

## INSTANCES OF SIMPLIFIED STYLE IN TEN ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF DANE ZAJC

*Nada Grošelj*

### Abstract

The article compares five poems by the Slovenian poet Dane Zajc and two translations of these poems into English. Focusing on the structures which are stylistically marked in Slovenian but neutralised in translation, the article categorises the translation solutions into groups according to how closely they correspond to the original and each other in syntactic form and in organisation of information (the functional sentence perspective), examining the instances from each group in detail and determining their relative frequency. It concludes by isolating the three types of marked Slovenian structures which tend to be neutralised in translation: marked word order, structural ambiguity, and non-basic constructions, including rhetorical devices.

This article examines contrastively the syntactic structures employed in five poems by the Slovenian poet Dane Zajc, and their equivalents as found in two translations of these poems into English. Each of the five poems – “Krokar”, “Mleko”, “Škorpijoni”, “Ujeti volk”, and “Zvonci novega dne” – has been translated once by Erica Johnson Debeljak, a native speaker of (American) English (referred to in the text as D), and by Sonja Kravanja, a native speaker of Slovenian (referred to as K).

With the exception of “Krokar”, published in the later collection *Dol dol*, the texts are taken from the edition *Dane Zajc v petih knjigah*: “Mleko” appears on p. 261, “Škorpijoni” on 264, “Ujeti volk” on 79, and “Zvonci novega dne” on pp. 76–77. The translations by Johnson Debeljak are taken from the anthologies *The Imagination of Terra Incognita* (“Bells of a New Day”, 200–201; “The Captive Wolf”, 195; “The Crow”, 197–198, and “Scorpions”, 202–203) and *The Fire under the Moon* (“Milk”, 111). Kravanja’s texts, on the other hand, follow the edition *Scorpions*, where they appear under the titles “Bells of a New Day” (37–38), “Captive Wolf” (39), “Milk” (29), “Raven” (32–33), and “Scorpions” (36).

The aims of the article are:

(1) to determine to what extent the English translations correspond to the original in terms of (un)markedness of the structures employed, i.e. of style. It focuses on the examples of those structures which are marked in Slovenian but neutralised in translation;

(2) to establish which types of Slovenian structures appear to be problematic in this respect, and to point out the translations which, although departing from the origi-

nal in their form, nevertheless preserve both the original organisation of content and level of style; these are important because they may serve as guidelines for future translations;

(3) to categorise all the translation solutions which are unmarked in English into a number of translation types, according to how closely they correspond to the original in their form and organisation of content; establish the relative frequency with which the different translation types are employed; and discover if there is any link between the frequency of a type and its stylistic difference from the original.

Each translated structure is assessed in respect to the following three parameters: (1) form, (2) the degree to which a sentence or clause element contributes new or important information to the content – or, if a stretch longer than one element is analysed, which of its parts are more and which less informative; and (3) markedness. “Form” subsumes (1) sentence / clause structure, (2) the type of structure (e.g. finite vs. non-finite clauses), and (3) “word order”, or, more precisely, the ordering of sentence / clause elements, sometimes also of participants. Since it is only the syntactic aspect that is examined, word choice is not addressed. The only exceptions occur when, for example, a pronoun is replaced by a much more meaningful noun phrase, as the latter carries more informative weight and potentially a different markedness.

In my approach to the organisation of content, or the distribution of information value among sentence / clause elements, I follow Firbas, adopting also the term “functional sentence perspective” (FSP) for this principle. According to Firbas, the higher or lower information value of an element depends on the words realising it<sup>1</sup> and on its role in the sentence / clause<sup>2</sup> (i.e. on its semantics); on the context, since an item which has already been referred to usually has a low degree of information value irrespective of other factors; and on its position, since the elements are often arranged from the less informative, or thematic, to the most informative, or rhematic, ones. FSP is in fact the main guideline for the ordering of clause elements in Slovenian, there being but a few strictly grammatical restrictions (among them belongs the requirement that clitics be placed after the first clause element). English, by contrast, demands a relatively fixed sequence of elements, irrespective of FSP. However, it has other means of expressing FSP: in addition to the – rather restricted – variations in word order, there are also articles, word choice, and special information-packaging structures, such as extensive use of passivisation or existential sentences.

Since the actual degrees of information value are thus not necessarily reflected in the linear order of elements, I adopt Firbas’ designation of “theme” / “rheme” for the less / more informative items regardless of position, in contrast to the approaches which automatically attach the label of “theme” to the initial element. However, since initial position is considered appropriate for the theme and final for the rheme, I do refer to these positions as “typically thematic” or “rhematic”.

---

<sup>1</sup> Certain pronouns and the definite article, for example, typically signal that a given item of information is already familiar and thus of little informative importance.

<sup>2</sup> For example, a context-independent adverbial adjunct, subject complement, object complement, or object usually has a higher degree of information value than the predicator, which typically serves as the transition between the theme and rheme.

The analysis is based on the following principles. In cases where one or both translations diverge from the original or each other in form, FSP, or markedness, the original structure and both its translations are analysed and compared along all three parameters. The label of “markedness” is attached to: (1) structures which fulfill an unusual role (e.g. an infinitival clause as an independent sentence); (2) non-finite structures employed where a finite form could be used equally well; (3) some, but not all, information-packaging constructions; (4) all examples of structural ambiguity, as opposed to the unequivocal – and thus simpler – variants. As for (5) word order, the criteria for English and Slovenian differ: in Slovenian, the marked order of elements is one which does not reflect the FSP (unless, of course, it is dictated by the fixed word order rules), while in English it is the order which diverges from the basic grammatical one (e.g. the initial position of objects, subject complements, and most types of adverbial adjuncts), or the order which flouts the end-weight principle, according to which longer and more complex structures tend to come last.

The total of Slovenian structures whose translations differ from the original or each other in one or more of the three above-mentioned aspects (form, FSP, markedness) is 124. This corresponds to 248 English examples in two translations. However, 33 out of the 248 are omitted from the subsequent discussion as irrelevant to this article. These comprise additions or omissions of words, phrases, and even of entire clauses, or else they cannot be analysed in regard to some aspect of the original structure because they are reformulated so that they do not contain it. An example of the latter are comparisons between the sequencing of the predicator and direct object in the original and in one translation, while the other translation has recourse to the passive and thus contains no direct object. This is the case in e.g. “Zvonci novega dne” 26: *S temno grožnjo ga [i.e. nebo] zagrinjajo* : “It [the sky] is blanketed by a dark threat” (D) / “Shroud it with a dark threat” (K).

The number of English structures addressed in this article is thus 215. Of these, 121 are unmarked and 94 marked. A comparison with Slovenian reveals that, of the 121 unmarked ones, 26 (cca 21,5 %) are in fact marked in the original, and of the 94 marked ones, 43 (cca 45,7 %) are originally neutral. The focus of this discussion is on the former, minor, group, i.e. marked Slovenian structures translated as unmarked in English. In regard to how closely they correspond to the original form and FSP, as well as to the form and FSP of the parallel translation, all 121 unmarked English translations may be divided into a number of groups. Seven of these groups (arranged from the most “faithful” to the “free” ones) contain examples which diverge from the original marked quality:

**1. The form and FSP are the same as in the original.** The contrastive analysis has yielded 24 unmarked English examples. With the exception of one pair which corresponds to a single Slovenian example, all others (22) represent one Slovenian structure each, so that the group corresponds to 23 Slovenian examples. This means that – with the above-mentioned exception – every Slovenian example has been translated once in a way which preserves the original form and FSP, and once in a way which is in some respect different.

Of these 24 structures, only one is – potentially – marked in the original: “With this lament, the broken bells / of the sheep herd / toll **the new day**” (K) : *V njegovo tožbo zvoní nov dan / s počenimi zvonci / ovčje črede* (“Zvonci novega dne” 35–37). The role of *nov dan* is slightly out of the ordinary because of its ambiguity: if the verb *zvoní* is interpreted as a subjectless expression, *nov dan* is its direct object, but it might also be a finite verbal form with *nov dan* as its subject. (The latter interpretation is admittedly marginal but not impossible, particularly as Zajc often places subjects after their predicators.) Since the English translations circumvent the problem by adopting the direct object interpretation (K) or making *nov dan* an adjunct: “the broken bells / ... / ring **in the new day**” (D), their structure is transparent, and thus rendered simpler, unmarked, by comparison.

**2. The form is the same as in the original, but the FSP differs from both the original and the other translation.** There is only 1 such example in the corpus, i.e. “Krokar” 9 (D), and its original is marked, again due to structural ambiguity:

Kadar leti, leti skoz samoto.  
Kakor skoz votlino v votlini,  
**ki gre z njim** in se sproti obnavlja. (7–9)

(*ki gre z njim* could refer equally well to the first or second *votlina*)

When he flies, he flies through solitude.  
As if through a cavern into another cavern,  
**which goes with him**, eternally renewed. (D)

(“which goes with him” can only refer to the second “cavern”)

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

(“that escorts him” could refer to the first or second “hollow”)

The uncertainty whether the first or second *votlina* / “cavern” / “hollow” should be understood as the antecedent of the (first) relative clause is preserved only in the latter version. In the former, the disambiguation is achieved at the expense of not only the original structure but also the meaning, since *v votlini* in translation (D) is no longer a postmodifier expressing location but an adjunct expressing direction.

**3. The form of one translation differs from the original but parallels the other translation; its FSP is the same as in the original.** Insofar as they have the same degree of markedness as the original, these deserve closer study because they appear to represent a favoured translation solution which conveys the same organisation of information at the same level of style as the original. Thus they may be of contrastive interest, serving as a guideline for the translation of structures which may not admit an equally idiomatic rendering of word for word.

There are 39 English examples belonging to this category. 1 of them stands apart in that it admits a comparison of the form but not the FSP. The structure compared is the subject – predicator sequencing in *Tudi takrat je njegov let / padanje v*

*kroge samote* ("Krokar" 16–17). Both translations have the order subject – predicator, different from the Slovenian predicator – subject. The validity of the comparison, however, is doubtful because the sentence is completely restructured in translation (D), the copula being replaced by a full lexical verb: "Even then **his flight / dives** into orbits of solitude."

The remaining 38 instances may be divided into:

(1) 34, i.e. 17 pairs representing 17 Slovenian structures. In these cases the parallel structures in English result in the same FSP, so that they may be viewed as adequate translation solutions;

(2) 4 examples whose counterparts in the alternative translations display a different FSP despite structural similarity. Once, in the case of translation (K) of the already discussed lines 16–17 from "Krokar", the different FSP displayed in the parallel version (D) is due to restructuring. Twice it stems from a difference in the articles (which contribute toward the representation of information as old or new but do so below clause element level), and once from the choice of words, where the meaning itself may contribute to higher or lower information value.

Out of these 39 examples, 5 are marked in the original. Before addressing those, however, it is worthwhile to survey the ones which are originally unmarked and thus represent stylistically adequate translations. Of the 34 English examples which are unmarked in the original as well, there are 15 pairs and 4 single examples, corresponding to 18 Slovenian ones.<sup>3</sup> The types of structure represented are:

(1) Word (or rather clause element) order:

(a) The sequencing in Slovenian and English differs because of the fixed word order rules in both languages; where these exist in Slovenian, they override the FSP requirements without resulting in markedness. An example is the position of clitics, which always follow the first clause element in Slovenian, while their position in English is determined by their syntactic role. A typical structure is the placement of a pronominal object in front of the predicator in Slovenian and behind it in English (as in "Škorpjioni" 2: *svetloba jih boli*: "light hurts **them**" (D and K)). Both structures are in strict keeping with grammatical rules, and their different ordering affects neither the markedness nor the FSP, the thematic character of the pronouns (a reference to something familiar) being inherent in their very category and in their clitic status. There are 8 such English examples, 6 of them paired and 2 isolated (corresponding to 5 Slovenian ones).

(b) The sequencing in Slovenian and English differs because Slovenian has, in the interests of FSP, a clause-initial or final element that is less usual or impossible in this position in English. There are 12 such examples in English, 10 of them paired and 2 isolated ones, corresponding to 7 Slovenian ones. Of these, 4 Slovenian examples (the originals of 6 English structures) have a final or post-verbal subject and 2 (the originals of 4 English structures) an initial adverbial adjunct, while the issue in 1 (again the original of 2 identical English structures) is the distribution of two adverbial adjuncts over the clause. In all these cases, the order of the elements is changed so

---

<sup>3</sup> Two of the examples treated as single because they differ in FSP belong to the same original, namely to "Krokar" 16–17.

that the neutral English patterns are preserved, with the subject preceding the predicator etc. An example is line 1 from "Mleko" (*že skož špranje lije svetloba*), where the order of Slovenian elements reflects their order of informative importance: the setting, being the lowest, occurs first; next comes the predicator, which presents the existence or appearance of a certain phenomenon; and the final position is occupied by the most salient element, the phenomenon to be presented. The translations, by contrast, employ the grammatical English word order, starting with the subject and putting the adjunct last: "light pours through the cracks."

(c) The sequencing remains the same but the participants are given slightly different roles. The example in question are lines 35–37 in "Zvonci novega dne", which originally begin with an adjunct of direction: *V njegovo tožbo zvoní nov dan / s počenimi zvonci / ovčje črede*. An initial adjunct of direction is less usual and therefore marked in English (cf. Quirk et al. 515). The translations, however, begin the sentence with an element which is still an adverbial adjunct, so that it is classed as the same structure, but stands in a looser relationship with the sentence and is quite common in initial position. This is a supplementive *with*-clause, which expresses "a vague notion of accompanying circumstance" (Quirk et al. 1124): "And with this solace [sic!], the broken bells / of a herd of sheep / ring in the new day" (D) / "With this lament, the broken bells / of the sheep herd / toll the new day."

(2) Passivisation (6 paired examples corresponding to 3 Slovenian ones).

(3) Restructuring due to other factors, mostly to the choice of words which demand clause elements other than the original ones to complement them (6 paired examples corresponding to 3 Slovenian ones).

The conclusion is that a change of word order is by far the most frequent adaptation made in such cases; moreover, it does not affect the original FSP.

The remaining 5 examples (3 in Slovenian), on the other hand, are originally marked, so that the English translations are in a way simplified. The markedness of the Slovenian structures is due to word order (in 2 Slovenian examples, namely in 1 pair and 1 single structure in English), and to predicator ellipsis,<sup>4</sup> made possible by the presence of the correlative conjunct *tedaj* (1 Slovenian example, 2 English ones).

Both Slovenian examples displaying marked word order begin with the sequence setting – predicator – subject. This order is typical of clauses where the emphasis is on a phenomenon presented as existing or appearing on the scene. In the two examples under discussion, however, the subject is subsequently revealed not to be the centre of interest after all, since it is followed by yet another element (a subject complement or adjunct) as the rheme proper. Therefore the postposing of the subject has a slightly marked effect in Slovenian, as it seems to convey undue prominence. In English, on the other hand, the subject is placed in the usual position in front of the verb. Yet the higher information value implied by its position in Slovenian may still be conveyed through the use of articles.

---

<sup>4</sup> Predicator ellipsis or reinsertion does not result in a changed FSP since the slots of syntactic roles and the degrees of information value are unchanged, its role of "transition" between theme and rheme still being present as the "zero transition", cf. Toporišič (660). The stylistic effect, on the other hand, may well be different.

An example are lines 8–11 from “Zvonci novega dne”: *kjer se zviija megla / v klobčič zlobe, / v klobčič slabosti, / v klobčič histeričnega smeha*. The higher rhematicity allotted to the fog is lost in translation (D) because of the definite article, which establishes it as another predictable part of the scenery (“where **the fog swirls round**”), but better preserved in (K) through the use of the zero article (“where **fog furls up**”). The zero article simply presents fog as a category, not linking it to the previous discourse.

The Slovenian example with an ellipted predicator are lines 28–30 from “Krokar”: *Če oponaša, tedaj sebe, / tedaj svoje glasove, zapleteno / govorico vijugastih klicev* : “If he mocks, he mocks **only** himself, / his own voices, the interwoven / speech of meandering calls” (D) / “If he imitates, he echoes himself, / his voices, intricate / language of curved calls” (K). The Slovenian is marked not only because of the (repeated) *tedaj*, which is a rhetorical and emphatic device according to Toporišič (637), but also because of the accompanying ellipsis of the predicator, which helps to form a terse, striking statement. In English, on the other hand, the conjunct is omitted altogether or replaced by “only”, and the verb is reinserted.

**4. The translation differs in form both from the original and the other translation, but its FSP is the same as in the original.** There are 16 such examples in English, corresponding to 15 Slovenian ones (only one Slovenian structure has both translations belonging to this category). Before concentrating on the examples which diverge from their originals in markedness, it may again be worthwhile to explore the ones which are unmarked in Slovenian as well, as these appear to fulfill the original function (i.e. convey the same FSP and markedness) through recourse to a different structure; of further interest are the solutions of their – structurally different – English counterparts.

There are 9 English examples which correspond to 9 unmarked Slovenian ones. 4 of them contain the structure discussed in 3. (1) (a), namely the different sequencing of the predicator and the pronominal direct object in English and Slovenian, which stems purely from the different grammatical requirements of the two languages. The reason why the English variant of the structure is not repeated in the other translation is the reformulation of the latter, which is such that it contains no direct object – in 3 instances, the passive is used instead, and once the entire clause originally containing this structure is omitted.

In the remaining 5 examples, the difference in form is due to the restructuring of the clause elements. In 2 instances (“Krokar” 4 and 9) the original middle voice is replaced by the passive in translation (D) but retained in (K). Once, in “Krokar” 10, the original adverbial adjunct of direction is arbitrarily replaced by an adjunct of position in translation (D): *Kadar se spusti nizko* : “When he flies **low**” (D) / “When he swoops **down**” (K). This change is interesting in that it results in a figure not present in the original: the clause is repeated verbatim in line 31, where it is a faithful rendition of the Slovenian, and as both lines appear at the beginning of a stanza (of stanzas 3 and 7, respectively), their parallelism is quite striking. In Slovenian and translation (K), on the other hand, there is no such figure because it is only line 31 (*ko leti nizko* / “When he flies **low**”) that contains a position adjunct, the one in 7 expressing direction. In another instance (“Krokar” 18–19), the original pattern copula – obligatory

adjunct is replaced by a full lexical verb plus direct object in translation (K): *Tista ... / je v tih razdalji* / “She ... **remains in the quiet distance**” (D) / “She ... **keeps a quiet distance**” (K). This is due to word choice, both translations showing a preference for a lexically fuller verb. Despite restructuring, however, the FSP of (K) parallels the original because the object is just as necessary for the complementation of the verb as the original adjunct.

The last example concerns the restructuring of the lengthy final direct object in lines 12–13 of “Mleko”: *in sonce ti butne v obraz / slapove žarkov in mlečne svetlobe* : “and the sun strikes your face / **water falls of beams and milky light**” (D) / “and the sun strikes your face / **with the waterfalls of rays and milky light**” (K). The structure pertaining to the group under discussion is (K), where the direct object is replaced by an instrument adjunct. This is a consequence of word choice, which demands a different complementation of the verb; however, the restructuring does not affect the FSP because the adjunct is just as important for the complementation of its predicator as the object. The other English translation, on the other hand, is restructured in such a way that even its FSP differs, as the link of the phrase to the context is so loose that the relationship is unclear (an independent sentence? a supplementive adverbial clause?), and the structure is heavily marked.

The conclusion is that the examples belonging to this group diverge from the originals because of grammatical word order requirements, the English tendency toward passivisation, or different word choice. Since they succeed in reflecting the FSP and stylistic effect of the original through their choice of form, the question arises why the other translation opts for a different form; most often this is due to the fact that the structure is not present in the other translation at all (the 4 cases with word order), or that the other translation is even more faithful to the original, preserving its form as well (4 examples); in one instance, however, the alternative translation is so free as to diverge from all aspects of the original.

The remaining 7 English examples have marked originals (6); with the exception of one original which is marked because of ambiguity, the others are marked because their word order does not reflect the FSP. This quality is smoothed over in the translations, not by following the FSP but by observing the grammatical English word order. 5 translations, that is 1 pair and 3 single ones, avoid markedness by placing an originally initial adverbial adjunct in final position, and 1 by moving an adverbial adjunct from the front of the direct object behind it.

The one structure which is ambiguous in Slovenian and changed into a more neutral one in English is the already discussed role of *nov dan* in “Zvonci novega dne” 35–37; translation (D) rephrases the direct object or even potential subject *nov dan* as an adverbial adjunct (“in the new day”), thus changing the form and simplifying the structure. The information value of the element, however, does not change by itself because the importance of the direct object to its verb is comparable to that of the adjunct in this case.

The example which displays a difference between adjunct – object sequencing is “Krokar” 1–2: *Požira navsezgodaj zvezdne oči* : “Devours / the star eyes **at daybreak**” (K). In Slovenian, the adverbial adjunct of time (a typical setting) would be expected to appear initially; its position in the sentence quoted above is marked, either because



its thematic character fails to be reflected in its position, or because the element is in fact given unusual informative prominence. Moreover, one possible interpretation of the sentence is that the subject is unexpressed, and in such cases (with the “zero theme”) the most common solution in Slovenian would be to begin with an adverbial as departure point, regardless of FSP (Davis 316); the sequence is thus again marked. In English, on the other hand, the order object – adjunct is a set pattern, particularly when the adjunct is realised by a longer structure such as a prepositional phrase.

The remaining five examples may be illustrated by the two translations of “Zvonci novega dne” 26: *S temno grožnjo ga zagrinjajo* : “It is blanketed by a dark threat” (D) / “Shroud it with a dark threat” (K). The original is marked because the only truly new, therefore the most salient, item of information is placed initially. This order would be marked in English as well, for the reason that process adjuncts, which include instrument adjuncts, are normally predicational and therefore final (Quirk et al. 556). While translation (K) is limited to rearrangement, translation (D) employs passivisation as well; the latter occurs in one more example.

As for the English alternatives of the 5 single translations, 3 are likewise unmarked and thus different from the original; in 2 cases, however, the alternative translation follows the original in all respects, since it is identical in form and FSP, and marked to boot. Both concern an initial adverbial adjunct whose thematic position is marked in Slovenian because it is the most informative element in the given clause; the preservation of this order in English has a corresponding marked effect as well, not because of FSP considerations but because this is not the canonical order of clause elements. An example is “Zvonci novega dne” 24–25: *V medvedjem plesu / zagrinjajo nebo*. While the semantics itself ensures that the FSP in translation remains the same, regardless of form, translation (D) employs a different structure and stylistic level through passivisation and through the final, unmarked repositioning of the adjunct: “The sky is blanketed in [/] the dance of bears.” Translation (K), on the other hand, retains not only the active form but also the initial placement of the adjunct, which has the same marked effect as in Slovenian: “In a bear dance they shroud the sky.”

**5. The translations differ from the original, but parallel each other, in both form and FSP.** There are 9 such English examples, 4 pairs and 1 single, corresponding to 5 Slovenian ones. (The counterpart of the single example has not been included in this group because its FSP is ambiguous: judging by the articles, it could be different from Slovenian and parallel to the other translation, or the same as in Slovenian.) Of these, 2 English examples are the translations of a single Slovenian structure which is originally marked, namely of the sentence structure of lines 28–30 from “Krokar”, quoted above. Originally, *tedaj svoje glasove* etc. is an appositive clause (to the preceding clause *tedaj sebe*), which contains a correlative conjunct, an ellipped predicator, and a direct object with an appositive noun phrase (*zapleteno govorico vijugastih klicev*). With the omission or restructuring of the conjunct, however, the equivalent of *svoje glasove* is perceived as an appositive noun phrase – not clause! – to “himself”, followed by another appositive noun phrase, the equivalent of *zapleteno govorico*, within the same clause. In short, the Slovenian clause is reinterpreted as two noun phrases

within a larger framework; in comparison with the original text, marked because of the repeated *tedaj* and ellipsis, the English versions are unmarked and simplified.

**6. One translation differs from the original in form but parallels its counterpart; its FSP, however, differs from both.** There are 2 such examples (belonging to 2 different Slovenian ones); their divergence in FSP from their structurally parallel English counterparts is due once to a different, much more explicit and thus rhematic word choice, and once to the use of articles. The example with articles is translation (D) of the lines 8–11 in “Zvonci novega dne”, which have been discussed in 3. The higher rhematicity of the fog, which is conveyed in the original and in translation (K), is lost (hence a different FSP); the structure – word order – itself, on the other hand, is unmarked as opposed to the Slovenian markedness.

7. Finally, there are 21 English examples (1 pair and 19 single ones, corresponding to 20 Slovenian structures) with **both the form and FSP differing from the original and the other translation**; of these, 9 (answering 9 Slovenian ones) have marked originals. Of the total, 14 English (i.e. 13 Slovenian) examples show restructuring, 4 lose their original ambiguity by settling for a clearly definable structure, and in 3 a change in the order of elements brings about a different FSP as well. These three types of change are represented also in the group with marked originals, which includes all 4 instances of disambiguation, 4 instances of restructuring, and 1 structure with changed word order.

An example of original structural ambiguity which is smoothed over in one translation are lines 6–7 from “Škorpijoni”: *stisnjeni pod kamni / v razpokah špranjah* : “squeezed **between the stones / in cracks, crevices**” (D). The relation of *v razpokah špranjah* to *kamni* could be either one of coordination (a listing of locations) or of subordination, with *kamni* as the headword further defined by the subsequent prepositional phrase. Translation (D), by contrast, clearly suggests only one interpretation through its use of articles, namely the second. The definite article is used only with the potential headword, whereas the other two location nouns are shown to play a different syntactic role by the use of the zero article. The definite article with “stones” is unexpected as such, the stones being as new to the discourse as the cracks or crevices; however, its use is perfectly natural if the following prepositional phrase is interpreted as a postmodifier further defining the “stones”. Thus the English text encourages the latter reading.

The 4 restructured instances originally contain marked structures: right dislocation, repetition of the predicator, punctuation which separates an apposition from the rest of the sentence with a full stop, and the emphatic correlative conjunct *tedaj*. The example of right dislocation is *Nanjo se spusti, na posteljo nočno ...* (“Krokar” 5), which is preserved in translation (K) as “He dives **on it, the night bed ...**” but replaced by the basic sentence pattern in (D): “He alights **upon the bed of night ...**” The example with changed word order is likewise to be found in “Krokar”, in the already discussed lines 1–2: *Požira / navsezgodaj zvezdne oči*. If the unusual position of the adjunct in Slovenian is understood to reflect a greater informative prominence, translation (D) departs from the original FSP by placing the element in initial position and

thus establishing it as the setting: “**In early morning** / he gulps down starry eyes” (D).

**Conclusion.** The findings discussed above may be summarised in the following table:

GROUP	NO. OF UNMARKED ENGLISH EXAMPLES	NO. AND % OF UNMARKED EN. EXAMPLES WHICH ARE MARKED IN SLOV.	NO. OF EXAMPLES UNMARKED IN EN. BUT MARKED IN SLOV. IN (D)	NO. OF EXAMPLES UNMARKED IN EN. BUT MARKED IN SLOV. IN (K)
1.	24	1 (4 %)	0 / 14 <sup>5</sup>	1 / 10
2.	1	1 (100 %)	1 / 1	0 / 0
3.	39	5 (13 %)	2 / 18	3 / 21
4.	16	7 (44 %)	3 / 7	4 / 9
5.	9	2 (22 %)	1 / 5	1 / 4
6.	2	1 (50 %)	1 / 2	0 / 0
7.	21	9 (43 %)	8 / 16	1 / 5
<b>TOTAL</b>	112 <sup>6</sup>	26	16 / 63 ( <b>25,3 %</b> )	10 / 49 ( <b>20,4 %</b> )

The two translators are fairly balanced in their replacements of marked Slovenian structures with neutral English ones, with Johnson Debeljak being slightly in the lead: such examples constitute 25,3 % of all unmarked structures in her translations, as compared to Kravanja's 20,4 % in hers. A group-by-group comparison of the two translations, limited to these diverging instances, shows that the seven groups are represented with very similar figures in both. The most conspicuous discrepancy is the last category, of very free and individual translation solutions, which appear to be much more common in Johnson Debeljak.

A comparison of the groups which takes into account all examples reveals that the largest group is 3., namely the one where the two translations differ from the original but parallel each other in form, at the same time preserving the original FSP. The next two choices are the absolutely faithful translations (1.) and their opposites, namely the most individual choices (7.). On the other hand, the percentage of examples which differ stylistically from the original is in inverse proportion to this scale, since groups 1. and 3. contain the fewest. In the smallest groups, by contrast, which are represented merely by 1 or 2 examples (2. and 6.), the latter mostly differ from the Slovenian. It may be concluded that the more “anomalous” translation solutions are more likely to deviate from the original.

<sup>5</sup> The second figure represents the sum of all unmarked English structures contributed to the group by one translator.

<sup>6</sup> It may be noted that the sum total yields fewer than 121 structures, which is the total number of unmarked structures found in the two translations. The missing examples belong to groups other than the seven discussed above; those groups contain no instances of diverging markedness and were therefore not considered.

Final, and perhaps most crucial, is the question which marked Slovenian structures tend to become stylistically neutral in translation. There are 22 cases in which an unmarked English translation belongs to a marked original; it is to be noted, however, that the actual number of Slovenian examples is slightly lower because some of them are matched by translations belonging to two different categories, in which case they are counted twice. These 22 Slovenian originals all fall into 3 groups: (1) those displaying marked word order – 9 examples; (2) those with structural ambiguity – 7 examples; (3) those with marked internal structure which are rephrased in translation – 6 examples.

In the first, most numerous group, the Slovenian texts are marked because they do not reflect the FSP (e.g. by placing a new, highly informative adjunct in initial position) or show an unusual FSP; the translations, on the other hand, are adapted to the requirements of the grammatical word order in English. Nevertheless, the original FSP is most often still preserved through factors other than word order, such as the meaning of the words and the context. The frequency of this type may be ascribable to the fact that the un/marked word order criteria differ in the two languages, and that, as a consequence, a less usual organisation of elements in a “free word order” language like Slovenian is perhaps not perceived as important enough to warrant a translation marked from the grammatical point of view. Moreover, determining to what extent the order of elements reflects the FSP, which is the first step towards deciding if it is marked or not (and if it should be accordingly rendered marked in translation as well), sometimes requires careful linguistic analysis, such as is probably rarely undertaken by translators.

The tendency toward disambiguation, which furnishes examples of the second best represented type, is understandable, since English may not have the same linguistic possibilities at its disposal, ambiguity may be considered a flaw to be corrected rather than imitated, or the possibility of an alternative interpretation is simply not noted. More difficult to explain are the instances where a structure is changed and simplified although it could be replicated in English, such as the deletion of right dislocation or of repetitions. A common denominator of these changes, however, appears to be a desire to provide a fluent, readable, “acceptable” text, rather than follow – or indeed explore – the twisting nuances of the original poem.

*University of Ljubljana*

#### WORKS CITED

- Davis, Margaret. *Aspects of Adverbial Placement in English and Slovene*. München: Sagner, 1989.
- Debeljak, Aleš, ed. *The Imagination of Terra Incognita: Slovenian Writing 1945–1995*. Fredonia, New York: White Pine Press, 1997.
- Firbas, Jan. *Functional sentence perspective in written and spoken communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Jackson, Richard, and Rachel Morgan, eds. *The Fire under the Moon: Contemporary Slovene Poetry*. Trans. Mia Dintinjana and Others. 2nd revised edition. Chattanooga: Black Dirt Press & PM Books, 1999.

- Quirk, Randolph, et al. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman, 1992.
- Toporišič, Jože. *Slovenska slovnica*. 4th ed. Maribor: Obzorja, 2000.
- Zajc, Dane. "Krokar." *Dol dol*. Zbirka Samorog. Ljubljana: Nova revija, 1998. 68–69.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Pesmi*. Dane Zajc v petih knjigah. Ljubljana: Emonica, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Scorpions*. Trans. Sonja Kravanja and Zdenka Štimac. *Litterae Slovenicae* 1/2000/XXXVIII/96. Ljubljana: Slovene Writers' Association, 2000.