Univerzitet u Sarajevu

Filozofski fakultet

Odsjek za anglistiku

ZAVRŠNI MAGISTARSKI RAD

ALICE'S ADVENTURES IN WONDERLAND - A WORD PLAY IN TRANSLATION

(ALISA U ZEMLJI ČUDA - IGRA RIJEČI U PREVODU)

Student: Dina Tošić   Mentor: prof . dr. Selma Đuliman

Sarajevo, 2023.

Apstrakt

Iako jedna od najprevođenijih knjiga na svijetu, „*Alisa u zemlji čuda*" i dalje ostaje veliki izazov za sve prevodioce koji žele da se uhvate u koštac sa ovim djelom. To je dijelom zbog mnoštva dvosmislenih značenja koja Lewis Carroll postiže vještim poigravanjem riječima stvarajući humoristični efekat, a dijelom zbog slikovite čudesne zemlje u kojoj je svaka logika besmislena.

Manipulacija jezikom, na više različitih nivoa, otkriva da se ispod površine dječije priče sa djevojčicom anarhične prirode, koja želi da istraži svijet izvan običnog, krije satira društva, obrazovanja i sistema uopšte, te da pisac preispituje logiku i razbija stigmu da sve treba da se radi „po pravilima".

 Bukvalnim prevođenjem određenih elemenata sa skrivenim značenjem, kakvim ova knjiga obiluje, u većini slučajeva bi se izgubio prvobitni smisao piščeve briljantne igre s jezikom, kojom nam prikazuje svijet koji je središte sarkazma i metaforičnih slika, u kojem je svaka sintagma potencijalna zagonetka. Stoga je od ključne važnosti da prevodilac pronađe odgovarajuće ekvivalente u ciljanom jeziku kojima se čuva vjernost izvornog teksta, vodeći računa o civilizacijskim, kulturološkim i vremenskim okvirima, a da se pritom zadrži originalna duhovitost, pronicljivost i jedinstvenost jezika.

Glavni cilj ovog rada je da analizira prevod originalne verzije romana „*Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*", sa fokusom na igru riječi i literarni apsurd karakterističan za period u kojem je autor živio i stvarao. Rad će se baviti analizom semantičkih konstrukcija prevodioca, čime se želi utvrditi da li je on, i kako uspio, da prenese istu poruku iz izvornog teksta. Takođe će se procijeniti stepen manjkavosti/uspješnosti njegovog izbora pri prenošenju glavnih ideja.

Ključne riječi: igra riječi, tehnike prevođenja, Lewis Carroll, apsurd

Abstract

Even though it is one of the most translatable books in the world, *Alice in Wonderland* still remains a huge challenge for all the translators who want to come to grips with it. This is partly due to numerous double meanings which Carroll renders by skilful play of words achieving a humorous effect, and partly due to the picturesque magic wonderland where logic fails to make sense.

Manipulation of language on multiple levels reveals that beneath a children's story with an anarchic girl who wants to explore the world beyond ordinary there is actually a satire of society, education and system as a whole, and that the author questions logic and breaks the main rule that everything has to follow certain rules.

Literal translation of the particular elements which bear hidden meanings would lead to the loss of the original nature of author's brilliant play on words, which he uses to show a world as a center of sarcasm and metaphorical pictures, where every sentence is a possible puzzle. Therefore, it is of crucial importance for a translator to find the corresponding equivalents in the target language which preserve the originality of the source text. Further, one has to bear in mind the importance of civilizational, cultural and time aspect, while at the same time keeping the original wittiness, smartness and uniqueness of the language.

The main aim of this paper is to analyse the translation of the original book *Alice in Wonderland*, focusing on the play of words and nonsense which were typical for the period of time in which the author lived and created. The paper will analyse the semantic constructions which the translator used, in order to determine whether and how he managed to transmit the same message from the source text. The paper will also analyse the level of achievement of the translator's choice in the process of transmitting the main ideas from the book.

Keywords: wordplay, translation techniques, Lewis Carroll, nonsense

Table of Contents

"It would be so nice if something made sense for a change."

Lewis Carroll

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The Intrigue of Lewis Carroll's writing

Although primarily written for children, Lewis Carroll's books were, and still are, captivating the attention of adults, due to the never-ending enigmas that he serves to his readers, skilfully portrayed to keep everyone's interest throughout reading. He kept questioning regular physical laws in which people lived and which seemed to be functioning perfectly. But there was something beyond that. Carroll brought an excellent world of nonsense and triggered his readers to be part of it, to try to decipher it.

Through his writing, Carroll escaped the ordinary. He was one of the most prominent representatives of literary nonsense as a genre ("Lewis Carroll, "Alice in Wonderland" as a Work of Nonsense Fiction", web), which leads us to conclude that the most of his writing was just the fruit of his imagination and such sentences often lacked basic grammatical rules, as are syntax and standard morphology.

In the words of Richard Lederer (Lederer 179), Carroll purposefully concocts eye-catching and ear-catching words by violating some of the basic conventions of word-formation. For instance, in the story, he introduces the word *uglification* as opposed to *beautification*, whereas Gryphon is disappointed upon finding out that Alice does not find this word familiar, although English speakers go by the fact that adjectives like *ugly* cannot have attached suffix *–fication.* At some points, it seems like he wanted to play with people's minds.

Another example would be *an unbirthday present*, where we can see an odd way of negating nouns by adding prefix *un-,* which is not the rule in English language. Most likely, Carroll was doing this intentionally, aiming to create confusion and mess among the readers, making them to question every rule. Certainly, he was not the one blindly following the rules and customs of the time in any sense, so why not play with grammatical rules as well.

Despite of how entertaining *Alice in Wonderland* might be for the young and older readers alike, there is the other side of the coin too, which means that Carroll's works caused a lot of trouble to

the translators who have been trying hard to transfer his original ideas into different languages. This is mostly due to the peculiarity of his language, unique humour and culturally different aspects of wordplay that he uses. Furthermore, one has to sense what the meaning that Carroll intelligently renders is and to interpret it as it was simple, and yet it is beyond simple.

1.2. Aim of the diploma paper

The main purpose of this paper is to analyse selected examples of wordplay from the original book *Alice in Wonderland* by Lewis Carroll and to present how those elements are translated to B/C/S language. The paper will examine translator's ways in dealing with problematic words and phrases, which may or may not have corresponding counterparts in the target language, as well as the ways the translator managed to overcome different obstacles that one may encounter while translating literary nonsense.

The paper will focus on the list of selected examples which include play on words and which are, most likely, problematic to be translated into any language, for any translator. In a few or no examples is literal translation fruitful. Translator's adeptness in language combined with their creativity and inventiveness play a crucial role in this process.

A question that arises here is whether at all certain parts with double meanings can be interpreted into the target text with the same message conveyed as it appears in the original text. If the answer is yes, then the level of such accomplishment remains to be estimated; on the contrary, it is to be analysed how the translator dealt with them.

The purpose of this final diploma paper is not to criticize the translation in any way, but to portray the extent to which the ideas from the source text are transmitted to the target text and whether all the effects are preserved (or lost) in the process of translation. It will analyse the translation by Zoran Jovanović, published by Narodna knjiga in Podgorica, in 2007.

1.3. Methodology

The study is conducted as a qualitative, interpretive analysis of the data. The final diploma paper is organized in the following way: the introduction focuses on the intrigue of Lewis Carroll as a writer and briefly describes what makes his style so unique; then follows the theoretical framework which offers definitions of the phenomenon of wordplay as well as the literary use of wordplay as defined by scholars and critics who wrote on this topic.

It further deals with Lewis Carroll's literary work and explains the challenges and difficulties one may encounter when translating wordplay. The third part is the core of the paper. It analyses the corpus, i.e. the specific examples from the original work and provides comments on how the translator dealt with those parts and which translation techniques he used to convey original ideas to the target language.

The final part summarizes the entire paper and reflects on the main ideas dealt with throughout the work.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Lewis Carroll and the world of imagination

Charles Lutwidge Dodgson, widely known by his pen name Lewis Carroll, lived and created during the Victorian era, which is the period of Queen Victoria's reign from 1837 until 1901. ("Victorian Era Timeline", web) This is an era of astonishing achievements and considerable changes that were a trigger for substantial transformation of the society as a whole.

As Sean Purchase describes in his *Key Concepts in Victorian Literature*, this is the period which saw increasing urbanization, industrialism and calls for reform, which meant that Britain was in a state of transition. It underwent rapid socioeconomic and political upheaval, witnessed the encroachment of scientific rationalism into all walks of life, and experienced a crisis of religious faith (Purchase 145). He further notices that the construction of huge factories and mass industries throughout Britain in the Victorian period helped cultivate an increasingly class-conscious nation. Nineteenth-century British society changed rapidly from a largely rural to a predominantly urban, and the Victorians were unparalleled as innovators in the sciences and technology (ibid, General introduction).

Infrastructural and economic growth that marked this period led to Britain's supremacy and its presence in many aspects of the world's stage as the global power. General atmosphere throughout the country was very optimistic, progressive and encouraging (ibid, General introduction).

Despite the generally positive and thriving ambience, this was also a point in history that brought a somewhat altered way of lifestyle compared to earlier and was not so favourable to all social classes at the time. The vast majority did not enjoy the benefits of prosperity and it was obvious that Victorians lived under a capitalist system of free-trade economics which was at the increasing mercy of periodic booms and slumps (ibid 4). The gap between the rich and the poor deepened even more and newly established dogmas took place in almost all spheres of everyday life.

Purchase explains that the society had to embrace pretty much rigorous and strict code of conduct in order to fit in. Even nowadays, the term 'Victorian' suggests a quite specific historical juncture, tending to connote a peculiarly rigid set of ideas, circumstances, values and attitudes (ibid, General introduction).

> "The Victorians are typically described as having lived rather drab lives that were little more than combinations of puritan ethics and repressions: severe moral probity, restraint, reserve, family values, a certain dourness or lack of humour, uncomfortable attitudes towards sex, stony faces in photographs, and black clothes." (ibid, General introduction)

Nevertheless, along with the industrial revolution came revolution in thinking, creating, observing life in general. Radical intellectual achievements were beginning to shape and change the age. Many Victorian theories and ideas had an immeasurable impact on the way that people came to understand and live their lives (ibid, General introduction). This, consequently, reflected in the field of literature, especially children's literature to which Carroll himself belonged. A true revolution of a kind is what happened in the world of literature as well.

As Purchase emphasizes, the Victorian age from the 1860s onwards is widely thought to be the first 'Golden Age' of children's literature. Literature for children consequently had an ideological influence on its readership early on, and it was central to the cultivation of Victorian ideas and attitudes (ibid 154-155).

The Victorians held a Romantic conception of childhood, which perceived children as innocent, pure, vulnerable and childhood came to represent humanity that is uncorrupt, unspoiled and untouched. However, the reality for Victorian children was often much more different and crueller than this picture. Child labour, hunger, disease, prostitution and other brutal conditions in which significant number of poor children lived was a cause for high early mortality rates among infants and children in general (ibid 155).

Most of the writers largely turned their literary opus towards criticizing all the changes the Victorian society had been undergoing, especially those aspects that were hypocritically shown

as progressive and good, but in essence were a true malfunction of the nation as a whole. For instance, as Purchase perceives, Charles Dickens's nostalgia for the innocence of childhood was ultimately a critique of the oppressions he associated with Victorian adulthood (ibid 18).

Novel came to be a medium for not just political protest and reflection, but also for real and lasting change that many authors tried to achieve. The mixture of fact, fiction and socially aware narrator was something that set the tone for the Victorian novel (ibid 147). Many novelists focused their writing on the industrial and political issues facing Victorian Britain and Carroll himself was one of them. This could be characterized as a sort of escapism that writers and artists in general, used to draw on in order to cope with reality more easily.

The publication of the *Alice* tales heralded the most significant "retreat from Victorian realities into ever-deeper realms of fantasy and nonsense". Carroll presented a Wonderland of an alternative and quite literally 'underground' Victorian society (ibid 156). His idea of a world that is physically lower reflects his canny intention of diminishing something that people inside and outside of Britain perceived as the highest and most valuable ideal.

Amanda L. Bryan points out that Alice, and the majority of the creatures in Wonderland, embody colonial attitudes about British subjects in its colonies. Those authority figures that Alice happens to meet during her adventure, whose values and rules make no sense at all, are the embodiments of the British attitudes and are the source of Alice's rebellion (Bryan 22).

If Alice is viewed as a figure for the colonised, then instead of celebrating imperialistic values and sensibilities as did the majority of Victorian children's literature, the story uses the coded form of narrative often found in children's fiction to illustrate the negative side of imperialism (ibid 22). Every image, every character and every single situation is used as a metaphor to satirize people, values and anything that could be connected with the Victorian era.

In general, Carroll's stories are marked by an underlying struggle for meaning and by mischievous questioning of Victorian moral certainties in which the 'truths' of the adult world are no longer secure (Purchase 156-157). Through his brilliant mathematical paradoxes and games

of logic, he turns the concept of normal upside down and constantly challenges the common sense of a reader.

While *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* is certainly a fairy tale where the protagonist finds herself in a strange realm, she is always seeking a way out of the strangeness and a way back to her familiar life or to familiar places, as in her desire to see the garden. Her ultimate goal is not to take anything over but to go back to her own life (Bryan 24). These pictures, most likely, reflect Carroll's cravings for the purity of society as it was before the mass transformation. This was his way to negate everything that was coming and was accepted by the majority. His works, with no doubt, were of huge importance in the introduction of new literary style and a turning point in children's literature.

Although his anti-imperialistic viewpoints are not recorded in his diary or letters, Carroll was an eccentric bachelor who did not fit into the mainstream Victorian society (ibid 23). The majority of his literary works seem to be focused on caricaturing everything Victorian and whenever we scratch deeper below the surface, we see that his nonsense actually makes a lot of sense.
He was an exquisite mathematician and his literary opus encompasses essays, political pamphlets and poetry ("Lewis Carroll Biography", web).

His Math master at Rugby School, which he attended, once observed:

> "I have not had a more promising boy his age since I came to Rugby".
>
> ("Victorian Web", web)

Peter Rickard wrote how André Breton regarded Carroll as an author of revolt and protest, appealing against the crushing individual by society (Rickard 46).
Richard Lederer describes Carroll and his writing in the following way:

> "Just as Lewis Carroll, an adept amateur magician, made his life a brilliant entertainment through his parlor magic, so, in his writing, he created a magic show of words: words pulled out of hats, words sawed in half, words dancing in the air, words that disappear or show up in strange places and forms."

(Lederer 179)

This quote, perhaps, most adequately describes Lewis Carroll and all that he was and all that he did in the world of literature. He had the ability to create a kaleidoscope of effects through his words, as his writing did not follow any rules or patterns and this mysteriousness of his is what charms children and adults alike even nowadays.

2.2. Wordplay: definition and literary use

Cambridge dictionary defines wordplay as the activity of joking about the meanings of words, especially in an intelligent way ("Cambridge Dictionary", web). Merriam Webster defines it as a playful use of words; verbal wit ("Merriam Webster", web).

On a more profound level, Dirk Delabastita provides definition of wordplay as the general name for the various textual phenomena in which structural features of the language(s) are exploited in order to bring about a communicatively significant confrontation of two (or more) linguistic structures with more or less similar forms and more or less different meanings (Delabastita cited by Jeroen Vandaele 181).

The term closely related to the phenomenon of wordplay is *pun*. Paul Simpson claims it to be one of the most common stylistic devices used for creating humour. In its broadest sense, a pun is a form of wordplay in which some feature of linguistic structure simultaneously combines two unrelated meanings (Simpson 45). Salvatore Attardo explains that puns are not exclusively word-based. Puns involve the presence of (minimally) two senses, but need not involve two 'words' (Attardo 91).

However, the strict distinction between the terms *wordplay* and *pun* is not commonly harmonized among scholars. Thus, some of them observe these two phenomena as interchangeable and synonymous elements (Giorgadze 271).

Giorgadze offers Delabastita's overview of the wordplay, which hereof, can be discussed in its narrow and broad senses. Wordplay in its narrow sense is equal to pun. Discussion of this phenomenon in a broad sense implies wordplay and its categories. According to this, wordplay includes pun, wellerism, spoonerism, anagram, palindrome, onomatopoeia, mondegreen, malapropism, oxymoron, etc. (ibid 272).

On the other hand, focusing on the puns solely, Delabastita divides them into four categories: 1. homonymy (identical sounds and spelling); 2. homophony (identical sounds but different

spellings);   3. homography (different sounds but identical spelling);   4. paronymy (there are slight differences in both spelling and sound) (Delabastita cited by Giorgadze 272).

Chinese scholar Yuan Chuandao provides another perspective on the classification of puns. He emphasizes the importance of context in the process of pun creation. Besides context, the manner of speech and logic play a crucial role, along with the meaning and homophony of the word. Chuandao offers the following classification of puns: 1. homonymic pun (identical sounds and spelling); 2. lexical meaning pun (polysemantic words); 3. understanding pun (implied meaning of a sentence is revealed through the particular context); 4. figurative pun (a simile or a metaphor as its surface meaning and the figurative meaning as its deep meaning); 5. logic pun (a rhetorical device, a kind of implication in a particular context) (Chuandao cited by Giorgadze 273).

Simpson further asserts that pun is an important part of the stylistic arsenal of writers because it allows a controlled 'double meaning' to be located in what is in effect a chance connection between two elements of language (Simpson 45). Whichever the angle, wordplay (and thus punning) enables writers to explore multiple meanings of words and to use them as their devices for creating humorous, witty effects by completely disconnecting form and meaning.

Regardless of the dimension, language can indeed be manipulated, distorted, displaced, and even rendered meaningless, all for the sake of comic purposes. How will a writer manoeuvre and process this verbal expression with a humorous effect? This can be done on all levels of linguistic analysis: from sound to morpheme, from word to sentence, from text to context (Ermida 41).

Giorgadze further explains that, according to its form, wordplay can be expressed in ambiguous verbal wit, orthographic peculiarities, sounds and forms of the words, in breaking the grammar rules and other linguistic factors. Same as Chuandao, she emphasizes the importance of context as a vital factor for the actualization of the wordplay (pun), as its pragmatic role (mainly humorous, satirical, sarcastic, etc) (Giorgadze 271).

The question that imposes itself here is why the concept of context is so important in the phenomenon of wordplay. Attardo illustrates that "all words are ambiguous, vague, or unspecified if they are not taken in context". This means that mere ambiguity is not enough to create a pun.

Furthermore, in words of Attardo, words to be transformed into a pun have to have 'opposed' meanings and the pun itself has to be 'concocted' (Attardo 133). This would mean that puns have to be purposefully created, with a predetermined function in a certain context. Attardo explains how puns have a built-in incongruity: a string activates two unrelated meanings (scripts). This means that mere ambiguity between the two activated meanings generates an incongruity by itself (ibid 99).

 As Simpson simplifies, the theory of incongruity is the concept, which applies more generally to any kind of stylistic twist in a pattern of language or any situation where there is a mismatch between what someone says and what they mean (Simpson 45). Certainly, this seeming lack of harmony between words is what triggers confusion at first, and ultimately causes comic effects, as readers tend to find amusing anything that is out of the ordinary.

 Ermida cites Max Eastman who says that "using words without a keen sense of their logical relations is most humorous," and "bad grammar is good fun." That is why comic writers often take advantage of this and exploit ungrammaticalities, such as blunders of children and non-native speakers who make numerous mistakes while they speak and that is exactly what readers experience as funny (Eastman cited by Ermida 73).

Bearing in mind what has been previously said, a logical path to think about is the category of nonsense or absurd, which largely relies on the use of wordplay and which was a literary domain of Carroll himself. It is closely related to the theory of incongruity, since in the words of Eastman, it consists of the negation of logic but also in the impossibility of solving the incongruity that so often underlies humour, linguistic or otherwise. In fact, nonsense represents an incongruity that is unsolved and cannot be solved - in other words, ''it lacks any sense while feeding on that very lack" (ibid 74).

However, despite of how hard the author tries to bring together what's usually incompatible and yet make it tempting, the major task is on the reader, who has to find out why and how the two things are juxtaposed and what is the message hidden behind the surface. Various cases of semantic and grammatical irregularities show that it is here where the comic pleasure springs: from one's capacity to identify – or configure – where and why the logic fails. Eastman explains that when one re-processes information and overcomes the logical obstacle, one attains 'resolution' and the corresponding interpretive enjoyment (ibid 74).

This revelation which brings humorous and amusing joy to the reader seeks certain amount of sharp-wittedness and comes no easily upon first reading. As Marlene Dolitsky puts it, "nothing would be more erroneous than to believe that all one must do is to nullify normal language conditions to create nonsense" (Dolitsky 10).

This paper will focus on the analysis of wordplay by employing the broader methodological approach. It will illustrate the selected examples of wordplay from the original work, point to their double or hidden meaning that Carroll cleverly rendered and interpret their counterparts in the C/B/S language, concluding whether and to what extent are these successfully transmitted into the target language.

2.3. Translating wordplay: challenges and difficulties

When translating wordplay, one cannot simply rely on mechanical reproduction of the source text into a target language. Every pun is rich in details, double meanings, culture-specific parts and other elements that even the most skilful translators may find challenging for translation. Using Gogol's image, Peter Rickard gives a picturesque description of what an ideal translation should look like, "a pane of glass so transparent that we do not notice it is there, enabling us to see everything that is in the original." He claims that the translator should strive to achieve "exactly the same breadth of interpretation, or even misinterpretation, as the original" (Rickard 63).

Rickard further maintains that no absolute correspondence between the vocabulary, sounds or morphology of the structures of language is possible (ibid. 46). Another difficulty that translators may come across lies in the substandard or unconventional language, most often in the form of dialect or bad grammar. Rickard provides an example where Alice famously exclaims "Curiouser and curiouser!" as a grammar violation which may be a serious obstacle in the translation process (ibid. 48). Numerous ungrammatical language forms, double negatives and other language violations leave the translator to choose how to cope with them. In relation to puns translation, this is even more demanding task.

In his *Focus on the Pun*, Delabastita states how scholars have been divided into those who theoretically argue that no 'real' translation of wordplay can be achieved and those who claim otherwise (Delabastita 223). Édith Félicité Koumtoudji cites Delia Chiaro who states that a literal translation does not necessarily guarantee the rendering of the wordplay, since to translate the wordplay requires a shared code and shared conventions between the source language and the target language (Chiaro cited by Koumtoudji 113).

As a phenomenon inevitably connected with the notion of humour, wordplay may appear as pretty troublesome type of text to translate. Humour is primarily characterized as subjective perception in accordance to one's personal preference, intellect and point of view. What one may find very funny, another may not experience as funny at all.

As in the words of Lopez "translators need to be aware of the way in which the ST author manipulates his/her readers' cognitive frames to create a humorous effect", which is an uneasy task, even for the most proficient translators. (Rojo Lopez cited by Koumtoudji 36)

In his work, Rickard cites Henri Parisot, one of the most successful translators of *Alice*, who says that a translator "would have to be a genius, a first-rate punster, and moreover a psychoanalyst subtle enough to capture every fine shade of a text whose every word may reflect a subconscious intention of the author." Very often, this implies extensive and meticulous work, which is not always well-appreciated (Parisot cited by Rickard 63).

Being an uncommon and a peculiar writer whose language and logic are constantly called into question, Carroll has ever since been a dare for translators. His language is everything but conventional; his readers are regularly left with their own imagination to interpret the text; his wordplay requires culture-specific knowledge. The question that imposes itself here is whether Lewis Carroll can be translated.

Rickard creates a paradox by stating, "Lewis Carroll is untranslatable, and everywhere he has been translated" (ibid. 45) Bearing in mind the fact that Carroll is among the most translated authors in the world, this triggers confusion and opens many doors for exploration. Rickard uses Sutherland's presentation of the most conspicuous aspects of Carroll's interest in language.

These include "firstly, ingenuity in coining portmanteau words; secondly, extensive word-play and literalism, used to exploit the frequent illogicality of conventional utterance; thirdly, pronouncements on the arbitrary nature of meaning; and lastly the realization that a familiar morphology and structure may impart to lexical gibberish an illusion of sense" (ibid. 54 – 55).

In the same abovementioned work, Delabastita opens several questions, such as whether is it actually possible to pin down the meaning of the source text and to what extent. He questions if a translation can unearth new meanings in the source text and so become constitutive of it, as well

as the impossibility of achieving semantic equivalence between source texts and target texts (Delabastita 225).

In his opinion, the main obstacle for translators is "the fact that the semantic and pragmatic effects of source-text wordplay find their origin in particular structural characteristics of the source language part, such as the existence of certain homophones, near-homophones, poly-semic clusters, idioms or grammatical rules". The task is, then, on the translator, who has to utilize all the linguistic resources available and thus manage to manoeuvre the original idea of the wordplay to the readers (ibid. 223).

In his other work, *There's a Double Tongue*, Delabastita offers several techniques for translating wordplay, maintaining that it is not necessary to exclusively use one of them, but it would be optimal for a translator to combine those as needed (Delabastita 1993, 191). These techniques will be used as the criteria for the analysis of puns translation in the work that is a subject of interest in this paper.

 The first technique, called pun > pun, assumes that a target text contains a suitable counterpart as the source text pun. The target text pun may, or may not, be based on the same type of structural properties, the same formal structure or the same semantic organization as the source text pun. Thus, if the source text pun relies on certain phonological, lexical or grammatical basis, the same basis may not be found in the target text pun (ibid. 192 – 193).

Delabastita maintains that translators also opt for pun > non-pun technique, which represents the opposite of the afore-mentioned one, i.e. the target text does not contain an appropriate pun as the one used in the source text. In such cases, he differentiates three subcategories: non-selective non-pun where both possible meanings of the wordplay are being translated, but none results in a pun; selective non-pun where translator selects and translates (more or less equivalently) one of the possible meanings from the source text, while disregarding the other one; diffuse paraphrase which assumes all the remaining cases and where appropriate target text pun cannot be find, but the translational solution contains certain semantic elements from the source text (ibid. 202 – 206).

Another translation technique is called pun > punoid, for which Delabastita introduced his own term *punoid*, aiming to "label the cognate phenomena or borderline cases that have clear affinities with wordplay but whose membership to this category is nevertheless uncertain or actually excluded for any one of a wide range of reasons" (ibid. 56). Therefore, the translator uses various wordplay-related rhetorical devices in order to recreate the effect of a pun from the source text (ibid. 207).

The translator may simply delete the source text fragment containing wordplay, which will hence not be included in the target text. Delabastita calls this technique pun>zero (ibid. 209).

Delabastita lists the technique of direct copy where the translator does not adapt source text wordplay to the target text context, but rather leaves it unchanged, "without actually 'translating' it" (ibid. 210). On the other hand, transference technique means translating by transferring the meaning of wordplay and all its parts into the target language, so the essence of the wordplay can be gathered from the target text. The main difference between these two, as he further explains, is that the direct copy technique puts focus on the *signifier*, whereas transference focuses the *signified* (ibid. 211 – 212).

Addition (non-pun>pun) is the technique which applies when "the [target text] contains wordplay in a passage that is obviously meant as a translational solution to a [source text] passage that features no wordplay" (ibid. 215). As the name itself implies, adding wordplay is usually a way to compensate for the other examples of wordplay that were lost in translation.

Finally, the last set of translation techniques includes editorial techniques. Delabastita describes them as "compensatory opportunities" which enable the translator to reflect and comment the text, with an aim of clarifying certain part of the text. Editorial techniques comprise various commentaries, endnotes, footnotes, explanations marked with brackets, etc. (ibid. 218).

3. CORPUS ANALYSIS

The focus of the paper's core part will be the analysis of twelve examples of wordplay found in the original book *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. The selection of the following puns is arbitrary and mostly includes well-known examples of Carroll's wordplay.

(1)   - „Ahem!" said the Mouse with an important air, „are you all ready? This is the <u>driest</u> thing I know. Silence all around, if you please!

C/B/S translation:

- Hm! –nakašlja se Miš značajno. – Jeste li se smjestili? Održaću vam jedno <u>suvoparno</u> predavanje. Molim da budete savršeno mirni!

To put the pun in the context, the above-mentioned line including an example of wordplay refers to the part where the Mouse tries to literally dry himself and the other animals which were all wet because they found themselves swimming in the lake of Alice's tears.
 He does so by telling the *driest* story he knows. This is an example of homonymic pun, where a word has the same pronounciation and/or spelling, but the meaning is different. The adjective *dry* is used with an allusion to its second, nonliteral meaning, which is something that is dull, uninteresting or lacks excitement.

The translator opted for a suitable counterpart pun into the target language text by keeping the same root of the word and using the word *suvoparno*, which in the target language signifies something that is monotonous and unvaried. Thus, the pun is maintained in the target text on the same lexical basis as is it presented in the original text.

(2)   *- „Mine is a long and a sad <u>tale</u>! said the Mouse, turning to Alice, and sighing.*
„It is a long <u>tail</u>, certainly," said Alice, looking down with wonder at the Mouse's tail; „but why do you call it sad?"

C/B/S translation:

> *- <u>Priča</u> mi je tužna i dugačka kao <u>rep</u>! – uzdahnu Miš i okrete se Alisi.*
>
> *Bogme, imaš dugačak rep – reče Alisa, pa mu u čudu pogleda rep. – Ali zašto kažeš da je tužan?*

The source text pun is an excellent instance of homophonic pun and relies on the identical pronounciation of the words *tale* and *tail*, which otherwise have no other linguistic properties in common. Carroll skilfully used this homophony to create confusion where Alice wonders how the *tail* can be sad, failing to grasp that it refers to the *tale*.

In the target text, there is an omission of the wordplay. Both of the words comprising a pun in the source text are translated into the target text, yet they do not attain any resemblance on formal, structural, phonological, lexical or any other level and hence confusion present in the source text is missing in the target text.

Jovanović employs the technique that Delabastita names diffuse paraphrase, where the translation consists certain semantic elements from the source text, but no punning is achieved. This sudden comparison of words *priča* and *rep* in the target text may cause disorientation among readers who are not familiar with the original text pun.

> (3) - „I beg your pardon," said Alice very humbly: „you had got to the fifth
> bend, I think"
> „I had <u>not</u>!" cried the Mouse, sharply and very angrily.
> „A <u>knot</u>!" said Alice, always ready to make herself useful, and looking
> anxiously about her.
> „Oh, do let me help to undo it!"

C/B/S translation:

> *- Oprosti mi, - odgovori Alisa vrlo ponizno.*
> *- Došao si do petog zavijutka, je li?*

- Baš si <u>namćor</u>? – dreknu Miš ljutito.

- Imaš <u>čvor</u>? – uzviknu Alisa, uvijek gotova da svakome pritekne u pomoć,
i zabrinuto pogleda oko sebe. – O, daj da ti pomognem da ga razdriješiš!

This is another example of homophonic pun in the source text. The words *not* and *knot* are pronounced identically, yet these are different in meaning. In the target text, the translator tries to recreate the pun by introducing the word *namćor* which he combines with the word *čvor* (knot), aiming to achieve rhyming. However, if one does a back translation of the word *namćor,* which in English would be a grump, a grumpy person, it can be concluded that this attempt rather results in, what Delabastita calls, punoid.

(4)   *- "You see the earth takes twenty-four hours to turn round on its <u>axis</u>-"*
"Talking of <u>axes</u>", said the Duchess, "chop off her head!"

C/B/S translation:

- Vidite, zemlji je potrebno dvadeset i četiri časa da se obrne oko svoje
ose, pa bi to moglo da nas <u>sjekira</u>...
- Kad si već pomenula <u>sjekiru</u> – prekide je Vojvotkinja – odrubi joj glavu!

Here is another example of homonymy based on the words *axes* and *axis* which have the same pronunciation, but have completely unrelated meanings and origins. Still, this probably was not such a challenge for the translator, since he successfully took advantage of the C/B/S homonym *sjekira*, whose meaning in English language as a noun is an axe and as a verb it means to be anxious or worried about something. Hence, the Duchess' command to chop off Alice's head could be easily understood in both source and target text.

(5)   *- „It's a mineral, I think," said Alice.*
„Of course it is," said the Duchess, who seemed ready to agree to everything that Alice said; „there's a large <u>mustard-mine</u> near here. And the moral of that is - 'The more there is of <u>mine</u>, the less there is of yours.'"

C/B/S translation:

> *- Misliš da je ruda – nastavi Alisa.*
> *- Dabogme da je – potvrdi Vojvotkinja, nekako gotova da se saglasi sa svim što Alisa kaže. – Nedaleko odavde je veliki rudnik iz koga <u>vade</u> senf, a pouka iz toga je: „Što više <u>vadim</u> sebi, to manje ostaje tebi".*

The source text pun could be found in the two words of the same pronounciation and spelling, but different meaning: *mine* as a noun refers to an excavation in the earth for extracting coal or other minerals, whereas *mine* as a pronoun refers to a person or thing signifying belonging.

To recreate this example of homonymy in the target text was quite a challenge, so the translator opted for transfering the pun to another pair of words having the same root, *vade – vadim*, a verb meaning to extract something, which might have a connotation to the word *mine* as a noun. The translator focused on transmitting the essence of the pun and one might gather it from the target text, yet the result is something what, according to Delabastita, could be classified as a punoid.

> (6) *- "The master was an old Turtle – we used to call him Tortoise – "*
> *"Why did you call him Tortoise, if he wasn't one?" Alice asked.*
> *"We called him <u>Tortoise</u>, because he <u>taught us</u>," said the Mock Turtle angrily; "really you are very dull!"*

C/B/S translation:

> *- Učitelj nam je bio jedna stara kornjača... zvali smo ga Kornjuča...*
> *- Zašto ste ga zvali <u>Kornjuča</u>, kad je bio kornjača? – upita Alisa.*
> *- Zato što je bio naš <u>uča</u> – ljutnu se Lažna Kornjača. – Ti si zbilja vrlo tupava!*

Carroll makes an excellent play on words by exploiting very similar pronunciations of the words *Tortoise* and *taught us*, whereby the verb to teach (past tense taught) connotes to a noun master, a synonym word for a teacher, also included in this puzzle of double meanings. This was, obviously, a perfect implication for Jovanović to utilize what Delabastita names a transference

technique, since the message of the source text pun can be clearly understood in the target text as well.

Namely, he translated word *Tortoise* by using a slightly changed, coined word – *Kornjuča*, which contains the word he used to translate the second part of the original pun – *uča*, which in C/B/S language is a nice way to address *učitelj* (teacher). Thus, a partial homophony is achieved in the target text and it results in a favorable adaptation of the source text pun.

> (7) - *"I couldn't afford to learn it,"* said the Mock Turtle with a sigh. *"I only took the regular course."*
> *"What was that?"* enquired Alice.
> *"<u>Reeling and Writhing</u>, of course, to begin with,"* the Mock Turtle replied: *"and then the different branches of Arithmetic – <u>Ambition, Distraction, Uglification, and Derision.</u>"*

C/B/S translation:

> - *Ja to nijesam ni učila – odgovori Lažna Kornjača uzdahnuvši. – Učila sam samo obavezne predmete.*
> - *A koji su to? – upita Alisa.*
> - *<u>Ritanje i puzanje</u>, naravno, u prvom redu; a zatim razne grane računice: <u>zdravlje, odupiranje, gloženje i krozenje</u>.*

This excerpt includes two puns. The first one represents an allusion to reading and writing as school subjects, whereby Carroll used the verbs to reel, meaning to lose one's balance and stagger and to writhe, meaning to make continual movements or twisting of the body. The translator successfully managed to transfer Carroll's wittiness into the target text by using the verbs *ritanje* and *puzanje*, which in C/B/S bear the same phonological resemblance to the verbs alluded to in the source text: *čitanje* and *pisanje*. Hence this creative play on words is not lost in the process of translation.

On the other hand, it is quite questionable whether the meaning of the second pun is conveyed into the target text. Original text abounds with Carroll's brilliant linguistic allusions that hint to four branches of arithmetic: all of them share the same endings with the words insinuated at, i.e. those typical for nouns in English language. Jovanović was most likely led by the same idea, however the reader might be disoriented with his choice of the word *zdravlje* (back translation: health) standing for ambition, which bears no semantic closeness to the word implied to.

The remaining three words are less confusing as they are morphologically similar to the names of three arithmetic branches in C/B/S/ as well as semantically, as one may easily gather Carroll's derogatory use of words to criticise the Victorian era. Finally, the translational solution will be classified as a punoid, rather than suitable punning.

(8)   - *"That's the reason they are called <u>lessons</u>," the Gryphon remarked: "because they <u>lessen</u> from day to day."*

C/B/S translation:

- *Zato se i zovu <u>predavanja</u> – objasni Grifon,*
- *Jer se svakom danu <u>preda</u> po jedan čas.*

Paronymy includes words that are similar in pronunciation and spelling, but are different in meaning. The following pun is a paronymic one, whereat words *lessons* and *lessen* are brought together due to their similarity in the two abovementioned features, yet they share no connection when it comes to meaning. Here, to put the pun into context, Gryphon explains why he used to spend so little time at school he attended; it is because the lessons were reducing in number, i.e. they were lessening.

Jovanović utilizes transference by using one possible C/B/S counterpart of the noun *lesson – predavanje*, just before introducing the verb *predavati* (*preda*) from which the noun itself is derived. In C/B/S, the verb *predavati* means to educate, teach or profess, but it is also a continuous form of the verb to hand over, which implies that something is being decreased. Therefore, the essence of the pun could be understood from the target text.

(9)   - „And what are they made of" Alice asked in a tone of great curiosity.
„*Soles* and *eels*, of course" the Gryphon replied rather impatiently: any shrimp could have told you that."

C/B/S translation:

- *A od čega je obuća u moru? – upita Alisa vrlo ljubopitljivo.*
- *Od cipola i sardela, zna se, - odgovori Grifon nestrpljivo. – To bi ti i svaki morski konj rekao.*

In this fragment, another paronymic pun relies on the double meaning of the word *sole*, which could be both a part of a shoe and a type of a flatfish, as well as the word *eels*, whose meaning is primarily connected to a type of fish, but the similarity in pronounciation with the word *heels* brings about the implied meaning related to shoes.

The translator opts for a very lucrative solution here by using the words signifying two types of fish in the target language, *cipol* and *sardela*, thus staying in the same thematic framework of the marine world, but also manages to give a hint to shoes, by the similarity of pronounciation, whereby *cipol* hints to *cipela* (a shoe) and *sardela* hints to *sandala* (a sandal). The paronymic nature of the pun is thus preserved in the target text.

(10)   - *"They were obliged to have him with them," the Mock Turtle said: "no wise fish would go anywhere without a porpoise."*
"Wouldn't it really?" said Alice in a tone of great surprise.
"Of course not," said the Mock Turtle: "why, if a fish came to me, and told me he was going a journey, I should say 'With what porpoise?' "
"Don't you mean 'purpose'?" said Alice.

C/B/S translation:

- *Ribica je morala da ide s jastogom – opet će Lažna Kornjača. – Nijedna pametna ribica neće nikuda bez jastoga.*
- *Je l' istina? – začuđeno će Alisa.*

- Dabome da neće! – potvrdi Lažna Kornjača. – Da neka ribica dođe k meni i kaže da ide na put, ja bih je odmah pitala: „Imaš li <u>jastoga</u> za put?"

- Valjda si htjela da kažeš „<u>razloga</u>"? – ispravi je Alisa.

Here, punning is achieved on the basis of similar pronunciation of the words *porpoise* and *purpose*, which are completely different in meaning and spelling. They do not belong to the same semantic field and as such are a dare for the translator.

Jovanović opted for Delabastita's selective non-pun technique: the word *porpoise* is translated as *jastog* (back translation: lobster), which means that he remained under the same semantic umbrella of the sea world. The juxtaposed word *purpose* is translated as *razlog*, which is one of the possible varieties of the literal translation of word *svrha*. Thus, no actual pun is recreated in the target text, although the translator probably strived to achieve wordplay on the homophonic level of the words *jastog – razlog*.

(11)   *„Thank you", said Alice, "it's very interesting. I never knew so much about a <u>whiting</u> before."*

"I can tell you more than that, if you like," said the Gryphon. "Do you know why it's called a whiting?"

"I never thought about it," said Alice.

"Why"?

"It does the boots and shoes," the Gryphon replied very solemnly.

Alice was thoroughly puzzled. "Does the boots and shoes!" she repeated in a wondering tone.

"Why, what are your shoes done with?" said the Gryphon. "I mean, what makes them so shiny?"

Alice looked down at them, and considered a little before she gave her answer. "They're done with blacking, I believe."

"Boots and shoes under the sea," the Gryphon went on in a deep voice, "are done with <u>whiting</u>. Now you know."

C/B/S translation:

> *- Hvala, odgovori Alisa – to je vrlo zanimljivo. Sad mnogo više znam o <u>ribicama</u>.*
>
> *- Mogu ti ispričati i više o njima, ako hoćeš – reče Grifon. – Znaš li zašto se zovu ribice?*
>
> *- Nikada nijesam razmišljala o tome – odgovori Alisa. –Zašto?*
>
> *- Zato što čiste obuću – odgovori Grifon vrlo ozbiljno.*
>
> *Alisa je bila sasvim zbunjena.*
>
> *- Čiste obuću? – ponovi začuđeno.*
>
> *- E, čime ti čistiš svoje cipele? – upita Grifon. – Mislim, od čega su tako sjajne?*
>
> *Alisa pogleda svoje cipele, malo se zamisli, pa na kraju odgovori:*
>
> *- Valjda zato što ih četkam.*
>
> *- A obuća u moru – nastavi Grifon muklo, - riba se. <u>Ribaju</u> je ribice. Sad znaš!*

In this example, Carroll juxtaposes two words of opposite meanings, but the notion he aims to render here is the marine world rather than the contrast between the black and white colours. Namely, the noun *whiting*, as a type of marine fish, bears resemblance in both pronunciation and spelling to the gerund *whiting,* meaning to make white or to bleach. He thus achieves a homonymic pun by bringing together a type of fish and the act of cleaning boots and shoes.

In the target text, the translator preserves the pun, although he does not include the primary meaning of the word *blacking*; rather, he opts for the word *četkam* (infinitive form: četkati; back translation: to brush) which does convey the same message: making shoes shiny. Yet, the actual pun is achieved by using the word *ribaju* (infinitive form: ribati; back translation: to rub), which has the same root as the word *riba* (fish) in the target text, so the essence of the original pun can be gathered from the translation, even though the focus is on the signified, which is typical for the transference technique applied here.

(12)   *"But I don't understand. Where did they draw the treacle from?"*

"You can draw water out of a water-well," said the Hatter; "so I should think you could draw treacle out of a treacle-well – eh, stupid?"

"But they were in the <u>well</u>," Alice said to the Dormouse, not choosing to notice this last remark.

"Of course they were," said the Dormouse, - "<u>well</u> in."

C/B/S translation:

- Ali, meni to nije jasno. Kako su mogle da slikaju sirupom?

- Da su bile u bunaru s vodom, slikale bi vodenim bojama – umiješa se Šeširdžija opet. – Prema tome čini mi se da se u bunaru sa sirupom može slikati samo sirupovim bojama!.. Je li tako, glupačo?

- Ali, sirup se <u>lijepi</u> – Alisa će Puhu, praveći se kao da uopšte nije ni čula šta je Šeširdžija rekao.

- Naravno – odgovori Puh. – I one su bile mnogo <u>lijepe</u>.

To make a pun understandable, during a mad-tea party, the Dormouse tells a story of three little sisters who lived at the bottom of a well or, as he later adds, the bottom of a treacle-well and who were learning to draw and they did so by using the treacle.

The original pun is contained within a word *well*, which is primarily used as a noun meaning a deep hole in the ground containing water, and later is used as an adverb, meaning in a good, satisfactory way. Here, the word *well* functions as a homophone, i.e. has the same spelling and pronunciation, but appears with both of the possible meanings, thus creating a wordplay in which Alice states that the three aforementioned sisters are inside of the well, while the Dormouse confirms that they are pretty much fine, or well, inside of it.

This game of words is not preserved in the target text; however, the translator tried to include another pun which would compensate for the original one. In the target text, the focus is transferred to the verb *lijepi* (infinitive form: lijepiti se; back translation: to stick together) and an

adjective *lijepe* (back translation: beautiful). The translator achieves a pun on a completely different level, focusing on the treacle, which is sticky, rather than the word *well*. The solution he opted for results in what Delabastita would call a punoid; the reader of the target text could certainly grasp a pun that the translator included, yet it does not seem to be a corresponding play on words as the one found in the source text.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the conducted analysis, it can be undoubtedly said that Lewis Carroll was quite a challenge for those who have been translating his books. Literary nonsense, the absence of physical and any other laws, modern critique directed towards everything that was presented as positive and yet it was not, are just a few of the many peculiarities of his style.

Speaking of the translation by Zoran Jovanović, which has been a focus of interest in this paper, following conclusions can be made: in the majority of examples analysed and those that were included in the research phase, the translator managed to transmit the essence of the original play on words into the target text; the translator used multiple techniques aimed at achieving credible puns which bear the same nature as the ones in the original book; minor part of the examples including puns appear as omitted or ill-adapted wordplay into the target language, mainly due to the peculiarity of Carroll's language and culturally specific elements used in the *Alice* tales.

At some points, it was impossible to reproduce the same play on words from the source text into the target text, or even to stay within the same lexical framework. Literal translation in most of the cases is useless effort, while adapting the pun to the target text background may imply that the translator introduces 'new' words that cannot be found in the source text, what often may impact a loss of the original idea from the source text. Similarly, some puns may simply be omitted due to the impossibility of the translator to find a corresponding counterpart in the target language, so new puns are included to compensate for those which are lost in translation.

Carroll's writing style is an impeccable example of how one can manipulate language and bring it to completely different meaning than the one which appears on the surface. His savvy ability to write a satire of one society and to do so through a children's book illustrates the magnitude of his being an unprecedented writer and, as such, his language could be anything but plain. It abounds with symbolism, numerous allusions, nonsense and hidden meanings. His manipulation of language is achieved on multiple levels: phonological, lexical and grammatical alike.

Yet, this is the book that changed the dogma of the time that everything that is written has to follow specific rules. Carroll wrote to entertain, both younger and older. Perhaps, the parody that

he portrays is targeted towards the latter ones, as children are being depicted as innocent and pure, still unaware of the corrupted world that awaits.

That being said, where does it leave a translator who wants to come to grips with this book? They have to deal with the unconventional language, intentional violations of grammar and slips of the tongue, culturally specific humour rendering and many other peculiarities that characterize Carroll's literary opus. Translators are often left with non-existence of adequate counterparts in the target language that would appropriately transfer the message from the original. Carroll's coined words are almost impossible to translate and even if one tries to do so, it is questionable whether the same extent of creativity, expressiveness and meaningfulness can be achieved.

Without doubt, to be able to translate any kind of text into any world language, to be fluent in the two languages is just a first step. One has to be familiar with the cultural, historical, geographical and many other aspects that are specific for the text in question. This is especially true for Carroll. Nothing is as it appears on the surface and the translator has to arm oneself with the facts and knowledge about him, his style and the period of time in which the particular book is written.

Again, literal translation leads the translator nowhere and it is crucial to go beyond it. It certainly is an uneasy task to, firstly, decipher multiple layers of meaning, then, secondly, to explore and opt for the best possible translational solution which will, hopefully, contain the same idea(s) and connotative meanings, with regard to the cultural background of the time, Carroll's brilliant use of sarcasm and unique style of writing. Finally, all of this has to be adapted in a way to be readable for the children, since, after all *Alice* is a children's fairy tale.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources:

Carroll, Lewis. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. Chicago, Illinois: Volume One Publishing, 1998.

Carroll, Lewis. *Alisa u zemlji čuda*. Podgorica: Narodna knjiga, 2007.

Secondary sources:

Ambrosiani, Per. *A Russian Tail? On the Translation of Puns in Lewis Carroll's Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. Stockholm: Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis, 2010.

Attardo, Salvatore. *Universals in puns and humorous wordplay*. Boston: De Gruyter, 2018.

Bakewell, Michael. *Lewis Carroll: A Biography*. Mandarin, 1996.

Bryan, Amanda. *Alice's Struggle with Imperialism: Undermining the British Empire through Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* in the Final Chapters: Concluding Papers of The Journal of Children's Literature Studies. London: Wizard's Tower Press, 2013.

Delabastita, Dirk. *Focus on the Pun: Wordplay as a Special Problem in Translation Studies.* Target, 1994.

Delabastita, Dirk. *There's a Double Tongue - An Investigation into the Translation of Shakespeare's Wordplay, With Special Reference to Hamlet.* Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi B.V.,1993.

Dolitsky, Marlene. *Under the Tumtum Tree: From Nonsense to Sense, A Study in Non-automatic Comprehension.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1984.

Ermida, Isabel. *The Language of Comic Narratives*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.

Garrett, Craig. *A Wonderland of Possible Words*. University of Canberra, 2008.

Giorgadze, Meri. *Linguistic Features of Pun, Its Typology and Classification*. European Scientific Journal, 2014.

Herman, David. *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

House, Juliane. *Translation as Communication across Languages and Cultures*. London and New York: Routledge, 2016.

Hurford, James R. Heasley, Brendan. Smith, Michael B. *Semantics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Ivanovska, Sandra. *Puns in Alice in Wonderland and Their Equivalents in Macedonian*. Skopje: Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, Journal of Contemporary Philology, 2020.

Koumtoudji, Édith Félicité. *Translating Alice in Wonderland for Different Audiences through the Years.* Johannesburg, 2012.

Lederer, Richard. *The Word Magic of Lewis Carroll.* Word Ways, Vol.43, 2010.

Maier, Christin. *Lewis Carroll, Alice in Wonderland as a Work of Nonsense Fiction,* Munich: GRIN Verlag, 2010.

Partington, Alan Scott. *A Linguistic Account of Wordplay: The Lexical Grammar of Punning.* Italy: University of Bologna, 2008.

Purchase, Sean. *Key Concepts in Victorian Literature*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Rickard, Peter. *Alice in France or Can Lewis Carroll Be Translated?.* Penn State University Press, 1975.

Simpson, Paul. *Stylistics*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Simpson, Paul. *On the Discourse of Satire: Towards a Stylistic Model of Satirical Humour.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2003.

Vandaele, Jeroen. *Wordplay in Translation*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2011.

Warren, Austin. *Carroll and His Alice Books*. Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1996.

Web sources:

Cambridge Online Dictionary. Date accessed: February 13, 2022.
https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/wordplay

Charles Lutwidge Dodgson (Lewis Carroll): A Brief Biography. Victorian Web, Nov. 2004.
Date accessed: January 10, 2021. https://victorianweb.org/authors/carroll/bio1.html

*Lewis Carroll Biography.*The Biography. A&E Television Networks, 2014. Date accessed:
August 29, 2021. https://www.biography.com/writer/lewis-carroll

Merriam Webster Online Dictionary. Date accessed: February 13, 2022.
https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/wordplay