



BRNO UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

VYSOKÉ UČENÍ TECHNICKÉ V BRNĚ

FACULTY OF ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING AND COMMUNICATION

FAKULTA ELEKTROTECHNIKY
A KOMUNIKAČNÍCH TECHNOLOGIÍ

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES

ÚSTAV JAZYKŮ

TRANSLATION THEORY OF DOUGLAS HOFSTADTER

PŘEKLADOVÁ TEORIE DOUGLASE HOFSTADTERA

BACHELOR'S THESIS

BAKALÁŘSKÁ PRÁCE

AUTHOR
AUTOR PRÁCE

Vojtěch Zvolánek

SUPERVISOR
VEDOUCÍ PRÁCE

Mgr. Miroslav Kotásek, Ph.D.

BRNO 2023

BAKALÁŘSKÁ PRÁCE

bakalářský studijní obor **Angličtina v elektrotechnice a informatice**

Ústav Jazyků

Student: Vojtěch Zvolánek
Ročník: 3

ID: 220931
Akademický rok: 2022/23

NÁZEV TÉMATU:

Překladová teorie Douglase Hofstadtera

POKYNY PRO VYPRACOVÁNÍ:

Ačkoli Douglas Hofstadter nevypracoval žádnou soudržnou teorii překladu, napsal knihu "Le Ton Beau De Marot: In Praise Of The Music Of Language", která pokrývá jak praktický, tak teoretický rozměr práce překladatele. Cílem práce je pojmenování základních postupů a principů, které Hofstadter při překladu využívá, stejně jako její zkusmé umístění do kontextu bádání v oblasti teorie překladu obecně.

DOPORUČENÁ LITERATURA:

Douglas Hofstadter: Le Ton Beau De Marot: In Praise Of The Music Of Language. Basic Books 1998

Termín zadání: 9.2.2023

Termín odevzdání: 30.5.2023

Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Miroslav Kotásek. Ph.D.

doc. PhDr. Milena Krhůtová, Ph.D.
předseda odborné rady

UPOZORNĚNÍ:

Autor bakalářské práce nesmí při vytváření bakalářské práce porušit autorská práva třetích osob, zejména nesmí zasahovat nedovoleným způsobem do cizích autorských práv osobnostních a musí si být plně vědom následků porušení ustanovení § 11 a následujících autorského zákona č. 121/2000 Sb., včetně možných trestněprávních důsledků vyplývajících z ustanovení části druhé, hlavy VI. díl 4 Trestního zákoníku č.40/2009 Sb.

Abstrakt

Bakalářská práce se zabývá překladovou teorií Douglase Hofstadtera, která je popsána v knize *Le Ton beau de Marot: In Praise of the Music of Language*, kde Douglas R. Hofstadter komentuje různé styly a přístupy různých lidí k překladu francouzské básně *A une damoiselle malade*. Zároveň také zmiňuje své zkušenosti a názory na překlad a svůj postup při překládání literatury na které se práce zaměřuje. Několik těchto překladů je v práci ukázáno a okomentováno. Nadále se práce zabývá převedením básně *A une damoiselle malade* do českého jazyka, komentářem těchto překladů a zjišťováním, jestli lze převést všechny prvky původní básně do češtiny a jaké problémy to stěžují. Také je proveden a okomentován překlad vytvořený programem ChatGPT, aby byl ukázán pokrok překládacích programů. Nakonec se bude práce zabývat porovnáním překladových teorií Douglase R. Hofstadtera a Josepha L. Malona, kde budou zjišťovány jejich rozdíly a pro co se jaká teorie dá lépe využít.

Klíčová slova

Teorie překladu, Douglas R. Hofstadter, rýmování, počet slabik, počet veršů, způsoby překladu.

Abstract

The bachelor thesis is focused on the translation theory of Douglas Hofstadter, which is presented in the book *Le Ton beau de Marot: In Praise of the Music of Language*, where Douglas R. Hofstadter comments on various styles and approaches of numerous people on the translation of a French poem *A une damoiselle malade*. These approaches are explained further in the thesis. Douglas Hofstadter then talks about his experience and opinions about translation and his process of translating poetry, which the thesis also discusses. The thesis will then focus on the conversion of the poem *A une damoiselle malade* into Czech, commentary on these translations and whether it is possible to transfer all of the properties of the original poem into Czech and what problems make this transfer harder. There is also shown a commented on translation made by a program ChatGPT to show the advancement of translation programs. At the end, the thesis will focus on comparison of translations theories of Douglas R. Hofstadter and Joseph L. Malone, their differences and what each of the translation theories is more suited for.

Keywords

Translation theory, Douglas R. Hofstadter, rhyming, number of syllables, number of lines, ways of translation.

Bibliografická citace

ZVOLÁNEK, Vojtěch. *Překladová teorie Douglase Hofstadtera*. Brno, 2023. Bakalářská práce. Vysoké učení technické v Brně, Fakulta elektrotechniky a komunikačních technologií, Ústav jazyků. Vedoucí práce Miroslav Kotásek.

Table of contents

1. ABOUT THE BOOK	10
2. DEVELOPMENT OF THE BACHELOR THESIS	13
3. TRANSLATION	14
3.1 ORIGINAL POEM	15
3.2 WAYS OF TRANSLATION	15
3.2.1 <i>Literal translation as a starting point</i>	16
3.2.2 <i>Creating a translation by using different styles of writing</i>	17
3.2.3 <i>Changing the formal properties of the original poem</i>	20
3.2.4 <i>Changing theme while keeping the message</i>	20
3.2.5 <i>Changing the constrictions of the translation</i>	22
3.2.6 <i>Translation of a translation</i>	25
3.2.7 <i>Machine translation</i>	25
3.2.8 <i>My translations</i>	29
3.3 THOUGHTS OF DOUGLAS R. HOFSTADTER ON TRANSLATION	32
3.4 HOFSTADTER'S APPROACH TO TRANSLATION	33
3.5 COMPARISON WITH THE THEORY OF JOSEPH L. MALONE	34
4. CONCLUSION	36
5. ROZŠÍŘENÝ ABSTRAKT	38

Introduction

The thesis is concerned with translation theory of Douglas R. Hofstadter that is derived from his experience with various languages and thought processes that are used during translation. This is presented by the translations of a French poem written in the sixteenth century by Clement Marot, popular and somewhat controversial poet of his time. The goal of this thesis is to formulate the theory that is hidden throughout the book of Douglas R. Hofstadter *Le Ton beau de Marot: In Praise of the Music of Language*: in his commentaries on translations, his own approach to the translation and his lifelong experience with different languages and their interactions.

Douglas R. Hofstadter, born in 1945 is a scholar of Comparative Literature, Computer Science, Physics and Concepts and Cognition. He wrote several books, *Gödel, Escher, Bach* (1979), book about cognition, meaning, understanding, basic principles of mathematics, art and music. This book won the Pulitzer Prize for general non-fiction and the National Book Award for Science Hardcover. *The Mind's I* (1981, co-edited with Daniel Dennett) is a book about the nature of self where they comment on works of numerous authors. *Metamagical Themas* (1985) is a collection of articles on various topics (language, art, logic, puzzles, environmental issues,...) and commentaries on these topics that Douglas R. Hofstadter originally wrote for magazine Scientific American. *Ambigrammi* (1987) is a book about study and creation of ambigrams that was published in Italian only. *Fluid Concepts and Creative Analogies* (1995) is a book about analysing how human mind solves problems and applying that knowledge to create a program that shows intelligent behaviour. Douglas R. Hofstadter worked as a College of Arts and Sciences Professor of Cognitive Science at Indiana University in Bloomington and as a director of the Center for Research on Concepts and Cognition where he studied mechanisms of analogy and creativity.

Douglas R. Hofstadter is interested not only in languages but also in the field of artificial intelligence. Mainly in an A.I. that is capable of understanding whole texts and contexts behind them and which is capable of formulating intelligent responses. He used his knowledge from the study of thought processes to help one of his students, Melanie Mitchell, with a project designed to create a program that would be capable of intelligent responses. This program is called Copycat and it was created in 1988. It is likely that the research of these thought processes influenced how he views the process of translation and thus they helped in creation of his translation theory.

Translation in general depends on several factors, with two of the most crucial ones being in my opinion the type of text and genre of the text that is being translated, for example: if the object of translation is a textbook, then the translator has to have knowledge or understanding of the topics and technical terms to be able to create a good translation. Should the topic be a poem, then the translator must have knowledge and understanding of properties of form like rhyming and meter and he has to be able to

understand the meaning of the poem and then transfer the form and content of the original poem into the target language.

1. ABOUT THE BOOK

The translation theory of Douglas R. Hofstadter is not very known topic outside professional circles of translators and even there it is not widely accepted and thus it has yet to be formulated in such a way that even people who are not proficient in translation can be given insight into the translation theory of Douglas R. Hofstadter, translation overall and how translation can vary depending on the person, their knowledge of the original text and their reason for the translation, which can be monetary gain only, challenge of the translation itself, spreading of the information to as much people as possible and many other reasons.

Translation is not a simple process, which requires only the knowledge of what the words in the original text mean to be able to create a translation. One has to have a deeper understanding of the language of the original text, they must understand the context of the text and must also understand and know the terms in both languages if the text is more professionally or technically oriented.

Le Ton beau de Marot: In Praise of the Music of Language was published in 1997 by Basic Books and has received mixed reviews with the majority being quite negative and critical of the “simplicity” of the translation theory of Douglas R. Hofstadter. One of these reviews is from Robert Alter, who is an American professor of Hebrew and comparative literature at the University of California, Berkeley since 1967. In his review he stated that due to its simplicity the translation theory would fail “if the text to be translated had been a truly great French poem following an intricate metrical and rhyme scheme” and that “it takes a good deal more than a bag of word-manipulation techniques to produce a satisfying version in another language” (Robert Alter, July 20, 1997). Most contemporary reviews do not agree with the stance that Douglas R. Hofstadter takes against several translators of other books and their ways and approaches, mainly Vladimir Nabokov and his translation of *Eugene Onegin*, in which he intentionally ignored the rhyming pattern of the original text. One of the points that Robert Alter praises in his review is the description of the challenges of translation of poetry, which reminded him of his own experience with translation “Along the way, there are some nice local perceptions about the challenges of translation. I was particularly struck, recalling some of my own struggles, by Hofstadter's notion of a “rickety bridge” effect” (Robert Alter, 1997). Douglas Hofstadter replied to this particular review by saying that Robert Alter did not fully understand some of the topics he was pointing out, for example: In Chapter 9 in which Douglas R. Hofstadter talked about *Eugene Onegin* and how he disagrees with the declaration of Vladimir Nabokov that translation of *Eugene Onegin* in verse is “mathematically impossible” and said that Nabokov “dedicated a full ten years, out of profound personal reverence for Alexander Pushkin’s *Eugene Onegin*, to translating the whole of that novel into English in a painstakingly precise, word-for-word manner, of course exquisitely aware of the fact

that the beauty and brio of Pushkin's novel stem not so much from its plot or its diction as from the tight metrical and rhyming hoop through which its author made every line of the original Russian text jump, yet adamantly maintaining that it would be a preposterous betrayal of literary truth to try to imitate that crucial, all-important property in his English reconstruction" (Hofstadter, 1998: 257). Then he mentioned his dissatisfaction with the unprofessional responses of Vladimir Nabokov to translators, who have tried to translate Pushkin's *Eugene Onegin*, and who in some cases did quite a good job in his opinion as he points out "This eccentric decision on Nabokov's part would be all right, though disappointing to those who admired his stunning linguistic gifts, were he not insufferably smug about it. Unfortunately, he felt compelled to sneer contemptuously at anyone who, tilting ignorantly against the inexorable windmills of "mathematical impossibility", imagined there might be another choice, and to condescend with unimaginable venom towards anyone - any "dainty mimic" tempted by the serpent's apple of "spirit" to "traduce" the "truth" of a text - who dared to actually try the pathway that he, from his lofty station, had deemed futile" (Hofstadter, 1998: 259).

Another review by Kirkus Reviews says that "despite Hofstadter's multifarious ingenuity, his central insights--e.g., the sublime complexity of language--seem banal. The complexities which Hofstadter explores will for the most part seem familiar, not just to philosophers of language and literary critics, but to thoughtful lay readers" (Kirkus Reviews, 1997). The authors of this review disregard the translation theory due to its simplicity. It is true that the translation theory of Douglas R. Hofstadter is quite simple and the concepts contained in it are not hard to understand, and they do not require any in depth-thoughts to realize. It does not mean that it is not interesting and cannot help people with their translation and help their outlook on translation overall, at least in my opinion.

While translation theory of Douglas R. Hofstadter may not be ground-breaking, it is nevertheless interesting for me because of its simplicity that many contemporary reviewers saw as a detriment and because it resonates with my thoughts about translation of poetry, which is the main focus of this translation theory. It is not overly complex theory coming from Hofstadter's experience with languages and thought processes that occur during the selection of appropriate words and the resulting translation that they create.

The book did not deserve as much criticism as it got, in particular with regards to his response to Vladimir Nabokov whose harsh responses to other translators of *Eugen Onegin* seemed very unprofessional. As some reviewers failed to understand that Douglas R. Hofstadter was only joking when he took on the Nabokovian role in Chapter 17 when he commented on several translations of Dante's *Divine Comedy*, "Pinsky's redistribution seems to me so artistically flawed that words fail me in conveying my reaction. [...] My jaw drops at the suggestion that Dante would have considered the

sloppy trio “*color/gather/together*” a suitable one for effecting terza rima [...] It is a slap in the face to the English language to claim that it can do no better, and simultaneously to the Italian language to imply it is so much less subtle” (Hofstadter, 1998: 533-534). “In favor to Heany, I can say that he renders a tercent by a tercent. It’s nice to see nine lines of gate inscription, instead of just seven. But, I regret to say, there’s not much more praise that i can offer. Look at the first line: “*Through me it leads to the city sorrowful.*” “*It?!*” What is this “*it*”? And “*city sorrowful*” is pretty sorrowful. If this line had been written by a high-school student, I would have struck it out in bright red ink and said to start again from scratch. To my ear, the sentence doesn’t even sound like it was written by a native speaker!” (Hofstadter, 1998: 535). He ended it with “Well, if you haven’t figured it out yet, you never will, so I shall now reveal the identity of the Vladimir Nabokov of Dante’s Inferno. [...] I – and this I’m ashamed to admit, but to me it seems true – am he. For proof, just look at the heartless hatchet job I’ve completed, above: flinging about all sorts of nasty epithets like “*feeble*”, “*flimsy*”, “*limp*”, “*wimpy*”, “*insipid*”, “*wishy-washy*”, “*half-hearted*”, “*obnoxious*”, and “*vomit*”, and then on top of it all, likening a poor innocent Nobel Prize winner in Literature to a talentless high-school student as well as to a grunting, mediocre weightlifter” (Hofstadter, 1998: 547-548).

2. DEVELOPMENT OF THE BACHELOR THESIS

Primary source of information is the book *Le Ton beau de Marot: In Praise of the Music of Language* written by Douglas R. Hofstadter which consists of introduction, seventeen chapters and conclusion. Sixteen out of the seventeen chapters include translations of the poem *A une Damoiselle malade* by Clement Marot written by variety of people. The book is not only about the analysis of the translations of the poem but it also includes thoughts of Douglas R. Hofstadter on translation overall and his experiences with translation from several languages into English and translation using computer programs.

As an extension of a semester thesis there will be translation of the poem *A une Damoiselle malade* into Czech to show if it is possible to keep all of the properties of the original poem in a Czech translation.

Translation theory of Douglas R. Hofstadter will be compared to translation theory of Joseph L. Malone compiled in his book *The Science of Linguistics in the Art of Translation: Some Tools from Linguistics for the Analysis and Practice of Translation*. I have chosen this translation theory because, at the time of its publishing, it received similar responses as translation theory of Douglas R. Hofstadter with the difference being that the translation theory of Joseph L. Malone was quite hard to understand and that it introduced many new terms with some of them being unnecessary. And mainly because I am interested in how many differences will these two translation theories have and in which way will they be different. It also seems interesting to me to compare two not so well received translation theories, where one was not accepted by majority of critics for its simplicity and reinventing of the wheel and the other for being quite complex and for creating new terms. So this will be a comparison of two translation theories on the opposite end of a spectrum. I also want to find their differences in approach to translation, because translation theory of Douglas R. Hofstadter is mainly focused on translation of poetry while translation theory Joseph L. Malone is not focused on any field of translation in particular.

3. TRANSLATION

To make an translation one has to have knowledge about the language that the text is from and the language that the text will be translated into. To make an accurate translation it is important to know what type of text is to be translated, whether it is prosaic, scientific, educational or other. Age of the text is also important, because the original may use words or phrases that are not used any-more or may mean something different. In translation of poetry, it is very important to understand the meaning and message that the text is trying to convey and know what properties the text has, for example: rhyming scheme, number of syllables per line or on which syllables is stress put on. It is not enough to be able to read and understand the individual words of the text. One has to be able to understand the text as a whole, understand why the author wrote the words he wrote and what message is the text trying to convey.

It is one thing to have information or knowledge on how to make a good translation of poetry and another thing is to know how to utilize this information or knowledge to actually make a good translation. Douglas R. Hofstadter compares his style of working to the Metaphor of the Rickety Bridge, where there is a deep chasm that you need to cross, so first you connect the two ends with a rope, than you add another rope and then you connect the two ropes with wooden boards, than you make railings and so on. Gradually you make the bridge more complex and than make more bridges, because if one bridge falls apart you still have another bridges to fall back on. (Hofstadter, 1998-367). I have used this method during my translation of the poem *A une Damoiselle malade* into Czech, where I have created several drafts and thought about which one should I improve and than analyse in this work.

Another important step in creation of translation is the reason for creating the translation. Be it making the translation because the translator has a bond with the original text and so he wants to translate it into his language, or because the translator wants to make the text available to as many people as possible or simply because it is fun to translate something. In the words of Douglas R. Hofstadter: “When I tackle a translating challenge, it is not in the least because I yearn to reveal to the poor deprived non-speakers of language X the hidden structure and meaning of some intricate passage in language X - no, for me, translating is simply the sheer joy of trying to do something deeply paradoxical: namely, to carry off in medium 2, radically different from medium 1, some virtuoso stunt that someone else once carried off with great aplomb in medium 1. That’s all, no more. It’s just a game, an exercise in creativity, a challenge that, if met with sufficient flair, provides a wonderful aesthetic reward” (Hofstadter, 1998: 366). I have chosen to create a Czech translation of *A une Damoiselle malade* as a part of my thesis and because I have never translated poetry, so it seemed as a good idea to practice my skills in the translation of poetry.

3.1 Original poem

In the book *Le Ton beau de Marot: In Praise of the Music of Language* there are various translations made by a large number of people. Some of these individuals are professional translators, others are students of Douglas R. Hofstadter, some of the translations are made by his mother and his wife. All the people mentioned had different approaches and different interpretations of the original poem, but they all started with knowledge of syntactic properties of the poem that Douglas R. Hofstadter gave them when he asked them in his letter if they could translate the poem and send him their translation.

Properties of the poem that Douglas R. Hofstadter send in the letter were these: “The poem is 28 lines long. Each line consists of three syllables. Each line’s main stress falls in its final syllable. The poem is a string of rhyming couplets: AA, BB ,CC,... . Midway, the tone changes from formal (“vous”)” to informal (“tu”). The poem’s opening line is echoed precisely at the very bottom. The poet puts his own name directly into his poem” (Hofstadter, 1998:1a).

The original poem reads as follows:

A une Damoyse malade / Clément Marot
Ma mignonne, / Je vous donne / Le bon jour ; / Le séjour / C’est prison. / Guérison /
Recouvrez, / Puis ouvrez / Votre porte / Et qu’on sorte / Vitement, / Car Clément / Le
vous mande. / Va, friande / De ta bouche, / Qui se couche / En danger / Pour manger /
Confitures ; / Si tu dures / Trop malade, / Couleur fade / Tu prendras, / Et perdras /
L’embonpoint / Dieu te doint / Santé bonne, / Ma mignonne.

Poems I, poem 1b

This poem was written by Clement Marot as a get-well wish for his friend. This friend was a young girl who had fallen ill and was put in a quarantine for several weeks. The poem begins with a greeting to the ill maiden, than follows with comparison of staying ill as being in prison, after that the lyrical subject tells the maiden to leave her room and eat otherwise she will remain sick and pale and lose her form, it is ended with prayer to God from author for regaining her health.

3.2 Ways of translation

Translation is influenced by various factors, which range from why the translation is being realized to the actual process of translation, which varies according to the

properties of the text that is being translated and people who will be translating. The properties are for example: length of the text, type of the text, whether it is prose or poetry and the language and how old the text is. All of this and more influences translation. Since Douglas R. Hofstadter in the book discusses mainly the ways of translation of the French poem *A une Damoyseille malade* the following analysis of the different ways of translation will be centred mainly about the translation of poetry.

3.2.1 Literal translation as a starting point

One approach to translation is the literal translation, where the words are literally translated without much care for properties of the original text. In the book, this type of translation is used by Douglas R. Hofstadter only to create line by line gloss of the poem, disregarding the properties of the original to make an English text that gives an idea of what the original poem is about. Even though the words are translated literally it is not as easy as it may seem, especially when dealing with an old piece of poetry. Some words that were used in the time period in which the poem was written may not be used any more, have since changed meaning or do not have a direct equivalent, for example: “porte” in the original poem means “door”, but in modern French it means “gate” .

Example is as follows:

To a Sick Damsel / C. Marot/D. Hofstadter

*My sweet, / I bid you / A good day; / The stay / Is prison. / Health / Recover, / Then
open / Your door, / And go out / Quickly, / For Clément / Tells you to. / Go, indulger /
Of thy mouth, / Lying abed / In danger, / Off to eat / Fruit preserves; / If thou stay'st /
Too sick, / Pale shade / Thou wilt acquire, / And wilt lose / Thy plump form. / God grant
thee / Good health, / My sweet.*

Poems I, poem 2b

As can be seen the translation does not keep most of the properties, except for the number of lines and repetition of first/last line and the switch midway from “you” to “thou”, respecting the switch from formal “vous” to informal “tu” in the original poem. That is due to it being translated to be simple literal translation. In words of Douglas R. Hofstadter: “Its sole raison de naître was to provide a “crib” - a clear line-by-line gloss of the poem - for people who speak little or no French, and also to clarify, for speakers of modern but not old French, a few obsolete terms” (Hofstadter, 1998: Poems I: 2a). Then he mentions some difficulties he had with this translation: “Executing a totally literal-minded carry-over of “*Ma Mignonne*” into English may seem a very mechanical and thus fairly trivial task. However, there are actually many - enormously many -

hidden subtleties. As clear a dilemma as one might wish for is posed already by the opening line: *Ma mignonne*. How in the world to render this literally in English? *Ma* is clearly “*my*”, but what to do with *mignonne*? It is an adjectival noun that means “*cute*” and also “*sweet*”, and the fact that it is given in a feminine form (*mignonne* as opposed to *mignon*) tells you it is addressed to a girl or a woman. But “*My cute*” sound most awkward in English. On the other hand, is it so awkward as to render it unacceptable? How about “*My sweet*”? Less awkward than “*My cute*” yet still awkward, is it acceptable?” (Hofstadter, 1998: Poems I: 2a). I have chosen to create a literal translation as a starting point from which I could derive and improve various versions of my translation. The following sub-chapters will present multiple ways of translation and show how they can vary and present the differences that separate them.

3.2.2 Creating a translation by using different styles of writing

Another way to make a translation is to use different styles of writing. Using different styles, which range from Archaic style, Modern style to even a Rap style gives translator access to different words and these words can help evoke different reactions and feelings in readers.

For example: using an archaic English from 16th and 17th century that William Shakespeare used in his plays. Some of these words are: “*forsooth - indeed*”, “*lest - less that*”, “*I entreat - implore*.” and use of “*thou*” instead of “*you*”. Or just using old style of word formation like ending most words with “*e*”. This style of writing evokes feeling of oldness and shows that the original text is truly archaic. It can also be used to give the text an artificial sense of age and make it seem as if the text is older than it truly is.

Using Rap style is another example of how much the translations of one poem can vary. Example of the terms used in the translation: “*Yo there dog - hey*”, “*your crib a slammer - your room is a prison*.” Such style of writing and composition is completely different than a poem written in a archaic form of language and can evoke entirely different reaction in the reader.

As is shown here:

To My Sweet / Melanie Mitchell

To my sweet / I entreat: / One regard! / O, 'tis hard, / Dear recluse. / Sicknes, loose / Thy cruel dart / From heart! / Then my love / Will remove; / She'll appear, / Clement's dear, / Past her door. / Come now, poor / Fair sweet-tooth / Starved, forsooth! / My heart breaks. / Eat some cakes / And some jam. / Courage! Dam / Up thy tears. / Stay thy fears, / Lest thou pale / And thus fail / Swift to mend. / May God send / Health complete / To my sweet!

Poems III, Poem 10b

Yo There Dog! / Marek Lugowski

Yo there dog! / Your crib a slammer, / And it ain't jit. / Get dap - / Bust outa this camp, / And don't be wack. / Just feed, dude, feed! / Clement rap: Succeed! / If you don't chow, / You feel so sad / Yo mama T. Jones / Get mad. You lose / Yo bad attitude, / Sparticulous mood. / For the hoop, whoop joy, / Say this rapper boy. / Rap make you free - / Cain't lose with me. / It all be sparks / In hoops, alleys, parks.

Poems XIII, poem 61b

As can be seen in the two translations of one poem, the differences of the form and style can be immediately recognized. While the composition of the first poem shows an archaic style of writing that indicates the age of the original text and keeps most of the properties of the original, with the exception of the transition between formal and informal addressing, which has been replaced with the archaic equivalent “*thou*”, showing an equivalent in Early Modern English. The second translation shows a composition similar to that of a rap song, using the words, phares and sentence formation originated from that style. Another visible difference from the other translation is that it does not keep the properties of the original text, mainly the number of lines, number of syllables per line, rhyming pattern, stress put on syllables and the equivalence of the first and last line. Even with the various differences the message of the translations is roughly the same, wishing for the friend of author to get better and overcome the illness that the friend is suffering from.

The author of the first translation Melanie Mitchell was praised by Douglas R. Hofstadter for her use of old phrases “A long-time lover of poetry and of Shakespeare in particular, Melanie too wanted to make a version that respected the poem’s temporal provenance, and in doing so she couldn’t resist inserting numerous bold Shakespearean touches, such as the old-fashioned phrases “*I entreat*”, “*one regard*”, “*'tis*”,

“forsooth”, and *“lest”*, as well as the non-rhyming rhyme of *“love”* and *“remove”* (which in Shakespeare’s day did rhyme, and that was her whole point)” (Hofstadter, 1998: Poems III: 10a). And then the quality of translation “Altogether, Melanie’s translation struck me as quite a tour de force, and, coming on the heels of Bob’s excellent performance, made me feel quite inadequate. [...] Next to Bob’s and Melanie’s, my two efforts felt like mere ditties, whereas theirs? - alas, they felt like true poems!” (Hofstadter, 1998: Poems III: 10a).

He liked the second translation due to its rhymes and references to the themes of the original poem but otherwise was unimpressed by it “I personally do not have the knowledge of rap talk that would be necessary to judge the degree of success of this effort, but I get genuine kick out of its snappy, crackly rhythms and rhymes, and I like its semantic allusions to the main themes of the original poem. However, it strikes me as pretty darned marginal in terms of being a translation thereof, because too many important aspects, at the levels of both form and content, were simply unceremoniously dropped or altered” (Hofstadter, 1998: Poems XIII: 61a). I have not made a translation using the older form of words because I am not confident in using such a method.

Translation can also be written in a stylization that is not immediately recognizable. These styles do not have word and phrase composition much different from each other, but they still have enough differences to be considered different styles. Such styles can be forms of writing of older poems and songs or even a colloquial form of speech transferred to writing but there are different dialects of languages and translation of dialect to another language is another big problem that translators have to keep in mind when translating.

While not a true process of translation, breaking words across lines can be used and incorporated into the translation process to keep three syllables per line even if multiple-syllable words are used. Changing the tone of translation midway from happy to sad or vice versa or including these tones can change the feeling the poem evokes in readers.

Another way to change the effect the translation has on readers does not require extensive changes to the writing style but use of punctuation marks such as exclamation mark, semicolon, colon and question mark for example. Use of these punctuation marks can influence the composition of the translation. For example use of colon signifies that the author is speaking directly, use of exclamation mark emphasizes the line of the poem and if there are several exclamation marks in succession it makes that part of the translation more pronounced.

All translations, although they are of the same text and even the original poem will evoke different feelings and will be perceived differently by readers, who if they have not seen or read the original text may not appreciate the effort it took to come up with a translation written in a style that may differ greatly from the style the original poem is written in and may think that the original poem is written in the same way as is the translation they are reading.

3.2.3 Changing the formal properties of the original poem

In poetry the formal properties of the text, such as rhyming pattern, number of lines, number of syllables per line and distribution of stress across syllables are important to the text as they are the form and thus crucial component of the poem. Translations should keep the properties of the original text but some translators do not transfer the properties of the original poem on to the translation. Either because they do not know the properties (although in this case the properties are quite hard to miss as they were aware of them), claim that it is impossible to transfer them or because they intentionally do not transfer them on to the translation.

There are several such translations in the book. Some have kept less formal properties than others, because the authors could not make a proper translation with these properties and other because they felt they could make better flowing translations without adhering to the properties or because they wanted to make the translation in such a way that would not allow the transfer of all properties. I have tried to keep all of the formal properties of the original poem in the Czech translations but I have found out that it is incredibly hard to do and in case of one property impossible.

3.2.4 Changing theme while keeping the message

Translations can be done with a degree of changes to the content while preserving the original message of the original text. These changes vary from smaller changes like changing one of the themes of the poem into its modern equivalent while keeping the same meaning to more prominent changes like changing the gender of the recipient of the poem, changing the relationship of the author and the recipient, addressing entirely different person or changing the setting of the poem. As long as these changes are parallel to the original content or deliver the message of the original text, than they can still be considered translations and not poems inspired by another poem.

Example of these differences can be seen as follows:

Goldilocks / D. Hofstadter

Goldilocks, / Feisty fox, / You're a pip, / Whom the grippe, / Sad to say, / Has in sway. / Gotta fight! / With a right / To the chin, / Babe, you'll win! / No kid gloves! / Clement loves / You, ya vamp- / You're his champ! / Champs must eat; / Wimpy wheat / Bread's a sham, / Without jam! / To gain brawn, / Champs chomp on / Jelly dough - / nuts; they go / Nuts for pies / (Your top prize- / fighters do). / As for you, / Beat that pox, / Goldilocks!

Poems X, poem 43b

Sugar Lump / David Moser

Sugar lump, / In a slump? / Sick-bed blues? / That's bad news. / Such a bore, / And what's more, / All shut in, / You'll get thin, / There's no doubt. / Let's go out! / I say so! / This I know: / You've no slight / Appetite. / Your lips lust / For a crust / Smear'd with jam. / Right I am! / No delay! / This I pray: / Lord above, / Give my love / Back her form, / Soft and warm. / Make her skin / Pink again, / Smooth and plump, / My sugar lump.

Poems IV, poem 16b

These two examples show the difference of the content that the translations have and while the differences are clearly recognizable, for example: while the first poem uses the metaphor that the girl is a boxer and must defeat the illness with a right hook, the second poem hints that the girl could have a relation with the author and that she must get better, otherwise she will lose her form and become thin. The message of these two translations is in essence the same as the message of the original poem, which is a wish of the author that the object of the poem will overcome her illness and get better. Changing content of the poem in the translation is a viable way of translation as long as the original message is carried over in the process of translation.

Douglas R. Hofstadter in the commentary to his translation explains why he choose the fighter metaphor “Here we have another conceit like “*Gentle Gem*”, but this one is based on a rather unexpected metaphor - that of pugilism. In it, Clément’s sweet little mignonne becomes a tough cookie, a vamp, a feisty fox, a saucy, gum-chewing boxing moll. But why in the world boxing? Well, just serendipity - I went with the flow of what fell my way. All it took was the little rhyme “*Use your right!*” that jumped to mind for line 7’s “*Gotta fight!*” (it was subsequently slightly modified) - and all of a sudden I found myself swimming in images of punching and counts and bells and knock-outs and so forth, and they didn’t let go of me until the whole poem had been transported into the metaphorical boxing ring” (Hofstadter, 1998: Poems X: 43a).

In the second translation, Douglas R. Hofstadter took note of a interesting property of the poem that the author did not noticed “While I was scanning “*Sugar Lump*” looking for characteristics to comment on, I chanced to observe that the exclamation points ending lines 10-11 were echoed on lines 18-19. I then noticed they were equidistant from the poem’s midpoint. Next I saw that lines 12-14 and lines 15-17, also symmetrically straddling the midpoint, formed a kind of natural pair as well, both of them concerning zest for food. The more I looked, the more symmetry I found in “*Sugar Lump*” - for example, “*blues*” on line 3 and “*pink*” on line 26 [...] I asked David if he’d intended the symmetry pervading “*Sugar Lump*”, but he had no idea what I meant. When he saw it, he was astounded by his poem’s temporal reversibility!” (Hofstadter, 1998:Pomes IV: 16a). I did not use many metaphors in my translations

because I have not thought of many suitable ones that would help me to create the poem in Czech.

Using metaphors and comparisons are useful means in the creation of a translation of poetry. For example addressing the recipient as a gem and incorporating into the translation gems such as zircon, amethyst, diamond, ruby, tourmaline and the concept of carats into eating that the recipient should eat a carat cake that has between eighteen and twenty-four carats. Another example would be using the metaphor of prison as a central point of the poem, thus addressing the recipient as a prisoner and wishing that they will be released as soon as possible. Or working under the impression that the poem is intended for a lover and using words of adoration such as turtledove, buttercup, honey bun and nightingale for addressing the recipient.

Without prior knowledge the different versions of translations do not seem to be related to each other as the means, phrasing and words used in their translation vary greatly but what connects them all is the message of the original poem that can be seen in all of them. It does not matter if the translators assumes that the young girl, that the original is intended for, is a boxer, prisoner, lover, or if they use other comparisons and metaphors that change the overall theme of the translation, as long as the message is carried over and even better if all of the properties are kept, that is what makes them all translations and not poems inspired by the original.

3.2.5 Changing the constrictions of the translation

Constrictions are properties of the poem that the translator chose to impose or not impose on himself. Some constrictions can clash with properties of the original poem as they can vary from increased or decreased number of syllables per line, reduced number of lines or rhyming. Changing of properties is discussed above but this chapter will in more detail discuss a way of translation that uses constraints, which translators took upon themselves to convey the message of the original poem in a different way than the original text. Translators make these constraints to make the process of translation more interesting and to discover what they are capable of producing. These constrictions range from reducing the number to one syllable per line but keeping the rhyming rhythm and number of lines, writing the translation as a acrostic (poem in which the first letters of each line spell a word or a message), making the translation bisyllabic but keeping the same number of syllables making the translation longer, condensing the poem into several lines while keeping the essence of the message intact, writing the translation using paraphrases, using homonymy in the first and last line like: "*Kiddo, hi!/Kiddo - high*", changing the rhyme pattern from AA BB, ending every line with the same letter, changing the placement of stress put on syllables or transforming the translation into a sonnet (a poem with three quatrains and a couplet in perfect iambic pentameter) or using homonyms to prevent repeating of words.

Example of such translations are as follows:

Love / Robert French

Love / dove, / still / ill? / "Fly / high!" / I / cry, / "Why / lie / so / low?" / For / your / sweet / treat, / eat / meat, / jam, / ham. / Pray / stay / in / thin, / slim / trim, / love / dove.

Poems VI, poem 22b

To a Damsel in Bed / D. Hofstadter

To you, dear / One, some cheer: // A good day. // Do not stay / Away long. / May your strong / Spirit kill / Ev'ry ill. / Leave your room // In haste; zoom / Nimbly thence, / By Clement's / Edict, love. / Dreaming of // Being fed? / Your sickbed // Crimps that hope. / Lest you mope, / Exit soon, / Miss, and spoon / Ex'lent jam! / Now, madame, / This flu you // Must undo, / And - soon plump - / Rise from slump! / Our Lord's near / To you, dear.

Poems X, poem 48b

The first translation is written with a constraint of one syllable per line, meaning that the author had to reduce the original three syllables per line into one syllable, which now represents the whole line of the original poem. The second translation is an acrostic, with an additional constraint of having the first letter of the acrostic be equal to its last letter.

In the first translation by Robert French, Douglas R. Hofstadter comments more in-depth on the reversal of one concept of the original poem "In a nutshell, I think Bob simply got it in his head that the girl should look good, and to him, what that means was obvious: being thin. No deliberate, intellectually sophisticated, transtemporal, transcultural reversal was involved - just a hasty misreading. And yet, even if Bob's reversal of the original meaning and imagery was executed entirely reflexively and unconsciously, the process involved could still be claimed to be one of many valid manners of effecting cross-cultural translation" (Hofstadter, 1998: Poems VI: 22a).

In the second translation, Douglas R. Hofstadter decided to impose a harder constraint on himself due to his newly gained familiarity with translation "As gradually I gained in skill and self-confidence, I realized that I was making new translations quite routinely and not finding the challenge nearly as hard as it had been at the beginning. For this reason, I decided one day to try imposing further constraints on myself - not blurry semantic ones such as a conceit or an overall tone, but really sharp, tight syntactic constraints. Such a proposal would have astounded me at the outset, but at this point I had made so much progress that it seemed completely reasonable" (Hofstadter, 1998: Poems X: 48a). The reason why he chose an acrostic is as follows "And so, keenly

aware of the fact that Marot himself had on occasion taken pleasure in composing acrostics (poems whose lines' first letters spell out a hidden message, usually someone's name), I thought that making an acrostic version would be an appropriate additional constraint to pile on" (Hofstadter, 1998: Poems X: 48a). In order to create a translation that would capture the message of the original poem I decided not to follow certain constraints that are in the original and even then it was incredibly hard for me.

Using cognates as a core of the translation is another type of constriction that can be used in the process of translation. Cognates are words that have a common origin in history, even though today they can be semantically different due to their evolution in different cultures under different conditions.

As is shown here:

My minion / Melanie Mitchell

*My minion, / To you I donate / A benign journey; / Your sojourn / Is prison. / Take care
/ To recover; / Posthaste open / Your portal, / And make a sortie / Vimfully, / For
Clement / Thus commands you. / Alley-ooop! Thou frisky / Of embouchure, / Who art
couched / In danger- / Go to a manger / Of confectionery. / If thou endurest / In this
malady, / A faded color / Wilt apprehend, / Along with perdition / Of thy bounteous
points. / Deity donate to thee / Benevolent sanity, / My minion.*

Poems VI, poem 23b

The idea of this style of translation in this particular example is to find in each line at least one French word that has a English cognate and around that cognate create a line that has a semblance to the original meaning (Hofstadter 1997). He comments on some of the cognates "Probably the subtlest French-English cognate used here is line 14's "*Alley-ooop!*" - an English way of saying *Allez hop !* (which is a French way of saying "*Alley-ooop!*"). The reason it counts as a cognate is that Marot's word *va* (line 14 of the original French poem) is the familiar imperative of the verb *aller* ("*to go*"), and *allez* is simply its more formal counterpart, derived from the same verb. More tersely put, "*alley*" is roughly *allez*, which is roughly *va*" (Hofstadter, 1998: Poems VI: 23a).

The idea of incorporating constrictions into the proces of translation is done to make the translating more restricted and find out what variations of translations can be made by following these restrictions. Or it is simply because of the challenge that the translator must face in order to make the translation.

3.2.6 Translation of a translation

Translation of a translation or a second order translation is a process where text in language A is translated into language B and then into language C. That should not matter however, since text B contains the message of text A, than text C should also contain the message of text A. But what if that is not the case? If text B does not contain the message of text A, than neither does text C, which would contain the message of text B.

Second order translation can bring into consideration problems that were not prevalent in translation from French, as different languages have different structures and rules governing them. Example of this is Italian, which has flexible vowels so that a word that has a six syllables can be “orally squeezed” into four syllables, another problem is that Italian has much more two-letter syllables than English, which has a large number of four and five letter monosyllabic words, meaning that a given number of syllables will be longer in English than in Italian (Hofstadter 1998: Poems XI, 50a).

Russian, similarly to Italian, needs less syllables to create a single morpheme, thus English translation needs more words to describe their Russian counterpart, possibly altering the meaning of the translation. Czech has much less suitable mono-morphemes than English due to endings that we add at the end of monosyllable words, so the words required to express an idea in Czech are longer than in English, but English uses more determiners, so the number of words used to express an idea is lower in Czech than in English.

Translation of the poem into a modern form of its language brings up issues, although not as big as in translation to other languages as the chance of misrepresenting of the message of the original poem is smaller.

The problem of continuous translation of translations from language to language is that the resulting translations stray further and further from the original poem and that the message of the original may become distorted or even lost in the process.

3.2.7 Machine translation

Douglas R. Hofstadter used several programs to produce a translation and then performed an analysis to see how successful the translations are. Resulting translations were literal translations that lacked the structure of a poem as it ignored line breaks, rhyming, syllable count, some words were seemingly translated without relation to each other or without context, thus lacking sense.

Explanation provided in the book of why the translation by programs Systran and Globalink Translation System was unsuccessful is that the machines do not “understand” the meaning of the poem and the message it is trying to convey, thus the translations can be considered as a translation of prose and not poetry. To circumvent this issue of not understanding and lacking context, a program called Candide had a

large bilingual database from which it draw comparisons and instances of what words were used in translation of other materials. This program also failed in its translation.

Machine translation is in the book compared to a translation done by a person who knows almost nothing of the two languages and is provided only with dictionaries of French, English and Chinese as the translator was from China. Without deeper understanding of either of the two languages and the message conveyed by the poem, the translation was mostly literal.

Below is shown a machine translation and translation done by a person with almost no knowledge of the two languages:

My Flapper / Candide

My flapper, / I give / This morning. / The time / It is in prison. / Cure / Recover, / Then you open / Your door, / And that sort / Vitement, / Because Clément / Summons / Meat pie. / Does your neighbor, / Who is sleeping / Safe, / Eat / Jams? / If you last / Too ill, / Funny flag / Shalt prendras, / And growing / Up. / Goodness different doint / Good health, / My flapper.

Poems XV, poem 67b

My treasure / Zhang Jiaying

My treasure, / I you given / The "good morning". / The drawing room / It is jail. / Recover, / Recover one's health, / Then open / Yours door, / And that people kind / Quickly, / Because Clément / You the summon. / Okay, gluttonous / Owing to yours mouth, / Which makes lie down / In dangerous, / For eat / Jam. / If you stubborn / Too sick, / Color dull / You take, / And lose / Full and developed body. / God give you / Good health, / My treasure.

Poems XV, poem 68b

As can be seen both translations do not make much sense because as is mentioned above, the machine and the translator do not understand the meaning of what they are translating. They are able to find possible translations of individual words out of the context of the poem. They do not fully "understand" the meaning of individual lines and what they mean when put together to form the poem. That is why the these translations do not make much sense, because the translators did not "understand" them as a whole. The translations by the machine programs Systran and Globalink Translation System were done in the year 1990 and the translation done by the program Candide was done

in the year 1992; since then the technology of machine translation progressed significantly but it still has room for improvement.

Douglas R. Hofstadter explained the general idea behind the decision making process of the translating program *Candide* “*Candide’s* strategy for figuring out which way to translate an ambiguous word involves exhaustively scouring the database for contexts that are “*similar*” to the context in which the word is embedded, and then choosing the way the word was rendered in the “*most similar*” contexts, where degree of similarity is measured by a complex mathematical formula that, rest assured, has nothing to do with text understanding. This principle is the very foundation on which the whole project rests” (Hofstadter, 1998: Poems XV: 67a). This is the reason why the translation is not very good. Because the program does not “understand” what it is translating, it merely searches for the most similar use of the word.

In the commentary to the second translation, Douglas R. Hofstadter explains how the Original poem was translated into English by someone, who knew no French and almost no English “We come now to one of the strangest stories of all. David Moser had an Chinese friend who had just arrived in the United States knowing about as little English as it is possible to know, other than the roman alphabet. She also knew no French. Somehow, in a flight of fancy, it occurred to David and me that it would be fascinating to see what Zhang Jiaying, in her absolutely naive state, would do with the “*Ma Mignonne*” translation challenge. And to our delight, Jiaying, once the idea had been explained to her, was game, and so, armed with a battery of thick, authoritative dictionaries interlinking the French, English, and Chinese tongues, she sat down on evening and tackled it” (Hofstadter, 1998: Poems XV: 68a).

I decided it would be a good idea to include translations made by a modern program and than comment on these translations and find out how they compare to the translations made by the older programs mentioned above. I have chosen a program called ChatGPT, which is an AI language model that has been trained on a wide range of data to generate human-like text based on the received input. I asked if it could translate the poem *A une Damoiselle malade* into English and keep these properties: The poem is 28 lines long. Each line consists of three syllables. Each line’s main stress falls in its final syllable. The poem is a string of rhyming couplets: AA, BB ,CC,... . Midway, the tone changes from formal (“vous”)” to informal (“tu”). The poem’s opening line is echoed precisely at the very bottom. The poet puts his own name directly into his poem.

This is the translation that ChatGPT created:

To a sick young lady / ChatGPT

*My sweet one, / I wish thee / A good day; / Yet, I say, / 'Tis a cell, / Where we dwell, /
This abode. / Regain road / To health's grace, / Open space, / Your door wide, / And
let's stride / Swiftly through, / For 'tis true, / Clément's plea. / Go, for me, / Sweet
delight / Of thy bite, / That does bare, / Without care, / To consume / Sweet perfume; /
Should you fade / In sick shade, / Pale and slight, / Lose the light, / Flesh's round, / May
God sound / Blessings fine, / Darling mine.*

There are properties in this translations that were not kept, mainly the first and last line mirroring, the length of the poem and the rhyming on the first and second line does not match up properly, otherwise the rest of the properties was kept. The poem is understandable with several lines that rhyme but do not make much sense. The main problem with this translation is the lack of “understanding” of the original poem by ChatGPT and then the composition of the lines of the poem that are the result of this non-understanding. An example of this is line 6 “Where we dwell,” where ChatGPT thinks that the author and the addressee of the poem live together, but there is no hint of this in the original poem. This misunderstanding repeats in line 12 “And let's stride”. Line 6 could be fixed if it went like this “Where you dwell,”. Another problem are the lines 8, 9, 10, 11 “Regain road / To health's grace, / Open space, / Your door wide,”, where they are put together in such a way that they do not make sense. They were written to rhyme and relate to the corresponding lines of the original poem but without deeper “thought” about the poem as a whole. Another example of this problem are lines 21 and 22 “To consume / Sweet perfume;”.

This I think is exactly the problem. ChatGPT made better translations than the other programs, as can be expected since the time separating these translations made by programs is more than 30 years and technology has advanced since then, but it suffers to a lesser degree from the same issue as the previous programs. It does not fully “understand” the poem as a whole and thus does not get the message of the poem which it could than express in its translation. It also prioritized the fulfilment of properties rather than to make sure that the translation made sense, but that is partially my fault as I told it to keep the properties and not told it to make sure that the translation made sense.

I then asked ChatGPT if it could keep all of the properties described above and this is the translation that ChatGPT came up with:

To a Sick Maiden

My dear child, / I bid you mild / Good day now; / Prison is the stay, / But mend your ails, / Unbar the rails, / Open the door, / Let us explore, / Swiftly let us go, / For Clément, you know, / Commands you so. / Go, my sweet, / With lips to greet, / That lie in danger / To taste and savor / Sweet preserves; / If you endure / Too long in illness, / Your hue will dull, / And you will lose / Your plumpness, dear, / God grant you cheer, / Good health so pure, / My darling pure.

This translation is worse than the previous one in terms of keeping of formal properties of the original poem. The number of lines is mostly four instead of three, the number of lines is 24 instead of 28 and certain lines do not rhyme, for example lines 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and most of the lines in the second part of the translation and the starting line and the ending line is different. In terms of the composition of the poem it is better than the previous attempt, although there is still the misunderstanding that the author and the addressee of the poem live together in lines 8 and 10 “/ Let us explore, / Swiftly let us go,”.

When compared to the translations made by older programs it is much better, which shows that the technology has advanced but it still struggles with the “understanding” of the poem as a whole and balancing that with the properties of the original poem.

3.2.8 My translations

These translations into Czech can be called second order translations as they have been translated from the English versions of the poem and not the original because I do not speak French. They are not put in the sub-chapter 3.2.6 Translation of a translation because they are not part of the book and because it is my attempt to translate the poem with all of its properties into Czech which after much struggle I found out to be, at least for me, impossible due to several issues about which I will talk below.

The first translation:

Nemocné slečně 1 / Clément Marot

*Má milá, / Přeji ti / Pěkný den; / Tvoje postel / Je jako vězení. / Uzdrav se / Rychle, /
Pak otevři / Dveře / A vyjdi ven / Spěšně, / Protože Clément / To vzkazuje. / Jdi
labužníku / Jejíž pusa, / Ležící v posteli / Je v nebezpečí / A jez / Sušené ovoce; / Jestli
zůstaneš / Déle nemocná, / Tak zbledne / Kůže tvá, / A ztratíš / Svou postavu. / Ať ti Bůh
vrátí / Tvé zdraví, / Má milá.*

As can be seen the translation does not follow the properties of the original except the length of the poem, mirroring of first and last line and author's name in the middle. The reason for that is because I wanted the first translation to be literal and to get the an approximate meaning in Czech without following the properties of the original too much to get an starting point, which could be improved and worked upon. Quality of this translation is not very high and some lines do not fit very well together like: "Jdi labužníku / Jejíž pusa, / Ležící v posteli / Je v nebezpečí". That is because I did not know how to properly incorporate the idea of the girl's mouth that lies in bed and is in danger into the translation. The other parts of the translation capture the basic meaning of the original but without the properties that make the original poem what it is, this can not be called a full translation, only an attempt to capture the basic meaning of the poem. But as stated above it is not meant to be a full translation, only a starting literal translation, which can be built upon and expanded into other more successful translations.

The second translation:

Nemocné slečně 2 / Clément Marot

*Má milá, / Přeji já / Hezký den; / Pobyť ten / Jak žalář. / Svoji zár / Ziskej zpět, / Dveře
hned / Otevři / A ven jdi / Rychleji, / Clément ti / To říká. / Chamtivá / Pusa tvá /
Zůstává / Na hraně / Jez hlavně / Ovoce; / Budeš li / Nemocná, / Tak bledá / Budeš být, /
A přijdeš / O svůj vzhled. / Ať si hned / Zase zdravá, / Má milá.*

This translation was an attempt to make an translation that follows the properties of the original. Although it is better than the previous translation it fails in several places to keep the properties, example of these are: "Ovoce; / Budeš li and Budeš být, / A přijdeš" where these lines do not rhyme or "Zase zdravá" where the line has four syllables instead of three but the biggest issue is that the translation looks unnatural, even forced. It does not look like a get-well-letter that someone would send to their

friend even if it was in the form of a poem. It is artificial and forcefully created which causes the way the words are put together to be wrong. That is because I put them together in such a way so that the lines would rhyme at least a little. That causes a problem in which the rhyming is given priority over the “naturalness” of word order, causing the way the words are put together to be strange but still make sense, even if the words are not normally put together in such a way. The reason for that is that it is hard to find words that have three syllables, make sense when put together and rhyme. And also the fact that it is the second translation I have done and thus I had little experience with translating poetry. But the biggest problem is the property where stress is put on the final syllable, which in Czech is impossible for most words that can be used to create an translation of this poem as majority of the words in Czech put stress on the first syllable.

The third translation:

Nemocné slečně 3 / Clément Marot

*Má milá, / Přeji ti / Hezký den; / Nemoc tvá / Tě poutá / K posteli. / Uzdrav se / Co
nejdřív, / Abys / Zas mohla / Vyjít ven / Na slunce. / Přeje si / Tvůj přítel. / Měla bys /
Více jíst / Výživnou / Potravu. / Abys / Získala / Zpět sílu. / Jestli ne, / Tak zhubneš / A
zbledneš / Ještě víc. / Uzdrav se / Co nejdříve, / Má milá.*

This translation does not follow the properties of the original intentionally, because it is an attempt to express the message that is in the original but without some of the properties that constrict it too much in Czech. It, for the most part follows the flow of ideas that are in the original, which are the greeting, how the sickness bounds her to the bed, to get better so she can go outside, how if she does not eat she will get pale and lose weight and finally prayer to God to regain her health. Properties that this translation does not follow are the rhyming property and the property of changing the addressing from formal to informal. Also in two cases in lines 9 and 19 “/ Abys /, / Abys /” the property of three lines per syllable is not kept. I am quite satisfied with this translations as it conveys the message of the original poem into Czech quite well despite not adhering to some of the properties.

In my opinion, to create a translation in Czech that keeps all of the properties is impossible, mainly the property where the stress is put on the final syllable as in Czech the stress is put mainly on the first syllable. Then the properties of rhyming and three lines per line can be kept, but not at the same time as I think that Czech does not have enough short-syllable words that can satisfy these properties at the same time and still be relevant to the original poem.

3.3 Thoughts of Douglas R. Hofstadter on translation

One of the topics concerning literary translation that is discussed in the book is the wish of most translators to remain “invisible”, because they tend to be very respectful to the authors whose books they are translating and want most if not all of the credit be given to the author. Douglas R. Hofstadter mentions that they should stop trying so hard to be “invisible” as it leads to a false sense of humility and that there is no reason why a good literary translator should be any more humble than a good opera singer or a good musical performer. I agree with Hofstadter on this topic because translators deserve praise for a good translation even if they wish to remain invisible.

Another topic that is discussed is the reason why Douglas R. Hofstadter translates. His reason for taking on translating challenges is not because it spreads the work of an author to more people but because it is an exercise in creativity and that it brings him into intimate contact with a work and an author that he admires. My reason for creation of translations is that it is a good way to test my knowledge about languages.

According to Douglas R. Hofstadter there are many texts, be it poems, books or snippets that may appear truly untranslatable because the message and medium of the text are fused together to such an extent that extraction of content cannot be done without destroying the essence of the text. This essence is not the form or message of the text but their fused form.

Translation of jokes, puns and idioms is another discussed topic in the book. These forms of language cannot be translated literally, because they would not make sense in the targeted language, so translator must find the closest approximation of the pun, joke or idiom to use in translation even if their form may seem completely different at first glance, their intended message will be approximately the same. My opinion on the translation of puns and jokes into other languages is that it is incredibly hard to translate them and during translation we create only a approximation of the intended meaning.

Should speech errors be translated or left as they are? It could be translated but then it would become an artificial speech error, because it did not happen in the targeted language and could misrepresent the original error. Answer of Douglas R. Hofstadter on this issue is to not translate the error as it is deeply connected with mechanisms buried deeply in the unconscious mind of the speaker and since the translator has no way of knowing what governs these mechanisms, he should not attempt to translate the error.

Aside from speech errors there are words and concepts that English has no equivalents for. There are explanations for these words and concepts but they do not consist of one word as in the original language and thus they are not equivalents. Humor is also hard to translate, because different nations have different cultures, values and what is considered funny in one culture could be not funny or even offensive in other culture.

The most important topic discussed in the book is poetry and what makes a poem. In words of Douglas R. Hofstadter: “Poetry, as I see it, involves the choice of an

esthetically restricted medium and the attempt to convey through it some roughly premeditated set of images or ideas” (Hofstadter, 1998: 524). and: “In any case, the essence of the act of writing poetry is the indissoluble fusion of a medium with a message, the unsunderable wedding of form to content as equal partners” (Hofstadter, 1998: 524). The “esthetically restricted medium” is explained through its effects, which are that looking or reading a poem should produce some sort of sensual pleasure.

Poetry should be made equally of content and form and not have content be the main part, which is accompanied in the background by form. Content and form must be both preserved as the act of translating is to show great respect to the fusion of content and form of the original author.

3.4 Hofstadter’s approach to translation

The way Douglas R. Hofstadter approaches the process of translation is, as mentioned at the beginning, the method of rickety bridge where he creates a simple bridge, reinforces that bridge, then he builds second bridge with the help of the first bridge, reinforces the second bridge and repeats the process. Each stage will be stronger and allows faster building of bridges and in case one of the bridges breaks, there is a previous stage that serves as a fall-back position.

He starts with ordinary translations but as he accumulates experience and number of translations he then proceeds to use more varied ways of translation, because if he fails he has other translations, which he can use either as a finished product or as a base to create a improved version of that translation. After the process of translation follows the process of polishing where quality of translations and their variations are evaluated but not every variation can be evaluated as even small modifications affect the whole translation, requiring more changes. A intuitive sense for what modifications are more promising and what modifications should be discarded is than needed to make that choice. Another important sense is a sense for weak points in the poem. This sense helps with finding what part of the poem is strong enough and what parts need to be changed to fit the particular style of translation that is being used. Because of that what is seen on paper is only what works and there is much more possible or discarded versions and variations of translations hidden in the mind.

Douglas R. Hofstadter also describes several processes that are constantly running in his head when he translates. One is a “syntactic regrouper”, which is moving words around to see if it sounds better that way. Next one is a “semantic substitutor”, which removes words that are doubted and replaces them with related words to improve the flow or vividness of imagery. The last one is “phonetic substitutor”, which considers the use of alternates that are phonetically related. These processes help him in translating and in speaking foreign languages.

3.5 Comparison with the theory of Joseph L. Malone

The reason for this comparison is to discover the differences between these two translation theories that are on the opposite end of a spectrum as the translation theory of Douglas R. Hofstadter is according to majority of contemporary reviewers too basic and translation theory of Joseph L. Malone quite complicated and to see the differences in their approach to translation. Another reason for this comparison is to see if the contemporary reviewers were right in their judgement, which will then be compared with my own findings as I have read the two books these translation theories are presented in.

Theory of Douglas R. Hofstadter is mainly about the translation of poetry but its principle can be applied to other fields of translation as well. It does not name any types of processes during translation like equation, substitution, divergence, convergence, amplification, reduction, diffusion, condensation and reordering like in the case of translation theory of Joseph L. Malone but Hofstadter uses some processes to create a translations. It is more general in the explanation of how translation is done than the translation theory of Joseph L. Malone, which is more detailed and elaborate in its explanation of translation between different languages, giving examples of texts being translated into and from various languages like English, German, Japanese and Hebrew. Douglas R. Hofstadter comments only on the translations of the poem *A une Damoyse malade* and these comments are mainly about what he thinks about these translations, what parts could be improved, his thoughts about why the translation was done the way it was done and he sometimes tells a story about that translator involving the original poem. Commentaries of Joseph L. Malone in his translation theory are primarily focused on the explanation of provided examples and explanations of his concepts and new terms that he invented.

The main concept of the translation theory of Douglas R. Hofstadter is that text consists of content and form and that they are equally important and together, they create a message. Content should not be prioritized over the form too much during translation and vice versa, because otherwise there is a risk that the message of the original text may be warped or lost during translation. Therefore it is important to respect the balance between content and form.

The main concept of translation theory of Joseph L. Malone is to create tools that will help people understand the process of translation and help with translation itself “The techniques and procedures outlined in this book are designed to serve either as tools for the study of completed translations (the ANYLYTIC mode), or as helpmates in the act of translation (the OPERATIVE mode)” (Joseph L. Malone, 1988: page 2). The tools being the nine types of processes that are used during translation: equation, substitution, divergence, convergence, amplification, reduction, diffusion, condensation and reordering. With numerous examples of each process used during translation from different languages to show how and when to use which process.

Translation theory of Douglas R. Hofstadter is basic, simple to understand and not very useful in the sense of learning about translation as it focuses mainly on translation of poetry. And the translation theory of Joseph L. Malone is on the other hand quite useful as it contains translation processes that Joseph L. Malone named, which can be used to help people understand translation better, but also rather hard to understand as there is a frequent use of terminology and abbreviations, with some of them being invented by Joseph L. Malone to help him explain his translation theory.

Of the two, the translation theory of Joseph L. Malone is probably more practical as it has explained the processes of translation, but the book itself is not easy to read and it was quite hard for me to understand with all of the new terms and abbreviations that are used in it. My thoughts about translation theory of Douglas R. Hofstadter are that that it is simple to read, easy to understand and the talk about the translation and how to do it is more philosophical than practical. Even though it is not ground-breaking, which in my opinion it does not have to be, the concept that text consists of form and content and that they are equal is a good idea to keep in mind during translation.

4. CONCLUSION

There are many ways to create a translation and many of them can be found in the book *Le Ton beau de Marot: In Praise of the Music of Language*. Most of these translations are written by different people and not by Douglas R. Hofstadter who wrote several translations but mainly commented on all of the translations given to him by these people, ranging from professional translators to his students to whom he wrote or asked if they could create a translation of the poem *A une Damoiselle malade*. That is the point of the book, to show that there are many ways how translation can be approached but that there is also a balance between content and form of a text that must be kept if we want to keep the message of the original text. Between translations and their comments in the numerous chapters are also thoughts, experiences and explanations about how Douglas R. Hofstadter views translation and how his process of translating poetry work. Thus his theory of translation can be obtained from these processes and the comments on different translations.

The most important in translation of poetry according to Douglas R. Hofstadter is to keep the content and form equal and transfer them as they are in the original, because if one side outweighs the other too much the essence of the original text will be distorted and because form is also part of the poem and there is a reason why it was written in such a way by the original author. So it should not be so easily changed by the translator.

Translations done by the old programs Systran, Globalink Translation System and Candide between the years 1990 and 2023, which are commented on by Douglas R. Hofstadter in his book and the new program ChatGPT, which I commented on differ to a certain extent, but also share some similarities. The differences are that between then and now over thirty years have passed. Technology has progressed since then, so it is reasonable to assume that there will be improvements and these improvements are that the program follows set parameters better. Translations made by ChatGPT better express the original poem and are more accurate. The similarities these programs share are that they are unable to grasp the meaning of the poem, they can translate the lines of the poem but they are unable to grasp the meaning and message of what they are translating even though ChatGPT is new and better than the old programs.

In my attempts to translate *A une Damoiselle malade* into Czech I learned that I am not very good at writing poetry and more importantly that it is impossible to create a translation in Czech that has all of the properties of the original poem. The properties are the length of 28 lines, three syllables per line, main stress of lines falling in its final syllable, rhyming pattern of AA, BB, CC, ..., change of the addressing of the recipient from formal to informal, mirroring of first and last line and the name of the poet in the poem. The property that cannot be kept is the one where the main stress is put on the final syllable because in Czech language the stress is put mainly on the first syllable. Then the two properties of the rhyming pattern and three syllables per line can be kept

but not at the same time. I have found out that Czech does not have many words that have three syllables, rhyme and are relevant for the translation. The property of changing the addressing from formal to informal can be done but is difficult. The rest of the properties is not a problem to keep.

Comparison of the translation theory of Douglas R. Hofstadter and translation theory of Joseph L. Malone has shown me the differences between these two theories, which are that the translation theory of Douglas R. Hofstadter is focused on the translation of poetry and that it is more philosophical in nature than the translation theory of Joseph L. Malone, which is more practical and focuses on all types translation. Another difference is how easy it is to read and understand the translation theory of Douglas R. Hofstadter, where the concept of the theory is clearly stated and explained, in addition there is not an excessive amount of terms and abbreviations used to explain the concept of the theory. Translation theory of Joseph L. Malone on the other hand is hard to read and understand due to abundance of the terminology, abbreviations and hard to understand graphs. While translation theory of Joseph L. Malone is more useful for helping people understand the depth of translation, translation theory of Douglas R. Hofstadter is also useful, as the concept it presents is helpful during translation. The mindset it gave me was more useful to me for writing this thesis, than knowing that according to one of several translation theories there are nine types of translations.

5. ROZŠÍŘENÝ ABSTRAKT

Semestrální práce se zabývá překladovou teorií Douglase Hofstadtera, amerického vědce a bývalého profesora Univerzity v Indianě, který se zabývá tématy jako jsou překlad, myšlení, tvorba a matematika. Tato teorie překladu se nachází v knize *Le Ton beau de Marot: In Praise of the Music of Language*, kde komentuje různé styly a přístupy několika desítek lidí k překladu básně *A une damoiselle malade*, napsané básníkem ze 16. století Clemétem Marotem. Ve své knize zároveň zmiňuje své zkušenosti a názory o překladu a svůj postup při překládání literatury na které se práce zaměřuje. Nadále se bakalářská práce zabývá překladem básně *A une damoiselle malade* do českého jazyka, komentářem těchto překladů a zjišťováním jestli lze převést všechny prvky původní básně do českého překladu a proč to lze nebo nelze provést. Také je proveden a okomentován překlad od programu, aby byl ukázán pokrok překládacích programů. Jako poslední se bude práce zabývat porovnáním překladových teorií Douglase R. Hofstadtera a Josepha L. Malona, kde bude zjišťováno jak a v čem se liší a pro co se jaká teorie dá lépe využít.

Přístup k analýze teorie překladu Douglase R. Hofstadtera se skládá z představení knihy *Le Ton beau de Marot: In Praise of the Music of Language* a několika základních informací o překladu. Poté je ukázána původní báseň *A une damoiselle malade* a její doslovný překlad vytvořený Douglasem R. Hofstadterem pro zobrazení přibližného významu básně v angličtině. Následně jsou uvedeny prvky básně, které pojmenoval Douglas R. Hofstadter při překladu původní básně. Následuje ukázka překladů od několika autorů s různými přístupy k překladu které jsou rozděleny do sedmi podkapitol podle přístupu k překladu, např. doslovný překlad, změna prvků původní básně, změna tématu a zachování zprávy původní básně a strojový překlad. Tyto překlady jsou následně okomentovány a jejich rozdíly probrány a ukázány. Jedna podkapitola se zabývá strojovými překlady, kde jsou ukázány díla od několika programů a také od člověka, který má minimální znalosti angličtiny a francouzštiny a tento překlad je následně porovnám s překlady vytvořenými těmito programy k zjištění jejich podobností a rozdílů. Do této podkapitoly jsou přidány dva překlady vytvořené programem ChatGPT. Tyto překlady jsou následně okomentovány a porovnány s překlady vytvořenými starými programy k ukázání jak se technologie překladu pomocí programy vyvinula a jaké problémy stále sdílí. Další podkapitola obsahuje překlady básně do češtiny, které jsou okomentovány a řeší problematiku překladu do češtiny se všemi vlastnostmi původní básně. Některé vlastnosti nelze převést kvůli rozdílům mezi češtinou a francouzštinou a další kvůli limitům českého jazyka v ohledu počtu vhodných jedno až tří slabičných slov. Následuje kapitola, která se věnuje tomu, jak Douglas R. Hofstadter vnímá překlad a co si o něm myslí. Tyto myšlenky odhalují důvod proč překládá, co si myslí o přání autorů aby zůstali “neviditelní” protože příliš respektují originální díla a jejich autory, poznatky o nelehkosti překladu vtipů a idiomů

a o tom, že mluvené chyby by se neměli překládat protože nevíme jaké vnitřní mechanismy způsobily tu mluvenou chybu a že je možné, že mluvčí cílového jazyka by tu určitou chybu takovým způsobem neudělal. A nejdůležitější je pak jeho názor co dělá báseň básní. Následuje podkapitola zabývající se přístupem Douglase R. Hofstadtera k překladu, kde svůj přístup popsal jako metodu vratkého mostu, dle které vytvoří úvodní překlad, který pak zlepšuje a z kterého se odvíjí další překlady. Dále také popisuje několik myšlenkových procesů které jsou aktivní když překládá a mluví cizími jazyky. Jako poslední kapitola, po které následuje závěr, je kapitola ve které jsou porovnány překladové teorie Douglase R. Hofstadtera a Josepha L. Malona. Tato kapitola se zaměřuje na rozdíly v přístupu k překladu, celkové obecnosti a konkrétnosti o překladu, uvedených příkladech vysvětlujících konkrétní témata a obtížnosti porozumění principů překladové teorie.

Úvod představil Douglase R. Hofstadtera, něco z jeho kariéry a jeho další díla. První kapitola představila knihu *Le Ton beau de Marot: In Praise of the Music of Language* a co si o ní mysleli dobový kritici. Druhá kapitola se zabývá způsoby použitými pro vypracování této práce. Třetí kapitola a následující podkapitoly se zabývají překlady různých autorů básně *A une damoiselle malade* a analýza těchto překladů odhaluje různé způsoby a postoje kteří tyto překladaelé mají vůči překladu. Z porovnání překladů vytvořenými programy před třiceti lety, které jsou uvedené v knize a překlady nového programu, které byly přidány jako rozšíření semestrální práce je vidět pokrok, který technologie v poli překladu stroji provedla. Problém který tyto programy stále sdílí je ten, že tyto programy nejsou schopny “porozumět” textu který překládají. Podle zadaných parametrů vědí co mají překládat a jak to překládat, ale “nerozumí” tomu co překládají, proto vytváří překlady, které můžou splňovat některé zadané parametry a přitom vypadat jako něco co by člověk který má znalosti o daných jazycích takto nepřeložil. Proto jsou v knize překlady vytvořené programy srovnávány s překladem vytvořeným někým, kdo má minimální znalosti o daných jazycích a k dispozici má pouze slovníky těchto jazyků. Překlady do češtiny a jejich analýza ukazuje, že nelze převést všechny prvky původní básně kvůli odlišnostem mezi francouzštinou a češtinou a nedostatečnému počtu vhodných slov, které by splňovaly požadavky prvků původní básně. Lze zachovat pouze některé prvky, z kterých se několik navzájem vylučuje. Myšlenky Douglase R. Hofstadtera uvedené v bakalářské práci ukazují jádro jeho teorie překladu, které je to, že text se skládá z formy a obsahu, které jsou stejně důležité a spolu tvoří zprávu textu. Při překladu by se neměl klást důraz na jedno nebo druhé příliš moc nebo se riskuje deformace či ztráta zprávy původního textu. Přístup k překladu Douglase R. Hofstadtera uvedený v bakalářské práci ukazuje jak postupuje při tvorbě překladu. Porovnání teorií překladu Douglase R. Hofstadtera a Josepha L. Malona ukazuje, že teorie Douglase R. Hofstadtera se zaměřuje primárně na překlad básní, je snadnější na pochopení a má více filozofickou povahu, protože prezentuje ideu o tom jak by měl člověk postupovat při překladu. Teorie překladu Josepha L. Malona je

naopak více technická a zaměřená na vysvětlení překladu a prezentuje nástroje na jeho vyhotovení. Je také obtížnější na pochopení kvůli velkému množství terminologie a zkratk, které jsou autorem často využívány.

Myslím si, že teorie překladu Douglase R. Hofstadtera byla dostatečně vysvětlena a že dodatečné doplnění o svoje překlady básně ukázaly, že některé prvky původní básně nelze převést do češtiny kvůli odlišnostem mezi češtinou a francouzštinou. Také jsem spokojen s porovnáním teoriemi překladu Douglase R. Hofstadtera a Josepha L. Malona, kde vynikly jejich rozdíly, protože se nezaměřují na to samé a přístupy k překladu jejich autorů se také liší.

Literatura

- [1] HOFSTADTER, Douglas R.. *Le Ton beau de Marot: In Praise of the Music of Language*. New York: Basic Books, a Member of Perseus Books, L.L.C., 1998. ISBN 9-780465-086450.
- [2] MALONE, Joseph L.. *The science of Linguistics in the art of translation*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1988. ISBN 0-88706-653-4
- [3] 15. 5. 2023:
<https://archive.nytimes.com/www.nytimes.com/books/97/07/20/reviews/970720.20altert.html>
- [4] 15. 5. 2023:
https://richmond.primo.exlibrisgroup.com/discovery/fulldisplay?vid=01URICH_I NST:OneSearch&search_scope=MyInstitution&tab=LibraryCatalog&docid=alma993862153606241&lang=en&context=L&adaptor=Local%20Search%20Engine&query=title,exact,Meaning-based%20Translation%20:%20a%20guide%20to%20cross-language%20equivalence&offset=0
- [5] 15. 5. 2023: <https://www.publishersweekly.com/978-0-465-08643-6>