2008:131).

Hariyanto (§2) reflects on similar problems referring to the sound of the poem as “anything connected with sound cultivation including rhyme, rhythm, assonance, onomatopoeia, etc.”, which a translator must try to keep in his/her translation. Amid facing so many criteria that need to be fulfilled for a poem to function in another language and culture, it is no surprise that certain aspects of a poem are often ‘sacrificed’ by the translator in order to retain others. Newmark (1981:67) argues that the translator should sacrifice the sound in the condition where one of the three factors (structure, metaphor, or sound) need to be neglected, but Hariyanto (§2) thinks the translator should balance where the beauty of a poem really lies, and

decide according to his/her own intuition and aesthetic feeling. According to Bantas (1998:126), a good translation is not only an ideal, but also a duty of every person who calls himself/herself "translator", and that person has at least two obligations: "to decipher (decode) the semantic code of the original text (denotation and connotation), and its formal code or system (figures of speech, imagery, prosody, etc.)" and "to render the same elements at the same level, without semantic or expressive *losses*, but as well without *gains* of any kind, not even in clarity". Naturally, this task gets way more difficult when one translates into a language provided with a certain grammatical category from a language devoid of such a category (Jakobson 235). Examples of this could be, for instance, translations from English to Croatian, as the latter is significantly more morpheme- and case-marked. Furthermore, target readership and listeners will be most concentrated on compulsory ingredients of their own verbal code that sound natural to them, which is what brings Jakobson to one of the key points of translations studies: "Languages differ essentially in what they *must* convey and not in what they *may* convey" (ibid: 236).

Jakobson (238) further elaborates on the statement that poetry, being the literary form in which phonemic similarity is sensed as semantic relationship, is by its definition untranslatable. The more appropriate term for him would be 'creative transposition', either intralingual (from one poetic shape into another), interlingual (from one language into another), or intersemiotic (from one system of signs into another, e.g., from verbal art into music, dance, cinema, or painting). He concludes this thesis by noting that "if we were to translate into English the traditional formula *Traduttore, traditore* as "the translator is a betrayer," we would deprive the Italian rhyming epigram of all its paronomastic value" (ibid: 238). Nida and Taber (1982:4) also note that "anything that can be said in one language can be said in another, unless the form is an essential element of the message", which in a way supports Jakobson's attitude.

However, not all linguists are as drastic when it comes to the ability to transfer poetic elements from one verbal code to another. Bennett (7) makes use of the term 'transpoiesis' to clarify and arrange this complex net of expressive and aesthetic criteria. He defines it as the process in which the translator tries not to transliterate the elements of the poem, but to recreate them in the target language and culture so as to maximally reduce the losses made unavoidable by the transfer. Namely, it is way more difficult to translate poems that are closely tied to 'mechanical' constraints of a language like orthography, syntax, puns, etc., and it could be argued that strict translation is impossible in, for instance, anagrams. In such cases,

it is necessary to recreate a work in the target language using the same constraint, and transpoiesis unavoidably occurs: “One does not translate the words composing the original poem, one translates (in the sense of carrying over from one language/literary tradition/culture) the creative act from which the original poem is sprung” (Bennett 3). If we look at the process from that angle, translator’s task might be even harder than the poet’s: “...the poet creates, the translator recreates. His choices are both limited and dictated by someone else whose priorities were self-imposed. The translator is not a writer. He is condemned (or permitted, depending on how you look at it) to re-write only” (ibid: 6). Since the translator cannot possibly retain all of the poem’s elements, the only definition of a successful translation can be that he was successful in conveying to his readers what he/she determined was the most important in the poem (ibid: 7). Since most of the readers do not know what was sacrificed and are not acquainted with the source content, they are not able to judge the translator’s success, and can at best conclude that it “reads well” or does not read well in their native language (ibid: 8).

The question of how the poem looks to the target readership and if it feels natural to them brings us to the next key term of poetry translation: translator’s invisibility. It is used by Venuti (1995:1) to “describe the translator’s situation and activity in contemporary Anglo-American culture”, and explains a great deal about what makes a work of poetry sound trustworthy:

“A translated text, whether prose or poetry, fiction or non-fiction, is judged acceptable by most publishers, reviewers and readers when it reads fluently, when the absence of any linguistic or stylistic peculiarities makes it seem transparent, giving the appearance that it reflects the foreign writer’s personality or intention or the essential meaning of the foreign text – the appearance, in other words, that the translation is not in fact a translation, but the ‘original’” (ibid: 1).

This brings us back to Bennett (9) and his transpoiesis, and the fact that “it was not a poetic form that was carried over from one tradition to another, but rather the act of writing poetry itself. The concern was not to preserve an artifact, but an art; to focus not on creation, but on recreation”, and that tells us a lot about the important task the translator has. He/she not only needs to be linguistically competent, but needs to be a creative individual, able to read the original work with passion and understanding vital to retaining the most important parts of it, i.e. recognizing what should stay intact and what requires recreation. In this sense, it is no

overstatement that “to translate poetry is to write it, to live the creative act that ultimately results in a poem at once the same and yet different from its source” (ibid: 9).

3. Rhyme

3.1. Defining rhyme and its function

Rhyme is one of the first things that comes to mind when mentioning poetry, and is without doubt one of its most expressive traits that determines its rhythm and flow. *Dictionary of World Literature* defines it as "correspondence of terminal sounds" (Shipley 1953:344), or a "repetition of identical or closely similar sounds arranged at regular intervals" (ibid: 344), whereas Zhirmunski (ibid: 344) named it an "acoustic repetition that carries an organizing function in the metrical composition of the verse". Its roots go way back: Aristotle first mentions it in the Western culture in his *Rhetoric*, and Quintilian (ibid: 344) also takes notice of "a poetic device by means of which two or several sentences receive identical endings".

Levy (2011:232) defines rhyme as "a component in the complex interplay between the acoustic and the semantic values of a poem", and names the three basic rhyme functions:

Semantic – it establishes a semantic link between rhyming words (and therefore also between the corresponding lines), a link which may also take the form of a contrast (e.g. *night – light, Queens – screens, elope – Pope*)

Rhythmic – rhyme highlights the conclusion of the line; a monosyllabic rhyme can emphasize a rising final intonation, whereas a polysyllabic assonance can emphasize the 'soft' ending of a line

Euphonic" (ibid: 232)

He further explains that euphony includes harmony of sound within the line, and is as such one of the greatest challenges of poetry translation (ibid: 267).

We could also simplify this division and state that rhyme's function, firstly, is beauty, and that fragments of words that are being repeated within appreciable distance effectively attract the reader's attention to the beauty of words, a trait that is neglected in all other kinds of practical translations, which is not to say that poetry completely abandons the importance of words' meaning. It only adds some color to it. Secondly, rhyme makes the verse of the poem seem 'rhythmically constructive' and could be compared to a little signal or 'a time-beater' audibly defining the end of each verse. (Shipley 1953: 344)

Schlegel (ibid: 345) notes it is “the aesthetic function of rhyme to attract our attention and compel our mind to appreciate and to compare words as such”, and it can without doubt be stated that it strengthens and supports the rhythm and, bearing that in mind, its function is not merely ornamental, but also organic and functional (ibid: 345). That is why each poetry translator needs to pay close attention on its function in the poem, and compare rhyming habits of both target and source culture and the individual writers.

3.2. Types of rhyme

There are many different types of rhyme, and this chapter will cover the majority of those occurring most frequently in the English language. It is important to note that not all types of rhymes are equally applicable in every language and not all are equally suitable for all poetry subtypes. Rhyming conventions are by no means universally the same (Shipley 1953:347).

The most widely used type of rhyme is *end rhyme*, and we could also call it true rhyme or rhyme proper. It is the most frequent sound device in middle and modern English, and is visible in the next example by Whittier:

The sun that brief December *day*

Rose cheerless over hills of *gray* (ibid: 346).

Initial rhyme (also head or beginning rhyme) occurs at the beginning of the line instead of the end, and *interior rhyme* occurs within the same line of a stanza (Espy 2006:5). Alliteration and assonance are also powerful poetic devices. Alliteration occurs when one or more syllables of different words begin with consonant sounds or vowel sounds felt to be identical, as is the case in the sentence ‘Peter piper picked a peck of pickled peppers’ (Shipley 1953:346). Assonance is a repetition of a vowel sound within the line, e.g. ‘Old bones move slowly’ (Espy 2006:6), here the vowel sounds are felt to be identical but the consonants joining them are different, and consonance is the opposite process; one or more syllables of different words are felt to be identical, but the vowels are different, e.g. road, bed, bid, rood (Shipley 1953:346).

There are many other interesting and linguistically rare ways to form a rhyme, and these are not as widely used in poetry, but are worth looking at. *Synthetic rhyme* uses words

‘artificially’ altered to achieve rhyme, e.g. *stile-a, mile-a* (Shipley 1953:348), and some of the earlier translators even used the system called ‘padding’, i.e. they would use a repertoire of rhymes containing meaningless short words such as *oh, no, yeah* that they could call on in a great variety of contexts (Levy 2011:193). In *cross rhyme*, the rhyming sound at the end of one line is matched somewhere inside another, *random rhyme* is irregular mixing of rhymed and unrhymed lines in a stanza, and in *identical rhyme* both consonant and vowel sounds match, though they are seldom repetitions of the same word, as in e.g. *praise – prays, bard – barred* (Espy 2006:5). *Eye rhyme* is only visually correct, but is justified by the changes in pronunciation throughout history, e.g. *join – divine, obey – tea* (Shipley 1953:347). In *vowel rhyme* only the vowel sounds of the rhyming lines correspond, e.g. *age – rail, take – blue, move – flute*, whereas *consonantal rhyme* matches only the sound that ends the syllable, e.g. *easy – busy, fast – waste* (Espy 2006:5). In rare cases, even the methods such as deliberately creating rhymes where consonants correspond and vowels differ are employed, as exemplified by poets like Emily Dickinson, Wilfred Owen and Archibald MacLeish, and called *pararhyme* (Levy 2011:261). *Mosaic rhyme* is also quite unusual in that it matches one word against two, or even more, e.g. *tiller – kill her, Ohio – I owe*, and an even more peculiar method is called *Procrustean* or *impossible rhyme*, which stretches words, chops them up or squeezes several into one to make a match (Espy 2006:6).

One of the most distinguished rhyme classifications is that between rich and grammatical rhyme and banal and original rhyme. In *rich rhyme*, there are semantic associations between lexical units, whereas in *grammatical rhyme* they exist only between identical grammatical suffixes. Furthermore, *banal rhyme* contains rhyming pairs that occur frequently, to the extent of becoming clichés, and *original rhyme* is made of unusual associations (Levy 2011:233).

However, perhaps the most important rhyme classification when it comes to poetry translation is the one on masculine, feminine and dactylic rhyme. As stated by Levy (2011:238), “depending on the distance of the last stressed syllable from the end of the line, the rhyme is monosyllabic (masculine), disyllabic (feminine) or trisyllabic (dactylic)”. He furthermore states that “monosyllabic (masculine) rhyme is the norm in languages in which the stress falls on the final syllable in the vast majority of words, whether it is because there is a predominance of monosyllabic words (as in English) or whether it is because the stress is fixed on the final syllable in a word (ibid: 238), whereas “disyllabic rhyme is the norm in languages in which the stress falls on the penultimate syllable in the vast majority of words”

(ibid: 238), which is more frequent in Italian or Spanish. Both types of rhyme are equally valid in languages in which the stress falls on the first syllable (Czech, Hungarian) or in polysyllabic languages in which stress is in principle free (German, Russian) (ibid: 238). What is most important when it comes to the contrast between masculine and feminine rhyme is their different semantic potency: whereas masculine rhyme sounds energetic, firm and gives a definite and sharp conclusion to the line, feminine rhyme sounds soft, fluid and concludes the lines more definitively (ibid: 239). That is why the choice of one or the other may be of great importance to the poem translated and influence not just the aesthetics, but the expression of the work as well.

3.3 Rhyme in translation

Creating an original poem and forming its rhyme pattern is completely different than trying to recreate the preexistent rhyme scheme in another verbal code, which is why this chapter will shed light on transferring rhyme from one language to another and deal with different prosodic and acoustic aspects of languages involved.

The task of poetry translation might be unmanageable to a less gifted translator, who will pay more attention to content words and thereby impoverish the work of those words and elements. Since poetry as a literary form is marked by those subtle elements and undoubtedly consists of more than just facts, its artistic style depends on “many short words such as *then, just, well, say*, which have hardly any lexical meaning but which carry shades of meaning and subtleties of tone and create a smooth, even rhythm, making speech fluent and lively” (Levy 2011:122). In cases of rhymed translation, where the translator is focused on the formal beauty of the poem and tries to recreate a text based on rhyming norms and conventions of the target culture, this notion comes to mind even more. Rhyme often is the best way to achieve rhythm and flow, so it is important to render it in the target language as close as possible.

The problem with translating rhyme, though, is that a rhyming pair of words in the target language only rarely corresponds semantically to a rhyming pair of words in the source language, and when it does, it is because the two languages belong to the same family, or are in any other way closely related. It is surprising if at least one rhyming pair semantically fits the rhyming pair from the source language; in languages less etymologically related, corresponding meanings can be achieved in rhyming positions, but they mostly need to be expressed with different lexemes or phrases. That is why rhyme is often achieved through some insignificant word, the extension of meanings already contained somewhere else in the

text (ibid: 192). Levy (2011:193) also stated that the translator's personal style and preferences are most visible in the closing words of the line, for his/her accuracy gradually decreases nearing the end of the line.

There are many differences in structures of languages that a translator needs to be acquainted with to retain the naturalness of rhythm and rhyme in the target language. For instance, rhymes involving unstressed function words, such as *minute – in it*, are considered only convenient and semantically weak in English poetry, and some of its poets and schools of poetry also refuse to use grammatical rhyme, finding it bland and lacking in creativity (ibid: 237).

It is interesting to note that different cultures apply drastically different prosodic rules, i.e. some think acoustically different sounds are equivalent for purposes of rhyme, and others consider them not equivalent. For instance, English prosodists would consider a rhyme like *dawn – morn* inadmissible, but their poetics is very tolerable when it comes to eye rhymes such as *love – move*, *door – moor*, that are graphically similar but pronounced differently (ibid: 249). German, on the other hand, is mostly made of consonants and they are an important element of every rhyme scheme so assonance, i.e. vowel or vocalic harmony, is rare to find in their literature, except when it is used to imitate foreign forms (ibid: 251). Another problem with German is that it is very abrasive because of the accumulation of consonants and the vowels sounds are suppressed. Its voiced consonants are often assimilated to voiceless (e.g. there is almost no difference between *Weg* and *Weck* when it comes to pronunciation), which makes it easier to form rhymes. English, on the contrary, is very sensitive to voiced consonants (ibid: 252). Then there are also Romance and Slavonic languages whose readers are used to repetitions of consonants and perceive them as an ornamental sound rather than a prosodic principle (ibid: 254), and those differences make it hard to assimilate rhyme conventions.

Sound patterns of rhyme often have semantic value as well: in German, for instance, “sombre moods are associated with *u* or *o* (Furcht, Ehrfurcht, Gruseln, Trauer), whereas cheerful feelings are associated with *i* or *e*” (Kronasser 1952:163). The semantic associations achieved through sound patterns are nevertheless unstable and vague and they form a concept almost impossible to recreate in another language, since the same lexemes and concepts may mean different things to readers of opposing cultures.

On the other hand, sounds can acquire a much clearer meaning when they are used to imitate nature: “If elements of such onomatopoeic words are repeated in verse, their meaning is recalled, and they become carriers of meaning” (Levy 2011:269). A good example may be translation of the English verb *rustle* as *rauschen* in German. The sibilants in both lexemes evoke the sensation of sounds the wind produces, and this type of acoustic entity is the easiest to translate, for the acoustic imagery of expressions representing the same meanings are quite similar in these two languages and they stem from the same language family (ibid: 269).

Some languages are richer in vowels (especially long ones), and their poetry is devoid of consonants, making it harder to achieve semantic breaks and contrasts since there is always a flowing sequence of vowel sounds. This is typical for French, its poetry teeming with open syllables, and German translators thus have a hard time trying to apply the same strategy to their native language full of consonants (ibid: 270). A sound sequence is naturally most frequently based on the most commonly occurring sounds in a language. Nevertheless, if one would purposefully repeat the sounds which are not that usual in the given language, that could create a special aesthetic feeling and euphony (ibid: 271).

Bearing all of this in mind, it is almost impossible to transfer rhyme from one language to another, unless the two language systems are closely related, and/or evoke the same associations in their respective readers.

4. Analytic vs synthetic languages

Linguistic typology deals with structural and functional language features and its main classification includes analytic and synthetic languages. This chapter will provide definitions and traits of both subtypes and try to connect them with poetry, especially rhyme, and determine how linguistic typology types influence rhyming possibilities of a given language and its translatability.

Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (5) defines analytic and synthetic languages as follows in her work *Typological Distinctions in Word-Formation*:

“*Analytic* languages tend to have a one-to-one correspondence between a word and a morpheme; they have few if any bound morphemes. Vietnamese... or Mandarin Chinese are good examples of analytic languages. In contrast, in *synthetic* languages a word consists of several morphemes, and there are numerous bound morphemes. Hungarian or Russian are representative of synthetic languages”.

We could say that an analytic language has a lower morpheme-per-word ratio, and that it is able to convey a grammatical relationship with minimal use of inflectional morphemes, however with a large number of definite or indefinite articles. The most prominent example of this group of languages not mentioned by Aikhenvald is modern English. Synthetic languages have a higher morpheme-per-word ratio, and include more inflectional morphemes and less articles. Croatian is a typical example, whereas German is a borderline example.

In terms of rhyming possibilities, synthetic languages (e.g. Russian, Czech, and to a certain extent also Italian, German and French) have a much bigger number of rhymes than analytical languages (Levy 2011:233). English, having no inflectional morphemes and no cases, prefers a masculine (monosyllabic) rhyme and that leaves us with quite a few rhyming issues. Levy (2011:234) states that “the English *love* can only rhyme with words ending in *-ove*, and there are altogether only three of them (*glove, dove, above* – and a few eye-rhymes like *move, prove*) ... the rhyming vocabulary of an analytical language is disjunctive by contrast with the continuous structure of the rhyming vocabulary of synthetic languages”.

When comparing the two types, analytical language has a number of disadvantages in terms of its rhyming vocabulary. Firstly, it has only about 25 rhyming groups containing more than 50 items, and those are the only groups that offer an adequate variety of rhymes. Many of

its lexemes bear a significant meaning, but do not have available rhyme due to their untypical form. Secondly, most of the semantic associations get hackneyed quickly because there is simply not enough concepts matching them. An English poet, e.g., can rhyme *love* only with three lexemes (*dove, glove, above*). making these combinations weak and outworn. That is why repetition in English poetry is considered an aesthetic weakness, and not a sign of virtuosity (ibid: 235). Statistically, an English poet would be obliged to repeat a rhyme pair on every 1 to 2 pages, and such issues are presumed to be the main reason why Petrarch's sonnet (with its rhyme pattern *abba abba cdc cdc*) was transformed from the Italian form to the simplified Shakespearean rhyme pattern (*abab cdcd efef gg*) (ibid: 236). That is why English poetry often uses stereotypical disyllabic rhymes made by, for instance, adding the participles -ing or -ed (*failing – sailing, peculated – hypothecated*) (ibid: 241).

It is much easier to distinguish parts of words in synthetic languages, and to distinguish ending rhymes from stem rhymes or banal rhymes from original rhymes, whereas analytical languages almost do not have any unanticipated rhyme and its rhyming categories are less clearly defined (ibid: 237). German, unlike English, possesses quite a rich rhyming vocabulary, and here one can easily distinguish traditional from non-traditional rhyme. That is why it is in most cases easier to translate from English to German than the other way around. When it comes to Slavonic languages, rhyming schemes are generally more flexible than in western European languages (ibid: 238).

It is important to note that predominance of any rhyme type in each language is not the author's free choice but a proof that rhyme pattern is language-specific. Therefore, it is not necessary to restrict oneself to the rhyme scheme of the original in cases where one translates from a language such as English or Italian with limited rhyming resources to the language possessing more extensive resources. (ibid: 239) Since English prefers masculine rhymes, and Italian feminine rhymes, these two languages cannot achieve rhythmic and semantic contrast of combining the two rhyme types; the usage of, e.g., feminine rhyme in English would be felt as stylistically marked and in a way odd. On the other hand, German, Russian or French do not have such restrictions so their rhyming possibilities are in this way also more elaborate.

To sum up, it is visible that this binary linguistic typology classification heavily influences the overall rhyme scheme of most languages. English, German and Croatian all act differently in this context and all have distinct rhyming possibilities, which will be analyzed in the practical part of this thesis.

5. Poetry of Edgar Allan Poe

Although Edgar Allan Poe was a versatile writer who dealt with many genres throughout his lifetime, wrote short stories, publications, tackled both the practical and the mysterious and even started the crime story as a genre, this chapter will entirely focus on his work in the field of poetry. In this aspect, he is the main representative and a central figure of Romanticism movement in the United States and American literature as a whole: “In fact, one can consider Poe as a latter-day follower of Romanticism in so far as his basic range of themes, language and images explores the domain of the irrational and unconscious” (Parra 2000:53).

Through both his creation and clearly defined attitudes, Poe emphasized that the essential elements of poetic style were “brevity, the value of the poem ‘per se’”, as well as rhythmical creation of supernatural beauty (ibid: 54), which is visible if we look at his material, his most prominent poems such as *The Raven* or *Annabel Lee*, consisting of quite a few mysterious and haunting notions in which Poe almost specialized.

Poe generally adopted many poetic strategies and theoretical beliefs from Coleridge’s *Bibliographia Literaria*, especially the notion of poetry being a medium for reaching pleasurable feelings and beauty prior to truth. With such attitude, he was significantly at odds with the predominant doctrine of American poetics at the time, since most of the poets thought that poetry should have a didactic and moral role: “However, and paradoxically, within Romanticism itself we witness a powerful intellectualist movement that rejects the birth of the poem as an outpouring of feelings and sets out to identify the poetic act with mental clarity, rigour and a critical spirit” (ibid: 54). However, Poe’s poetic works were devoted to transcendence, aesthetic pleasure or shocking closures, and he was determined to assign a method to literary creation, as proven by his numerous theoretical works on poetry, i.e. he challenged the Romantic criteria regarding freedom of inspiration and called for an intellectual and analytical study which would benefit poetic composition (ibid: 53).

M. Minor (1982:2240) noted that Poe’s setting, atmosphere or situation were almost instantly recognizable in all surroundings: "specific poems of his have so passed into the common literary heritage that readers with only the slightest acquaintance with his work can quote lines and phrases from such poems as 'Annabel Lee' and 'The Raven'". It is evident that,

although Poe is recognized as a part of Romanticist movement, his ideas were not always exclusively under that category:

“Poe’s doctrine of effect is usually expressed in transcendental terms, such as “an elevating excitement of the Soul” and can thus be located within the field of Romantic literary theory... but Poe’s antididactic, antimimetic, and antiexpressive critical orientation; his doctrines of construction and of effect; his vision of the text as a system – these features of critical and creative work are modernist” (Carlson 1996:278).

Poe wrote numerous theoretical works on poetry and is as such a critical and lucid writer, who not only writes spontaneously, but is able “to judge his own, accept or reject elements of poetry and watchfully attend the creation of his work” (Parra 2000:54). Still, as paradoxical as it may sound, he believed that “no more completely dignified work exists than that of the poem "per se"... "this poem which is a poem and nothing more, this poem written solely for the poem's sake" (ibid: 55). In fact, he reminds us of the initial and original acoustic and oral character of all poetry, and notes that poetry would not exist without its rhythmic elements, and that is how it maintains its “absolute essentiality” (ibid: 56), and that could be the reason he so heavily influenced numerous American poets and scholars. The final aim of poetry, for Poe, is the elevation of soul:

“Poetry is “no mere appreciation of the Beauty before us – but a wild effort to reach the Beauty above. Inspired by an ecstatic presence of the glories beyond the grave, we struggle, by multiform combinations among the things and thoughts of Time, to attain a portion of that Loveliness whose very elements, perhaps, attain to eternity alone” (ibid: 290).

His poems read well, the rhythm constantly flows and that is evident not just through rhyme, but through prosodic details, pauses and line durations, poem plots that are clear, concise and finish suddenly, almost abruptly, and he advocates the importance of good rhythm in his theoretical approach as well:

“In fact, Poe had already stated in *The Poetic Principle* the "absolute essentiality of rhythm" and the importance of musicality in the poem. He subsequently finishes by defining poetry as "The Rhythmical Creation of Beauty" and praises the different authors' compositions in which he underlines the rhythmical flow, the harmony

between the metre and the nature of the sentiments expressed, the melodic value, and the expression in verse of the theme treated” (ibid: 59).

When it comes to rhyme as an integral part of poetry’s rhythm, Poe devotes a whole essay in his *Marginalia* to discussing its importance and states that “a poem should have equidistant rhymes which are repeated regularly in such a way that on varying the rhyme scheme the unexpected is produced. According to the author, the perfection of rhyme can only be achieved by combining both elements: regularity and the unexpected” (ibid: 61). In all of Poe’s poems, the rhyme is complex but consistent, repeating regularly throughout the poem without exception, but every once in a while, there is an additional element forming the contrast to the rest of the poem and that has somehow become a trademark of his poetry aesthetic. This kind of rhyme helps to achieve greater cohesion between the stanzas, and makes the poem seem vivid and fluent at the same time. The practical part of this thesis will thus focus on rhyme not just in Poe’s poem *The Raven*, but on its translations to German and Croatian.

6. Analysis of *The Raven* and its German and Croatian translations

This paper's practical part is the analysis of Edgar Allan Poe's original poem *The Raven* and its translations into German and Croatian respectively. The focus of the analysis is the original poem's rhyme scheme as opposed to rhyme schemes of its translations, and the aim is to discuss different rhyming techniques in these three languages according to their different traits and typological classes, and try to determine if these different rhyming patterns are language-specific. Works used in this section are *The Raven* by Edgar Allan Poe, extracted from volume VII of *The Works of the Late Edgar Allan Poe with Notices of His Life and Genius*, a German translation of the poem by Theodor Etzel and Hedwig Lachmann, and the Croatian version translated by Ivan Slamnig and Antun Šoljan. To make the rhyme scheme and explanation of the analysis clearer and more noticeable, all rhyming words will be marked in cursive and the external rhyme scheme pattern will be marked with capital letters and written in bold font.

6.1. 1st Stanza

“Once upon a midnight *dreary*, while I pondered, weak and *weary*, **A**

Over many a quaint and curious volume of forgotten *lore*— **B**

While I nodded, nearly *napping*, suddenly there came a *tapping*, **C**

As of some one gently *rapping*, *rapping* at my chamber door. **B**

“’Tis some visitor,” I muttered, ‘*tapping* at my chamber door— **B**

Only this and nothing *more*.’” **B**

(Poe 1852:7)

What makes *The Raven*'s rhyming scheme so unique and complex is the fact that it has both the internal and external rhyming scheme and keeps both almost intact and continuous throughout all 18 stanzas. When talking about rhyming schemes, one must note that external rhyming scheme includes all rhymes occurring at the end of a line, more precisely at the last syllable of the last word in each line, whereas internal rhyme scheme means rhyming inside

the same line of a stanza, or somewhere in the middle of two or more lines. While external rhyme scheme is very common, not many poems achieve both, and that is what gives *The Raven* its unique rhythmic quality and flow, but also makes it an extremely hard task for any potential translator trying to achieve the same effect in his/her target language. In this stanza, internal rhyme scheme is visible in the 1st line (*dreary – weary*), and also in the 3rd line (*napping – tapping*), and 4th line (*rapping – rapping*). The last two pairs are grammatical rhymes, achieved by adding the -ing participle, and while this type of rhyme is often avoided in the English language, here it creates an interesting sound effect and evokes onomatopoeic associations, imitating a light sound sensation of someone knocking at the door. The word *rapping* is repeated twice and thus forms the identical rhyme pair, although this repetition in no way implies Poe had no inspiration for a different rhyming pair; he wanted to create a special sound sensation that is somehow even a foreboding of the uncanny plot unfolding in the next stanzas. It is also interesting to note that all rhyme pairs forming the internal rhyme scheme are feminine (disyllabic) rhymes, and that is not the most common device of English poetry. The external rhyme is ABCBBB and all B rhyme pairs are feminine (monosyllabic) rhymes: *lore – door – door – more*. The pair *door – door* again implies Poe probably uses repetitive or identical rhymes for a good reason. All these rhymes are end rhymes and the use of both masculine and feminine rhymes carefully mixed together creates a continuous but exciting flow of the rhythm.

Here is the German translation, translated as *Der Rabe*:

„Einst in dunkler *Mitnachtstunde*, als ich in entschwindner *Kunde* **A**

Wunderlicher Bücher forschte, bis mein Geist die Kraft *verlor* **B**

Und mir's trübe ward im *Kopfe*, kam mir's plötzlich vor, als *klopfe* **C**

Jemand zag ans Tor, als *klopfe – klopfe* jemand sacht ans *Tor*. **B**

“Irgendein Besucher”, dacht ich, “pocht zur Nachtzeit noch ans *Tor* – **B**

Weiter nichts.” – so kommt mir's *vor*. –“ **B**

(Poe 2015:85)

German version of the 1st stanza shows it is a rhymed translation where the translators put a significant emphasis on transferring the original rhyme scheme and recognize it as one of the

most important poem's features. Both internal and external rhyming patterns are respected. Internal rhyme again occurs in the 1st line (*Mitnachtstunde – Kunde*), and forms a feminine rhyme just like in the original, with stress falling on the penultimate syllable, which helps to achieve the same rhythmic flow. As was expected, the original corresponding rhyming pair *dreary – weary* is here achieved through different semantic and lexical units. The second internal rhyme scheme occurs in lines 3 and 4: *Kopfe – klopfe, klopfe – klopfe*. These are also feminine rhymes, and the German version also repeats the rhyming word *klopfe* (the original version is repetition of the word *rapping*). What is impressive is that these two are even semantically close, they both evoke similar associations in the reader and depict a sound of someone lightly knocking, which helps to achieve the original effect. That can be explained by the fact that these two languages are tightly bound and, despite the obvious typological distinctions and differences in inflection, still belong to the same language family and that offers us an akin repertoire of lexems. The external rhyming scheme also follows the original: ABCBBB, with B segments that are masculine (monosyllabic), exactly like the original pattern: *Verlor – Tor – Tor – vor*. The word *Tor* is not only repeated just like the word *door* in the original, but the two are practically synonyms. All of the abovementioned criteria make this stanza an example of a very successful rhymed translation.

Here is the Croatian version of the 1st stanza, the name of the poem being translated as *Gavran*:

„Ponoći sam jedne *tužne* proučavo, slab i *snužden*, **A**

Neobične drevne knjige što prastari nauk *skriše* – **B**

Gotovo sam u san *pao* kad je netko *zakucao*, **C**

Pred sobna mi vrata *stao*, kucajući tiho, *tiše* – **B**

'Posjetilac', ja promrmljah, 'što u sobu ući *ište*, **B**

Samo to i ništa *više*." **B**

(Markusi-Dujmović, Rossetti-Bazdan 2008:308)

Croatian version also proves that we are talking about a rhymed translation where the rhyme scheme is closely observed, but here it is achieved a bit differently than in the German translation. Firstly, the internal rhyme present in the 1st line, the word pair *tužne – snužden*, is

an example of assonance, where only vowel sounds of the word match, and the rhythmic effect that is accomplished through end rhyme in the original poem is not present here. The rest of the internal rhyme also occurs in lines 3 and 4, through the rhyming words *pao* – *zakucao* – *stao*. However, *pao* and *stao* form an imperfect rhyme with *zakucao*, where the stress is on the 1st syllable and thus rhyme is achieved between the stressed and unstressed syllables. Croatian language is obviously not as sensitive to accentual variations as English, where such deviations in stress would surely disturb the poem's rhythm; Croatian has more accent types and is thus very hard to have all rhymes perfectly correspondent in terms of stressed and unstressed syllables. When it comes to external rhyme scheme, it follows the original scheme: ABCBBB. The one interesting exception is the word *ište*, which is not a proper rhyme pair with the rest of the end rhymes, *skriše* – *tiše* – *više*. It could be classified as the example of both assonance and consonance when compared to the rhyming pair from the line above it, *tiše*, since it has the same consonant and vowel sounds, but it does not form end rhyme with any of the B rhyme pairs. These insufficiencies in the Croatian version as opposed to German version are caused by the fact that English and German are highly related languages and it is much easier to find correspondent rhyming pairs and achieve rhyme through same lexical means in the German version.

6.2. 2nd Stanza

“Ah, distinctly I *remember* it was in the bleak *December*; **A**
 And each separate dying *ember* wrought its ghost upon the *floor*. **B**
 Eagerly I wished the *morrow*; —vainly I had sought to *borrow* **C**
 From my books surcease of *sorrow*—*sorrow* for the lost *Lenore*— **B**
 For the rare and radiant maiden whom the angels name *Lenore*— **B**
 Nameless here for *evermore*.” **B**

(Poe 1852:7)

In this stanza, the internal rhyme scheme is extended, and now includes lines 1 and 2, with rhyming pairs *remember* – *December* – *ember*. In all three of them, the stress falls on the penultimate syllable, forming the feminine (disyllabic) rhyme, and all of them are typically

end rhymes. Same goes with rhyming pairs *morrow – borrow – sorrow* which form the rest of the internal rhyme scheme in lines 3 and 4. The external rhyme scheme goes as follows:

December (A) – floor (B) – borrow (C) – Lenore (B) – Lenore (B) – evermore (B). All rhyming words forming the B pattern are end rhymes and masculine or monosyllabic rhymes, which creates a typical flowing rhythmical pattern.

„Oh, ich weiß, es war in *grimmer* Winternacht, gespenstischen *Schimmer* **A**

Jagte jedes Scheit durchs *Zimmer*, eh es kalt zu Asche *fror*. **B**

Tief ersehnte ich den *Morgen*, denn umsonst war's, Trost zu *borgen* **C**

Aus den Büchern für das *Sorgen* um die einzige *Lenor*, **B**

Um die wunderbar Geliebte – Engel nannten sie *Lenor* –, **B**

Die für immer ich *verlor*.” **B**

(Poe 2015:87)

German translation also kept the internal rhyme scheme of lines 1 and 2 in an almost impeccable manner, with rhyming words *grimmer – Schimmer – Zimmer*. All these words not only depict the original atmosphere of a cold winter time and darkness, but they are also compact end rhymes and feminine (disyllabic) rhymes, thus following the pattern of the original poem. The internal rhyme in lines 3 and 4 is also reduplicated through rhyming words *Morgen – borgen – Sorgen*, also end rhymes and feminine rhymes which tend to occur very frequently in German and they feel very natural when reading the poem out loud.

Furthermore, segments of B rhyme scheme are very well adjusted to the rhythm and they are all masculine rhymes and end rhymes just like in the original pattern, with the word *Lenor* repeating in two successive lines and forming the identical rhyme: *fror – Lenor – Lenor – verlor*.

„Ah, da, još se sjećam *jasno*, u prosincu bješe *kasno*; **A**

Svaki ugarak, što *gasne*, sablasti po podu *riše*. **B**

Žudim vruće za *svanućem* – uzalud iz knjiga *vućem* **C**

Spas od boli što me *muče* – jer me od Nje *rastaviše* **B**

Andeli, što divnu djevu zvat Lenorom *nastaviše* – **B**

Tu imena nema *više*.” **B**

(Markusi-Dujmović, Rossetti-Bazdan 2008:308)

Croatian translation of the 2nd stanza reduplicates the internal rhyme scheme; it is present in the 1st line with rhyming pair *jasno* – *kasno*, and extends to line 2 like Poe’s with the near rhyming pair *gasne*. Since Croatian is a typical example of synthetic languages, it is impressive that the translator succeeded in following the original stress pattern, since these rhyming pairs also consists of feminine (disyllabic) rhymes. Internal rhyme scheme is kept in lines 3 and 4; *svanućem* – *vučem* are all again disyllabic end rhymes, and could also be termed original rhyme, since these patterns do not occur often in Croatian literature, and they rhyming word *muče* forms assonance in relation to both. Whereas it is very hard to reduplicate the English morpheme structure in Croatian, the advantage to translating literature to Croatian is its rich and wide vocabulary and numerous morphemic possibilities that account for wide variety of rhyming pairs. It is also visible in the external rhyme scheme of this stanza, with rhyming pairs such as *riše* – *nastaviše* – *rastaviše* – *više*.

6.3. 3rd Stanza

“And the silken, sad, *uncertain* rustling of each purple *curtain* **A**

Thrilled me—*filled* me with fantastic terrors never felt *before*; **B**

So that now, to still the *beating* of my heart, I stood *repeating* **C**

“’Tis some visitor *entreating* entrance at my chamber *door*— **B**

Some late visitor *entreating* entrance at my chamber *door*; — **B**

This it is and nothing *more*.” **B**

(Poe 1852:7)

The 3rd stanza brings an even more complex internal rhyme scheme; Poe does not cease to amaze and surprise with his original rhyme pairs, so we have *uncertain* – *curtain* in the 1st line, feminine (disyllabic) end rhyme pair, whereas the 2nd line contains *thrilled* – *filled* at the

beginning, a masculine (monosyllabic) rhyme pair. Furthermore, the internal rhyme scheme occurs throughout lines 3, 4, and 5, with the words *beating – repeating – entreating – entreating*; these are considered quite banal in the English language, bearing in mind that they are grammatical rhymes made by adding the -ing participle, but they do provide the necessary rhythmic flow. The word *entreating* is repeated in 2 successive lines (identical rhyme) just like the word *door* in the external rhyme scheme, and both repetitions are carefully put to those spots to emphasize the notion of an unknown presence entering the poem's plot, which is typical Poe's device of using lexemes and syntax to boost the semantic aspects of a poem.

„Die Gardinen rauschten *traurig*, und ihr Rascheln klang so *schaurig*, **A**

Füllte mich mit *Schreck* und Grausen, wie ich nie *erschrak zuvor*. **B**

Um zu stillen Herzens *Schlagen*, Herzens Zitter, Herzens *Zagen*, **C**

Mußt ich murmelnd nochmals *sagen*: „Ein Besucher klopft ans *Tor*. – **B**

Ein verspäteter Besucher klopft um Einlaß noch ans *Tor*.“ **B**

Sprach ich meinem Herzen *vor*.“ **B**

(Poe 2015:91)

German translators kept the internal rhyme in lines 1 and 2 (*traurig – schaurig* in line 1 and *Shreck – erschrak* as a half rhyming pair). Internal rhyme scheme is also kept only partially in lines 3 and 4, without the original repetition in line 5; here we have the rhyming words *Schlagen – Zagen – sagen*, also grammatical rhymes achieved through the German grammatical suffix *-en* used for forming infinitive verbs and verbal nouns. All of these are end rhymes and feminine rhymes. The external rhyme scheme consists solely of masculine end rhymes, and the word *Tor* is repeated just like *door* in the original, and that helps retain the original stanza's foreboding effect.

„Od svilenog tužnog *šuma* iz zastora od *baršuna* **A**

Nepoznati, fantastični *užasi* me *ispuniše*; **B**

Da utišam srce *svoje*, ja ponavljam mirno *stojeć*: **C**

“Posjetilac neki *to je*, što u sobu ući *ište* – **B**

Posjetilac kasni koji možda traži *zaklonište* – **B**

Eto to je, ništa *više*.” **B**

(Markusi-Dujmović, Rossetti-Bazdan 2008:308)

The Croatian version contains two assonance pairs in lines 1 and 2; the rhyming pair *šuma* – *baršuna* from line 1 could at most be perceived as an example of assonance with its matching vowel sounds that ensure the rhythmic flow, whereas *užasi* – *ispuniše* could be termed a partial assonance. Same goes with the rhyming pair *svoje* – *stojeć* from line 3, however the two words *to je* from line 5 rhyme with *svoje* and are a very interesting example of mosaic rhyme where the two words are matched against one in order to achieve rhyme. Furthermore, the external rhyme scheme has some very interesting rhyming pairs, e.g. *ište* – *zaklonište* because both words are quite rare in everyday and/or colloquial language and form the imperfect (near) rhyme because the rhyme is achieved between the stressed and unstressed syllable. To sum up, although this version does contain some deficits, they are well compensated for with very imaginative and original rhyming pairs.

6.4. 4th Stanza

“Presently my soul grew *stronger*; hesitating then no *longer*, **A**

‘Sir’, said I, ‘or Madam, truly your forgiveness I *implore*; **B**

But the fact is I was *napping*, and so gently you came *rapping*, **C**

And so faintly you came *tapping*, *tapping* at my chamber *door*, **B**

That I scarce was sure I heard you’—here I opened wide the *door*; — **B**

Darkness there and nothing *more*.” **B**

(Poe 1852:8)

The 4th stanza’s rhyme pattern resembles the one from the 1st stanza, especially because of the internal rhyme scheme in lines 3 and 4: *napping* – *rapping* – *tapping* – *tapping*. These grammatical rhymes are formed by adding the -ing participle and they all evoke sound associations connected with someone trying to enter the room. Furthermore, words *tapping*

and *door* are both repeated twice just like in the 1st stanza, and it is clear that some plot twist is about to take place; it happens in the line 6, where the subject opens the door and finds there is “darkness there and nothing more”. This effect is brilliantly supported by the monosyllabic rhymes forming the B pattern of the external rhyme scheme: *implore – door – door – more*.

„Alsobald ward meine *Seele* stark und folgte dem *Befehle*. **A**

»Herr«, so sprach ich, »oder Dame, ach, verzeihen Sie, mein *Ohr* **B**

Hat Ihr Pochen kaum *vernommen*, denn ich war schon *schlafbenommen*, **C**

Und Sie sind so sanft *gekommen* – sanft *gekommen* an mein *Tor*; **B**

Wußte kaum den Ton zu deuten ...« und ich sperrte auf das *Tor*: **B**

Nichts als Dunkel stand *davor*.” **B**

(Poe 2015:93)

The German translators achieved internal rhyme in the 1st line through rhyming words *Seele – Befehle*, feminine end rhyme just like the original version. Furthermore, internal rhyme in lines 3 and 4 is also grammatical; rhyming words *vernommen – schlafbenommen – gekommen* are all participles used to form the German past tense, with word *gekommen* repeating twice just like the word *tapping* in the original poem and used to evoke the same sense of foreboding. The external rhyme is kept intact and consist of words forming mostly monosyllabic rhyme, e.g. *Ohr – Tor – Tor – davor*.

„Kad smjelosti malo *stekoh*, ne oklijevah nego *rekoh*: **A**

“Gospodine ili gospo oprostite, evo *stižem*! **B**

Zapravo sam malo *drijemo*, kucali ste tako *nijemo*, **C**

Tako blago, pritajeno, i od mojih misli *tiše*; **B**

Gotovo vas nisam čuo” – i vrata se *otvoriše* – **B**

Mrak preda mnom, ništa *više*.” **B**

(Markusi-Dujmović, Rossetti-Bazdan 2008:308)

The Croatian version successfully keeps the internal rhyme in lines 1 and 3 (*stekoh – rekoh; drijemo – nijemo*), both rhyming pairs being feminine (disyllabic) end rhymes; however, the external rhyme scheme is a little different and the word *stižem* does not correspond to rest of the rhymes (*tiše – otvoriše – više*). Its vowels match with the vowels in rest of the rhyming words so we could call it an assonance. The rest of the B rhyming pattern suits the rhythm well. Although this version deviates from the original in few minor details, its choice of words is very interesting and original and ensures the continuous dynamic of the poem.

6.5. 5th Stanza

“Deep into that darkness *peering*, long I stood there wondering, *fearing*, **A**

Doubting, *dreaming* dreams no mortal ever dared to dream *before*; **B**

But the silence was *unbroken*, and the stillness gave no *token*, **C**

And the only word there *spoken* was the whispered word, “*Lenore?*” **B**

This I whispered, and an echo murmured back the word, “*Lenore!*”— **B**

Merely this and nothing *more*.” **B**

(Poe 1852:8)

The internal rhyme scheme in the 5th stanza is achieved through grammatical rhymes *peering – fearing – dreaming* in lines 1 and 2 and *unbroken – token – spoken* in lines 3 and 4.

Unbroken and *spoken* are both participles, but *token* is a fairly unusual and creative rhyme choice. The external rhyme scheme consists of *fearing – before – token – Lenore – Lenore – more*. The words *Lenore* and *more* are the most frequent rhyme words in the poem, they are both monosyllabic, as well as the word *before* matched to them in this stanza, and we can thus conclude the rhythmic flow of the poem is still dynamic and rhyming scheme is steadfast.

„Starr in dieses Dunkel *spähend*, stand ich lange, nicht *verstehend*, **A**

Träume *träumend*, die kein ird’scher Träumer je gewagt *zuvor*; **B**

Doch es herrschte *ungebrochen* Schweigen, aus dem Dunkel *krochen* **C**

Keine Zeichen, und *gesprochen* ward nur zart das Wort »*Lenor*«, **B**

Zart von mir gehaucht – wie Echo flog zurück das Wort »*Lenor*«. **B**

Nichts als dies vernahm mein *Ohr*.” **B**

(Poe 2015:95)

The German translators also chose to retain the internal rhyme scheme in lines 1 and 2 through grammatical rhyme; here we have *spähend*, *verstehend* and *träumend*, all of which are what German grammar calls ‘Partizip Präsens Aktiv’, and it is affined to -ing participles in English. Furthermore, internal rhyme in lines 3 and 4 is also achieved through verbs, either in infinitive or participle form: *ungebrochen* – *krochen* - *gesprochen*, all of them being typically feminine end rhymes. The external rhyme scheme also preserves the word *Lenor* twice like the original, emphasizing it and combining it with masculine rhymes *zuvor* and *Ohr*.

„Pogledom kroz tamu *bludim*; stojim, plašim se i *čudim*; **A**

Ah, ne može smrtnik snove sniti što se meni *sniše*! **B**

Al nevinu bje *tišina*; znaka nije dala *tmina*, **C**

S mojih usta riječ *jedina* pade poput kapi *kiše*, **B**

“*Lenora*”, prošaptah tiho, jeka mi se vrati *tiše*, **B**

Samo to, i ništa *više*.” **B**

(Markusi-Dujmović, Rossetti-Bazdan 2008:308)

The Croatian version of the 5th stanza is full of interesting rhyme solutions; firstly, the internal rhyme scheme at the beginning consists of rhyming words *bludim* and *čudim*, also grammatical rhymes since the rhyming syllables are typical grammatical morphemes forming the 1st person singular of the present tense. The translators chose to achieve the internal rhyme in line 3 through *tišina* and *tmina*, both of them evoking strong visual and acoustic sensations, and that is further emphasized by the words chosen for the external rhyme scheme: *kiše* – *tiše* – *više*, feminine end rhymes.

6.6. 6th Stanza

“Back into the chamber *turning*, all my soul within me *burning*, **A**

Soon again I heard a tapping somewhat louder than *before*. **B**

‘Surely’, said I, ‘surely *that is* something at my window *lattice*; **C**

Let me see, then, what *thereat is*, and this mystery *explore*— **B**

Let my heart be still a moment and this mystery *explore*; — **B**

’Tis the wind and nothing *more!*’” **B**

(Poe 1852:8)

In this stanza, the internal rhyme scheme occurs in the 1st line (*turning – burning*), and it is again the grammatical rhyme with the stress on the penultimate syllable (feminine rhyme). However, Poe offers us something unexpected in lines 3 and 4; he combines the word *lattice*, quite rare by itself, with mosaic rhymes *that is* and *thereat is*. It is another proof of Poe’s theory that poetry should offer something unexpected and mix it with fixed expressions that follow in the external rhyme scheme: here he closes the stanza with the typical rhyming word *more*, rhymes it with *explore* and *before*, forming the stable rhyme scheme consisting of masculine end rhymes.

„Wandte mich zurück ins *Zimmer*, und mein Herz erschrak noch *schlimmer*, **A**

Da ich wieder klopfen hörte, etwas lauter als *zuvor*. **B**

‘Sollt ich’, sprach ich, ‘mich nicht *irren*, hörte ich's am Fenster *klirren*; **C**

Oh, ich werde bald *entwirren* dieses Rätsels dunklen *Flor* – **B**

Herz, sei still, ich will *entwirren* dieses Rätsels dunklen *Flor*, **B**

Wind wohl machte da *Rumor*.’” **B**

(Poe 2015:97)

The German translation of the 6th stanza brings us many creative deviations; firstly, the internal rhyme in the 1st line is achieved through the rhyming pair *Zimmer – schlimmer*, and it is continued throughout lines 3 and 4 with infinitive verb forms *irren*, *klirren* and *entwirren*. We also have a repetition of the word *entwirren* which brings a clearer rhythm, and most of the external rhyme scheme is achieved through masculine end rhymes, e.g.: *zuvor – Flor –*

Flor – Rumor. The last word is especially interesting as it is a very rare German expression, quite outdated and in this case employed to retain the archaic character of the poem.

„U svoju se sobu *vratih*, dok u meni duša *plamti*; **A**

Nešto jači nego prije udarci se *ponoviše*. **B**

‘Zacijelo’, ja rekoh, ‘*to je* na prozoru sobe *moje*; **C**

Da pogledam časkom *što je*, kakve se tu tajne *skriše* – **B**

Mirno, srce. Da vidimo kakve se tu tajne *skriše* - **B**

Valjda vjetar, ništa *više*.” **B**

(Markusi-Dujmović, Rossetti-Bazdan 2008:309)

This translation does not retain the strict end rhyme in the 1st line; *vratih – plamti* is at most assonance. However, the lines 3 and 4 offer some interesting rhyme examples; the word *moje* rhymes with *to je* and *što je*, both mosaic rhymes consisting of two words matched against one, but with same stressed syllables. The external rhyme typically closes with word *više*, apparently the equivalent of the English expression *evermore* that seems to be the most relevant word in the poem. However, in the Croatian version, this lexeme is put next to the repeated rhyme *skriše*, but also next to *ponoviše*, which has a different stress pattern and thus forms the imperfect (near rhyme) pair. Generally, Croatian version of the poem is less prone to following the original stress pattern, since it is less sensitive towards stress variations than English.

6.7. 7th Stanza

“Open here I *flung* the *shutter*, when, with many a *flirt* and *flutter*, **A**

In there *stepped* a *stately* Raven of the *saintly* days of *yore*; **B**

Not the least obeisance *made he*; not a minute *stopped* or *stayed he*; **C**

But, with mien of lord or *lady*, *perched* above my chamber *door*— **B**

Perched upon a bust of Pallas just above my chamber *door*— **B**

Perched, and sat, and nothing more.” B

(Poe 1852:8)

This incredibly rhythmic stanza opens with the internal rhyme *shutter – flutter*, and continues with mosaic rhymes *made he – stayed he* that rhyme with the word *lady* in lines 3 and 4. Typically, all of these are feminine rhymes and they are completed by monosyllabic rhymes in the external rhyme scheme: *yore – door – door – more*. The lines 1 and 2 also contain interesting alliterations; *flung – flirt – flutter* and *stepped – stately – saintly*. *Stately* and *saintly* are also grammatical rhymes, and many words throughout the stanza repeat (e.g. *perched* in lines 4,5 and 6) which creates an even and flowing rhythm. Furthermore, Poe was also careful about the number of syllables and their accents, so here we have an amazing example of impeccable rhyming combinations together with matched number of syllables and numerous repetitions.

„Offen warf ich nun die *Schalter* – flatternd kam herein ein *alter*, **A**

Stattlich großer, schwarzer Rabe, wie aus heiliger Zeit *hervor*. **B**

Machte keinerlei *Verbeugung*, nicht die kleinste *Dankbezeugung*, **C**

Flog mit edelmännischer *Neigung* zu dem Pallasaupt *empor*, **B**

Grade über meiner Türe auf das Pallasaupt *empor* – **B**

Saß – und stumm war's wie *zuvor*.” **B**

(Poe 2015:99)

The German translation follows the original rhyme pattern with *Schalter* (even phonemically very close to the original *shutter*), and here it rhymes with the word *alter*, which is a comparative form of the adjective *alt*. The internal rhyme scheme in lines 3 and 4 consists of words *Verbeugung*, *Dankbezeugung* and *Neigung* and all of them are grammatical rhymes because the suffix *-ung* is typically used to form nouns from verbs in German. The external rhyme scheme consists of masculine end rhymes, with the word *empor* repeating in 2 successive lines and forming the identical rhyme pair.

„Prozorsku otvorih *kuku*, kad uz lepet i uz *buku* **A**

Dostojanstven uđe Gavran, što iz drevnih dana *stiže*, **B**

Ni da pozdrav glavom *mahne*, ni trenutak on da *stane*, **C**

Poput lorda ili *dame* kroz moju se sobu *diže*

I na kip Palade sleti, što se iznad vrata *diže*. **B**

Sleti, sjede, ništa *više*.” **B**

(Markusi-Dujmović, Rossetti-Bazdan 2008:309)

In the Croatian translation, internal rhyme in line 1 is achieved through feminine rhyme pair *kuku – buku*. The internal rhyme in lines 3 and 4, however, is merely an example of assonance (*mahne – stane – dame*) and does not achieve the desired effect. The external rhyme scheme consists of rhyming words such as *stiže – diže*, the word *diže* is again repeated in 2 successive lines to emphasize the notion of raven’s arrival, and the final rhyming position is achieved through the word *više*, one of the most frequent words in the poem.

6.8. 8th Stanza

“Then this *ebony bird beguiling* my sad fancy into *smiling*, **A**

By the *grave* and *stern decorum* of the countenance it *wore*, **B**

‘Though thy *crest* be *shorn* and *shaven*, thou’, I said, ‘art sure no *craven*, **C**

Ghastly grim and ancient *Raven wandering* from the Nightly *shore*— **B**

Tell me what thy *lordly* name is on the Night’s Plutonian *shore*!’ **B**

Quoth the *Raven* ‘*Nevermore*.’” **B**

(Poe 1852:8,9)

The 8th stanza opens with the internal rhyme *beguiling – smiling*, and continues with internal rhyme in lines 3 and 4, words *shaven* and *craven* rhyming with the key term *Raven*. All internal rhymes in this stanza are feminine end rhymes. External rhyme scheme consists mostly of masculine end rhymes, such as *wore – shore – nevermore*, with word *shore* repeating in 2 successive lines. Here we also have a number of interesting alliterations, e.g. *ebony – bird – beguiling* in the 1st line, *grave – stern – decorum – wore – crest – shorn – art –*

craven – grim – Raven – wandering – shore – lordly. shore – Raven in the rest of the lines, and even *ghastly – grim* in the 4th line.

„Doch das wichtige Gebaren dieses schwarzen Sonderbaren **A**

Löste meines Geistes Trauer bald zu lächelndem Humor. **B**

‘Ob auch schäbig und geschoren, kommst du’, sprach ich, “unverfroren, **C**

Niemand hat dich herbeschwoeren aus dem Land der Nacht hervor. **B**

Tu mir kund, wie heißt du, Stolzer aus Plutonischem Land hervor?’ **B**

Sprach der Rabe: ‘Nie du Tor.’” **B**

(Poe 2015:101)

The German translation also opens this stanza with an internal rhyming pair *Gebaren – Sonderbaren* in line 1, that forms feminine end rhyme, and continues with *geschoren*, *unverfroren* and *herbeschowen* in lines 3 and 4, where all of these rhyming pairs are participles ending in *-en*. Again there is a rare expression *Humor*, with the stress on the last syllable, rhyming with the usual set of words in the external rhyme scheme: *hervor* (repeated in 2 successive lines) and *Tor*. It is also interesting to note that the German translators always replace the original term *nevermore* with the more complex phraseological expression *nie du Tor*, which is semantically completely different when excluded from the context, but serves as a proper equivalent when compared to the whole stanza. The German translators also did an amazing job in reproducing, as extensively as possible, the alliteration scheme in the original stanza; e.g., *Doch – wichtige* in the 1st line, *Löste meines Geistes Trauer* in the 2nd line, or *schäbig – geschoren – sprach – herbeschwoeren – Stolzer – Sprach* in the remaining lines.

„Kad ugledah crnu pticu, u smijeh tuga se obrnu, **A**

Zbog ozbiljnog dostojanstva kojim strogi lik joj diše. **B**

‘Nek si ošišana ptica’, rekoh, “nisi kukavica, **C**

O, Gavrane, mrka lica, što sa Noćnog žala stiže, **B**

Kako zovu te na žalu hadske noći, otkud stiže?’ **B**

Reče Gavran: ‘Nikad više.’” **B**

(Markusi-Dujmović, Rossetti-Bazdan 2008:309)

The Croatian translators retained the internal rhyme scheme in line 1 through the rhyming pair *crnu - obrnu*, and they successfully followed the same pattern in lines 3 and 4, using the words *ptica – kukavica – lica* to achieve rhythm. Whereas *ptica* and *lica* are straightforward examples of feminine end rhyme, *kukavica* has a bit different stress pattern and thus forms an imperfect rhyme pair with the two. The external rhyme scheme contains the rhyming words *tiše – više – stiže*.

6.9. 9th Stanza

“Much I marveled this *ungainly* fowl to hear discourse so *plainly*, **A**
 Though its answer little *meaning*—little relevancy *bore*; **B**
 For we cannot help *agreeing* that no living human *being* **C**
 Ever yet was blessed with *seeing* bird above his chamber *door*— **B**
 Bird or beast upon the sculptured bust above his chamber *door*, **B**
 With such name as ‘*Nevermore*.’” **B**

(Poe 1852:9)

The opening line brings the internal rhyme *ungainly – plainly* and although it could be considered a typical grammatical rhyme, the first word is a rare English word and a very interesting and creative choice. The internal rhyme scheme continues throughout lines 2, 3 and 4, with rhyming words *meaning – agreeing – being – seeing*, and all of them are feminine rhymes which further emphasizes their rhythmic flow. The external rhyme scheme retains the usual masculine rhymes such as *bore – door – nevermore*, and *door*, as usual, is repeated twice.

„Daß er sprach so klar *verständlich* – ich erstaunte drob *unendlich*, **A**
 Kam die Antwort mir auch *wenig* sinnvoll und erklärend *vor*. **B**
 Denn noch nie war dies *geschehen*: über seiner Türe *stehen* **C**

Hat wohl keiner noch *gesehen* solchen Vogel je *zuvor*, **B**

Über seiner Stubentüre auf der Büste je *zuvor*, **B**

Mit dem Namen ‘Nie du *Tor*’.” **B**

(Poe 2015:103)

The German translation opens the internal rhyme scheme in line 1 with rhyming pair consisting of adjectives ending in *-lich*, *verständlich* and *endlich*, and continues through lines 3 and 4 with grammatical rhymes *geschehen – stehen – gesehen*, all verb forms, either infinitive or participles. The external rhyme scheme follows the original set of words frequently repeated throughout the poem so here we have *vor*, *zuvor* (repeated twice) and *Tor*, typically masculine end rhymes.

„Začudih se tome *mnogo*, što crn stvor je zborit *mogo*, **A**

Premda malobrojne riječi malo što mi *objasniše*. **B**

Al priznati mora *svako*, ne događa da se *lako* **C**

Da živ čovjek gleda *tako* pticu što se nad njim *njiše*, **B**

Na skulpturi iznad vrata, zviđer il pticu što se *njiše*, **B**

S tim imenom ‘Nikad *više*’.” **B**

(Markusi-Dujmović, Rossetti-Bazdan 2008:309)

The Croatian translators chose the rhyming pair *mnogo – mogo* to form the internal rhyme scheme in line 1, and they go on with rhyming words *svako – tako – lako*. These are all feminine rhymes, quite short and concise, and they make a steady dynamic supported by the continuous ABCBBB external rhyme scheme, typically consisting of feminine end rhymes.

6.10. 10th Stanza

“But the Raven, sitting *lonely* on the placid bust, spoke *only* **A**

That one word, as if his *soul* in that one word he did *outpour*. **B**

Nothing *farther* then he *uttered*—not a *feather* then he *fluttered*— **C**
 Till I scarcely more than *muttered* ‘Other friends have flown *before*— **B**
 On the morrow *he* will leave me, as my Hopes have flown *before*.’ **B**
 Then the bird said ‘*Nevermore*.’” **B**
 (Poe 1852:9)

While the external rhyme scheme is this stanza pretty much follows the standard Raven’s pattern, with words like *before* and *nevermore*, its internal rhyme scheme is complex and consists of rhyming pairs *lonely* – *only* in the 1st line, the imperfect rhyming pair *soul* – *outpour* in the 2nd line, grammatical rhymes *uttered* – *fluttered* – *muttered* and an imperfect rhyming pair *farther* – *feather* in the 3rd line.

„Doch ich hört in seinem *Krächzen* seine ganze Seele *ächzen*, **A**
 War auch kurz sein Wort, und brachte er auch nichts als dieses *vor*. **B**
 Unbeweglich sah er *nieder*, rührte Kopf nicht noch *Gefieder*, **C**
 Und ich murrte, murmelnd *wieder*: ‘Wie ich Freund und Trost *verlor*, **B**
 Werd ich morgen *ihn* verlieren – wie ich alles schon *verlor*.’ **B**
 Sprach der Rabe: ‘Nie du *Tor*.’” **B**
 (Poe 2015:105)

The internal rhyme starts with the rhyming pair *Krächzen* – *ächzen*; whereas the first one is a verbal noun with strong onomatopoeic associations, the second is an infinitive verb. In lines 3 and 4 internal rhyme is achieved with the rhyming pair *nieder* – *Gefieder* – *wieder*, quite a unique choice of words, a very rare collective noun mixed with two prepositions, all of them feminine end rhymes. The external rhyme scheme consists mostly of masculine end rhymes.

„Gavran sam na bisti *sjedi*; tek te riječi *probesjedi*, **A**
 Baš kao da cijelu dušu te mu riječi *izraziše*: **B**
 Više niti riječ da *rekne* – više ni da perom *trepne* – **C**

Dok moj šapat jedva *jekne*: ‘Svi me druzi *ostaviše*, **B**

Pa će zorom i on, ko što nade već me *ostaviše*.’ **B**

Tad će ptica: ‘Nikad *više*.’” **B**

(Markusi-Dujmović, Rossetti-Bazdan 2008:309)

In the Croatian version, the two words forming the internal rhyme scheme in line 1 are *sjedi* and *probesjedi*, and although they graphically look similar, their stress is different, so this is also the case of an imperfect (near) rhyme. Furthermore, *rekne* and *trepne* in line 3 are an assonance pair, extended in line 4 through rhyming word *jekne*. The B segments of the external rhyme pattern are *izraziše – ostaviše – više*, the word *ostaviše* is repeated in 2 successive lines, and these are all grammatical rhymes, ending in the grammatical morpheme *-iše* which forms this archaic past tense.

6.11. 11th Stanza

“Startled at the stillness *broken* by reply so aptly *spoken*, **A**

‘Doubtless’, said I, ‘what it utters is its only stock and *store* **B**

Caught from some unhappy *master* whom unmerciful *Disaster* **C**

Followed fast and followed *faster* till his songs one burden *bore*— **B**

Till the dirges of his Hope that melancholy burden *bore* **B**

Of ‘Never—*nevermore*’.” **B**

(Poe 1852:9)

Again, the first internal rhyme is grammatical rhyme, consisting of participles *broken* and *spoken*, but the rest of the internal rhyme is achieved through rhyming words *master*, *Disaster* and *faster*, all feminine end rhymes. It is interesting that *Disaster* is started with a capital letter, just like *Raven* throughout the poem, and implies that both occurrences are personified and mean more than they appear. The external rhyme scheme again consists of masculine end rhymes, in this case these are *store - bore - bore - nevermore*.

„Seine schroff gesprochenen *Laute* klangen passend, daß mir *graute*. **A**
 ‘Aber’, sprach ich, ‘nein, er plappert nur sein einzig Können *vor*, **B**
 Das er seinem Herrn *entlauschte*, dessen Pfad ein Unstern *rauschte*, **C**
 Bis er letzten Mut *vertauschte* gegen trüber Lieder *Chor* –**B**
 Bis er trostlos trauerklagte in verstörter Lieder *Chor* **B**
 Mit dem Kehrreim: ‘Nie du *Tor*.’” **B**

(Poe 2015: 107)

The German translators omitted the grammatical rhyme in the 1st line and went with the rhyming pair *Laute* – *graute*, but they included grammatical rhyme in lines 3 and 4; *entlauschte*, *rauschte* and *vertauschte* are all marked by the morphem *-te*, forming the 3rd person singular of the German past tense ‘Präteritum’. The rest of the rhymes are masculine rhymes appearing at the end of almost each line of the stanza; since the German language is less analytic than English and thus less prone to masculine rhymes, the choice of words for this pattern is rather limited. The stanza typically ends with the expression *Nie du Tor*, and to it are joined rhyming words *vor* and *Chor* (repeating twice).

„Muk se razbi, ja, *zatečen* – na odgovor spremno *rečen* – **A**
 ‘Nema sumnje’, reko, ‘to je sve mu znanje, ništa *više*, **B**
 Riječ od tužna gazde *čuta*, koga Nevolja je *kruta* **C**
 Stalno pratila duž *puta*, pa mu sve se pjesme *sliše*, **B**
 Tužaljke se puste nade u jednu tegobu *sliše*, **B**
 U ‘Nikada – nikad *više*.’” **B**

(Markusi-Dujmović, Rossetti-Bazdan 2008:309)

The 1st internal rhyme pair – *zatečen* – *rečen* – also grammatical pair, with grammatical morpheme *-en*. The rest is achieved in lines 3 and 4 through rhyming words *čuta* – *kruta* – *puta*, and all rhymes in the internal rhyme scheme are feminine end rhymes, following the original pattern. Unlike the original poem, the external rhyme scheme also consists of

feminine rhymes. Croatian words mostly have stress falling on the first syllable, so only words consisting of one syllable would fall under the category of masculine rhyme.

6.12. 12th Stanza

“But the Raven still *beguiling* all my fancy into *smiling*, **A**
 Straight I wheeled a cushioned seat in front of bird, and bust and *door*; **B**
 Then, upon the velvet *sinking*, I betook myself to *linking* **B**
 Fancy unto fancy, *thinking* what this ominous bird of *yore*— **B**
 What this grim, ungainly, ghastly, gaunt, and ominous bird of *yore* **B**
 Meant in croaking ‘*Nevermore.*’” **B**

(Poe 1852:9,10)

Again, external rhyme scheme is typically made of words rhyming with (*Never*)*more* which ends almost every stanza, and these rhyming pairs are always masculine end rhymes, with the word *yore* repeating twice, as is the usual occurrence at the end of lines 4 and 5. The rest of the rhyme scheme consists of grammatical rhyming pairs *beguiling* – *smiling* in line 1, i.e. *sinking* – *linking* – *thinking* in lines 3 and 4.

„Da der Rabe das *bedrückte* Herz zu Lächeln mir *berückte*, **A**
 Rollte ich den Polsterstuhl zur Büste, Tür und Vogel *vor*, **B**
 Sank in Samtsitz, *nachzusinnen*, Traum mit Träumen zu *verspinnen* **C**
 Über solchen Tiers *Beginnen*: was es wohl gewollt *zuvor* – **B**
 Was der alte finstergrimme Vogel wohl gewollt *zuvor* **B**
 Mit dem Krächzen: ‘Nie du *Tor.*’” **B**

(Poe 2015:109)

The German translators followed the external rhyme scheme of the original poem and replaced it with masculine end rhymes *vor*, *zuvor*, and *Tor*, also repeating the word *zuvor* twice in lines 4 and 5 to achieve the desired emphasis. German clearly has the features of both analytic and synthetic languages and, unlike Croatian, has a wide variety of masculine rhymes to retain the original rhyme scheme more faithfully. Internal rhyme is made of an original rhyme pair *bedrückte* – *berückte* and grammatical rhyming words *nachzusinnen*, *verspinnen* and *Beginnen*.

„Ali mi i opet *Gavran* tužne usne u smijeh *nabra*; **A**
 Dogurah pred kip i pticu moj naslonjač prekrit *plišem*: **B**
 Te u meki baršun *padoh*, povezivat mašte *stadoh*, **C**
 Na razmatranje se *dadoh* – kakvu mi sudbinu *piše* **B**
 Grobna, kobna drevna ptica – kakvu mi sudbinu *piše* **B**
 Kada grakće: ‘Nikad *više*.’” **B**

(Markusi-Dujmović, Rossetti-Bazdan 2008:310)

The internal rhyme scheme in the 1st line is replaced by an assonance pair in the Croatian translation: *Gavran* – *nabra*. It is interesting to note that both *b* and *v* are both labial consonants, but *b* is a bilabial, whereas *v* is a labiodental, and that goes to show that Croatian is less sensitive to voiced consonants than English. Another assonance pair are the rhyming words *plišem* and *piše*, and the latter is repeated, forming the identical rhyme, just like in the original poem.

6.13. 13th Stanza

“This I sat engaged in *guessing*, but no syllable *expressing* **A**
 To the fowl whose fiery eyes now burned into my bosom’s *core*; **B**
 This and more I sat *divining*, with my head at ease *reclining* **C**
 On the cushion’s velvet *lining* that the lamp-light gloated *o’er*, **B**

But whose velvet-violet *lining* with the lamp-light gloating *o'er*, **B**

She shall press, ah, *nevermore!*" **B**

(Poe 1852:10)

Grammatical rhyme is again used by Poe to form the entire internal rhyme scheme, and thus by using the -ing participles: *guessing*, *expressing*, *divining*, *reclining* and *lining*. Another interesting method in this stanza is contraction of the word *over* to *o'er* so it could form a monosyllabic rhyme with the rest of the rhyming words in the external rhyme scheme (*core*, *nevermore*). This proves just how much sensitive English poetry is to variations in stress of its rhyming syllables, and rhyming an unstressed syllable with a stressed one would surely sound unusual and stylistically marked.

„Saß, der Seele Brand *beschwichtend*, keine Silbe an ihn *richtend*, **A**

Seine Feueraugen wühlten mir das Innerste *empor*. **B**

Saß und kam zu keinem *Wissen*, Herz und Hirn schien *fortgerissen*, **C**

Lehnte meinen Kopf aufs Kissen *lichtbegossen* – das *Lenor* **B**

Pressen sollte – lila Kissen, das nun nimmermehr *Lenor* **B**

Pressen sollte wie *zuvor!*" **B**

(Poe 2015: 111)

Although the English version of this stanza does not directly mention Lenore, but puts the pronoun *she* instead, the German translators chose to include her name twice at the end of lines 5 and 6 in order to retain a complex external rhyme scheme and combine it with already standard lexemes *empor* and *zuvor*. The rest of the rhyme scheme consists mostly of grammatical rhymes and all of the internal rhymes are feminine end rhymes.

„Sjedah tražec smiso *toga*, al ne rekoh niti *sloga* **A**

Ptici, čije žarke oči srž mi srca *opržiše*. **B**

Predan toj i drugoj *mašti*, pustih glavu mirno *pasti* **C**

U taj baršun *ljubičasti*, kojim svjetlo sjene *riše*. **B**

Sjest u baršun *ljubičasti*, kojim svjetlo sjene *riše*, **B**

Ona neće nikad *više*.” **B**

(Markusi-Dujmović, Rossetti-Bazdan 2008:310)

Croatian translators adhere to the original version and imply Lenore’s presence in the stanza only through the pronoun *ona*, and they put the verb *riše* at the end of lines 4 and 5. They also form an interesting internal rhyme scheme, combining the word *mašti* with *ljubičasti*. They also form the internal rhyme in line 3 through the assonance pair *mašti – pasti*, again an interesting example with *š* and *s* as closely related consonants (both fricatives). Croatian, in general, is obviously more prone to assonance pairs than English and German and that does not sound unnatural nor stands out in any other way.

6.14. 14th Stanza

“Then, me thought, the air grew *denser*, perfumed from an unseen *censer* **A**

Swung by Seraphim whose foot-falls tinkled on the tufted *floor*. **B**

‘Wretch’, I cried, ‘thy God hath lent *thee*—by these angels he hath sent *thee* **C**

Respite—respite and *nepenthe* from thy memories of *Lenore*; **B**

Quaff, oh quaff this kind *nepenthe* and forget this lost *Lenore!*’ **B**

Quoth the Raven ‘*Nevermore.*’” **B**

(Poe 1852:10)

The external rhyme scheme of this stanza is the usual masculine end rhyme consisting of repeated word *Lenore* and concluded by the word *nevermore*. However, Poe uses some really interesting lexemes in the internal rhyme scheme, and forms an original rhyme with *denser* and *censer* in line 1. Furthermore, he uses the obsolete pronoun *thee* to form the internal rhyme scheme in lines 3 and 4, where it rhymes with the obscure term *nepenthe*, and with it he not only enhances the rhythm of the poem, but creates a more sublime and dramatic atmosphere.

„Dann durchrann, so schien's, die *schale* Luft ein Duft aus *Weihrauchschale* **A**

Edler Engel, deren Schreiten rings vom Teppich klang *empor*. **B**
 ‘Narr!’ so schrie ich, ‘Gott *bescherte* dir durch Engel das *begehrte* **C**
 Glück Vergessen: das *entbehrte* Ruhen, Ruhen vor *Lenor!* **B**
 Trink, o trink das Glück: Vergessen der verlorenen *Lenor!*’ **B**
 Sprach der Rabe: ‘Nie du *Tor.*’” **B**
 (Poe 2015:113)

Again, the original quote *Nevermore* is smoothly replaced by the German expression *Nie du Tor*, and it rhymes with the usual *Lenor* (repeated twice) and *empor*. The rhyming pair forming the internal rhyme scheme of the 1st line, *schale – Weihrauchschale*, is to some extent an identical rhyme, although the two belong to different word classes. The rest of the internal rhyme is formed in lines 3 and 4 through lexemes *bescherte*, *begehrte* and *entbehrte*.

„Tad ko da se uzduh *zgunu*, čudni miris me *zapljusnu*, **A**
 Začuh lagan hod serafa, koji kadionik *njiše*. **B**
 ‘Bijedo’, kliknuh, ‘Bogu *slava!* Anđelima te *spasava*, **C**
 Šalje travu zaborava, uspomenu da ti *zbriše!* **B**
 Pij, o pij taj blag nepenthe, nek Lenori spomen *zbriše!*’ **B**
 Reče Gavran: ‘Nikad *više!*’” **B**
 (Markusi-Dujmović, Rossetti-Bazdan 2008:310)

In this stanza, the Croatian translators chose two internal rhyming pairs that would most likely be perceived as uneven or even inadmissible. Firstly, *zgunu* in the 1st line is a typical example of feminine rhyme with the stress on the penultimate syllable, whereas *zapljusnu* would be described as dactylic (trisyllabic) rhyme by English poets, having its stress put on the antepenultimate (third from last) syllable, or it could be read as feminine rhyme in some dialects where the stress is put on the second syllable, in which case it would form an impeccable feminine rhyming pair. Same goes with the rhyming pair *slava – spasava* in the 3rd line. Croatian is a synthetic language, meaning it has less articles, but a great number of morphemes with various functions. That means its words also typically contain more syllables

than English words, and that leaves us with a number of accentual variations on them. This is why it is not unnatural for Croatian to have such rhyming combinations, although the ideal ones would of course include rhyming pairs with same stressed syllables whenever possible.

6.15. 15th Stanza

“‘Prophet!’ said I, ‘thing of *evil!* —prophet still, if bird or *devil!* — **A**
 Whether Tempter sent, or whether tempest tossed thee here *ashore*, **B**
 Desolate yet all *undaunted*, on this desert land *enchanted*— **C**
 On this home by Horror *haunted*—tell me truly, I *implore*— **B**
 Is there—*is* there balm in Gilead? —tell me—tell me, I *implore!*’ **B**
 Quoth the Raven ‘*Nevermore.*’” **B**

(Poe 1852:10)

The internal rhyme scheme in this stanza is formed by rhyming pairs *evil* – *devil* in the 1st line, and grammatical rhyme pairs *undaunted* – *enchanted* – *haunted* in lines 3 and 4. The closing word *nevermore* is joined by interesting rhyming pairs *implore* (repeated twice) and *ashore*, both far from being banal choices. We can conclude that, while Poe follows his established rhyme scheme impeccably, he always adds something new and unexpected to surprise the reader and enhance the rhythmic flow of the poem.

„,Weiser!’ rief ich, ‘sonder *Zweifel* Weiser! – ob nun Tier, ob *Teufel* – **A**
 Ob dich Höllending die Hölle oder Wetter warf *hervor*, **B**
 Wer dich nun auch trostlos *sandte* oder trieb durch leere *Lande* **C**
 Hier in dies der Höll *verwandte* Haus – sag, eh ich dich *verlor*: **B**
 Gibt's – o *gibt's* in Gilead Balsam? – Sag mir's, eh ich dich *verlor!*’ **B**
 Sprach der Rabe: ‘Nie du *Tor.*’” **B**

(Poe 2015:115)

Zweifel and *Teufel* in the 1st line is an expected rhyme choice in German literature, both lexemes with their penultimate syllable stressed and an example of banal rhyme. In line 3, however, there is assonance between the rhyming pair *sandte* – *Lande*, which is a rare occurrence in German language, whose final consonants often vary depending on different pronunciations in different dialects. *Sandte*, however, works fine with *verwandte* in line 4, all of these rhymes are feminine rhymes and the external rhyme scheme, as usual, consists almost entirely of masculine rhymes.

„Proroče, kog rodi *prorok* – vrag il ptica, ipak *prorok!* – **A**

Napasnik da l posla tebe, il oluje *izbaciše* **B**

Sama al *nezastrašena* usred kraja *urečena*, **C**

U dom opsjednut od *sjena*, reci, mogu l da me *liše* **B**

Melemi iz Gileada, mogu l jada da me *liše?*’ **B**

Reče Gavran: ‘Nikad *više.*’” **B**

(Markusi-Dujmović, Rossetti-Bazdan 2008:310)

The Croatian translators chose to achieve the internal rhyme in the 1st line by repeating the word *prorok* twice and form the identical rhyme. The rest of the internal rhymes in lines 3 and 4 is an interesting choice of a grammatical rhyme pair *nezastrašena* – *urečena* extended through the lexeme *sjena*, again the example of dactylic rhyme combined with feminine rhyme. External rhyme scheme, as usual, is achieved through feminine end rhymes.

6.16. 16th Stanza

“‘Prophet!’ said I, ‘thing of *evil!* —prophet still, if bird or *devil!*’ **A**

By that Heaven that bends above us—by that God we both *adore*— **B**

Tell this soul with sorrow *laden* if, within the distant *Aidenn*, **C**

It shall clasp a sainted *maiden* whom the angels name *Lenore*— **B**

Clasp a rare and radiant maiden whom the angels name *Lenore.*’ **B**

Quoth the Raven ‘*Nevermore.*’” **B**

(Poe 1852:10)

In this stanza, the usual external rhyme scheme consisting of lexemes like *Lenore* and *Nevermore* is complemented with the verb *adore*, all of them typically masculine rhymes, whereas the internal rhyme scheme consists of rhyming pairs *evil – devil* and *laden – Aidenn – maiden*.

„’Weiser!’ rief ich, ‘sonder *Zweifel* Weiser! – ob nun Tier, ob *Teufel* – **A**

Schwör's beim Himmel uns zu Häupten – schwör's beim Gott, den ich *erkor* – **B**

Schwör's der Seele so voll *Grauen*: soll dort fern in Edens *Gauen* **C**

Ich ein strahlend Mädchen *schauen*, die bei Engeln heißt *Lenor?* – **B**

Sie, die Himmlische, umarmen, die bei Engeln heißt *Lenor?*’ **B**

Sprach der Rabe: ‘Nie du *Tor.*’” **B**

(Poe 2015:117)

In the German version of the 16th stanza we once again have the internal rhyme pair *Zweifel – Teufel*, and in lines 3 and 4 we have the rhyming pairs *Grauen – Gauen – schauen*, all feminine end rhymes. The external rhyme scheme consists of the usual closing phrase *Nie du Tor*, joined by the masculine rhyming words *erkor* and *Lenor*.

„’Proroče, kog rodi *prorok* – vrag il ptica, ipak *prorok!* – **A**

Neba ti, i Boga, po kom obojici grud nam *diše*, **B**

Smiri dušu *rastuženu*, reci da l’ ću u *Edenu* **C**

Grlit ženu *posvećenu*, Lenora je *okrstiše*, **B**

Djevu divnu, jedinstvenu, koju anđeli mi *skriše.*’ **B**

Reče Gavran: ‘Nikad *više.*’” **B**

(Markusi-Dujmović, Rossetti-Bazdan 2008:310)

The Croatian translators kept the same solution as in the previous stanza and repeated the lexeme *prorok* in the 1st line. The rest of the internal rhyme is formed by the rhyming words *rastuženu – Edenu – posvećenu*, with significant stress variations (The word *Edenu*, unlike the other two, is a typical feminine rhyme). In the external rhyme scheme the translators retained the usual feminine rhyme form, except in the word *okrstiše*, which is dactylic.

6.17. 17th Stanza

“‘Be that word our sign of *parting*, bird or fiend!’ I shrieked, *upstarting*— **A**

‘Get thee back into the tempest and the Night’s Plutonian *shore*! **B**

Leave no black plume as a *token* of that lie thy soul hath *spoken*! **C**

Leave my loneliness *unbroken*! —quit the bust above my *door*! **B**

Take thy beak from out my heart, and take thy form from off my *door*!’ **B**

Quoth the Raven ‘*Nevermore.*’” **B**

(Poe 1852:11)

Most of the rhymes in the 17th stanza have already been used by Poe earlier in the poem, especially the external rhyme scheme segments. The 1st line is marked by the grammatical rhyming pair *parting – upstarting*, and the rest of the internal rhyme scheme consists of rhyming words *token*, *spoken* and *unbroken*.

„’Sei dies Wort dein letztes, *Rabe* oder Feind! Zurück zum *Grabe*! **A**

Fort! zurück in Plutons Nächten!’ schrie ich auf und fuhr *empor*. **B**

‘Laß mein Schweigen *ungebrochen*! Deine Lüge, frech *gesprochen*, **C**

Hat mir weh das Herz *durchstochen*. – Fort, von deinem Thron *hervor*! **B**

Heb dein Wort aus meinem Herzen – heb dich fort, vom Thron *hervor*!’ **B**

Sprach der Rabe: ‘Nie du *Tor*.’” **B**

(Poe 2015:119)

The internal rhyme scheme opens with an interesting rhyming pair *Rabe – Grabe*, and continues with grammatical rhymes *ungebrochen, gesprochen* and *durchstochen*, all of them participles. When it comes to the external rhyme scheme, it consists of the usual set of words: *empor – hervor – hervor – Tor*, and all of them are masculine end rhymes.

„Rastanak je to što *kažeš*”, kriknuh, “Ptico ili *vraže!* **A**

U oluju bježi, na žal hadske Noći otkud *stiže!* **B**

Niti pera ne *ispusti* ko trag laži, što *izusti!* **C**

U samoći mene *pusti!* – nek ti trag se s biste *zбриše!* **B**

Nosi lik svoj s mojih vrata, vadi kljun, što srce *siše!* **B**

Reče Gavran: ‘Nikad *više!*’ **B**

(Markusi-Dujmović, Rossetti-Bazdan 2008:310)

In the 1st line, we have the assonance pair *kažeš – vraže*, and the rest of the internal rhyme scheme occurs in lines 3 and 4, rhyming words *ispusti – izusti – pusti*. The external rhyme scheme consists of feminine end rhymes, apart from the lexeme *stiže*, which is not an end rhyme but assonance.

6.18. 18th Stanza

“And the Raven, never *flitting*, still is sitting, still is *sitting* **A**

On the pallid bust of Pallas just above my chamber *door*; **B**

And his eyes have all the *seeming* of a demon’s that is *dreaming*, **C**

And the lamp-light o’er him *streaming* throws his shadow on the *floor*; **B**

And my soul from out that shadow that lies floating on the *floor* **B**

Shall be lifted—*nevermore!*” **B**

(Poe 1852:11)

The last stanza of the poem contains the grammatical rhyming pair *flitting – sitting* in its 1st line, and continues that pattern with *seeming, dreaming* and *streaming* in lines 3 and 4. Of course, the poem is concluded by the word *nevermore*, and it is joined by masculine end rhymes *door – floor – floor*.

„Und der Rabe rührt sich *nimmer*, sitzt noch immer, sitzt noch *immer* **A**

Auf der blassen Pallasbüste, die er sich zum Thron *erkor*. **B**

Seine Augen träumen *trunken* wie Dämonen *traumversunken*; **C**

Mir zu Füßen *hingesunken* droht sein Schatten tot *empor*. **B**

Hebt aus Schatten meine Seele jemals wieder sich *empor?* – **B**

Niemals mehr – oh, nie du *Tor!*” **B**

(Poe 2015:121)

The internal rhyme pair *nimmer – immer* in the 1st line is a rather typical feminine end rhyme, and the internal rhyme scheme continues with the grammatical rhyming words *trunken, trankersunken* and *hingesunken*. The external rhyme scheme consists mostly of masculine end rhymes, putting the necessary emphasis on the poem’s closure and its dramatical effect, e.g. *erkor – empor – empor – Tor*.

„I taj Gavran *postojano*, još je *tamo*, još je *tamo*, **A**

Na Paladi blijedoj sjedi, što se iznad vrata *diže*; **B**

Oko mu je slika *živa* oka zloduha, što *sniva*, **C**

Svjetlo, koje ga *obliva*, sjenu mu na podu *riše*; **B**

Moja duša iz te sjene, koja se na podu *riše*, **B**

Ustat neće – *nikad više!*” **B**

(Markusi-Dujmović, Rossetti-Bazdan 2008:311)

In the last stanza of *The Raven*, the 1st line is marked by the assonance rhyming pair *postojano – tamo*, and the internal rhyme scheme continues in lines 3 and 4 with the rhyming words *živa – sniva – obliva*. The Croatian translators followed the usual course of external rhyme

scheme, feminine end rhyme with word *riše* repeating in 2 successive lines, and *više* as the closing word of the poem.

7. Conclusion

The analysis of *The Raven* and its German and Croatian translations showed that rhyme and its patterns are to a large extent language-specific. Throughout the 18 stanzas of the poem, one could notice the continuous rhyme scheme patterns in each of these three languages. This poem was especially suitable for such an experiment for it has a very specific, rare and unique rhyming pattern which is very hard to reproduce, even in the closely related languages. It keeps both the internal and external rhyme scheme constant and steadfast throughout the poem, creating a special rhythmic sensation and enhancing the poem's interesting and mysterious plot.

Throughout the analysis, it was noticeable that the original poem written in English contained mostly masculine end rhymes, with occasional feminine end rhymes, mostly as part of the internal rhyme scheme. Since English is a typical example of analytic languages, it is no wonder that masculine rhymes were the ones that sounded most natural, and they moved the whole plot forwards most effectively. The problem with English monosyllabic rhymes, however, is that they quickly get hackneyed because there is a small number of words that form proper rhymes and that belong to the same rhyming groups. For that reason, Poe included feminine rhymes as well and carefully mixed them with the masculine rhyme scheme; that way he created an interesting rhythmic pattern that he kept throughout the poem. The most frequent masculine rhymes were, e.g.: *before, Lenore, more...* and almost all other lexemes used were their rhymes. That is why they had to be used very carefully and put at the right places to create further suspense and retain the sublime effect of the poem. Poe also did not avoid using grammatical rhyme pairs, such as -ing or -ed participles, although these are generally perceived as weak rhymes in the English poetry. Furthermore, the analysis shows that English in general is very sensitive to variations in stress when forming rhymes. There

was not one example of two words rhyming without having the stress on the same syllable, and that kind of occurrence would surely be marked as stylistically odd and would disturb the rhythm.

The German version, on the other hand, although it is part of the target language and culture closely related to English, showed much greater flexibility in forming rhyme patterns. Since it has the features of both the analytic and synthetic languages, it has a richer variety of rhyming possibilities. Like English, it has a number of articles, but, unlike English, it possesses a wide variety of inflectional morphemes, which offers a whole new set of rhymes and rhyming groups the English language does not have. Throughout the analysis, it was visible that the German translators were equally comfortable with both masculine and feminine rhymes, and that the choice of one or the other did not in any way obstruct the natural rhythm of the poem. Feminine rhymes sounded very natural in German, whereas masculine rhymes were a good contrast and the two were sufficient to achieve a steady flow of the original. Grammatical rhymes were also quite frequent, and once again those were mostly participles or infinitive verbs. Another recognizable occurrence in the German language is that it forms compositions simply by ‘gluing’ the words together, which implies that there are numerous rhyme variations and possibilities. Furthermore, German turned out to be less sensitive to stress variation than English, which is no wonder considering its larger amount of rhymes and different methods of inflection English is devoid of. However, it was not as flexible as Croatian. These analysis outcomes confirm the fact that it is way easier to translate English poetry into German than the other way around, for German is less strict when it comes to rhyme types and its rhythm can bear much more variations.

However, the Croatian translators had without doubt the hardest task; it was almost impossible to render the complex rhyme scheme of *The Raven* in a language so different from English and not suffer many losses in the process. Croatian is a typical example of synthetic languages, which means it has a higher morpheme-per-word ratio and less or no articles. Masculine rhyme in general is very rare in Croatian poetry, whereas it is the most recognized type of rhyme in English, and that gap is hard to overcome. Croatian words almost never have their last syllable stressed, so the only words able to form monosyllabic rhyme would be the ones consisting of one syllable only, and they are not frequent. That is why Croatian translators almost exclusively went with feminine rhyme, and it fit in the poem’s rhythm smoothly. Their choices, in general, were very creative due to Croatian’s rich vocabulary and a number of different grammatical and inflectional procedures that automatically offer new

rhyming possibilities, which is why they used grammatical rhymes less frequently than German translators. Furthermore, they more often used assonance in cases where forming end rhyme was inconvenient, which, surprisingly, did not disturb the rhythm of the poem. However, the biggest difference between English and Croatian poetry rhythm is the fact that Croatian is less sensitive to stress variations, so the cases where two rhyming words do not have the same stressed syllable feel almost as natural as perfect examples of masculine or feminine rhyme.

After paying closer attention to detailed rhyming patterns of the English original and its German and Croatian translations, it is evident that rhyme schemes and translator's choices to a large extent were language-specific. Both German and Croatian translators tried hard to faithfully recreate the original complex rhyming pattern, but some had it easier than the others in the start due to relatedness of their source and target languages. The poem's rhyme scheme was very complex, so it gave them a chance to explore their own creative vocabulary, reflect on how Poe would do it, dig deep into the haunting storyline, and then finally try to recreate the atmosphere in terms of their own language and culture. That is what translating poetry, in the end, is all about: it is a rare and exquisite moment of bridging the gap between your own culture and language habits and the culture that fascinates you; it truly is the process of recreating, retelling a certain story, and employing all your creativity and linguistic skills to form something new out of something old, same in a way, but also completely new. Throughout that complex process, some choices are all up to you and your aesthetic intuition, but other times you are obliged to apply the norms and rules of the target language and culture, so that the new poem would read as naturally as the original. To accomplish that, the translator needs to take both these aspects into account and bear in mind the unwritten rules of poetic language.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. *Typological Distinctions in Word-Formation*. Cambridge University Press.

Bantas, A., Croitoru, E. (1998). *Didactica traducerii*. Teora, Bucuresti.

Bennett, Guy. *Translation of Poetry/Poetry of Translation: Some Thoughts on Transpoiesis*.

http://www.mindmadebooks.com/bennett.translation_of_poetry.pdf

Accessed 8th August 2017

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *Bibliografia Literaria*.

<https://www.poetryfoundation.org/articles/69385/from-biographia-literaria-chapter-xiv>

Accessed 7th August 2017

Carlson, Eric W. A. (1996). *Companion to Poe Studies*. Greenwood Publishing Group.

Duff, Alan (1981). *The Third Language*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Espy, Willard R. (2006). *Words to Rhyme With. A Rhyming Dictionary*. Third Edition. Facts on File, New York.

Hariyanto, Sugeng. *Problems in Translating Poetry*. State Polytechnic. Malang, Indonesia.

<http://www.translationdirectory.com/article640.htm>

Accessed 8th August 2017

Jakobson, Roman. *On Linguistic Aspects of Translation*.

<https://web.stanford.edu/~eckert/PDF/jakobson.pdf>

Accessed 8th August 2017.

Kronasser, Heinz (1952). *Handbuch der Semasiologie: Kurze Einführung in die Geschichte*. C. Winter. Heidelberg.

Levy, Jiry (2011). *The Art of Translation*. John Benjamins Publishing Co. Amsterdam.

Markusi-Dujmović, Dragica, Rossetti-Bazdan Sandra (2008). *Književni vremeplov 2*. 1. izdanje. Profil. Zagreb.

Matiu, Ovidiu (2008). *Translating Poetry. Contemporary Theories and Hypotheses*. Lucian Blaga University. Sibiu.

Minor, M. (1982). Edgar Allan Poe. *In Critical Survey of Poetry (English Language Series)*. Vol. 5. Salem Press. New Jersey.

Newmark, Peter (1981). *Approaches to Translation*. Pergamon Press. Oxford.

Nida, Eugene A. & Taber, Charles R. (1982). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Volume VIII. United Bible Societies. Leiden.

Parra, Luz Garcia Ma. (2000). *Poe: The Concept of Poetry and Poetic Practice with Reference to the Relationship between The Poetic Principle and Annabel Lee*. I.B. Cardenal Lopez de Mendoza. Burgos.

Poe, E.A. (2015.) *Der Raabe und sämtliche Gedichte*. Nikol Verlag. Hamburg.

Poe, E.A., Griswold, L.W., Willis, N.P. & Lowell, J.R. (1852). *The Works of the Late Edgar Allan Poe with Notices of His Life and Genius*. Vol. VII. Poems and Miscellanies. J.S. Redfield. New York.

Pound, Ezra (1991). *ABC of Reading*. Faber and Faber. London.

Shipley, Joseph T. (1953). *Dictionary of World Literature*. Philosophical Library. New York.

Venuti, Lawrence (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. Routledge. London.

Wordsworth, William. *Preface to Lyrical Ballads. Famous Prefaces*. The Harvard Classics. 1909-14.

<http://www.bartleby.com/39/36.html>

Accessed 7th August 2017

Sažetak

Cilj ovog rada je analiza rime u pjesmi *Gavran* Edgara Allana Poea i njezinim odabranim prijevodima na njemački i hrvatski. Teoretski se dio bavi prevođenjem poezije općenito, razrađuje brojne vrste rime i njihovu prevodljivost na različite jezike, objašnjava razliku između analitičkih i sintetičkih jezika te se pobliže fokusira na značajke poezije Edgara Allana Poea. Praktični dio analizira 18 zasebnih strofa pjesme *Gavran* u izvornom obliku zajedno s njezinim odabranim prijevodima na njemački i hrvatski, a cilj je analize ustvrditi kakva rima prevladava u svakom od ta 3 jezika i zašto.

Ključne riječi: prevođenje poezije, rima, sintetički jezici, analitički jezici, Edgar Allan Poe, Gavran