

# A Study on Translation Strategies for Wordplay: Comparing Two Korean Translations of *Alice*

Yoon, So-Young  
(Konkuk Univ.)

## 1. Introduction

Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* (1866) has had countless and diverse readers ranging from children to adults since its publication. This formation of dual readership may reflect the importance and value of *Alice* as classic literature. Moreover, the fact that its numerous translations can be found in various languages indicates not only steady interest and fondness from world-wide readers but also its significance as a literary text to translators and researchers. Language use in *Alice* is often distinctive and multi-leveled for both children and adults. Creativity and artistic inventiveness in form and content may appeal to literary tastes of both groups of reader. Dual readership

of this text can be ensured by literary originality and imagination.

What is noteworthy is that the dynamic use of language in *Alice* proves to be a rich area for linguistic analysis. Reading *Alice* could be a challenge since the text abounds with linguistic and stylistic devices such as wordplay which can produce ambivalence of the text. Moreover, the textual density and exquisiteness of *Alice* allows a choice of particular stylistic features for analysis: in case of this paper it is wordplay. An analysis of different types of wordplay may show differences between form and meaning.

In addition to its literary value, *Alice* is a valuable source of linguistic features that are particularly relevant to translation. Translation involves at least two languages. Therefore, language differences can lead to some shifts in wordplay as well as some difficulties to be solved. One such difficulty is translatability. The objective of this analysis is to study how to understand and interpret wordplay in a different cultural and linguistic context. Thus, it will be of significance to explore whether wordplay can be translatable or not.

In essence, similarity of sound in wordplay can generate laughter since a word may be understood as a different word which has similar sounds. In other words, wordplay can create some confusion between words of similar sounds. This phenomenon makes wordplay interesting and significant. In practice, translating wordplay into the target language (TL) encounters a variety of difficulties because of linguistic and socio-cultural differences between source language (SL) and TL. Translatability of wordplay is linked to language differences and restrictions.

According to the strategies of individual translators, wordplay can be translated in many different ways. This research will investigate how Korean translators translate wordplay with a view of revealing linguistic differences between SL and TL. In particular, linguistic differences between English and Korean could display to what extent wordplay can be translatable and how different its forms and meanings are in both languages. In addition, translation strategies used by Korean translators are important in revealing how wordplay

was translated.

As in many other countries, there are more than forty *Alice* translations in Korea. Several ST-oriented complete translations of *Alice*, apart from many simplified versions, exist. For several reasons two Korean translations published since 2001 were chosen for analysis. Firstly, these two translations were produced by professional translators; secondly, they are on the list of the most highly recommended books suggested by Kyobo Books, which is the largest and most representative bookstore in Korea. Moreover, these translations are appropriate for investigation since they are full translations. Unlike some others, these translations cover faithfully all the sentences of the content, and do not simplify the text.

The main focus of this paper will be on how wordplay has been translated into Korean and what strategies for translating wordplay have been applied by translators. In order to investigate how the two translators managed to close a linguistic gap between the two languages, translators' selection criteria for translation strategies will have to be identified and described. Therefore, this paper deals with translation strategies for wordplay in practice. Two Korean translations will be compared with emphasis on many examples of *Alice*. By comparing different translated versions, different approaches to translating wordplay will be revealed.

## 2. What is Wordplay?

Wordplay in *Alice* is a stylistic device which creates distinct peculiarity of its literary language. Wordplay is a literary device that can make confusion between sound and spelling. This phenomenon can be explained by “what words are said to do to the ear” (Culler 1988: 13). That is, words are saying something different, but their likeness of sounds evoke disparate words. In this

respect, wordplay creates a humorous effect. According to Delabastita, wordplay can be defined as “a characteristic combination of differences of meaning and likeness of form” (1993: 57). Also, wordplay can be said to involve some degree of ambiguity. Ambiguity in sounds may cause some confusion in accepting meanings of words.

Delabastita identifies four kinds of wordplay: homonymy, homophony, homography, and paronymy (1993: 80, 1996: 128). His emphasis is upon the contrast between linguistic structures and different meanings arising from their formal similarity. That is, wordplay can indicate how disparate meanings co-occur and what effect this co-occurrence has on meaning and form.

First, homonymy consists of identical sounds and spellings; second, in homophony there exist identical sounds but different spellings; third, homography is associated with different sounds but identical spellings; and last, paronymy has slight differences between both sound and spelling. Furthermore, he divides puns into two linguistic structures of vertical and horizontal wordplay. “In vertical wordplay, there can be some clash of co-present association, whereas horizontal wordplay is related to contiguity in the text” (Delabastita 1996: 128).

In terms of their formal organization, the following table shows a typology of puns:

Table 1 Types of Wordplay

	Homonymy	Homophony	Homography	Paronymy
	=sound =spelling	=sound ≠ spelling	≠ sound =spelling	≠ sound ≠ spelling
Vertical	pyromania: a burning passion	wedding belles	MessAge name of rap band	Come in for a faith lift
Horizontal	Carry on dancing Carried to the top	Counsel for Council home buyers	How the US put US to shame	It's G.B. for the Beegees

(Delabastita 1996: 128)

Similarity of pronunciation can evoke different interpretation and understanding between homophonic and paronymic words. Homonymy is relatively easy to recognize but is almost impossible to translate into TL. Homophony can be found in mixture of foreign and vernacular words; for example, 'belle' and 'bell' have the same sounds but the meanings are totally different. Interestingly, homophony can be created when borrowing words are applied to occurrence of wordplay.

In homophony translators can interpret the intention of the author, however, words which have similar sounds cannot be easily adopted. If imitating sound itself can produce the same effect, it cannot be called a translating activity but just conveying the sound images. In case of homography, translators may decide to translate it literally in spite of loss of forms. Paronymy may be the most difficult part for non-native translators because slight difference of letters and sound can be very elusive in translation.

In this respect, can wordplay be translatable? Translatability of wordplay is linked with translators' competence. If translators can find solution through their skill or sheer luck, the texture of original wordplay will be retained. If not, loss and gain replace the wordplay of the original. Therefore, what strategies for translating wordplay can be applied is the core to interpret and appreciate in the process of translating wordplay. Therefore, it is necessary to explore in more depth different strategies for translating wordplay to identify the most common and successful techniques applied by translators.

### 3. Translation Strategies for Wordplay

In this chapter the actual examples of wordplay in the TT will be investigated and compared. The principal aim of this chapter is to explore how wordplay has been translated into Korean and what strategies for translating wordplay in *Alice* are applied. A comparison between SL and TL can reveal

linguistic differences between two languages.

Bassnet argues that “translation involves the transfer of ‘meaning’ contained in one set of language signs into another set of language signs through competent use of the dictionary and grammar, the process involves a whole set of extra-linguistic criteria also” (2002: 21). That is, transference from one language into another should incorporate all aspects of the interlinguistic and intralinguistic elements which are related to a text. In particular, every language has its own peculiarity and is composed of form and meaning.

Neubert and Shreve emphasize that “the translation situation always determines the set of translation strategies to be used” (1992: 5). In this respect, translators’ decision plays an important role as to the degree and nature of change to the content and form of a translation.

### 3.1 Categories of Translation Strategies

Baker (1992) deals with problems of achieving equivalence in translation in a comprehensive way. Although she does not mention strategies for translating wordplay, her suggestions for dealing with different types of equivalence could be applied to analysing translation strategies while dealing with wordplay. Baker categorises translation strategies in terms of equivalence (1992) at different levels. For instance, equivalence at word level can be achieved through eight strategies as follows:

- (a) Translation by a more general word (superordinate)
- (b) Translation by a more neutral/ less expressive word
- (c) Translation by cultural substitution
- (d) Translation using a loan word or loan word plus explanation
- (e) Translation by paraphrase using a related word
- (f) Translation by paraphrase using unrelated words
- (g) Translation by omission

(h) Translation by illustration

(Baker 1992: 26-42).

Translation strategies mentioned above are based on linguistic and cultural differences between SL and TL. When translators cannot find any corresponding words or expressions in the TL, it will be acceptable to adopt more general or neutral words or phrases. Using cultural substitution and explanation will be appropriate for explaining exotic elements in the ST. Paraphrasing might be called 'active' translation since paraphrased expressions help the TT readers understand the difficult clausal meaning of the ST. However, paraphrasing is not always desirable when it may lead to distortion of the original meaning or disintegration of coherence in the whole text.

Omission is the last resort and it is not recommended for translating literary texts. In literary texts every sentence needs to be reproduced in order to savor the originality of the ST. Translation of literary texts should be more accurate than other non-literary texts since literary texts tend to use emotive languages. Therefore, translating literary texts may need more efforts and skills.

In sum, following Baker's classification, translation strategies can be as follows:

1. Literal translation
2. Translation by cultural substitution
3. Translation with explanation
4. Translation by paraphrase
5. Translation by omission
6. Translation by compensation

In particular, her approaches to various levels of language and text, from words to cultural contexts, can provide a fundamental key for translating activities. A combination of theoretical approaches and practical applications

can be adopted in translating every text. In this chapter, the strategies employed by Korean translators are the most important thing to discuss. In practice, for translating wordplay the two Korean translators apply literal translation and translation with explanation in general. This will be discussed in terms of domestication and foreignization.

Translating wordplay has different aspects from other linguistic characteristics. In spite of different language systems between two languages, similar linguistic problems including syntactic and semantic disparity can be pointed out. For instance, the possibility for realizing similarity of sound in the TT is very rare. However, it is not impossible to represent wordplay in translated versions. In Korean, for example, due to high occurrence of homonymy and homophony, wordplay can frequently occur. That is, using homonymy can be one of the effective ways of creating wordplay since there are many words which have the same sounds and spellings but different meanings.

Neubert and Shreve see translation is a process of decision-making (1992: 15). According to them, translators' decisions are linked with the term 'mediation'. Mediation is "the extent to which translators intervene in the transfer process, feeding their own knowledge and beliefs into their processing of a text" (Hatim and Mason 1997a: 147). That is, mediation requires translators to make some changes at different levels, from words to the whole structure. Mediation is affected by translators' knowledge of SL and TL, and their competence; both elements play a crucial role in translating texts into different languages.

When translating wordplay, the most difficult thing is to attain translatability of wordplay or to make new wordplay acceptable to the target culture. Literal translation often results in a text that does not make sense in the TL, and very rarely preserves the stylistic features of the original. Therefore, it is not suitable for translating imaginative literature, where form is often more important than content. As Fried argues, "the translation of puns is

of marginal importance and of irresistible interest” (1988: 217). This evokes the translatability of wordplay. Translators’ efforts are concentrated on the choice of either form or meaning, or both. There are several possible ways to overcome the limitation. For instance, adoption of new words, although distorting the meaning of the original version is advisable in that it can make new wordplay in the TT. However, this attempt can bring some shifts in original contents. At this juncture, the original meaning of the SL may disappear but its intended effect can be attained.

When translating wordplay, translators should pay attention to how they can achieve similar effects in the TT from words in the ST. If they want to retain the similar effect as the SL, translators can take three ways. One is to find out the same set of wordplay in the TL; and another is to add some explanations about the intention of the SL author. And the third is compensation, which is very common way of dealing with wordplay. Translators’ efforts and decisions are closely linked to what translation strategies will be adopted, as translation strategies are applied to overcome translation problems.

Also, translation should reflect the contextual meaning, not simply convey the meaning of a text. This is true of translating wordplay. Translating wordplay is accomplished in line with close relevance to the overall structure. Literal translation is sometimes appropriate to convey the meaning of the ST, however, in many cases the similarity of sound or other stylistic devices will be lost, especially in translating wordplay.

### 3.2 TL-oriented Translation or SL-oriented Translation

By comparing individual Korean translators’ strategies different versions are analysed. The main concern of this chapter is to investigate different kinds of strategies for translating wordplay adopted by individual translators. A translator’s choice between the TL-oriented and SL-oriented translation can

make difference in producing wordplay. If applying TL-oriented translation strategies, the content of original wordplay can be transformed in order to animate the texture of wordplay. At the expense of the original text, wordplay can be reproduced in a particular context of the TT. This translation is called domestication.

Literal translation on the other hand very often results in the loss of wordplay. In order to retain wordplay itself in a certain context, paraphrasing may be necessary to some extent. In this respect, translators' creativity and determination will be crucial in order to reinforce textual distinctiveness. For example, miscommunication about 'not' and 'knot' between characters results from the process of Alice's saying "you had got to the fifth bend" (Gardner 2001: 36). Wordplay more often than not results from miscommunication, which reveals the importance of the contextual meaning in generating wordplay. That is, disparate interpretation of the contextual meaning can create wordplay.

Translation strategies applied by translators can determine how wordplays are translated into different languages. That is, according to the strategies, wordplay can be represented in different ways. Also, translating strategies can be influential factors to reveal translators' visibility. SL-oriented translation may be literal translation. This strategy can make translators visible in a translated text. In this regard, according to Toury (1995: 57) good translations depend upon enhancing 'acceptability' or 'adequacy' of translation. Norms of acceptability are the end of domestication strategy whereas adequacy is associated with foreignization strategy.

### 3.3 Foreignization and Domestication

Venuti (1995) gives an insight into cultural transition in translating activity. According to him, translating a text requires two basic translation strategies: domestication and foreignization. These strategies are based on cultural

transition between ST and TT. Domestication involves transformation of SL form and cultural elements in the TL. Domesticating strategies enable a text to be familiar with the target culture, whereas foreignizing strategies are source text oriented strategies.

Through domestication a translation is easily acceptable in the target culture, but it can lose tastes of originality of the ST, as well as deviating from the meaning of the ST. In addition, effects of foreign characteristics of the SL may be considerably reduced or disappear. Domestication strategies may transform the cultural values of the ST by adapting them to the target culture. By adopting domestication, the original wordplay in the ST may disappear in TT, but its effect can survive as different forms.

Foreignization, on the other hand, means translating in such a way that the TT can give foreign feeling to the target culture readers. This strategy includes adherence to SL form. Foreignization also tends to introduce the ST culture. Foreignization is likely to adopt literal translations and sometimes add explanations with footnotes. Moreover, in use of retention of source cultural elements, translated texts may convey cultural and linguistic differences.

Venuti opposes the domesticating translation. The reason is that this strategy can make translation more familiar with the TT readers, thus resulting in the invisibility of translation. Therefore, Venuti advocates foreignization. He pursues “cultural diversity, foregrounding of the linguistic and cultural differences of the ST and transformation of the hierarchy of cultural rules in the target language” (1995: 309). In this case, translators’ shared knowledge about the SL can be assumed. Assumed knowledge of the intended readers may provide images of source culture.

#### **4. Examples of Korean Translations**

The two translators analysed here translate wordplay mainly by the

foreignization strategy. This strategy is closely related to Venuti's viewpoint. Venuti argues the importance of translators' visibility (1995). Historically translators' role and identity seems to have little significance. He puts emphasis on the importance of foreignization since translators can be visible in translations through this strategy. This aspect can prove translators' foreignizing strategies for translating wordplay. In conclusion, translators' visibility is focused on Korean translations of *Alice*.

In general, Young-Me Sohn adopts literal translations with added explanations. Therefore, when reading her translation wordplay can be found easily but not be easily savored. Sohn's strategies for translating wordplay can be divided into literal translation and literal translation with explanations. Her main strategy can be regarded as foreignizing strategy. Also, she adopts domestication. This will be mentioned later.

In-Ja Choe's translation contains Gardner's annotations of *Alice*. This book seems to be a good resource for academic approaches since it has all of the translated annotations. She applies foreignization in translating wordplay. It is likely that the translator adopts foreignizing strategies because this text has full annotations. In sum, she translates all wordplay literally and adds explanations with parentheses. See the tables:

#### 4.1 Translation of Homonymy

Table 2 Examples of Homonymy

	Sohn(2001)	Choe(2005)
beat	박자를 맞추다 vs. 두들기다 (99)	시간을 맞춰야 (박자를 맞춰야) (118)
bite	물다 vs. 맵다 (128)	물다 vs. 톡쏘다(143)
mine	광산 vs. 내 것 (128)	광산 vs. 내 것 (143)
extra	보충수업 vs. 추가비용 (137)	별도 (151) (extra charge)
whiting	대구 vs. 흰색구두약 (148)	대구 vs. 구두에 윤내다 (160)
sole	가자미 (148)	혀가자미 vs. 구두밑창 (160)

In case of translating homonymy, Sohn takes literal translation with explanation to give the possibility of two possible interpretations. However, she translates 'sole' (148) literally without any explanation. What is noteworthy is Choe's effort to reveal English letters in every homonymic word. Choe adds annotations to show what kind of wordplay is applied.

When translating a homonymic word 'whiting' (*ibid.*: 159), she translates 'boots and shoes are made like that' (back translation). She adapts 'whiting' with 'shoes' so that she changes the contextual meaning of the original. In translating homonymic words such as 'mine', 'beat', 'bite', the same strategy is adopted by the two translators.

#### 4.2 Translation of Homophony

Table 3 Examples of Homophony

	Sohn	Choe
tale vs. tail	이야기 vs. 꼬리 (42)	이야기 vs. 꼬리 (69)
not vs. knot	아니다 vs. 매듭 (44)	아니야 vs. 매듭 (71)
axis vs. axes	축 vs. 도끼 (82)	축 vs. 도끼 (104)
pig vs. fig	돼지 vs. 대지 (90)	돼지 vs. 무화과 (111)
taught us vs. tortoise	가르쳤다 vs. 민물거북 (136)	가르쳤다 vs. 거북 (149)
lesson vs. lessen	수업 vs. 줄어들다 (140)	수업 vs. 줄어들다 (153)
eel vs. heel	장어 (148)	장어 vs. 신발뒤축 (160)
purpose vs. porpoise	목적 vs. 돌고래 (149)	목적 vs. 돌고래 (160)

When translating homophonic words, foreignizing strategies are applied. That is, translating homophony is accomplished literally with explanations. Without explanations, readers may have some difficulty to understand contextual meanings.

Sohn deals with homophony through adding footnotes. The outstanding examples are shown in table 3. These are good examples of wordplay arising

from similar pronunciations. Each of them has likeness of sounds but different spellings. Interestingly, disparity of spellings can inevitably produce different meanings but similarity of sound can involve more easily the process of word association than dissimilarity of spellings.

When Alice says ‘axis’, this word is understood as ‘axes’ by the addressee, Duchess. Thus, wordplay can change the contextual meaning. ‘Lesson’ and ‘lessen’ are homophonic words. This set of words is an appropriate example for wordplay, but Sohn translates verbatim into Korean. This is true of ‘taught us vs. tortoise’ and ‘purpose vs. porpoise’.

However, Choe translates somewhat differently mentioned above. ‘Taught us vs. tortoise’ (Choe 2005: 140) is translated into “We call it like this because they taught us” (back translation). In this example, the translator does not retain the word ‘tortoise’.

In translating ‘pig’ and ‘fig’, Sohn attempts domestication strategy. She puts no explanation but produces some satisfactory result to savor wordplay itself in Korean homophonic words. It is an outstanding example to show the texture of wordplay in the TT.

Table 4 Examples of Homophonic Subjects

	Sohn(2001)	Choe(2005)
Reeling	비틀거리기	비틀기
Writhing	뒤틀기	몸부림치기
Ambition	야망	야망
Distraction	착란	흔빠놓기
Uglification	추화	추화
Derision	조롱	조롱
Mystery	신비	신비
Drawling	느리게 말하기 (138)	느리게 말하기 (152)
Stretching	기지개켜기 (139)	뻗기 (152)
Fainting in coils	구부러서 기절할 척하기 (139)	몸 둘둘말고 기절하기 (152)

In chapter 9 in *Alice*, homophony evokes slight spelling differences, in use of similarity of sound. Mock Turtle talks about lessons in school: “Reeling, Writhing, Ambition, Distraction, Uglification, Derision, Mystery, Drawling, Stretching, and Fainting in coils”, but they are wordplay for expressing “Reading, Writing, Addition, Subtraction, Multiplication, Derision, History, Drawing, Sketching and Painting in oils.”

Sohn translated them verbatim without any explanation as shown above. This part reveals the difference of subjects which belong to a different world where characters exist in the original version. However, the translated version is rendered word for word. In this part, the translator does not add explanations. Readers may not notice wordplay.

In contrast, Choe puts some explanation about the subject for readers’ easier understanding. Therefore readers can recognize wordplay in this part. With this regard, Choe’s translation seems somewhat desirable to consider the effect of homophonic words.

Consequently, two translators adopt literal translation plus explanations for translating homonymic and homophonic words. That is, Carroll’s intention to use homonymic and homophonic wordplay can be translated into Korean with explanations.

#### 4.3 Paraphrasing for Domestication

There are good examples of paraphrasing. In chapter 1, dealing with ‘antipathy’, Sohn applies wordplay to this word. She translates the word into ‘극척짐’ (*Geuk-chok-jom* is a slip of the tongue of antipode in Korean; actually this word is a kind of neologism of Sohn’s) and ‘대척짐’ (*Dae-chok-jom* means antipode). She may consider the effect of wordplay between the two Korean words. The Korean word ‘극’ [Geuk] means an extreme, so the translator tries to replace the prefix, ‘대’ [Dae], with ‘극’ [Geuk] in order to

retain the meaning. The original version uses ‘antipathies’ but she adapts it in order to show Alice’s slip of the tongue. Thus, she uses dissimilarity of spellings to show wordplay.

In chapter 11, the mad Hatter says to the King about the mad tea party. Considering the King’s sentence “the twinkling of what?”(Gardner, 2001: 163), Sohn adopts a domesticating strategy by translating into “lapping what?” (back translation). She tries to combine movement of tea in a cup with twinkling because the word twinkling or shining can evoke the meaning of lapping tea in Korea. Also, the phonetic sign of ‘lapping’ (찰랑거리다 in Korean) can be overlapped the word ‘tea’ (차 in Korean). This is another example for domestication. And this is a good example to reveal that the translator’s first concern must be “the continuous involvement in experiencing and defining the boundaries of meanings and associations surrounding each word” (Biguenet and Schulte, 1989: xiii).

These are good examples of domesticating strategy. With the regard, she transforms the context in an acceptable way. For analyzing these examples, sentence-level translation should be applied. In this respect, the importance of interpreting context can be revealed. Also, she can achieve satisfactory translation in terms of wordplay.

## 5. Suggestion for Translating Wordplay into Korean

Regardless of different written forms, some words that have similar sounds can produce confused meanings in a context. This causes not only contextual misunderstanding but also textual cracking of coherence. This phenomenon may not be interpreted by translating at word level. Rarely equivalence at word level may satisfy translation of wordplay. Translation at sentence level is a more satisfactory solution to evoke the effect of wordplay. Sentences comprise

certain context so wordplay in a context of a sentence is more recognizable than while translating at word level.

Difference between tail and tale cannot be translated into Korean at word level. One suggestion is a situation shift. If translated ‘꼬리에 꼬리를 무는 길고도 슬픈 이야기지’ (back translation: This is a long and sad tale which can be chained by words). In this situation, the word ‘chain’ can join the meaning of a tail in Korean.

Another appropriate example is ‘knot’ and ‘not’. ‘Knot’ is translated ‘매듭’ (mae-deup) into Korean. In Korean word ‘mae-deup’ has two meanings: knot and finish. The second meaning is valid in case of using an idiom ‘making a knot’ (back translation). Therefore, ‘not’ used in the original book can be translated into ‘not making a knot’ with a view of creating wordplay. Using words with similar sounds can be the most effective way to correspond to wordplay techniques. To this effect, it can be difficult to earn the same effect or result, in use of literal translation of wordplay. However, if translators adopt loss and compensation strategies, they can find some possible solutions mentioned above.

## 6. Summary and Conclusion

The two Korean translations of *Alice* show that translators adopt mainly foreignizing strategies when translating wordplay. Domestication, however, can be found as well. The two translators endeavor to recreate wordplay by foreignization in their translations.

To reflect the author’s intention to create wordplay through the use of homophony, translators might attempt the same types of wordplay in translated texts. In this case, some transformation of the content usually occurs because an adherence to its original form can lead to some shifts in meaning. Wordplay can occur in certain situations involving communication between characters.

In terms of wordplay, the most successful translation can be regarded when translators can achieve or retain all types of wordplay. It is rarely possible to attain translation of homonymy, as it is rarely. That is, it is very difficult to find the same homonyms in the SL and TL in that homonymy can seldom be translated. This is also the case with Korean translations of *Alice*. In many cases, *Alice* presents many homonymic and homophonic puns as well as homography. Through homophony disparity of sound and sense can produce wordplay. In case of using homophony, there can be some chances to apply domesticating strategies. Homography reflects dissimilarity of meaning in spite of similarity of form. In order to achieve or retain the taste of the original wordplay, some suggestions can be made. Also, they may need some contextual change.

Possible solutions for translating wordplay into Korean are word association by contextual meaning, word association by similarity of sound and word association by homophony. That is, repetition of the same words, which have different meanings, can produce wordplay in Korean translations. In such cases, words are used redundantly in terms of form, but they serve the purpose of creating wordplay. In case of words with the same sound and different spelling, a different type of wordplay can occur.

Taking into account wordplay as a general phenomenon in languages, its translatability can be found in translators' competence. They can reshuffle of the original text in terms of transformation of content and change in words. Translators might be in the middle of decision: stick to the original content or create another text which will contain wordplay. In case of Korean translators, when they chose the former, they translated wordplay literally and added explanations in brackets. In this case, Korean readers can identify the author's intention but reading could be somewhat boring due to lack of ambiguity in translated words, and thus lack of wordplay. In other words, Korean translations seem to retain the content of the original, but the spirit of the book may be lost.

In conclusion, considering translation strategies for wordplay, the two Korean translators mainly adopted foreignizing strategies. Therefore, Korean *Alices* can be easily identified as translations, and the voice of translators is clearly recognizable.

### References

- Baker, Mona. 1992. *In Other Words*. London: Routledge.
- Bassnet, Susan. 1980, 1991, 2002. *Translation Studies*. Third Edition London: Routledge.
- Biguenet, John and Schulte, Rainer. 1989. *The Craft of Translation*. Chicago: U of Chicago P.
- Choe, In-Ja. 2005. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. Trans. Seoul: Bookfolio.
- Culler, Jonathan (eds). 1988. *On Puns: the Foundation of Letters*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Delabastita, Dirk. 1993. *There's a Double Tongue*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- . 1996. *The Translator: Wordplay and Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- . 1997. *Traductio: Essays on Punning and Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Fried, Debra. 1988. "Rhyme Puns" in *On Puns: the Foundation of Letters*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gardner, Martin. 1960, 2001. *The Annotated Alice*. London: Penguin Books.
- Hatim, B. and Mason, I. 1990. *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman.
- . 1997a. *Communication Across Cultures*. Exeter: U of Exeter P.

- . 1997b. *Translator as a Communicator*. London: Routledge.
- Lefevere, Andre. 1992. *Translation, History, Culture: a Sourcebook*. London: Routledge.
- Neubert, A. and Shreve, G.M. 1992. *Translation as Text*. Kent, Ohio: The Kent State UP.
- Nida, Eugene. 2000. "Principles of Correspondence", in L. Venuti (eds) *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Sohn, Young-Me. 2001. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. Trans. Seoul: Sigongjunior.
- Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility: a History of Translation*. London: Routledge.

[Abstract]

**A Study on Translation Strategies for Wordplay:  
Comparing Two Korean Translations of *Alice***

Yoon, So-Young  
(Konkuk Univ.)

The aim of this paper is to investigate how wordplay in Lewis Carroll's novel *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* is translated into Korean. Two Korean translations were chosen for analysis. The discussion is focused on what strategies for translating wordplay were applied by Korean translators.

One of the most outstanding linguistic characteristics of Carroll's novel is wordplay that draws special interests for analysis. Investigating translation strategies adopted by two Korean translators, the main concern of this paper is to explore difficulties of translating wordplay into Korean and the resulting differences of translated texts. Linguistic differences between the two languages lead to many gaps of translation. Therefore, to overcome these differences and difficulties, translators' competence to interpret and understand the ST is essentially required.

It is clear that translating wordplay could be a difficult task for translators. The reason is that every language has its own linguistic structure and characteristics, and contains its peculiar cultural texture. Considering the inseparable relationship between language and culture, linguistic and stylistic aspects should be rendered while translating wordplay. Translation is not a mere rewriting activity since this involves more than rendering the form and the content of the ST, as the translators' interpretation of the contextual meaning of the ST should be represented into the TT.

Regarding translation strategies, the most common strategies are

domestication and foreignization. Domestication is a strategy for making translated books more readily acceptable to the TT readers. This strategy allows some adaptation and transformation of the TT. In contrast, foreignization can be literal translation with or without some explanations. This strategy can make translators foregrounded and visible in translated texts. That is, this strategy is an attempt to overcome translators' invisibility.

In the analysis of the two Korean translations of *Alice*, the most difficult thing to deal with was how wordplay could be translated in an acceptable way in the TT culture. When it comes to Korean translations, the translators applied literal translation in most cases; in some cases with additional explanations or footnotes. Translatability of wordplay can be found in employing homonymy, homophony and homography. These strategies can be linked both with domesticating or foreignizing strategy.

Korean translators applied literal translation to interpret wordplay in many cases. However, there are some cases where wordplay can be recreated. Therefore, some suggestions were brought to overcome the limitation of translating wordplay. Also, some translation strategies were presented, and possible problems discussed.

▶ Key Words: wordplay, translatability, translation strategies: domestication and foreignization, acceptability, adequacy, translators' (in)visibility

윤소영

건국대학교 충주캠퍼스 교양학부 강의교수

syyoon@kku.ac.kr

관심분야: 영미드라마, 번역학

논문투고일: 2007년 10월 29일

심사완료일: 2007년 11월 26일

게재확정일: 2007년 12월 15일