

## EQUIVALENCE IN ENGLISH-BAHDINI KURDISH TRANSLATION OF CULTURAL ITEMS IN CHILDREN'S FICTION: A CASE STUDY ON LEWIS CARROLL'S ALICE IN WONDERLAND

AHMED HASSAN MUSTAFA

Dept. of Translation, College of Languages, University of Duhok, Kurdistan Region-Iraq

*(Received: October 1, 2022; Accepted for Publication: July 4, 2023)*

### ABSTRACT

This paper deals with equivalence in the translation of cultural items. The study is based on the categorization of cultural terms according to Newmark's model (1988) which categorizes cultural terms into: material culture, ecology, social culture and historical and religious culture. Examples of cultural items are selected from the source language (SL) text, i.e., *Alice in Wonderland* by Lewis Carroll which is translated by Kawa A. Niheli, coupled with their target language (TL) equivalences provided within the translated version. Both are listed within the categories specified. The question- to what extent equivalence is achieved in translating the cultural items and what are the reasons for the inadequate translations of some of the items? The translated items are analyzed and compared. It appears that the majority of the selected items are inadequately translated due to lack of experience on the part of the translator, his/her attempt to make the translation more palatable to the young reader at the expense of achieving adequate equivalence, and not using illustration, description and footnotes.

**KEY WORDS;** Equivalence, children literature translation, cultural items, Newmark's model 1988, *Alice Adventures in Wonderland*.

### INTRODUCTION

Children literature is one of the genres of literature that has relatively recently gained credit, for it is believed to be one of the tools to better children's experience in life, to get them acquainted with other cultures and prepare them to be good future adults.

Translation of children's literature is one of the baffling topics due to many constraints such as linguistic constraints, SL and TL cultural difference, didactics, social and religious affairs.

The current paper deals with the translation equivalence in English/ Kurdish translation of cultural items according to Newmark model (1988) into material culture, ecology, social culture and historical and religious culture.

Examples of cultural items are selected from the SL text, i.e., *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* by Lewis Carroll(1865) coupled with their translations into Bahdini Kurdish. The study aims at highlighting the problems encountered in achieving exact equivalences in translating cultural items i.e., the words that are associated with a particular language. It puts forward, whenever necessary, alternative solutions to narrow the gap between the SL and TL.

### Research Questions

1. To what extent equivalence is achieved in translating the cultural items from English into Bahdini Kurdish?
2. What are the reasons behind the inadequate equivalence in some of the translations?

### Methodology

The current paper is a descriptive one that deals with equivalence in English/ Kurdish translation of cultural items according to Newmark's model (1988). The SL cultural items are listed and coupled with their TL equivalence. The translations are analyzed and compared to the SL items to check to what extent the translator was successful in rendering the SL cultural items into equivalence and what tools did the translator use to narrow the gap between SL and TL. The study also puts forward, whenever necessary, alternative solutions to narrow the gap between the SL and TL.

### Data Collection

Examples of cultural items are selected from the SL text, i.e., *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* translated by Kawa A. Niheli coupled with their translations into Bahdini Kurdish. The study aims at highlighting the

problems encountered in achieving exact equivalences in translating cultural items.

### **Definition of Children's Literature**

There is no unanimous agreement among scholars over what makes the best definition for children's literature, for instance, Hunt (1990:1) states that the boundaries of children's literature are not clear-cut and that children's literature cannot be defined by textual characteristics either of style or content, while its primary audience is equally elusive. He adds that children's literature, as an outsider to the academic world, does not fit neatly into any of the established subject categories and has been positively snubbed by some of those categories. For him, children's literature is a species of literature which has mainly been defined in terms of reader rather than the author's intentions or the texts themselves.

Oittinen (2000:61) gives a brief but concise definition focusing on children as readers, and states that "children's literature can be seen as either literature produced and intended for children or as literature read by children".

Nodelman (2008:151) notes that literature aims to offer readers pleasure and "the books adults appropriately label as children's literature must surely be the ones children will actually enjoy reading".

O'Sullivan (2005:13) describes children's literature as literary work being written primarily for the young reader by adults, and excludes the literary work produced by children themselves.

Given the aforementioned points, Epstein (2012:3) discusses children's literature as being more reader oriented and further points out that adult literature is defined basing on the genre and topic whereas literary work for children is classified by age, style or topic and, thus, this can promise the possibility that children's literature might function differently than that of adult literature.

In their attempts to find a clearer definition for children's literature and its intentions, some scholars draw attention to children's needs beyond pleasure, such as education. It goes without saying that didacticism is more or less recognizable in children's books either in an explicit or implicit way (Puurtinen, 1998:2). Since children are widely regarded as innocent and inexperienced beings by adults, adults feel the necessity to teach them. From this perspective, the fundamental function of

children's literature is educative (Nodelman, 2008: 157).

Some other scholars such as Sever(2008:17) gives priority to age and states that children's literature comprises the term beginning from the early childhood until the adolescence period. She also argues that the genre enriches children's world of emotion and imagination by linguistic and visual messages in line with their language development and comprehension levels.

Thus, it is apparent that the above-mentioned scholars' definitions of children's literature depend upon their own perception of childhood and adulthood, and a general definition of children's literature can be summarized as the literature that is aimed at children in their growing years and is suitable for their stage of mental and psychological development. This includes written material for children that are not yet interested in adult literature or do not yet possess adult reading skills (Bika'ee, 2003:2).

### **Children's Fiction in Translation**

Translation of children's literature is very much limited due to young readers' lack of knowledge. They can hardly ever be expected to understand other cultures or languages which adult readers take for granted. To solve this problem, a translator may feel encouraged to explain foreign terms such as names of geographical places, food and drink that are not well-known in the target language(O'Connell2006:17). Translation and creation of children's literature is influenced by the relationship between the adult writer, or translator, and the young reader.(Lathey,2006:4-5)

Shavit (1986:112- 113) states that the translator is permitted to manipulate the text in various ways by changing, enlarging, or abridging it or by deleting or adding to it. Nevertheless, all these translational procedures are permitted only if conditioned by the translator's adherence to the following two principles on which translation for children is based: an adjustment of the text to make it appropriate and useful to the child, in accordance with what society regards (at a certain point in time) as educationally "good for the child"; and an adjustment of plot, characterization, and language to prevailing society's perceptions of the child's ability to read and comprehend.

Nida (1964:164-71) points out that decoding ability is categorized into four subgroups of which the first group belongs to children. To this effect, translator should consider the taste of children in translation with the purpose of fulfilling their needs thoroughly.

Sound effects have a crucial role in child fiction. Children are enchanted with the sounds of language but hardly can a translator reproduce a sound effect equivalence to that used in the SL text (Newmark, 1988: 58).

Another important means is the utilization of illustrations. Pictures matter to the child as much as, and often more than the words (Huck & Kuhn, 1968: 108). They could become an integral part or an extension of the text.

“Inevitable loss occurs because of the divergent systems of the two languages regardless of the skill and competence of the translator who cannot establish equivalence and therefore resorts to compensatory strategies” (As-Safi, 2007: 68).

Translators of children’s books also need to be alert to the uses of the texts written for children. Since books intended for children are usually produced to be read loud out, ‘the aural texture of a translation’ –rhythm, intonation, stress, pauses, tempo, tone – is of high importance to the child reader (Lathey, 2006:10). Therefore, translators should fulfil this creative task by producing a text which tastes good on adult’s tongue (Oittinen, 2000:32). When it comes to visual elements, another common feature of literary works intended for children, translators should also take into account the interaction between the verbal and the visual. Translators should address the exact counterpoint between visual and verbal codes in illustrated texts and picture books for children (Lathey, 2010: 8).

### **Equivalence in Translation**

Translation has been defined as the process of establishing equivalence between the source language (SL) and target language (TL) texts, in which a representation of a text in one language is replaced by a representation of an equivalence text in a second language (Hartmann&Stork, 1972: 242).

Equivalence in translation is considered one of the baffling tasks for translator cannot establish absolute correspondence between languages, since no two languages are identical, whether in the meaning given to corresponding symbols, or in the way in which such symbols are arranged in structures (Nida, 1964: 156). The

difference in languages makes it hard to achieve total equivalence. But different degrees of equivalence may be attained on the level of semantics, syntax or pragmatics, and at different ranks (word-for-word, phrase-for-phrase, or sentence-for-sentence).

Language can be described as a code which possesses phonological, graphological, syntactic, lexical and semantic features, and language users can make selections from among these sets of code features to create texts that can adequately communicate meaning (Bell, 1991: 8).

A note-worthy view of translation equivalence is that of Neubert (1967 cited in Bassinet-McGuire: 27). He identifies equivalence as “a semiotic category comprising semantics, syntactic and pragmatic components. These components are arranged in a hierarchical relationship, where semantic equivalence takes priority over syntactic equivalence, and pragmatic equivalence conditions and modifies both the other elements”. Thus, equivalence represents the outcome of interaction between signs, referents and those who use them.

The first problem that may face the translator is identifying the meaning of lexical units, i.e. words collocations or idioms, since corresponding SL and TL words do not usually have precisely the same semantic range. The difficulty of adapting the lexical structure of the source language to the semantic requirements of the target language may leave multiple alternatives from which the translator has to choose (Nida, 1964: 167).

The semantic aspect of meaning involves relating the linguistic units or symbols to their referents. According to Newmark (1984: 117), the meaning of a particular lexical item can be clearly identified if weighed against three main series of semantic categories: ordinal, qualitative and logical series, a procedure which is followed by translators intuitively. The first series consists of six categories involving the primary sense, the secondary senses, the derived secondary senses, nonce senses, neologism and hapax senses. As for the second series, it covers the physical, conceptual, figurative, technical, cultural, and colloquial and zero aspects of meaning. The third, the logical series, comprises four categories of meaning: denotation, connotation, intention and extension.

The denotative meaning represents the shared property of the speech community which uses the language. This referential aspect of

meaning is more readily accessible, and for which equivalence in translation can easily be tested (House, 1977: 25). Connotative meaning, on the other hand, is the experiential aspect of meaning. Unlike denotative meaning, it is indeterminate and open-ended. The culture specificity of connotative meaning can pose a serious problem to translator. (Saedi, 1990: 391). Connotations may vary from person to person and from society to society. For example, the denotative meaning of (owl) is identical in both Kurdish and English, but its connotation for Kurds (who see the owl as a bird of ill omen) is entirely different from its connotation in the English culture, where it is viewed as a symbol of wisdom.

What makes exact translation between languages difficult, and at times impossible, is not restricted to difference of lexical structure, including, lexical gaps. Languages also differ in terms of the number and function of the structural elements that convey the meanings (Lyons, 1981: 310). Thus changes on this level may involve shifts concerning features relevant to parts of speech such as gender, number, voice, mood, tense and word order, case-relationships and the direction of the verbal event.

Grammatical changes can be made more readily, since they are dictated by the obligatory structures of the target language (Nida, 1964: 173). In other words, the translator has to make such adjustments as shifting word order, using verbs in place of nouns, deleting or inserting lexical items, and substituting nouns for pronouns, or plural for singular.

The obligatory features pose no problem to translators. However, obstacles may stand in the way if reference should be made in the TL to something nonexistent in the source message, or when elaboration is needed in the TL on something poorly defined, or when something overt in the original text should be made covert in the TL (Nida, 1964: 175). But the serious difficulty lies in the optional elements, and it is up to the translator to make the choice. And this choice may even be affected by the translator's reaction to the writer's style, and his or her awareness of the intention of the message and the kind of readership this message addresses.

The translator needs to understand not only the semantic sense of a stretch of language, but also its communicative value (Bell, 1991: 83).

Pragmatics covers the extralinguistic aspect of meaning influencing communicative

interactions. Knowledge of the pragmatic rules can lead to the way the extralinguistic factors affect communication. What matters in translation is to establish equivalence in terms of the message and the way it is conveyed (Saedi, 1990: 394).

The intention of the SL text usually represents the writer's attitude to the subject matter (Newmark, 1988: 12). The variety of the language used in the original text may give the translator clues to the readership of the SL text and consequently of the translation. It may also enable him to assess the level of education, the class, age and sex of the readers. A translation intended for children, whose vocabulary and cultural experience are limited, cannot be the same as the one designed for adults.

When the writer creates a text, he or she usually draws an image of a communicative partner and expects his possible reaction to it. As the reader enters the communicative interaction, a kind of implicit contact is established, the aim of which is to understand the writer's intention. The producer of a text must intend it to contribute toward some goal, and the receiver of it must accept that it fulfils in some purpose (Bell, 1991: 167).

Problems caused by the differences between the SL and TL cultures cannot be easily overcome. The risk of stalemate in translation is genuine when equivalence cannot be established due to the absence in the TL culture of a relevant situational feature for the SL text (Nida, 1964: 172). Wide gaps are likely to emerge when there is no object or event in the target culture which correspond to an SL referent, but the equivalent function is realized by another object or event. In another instance, the TL culture does possess a parallel object or event to the SL referent, but with entirely different function. There are also instances where no adequate equivalence is available to the SL term.

Different procedures can be followed in an attempt to bridge the gap caused by the remoteness between the SL and TL cultures. The translator may place an equivalent term in the TL text and describe the function in a footnote (and / or an illustration, a procedure widely followed in the translation of child fiction). He or she also may use the functional equivalence in the TL text, with or without reference to the formal referent in the margin. Another alternative is the use of a borrowed term, to which a descriptive classifier can be

added when necessary. Choosing descriptive expressions employing TL words to explain the SL term is yet another option. But the problem caused by the absence of a TL substitute is sometimes left unresolved, when the translator skips the SL term (Oittinen, 2006:37).

#### Application of the Study

The study is based on the categorization of cultural items according to Newmark's model(1988) into: material culture, ecology,

social culture and historical and religious culture. Examples of cultural items are selected from the source language (SL) text, i.e., *Alice in Wonderland* by Lewis Carroll(1865) which is translated by Kawar A. Niheli, coupled with their target language (TL) equivalences provided within the translated version. Both are listed within the categories specified to check to what extent equivalences were achieved between the SL and TL items.

#### The Cultural Categories

#### (1) Material Culture

a – Food:

SL	TL
1. orange marmalade (p.4)	(p.4) مره بهيا پرته قالا
2. custard (p.16)	(p.15) كاستهر
3. buttered toast (p.16)	(p.15) نيشكى بزارتى
4. cake (p.20)	(p.19) كيك
5. tart (p.16)	dropped from translation
6. treacle (p.126)	(p.125) دوشاؤ
7. tarts (p.204)	(p.203) كيك

Some of the food terms within this category have been assimilated into the Target Language (TL) culture such as, “custard”, “cake” and “treacle”. They could be either rendered by using the strategies of transference which means transcription of the SL word or transliteration. Naturalization is also used by providing descriptive equivalence, for example, "orange marmalade" is rendered into. "مره بهيا پرته قالا". The

exact sense of “buttered toast” is lost in translation for the word toast was not translated at all. The word tart was not translated in page 16, but the translator failed to translate “tart” into its exact equivalence in page 240. Though tart could be naturalized into “تورته”, which is understandable by nowadays kids.

b – Drinks:

SL	TL
1. tea (p.108)	(p.107) چا
2. wine (p.112)	(p.111) ناروق

The words “tea” and “wine” are translated into their exact equivalence. But due to the vulnerability of young readers, some educators

do not recommend “ناروق” to be used as an equivalence for the word “ wine”

c– Clothing:

SL	TL
1. waistcoat (p.2)	(p.1) چوخك
2. boots (p.22)	(p.21) چوته كا پيلافا

“Waistcoat” is also part of the Kurdish traditional outfit that is why it is successfully translated into its equivalence in Kurdish.

The second item, i.e. “boots” is replaced by ((چوتنه کا پیتلافا)) which means a pair of shoes. The

best translation for “boots” could be either ((بووت or جهز مه)) which has gained currency in the TL culture.

#### d – Furniture and Household Utensils:

TL	SL
1.Saucer (p.8)	سینیک (p.7)
2.Bottle (p.14)	شیشه (p.13)
3. bottle (p.62)	دولکه (p.61)
4. fireplace (p.66)	جھي ناگری (p.66)
5. cauldron (p.96)	متجلمکا مەزن (p.95)
6.stool (p.96)	کورسی (p.95)
7.Hearth (p.98)	سوپه (p.97)
8.China tea pot (p.122)	قوریکي چایی (p.121)
9. tureen (p.198)	قازان (p.198)

“Saucer” is rendered into (سینیک) which is a generic word that refers to plate for serving food, while “saucer” itself is a small round plate that curves up at the edge that a cup is put on.

“Bottle” is translated into two different items, namely (شیشه) and (دولکه). Bottle could be naturalized into (بتلی نافی).

The term “fireplace” is translated into (جھي ناگری) which is the accurate equivalence for “fireplace”.

In fiction, the message and the didactic element usually outweigh the cultural element (Newmark, 1984:82), thus in translation many details are overlooked. This may justify the rendering of “cauldron” and “tureen” into the generic words (مەنجەله کا مەزن) and (قازان), although the first refers to a large round metal pot for

boiling liquids over a fire, and the second refers to a large dish with a lid, used for serving soup or vegetables. It seems apparent that the use of (مەنجەله کا مەزن) and (قازان) as equivalences for “cauldron” and “tureen” is not the correct choice.

The word “stool” is rendered into (کورسی) which is a generic term and does not signify its peculiarity of having no back or arms; still it’s the only equivalent word in the TL culture.

“Hearth” is translated into (سوئە) which means (heater). This either because the translator wanted to create the atmosphere of sitting around the heater in a cold weather, or he could not find the appropriate equivalence to use.

“China tea pot” is translated into (قوریکي چایی) which is a generic term and does not signify its peculiarity of being made of china.

#### e- Currency:

SL	TL
1.dollars (p.206)	دۆلار (p.206)
2.cents (p.206)	سەنت (p.206)

Rendering “dollars” and “cents” into (دۆلار) and (سەنت) may do justice to the SL text as well

as the TL reader, especially if an explanatory footnote is added.

## (2) Ecology:

## a – Flora:

TL		SL	
1.daisies	(p. 2)	(p. 1)	كوليلك
3.Lilac	(p.46)	(p.45)	ليلاك
4. buttercup	(p.72)	(p.71)	گوله كا نازنازوك
5. tulip	(p.134)	(p.133)	توليب
6.roses	(p.134)	(p.133)	گولان
7.rose	(p.140)	(p.139)	طول محتمدى

In translating flora, the translator adopted several strategies. The term “daisies” is translated into (كوليلك) which is a generic term that means flowers; while (داوودى) is an exact equivalence for daisy in the TL culture.

Sometimes, terms relevant to ecological features are transferred to retain the local color of SL culture, but this approach is not advisable when there is an exact equivalence in the TL culture. The translator here adopted the aforementioned approach in translating both of the terms “lilac” and “tulip” into (ليلاك) and (توليب), although there are the terms (شليبر) and

(خزيم) in the TL that form exact equivalence for “lilac” and “tulip”.

“Buttercup” is translated into (گوله كا نازنازوك) which literally means a “fine flower”, although there is an equivalent term in the TL culture for the SL term. This choice may be attributed to the fact that the translator tends to replace the SL term with a descriptive equivalent to inform the reader of something to come within the text. The equivalence for “buttercup” in the TL is (بلوور). The item “rose” is translated into the generic word (گول) which means flowers. On page 139, the word rose is translated into its exact equivalences

## b- Fauna:

SL		TL	
1.hippopotamus	(p.34)	(p.33)	هدسي نافي
2. dodo	(p.38)	(p.37)	دودو
3. rat	(p.38)	(p.37)	بزغمشك
4. eaglet	(p.40)	(p.39)	تيشكا نهفوى
5.magpie	(p.54)	(p.53)	قعل
6.Guinea pigs	(p.68)	(p.37)	بهراز
7.Lizard	(p.68)	(p.67)	مارگيسك
8.Puppy	(p. 69)	(p.68)	سه
9.Caterpillar	(p. 82)	(p.81)	كومي دارى
10.Cheshire cat	(p.98)	(p.97)	پشيك شيرشرى
11. March Hare	(p.108)	(p.107)	مارچا كيتريشك
12. flamingo	(p.160)	(p.159)	قولنگ
13. pig	(p.162)	(p.161)	بهراز
14. Mock turtle	(p.170)	(p.169)	كيسهله موك

15. gryphon	(p.170)	(p.169)	گريفون
16.Tortoise	(p.174)	(p.173)	تورتس
17.Jellyfish	(p.184)	(p.183)	ستيرين دهر ياي
18.seal	(p.188)	Dropped from translation	
19.snail	(p.188)	(p.187)	شه پنانوك
20.eel	(p.192)	(p.191)	مار ماسي
21.Porpoise	(p.194)	(p.194)	دولفين
22.Lark	(p.196)	(p.196)	چويچك
23. turtle	(p.198)	(p.197)	كيسهله
24. Dormouse	(p.208)	(p.207)	مشكي خهوين
25.Dormouse	(p.214)	(p.213)	مشك

Of all the fauna items, only “hippopotamus”, “eagle”, “magpie”, “lizard”, “pig”, “snail” and “eel” are translated into their equivalents in the TL.

Different strategies are used in rendering the rest of the items. “Dodo”, “tortoise” and “gryphon” are transliterated. “Dodo” and “gryphon” are translated into (دودو) and (طريفون). “Dodo” is transliterated into (دودو) which is an acceptable rendering if another word such as (بالندة) is added or a footnote is used to explain it. As for “tortoise” it is transliterated though it has an exact equivalence in the TL. An exact equivalence for “tortoise” is (كيسهلا هشكاتي).

“Rat”, “guinea pigs”, “flamingo”, “porpoise”, “jellyfish” and “lark” are unjustifiably translated into animals that have got nothing to do with the SL terms. “Rat” is rendered into (برغمشك) which means “lizard” although it has an exact equivalence in TL, namely, (جود). “Guinea pigs” is translated into (بهراز) which means “pig”. “Guinea pigs” could be translated into (بهرازين گيني) which is an exact equivalence for “guinea pigs”. “Flamingo” could be transliterated into (فلامينگو) instead of (قولنگ) for “flamingo” has gained currency in the TL. “Porpoise” is a sea animal that looks similar to a dolphin and breathes air, but it is translated into “dolphin” although there are some differences between them. “Porpoise” could be translated into (دولفيني پورپوس). “Jellyfish” is translated into (ستيرين دهر ياي) which means “starfish”. “Lark” is translated into (چويچك) which refers to

“sparrow”, although the SL term has equivalence in the TL, namely, (شفانكوژ) or (تبي).

“Puppy” is translated into (سه) which is a generic term for “dog”. An exact equivalent for “puppy” in the TL is (كوچك).

“Caterpillar” is translated into (كرمي داري) which refers to a specific type of caterpillar, namely, “tree caterpillar” though “caterpillar” is a generic term.

The translator seems to have deliberately translated “Cheshire cat” into (تشديكا شيرشري) either to indicate that the cat is named after the Cheshire County in Britain, or he tried his best to maintain a sound effect similar to that of “Cheshire cat”; either way the translator failed to convey all the associations and connotations of the grinning Cheshire cat on the cover of the novel.

Rendering “March Hare” into (مارچا كئيريشك) sacrifices the meaning of the term which refers to hare’s excited behavior in March, which is their mating season (Yourdictionary.com). A literal translation of “March Hare” into (كئيريشكا) could have rendered part of the meaning, especially if complemented by a footnote explanation of the reason behind its madness.

As for “mock turtle”, it is apparent that the translator could not find an equivalent for it, for it does not exist in the TL, thus translating it into (كيسهله موك) fails to evoke the associations the SL term has for the SL reader who can readily relate it to a particular food, namely, “mock turtle soup”.



“Dormouse” is unjustifiably translated into (مشكىّ خهوين) and (مشكىّ خهوين) is an acceptable translation of “dormouse”, i.e., “sleepy mouse” for they are known for their long periods of hibernation. As for the second

translation, i.e., (مشك) it is a generic term for mouse. This could cause a kind of confusion for the young readers for the same item is given two names.

(3) Social Culture:

a – Address Terms:

SL		TL	
1. Duchess	(p.24)	(p.23)	مير كچ
2. Queen	(p.92)	(p.91)	خاتوين
3. Queen	(p.135)	(p.134)	شاهزن
4. king	(p.135)	(p.134)	پاشا

“Duchess” is peculiar to the SL culture that is why the translator had hard times in rendering it into its equivalence in the TL culture. Rendering “Duchess” into (مير كچ) is entirely unsuccessful rendering; for it means “princess”, while “Duchess” is a woman with the highest social rank outside the royal family or the wife of a Duke’. Thus, it becomes apparent that the translation falls short of approaching the meaning. The translator could use (دوقه) as an equivalence for “Duchess” and a description of

the term could be added within the text or in a footnote to facilitate comprehension. As for the other three terms, “king” is rendered into its equivalent in the TL culture, but “Queen” is rendered into two different terms. It is translated into (شاهزن) which is the correct equivalent in the TL culture and in another place, it is rendered into (خاتوين) which means Madam”. Thus, the rendering falls short of approaching the meaning.

b- Work

SL		TL	
1. Footman	(p.96)	(p.95)	خولام
2. herald	(p.204)	(p.203)	گازيكهر گازيكهر

According to Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, both “footman” and “herald” carry the period flavor. A “footman” is a male servant in the past that opened the front door and announced the names of the visitors. A “herald” refers to someone who carried

messages from a ruler in the past. Rendering the two English terms into (خولام) and (گازيكهر) does not reflect the full meaning. The problem could be solved by adding a footnote to explain the meaning of the terms.

c- Leisure Activities:

TL		SL	
1. Croquet	(p.18)	(p.17)	ياريا كريكهت
2. A game of croquet	(p.154)	(p.153)	ياريا كروكهيتي
3. Jack – in – the – box	(p.65)	(p.54)	جاكي د سندوقي دا
4. Queen of Hearts	(p.120)	(p.119)	خاتوينا دلا
5.the Lobster Quadrille	(p.184)	(p.183)	چواري كينغز الهى

The translation of both terms “croquet” and “a game of croquet” may cause a kind of confusion to the young reader for “croquet” is translated into two different words. This translation gives the impression that it is “the cricket game”.

An explanation function can help the translator find a way out of the impasse reached in the absence of a recognized TL equivalent to the SL term. But the translator did not adopt the aforementioned approach, so “Jack-in-the-box” is a toy in the form of a box with a figure inside

that springs up when the lid is opened(vocabulary.com) is translated word-for-word into (جاکی د سندوقی دا). This translation falls short of approaching the original meaning of it in the SL culture. The term “Jack-in-the-box” could be translated into something like (( نهجی د )) coupled with a footnote, though it has not yet gained currency in the TL culture.

Card games are familiar to both SL and TL cultures, hence translating them is not expected

to be problematic, but the translator translated “Queen of Hearts” into (خاتون دلا) instead of (شاهزنا دلا) which is considered an exact equivalent.

The last term in this group, i.e.” the Lobster Quadrille” is translated into (چواری کيفڑالهی) which does not give the young reader any clue what is that. If a word such as (سهما) is added to the translation, it would make the translation understandable.

d – Postures:

SL	TL
1. and it sat for a long time with one finger pressed upon forehead. (p.46)	بۆ ماوه کی درێژ نهو راوهستیا و تبه له کا ویژی ب نهیا ویقه بوو. (p.46)
2. Alice picked up the fan and gloves and, as the hall was very hot, she fanned herself madly. (p.26)	نهلیسی دهستگورک و پانک ههلهگرتن و، ژ بهر کو هول گهلهک یا گهرم بوو، وی ب توریقه بهری پانکی دا خوه 25).. (p)

Both postures are literally translated into their equivalents.

e- Customs:

SL	TL
1. For instance, suppose it were nine o'clock in the morning, just time to open your books in school and get to work.)p. 118)	کا دا بیژن دههژمهیر نهه سییدی یه و دهی فهکرنا پهرتووکا ته به ل قوتابجانی و چوونا لسه کار. (p.117)

In the translation of the custom, the translator rendered plural “ books” into singular in the TL and translated “get to work” into (ضونا لستر کاری), which does not convey what the writer meant. Thus the translation appears to be insipid. The best translation for the part of “get to work” is “(دهستهپیکرنا وانا).

(4) Historical and Religious Culture:

SL	TL
1-Christmas (p.22 )	سهرسال (p.21)
2. William the Conqueror (p.34 )	ولیهمی داگیر کهر (p.33)

“Christmas”, which is a Christian occasion commemorating the birth of Christ, is translated into (سترسال) that means the New Year. This translation falls short of approaching the real meaning, although it has an exact equivalent in the TL culture, namely (جدهژنا ژ دایکبوونا ههزرتی مهسیح) which is a description that conveys the full meaning. As for “William the Conqueror”, it is word-for-word translated into ((ولیهمی داگیر کهر)) which is very difficult for the young readers to get all the connotations and associations related to the SL term. The problem could be solved by adding a footnote explaining who William the Conqueror <sup>1</sup>was.

**CONCLUSIONS**

This study has reached to the following conclusions:

1. Three of the seven food items were not translated into their exact equivalents in the TL, which makes 42% of the food items. Both drinks are translated into their exact equivalents, which make 100%. 50% of clothing items are translated into their exact equivalents. Only one item of furniture and household utensils was translated into its exact equivalent, which makes 11% of all the items.100% of currency items were translated into their exact equivalents. Of all seven flora items only one item is translated

<sup>1</sup> William the Conqueror was the Duke of Normandy who led the Norman invasion of England and became the first Norman to be King of England; into England (1027-1087) ([https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/William the Conqueror](https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/William%20the%20Conqueror). Accessed 05 Jun. 2023.)

into its exact equivalent, which makes 14% of all the items. 7 items out of 25 fauna items are translated into their exact equivalents which make 28%. Two address terms were successfully translated into their exact equivalents which make 50%. Both work items are not successfully translated which means that 0% of the work items are translated into their exact equivalents. 0% of the leisure and activity items were translated into their exact equivalents. Both posture items are translated into their exact equivalents which makes 100%. Custom item was not translated into its exact equivalent which makes 50%.of the historical and religious culture items were translated into their equivalents.

2. Adaptation was used in translating some of the cultural items, though there was no need for adaptation.

3. No tools such as description, footnote or illustrations were used to make the translations palatable to the young readers.

## REFERENCES

- As-Safi, B. (2007). Theories, Methods and Strategies of Translation. Atlas Global Center for Studies and Research, 2(1), 15-22
- Bassnett-McGuire S.(1991). Translation Studies.New York: Methuen&Co.Ltd.
- Bell, R. T. (1991) *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*, London and New York: Longman.
- Bika'ee E.(2003) *Children's Stories:Their Essence, Choices and how to be related*. Beirut: Dar al-Fikir.
- Carroll Lewis. (2019). *Alice in Wonderland*, (English/Kurdish): Translated by Kawar A. Nheli. Duhok: Nursin.
- Epstein,B. J. (2012).*Translating Expressive Language in Children's Literature: Problems and Solutions*. Oxford, England: Peter Lang.
- House,Juliane(1977).*A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*. Tübingen:Narr
- Huck, C. S. and Kuhn, D. Y. (1968). *Children's Literature in the Elementary*. New York: Holt Reinhart and Winston, Inc.
- Hunt. (1990). *Children's Literature in Criticism*. London: Rutledge.
- Lathey G. (2006) *The Translation of Children's Literature: A Reader*. Multilingual Matters. Latka-Gajer,
- Lathey, G. (2010). *The role of translators in children's literature: Invisible storyteller* New York and London: Routledge
- Lyons, John (1981). *Language and Linguistics*. London& New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hartmann, R. R. K. & Stork, F. C (1972).*Dictionary of language and linguistics*. London: LTD.
- Newmark, P.(1984).*Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon press.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E. A. (1964). *Towards a science of translation, with special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*. Leiden: Brill.
- Nodelman, P. (2008). *The Hidden Adult: Defining Children's Literature*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- O'Connell, E. (2006). *Translating for Children*. In Lathey. G. *The Translation of Children's Literature, A Reader* (pp. 14-25). Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Oittinen, Riitta,(200) *Translating for Children*. New York: Garland, Inc.
- Oittinen, R. (2006). *No Innocent Act: On the Ethics of Translation for Children*. In J. V. Coillie and W. Verschueren (Eds.) *Children's Literature in Translation: Challenges and strategies* (pp. 35-45). Manchester, England: St. Jerome Publishing.
- O'Sullivan, E. (2005). *Comparative Children's Literature*. London, England: Routledge.
- Puurtinen, T. (1998). *Syntax, Readability and Ideology in Children's Literature*. *Meta*, 43(4), 524-533. DOI: 10.7202/003879ar.
- Saedi,L. (1990) *Discourse Analysis and the Problem of Translation. Equivalence*. In *META Journal XXXV/2* pp 389-397. Retrieved <http://jaits.web>.
- Sever, S. (2008). *Çocuk ve Edebiyat*. İzmir: Tudem.
- Shavit, Z. (1986). *Poetics of Children's Literature*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Dictionaries  
Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (Fifth edition). (2009). Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Aaadallah, S.(2000). *English=Kurdish Dictionary*. Paris: Avesta.  
<https://www.dictionary.com/browse>.  
<https://www.vocabulary.com/lists/303330>

وهكهه فييا وهه رگيرانا كه ره ستيين كه لتووري ژ ئينگليزي بو كوردي د چيروكين زارووكاندا:  
ئه ليس ل وهلاتي سهير و سه مه ران وهك نمونه

بوخته

ئهف قه كولينه ده رباري وهكهه فيينه د وهه رگيرانا كه ره ستيين كه لتوورييه. قه كولين يا هاتيه بنياتكرن ل گور موديل نيومارك بو پولينكرنا كه ره ستيين كه لتووري يا 1988 ئه وا هاتيه وهه رگرتن ژ نايدا 1964. ئهف موديله كه ره ستيين كه لتووري پوليندكهت بو: ماددين كه لتووري، ژينگه هي، وكه لتووري كومه لايه تي و ديرووكي و ئاييني. نمونين كه ره ستن كه لتووري ژ زماني سه رچا قه (ئينگليزي) هاتينه هه لبارتن واته ژ رومانا ئه ليس ل وهلات سهير و سه مه ران و ئه و نمونه هاتينه هه مبه ركرن دگه ل وهه رگيرانا وان ل زماني ئارمانج (كوردي). هه مي كه ره ستيين كه لتووري هاتينه دانان ل ديف پولينكرنا وان. پرسيار ئه وه-هه تا چ راده ي وهكهه في هاتيه جي به جيكرن د وهه رگيرانا كه ره ستيين كه لتووري و چنه ئه گرين نه وهكهه في د هندهك وهه رگيراناندا؟ ئه و كه ره ستيين هاتينه وهه رگيران هاتنه شيكاركرن و هه قبه ركرن. وه سا دياره كه گه له كييا وان كه ره ستيين هاتينه هه لبارتن نه هاتينه وهه رگيران بشيوه كي راست و درست ژ ئه گه ري نه شه هره زايي ژ لايي وهه رگيري قه و هه ولدانا وي بو نيزيكرنا وهه رگيران بو زارووكان، هه روه سا ژ بهر نه بكاريئانا هامش و وينان .

په يقين كليلى

وهكهه في د وهه رگيران دا، وهه رگيرانا ئه ده بي زارووكان، كه ره ستيين كه لتووري، موديل نيومارك يا سالا 1988، ئه لبس ل وهلاتي سهير و سه مه ران

التكافؤ في ترجمة المصطلحات الثقافية من الانجليزية الى الكردية:

دراسة تطبيقية على رواية اليس في بلاد العجائب

الخلاصة

يتناول هذا البحث المكافئ الترجمي في ترجمة العناصر الثقافية. تستند الدراسة على تصنيف المصطلحات الثقافية وفقا لنموذج نيومارك 1988 الذي يصنف المصطلحات الثقافية المفضة الثقافة المادية والبيئية والثقافة الاجتماعية والتاريخية والدينية. تم اختيار امثلة على العناصر الثقافية من نص اللغة المصدر اي الانجليزية من رواية اليس في بلاد العجائب الى جانب مكافؤها في الترجمة في اللغة الهدف اي الكردية. السؤال هو الى مدى تم تحقيق المكافئ في ترجمة العناصر الثقافية؟ وما هي اسباب عدم تحقق المكافئ في الترجمة؟ تم تحليل العناصر المترجمة ومقارنتها مع النص الاصلي وتبين انه لم يتم ترجمة معظم العناصر الثقافية الى مكافئاتها في النص الاصلي، لاسباب مثل قلة خبرة المترجم ومحاولته جعل الترجمة سهلة ومتاحة للقاريء الصغير على حساب تحقق المكافئ المناسب، وعدم استخدام الوصف والرسوم التوضيحية والهوامش.

الكلمات الدالة: التكافؤ، ترجمة ادب الاطفال، المصطلحات الثقافية، نموذج نيومارك 1988، اليس في بلاد العجائب