Teacher who will receive this document: O. Dekkers, U. Wilbers

Title of document: Tiel,van_BA Thesis

Name of course: Bachelor's Thesis English Literature

Date of submission: 16-06-2019

The work submitted here is the sole responsibility of the undersigned, who has neither committed plagiarism nor colluded in its production.

Signed

WHIFFLING THROUGH THE TULGEY WOODS OF TRANSLATION: TRANSLATING
THE NONSENSE VERSE IN "JABBERWOCKY"

Kayleigh van Tiel
BA Thesis English Literature
16 June, 2019

Kayleigh van Tiel
s4618149
BA Thesis English Literature
O. Dekkers, U. Wilbers
16 June, 2019

Abstract

The focus of this thesis is the interaction between nonsense devices and translation strategies as described by Andrew Chesterman. An analysis was made for "Jabberwocky" and four Dutch translations. It was found that the nonsense devices used in the source text were also present in all target texts, though not necessarily as equivalents. These devices are: neologism, portmanteau, and rhyme scheme, all three being subcategories of the simultaneity device. The arbitrariness device is used by Carroll as well. An additional nonsense device, imprecision, was found in one of the target texts, as a result of translation strategies. In general, neologisms and portmanteaux often got translated as one another. In cases where neologisms were involved, it was difficult to establish which translation strategies had been used, as they appear to be geared towards the translation of meaningful units, which nonsense does not always adhere to.

Key words: *Nonsense literature, nonsense device, translatability, translation strategies*

Index

Whiffling Through the Tulgey Woods of Translation: Translating the Nonsense Verse in "Jabberwocky"

"Jabberwocky" is a poem included in one of Lewis Carroll's acclaimed Alice books, *Through the Looking-Glass* (1871 - though its first stanza had already been published several years prior in Carroll's periodical *Mischmasch* titled as "Stanza of Anglo-Saxon Poetry"[1]). It has puzzled readers ever since its release: the poem plays a game with the rules of language and uses words and meaning in such a way that it leaves the reader quite unsure of what they have just read. In Alice's words: "It's *rather* hard to understand! […] Somehow it fills my head with ideas only I don't know exactly what they are!"[2] Immediately upon release in 1843, the public was enraptured by Carroll's whimsical style. The Alice books impressed readers and critics alike, enamouring them precisely because it was "without aim or object other than pure amusement," something yet to be seen in the moralistic children's stories of Victorian Britain.[3] Unsurprisingly, it did not take long for the first translations of *Alice in Wonderland* to be published: in 1869, Alice ventured down both French and German rabbit holes – and many other Alice's followed suit, including the first Dutch Alice in 1887.

While Alice quickly spread around the world, the Jabberwock seemed somewhat more hestitant, making its first Dutch appearance in 1947 as "Wauwelwok", when Alfred Kossman and Cornelis Reedijk translated *Through the Looking-Glass*. Since then, 8 other Dutch Jabberwocks have been slain: Martin Deelen's "Koeterwalski" (1965), Ab Westervaarder & René Kurpershoek's "Krakelwok" (1982), Elly Schippers's "Wauwelwok" (1994), Nicolaas Matsier's "Koeterwaals" (1994) and his reworking of this translation in 2009 under the same title, Sophia Engelsman's "Zwateldrok" (2006), Dorine Louwerens's "Beuzelzwans" (2016), and lastly, Jur Koksma & Joep Stapels's "Klepperjaks" (2017). Koksma and Stapel also wrote an essay for their translation, lamenting the difficulties of the job, and celebrating its challenges: "We admit our failures – of course we failed, the perfect translation doesn't exist."[4] On a more positive note, they point out that while the poem cannot be recreated perfectly in Dutch, this also means it can be translated endlessly.[5] Carroll's nonsense literature remains popular today, though, as Martin

---

[1] L. Carroll, *The Rectory Umbrella and Mischmasch*, 139.
[2] L. Carroll, *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland & Through the Looking-Glass*, 150.
[3] L. Carroll & M. Gardner, *The Complete Alice,* 459.
[4] Koksma & Stapel, *Begeleidend Essay,* in *Het Nonsensgedicht Jabberwocky van Lewis Carroll,* 21 [translation mine].
[5] Ibid.

Gardner points out, its intended public has somewhat evolved. The books were written for children, but nowadays gather more interest from adult readers – "scientists and mathematicians in particular." While the books were perfectly enjoyable for the ten-year-old Alice Liddell, for who they were written, "children today are bewildered and sometimes frightened by the nightmarish atmosphere of Alice's dreams. It is only because adults […] continue to relish the *Alice* books that they are assured of immortality."[6]

These books, and with them "Jabberwocky", are part of what is referred to as nonsense literature (commonly referred to as just 'nonsense' in relevant literature). The genre grew so popular in the nineteenth century that it is often falsely believed to be 'exclusive product'[7] of this period, says Malcolm, who also argues that the genre sprang up in England as early as the late Middle Ages, and was 'in vogue' for a good half of the 17th century as well.[8] Nonsense, it can even – and has been – be argued, is a timeless phenomenon.[9] Nonsensical elements can certainly be ascribed to many texts, even back to the classic plays performed in Greece, which often featured elements that did not fully align with reality as we know it. For the sake of this thesis, however, only the nonsense of Victorian England shall be explored further, as it is to this timeframe that the poem to be discussed belongs. The Victorian age was one of political stability and modernisation, driven by industrialisation. It offered, in that sense, a newfound freedom, which set the stage for rapid social change. At the same time, it was an age with strict moral standards, and almost overwhelmingly restrictive social conventions – the sheer amount of etiquette books published can attests to that.[10] This combination of a "political stability and an inflexible social system"[11] lent itself perfectly for the emergence of nonsense literature: it provided both the opportunity to spend time on the arts, and the desire for comic relief and non-conformity. Prickett claims that "[n]onsense offered the Victorians […] an alternative language for coping with the conditions of a world at once more complicated and more repressive."[12] Victorian nonsense, then, is best understood as a means of breaking with mainstream ideals of the time, an escape of sorts. With regards to literature, nonsense as a genre is often seen as a reaction

---

[6] M. Gardner, *Introduction to the annotated Alice*, xiv.
[7] N. Malcolm, *The Origins of English Nonsense,* 3.
[8] Ibid., 4.
[9] Tigges, 229.
[10] T. Weller, *The Puffery and Practicality of Etiquette Books: A New Take on Victorian Information Culture,* 3.
[11] Tigges, 230.
[12] Prickett, *Victorian Fantasy,* quoted in Tigges, 229

to Romanticism.[13] With the romantic movement came the use of language and images as a means to synthesise and evoke emotion, as opposed to its analytical use in the preceding movement of enlightenment.[14] This use of language is deconstructed in nonsense literature, which, as will be discussed in more detail in the first chapter of this thesis, uses language to hint at meaning without ever fully providing it.

In the following chapter, I will get to the crux of this thesis: the relationship between nonsense and translation. I will first provide a more fleshed out definition of nonsense as a genre, based on Dutch scholar Wim Tigges's "An Anatomy of Literary Nonsense." Based on the works of various scholars, I will then explain the ongoing debate of the translatability of such works. To conclude, I will introduce the reader to Andrew Chesterman's framework for translation theories. This information will then be used to analyse the translation strategies used for four Dutch translations of "Jabberwocky" and the way they interact with the devices of nonsense within the poem in the following chapters. The aim of this thesis is to discover how nonsense devices are influenced by translation strategies.

---

[13] Tigges, 234.
[14] Tigges 234.

Chapter I – Methodological framework

In order to fully – I use this term loosely – understand the content of "Jabberwocky," it is important to establish a functional definition of literary nonsense as a genre. Tigges provides his readers with an elaborate overview of previously established definitions as he works towards his own. Throughout the varying, often incomplete definitions, he notes that it is at least agreed upon that the works of certain writers such as Carroll and Lear are part of it.[15] Another crucial point is that most, if not all scholars agree that "game or play, with language and logic playing important thematic as well as structural roles"[16] reside at the core. What these works are largely lacking in, however, is a definition of nonsense in the literary sense, as they mostly focus on its linguistic elements – nonsense as a set of qualities shared by various texts. These elements are crucial for the definition of literary nonsense, but do not suffice. This is the gap that Tigges has set out to fill, and throughout this thesis, I will adhere to the laborious definition he has provided:

> [Nonsense is] a genre of narrative literature which balances a multiplicity of meaning with a simultaneous absence of meaning. This balance is effected by playing with the rules of language, logic, prosody and representation, or a combination of these. *In order to be successful, nonsense must at the same time invite the reader to interpretation and avoid the suggestion that there is a deeper meaning which can be obtained by considering connotations or associations, because these lead to nothing.* The elements of word and image that may be used in this play are primarily those of negativity or mirroring, imprecision or mixture, infinite repetition, simultaneity, and arbitrariness. A dichotomy between reality and the words and images which are used to describe it must be suggested. The greater the distance or tension between what is presented, the expectations that are evoked, and the frustration of these expectations, the more nonsensical the effect will be. The material may come from the unconscious … but this may not be suggested in the presentation.[17]

The most important element in this definition is a balance between meaning and the lack thereof. This can function on two levels: it acts as an overarching characteristic for the work as a whole

---

[15] Tigges, 2-3.
[16] Ibid, 46.
[17] Ibid., 47. [emphasis mine]

but can also be used as a device on a smaller scale. It should here be noted that every text lends itself for meaningful interpretation, depending on how far one is willing to reach. For example, in "'Through the Looking-Glass' Decoded," the book is presented as a cryptogram for the Talmud, which is the central text of Judaism, and Carroll is claimed to have referred to the Jewish ritual.[18] Literary nonsense is concerned simply with lack of meaning within the text itself – even if meaning can be imposed upon the text from an outside perspective, it can be categorised as nonsense if the text assessed does not lend itself for a meaningful interpretation when read in isolation.

The simultaneous presence and absence of meaning also results in a lack of emotional involvement: any suggestion of emotion is immediately negated when meaning is not established.[19] Emotion gets frustrated by the nonsensicality of its context, and as such the genre fails to earnestly express feelings. This is reinforced by the playful nature of nonsense.[20] This playful nature expresses itself in a game-like manner, where the text adheres to arbitrary rules voluntarily and meticulously – a simultaneous presence and absence of rules.[21] The rules are created and negated mainly by the use of language in such works. As Tigges puts it: "in nonsense the word has precedence over reality."[22] It can then be said that literary nonsense is not so much a collection of devices, as a genre characterised by four main qualities, being: an unresolved tension between meaning and the lack thereof, playful presentation, lack of emotional involvement from the author, and a strong emphasis on the way language can be used to construct meaning.

Though nonsense should not be seen as a collection of devices, as has just been established, it does exert itself through various devices. It is through these devices that I will attempt to analyse the way nonsense is established in "Jabberwocky" and several of its Dutch counterparts. These devices, which I will explain in detail below, are: mirroring, imprecision, infinity, simultaneity, and arbitrariness.

Mirroring in nonsense often applies on a lexical level: letters can be mirrored, words can be reversed or used for their opposite meaning. On a pragmatic level, discourse can be self-

---

[18] Jean-Jaqcue Lecercle, *Philosophy of Nonsense,* 6.
[19] Tigges, 52.
[20] Ibid., 54.
[21] Ibid.
[22] Ibid., 55.

denying.[23] Tigges stresses that in order to be nonsense, the primary requirement of unresolved tension must be fulfilled, thereby excluding such reversals as palindromes, spoonerisms or fables.[24] It is a thematic device that is not necessary for nonsense, though it can play a role in it.

Imprecision plays with boundaries. It occurs when separate elements are combined with one another without fully overlapping.[25] In the case of nonsense, it prompts the reader with a puzzle they will find themselves unable to solve – "the misdirection or deficiency or surplus of significance must be presented as a meaningful direction or a sufficient signification."[26]

Infinity brings an element of play to nonsense: stringing, or seriality, leads to a series without cause and effect. The necessary tension between meaning and non-meaning is preserved by "the arbitrariness of closure … as well as the frequently episodic nature of the text."[27]

Simultaneity is the strongest semiotic device in the nonsense repertoire, presenting most clearly the tension between two separate elements.[28] We speak of simultaneity in mismatched pairings for which the surrounding text offers no context that would allow for a sensible reading. There is some discussion about the role of rhyme in this device, on which Tigges quotes three scholars: Stewart, who states that "rhyme works as a principle of convergence,"[29] Holoquist, who maintains that rhyme, in a "rule of three" binds two words together into a new meaning,[30] Sewell, who categorises it as "pseudo-series,"[31] and finally Redfern, who suggests a relationship between rhyme and puns, as both "call the sense by the sound … [bringing] together words which often are thought separate."[32] For my thesis I shall, in line with Tigges, maintain that rhyme will be qualified as a nonsense device so long as it maintains an unresolved tension. In addition to rhyme, Tigges shares under simultaneity three 'very important' lexical devices: *the pun, the portmanteau,* and *the neologism*, which he discusses in separate sections.

---

[23] Stewart, *Nonsense. Aspects of Intertextuality in Folklore and Literature,* quoted in Tigges, p. 56-57.
[24] Tigges, 57.
[25] Ibid.
[26] Ibid., 58.
[27] Stewart, quoted in Tigges 59.
[28] Tigges, 59.
[29] Stewart, quoted in Tigges 59.
[30] Holoquist, quoted in Tigges 60.
[31] Sewell, *The Field of Nonsense,* quoted in Tigges 60.
[32] Redfern, *Puns,* quoted in Tigges 60.

Puns encompass vertical wordplay, where a word or phrase with multiple meanings is used ambiguously in such a way that it "*simultaneously* strengthens a point *and* frustrates it."[33] Metaphors can be used in a similar way to constitute nonsense, when taken literally.

The portmanteau, interestingly enough, was coined by Carroll in *Through the Looking-Glass.*[34] It refers to words consisting of two words that were mixed together, such as "slithy" in the first line of "Jabberwocky".

Neologisms are words that were created by the writer, and as such have no meaning attached to them. Successful neologisms must behave like 'normal' words in that they adhere to the syntactical, morphological and phonological rules of the language they are coined in. Of course, in the context of nonsense, those coinages are not meant to be added to the vocabulary.[35]

Arbitrariness is used by Tigges in a very general sense: it creates an opportunity for the play of nonsense, a setting for it to take place. It is, in that sense, intertwined with both simultaneity and infinity.[36]

In order to maintain a manageable scope for my thesis, I will exclude those elements that do not concern themselves with wordplay from consideration, leaving me with mirroring, imprecision, and the several devices of simultaneity. This choice is based on Carroll's aforementioned affection for wordplay, as well as my assessment of their importance to "Jabberwocky" in general – the other elements more so set the stage and boundaries for nonsense to occur, than portraying nonsense itself, in my opinion.

Before delving into the mechanisms of translating something apparently void of meaning, we should pose ourselves the question of whether or not it can truly be translated – certainly, we would not be the first. Several papers have been published on the translatability of nonse in "Jabberwocky", for example, ranging in focus from syntactical problems (Björn Sundmark, C. van Schalkwyk, Flamina Robu) to cultural ones (Mikiko Chimori). In his paper 'Translate it, translate it not' (2008), Jean-Jacques Lecercle provides readers with an overview of seven possible stances on the subject: "You can't translate nonsense, you mustn't translate nonsense, you needn't translate nonsense, you don't translate nonsense but you transpose it, nonsense is endlessly translatable, nonsense is endlessly translated, translations of nonsense are the most

---

[33] Tigges, 62.
[34] Reichert, *Lewis Carroll,* quoted in Tigges 65.
[35] Tigges, 67-68.
[36] Ibid., 70.

complete, satisfactory and successful of all translations."[37] What all these works have in common is that they concern themselves with the possibility of a perfect translation, a discussion on which Daniela Almansi offers another interesting perspective: that rather than questioning the translatability of nonsense, the act of translating can be used as a nonsense device.[38] She argues that "whenever we read—or indeed produce—a translation, we must find a way to overlook, were it only temporarily, the absurdity of the illusion that two texts written by different people, in different languages, and using different words, are the same text,"[39] noting as well that such "common-sense assumptions" are exactly what nonsense translations mean to challenge. Thus, even if we can say that nonsense literature offers many difficulties for translation that cannot be fully resolved, we must not forget that the same holds true for any text – the perfect translation is an illusion, as no two languages are the same. Nonsense translations, Almansi offers, are an extension of the original, meant to be enjoyed alongside each other rather than as a replacement.[40] The impossibility of a perfect translation that Almansi touches upon is also noted by Andrew Chesterman, who states that "(total) equivalence is a red herring, in that it is virtually unattainable."[41] A source text might be the starting point for a translation, but it does not move towards it, for then it would cease to exist in its original language. Instead, the translation "extends the readership"[42] of the original. This viewpoint is what underlies my thesis; equivalence may not be attainable, but as Almansi has demonstrated, this may not be problematic, especially when considering nonsense texts. However, if the text cannot be left the same, it is likely that the nonsense devices used in it will have to change to accommodate the new language as well. The idea that translation itself could function as a nonsense device is a relevant one that I mean to explore: could translation result in a text that fits into the genre of nonsense in different ways? How could a translator achieve this?

In order to answer the latter question, I will call upon Chesterman's *Memes of Translation*, in which he provides his thoughts on the matter. The translation strategies lined out in this work are meant to provide a solution to the problem of inequivalence – through them, translators try to create the best version of the text in their target language. These strategies are

---

[37] Lecercle, *Translate it, Translate it not,* 90.
[38] D. Almansi, *Nonsensing nonsense,* 57.
[39] Ibid., 57.
[40] Ibid., 60.
[41] A. Chesterman, *Memes of Translation*, 9.
[42] Ibid., 8.

prompted when a translator encounters a word or phrase in the source text which has no satisfying equivalent in the target language (if there ever is any). Conversely, if there is a satisfying equivalent in the target language, a translator can opt to use this equivalent and not opt a translation strategy.

He divides his strategies into three categories: *syntactic, semantic,* and *pragmatic.* I will explain those strategies that are relevant to the subject at hand as no one category is fully applicable to the translations of "Jabberwocky". The relevant syntactic strategies are the *loan, scheme change*, *transposition* and *sentence structure change.* The loan refers to directly borrowing a word from the source text, and scheme change refers to the changes made to "rhetorical schemes such as parallelism, repetition, alliteration, metrical rhythm etc."[43] When altering the scheme, the translator has three options: transferring the scheme to the target language, using a different scheme that fulfils a similar function, and dropping the scheme altogether. The decision is made based on the importance of the scheme in the source text, and whether or not a similar structure can be achieved in the target language. Transposition indicates a change in word-class between the source text and the target text, for example from noun to verb.[44] This strategy is often used together with sentence structure change, which involves changing the structure of a sentence.[45]

Regarding semantic strategies, *synonymy, hyponymy, distribution change, emphasis change, paraphrasing* and *trope change* are relevant. Synonymy is the selection of a synonym or near-synonym over the 'usual' equivalent.[46] This choice can be made to avoid repetition, for example. Hyponymy concerns the relation between hyponym and superordinate.[47] The translator can use this strategy in three different ways: moving from hyponym to superordinate, moving from superordinate to hyponym, and moving from hyponym to another hyponym of their shared superordinate. With Distribution change, a change is made in the way information is spread over semantic components.[48] This can go two ways: expansion, where the information gets spread over more items, and compression, where the information is bound into fewer items. Emphasis

---

[43] Chesterman, 99-100.
[44] Ibid, 100.
[45] Ibid.
[46] Ibid., 102
[47] Ibid.
[48] Ibid., 104.

change "adds to, reduces or alters the emphasis or thematic focus."[49] This can be done by adding adjectives to the text, for example, but it can also be the result of changes in the syntactic structure between the two languages. When paraphrasing, the source text is not translated with the goal of semantic equivalency in mind. This strategy results in a loosely translated text, "in some contexts even under translated"[50] Semantic components are disregarded in favour of pragmatics, often functioning at an overarching level. It is a common strategy for the translation of idioms, which often do not have an equivalent in the target language.[51] The Trope change is the semantic equivalent of the syntactic scheme change. It is a set of strategies that can be applied to the translation of figurative expressions.[52] Like the scheme change, this can be done in three ways: the trope can be maintained in the target language, the trope can be replaced by a trope of the same type that differs semantically but is still related, and finally, the trope is disregarded. The latter can be divided into four types: replacement with a lexically unrelated trope of the same type, selecting a different trope in the target language, and dropping the trope, and lastly, adding a trope in the target text that was not present in the source text.[53]

Lastly, the relevant pragmatic strategies: *cultural filtering, information change,* and *partial translation.* Cultural filtering concerns the way in which parts of the source language, particularly culture-specific items, are adapted into the target language, in a way that they conform to the norms of the target language.[54] This process is called domestication. Its opposite is foreignization, where items are borrowed directly. This strategy can be used to make a text more familiar to the reader by removing foreign cultural elements and substituting equivalent elements from the target language culture. Conversely, it can be used to give the text a more foreign feeling by directly borrowing these elements. The term information change refers to the addition of non-inferable information to the target text which would be relevant to the readership. Conversely, an excess of context can be omitted, for example by summarising.[55] The information that is left out during omission cannot be inferred from the surrounding text, differentiating it from implication. This strategy is used make the translated text easier to read by providing

---

[49] Ibid.
[50] Ibid.
[51] Ibid.
[52] Ibid., 105.
[53] Ibid., 106
[54] Chesterman, 108.
[55] Ibid.

relevant context for the translated text or cutting out excess information. Partial translation covers any type of partial translation, including summarisation, transcription, translation of sounds only, etc[56].

      To summarise, nonsense, clear as day, poses interesting problems for translation. In this thesis, I will analyse the nonsense devices occurring in 'Jabberwocky' and four of its Dutch counterparts and assess the translation strategies that led to these translations. Given the difficulties that arise during translation, and the impossibility of a perfect translation, I expect that the different translations of "Jabberwocky" will at times result in a different kind of nonsense than presented in the source text. With this thesis, I mean to shed light not only on the nonsense presented in the Dutch translations, but also on the way the device of translation has influenced this nonsense – nonsense and translation, after all, share quite a few similarities. I shall set out to answer the following question: which translation strategies were applied to the different Dutch translations of the poem "Jabberwocky", and how do they interact with the nonsense devices in the poem?"

---

[56] Ibid.

Chapter II – Our manxome foes

This chapter will be devoted to analysing the use of three nonsense devices in the poem 'Jabberwocky' and four Dutch translations: "Wauwelwok", "Krakelwok", "Koeterwaals", and "Klepperjaks". Though analysing all Dutch translations would have been ideal since it would provide a more complete analysis of the translation history, a selection had to be made to maintain a manageable scope for this thesis. "Wauwelwok" was part of the first Dutch translation of the Alice books, and as such enjoys a honorary status – 'canonical', even, say Koksma & Stapel.[57] Given this status, it seemed almost necessary to include it. "Krakelwok" was selected because it is the only Dutch translation to not include a translation for Humpty Dumpty's explanation, and "Koeterwaals" because it bridges the gap between earlier and later translations. Klepperjaks was selected for the extensive accompanying essay written for it, as well as being the most recent publication. The analysis, with exception for the rhyme, will be divided into stanzas as these provide a natural demarcation for the content of the poem, with sentences not running across different stanzas. I will first discuss the rhyme and touch upon a few words that are particularly difficult in the analysis, before discussing each stanza. For brevity's sake, the poems are included in an appendix at the end of this thesis.

The name "Stanza of Anglo-Saxon Poetry" given to the first stanza by Lewis Carroll holds true for "Jabberwocky" as well. The poem is written in ballad form: it has regular four-line stanzas and it largely adheres to an ABAB rhyme scheme, with each stanza ending on a stressed syllable. Stanzas 3, 5, and 6 have an ABCB scheme. The fourth of each stanza ends on two syllables. Excluding the first and last stanzas, the third line of each stanza has internal rhyme, sometimes alliterative. This internal rhyme seems reminiscent of the Anglo-Saxon oral tradition, which relied heavily on alliteration, amongst other mechanisms. Specifically, it relates to the heroic tradition of Anglo-Saxon poetry, and in doing so, strengthens its own contents which depict a heroic adventure.

The form appears to contribute significantly to the interpretation of the poem in two ways: firstly, the neologisms and portmanteau Carroll uses always bend to the form. Carroll was particular about their pronunciation, noting in his preface to a later work, *The Hunting of the Snark*, how "toves" and "borogoves" should be pronounced.[58] In this sense, the 'arbitrary' rules

---

[57] Koksma & Stapel, *Begeleidend Essay*, 22-54.
[58] Gardner, *The Annotated Alice,* 179.

take precedence, as is so often the case with nonsense – the element of 'arbitrariness' is at play as a device at this point. In a simpler way, the rhyme in "Jabberwocky" becomes meaningful in its resemblance to a common poetic format – it confirms to the reader that they are reading a heroic adventure. At the same time, it is at odd with the contents of the poem, which does not provide a satisfactory answer to how exactly this adventure takes place, and what happens during it, other than the slaying of the Jabberwock. The rhyme thus helps maintain the tension between meaning and the lack thereof and can be viewed as a nonsense device within the contexts of "Jabberwocky", both as a device of its own and within the context of the arbitrary device.

The ballad form has been preserved in all four translations, with all stanzas following either an ABAB or an ABCB scheme. The masculine rhyme, too, has mostly survived, but there were instances where concessions had to be made. Koksma & Stapel opted for assonance in the first and second stanzas: 'slijverpriets/warrekiet' and 'graait/Beendersnaai'. The internal rhyme in the third lines of each stanza has proven to be a rather challenging task, however. Only Kosmann & Reedijk have convincingly succeeded at this, keeping it for 5 out of 6 stanzas (disregarding the last stanza, which is identical to the first). Westvaarder & Kurpershoek, Matsier, and Koksma & Stapel have kept the internal rhyme in 4, 3, and 3 stanzas respectively. It can be argued that the rhyme device is somewhat weakened in these translations. It seems, however, that the form has not been influenced to such an extent as to nullify this device, or even detract from in a significant way, in any of these translations.

It should be noted that several of the words coined by Carroll have since made their way into the dictionaries of the English people – something which, of course has not happened in Dutch (and it might be interesting to think how more modern translators have, in determining a possible translation, looked towards the English dictionary and sought a Dutch equivalent for that word). These words are: galumphing, chortled, and, to a lesser extent, frabjous.

Opposite to these words, which have become meaningful since Carroll's time, there are also words that have lost their meaning to the contemporary modern reader, and could easily be mistaken for Carrollian words. "[G]yre", used in the first and last stanzas, meant 'to turn or twirl.'[59] As this fits with the contents of the line, and Carroll left no further remarks on the word, this instance will be considered regular use of the word at the time. "Whiffling" is another such word, holding a variety of meanings. It usually meant to 'blow unsteadily in short puffs' and was

---

[59] Ibid., 180.

colloquially used to mean 'evasive'.[60] The last faux-Carrollian word is "beamish", which the Oxford English Dictionary traces back to 1530 as being a variant of beaming.[61] In addition to these words, there are several other words used in "Jabberwocky" that were meaningful at the time, but which Carroll, either in *Through the Looking-Glass* or additional materials such as letters, has said to have made them himself. These instances will be discussed later in this chapter.

An invaluable source can be found in Humpty Dumpty, and Carroll himself. They help in determining what Carroll meant with his nonsense words – especially in cases where a word already existed in the English language during Carroll's time, but he obviously used it in a dissimilar way. For such words, there are two options: either he was not aware of the existing word, or he chose to disregard it, and perhaps even use it to his advantage – to use an already existing word in a way that is incompatible with its normal use is in and of itself nonsensical. Given Carroll's meticulous involvement with the printing of the Alice books, I will assume that such choices were made deliberately.[62]

The portmanteau, in this poem, is an especially difficult category. The word was coined by Carroll himself later in *Through the Looking-Glass* when Humpty Dumpty attempts to explain 'Jabberwocky' to Alice. He uses describe several of the nonsense words that are made up out of two separate words, such as "slithy", consisting of "'lithe and slimy'"[63] These words can sometimes best be analysed with help the help of Humpty Dumpty's explanations, even if he can be seen as an unreliable narrator in a sense: he himself admits that "when [he] use[s] a word […] it means just what I choose it to mean – neither more nor less."[64]

The analysis of nonsense starts with the title of the poem, which is a neologism. "Jabberwocky" appears to refer to a language, aptly describing the nonsensical language in the poem, and in this way functions as an arbitrary device, introducing to the reader the notion that they are about to read something nonsensical, without fully giving away what they are about to read. Kossmann & Reedijk, as wel as Westvaarder & Kurpershoek, have omitted this distinction between the beast and a language, erasing the title's relation to the arbitrariness device. This was

---

[60] Ibid.
[61] Ibid., 181.
[62] Carroll, *The Complete Alice,* 455.
[63] Carroll, *Through the Looking-Glass,* 212.
[64] Ibid., 210.

done by Matsier in a different way: he has opted to title the poem "Koeterwaals", which is a Dutch word denoting nonsensical language. Koksma & Stapel have kept this distinction, and with it, the arbitrariness device.

Carroll	Kossmann & Reedijk	Westvaarder & Kurpershoek	Matsier	Koksma & Stapel
Brillig - neologism	Bradig – neologism	Bradig – neologism	Schiewerde – neologism	Bradig - neologism
Slithy - portmanteau	Slendig – portmanteau	Slijp'le - neologism	Glappe – portmanteau	Slijver - portmanteau
Toves - neologism	Spiramants – portmanteay	Torfs – neologism	Muik – neologism	Priets - neologism
Gyre – English word	-	-	Graffelde – neologism	wrentel – portmanteau
Gimble - neologism	Bedroorden – portmanteau	Driltolden – neologism	-	gerierden - portmanteau
Wabe - neologism	Zwiets – portmanteau	Weep – neologism	Vijchten – portmanteau	Zwoord - portmanteau
Mimsy - portmanteau	Klarm – portmanteau	Misbrozig – neologism	Sloef – portmanteau	Zwellendig - portmanteau
Borogoves - neologism	Ooiefants – portmanteau	Borogorfs – neologism	Rontelguik – neologism	Warrekiet – portmanteau
Mome - portmanteau	-	Verdwoolde – portmanteau	Strave – portmanteau	Vnuize – portmanteau
Raths - neologism	Beriets – neologism	Grasvark – neologism	Woelen - neologism	Frats – neologism
Outgrabe – neologism	Bluifen – portmanteau	Schreep – neologism	Krijgten – neologism	Kreet broord – neologism + portmanteau

Overview of nonsense devices in the first and seventh stanza.

The first (and identical seventh) stanza include a large number of nonsense words, a feature which slows down somewhat in the body of the poem in favour of the story. "[B]rillig" is the first of these words, a neologism referring to the time of day. It was translated two different ways into Dutch: "bradig" in "Wauwelwok", "Krakelwok", and "Klepperjaks", and "schiewerde" in "Koeterwaals". It is soon followed by "slithy" and "toves" in the same line, a portmanteau (as explained by Humpty Dumpty) and a neologism respectively. The translators were more divided on these issues, resulting in four different alternatives:

> Kossmann & Reedijk: "spiramants … slendig"
>
> Westvaarder & Kurpershoek: "slijp'le torfs"
>
> Matsier: "glappe muik"
>
> Koksma & Stapel: "slijverpriets"

In one of these translations, "slithy toves" has been contracted into one word, following Dutch grammatical conduct for combining words. Koksma & Stapel's Humpty Dumpty explains "slijver" and "priets" as separate words: the first is a portmanteau of 'nijver' (diligent) and 'slijmerig' (slimy), and the latter is a neologism. In Kossman & Reedijk's version, "spiramants" is the equivalent of "toves", indicating a type of salamander. While Humpty Dumpty does not categorise it as such, it appears to be a portmanteau, consisting of the Dutch words 'spiraal' (spiral) and 'salamander'. They have translated "slithy" as "slendig", another portmanteau made up out of 'slijmerig' and 'behendig' (lithe). Westvaarder & Kurpershoek seem to have introduced two neologisms, as the 'p'le' part of "slijp'le" doesn't appear to resemble any Dutch word. Matsier kept the portmanteau and neologism combination, his portmanteau being made up out of 'glad' (slippery) and 'slap' (weak/limp).

      The second line gives us the neologisms "gimble" and "wabe". The latter could be argued to be a portmanteau, given that it combines the sounds of two words into one, as well as meaning. Since the 'be' part of the word can refer to more than one word per Humpty Dumpty's explanation, I have chosen to categorise it as a neologism instead – it does not truly combine the sounds of all those words. Koksma & Stapel have translated "gyre" as the portmanteau "wrentel". "gimble" remains a neologism in all but Kossmann & Reedijk's translation, where its equivalent

is the portmanteau "bedroorden". The "wabe" becomes a portmanteau in all but Westvaarder & Kurpershoek's version, in which it remains a neologism.

The portmanteau "mimsy" got translated as a portmanteau by all but Westvaarder & Kurpershoek, who used a neologism instead. "Borogoves", a neologism, has yet again caused division. Westvaarder & Kurpershoek and Matsier's translations use neologisms, while Kossmann & Reedijk and Koksma & Stapel contrived portmanteaux that are inspired by Dutch words for existing animals. The last line's adjective portmanteau "mome" has been left out by Kossmann & Reedijk but translated as a portmanteau by all other parties. Its object, "raths", is a neologism and has been translated as one in all versions. The stanza is finished with "outgrabe", a neologism. In translating it, Koksma & Stapel made the unusual decision to cut the word in two, resulting in a neologism, "kreet", and a portmanteau "broord", the latter consisting of the words 'moord' (murder) and 'brand' (fire). Westvaarder & kurpershoek and Matsier translated it as a neologism, and Kossmann & Reedijk formed a portmanteau from the words 'blaffen' (barking) and 'fluiten' (whistling).

Carroll	Kossmann & Reedijk	Westvaarder & Kurpershoek	Matsier	Koksma & Stapel
Jabberwock – neologism	Wauwelwok – neologism	Krakelwok – neologism	Koeterwaal – neologism/imprecision	Klepperjak - neologism
Jubjub bird – neologism	Tsjoep-tsjoep – neologism	Jubjub-vlerkenbrok – neologism	Dubdubdier – neologism	Tjeptjepsnep – neologism
-	-	-	Verschoon – imprecision	-
Frumious – portmanteau	-	Gritse – neologism	Glurieuze – portmanteau	Grammige – neologism
Bandersnatch – neologism	Barbeleet – neologism	Bandjegauw – neologism	Beffesnaai – neologism	Beendersnaai – neologism.

Overview of the nonsense devices in the second stanza.

The second stanza introduces us to the title character of the poem, the Jabberwock. It is a neologism that is maintained as such across all translations, though an additional comment can be made for Matsier's "Koeterwaal". The Dutch word "koeterwaals", which is also the title of the poem, means gibberish (which also makes it the only title to not be a nonsense word). Something like a 'koeterwaal' does not exist in Dutch – it is in that sense that the word is a neologism – but it is close enough to say that the element of imprecision is adopted as well. By using a word so close to an existing word, Matsier misdirects his readers: it hints at being meaningful, without actually helping the reader decipher the contents of the poem. The other creatures in this stanza, the Jubjub bird and the Bandersnatch, survive as neologisms in all translations as well. The portmanteau "frumious" proved to be more challenging, only remaining as a portmanteau in Matsier's version. Westvaarder & Kurpershoek, as well as Koksma & Stapel, substituted it for neologisms, and Kossmann & Reedijk opted to leave it out. Lastly, a peculiar choice was made by Matsier in choosing to translate "shun" with "verschoon", which means to clean, and is often used to refer to changing a diaper. This results in a rather absurd image for the Dutch reader and indicates the use of the imprecision device.

Carroll	Kossmann & Reedijk	Westvaarder & Kurpershoek	Matsier	Koksma & Stapel
Vorpal – neologism	Gnijpend – portmanteau	Vorpalen – neologism	Worpel – neologism	Stadel – portmanteau
Manxome – neologism	Aarts-schavoest – neologism	Manxaam – neologism	-	Mankse – neologism
Tumtum tree – neologism	Tumtumboomknoest – neologism	Ploemploemplant – neologism	Plingplongboom – neologism	Pompomboom - neologism

Overview of nonsense devices in the third stanza.

The third stanza brings forth three neologisms. The first neologism, "vorpal", results in two neologisms, by Westvaarder & Kurpershoek and Matsier, and two portmanteaux, by Kossmann & Reedijk and Koksma & Stapel. The latter mention that the sword is made of "edel/adel staal" (noble steel; translation mine), providing evidence for this analysis.[65] No

---

[65] Koksma & Stapel, *Begeleidend Essay,* 29.

materials exist to support the classification of "gnijpend" as a portmanteau. However, it appears to be made with the words 'nijpend' (urgent) and 'geniepig' (sneaky). Lastly, the Carroll's "Tumtum tree" has taken root in all Dutch translations as a similar neologism.

Carroll	Kossmann & Reedijk	Westvaarder & Kurpershoek	Matsier	Koksma & Stapel
Uffish – neologism	Diep – Dutch word	Nijvig – portmanteau	Ruffig – neologism	-
Whiffling – not nonsense	Zwalpse zwenk – neologism + dutch word	Blaaide – portmanteau	Ruisend – Dutch word	Glitsend - portmanteau
Tulgey wood– neologism	Bos – Dutch word	Rapuinhout – neologism	Groene vlaar – dutch word + neologism	Woudnatuur – Dutch word
Burbled – neologism	Borbelend – portmanteau	Burbelend – portmantea	Brankelend – neologism	Borbelend - portmanteau

Overview of nonsense devices in the fourth stanza.

The most intriguing occurrence in this stanza is the invention of nonsense by the translators. The word "whiffling" has yielded two portmanteaux, a neologism, and one omission of nonsense. This is likely due to whiffling having fallen out of use as an English word, which would lead the translators to assume that it is a Carrollian word. The word "uffish", on the other hand, was only maintained as a nonsense word in the translations of Westvaarder & Kurpershoek and Matsier, as a portmanteau and neologism respectively. Kossmann & Reedijk have replaced it with a Dutch word, and Koksma & Stapel have completely left it out. Both of these last translations took a similar approach to to the Tulgey wood, turning it into a regular wood instead. Westvaarder & Kurpershoek and Matsier have invented neologisms in their versions. "[B]urbled" appears to have caused the least trouble in this stanza, twice translated as the portmanteau "borbelend", a combination of 'bubbelen' and 'borrelend', both meaning 'bubbling'. Westvaarder & Kurpershoek's "burbelend" consists of the same two words, albeit in a different configuration.

Carroll	Kossmann & Reedijk	Westvaarder & Kurpershoek	Matsier	Koksma & Stapel
Snicker-snack – neologism	Kler de kling toen krissekruis – complex	Kriskras – Dutch word	Vliegensvlug – Dutch word	Kling-klewang – pun
Galumphing – portmanteau	-	Galomfaal - portmanteau	Galopsend – neologism	Galomf - portmanteau

Overview of nonsense devices in the fifth stanza.

The fifth stanza revolves around the climax of the poem. Being so important to the plot, it displays relatively little nonsense devices. Carroll's "snicker-snack", a reference to an old English word for knife,[66] appears to be difficult to articulate in Dutch. Its use as a nonsense device appears to be lost in all but Koksma & Stapel's version, where it presented as a pun that combines the onomatopoeia 'kling klang' with a type of sword, the 'klewang'.[67] The other translations offer various alternatives that are part of the Dutch lexicon. Kossmann & Reedijk's "kler de kling toen krissekruis" is somewhat puzzling. Out of all these elements, "kler" it the only to not be an existing word. It hovers somewhere between neologism and a natural extension of sound effects that are already used, but as it appears not to maintain any tension between meaning and non-meaning, will not be categorised as a nonsense device.

Carroll	Kossmann & Reedijk	Westvaarder & Kurpershoek	Matsier	Koksma & Stapel
-	Versnaggeld – neologism	-	-	-
Beamish – English word	Jokkejeugd – neologism	Brale – neologism	Glans der jeugd – Dutch words	Glimmerik – neologism
Frabjous – portmanteau	Fantabeltijd – portmanteau + dutch word (tijd)	Heugle – neologism	Kostbaarlijke – portmanteau	Jubeltij – neologism

---

[66] Gardner, *The Annotated Alice,* 181.
[67] Koksma & Stapel, *Begeleidend Essay,* 29.

Callooh – neologism	-	Hoezee – Dutch word	Kaneel – Imprecision	Kalloe – neologism
Callay – neologism	-	Hoezot – neologism	Kanaal – imprecision	Kallei - neologism
Chortled – portmanteau	Knorkelde – neologism	Gnorde – portmanteau	Gnuivelde – portmanteau	Knorkelde - neologism

Overview of nonsense devices in the sixth stanza.

The (next to) last stanza offers interesting disparities between the nonsense devices, the first of which is Kossmann & Reedijk's neologism "versnaggelen," which has no counterpart in the source text. In the second line, the faux-Carrolian word 'beamish' results in three neologisms, with only Matsier opting for existing words. The portmanteau "Frabjous" is kept as a portmanteau in Kossmann & Reedijk and Matsier's versions, whereas it becomes a neologism at the hands of Westvaarder & Kurpershoek and Koksma & Stapel. Carroll's "Calloo! Callay!", two neologisms likely based on the Greek word 'kalos',[68] prove difficult to translate as well. Kossmann & Reedijk have left them out, Westvaarder & Kurpershoek have paired an existing word with a closely related neologism, and Koksma & Stapel simply used neologisms. Most marked is Matsier's approach: he has taken the Dutch words for cinnamon and canal and used them in such a way that they appear to refer to nothing in particular other than a being an exclamation of joy. Used in this way, they function as the imprecision device.

As shown above, all translations display nonsense devices similar to those in the source text. At times, changes were made, either in the specific nonsense device used in a target text, or by omitting/adding a device. Specifically, outdated verbiage in the source text appears to have led to the invention of nonsense in the target texts. Notably, efforts were made to preserve the rhyme scheme of the source text, which preserved the overall nonsensical style of the poem. The next chapter will explain the translation mechanisms that were used by the translators, and how they have influenced change from the nonsense devices present in the source text to those present in the target texts. These strategies have already been touched upon in the chapter at hand, but by involving Chesterman's framework for translation strategies, I intend to provide a more in-depth analysis which can be used to further explain these changes.

---

[68] Gardner, *The Annotated Alice,* 182.

Chapter III – How hast thou slain the Jabberwock?

The previous chapter discussed the nonsense devices that were present in "Jabberwocky" and four of its translations. The current chapter intends to explore the relationship between nonsense devices and translation strategies by analysing the strategies that were applied to the translations at hand. A more in-depth analysis of the changes made to the nonsense devices will be presented. I will first touch upon several important factors that have possibly influenced the translation process, after which the translations will be discussed per stanza. I will not comment on every choice made in the translation of 'Jabberwocky' or Humpty Dumpty's explanation – the decisions discussed are those that are pertinent to the preservation of, or changes made to, nonsense devices.

Firstly, it is important to acknowledge that "Wauwelwok" and "Koeterwaals" are part of translations of *Through the Looking-Glass*, whereas "Krakelwok" and "Klepperjaks" are standalone pieces. The first two must then fit in with the overall tone of the book and the translations made by John Tenniel that are presented next to the poem, which is not a consideration for the latter two. All translations but "Krakelwok" were translated alongside Humpty Dumpty's explanation of the first stanza, which faces translators with the additional issue that both parts must make sense together as well as on their own. Lastly, all translators but Kossmann & Reedijk had the option to look at the work of their predecessor(s), an influence which can certainly be seen in several instances as well: Koksma & Stapel freely admit they often examined previous translations when they ran into problems.[69]

As discussed in the previous chapter, all translators have attempted to preserve the original scheme of the poem, a subcategory of the strategy Chesterman refers to as scheme change. This was possible largely due to the freedom given to translators by neologisms, which enabled them to invent neologisms that rhyme rather than having to pick their words from an existing lexicon. As all have retained this scheme in their translations, a logical conclusion is that the preservation of this scheme has played an overarching role in the choices that were made on a smaller scale, such as word choice. Specific instances where neologisms are led by the form will be discussed below. Scheme changes have been made, however, to the alliterative scheme, which has been omitted by various translators in several instances. These changes will be discussed separately as well.

---

[69] Koksma & Stapel, *begeleidend essay,* 22

Regarding the title, Kossmann & Reedijk have opted for the nearest equivalent Dutch has to offer for 'jabber', 'wauwelen', and to copy the 'wock', altered to fit Dutch spelling. The latter can be considered partial translation, specifically phonetic translation. Westvaarder & Kurpershoek have applied the same strategy to the second half of the title. For 'krakel', it is somewhat difficult to pinpoint which translation strategy was used – 'krakel', which means 'to crackle', bears no obvious link to the word 'jabber'. Even so, it can be argued that a minimal link is maintained on the basis of both being harsh sounds. The most suitable translation strategy to describe this process, it seems to me, is paraphrasing. A partial link with the source text was maintained, yet a (near) equivalent option was abandoned in favour of preserving the harsh sounds connotated with 'jabber'. Matsier has erased the nonsense device through domestication and paraphrasing. His selection of Koeterwaals, an existing Dutch word, aptly describes the contents of the poem as unintelligible. In a sense, the contents of the title, and to a certain extent of the entire poem, have been paraphrased: though 'koeterwaals' is hardly an equivalent of "Jabberwocky", it does capture the spirit of the poem as a whole – as nonsense. This is one of the two translations to incorporate the distinction between "Jabberwocky" and "Jabberwock" ("Koeterwaals" and "Koeterwaal"), which is to say, the distinction of using the title to indicate the sort of language used in the poem, and the beast. Koksma & Stapel have also paid attention to this distinction. Their "Klepperjaks" shows the synonymy strategy; 'klepperen', they argue, is a less obvious option to translate the 'jabber' in jabberwocky, but it does preserve the harsh, aggressive impression of the source language.[70] It still relates to speech, meaning as much as 'to talk rapidly', and often noisily.

The first line of the first stanza immediately represents a situation in which multiple translations have been inspired by an earlier translation: Kossmann & Reedijk's "bradig" has been used by three translators. In "Jabberwocky", the word "brillig" appears to have been deducted from 'broiling', per Humpty Dumpty's explanation. Kossmann & Reedijk adhere closely to the source text and have deducted their neologism from the closest Dutch equivalent for 'broiling', 'braden', which they also use in the explanation. The same approach was taken by Koksma & Stapel, who have stated in their introductory essay that it was one of the few 'findings' they have directly copied from their predecessors in translation.[71] Kurpershoek &

---

[70] Ibid., 23.
[71] Ibid., 22.

Westvaarder did not have to consider Humpty Dumpty's explanation to this extent but have selected this translation as well. Even in the absence of the verbiage underlying the neologism in the target text, this decision will be considered as an instance where the closest equivalent was selected for the target language, as the underlying words for this neologism were not erased and were likely still considered by Westvaarder & Kurpershoek. Considerably more liberty was taken by Matsier, as can be observed in the following excerpt of Humpty Dumpty's translation. I have supplied my own translation for clarity:

> Carroll:
>> Brillig means four o'clock in the afternoon – the time when you begin broiling things for dinner.
> Matsier:
>> Het schieuwerde, dat wil zeggen: het is nog niet helemaal donker en de tafel is nog niet gedekt.
>> *It schieuwerde, that is to say: it isn't fully dark yet and the table has not been set.*

Matsier has chosen to paraphrase Humpty Dumpty's explanation and change the emphasis from dinner being prepared to the time it would be served.

Kossmann & Reedijk's "slijver" is a direct translation of the two components of "slithy". Koksma & Stapel, in a similar fashion, have chosen the same equivalent for 'slimy'. In favour of preserving the 'ij', or 'i' sound of the source text, they paraphrased the second part of the portmanteau as 'ijver' (zeal/diligence). Westvaarder & Kurpershoek have partially translated the word, it seems, as it is very close to the source text in form. In doing so, they have omitted the semantics of the original. The "glappe" in Matsier's version has been paraphrased from the source text; 'glad', which means 'slippery', can be seen as a synonym for 'slimy'. 'Slap', which means 'limp' is redaction of the semantic level in favour of establishing a neologism, for which any Dutch equivalent of 'lithe' would not be suitable.

"[T]oves", as explained by Humpty Dumpty, are a type of animal; English translations (italicised) by me:

Carroll:

> Well, toves are something like badgers – they're something like lizards – and they're something like corkscrews.

Kossmann & Reedijk:

> Wel, spiramant**s** zijn zoiets als salamanders en zoiets als kurketrekkers.
>
> *Well, spiramants are something like salamanders and something like corkscrews.*

Matsier:

> Tja, een muik is een soort van das – hij heeft iets van een hagedis – en hij heeft iets van een kurkentrekker.
>
> *Well, a muik is a type of badger – it is something like a lizard – and it is something like a corkscrew.*

Koksma & Stapel:

> Nou, priets zijn een soort dassen – ze hebben ook wel iets weg van hagedissen, en van kurketrekkers.
>
> *Well, priets are a type of badger – they are something like lizards as well, and something like corkscrews.*

Kossmann & Reedijk have omitted the likening to badgers in favour of introducing a portmanteau, as well as applied the paraphrase strategy by selecting an animal which is similar in appearance to the lizard of the source text. Westvaarder & Kurpershoek have kept the information the same. Regarding the neologism, it appears that they have paraphrased it – they have invented an equally semantically empty equivalent. The same can be said for Koksma & Stapel. Westvaarder & Kurpershoek have partially translated the word into Dutch, but modified it slightly to suit Dutch phonetics.

The translation of "gyre" and "gimble" appear very much interwoven, with translators choosing to translate either one of the two, like Matsier, or to enmesh the two words. Regarding the first situation, Matsier has translated only "gyre" as "graffelde", which per Humpty Dumpty carries the same semantic content. None of Chesterman's translation strategies aptly describe the process that has taken place to arrive at this translation, as deviation only at the level of lexical form is not discussed, other than in relation to preservation of another level. As this does not seem to be the case here, it appears that Humpty Dumpty's explanation has led Matsier to assume

the word to be a neologism, for which he has introduced his own. The strategy that has been applied would then be paraphrasing. Westvaarder & Kurpershoek have combined the two words into the neologism "driltolden", a paraphrase which inserts the (in their version absent) semantic content provided by Humpty Dumpty directly into the poem. The 'dril', meaning 'to drill holes', part is the equivalent of 'gimble', and 'tolden', which refers to the spinning motions of a spinning top, is a synonym of "gyre", being a similar motion. A similar approach was taken by Kossmann & Reedijk, who have combined both words into a portmanteau. Their portmanteau directly relates the semantic content of 'gimble' as 'to drill', but paraphrases "gyre" as 'rond draven' (trotting around). In Koksma & Stapel's translation, we see evidence of level shift. "[G]erierden" can be seen as a phonetic translation of "gyre", but per Humpty Dumpty's explanation, it carries the semantic content of "gyre". "Wrentel" combined 'wroeten' (to grub) with 'wentelen' (to roll), and as paraphrases gyre, though dissimilar in form. Regardless of which word is the equivalent of which word in the source text, there are two nonsense words present in the target text, and only one in the source text. It is quite possible that this change was not deliberate, as Humpty Dumpty's explanation suggests that this word has been invented by Carroll as well.

"[W]abe" has been handled in various different ways. Westvaarder & Kurpershoek have taken the least complex approach by translating it phonetically. For the other translations, it is important to compare their translations of Humpty Dumpty's explanation:

Carroll:

It's called wabe, you know, because it goes a long way before it, and a long way behind it – And a long way beyond it on each side, Alice added.

Kossmann & Reedijk:

[…] en het heet zwiets omdat je, als je er in gaat graven, zo zwart wordt – als iets, vulde Alice aan.

[…] and it's called zwiets because, if you start digging into it, you turn black – like something, Alice added.

Matsier:

Die heten vijchten, moet je weten, omdat ze een heel eind voorwaarts groeien, en een heel eind achterwaarts – en een heel eind zijwaarts aan weerskanten, voegde Alice toe.

> *You should know they are called vijchten because they grow a long way <u>forwards</u>,*
> *and a long way <u>backwards</u> – and a long way <u>sideways</u> on both sides, Alice added.*

Koksma & Stapel:

> Het heet zwoord omdat een zonnewijzer aan het begin van de dag van <u>zuid</u> naar
> <u>noord</u> wijst – en aan het eind van de middag van <u>west</u> naar <u>noord</u>, vulde Alice aan.
> *It's called zwoord because at the start of the day, a sundial points from <u>south</u> to*
> *<u>north</u> – and at the end of the day, from <u>west</u> to <u>north</u>, Alice added.*

Matsier's translation is closest to the source text, bordering on literal translation and essentially only using the synonymy strategy for a more natural sentence in Dutch, as well as to be able to properly combine these words into the portmanteau "vijchten". Koksma & Stapel, who have paraphrased the source text, stay relatively close to it as well. They have preserved the original link to the sundial, as well as the element of direction which was incorporated in Carroll's neologism "wabe". Their portmanteau "zwoord", then, is a paraphrase of the neologism. Kossmann & Reedijk have taken an approach which is difficult to describe in terms of Chesterman's strategies. As evidenced above, they have completely disregarded both form and contents of the source text. Paraphrasing, in this case, is not quite a satisfactory explanation since the contents of the two text are too dissimilar. The information change strategy comes closest to describing what has happened here, though Chesterman only describes it as adding or omitting non-inferable information, rather than entirely changing the contents. In this case, one would need to assume that both sides of this strategy were applied: first, omission of the source text, and then adding of the new content.

Regarding form, the first stanza sees a curious development in terms of internal rhyme in the third line. In the source text, though internal rhyme is often present in the third lines of stanzas, this is not the case for the first stanza. In all but Matsier's translations, the third line of this stanza contains internal rhyme, with Koksma & Stapel adding alliteration as well. In the presented lines, internal rhyme is indicated by underlining the relevant parts, and alliteration is indicated by adding a bold font as well.

> Carroll: All mimsy were the borogoves
> Kossmann & Reedijk: Hoe kl**a**rm w**a**ren de ooief**a**nts

Westvaarder & Kurpershoek: Misbr<u>o</u>zig st<u>o</u>nden b<u>o</u>rog<u>o</u>rfs

Koksma & Stapel: Z<u>w</u>ellendig **wa**s de **wa**rrekiet

This choice appears to be made to conform to the general use of internal rhyme in the third lines of the poem; while it is obviously a deliberate element in the source text, there seems to be no particular reason behind which stanza has internal rhyme and which one does not – rather, it appears that where Carroll could work it into the poem, he did. Dutch translators appear to have acted along this line of thinking as well, paying attention more so to the 'spirit' of the form rather than being constrained by trying to produce an exact copy of the original scheme.

Most translators have attempted to preserve "mimsy" as a portmanteau, with the exception of Westvaarder & Kurpershoek, who have turned it into a neologism. In doing so, they have applied the information change strategy – the semantics of the words contained in mimsy is lost. Kossmann & Reedijk's portmanteau "klarm" combines the words 'klam' (clammy/damp) and 'warm' (warm). This appears to be the result of paraphrasing in favour of establishing internal rhyme in this line, as can be seen in the previous paragraph. Matsier's "sloef" stays closer to the source text and combines 'sloom' (slow) with 'droef' (sad). The latter displays synonymy with the 'miserable' part of flimsy. 'Sloom' can be seen as a paraphrase for the 'flimsly' part, a choice made based on wanting to maintain a portmanteau in the target text. Koksma & Stapel combine 'zwelgen' (to wallow) and 'ellendig' (miserable), the latter being the closest Dutch equivalent for miserable. Their other word of the portmanteau was paraphrased, which results in a change of emphasis as well: "zwellendig" essentially translates to 'wallowing in misery', which puts more emphasis on the misery than the source text did.

The translation of "borogoves" appears very much interwoven with Humpty Dumpty's explanation:

Carroll:

And a borogove is a thin shabby-looking bird with its feathers sticking out all round – something like a live mop.

Kossmann & Reedijk:

En een ooiefant is een haveloos dier dat lijkt op een ooievaar en op een olifant en tegelijk een beetje op een fazant. En het heeft ook iets bezemsteel-achtigs.

> *And an ooiefant is a ragged animal that looks like a stork and like an elephant and at the same time, a bit like a pheasant. And it is also a bit like a broomstick.*

Matsier:

> En een rontelguik is een dunne sjofele vogel met veren die alle kanten op steken – iets als een levende zwabber.
>
> *And a rontelguik is a thin, shabby bird with feathers sticking out in all directions – something like a live mop.*

Koksma & Stapel:

> En een warrekiet is een dunne haveloze vogel met warrige veren die alle kanten op steken – zoiets als een levende ragebol.
>
> *And a warrekiet is a thin, ragged bird with tousled feathers that stick out to all sides – something like a live mop. (note: a ragebol has no English equivalent. It is a type of broom with a head that resembles that of a toilet brush).*

Kossmann & Reedijk, rather than basing their translation of "borogoves" on the explanation, have tailored the explanation to suit their translation of the neologism. Thus, the translation strategies applied in the poem can be derived from the poem itself. "[O]oiefants" suits both the rhyme and metre of the stanza and appears to have been invented to preserve the rhyme scheme. As the word needs to rhyme with the preceding "spiramants", an obvious candidate was the Dutch word for elephant, 'olifant'. In order to preserve the nonsensical nature of the neologism, they have combined this word with two other words, those for pheasant and stork, which has resulted in a portmanteau in place of the neologism in the source text. In Matsier's translation, it is difficult to establish which translation strategies were used other than preservation of the rhyme scheme, which shows in the last syllable of "rontelguik" rhyming with "muik" in the first line of the stanza. The first part of the word has no bearing on either the source text or Humpty Dumpty's explanation. Koksma & Stapel's translation shows characteristics of the domestication and emphasis change strategies. Their translation has resulted in a portmanteau, which has made the text more accessible to the target audience by virtue of combining two known words. The words they have chosen, 'warrig' (dissheveled) and 'parkiet' (parakeet), reaffirm the information that is provided in the explanation, and as such emphasises it. Westvaarder & Kurpershoek applied the partial translation strategy with a phonetic translation of "borogoves".

In the last line of this stanza we encounter three instances of nonsense: "mome", "raths", and "outgrabe". Kossmann & Reedijk are the only ones to have altered this line significantly by omitting the adjective "mome". Westvaarder & Kurpershoek have paraphrased the meaning of "mome", which Humpty Dumpty explains to be a contraction of 'from' and 'home'. Their "verdwoolde" is a contraction of 'verdwaald' (lost) and 'dolen' 'to wander (especially aimlessly so)'. It is clear that this portmanteau is based on the explanation of the source text. Koksma & Stapel have taken a very literal approach and selected the nearest equivalents for 'from' (van) and 'home' (huis), which they have combined into "vnuize". Matsier's "strave" combines 'extra' (extra) and 'vette' (fat), giving this portmanteau a completely different meaning than the one in the source text. The description given by Humpty Dumpty has been altered accordingly. It is difficult to establish which translation strategy was used here other than an attempt to preserve the adjective as a portmanteau. In order to do so, however, it was not necessary to change the meaning of the word so drastically, as has been proven by Westvaarder & Kurpershoek and Koksma & Stapel. Possibly, this could be due the noun it modifies, "raths" (or in Matsier's case, "woelen"): in both the source text and in Matsier's version, this is a type of pig. Since pigs are often associated with being fat, it is likely that Matsier intended to play into this association.

Matsier's strategies are even more difficult to determine for "woelen", which is a neologism of which the form has no roots in the Dutch language or in Humpty Dumpty's explanation. It does not appear to contribute to the preservation of the scheme either, other than fitting the metre. The same can be said of Kossmann & Reedijk's translation, "beriets". Contrary to these translations, the translation strategies of Westvaarder & Kurpershoek's "grasvark" are more transparent. The two words that are included in this neologism are 'gras' (grass) and 'varken' (pig). This means it as a paraphrase of Humpty Dumpty's description of the "rath" as a type of green pig. It therefore places emphasis on this meaning as well, and in making the text more accessible to the target audience, it also displays characteristics of domestication. Somewhere in between Matsier and Westvaarder & Kurpershoek's approach are Koksma & Stapel. "[F]rats" is a neologism which in sound bears a resemblance to the word 'wratten' (warts), which can frequently be found on warthogs, which are family of pigs. It is likely that Koksma & Stapel have based their decision for the exact form of the neologism on this information. Regarding strategies, the paraphrase strategy would fit this approach best.

The last nonsense word of the stanza is "outgrabe", which describes a type of outcry per Humpty Dumpty's explanation:

Carroll:
> Well, outgribing is something like bellowing and whistling, with a kind of sneeze in the middle[.]

Kossmann & Reedijk:
> Bluifen houdt het midden tussen blaffen en fluiten met halverwege een soort genies.
>
> *Bellowing is something between barking and whistling, with a kind of sneeze halfway through.*

Matsier:
> Tja, krijgten is iets tussen blaffen en fluiten, met een soort van nies middenin[.]
>
> *Well, krijgten is something between barking and whistling, with a kind of sneeze in the middle.*

Koksma & Stapel:
> Nou, broord krijten is zoiets als moord en brand schreeuwen, maar dan tegelijkertijd.
>
> *Well, broord krijten is something like screaming bloody murder (litt. 'murder and fire), but at the same time*

Kossmann & Reedijk have based "bluifen" on Humpty Dumpty's explanation, which they translate with use of hyponymy in case of bellowing, and directly for whistling. The resulting words, 'blaffen' and 'fluiten', have been combined in a portmanteau. Aspects of domestication, as seen before, are applied because this makes the text more accessible to Dutch readers. It also emphasises the meaning of the word more than the source text does. The same approach can be seen in Matsier's translation, which is almost identical to that of Kossmann & Reedijk. In this case, it is likely that Matsier was inspired by his predecessors. Koksma & Stapel have produced a completely different translation with little relation to the source text, other than defining "broord krijten" as a type of outcry. The "broord" part of this translation rhymes with "zwoord" in the second line and was likely invented with preservation of the rhyme scheme in mind. It seems that

this has led to paraphrasing Humpty Dumpty's explanation to such an extent, so it could fit with this portmanteau. The neologism "kreet" appears to have been selected in a similar fashion, to fit with "broord". It is based on the Dutch word "kreet" (shout/cry). Since their translation for "outgribing" resulted in two words instead of one, the distribution change strategy has been applied as well. Lastly, Westvaarder & Kurpershoek's "schreep" appears to have paraphrased the source text; it is based on the Dutch word 'schreeuwen' (to shout) and as such bears semantic resemblance to "outgribing". It also displays intention to preserve the rhyme scheme, as it rhymes with 'weep' in the second line.

The second stanza describes various creatures of wonderland, starting with the title character, Jabberwock. The translation strategies used here are parallel to those used for the titles, with the exception of Matsier's "Koeterwaal". While 'Koeterwaals' is a Dutch word, the 'Koeterwaal' is not, being an imaginary beast. Domestication still takes place, but the paraphrase strategy is no longer in use.

The "Jubjub bird" is loaned once by Westvaarder & Kurpershoek, who subject the 'bird' part to hyponomy. Their "vlerkenbrok" consists of two parts: 'vlerken', a dated word for 'feathers', and 'brok', (lump). The latter part appears to have been chosen with regards to the preservation of the rhyme scheme – an instance where content is led by form. All other translations follow the partial translation strategy for the 'jubjub' part. Kossman & Reedijk omit 'bird' from their translation, and Matsier has opted for the hyponym 'dier', 'animal'. Koksma & Stapel likely omitted this part as well, with their "Tjeptjepsnep" seeming to be one word.

Matsier's translation of "shun" as "verschoon" at the end of the third line is a puzzling choice, semantically speaking. There appears to be little motivation behind this paraphrase other than to preserve the rhyme scheme, as it rhymes with "zoon" in the first line of the stanza, and alliterates with "vermijd" at the beginning of the third line. A somewhat weak argument can be made for synonymy, with a dated meaning of "verschonen" being 'to set free/to spare'. Given the context, this meaning is preferable over the more common meaning, which is to change a diaper or clothes.

"Frumious" has been subjected to omission by all but Matsier, though in different ways. Kossmann & Reedijk have omitted the phrase entirely, whereas Westvaarder & Kurpershoek and Koksma & Stapel have translated it as a neologism. The neologisms, however, are semantically empty, and as such the semantic content of frumious is still omitted. Matsier has paraphrased the

portmanteau, with his own portmanteau favouring form over semantic content, though the semantic content still captures the frightening nature of the "Bandersnatch".

All translations of the latter feature partial translation, in so far that all versions retain at least a part of the soundpatterns of the original. The "Bandersnatch" is comprised of two-word units: semantically empty 'bander' and the word 'snatch'. The last part is directly translated as 'snaai' by Matsier and Koksma & Stapel. Matsier's version likely intends for 'beffe' to be semantically void as well, as the only meaning associated with 'beffe' is too vulgar for a children's book. As such, I will consider this part the result of paraphrasing, with the intention of keeping the 'b' sound at the beginning of the word, similar to the source text. Koksma & Stapel have changed the information of the 'bander' unit in their translation: 'beender' are bones, making the "beendersnaai" a thief of bones. They have added semantic meaning to the first unit in their translation. Kossmann & Reedijks "Barbeleet" is the result of partial translation, as seen in the preservation of the 'ba' at the beginning of the word, and scheme preservation. The latter is shown in its rhyme with 'wreed' in the second line. The same strategies have been applied to Westvaarder & Kurpershoek's "Bandjegauw", which rhymes with 'klauw'.

In the third stanza, Kossmann & Reedijk and Koksma & Stapel domesticated the vorpal sword by translating "vorpal" as a portmanteau, making it more accessible to Dutch readers. In both cases, the information change strategy was applied as well: "vorpal", per Carroll's own saying, has no roots in any specific existing word.[72] As such, the portmanteaux, which consist of existing words, inherently carry information not present in the source text. Westvaarder & Kurpershoek and Matsier have loaned the word in their translations.

Westvaarder & Kurpershoek applied the same strategy to "manxome", which they borrowed as "manxaam", as did Koksma & Stapel, who borrowed it as "mankse". Matsier has chosen to omit this information. Kossmann & Reedijk have domesticated "manxome foe" as "aarts-schavoest", a combination of the Dutch 'aartsvijand' (archenemy/nemesis) and a neologism of his own invention, 'schavoest'.

Scheme change appears to be the leading strategy for translating the "Tumtum tree", specifically preservation of the scheme. Westvaarder & Kurpershoek's "Ploemploemplant" preserves the alliteration of the source text, and Koksma & Stapel's "Pompomboom", though not alliterative, presents a similar scheme by adhering to internal rhyme with the consistent 'm'

---

[72] Gardner, *The Annotated Alice*, 182.

sounds. Additionally, the 'plant' part in Westvaarder & Kurpershoek's version is a hyponym of 'tree'. Kossmann & Reedijk have loaned 'tumtum', and also selected a hyponym of tree 'boomknoest', which is a burr. By loaning 'tumtum', they have significantly altered the meaning of the text: the original tumtum refers to the sound of a stringed instrument, whereas in Dutch, 'tumtummetjes' are a type of sweets. This original meaning is preserved by Matsier, whose 'plingplong' is the Dutch onomatopoeia for stringing a guitar or similar instrument. In doing so, he has preserved this trope, which has been omitted in every other version.

The uffish thoughts encountered in the fourth stanza have been translated in various ways. Kossmann & Reedijk have domesticated the neologism by translating it as "diep" (deep) and making it more accessible to Dutch readers. It was domesticated differently by Westvaarder & Kurpershoek, who preserved the element of nonsense through a portmanteau of 'nijdig' (angry) and 'ijverig'(diligent). Matsier's "ruffig" appears to be a partial translation of "uffish": '-ig' is the Dutch equivalent of '-ish', and the 'r' which has been added to the beginning of the word, makes the word more phonemically corresponding to Dutch as well. Koksma & Stapel have changed the information of the text by omitting "uffish" entirely.

As shown in the previous chapter, finding an equivalent translation for "whiffling" was a difficult task, perhaps due to the datedness of the word. Matsier appears to be the only one to have recognised the word: his "ruisend" incorporates the synonymy strategy. The gist of "whiffling" is also present in the portmanteau of Westvaarder & Kurpershoek, who combined two Dutch equivalents of the word, being 'blazen' and 'waaide'. It can be argued that the emphasis change strategy is used here, though perhaps inadvertently so – the appearance of a neologism will undoubtedly grab the attention of the reader, and with both words being an equivalent to the source text, no other strategy appears to have been applied. Kossmann & Reedijk change both information and distribution with their "zwalpse zwenk" – "whiffling" has been split into an adjective and a noun, but the meaning of the target text is not quite similar to that of the source text. "[Z]walpse" does not appear to be rooted in the Dutch lexicon, and as such part of the information contained in "whiffling", which is to say, the *way* of moving, is omitted, as the reader cannot decipher the meaning of "zwalpse". Koksma & Stapel's neologism combines the Dutch words for 'shiny' and 'flashing', decidedly removing it from the source text. None of the strategies applied by Chesterman offer a fully satisfactory explanation for the choices made in translation, it seems. The closest candidates are information change and paraphrasing. Out of

these two, information change is the least satisfying, as according to Chesterman's explanations, this strategy is applied when adding or omitting information, rather than substituting it. Paraphrasing, however, is arguably a better candidate: while the semantics of 'whiffling' and 'glitsend' are completely different, the 'i' sound has been preserved. Adittionally, it is in line with the duo's partiality for harsher sounds, as evident in "Klepperjaks and "Tjeptjepsnep".

The strategies applied to 'Tulgey wood' are more comprehensible. Kossmann & Reedijk have omitted the neologism entirely, as have Koksma & Stapel. Westvaarder & Kurpershoek have paraphrased "Tulgey" as "rapuin", both being neologisms with no ties to the existing lexicon. Matsier's "groene vlaar" can be argued to be the result of distribution change; this usually refers to the spreading of information over a different number of units. With "groene vlaar", the neologism has been moved to the "vlaar", which is the equivalent of 'wood' – it has been distributed differently.

"[B]urbled" has caused little division between the translators, with all except for Matsier loaning the word. At the same time, information change takes place, as the loans also function as portmanteaux, comprised of two words for bubbling: 'borrelend' and 'bubbelend'.

The fifth stanza introduces the onomatopoeia "snicker-snack", which poses problems that are met with inventive solutions. Kossmann & Reedijk have used several translation strategies for it, starting with distribution change, in combination with abstraction change. A comparison between the source text and the target text:

Carroll:

The vorpal blade went snicker-snack

Kossmann & Reedijk:

Ging kler de kling toen krissekruis

Proper analysis of Kossmann & Reedijks translation strategies requires careful dissection of this line. "[K]ler" is an onomatopoeia referring to the sound of a blade, in this case the vorpal sword, hitting something. This is achieved through the trope change strategy – specifically, the preservation of the onomatopoeia present in the source text. The translation of "snicker-snack" does not end here, it seems. "[K]rissekruis", derived from 'kriskras', meaning 'criss-cross', likely is part of the translation of this word as well, as it still refers to the motion of the vorpal blade.

This is evidence for the distribution change strategy. "[D]e kling" can be translated as 'the blade'. This choice displays two translation strategies; firstly, synonymy, by selecting a non-obvious equivalent for 'blade'. Secondly, abstraction change, by omitting the implied adjective 'vorpal'.

Westvaarder & Kurpershoek, too, have made use of several strategies for this particular neologism. Similarly to Kossmann & Reedijk, they change the distribution of "snicker-snack", splitting it between the adjective "kriskras" to capture the motion, and the adjective-noun combination "luid gedruis" (loud noise) for the sound. Conversely, it could be argued that "kriskras" is meant to be the equivalent of "through and through" in the first line of this stanza in the source text:

> Carroll:
>> One two! One two! *And through and through*
>> *The vorpal blade* went snicker-snack
> Westvaarder & Kurpershoek:
>> Hup één! Hup twee! *Het scherp vorpaal*
>> *Hieuw kriskras* en met luid gedruis

The italicised elements have switched places between these translations, and as such, it is not entirely unlikely that the underlying strategy for this part is sentence structure change. Regardless, the onomatopoeic effect of "snicker-snack" is no longer present, meaning trope change has taken place. Matsier's "vliegensvlug" exhibits a similar trope change, as it omits the onomatopoeic effect as well. By choosing to translate a neologism with an established Dutch word, Matsier has also domesticated this part of the text – especially considering that the snicker-snee would not be a known weapon to a Dutch audience. Koksma & Stapel found another way to wield this weapon – rather than striving to domesticate the snicker-snee specifically, they searched for a sword that could be incorporated with the Dutch onomatopoeia 'kling-klang'.[73] In doing so, they preserved the trope, but managed to domesticate and foreignize it at the same time: the domestication, here, is portrayed by the selection of a typically Dutch onomatopoeia whereas the one in the source text is a neologism. The sword it was combined with, the 'klewang', however, is an Indian sword, and unlikely to be recognised by the target audience.

---

[73] Koksma & Stapel, *begeleidend essay*, 29.

"[G]alumphing" proved an easier puzzle to solve for most translators. All except Kossmann & Reedijk, who have chosen to omit this information, stayed close to the source text for their translation. It can be argued that Westvaarder & Kurpershoek and Koksma & Stapel have loaned the portmanteau, albeit with transposition of its word class – from verb to adjective and from verb to noun, respectively. Their portmanteaux both closely resemble the one in the source text, and the closest equivalent for both of the words it consists of. Matsier's neologism retains the 'galop', but he applied the information change strategy by omitting the 'triumphant' that was present in the neologism as well.

The first line of the sixth stanza involves a peculiar translation choice made by Kossmann & Reedijk, who opted to translate 'slain' with "versnaggeld", a neologism with no obvious ties to any Dutch word that would make sense within the context. Determining which translation strategy was used in this case has proven to be exceedingly difficult, as this choice bears little resemblance to any of the translation strategies described by Chesterman – other than assuming that Kossman & Reedijk took 'slain' to be a neologism, which seems unlikely, the strategy that has the most bearing is that of paraphrasing. The free nature of paraphrasing would allow for such changes to be made, and it would not be unreasonable to assume that in this case, Kossmann & Reedijk opted to introduce a neologism to add do the nonsensical style of the poem.

"[B]eamish" is yet another instance that has led to the invention of neologisms based on at the time regular English. Kossmann & Reedijk and Westvaarder & Kurpershoek have applied the information change strategy: their neologisms appear to have no ties to their equivalent in the source text, which means that this information has been omitted, as neologisms hold no fixed meaning. Koksma & Stapel's neologism, however, has clear links with 'glimmen' (to shine), and does not change the information. Since "glimmerik" represents "beamish boy", however, the distribution change strategy was applied. Matsier is an outlier in this regard; his "glans der jeugd" accurately portrays lack of nonsense the 'beamish boy' holds. "[G]lans der", which is the equivalent of "beamish", is a result of synonymy – it was likely selected because the most obvious equivalent, 'stralende', would not fit the metre.

With the Jabberwock slain, the "frabjous day" has finally arrived. Kossmann & Reedijk and Matsier have managed to preserve this portmanteau in their translations by paraphrasing its contents – fabulous, fair, and joyous have become 'fantastisch' (fantastic) and 'fabel' (fable) for the first, and 'kostbaar' (valuable/precious) and 'wonderbaarlijk'(wonderful) for the latter.

Westvaarder & Kurpershoek's "heugle" appears to utilise the synonymy and information change strategies, as it is based on 'heugelijk', which can be translated as 'memorable', a word which bears resemblance to the spirit of "frabjous". The same can be said for Koksma & Stapel's "jubeltij", as it is based on 'jubelen', which can be loosely translated as 'to make joyous exclamations'.

These joyous exclamations, "Callooh! Callay!" are subjected to various different translation strategies by the translators. Kossmann & Reedijk have omitted them entirely. Westvaarder & Kurpershoek have domesticated them, translating the first as a well-known Dutch exclamation of joy, and the latter as a neologism based upon the first. Matsier has selected two unrelated Dutch words, "Kaneel! Kanaal!", which appears puzzling at first. Upon closer inspection, it appears that he has applied the paraphrase strategy: semantical meaning, in as far as this is present in the neologisms, is abandoned in favour of preserving the scheme of the source text. "Kaneel" and "[k]anaal" form an alliterative unit, akin to "[c]allooh" and "[c]allay".

Lastly, the portmanteau "chortled", which consists of 'chuckle' and 'snort'. Kossmann & Reedijk invented the neologism "knorkelde" as its equivalent, which was later adopted by Koksma & Stapel as well. It is based on 'knorren', which in this context is an equivalent for 'snort'. The 'chuckle' part of the portmanteau has been omitted in these translations. Westvaarder & Kurpershoek's translation has directly translated the 'snort' in the same manner, and combined it with 'gniffelen', the obvious equivalent for chuckle. Matsier has selected the same equivalent for 'chuckle', and combined it with 'snuiven', which means 'to sniff'. The underlying strategy for this is synonymy. Koksma & Stapel have partially translated it: their "Kalloe! Kallei!" translates the sounds.

To summarise, translation involving nonsense devices appears to be difficult to describe in standardised translation strategies. This mainly shows when it comes to the translation of neologisms (or invention thereof) that have no visible roots in the language they are introduced to. In such cases, only tentative assumptions can be made as to the reasons the translator had for this particular translation. In several instances, it was shown that a likely influence on the exact forms of neologisms was the rhyme scheme, which, true to many nonsense texts, seems to have determined content to a considerable extent. In one case, this has led to the introduction of a nonsense device which was not present in the source text: the imprecision device of Matsier's "Kaneel Kanaal!". Another notable occurrence was the move from less meaningless to more

meaningless nonsense words. Neologisms were frequently translated as portmanteaux, and several neologisms in the target texts had a more visible root in the Dutch language than their counterparts in the source text did in the English language. This process is similar to the domestication Chesterman mentions, in that the target text becomes more conforming to the norms of the target language. Domestication was often established by applying the paraphrasing and/or synonymy strategies. Partial translation, specifically phonetic translation, often resulted in the opposite effect of foreignization. These changes in nonsense devices between source text and target text have shown that translation can function as a nonsense device as well. Further research into translation strategies geared specifically towards the translation of literary nonsense could help provide a more detailed analysis of the interaction between nonsense devices and translation strategies.

Conclusion

In this thesis I have compared the nonsense devices present in "Jabberwocky" to four Dutch translations of the poem. First, I have established that the devices present in the source text are primarily the neologism and the portmanteau, both subcategories of simultaneity, and that simultaneity also functions on the level of the rhyme scheme. I have shown that the presence of nonsense devices was largely transposed to the target texts, though at times the exact nature of the device had changed. The imprecision device, which has no presence in the source text, is added to the text by one of the translators, Matsier.

The rhyme scheme was approached most closely in all translations, and therefore functioned under the simultaneity device in every version. The preservation of this scheme appears to have led to translation being used as a nonsense device as well: it can in several cases be argued that the contents of the poem, and especially the precise forms of neologisms, were led by this scheme. Notably, this preservation of the rhyme scheme, as well as the preservation of the scheme as a whole, has served as a catalyst for Matsier's use of the imprecision device. As shown previously, form leading content is an important mechanism of nonsense literature, in the sense that it imposes arbitrary rules. An interesting relation was discovered between neologisms and portmanteaux, which were frequently switched between source text and target text. Notably, neologisms were often made more accessible in the target text by turning them into portmanteaux, even when the accompanying explanation already clarified this for the reader.

When examining how translation strategies were applied by translators, it quickly became apparent that the conventional translation strategies as described by Chesterman were not necessarily applicable to a nonsense text; certainly, elements of these strategies can still be recognised in these nonsense translations, yet it was often found that they needed to be modified in order to properly describe the translation process of nonsensical verbiage within the source text. Without looking beyond the exact descriptions of these strategies, a satisfactory explanation of the interaction between nonsense devices and translation strategies can not be achieved. This is not entirely unsurprising: Chesterman's work on translation strategies is built around the premise that translators change something when they encounter a problem – that is to say, when direct translation does not result in a satisfying equivalent in the target language. When it comes to neologisms, which feature heavily in 'Jabberwocky', not only does a satisfying equivalent not exist – no equivalent exists at all. In fact, the word does not truly exist in the source text either.

This produces a complex paradox where a translator is at the same time faced with an intricate problem in need of change, and the absence of a problem. This leads back to the debate around the translatability which was touched upon in the introduction, and, though a stimulating discussion point, is not the focus of this thesis. Generally, though, this thesis has found evidence that translation can indeed be used as a nonsense device, as evidenced by the changes made to the nonsense devices, and the invention of nonsense to solve certain translation problems. In order to be able to properly describe translation strategies surrounding nonsense devices, however, this specific topic should be explored further.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Almansi, D. "Nonsensing Translation: How to Turn the Spotlight on the Blind Spots of Interpretation," *Bookbird 54,* no. 3 (2015): 56-65. doi:10.1353/bkb.2015.0069.

Carroll, Lewis. *Jabberwocky: het nonsensgedicht Jabberwocky van Lewis Carroll in één nieuwe Nederlandse, zes bestaande Nederlandse, twee Afrikaanse vertalingen met begeleidend essay.* Lewis Carroll Genootschap, 2018.

Carroll, Lewis, and Martin Gardner. *The Annotated Alice: 150th Anniversary Deluxe Edition.* Ww Norton & Co, 2015.

Chimori, M. "Sense in Nonsense: The Alice Books and Their Japanese Translators and Illustrators." PhD diss. University of East Anglia, 2002.

Lecerle, J. *Philosophy of Nonsense: The Intuitions of Victorian Nonsense Literature.* Taylor & Francis Ltd, 1994.

Lecercle, J. "Translate it, translate it not," *Translation Studies 1*, no. 1 (2008): 90-102. doi: 10.1080/14781700701706559

Malcolm, Noel. *The Origins of English Nonsense*. HarperCollins Publishers, 1997.

Schalkwyk, C. van. "Translating Jabberwocky into Brabbelwoggel," *South African Journal for Communication Theory and Research* 9, no. 1 (1983): 31-34. doi:10.1080/02500168308537558.

Sundmark, B. "Some Uffish Thoughts on the Swedish Translation of 'Jabberwocky,'" *European Journal of Humour Research* 5, no. 3 (2017): 43-56. doi:10.7592.

Tigges, Wim. *An Anatomy of Literary Nonsense.* Brill, 1988.

APPENDIX

I

Jabberwocky – Lewis Carroll (1871)

'Twas brillig, and the slithy toves

Did gyre and gimble in the wabe:

All mimsy were the borogoves,

And the mome raths outgrabe.

'Beware the Jabberwock, my son!

The jaws that bite, the claws that catch!

Beware the Jubjub bird, and shun

The Frumious Bandersnatch!'

He took his vorpal sword in hand:

Long time the manxome foe he sought –

So rested he by the Tumtum tree,

And stood awhile in thought.

And, as in uffish thought he stood,

The Jabberwock, with eyes of flame,

Came whiffling through the tulgey wood,

And burbled as it came!

One, two! One, two! And through and through

The vorpal blade went snicker-snack!

He left it dead, and with its head

He went galumphing back.

'And hast thou slain the Jabberwock?

Come to my arms, my beamish boy!

O frabjous day! Callooh! Callay!

He chortled in his joy.

'Twas brillig, and the slithy toves

Did gyre and gimble in the wabe:

All mimsy were the borogoves,

And the mome raths outgrabe.

II

Klepperjaks – Jur Koksma & Joep Stapel (2017)

'Twas bradig en de slijverpriets

Gerierden wrentel in het zwoord:

Zwellendig was de warrekiet,

En de vnuize frats kreet broord.

'Pas op voor de Klepperjak, mijn zoon!

De bek die bijt, de klauw die graait!

Pas op voor de Tjeptjepsnep en mijd

De grammige Beendersnaai!'

Hij nam zijn stadel zwaard ter hand.

Lang zocht hij naar het mankse drocht –

Het zoeken loom, bij de Pompomboom,

Bepeinsde hij zijn tocht.

Terwijl hij daar zo peinzend stond

Kwam glitsend uit de woudnatuur

Luid borbelend de Klepperjak,

Zijn ogen spogen vuur!

En hier! En daar! En rits rats
Ging kling-klewang het zwaard te keer!
Hij sloeg het dood en nam de kop
En in galomf keerde hij weer.

'Hebt gij de Klepperjak geveld?
Kom aan mijn hart, mijn glimmerik!
O jubeltij! Kalloe! Kallei!'
Hij knorkelde van schik.

'Twas bradig en de slijverpriets
Gerierden wrentel in het zwoord:
Zwellendig was de warrekiet,
En de vnuize frats kreet broord.

III

Wauwelwok – Alfred Kossmann & Cornelis Reedijk (1947)

't Wier bradig, en de spiramants
Bedroorden slendig in het zwiets:
Hoe klarm waren de ooiefants,
Bij 't bluifen der beriets.

'Pas op de Wauwelwok, mijn kind!
Zo scherp getand, van klauw zo wreed!
Zorg dat Tsjoep-Tsjoep je nimmer vindt,
Vermijd de Barbeleet.'

Hij nam zijn gnijpend zwaard ter hand:
Lang zocht hij naar den aarts-schavoest

Maar nam toen rust in lommers lust
Op een tumtumboomknoest.

En toen zat hij in diep gedenk,
Kwam Wauwelwok met vlammend oog,
Dwars door het bos met zwalpse zwenk,
Sluw borbelend wijl hij vloog.

Eén, twee! Hup twee! En door en door
Ging kler de kling toen krissekruis.
Hij sloeg hem doo den blodd'rig rood
Bracht hij het tronie thuis.

'Hebt gij versnaggeld Wauwelwok?
Kom aan mijn hart, o jokkejeugd!
O, heerlijkheid, fantabeltijd!'
Hij knorkelde van vreugd.

't Wier bradig, en de spiramants
Bedroorden slendig in het zwiets:
Hoe klarm waren de ooiefants,
Bij 't bluifen der beriets.

IV

Krakelwok – Ab Westervaarder & René Kurpershoek (1982)

't Was bradig en de slijp'le torfs
Driltolden op de wijde weep:
Misbrozig stonden borogorfs,
't Verdwoolde grasvark schreep.

'Mijn zoon, vrees steeds de Krakelwok!
Zijn kakement, zijn grepe klauw!
Vrees ook de Jubjub-vlerkenbrok,
De gritse Bandjegauw!'

Hij nam 't vorpalen zwaard ter hand:
Lang zocht hij naar het manxaam vod--
Toen, rustend bij de Ploemploemplant,
Bepeinsde hij zijn lot.

Zo, nijvig peinzend, stond hij daar,
Toen Krakelwok, zijn oog vol vlam,
Door het rapuinhout blaaide, zwaar
Burbelend waar hij kwam!

Hup één! Hup twee! Het scherp vorpaal
Hieuw kriskras en met luid gedruis!
Het beest lag dood; hij, galomfaal,
Reed met de kop naar huis.

'Hebt gij de Krakelwok geveld?
O heugle dag! Hoezee! Hoezot!
Omhels mij, zoonlief, brale held!'
Hij gnorde van genot.

't Was bradig en de slijp'le torfs
Driltolden op de wijde weep:
Misbrozig stonden borogorfs,
't Verdoolde grasvark schreep.

V

Koeterwaals – Nicolaas Matsier (2009)

Het schiewerde, de glappe muik
Graffelde in de vijchten:
Maar heel sloef was de rontelguik,
En strave woelen krijgten.

'Hoed voor de Koeterwaal je, zoon!
Zijn scherp gebit, zijn reuzenzwaai!
Vermijd het Dubdubdier, verschoon
De glurieuze Beffesnaai!'

Hij nam zijn worpel zwaard al tot verweer
Maar moest lang op de vijand wachten,
Zat bij de Plingplongboom teneer,
Stond toen een poosje in gedachten.

In ruffig denken trof hem daar
De Koeterwaal, met vlammend oog,
Die ruisend door het groene vlaar
Hem brankelend bevloog.

Daar ging zijn zwaard: van hup en hop,
Het vlijmde vliegensvlug.
Dood bleef het monster – met de kop
Ging hij galopsend terug.

'Is hij ontzield, de Koeterwaal?
Werp aan mijn borst u, glans der jeugd!
O kostbaarlijke dag! Kaneel! Kanaal!'
Hij gnuivelde van vreugd.

Het schiewerde, de glappe muik
Graffelde in de vijchten

Maar heel sloef was de rontelguik,

En strave woelen krijgten.