

**Lost in Translation: How the perception of Characters changes in the German
Translations of J.R.R. Tolkiens *The Lord of the Rings***

**Lost in Translation: Wie sich die Wahrnehmung von Charakteren in den deutschen
Übersetzungen von J.R.R. Tolkiens *The Lord of the Rings* verändert**

by

Alexander Held

A thesis

presented to the University of Waterloo

and the Universität Mannheim

in fulfilment of the

thesis requirement for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Intercultural German Studies

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada / Mannheim, Germany 2021

© Alexander Held 2021

Author's Declaration

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis. This is a true copy of the thesis, including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners.

I understand that my thesis may be made electronically available to the public.

Ehrenwörtliche Erklärung

Ich versichere, dass ich die Arbeit selbstständig und ohne Benutzung anderer als der angegebenen Hilfsmittel angefertigt habe. Alle Stellen, die wörtlich oder sinngemäß aus Veröffentlichungen in schriftlicher oder elektronischer Form entnommen sind, habe ich als solche unter Angabe der Quelle kenntlich gemacht. Mir ist bekannt, dass im Falle einer falschen Versicherung die Arbeit mit „nicht ausreichend“ bewertet wird. Ich bin ferner damit einverstanden, dass meine Arbeit zum Zwecke eines Plagiatsabgleichs in elektronischer Form versendet und gespeichert werden kann.

Zwingenberg, 29.07.2021

Abstract

It is an accepted paradigm that translated texts will never be the perfect equivalent to the original text in a different language. It is a fact that foreign literary works will influence a culture through translations. However, this influence of the translation will usually be attributed to the author of the original work, not to the translator.

The aim of this study is to raise awareness of the influence of the translator rather than the author, and thus to kill the author of the examined work, J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings*, twice: once as the author influencing the German (fantasy) literature through the German translations of Margaret Carroux and Wolfgang Krege, and a second time as authoritative figure in the academic field of Tolkien studies.

To this end, the three text versions have been read following the hermeneutic approach of Paul Ricœur and subscribing to Roland Barthes Death of the Author paradigm. In this study, the most significant differences have been analyzed, making the impact of the translators on character perception, and, thus, on the influence of *The Lord of the Rings*, obvious.

The analysis resulted in a plethora of significant differences between the three text versions, confirming that translations may deviate from the original work even when translating sentence-for-sentence. The changes include a discussion of xenophobia and racism, thinning the lines of social standings and relations, and many more. I argue that these differences are in themselves an argument for killing the author in Tolkien studies, creating an opportunity to discuss these aspects introduced by translators, and that they are evidence for how translators influence their culture as much as the author.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Prof. Paul Malone of the Department of Germanic and Slavic Studies at the University of Waterloo, for his guidance in this project from a confused e-mail about "translations and stuff" I sent him in the Summer of 2020, to the development of the idea of this thesis, to research and, finally, to this final product. He continuously led me to the next crossroads, while leaving the choice of left, right, or center to me. Thank you!

I would also like to thank Prof. Thomas Wortmann of the Philosophische Fakultät at the Universität Mannheim for his enthusiastic agreement to be the second supervisor of this thesis. Danke!

I further extend my thanks to the faculty, students, and staff at both universities who had my back in various academic and bureaucratic challenges.

Finally, I would like to thank my friends around the world, who gave me a safe space to cool down whenever I needed one, and my family for the constant support across the board and from all sides.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Literature Review.....	3
2.1 Translation Theory.....	3
2.2 Literature Theory.....	7
2.3 Tolkien-Specific Literature.....	11
3. Methodology.....	16
4. General Comparison.....	20
5. Analysis.....	29
5.1 The Black Riders.....	30
5.2 Gollum.....	43
5.3 Galadriel.....	50
5.4 Other Characters And Scenes.....	59
5.4.1 Boromir.....	59
5.4.2 Aragorn/Strider.....	62
5.4.3 Denethor.....	64
6. Analysis: Results.....	66
6.1 Result 1: Translations In Literature Studies.....	67
6.2 Result 2: Tolkien Studies.....	70
7. Conclusion.....	72

1. Introduction

John Ronald Reuel Tolkien first published *The Lord of the Rings* in 1954 and 1955 (split into three volumes), expanding his text-world of Middle-Earth from the small confinement of *The Hobbit* into something bigger, a world that mesmerized readers for decades to come and brought forth one of the most successful franchises of our time. It was adapted into multiple other media, the most well-known adaptation being Peter Jackson's movie trilogy in 2001 to 2003. Even in the current year of 2021, almost 50 years after the author's death, people across the world are looking forward to more content around Tolkien's Middle-Earth, with the current publication on the horizon being a TV Series around the Second Age of Tolkien's world.

Translators across the world undoubtedly played a huge part of the international success of Tolkien's work, translating *The Lord of the Rings* into dozens of languages. In some languages it was even translated twice, like in German.

In this study, I will examine three different versions of *The Lord of the Rings* (henceforth *LotR*), focusing on differences in the perception of characters in the text-world by readers of the three versions. The three versions I will examine are the English text by J.R.R. Tolkien, using the 50th Anniversary Edition from 2004; the German translation by Margaret Carroux, using the 12th edition from 1984, originally published 1969-1970; and the German translation by Wolfgang Krege, using the 10th edition 2002, originally published in 2000.

I will take an in-depth look at how translation decisions by Carroux and Krege change the perception readers have of their characters compared to the same characters in the respective other versions of the text. Towards this goal, I will first compare both translations in their overall translation strategy, showing how their approaches to *LotR* were different from each other. Next, I will examine what I call "meaningful differences" in the text and explain why the excerpts I show in this study are meaningful, and which impact they have on

the perception of the characters acting in, or being talked about in these excerpts. These excerpts will include utterances by characters, but also how characters are framed by the narrator throughout the text.

The goal of this examination is to show the impact translations have on the interpretation of the translated text, especially by academics of literature studies. Thus, the goal is at the same time to show the implications of working with translations in literature studies. Towards this end, I work with a hermeneutic approach following Ricœur. I argue that translations change the clues the text provides for the construction of possible meanings, leading to different possible interpretations, even when working with the "same" text.

Building upon this goal I then pursue a follow-up goal of this study. That goal entails pointing out that translations have an impact on the target cultures, especially on the future texts produced by these cultures. By establishing this impact, the goal is to emphasize the importance of working with translations in the academic field of literature studies, instead of only working with texts originally produced in the respective language.

2. Literature Review

Before the analysis begins, it is necessary to introduce some theoretical background I will be referencing in this study. This includes translation studies, literature studies, but also studies done exclusively around Tolkien and his works as well as specific terms used in these academic fields, which will be explained below.

2.1 TRANSLATION THEORY

Two terms which will be frequently used in this study are the terms Source Language (SL) and Target Language (TL). In translation studies, TL is the language the translator translates into, creating the target text (TT), while SL is the language the source text (ST) is written in (or spoken in, in verbal translation). In the case of this study's subject, the SL is English (Tolkien's text), while the TL is German (Carroux's and Krege's texts). The translator's role then is that of a mediator between SL and TL, or as Rainer Nagel phrases it:

The specific mediation a translator performs is that of mediating between the speakers of two languages, implying that speakers of the target language (TL), the one he is translating for, are not (or at least not sufficiently) familiar with the source language (SL). This means that first he has to process and understand (and interpret) the SL text before he can go on to produce a derived version of that text in the target language. ("New One" 22)

Nagel paraphrases the terms SL and TL and one of many definitions of the role of the translator in translation studies, but this quote is a good starting point to talk about more controversies that kept (and still keep) translation studies theorists busy for a long time.

In this passage, Nagel states that it is implied that TL speakers are not sufficiently familiar with the SL to be able to process the ST themselves. This is not a general statement: it is not supposed to imply that all TL speakers are unable to understand the SL. It is

supposed to show the premise the translator should start from in his work: making the inaccessible accessible.

When making the inaccessible accessible, the translator always creates an interpretation of the ST, as Nagel mentions. Venuti in *The Translator's Invisibility* quotes Derrida as follows:

Translation is a process by which the chain of signifiers that constitutes the foreign text is replaced by a chain of signifiers in the translating language which the translator provides on the strength of an interpretation. Because meaning is an effect of relations and differences among signifiers along a potentially endless chain (polysemous, intertextual, subject to infinite linkages), it is always differential and deferred, never present as on original unity. (13)

This part of translation as interpretation will be further elaborated in 2.2.

Due to the subject of this study, I will analyze translations on a small word-for-word or sentence-for-sentence scale of translation. In this analysis, I will show and argue that while it is possible to transpose a message signifier by signifier (at least between German and English), additional issues arise even then, due to the task of interpretation done by the translator: in this signifier-by-signifier translation, the translator can, on purpose or by accident, change the possible perceived message (see 2.2). In these cases, then, it can be argued that the translator did so on purpose, and it is possible that they follow a larger scale translation strategy.

In *The Translator's Invisibility*, Laurence Venuti discusses two different large-scale strategies translators have used to make the inaccessible source text accessible for their audience: "foreignizing" and "domesticating" translations. Venuti writes:

Admitting ... that translation can never be completely adequate to the foreign text, Schleiermacher allowed the translator to choose between a domesticating practice, an

ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to receiving cultural values, bringing the author back home, and a foreignizing practice, an ethnodeviant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad. (15)

In other words, a domesticated text is a text that was changed to fit the Target Culture, the culture the TL is spoken in, while a foreignized text is a text mimicking the ST in stylistic, linguistic and cultural properties.

In the opening chapter of *The Translator's Invisibility* Venuti writes under "The regime of fluency":

A translated text ... is judged acceptable by most publishers, reviewers and readers, when it reads fluently, when the absence of any linguistic or stylistic peculiarities makes it seem transparent, giving the appearance that it reflects the foreign writer's personality or intention or the essential meaning of the foreign text – the appearance in other words, that the translation is not in fact a translation, but the "original". (1)

This describes Venuti's idea of a domesticated text: when the translated text was adapted to the TL so much that it is not apparent to the reader anymore that they are reading a translated work that was originally written in a different language. A "foreignized" text then is the opposite:

Foreignizing translation signifies the differences of the foreign text, yet only by disrupting the cultural codes that prevail in the translating language. In its effort to do right abroad, this translation practice must do wrong at home, deviating enough from native norms to stage an alien reading experience. (15)

Thus, when reading a foreignized text, the reader will notice that they, in fact, read a translation of a foreign text and not a text initially written in the language they are reading it

in. However, this is not due to the translator using subpar style on purpose, but due to the foreign source's culture being preserved.

As a part of this study, I will also attempt to determine whether the Carroux and Krege translations, respectively, could be dubbed as domesticated or as foreignized translations.

When talking about foreignized and domesticated translations, the word "culture" appeared repeatedly. Reiß and Vermeer list five "refractions" in *Towards a General Theory of Translational Action* in their passage about "Language and Culture": Culture-specific conventions (or traditions), individual attitude (or disposition), different realities (or 'possible worlds'), frozen traditions, and value systems (23). Each of these cultural refractions, they argue, can cause translation problems (24).

However, Reiß and Vermeer do not work towards a differentiation of foreignizing and domesticating translations, but, as the title of their book suggests, towards a theory of translation, known as the *skopos* theory. It states:

- (1) A *translatum* is determined by its *skopos*. ...
 - (2) A *translatum* is an offer of information in a target culture and language about an offer of information in a source culture and language. ...
 - (3) A *translatum* is a unique, irreversible mapping of a source-culture offer of information. ...
 - (4) A *translatum* must be coherent in itself. ...
 - (5) A *translatum* must be coherent with the source text. ...
 - (6) These rules are interdependent and linked hierarchically in the order set out above.
- (Reiß and Vermeer 107)

The most central part of this theory lies within (1), the *skopos*. In short, the *skopos* is the purpose behind the translational action, which, according to (1), determines the translation:

"Given that translational action is a specific form of interaction, it is more important that a particular translational purpose be achieved than the translation process be carried out in a particular way." (Reiß and Vermeer 89) or: "A translational action is governed by its purpose." (85). To determine the *skopos* of a translation, the translator first needs to determine the target audience, Reiß and Vermeer argue: "A *skopos* cannot be set unless the target audience can be assessed. If the target audience is not known, it is impossible to decide whether or not a particular function makes sense for them." (91).

In this study, I will argue that Krege, whether on purpose or by accident, follows the *skopos* theory in his translation, following Rainer Nagel (see 2.3).

2.2 LITERATURE THEORY

This study is in huge parts also a literature studies study, thus it can not operate solely on translation studies. Arguably the most important literature theory discussion to touch on here is the discussion on the authority of the author.

Due to the subject of the study being two translations and the original text, the relationship of the author of the original text is an unusual one compared to the majority of literature studies texts. For example, Roland Barthes published his essay *La mort de l'auteur* in 1967, claiming the – translated - Death of the Author. Paraphrased, he claims that the author of a text has no greater authority over that text than any literature critic or other reader, as the text should speak for itself. Thus, one should not ask the author to decipher a text but presume that the reader has all the tools needed; in extension, a text should be able to be understood without the help of the author.

What does this mean for translations? I argue that one can read translations as the interpretation of a reader – in fact it would be difficult to argue otherwise. A translation, then, is the original text as the translator, the "first reader" so to say, read it. From a purely literature studies perspective, it is then the same whether it was written down in the same

language as the original text or whether it was written down in a different language: one way or the other, the reader is confronted with an interpretation, and yet again we kill the author; this time the interpreting translator. It does not matter what interpretation of the original text the translation was supposed to show according to the translator, what matters is what the text actually shows to the reader. This also means that any influence Tolkien or editors may have had on the translations (as was the case in Carroux's translation, see Stopfel 11) is not important for the understanding of the text.

Allan Turner in *Translating Tolkien* (see 2.3) attempts to make an exception to the Death of the Author in the case of (Tolkien) translations: he argues, that, "while the critic may opt for multiple interpretations, ... the translator normally has to produce just one target text" and "in translation there may be a valid part for both the author and the translator to play. ... [T]he author may clarify ideas for the translator, and ... the translator may be helping to create meaning(s) of the text in the target culture" (60). However, this is a weak counter-argument as the same reasoning for the Death of the Author works here as well: if the author manages to convey his intended meaning(s) in the text, the translator does not need to consult the author to "clarify ideas" and will "create meaning(s)" of his own according to the meaning(s) they gathered from reading the ST. If the author did not manage to convey his intended meaning(s) in the ST, the translator would not translate the ST when consulting the author for the meaning(s), but create a new text that can not be seen as a translation any longer. It is of course possible that the translator makes mistakes or misunderstands the semantics of a rare phrase in his second language; however, to quote Turner: "key issues will come across clearly in translation even if some of the fine detail is inevitably lost at word level" (53).

The subject of this study is the change of the reader's perception of the text, more specifically the characters, due to differences in the three text versions. In other words, it is

concerned with differing possible interpretations of characters and their actions. Thus, this study can be situated within the literature studies sub-field of hermeneutics; not as a contribution to hermeneutic theory, but as a study that applies hermeneutics in practice.

Paul Ricœur writes in *The Task of Hermeneutics* about interpretation: "it consists in recognising which relatively univocal message the speaker has constructed on the polysemic basis of the common lexicon" (4), where polysemy is "'the feature by which our words have more than one meaning when considered outside of their use in a determinate context" (*Task* 4). Thus, interpretation is the activity of choosing a possible meaning of an ambiguous word or phrase or paragraph. One immediately recognizes the similarities of Ricœur's theory of hermeneutic interpretation and Derrida's description of the task of a translator quoted by Venuti in 2.1.

Following Heidegger, and in accordance to Roland Barthes, Ricœur rejects the idea of early hermeneutics that the reader should attempt to grasp the meaning the author gave the text: "the text must be unfolded, no longer towards its author, but towards its immanent sense and towards the world which it opens up and discloses" (*Task* 13). Thus, the reader constructs the meaning of a text:

Why must we 'construct' the meaning of a text? First, because it is written: in the asymmetrical relation between the text and the reader, one of the partners speaks for both. ... Reading resembles ... the performance of a musical piece regulated by written notations of the score. For the text is an autonomous space of meaning which is no longer animated by the intentions of its author; the autonomy of the text, deprived of this essential support, hands writing over to the sole interpretation of the reader.

A second reason is that the text is not only something written, but is a work, that is, a singular totality. As a totality, the literary work cannot be reduced to a sequence of

sentences which are individually intelligible; rather, it is an architecture of themes and purposes which can be constructed in several ways ... and it is by constructing the details that we build up the whole. (*Metaphor* 136)

Thus, while the reader constructs the meaning of the text, he is also limited in his interpretation by the fact that the text is a singular totality; Ricœur elaborates later on: "As Hirsch says in *Validity in Interpretation*, there are no rules for making good guesses, but there are methods for validating our guesses" (*Metaphor* 137); thus, any constructed meaning should be validated by the text. Ricœur: "the construction rests upon 'clues' contained in the text itself. A clue serves as a guide for a specific construction, in that it contains at once a permission and a prohibition; it excludes unsuitable constructions and allows those which give more meaning to the same words" (137).

In the context of Ricœur's hermeneutic approach I will also mention Norbert Greiner's book *Übersetzung und Literaturwissenschaft*. As the title (translation and literature studies) suggests, this book is interested in the effect of translation on the works of literature studies and thus can be situated both in translation studies and literature studies.

In the passage "Übersetzung und Interpretation" (Translation and Interpretation), Greiner writes:

Ein allgemein bekannter Grundsatz der philosophischen Hermeneutik besagt, daß sich das Verstehen eines Textes immer nur als Gespräch zwischen Interpreten und dem Sinnangebot des Textes vollzieht, daß sich also das Verstehen eines Textes nicht nur aus dem ergibt, was im Text angelegt ist, sondern in gleichem Maße aus dem, was als Erwartungshaltung und Sinnhorizont des Interpreten an ihn herangetragen wird. Insofern ist jedes Übersetzen mehr als die Übersetzung einer Sprachäußerung, sondern stets eine ... Interpretation eines literarischen Werkes. Darin liegt ein weiterer Grund für die zwangsläufig gegebene Abweichung der Übersetzung vom Original: der

Umstand nämlich, daß zwischen dem übersetzten Text und dem Original immer ein Verständnis des originalen Textes zwischengeschaltet ist ... [D]er Übersetzer [unterliegt] als Interpret den hermeneutischen Bedingungen des Verstehens: Er erstellt den Sinn des Werks durch seine Lektüre, faßt dieses Ergebnis in neue Sprache, in neue Worte. Insofern ist jede Übersetzung im guten Sinne vorläufig, Teil eines nicht endenden Rezeptions- bzw. Interpretationsprozesses. (105)

To vaguely translate: there is a hermeneutic theory that understanding a text results from a sort of conversation between the reader and the clues for meaning in the text (to use Ricoeur's words). Thus, the understanding of a text results not only from what the text offers, but also from the expectations and experiences of the reader who reads the text. This means that translation is more than transposing an utterance into a different language, but also involves the interpretation of a literary work. Thus, the translation will always deviate from the original, as between reading the original and writing the translation, the translator goes through the process of hermeneutic interpretation: while reading the original, the translator constructs the meaning of the text and then attempts to express this meaning in a new language. Any translation, then, is only a part of a never-ending process of reception and interpretation.

Greiner also mentions that a translator will always be influenced by previous translations (and, thus, interpretations) of the same text, and raises the possibility of consciously interpreting the text differently than older translations (106).

2.3 TOLKIEN-SPECIFIC LITERATURE

Tolkien's *LotR* has been heavily discussed since its publication in the 1950s. Thus, it is not surprising that a lot of literature has been written specifically about this work, and more specific about the translations of this work. Some of these texts have been written by Tolkien himself, such as the *Guide to the Names in The Lord of the Rings*, also known as

Nomenclature of the Lord of the Rings, as it is cited in *The Lord of the Rings. A Reader's Companion* (pp. 750-779). The *Guide* gives instructions to translators how to translate the names of people, characters or places and singular words or phrases (such as "Elder Days" or "Tale of Years").

Additionally, Tolkien wrote about translations in *LotR* itself, namely in Appendix F II: "On Translations" (pp. 1133-1138). Here Tolkien explains the linguistic workings of his pseudotranslation, as the books are, in Tolkien's text-world, a translation into English from the fictional Red Book of Westmarch. In Appendix F then, Tolkien explains how he translated names, which characteristics of the fictional language Westron Tolkien attempted to show in his writing choices and why some characters and/or races use a different style of speech from each other. Some parts of Westron Tolkien wanted to express he found to be impossible to express in English, hoping that translations into other languages may be able to express it, for example:

One point in the divergence may here be noted, since, though important, it has proved impossible to represent. The Westron tongue made in the pronouns of the second person (and often also in those of the third) a distinction, independent of number, between 'familiar' and 'deferential' forms. It was, however, one of the peculiarities of Shire-usage that the deferential forms had gone out of colloquial use. ... Peregrin Took, for instance, in his first few days in Minas Tirith used the familiar for people of all ranks, including the Lord Denethor himself. (Tolkien 1133)

However, both translations translated Pippin's speech pattern towards Denethor rather formal, ignoring this passage, even though the German language has the means to distinguish familiar and deferential pronouns with "Du" and "Ihr/Sie". Tolkien's guidelines for the translation of names, however, were followed in both translations, leading to very homogeneous names between both German versions.

The most in-depth work on Tolkien translation is probably Allan Turners *Translating Tolkien*. In this book, Turner approaches *LotR* as he believes Tolkien approached it, from a philological angle, and examines how translations worked around the rich linguistic background of Tolkien's text-world; for example, Turner points out that the Rohirrim's language is based on Old English, which shows in their usage of the word "cunning" as "skillful" rather than "deceitful" and the following ambiguous meaning of Saruman's tower Orthanc, which is supposed to mean "Cunning Mind" – as in "skillful" when it was built, but as in "deceitful" when it is the homebase of Saruman (see Turner 31).

While Turner's theoretical framework is not the same used in this study (as he uses a hermeneutic approach based on "reconstructing the author's literary design" (182)), working with *Translating Tolkien* proved to be useful nonetheless: Turner explains multiple issues translators are facing when translating *LotR*, some of which directly or indirectly influence the translation of characters as well, for example the (in Tolkien criticism) popular theory of the Shire as a representation of an idealized rural society in ~1900 England, or the literary device of the pseudotranslation as explained above. While I disagree with Turner's author-centered methodology, I will reference some of his results and theories throughout this study.

Rainer Nagel compares the two German Translations in ""The New One Wants to Assimilate the Alien." Different Interpretations of a Source Text as a Reason for Controversy: The 'Old' and the 'New' German Translation of The Lord of the Rings" and the German counterpart to that article, "Verschiedene Interpretationen eines Textes als Grundlage von Übersetzungsstrategien. Die "alte" und die "neue" deutsche HdR-Übersetzung¹". Due to minor differences between the articles I will reference the English version if possible, while referencing the German version if needed (e.g. for the terms "Funktionsäquivalenz" and

¹ HdR = Herr der Ringe, the German title of *LotR*.

"Formäquivalenz" which only appear in the German version, see below); statements in the form of "Nagel argues ..." in this study generally refer to both articles.

Nagel points out some core differences between the two German translations, labelling Carroux's translation as "formäquivalent" (formally equivalent) and Krege's translation as "funktionsäquivalent" (dynamically equivalent). According to Nagel, Carroux remains "as 'loyal' to the text as was possible without sacrificing the need to create a readable German text" ("New One" 25). This so-called loyalty, according to Nagel, leads "up to the point of producing awkward German" ("New One" 48). Krege, on the other hand "is more fluent, but takes unnecessary liberties with [Tolkien's original version]" ("New One" 48), for example "[Krege] does have a certain tendency of explaining things to the reader in places where further explanations are not really necessary" ("New One" 37). Both claims will be examined in this study.

With *Duzen und Ihrzen in the German Translation of The Lord of the Rings* Arden R. Smith contributed an analysis of the usage of "Du", "Ihr" and "Sie" (and their respective forms) as translations of "you" and "thou" (and their respective forms) in the translation of Margaret Carroux. This article will be referenced when translation choices of "you" and/or "thou" in German change the perception of characters. Since the article was published before the translation by Wolfgang Krege, the missing information will be provided by my own research.

Lastly, Susanne Stopfel offers a short comparison of the German *LotR* translations in *Traitors and Translators: Three German Versions of the Lord of the Rings*. The third version mentioned in the title is a "corrected and revised" version of the Carroux translation published in 1991 that went out of print quickly (Stopfel 12). In her comparison, Stopfel points out some of the differences Rainer Nagel talked about in his article as well, but also introduces a criticism of Krege's translation implying an erasure of anything that could be

understood as homoerotic scenes (Stopfel 13-14). This criticism (or accusation) of homophobic tendencies will be discussed later in this study as well.

3. Methodology

It is important to note that this study started as a translation theory study before it became a study concerned with *LotR*. The reason why *LotR* became the subject of this study was simply due to practical reasons: my knowledge of the text, the fact that there were two German translations, and easy access to the English text as well as both German translations. Thus, I approached *LotR* looking for meaningful differences in the translations, opposed to noticing such a difference and then examining the whole book.

My definition of "meaningful differences" are such differences between the text version in which semantics or syntax was changed in translation, compared to the "usual" differences one can observe in almost every sentence between the Krege and Carroux translation, as every sentence can be translated slightly differently. However, changes in syntax (e.g. splitting phrases or combining them) and semantics (especially polysemic words or phrases, but also idioms) can be meaningful.

In this study, I quote such differences by quoting all three text-versions in a table, with the left-most column showing the citations, and the other three columns showing the quotations in the order of Tolkien – Carroux – Krege. Since the version of Carroux's translation I am working with is split into three volumes, I will cite Carroux as I:22 for page 22 in the first volume, or III:123 for page 123 in the third volume. An example:

Tolkien 375 Carroux I:453 Krege 404	In this box there is earth from my orchard, and such blessing as Galadriel has still to bestow upon it.	In diesem Kästchen ist Erde aus meinem Obstgarten, und was Galadriel noch an Zaubersegen zu vergeben hat, ruht darauf.	In der Schachtel ist Erde aus meinem Obstgarten, mit allem Segen, den Galadriel noch verleihen kann.
--	---	--	--

In this table, I am citing Tolkien 375 (English-text column), Carroux I:453 (middle text column) and Krege 404 (right-most column). This excerpt is an example for a meaningful difference of semantics: The Elves make it clear multiple times that they do not

understand what Sam means when he is talking about "magic". Thus, it is odd for Galadriel to use "Zauber" ("spell; sorcery; magic") in Carroux's translation.

My initial work with the three text versions was not focused on the reader's perception of the characters yet. Instead, I was merely looking for any meaningful differences between the three versions. To find these differences, I carefully compared each sentence on its own and jotted down any meaningful difference I found, together with my thoughts on those differences. With this approach, I was able to identify every such difference, but I also progressed very slowly, never exceeding ten pages (of the English version) per day. While this approach was sure to give the most fool-proof and detailed results, it also meant that it would take over a hundred days of concentrated work before I would be able to start working with my results. This approach was not feasible.

Thus, I had to quicken my approach. I first increased the amount of text I would read at once before switching between text versions to compare it to a paragraph. Shortly after I thus increased my pace, I was confronted with the Black Riders in the text of *LotR*. The depiction of the Rider that talked to Farmer Maggot (Tolkien 94), combined with the difference in the depiction of Gollum in the Prologue (Tolkien 11) shaped the topic of my study: the change in the reader's perception of characters in *LotR* across the three versions of the text. At this point I changed my approach again and started only reading the English *LotR*, while consulting the German translations only when I suspected the possibility of a meaningful difference for my topic. This included descriptions of characters, external as well as internal (thoughts, monologues or similar), characters talking about other characters, characters getting addressed in a certain way (thou vs. you, titles etc.) and, as a general rule, I also compared every scene where a new major character gets introduced with the same approach I initially used for the whole text, reading all three versions sentence for sentence.

This approach highly quickened my pace, thus making it possible for me to finish *LotR* in a reasonable time. The obvious downside of this approach was its susceptibility to missing single passages with meaningful differences, which thus would not appear in this study. However, the goal of this study is merely to show that meaningful differences between the text versions do exist, and what this means for literature studies and translations going forward. Thus, a few missed meaningful differences will not invalidate this study; finding them would merely increase its validity.

To build my theoretical framework, I researched literature about Tolkien translations, both in general and specific to the German translations. Turner's *Translating Tolkien* then gave me a model for a theoretical framework I adapted to include and to be consistent with Roland Barthes' concept of the Death of the Author.

During this research, the goal of this study solidified as I researched what had been done before, and what has not been done yet. I wanted to avoid merely building upon existing studies, and instead aimed for a new contribution to Tolkien translations specifically and going forward to the combination of literature studies and translation studies in general. As general comparisons between the German translations of *LotR* had been done already (e.g. Stopfel and Nagel), as well as an in-depth comparison of the translations of multiple languages concerning the songs and poems, archaisms, name translations, and the manner in which proverbs show the worldview of different people in *LotR* (Turner), and other detailed examinations of specific characteristics (e.g. German pronouns in Carroux's translation with Smith), what was missing was a literature studies approach to characters between different translations.

As I mentioned initially, the study was not inspired by a meaningful character difference I observed prior to this study, but was built on an exploring approach, reading through the three text versions with an open mind for anything of value for a literature studies

approach to translations. This means this study is build upon what I found without prior knowledge of how significant it would be. However, while most differences of a reader's perception of a character were minuscule, singular differences were significant, as will be shown in the analysis section.

4. General Comparison

Before starting the in-depth analysis of single characters, I begin by comparing the two German translations as a whole concerning translation choices with direct or indirect influence on character perception.

Some comparisons have been made already, as mentioned in the Literature Review. Rainer Nagel argues that a core difference between the translations is the utilization of "Formäquivalenz" (formal equivalence) by Carroux and "Funktionsäquivalenz" (dynamic equivalence) by Krege: "It is obvious at first glance that [Carroux] tries to convey Tolkien's old-fashioned syntax, while [Krege] modernises syntactic structures almost wherever possible" ("New One" 33).

As quoted in 2.3, Nagel states that Carroux translates with formal equivalence "up to the point of producing awkward German" ("New One" 48). As an example, Nagel states:

Tolkien 365 Carroux I:441 Krege 393	Would not that have been a noble deed to set to the credit of his Ring, if I had taken it by force or fear from my guest?	Würde das nicht eine edle Tat gewesen sein, die dem Einfluß des Ringes zuzuschreiben wäre, wenn ich ihn meinem Gast mit Gewalt oder unter Drohungen abgenommen hätte?	Wäre es nicht ein schöner Beweis für des Ringes Kraft, wenn ich ihn mit Gewalt oder List meinem Gast abnähme?
--	---	---	---

Nagel: "While [Carroux] closely mirrors the syntactic relations of [Tolkien], its ... choice of the present perfect subjunctive, even less frequent in German as it is in English, makes for somewhat hard reading, while [Krege]'s syntactic simplification ... still gets Galadriel's meaning across" ("New One" 48). As a second example I provide the following:

Tolkien 63 Carroux I:87 Krege 81	How long have you been eavesdropping?" "Eavesdropping, sir? I don't follow you, begging your	Wie lange hast du gelauscht?" "Gelauscht, Herr Gandalf? Ich kann Euch nicht folgen und bitte um	Wie lange hast du schon gehorcht?" "Gehorcht? Herr Gandalf? Bitte gehorsamst um Verzeihung, aber
---	---	--	---

pardon. There ain't no eaves at Bag End, and that's a fact!"	Vergebung. In ganz Beutelsend gibt's kein Haarwild und folglich keine Lauscher."	ich gehorche immer aufs Wort, Herr Gandalf!"
---	--	--

In this example, it is not the syntax that makes Carroux's version awkward to read, but the terms used. While Carroux's sentence in theory makes sense and is correct, the average reader will have a hard time understanding it, due to Carroux presupposing the knowledge of two terms: "Haarwild" ("furred game" as in quarry when hunting) and "Lauscher". "Lauscher" in common knowledge is the noun to "lauschen", which would be the translation of "eavesdropping"; however, the average reader will not be aware that the word "lauschen" is derived from the term "Lauscher" for the ears of "Haarwild".

In short, if the reader is not familiar with hunting, they will most likely have the same reaction I had initially when reading Sam's response in Carroux's translation: confusion as to why "Haarwild" is mentioned in the first place. The reason why Carroux is using these hunting terms is to stay true to Tolkien's sentence structure and pun setup; and admittedly, Carroux solved the pun very well, albeit using terms the reader would most likely not know.

Looking at the whole translation, I would agree with Nagel that Carroux's translation attempts (and, for the most part, succeeds) to mirror Tolkien's text down to the exact vocabulary and sentence structure, if it is possible in German to do so. There are awkward sentences as a result, as shown in the two excerpts above; however, they are less prevalent than Nagel's article may suggest. In the passages I jotted down in preparation for this study (see 3 for my methodology of doing so), the second excerpt is the only one with awkward German I could find.

At the same time, that passage is also an example for Krege's translation with dynamic equivalence (meaning "Übersetzung nach zu vermittelnden Informationen" ("Translation guided by information to be imparted")) according to Nagel ("Verschiedene Interpretationen"

88)). While Sam's attempt at pretending not to understand what Gandalf is on about is very weak in Krege's version, as it is in Tolkien's English text, so that Krege's creative translation conveys the same meaning: a flustered Sam tries to weasel out of an awkward situation under the eyes of a (to him) terrifying wizard.

A clearer example of dynamic equivalence may be the following excerpt:

<p>Tolkien 31 Carroux I:47 Krege 46</p>	<p>"There's something fishy in this, my dear! I believe that mad Baggins is off again. Silly old fool. But why worry? He hasn't taken the vittles with him." He called loudly to Frodo to send the wine round again.</p>	<p>"Da ist irgendwas faul, meine Liebe! Ich glaube, der verrückte Beutlin ist wieder auf und davon. Alberner alter Narr. Aber warum sollen wir uns darüber Gedanken machen? Die Weinbuddeln hat er ja nicht mitgenommen." Laut rief er zu Frodo hinüber, er möge den Wein noch einmal kreisen lassen.</p>	<p>"Da ist doch etwas faul, meine Liebe! Ich glaube, dieser verrückte Beutlin ist wieder auf und davon. Alter Narr! Aber was sollen wir uns grämen? Das Wichtigste hat er ja dagelassen." Und er rief laut zu Frodo hinüber, dass die Weinflaschen noch mal herumgehen müssten.</p>
--	--	---	---

This excerpt is the reaction of Rory Brandybuck on Bilbo's party, right after Bilbo uses the Ring to turn invisible and leaves the party (and later the Shire) without a proper good-bye. The important part of this passage is the second-to-last sentence. Tolkien and Carroux mention the vittles/Weinbuddeln, conveying the message: there is no reason to worry about what Bilbo is doing, as the wine is still here to enjoy. Krege translates: "Das Wichtigste hat er ja dagelassen" (Re-translated: "He left the most important thing behind after all"). Thus, Rory Brandybuck's message in Krege is: there is no reason to worry about what Bilbo is doing, as he left the most important thing behind – as the reader learns in the following sentence, the wine. Krege takes much more liberty in translating this sentence compared to Carroux, who once again matches Tolkien's template verbatim.

Unlike the awkward sentences of Carroux, the freely translated examples for Krege's dynamic equivalence are encountered frequently throughout Krege's text, albeit not all of them are as obvious as the above example, which basically replaces a sentence with another that leads to a similar message being conveyed. Thus, I agree with Nagel's attribution of Krege's translation as a translation with dynamic equivalence opposed to Carroux's translation with formal equivalence.

However, Nagel also criticizes Krege for "tak[ing] unnecessary liberties" ("New One" 48) in his translation of *LotR*. Two reoccurring liberties are mentioned: the "tendency to give explanations to the reader, thus possibly falling prey to a form ... of overspecification" ("New One" 40) and the use of familiar instead of deferential pronouns (while modern English does not differentiate between familiar and deferential pronouns, Nagel criticizes the use of familiar pronouns in Krege's translation when the situation (to Nagel) calls for a deferential pronoun).

Krege's tendency to give explanations is important in the scope of this study as it occasionally results in ambiguity being removed in his translation while Carroux manages to retain it – considering Ricœur's definition of interpretation as choosing a possible meaning in an ambiguous context, this is especially impactful when constructing the meaning of a sentence, paragraph or even character as a whole. It often surfaces as Krege stating explicitly what Tolkien and Carroux simply imply.

When examining the changing perception readers may have of characters when reading the three versions of *LotR* used in this study, the use of familiar or deferential pronouns plays a huge part: The pronoun a character uses when addressing another character not only tells the reader the social standing of the addressed character, but also of the character using the pronoun.

The pronouns in Carroux's translation have been studied in-depth by Smith; however, a comparison to Krege's translation has not been made as Smith's article precedes it. To preface the comparison, Smith explains the deferential pronouns the following way:

[L]anguages like German ... make a distinction in the second person pronouns between singular and plural and between familiar and deferential forms, whereas modern English makes no such distinctions. Thus, in translating out of English, the translator of a literary text must determine whether a character in the text is speaking to one or more other characters and what sort of relationship exists between these characters. (33)

In her translation of *The Lord of the Rings*, Carroux makes use of three second person pronouns: familiar singular *du*, familiar plural *ihr*, and polite singular and plural *Ihr*. She presumably eschews *Sie* in order to give the story a more medieval flavor. If she uses *Ihr* where *Sie* is used in the modern standard language, we should expect to find *du* and *ihr* used in addressing the following: relatives; spouses; (close) friends; equals in certain occupations ...; someone to whom respect is deliberately not being shown ...; young people and children; the dead; deities and saints; animals; inanimate objects; abstract concepts ... we should expect *Ihr* in all other exchanges. (34)

Overall, Smith finds that Carroux adheres to these rules, with very few exceptions in complicated relationships (e.g. he finds Éomer and Éowyn addressing Theoden with "Ihr" even though they are relatives, likely because while Theoden is their uncle, he is also their king (36)) and some exceptions that appear to have been mistakes or oversights which were partly removed in later prints of the Carroux translation.

When comparing the use of pronouns between the Carroux translation and the Krege translation, then, as a general rule it could be said that, when in doubt, Carroux uses deferential pronouns, while Krege uses familiar pronouns. As examples may be mentioned:

Frodo uses deferential pronouns towards Tom Bombadil in Carroux (e.g. I:160), but familiar pronouns in Krege (147); Butterbur uses deferential pronouns towards Strider in Carroux (e.g. I:210), but familiar pronouns in Krege (190); Faramir uses deferential pronouns towards Frodo in Carroux (II:305), but familiar pronouns in Krege (695) (and vice versa respectively); Ingold uses deferential pronouns towards Gandalf in Carroux (III:17), but familiar pronouns in Krege (790) (and vice versa respectively). However, neither does Carroux use exclusively deferential pronouns, nor does Krege use exclusively familiar pronouns throughout their respective translations. The tendency of Krege to default to familiar pronouns does change character perception in some places, however, as I will show in the analysis later. It was the reason why Nagel criticizes Krege's usage of familiar pronouns: as an example Nagel gives Krege 390 (Tolkien 363), where Galadriel offers Frodo to look into her mirror. In that scene, Frodo uses familiar pronouns, even though their social standings call for deferential pronouns.

It is also worth to view the two German translations on the scale of foreignizing and domesticating translations, especially in the context of the ST, as Turner states in *Translating Tolkien*:

[T]he principles of domesticating and foreignising translation are already inscribed in the text of *The Lord of the Rings* as a part of its literary and philological structure. The device of pseudotranslation has given Tolkien the justification for making a clear linguistic distinction between those characters and settings which are intended to appear familiar to the reader, and those which are meant to be exotic. (69)

Foreignization in the sense of Venuti means preserving the culture of the foreign in the translation into the TL; for example, one could leave aristocratic titles of the source culture when translating from one language and thus culture into another, or one could attempt to replace them with those aristocratic titles of the target culture which best match the cultural implications of the original titles. Keeping the titles would be foreignization: the reader of the

translation in the TL is confronted with SL-titles, thus noticing that the ST was written in a different language, and the text he is confronted with is a translation. Changing the titles, and thus domesticating the translation, makes it more difficult for the reader to realize he is reading a translation.

Turner now argues that Tolkien already uses domestication and foreignization in the ST as he is "translating" the text from the fictional Red Book of Westmarch. Turner implies that the Hobbit culture would be domesticated, while for example Elvish culture is foreignized. Thus, Elvish words are often left in their language, e.g. Tolkien 377 ("*Ai! laurië lantar lassî sùrinen,...*"), to show the "otherness" of the Elvish culture compared to the familiarity of the Hobbit culture: Tolkien's *Guide* helps with this "local" domestication and foreignization, as it (generally speaking) advises to translate names from around the Shire (including Bree), while names from e.g. Rohan are usually advised to be left untranslated. Additionally, Turner mentions the Rohirrim using a lot of archaic uses for contemporary words (the meaning of "skilful" for "cunning"), as well as compounds ("sister-son"), making their culture foreign in the sense of archaism.

A "second-hand" translation from English into a "third" language, then, should (if we assume authority for this proposal) domesticate the text where it is "domesticated" to the English reader, while leaving the text foreignized where it shows "otherness".

This is not the case in the German translations, however. Carroux's translation shows a sort of foreignization throughout the text, but not by preserving English allegories necessarily, but by using archaic language (e.g. the archaic deferential *Ihr* pronoun) and at places awkward syntax. There is also barely any effort being made in assimilating the text to the modern German culture (besides following the *Guide* to translate names). It may be a hyperbole, but for a potential target reader, who is not familiar with the SL English, and who thus does not notice that the syntax may stem from following the source syntax too closely,

Carroux's translation may read like a "translation" from Middle High German into modern German, and thus foreignized.

The only element in the text (I noticed) that will definitely mark it as a modern text is the anachronism Tolkien uses in the first Chapter: "express train" (28), or "Schnellzug" in Carroux (43). There is no feasible explanation as to why Tolkien chooses to let a fictional source from a mythical past compare something to an express train, besides the proposed theory of Turner that this was a change made by Tolkien to the fictional ST by domesticating it to modern English.

Krege's translation has no further problem with the "Expresszug" (43): he uses a, for the time of publication in 2000, modern German (though he preserves the archaism where a contrast between archaic and modern speech was made in Tolkien's text, e.g. in the first meeting of Theoden and the Hobbits in Isengard). This "modern" aspect of Krege's language does not hold up well to a reader in 2021: for example words like "Halunke" (412) are not used in the German of 2021; but Nagel in 2004 criticizes the use of "speziell" by Krege as it ruins the simple speech of Butterbur ("Verschiedene Interpretationen" 96), while a German reader in 2021 would not even notice it. However, as we can read in Nagel's articles, at the time of publication Krege's German struck readers as too modern for an epic tale such as *LotR*. In fact, Nagel even "accuses" Krege of creating the translation for young people as the target audience, following the *skopos* theory of Reis/Vermeer: "[I]t would appear that Wolfgang Krege approached his translation not merely as a translation, but as a modernisation of Tolkien's text to make it acceptable ... for what he believed to be a 'new' generation of readers" ("New One" 28); "we ... expect the new German translation to be a conscious modernisation of the original, adapting it to a younger audience by deliberately changing Tolkien's sometimes old-fashioned choice of words and phrases to a text easier to read for young people and ... more 'in tune' with current German" ("New One" 32).

While not all of the "modern" word choices of Wolfgang Krege preserved their "modernness" over the years, in total I would have to agree with Nagel that it is at least overall less archaic than Carroux's. Krege changes the manner of speech of certain characters, to lend Nagel's example of Butterbur: in Tolkien's text, Butterbur speaks a form of a rural English dialect in an old-fashioned form ("New One" 29;30); while Carroux, as usual, tries to translate verbatim with a similar syntax, Krege gives Butterbur a vernacular manner of speech, with expressions like "Dalli, dalli!" (174; Tolkien: "Double sharp!" 153; Carroux: "Schneller, schneller!" 193). This is symptomatic for Krege's translation, as he repeatedly replaces idioms or introduces an idiomatic phrase when the English text did not include one:

Tolkien 170	If he forgets, I	Wenn er es vergißt,	Wenn er's vergisst,
Carroux I:213	shall roast him.	werde ich ihn	wasch' ich ihm den
Krege 193		rösten.	Kopf.

As usual, Carroux sticks close to the English text, while Krege takes the opportunity to introduce a German idiom: "jemandem den Kopf waschen", literally "to clean somebody's head", but with a similar meaning of the English idiom: "to give somebody a piece of one's mind." This is not an exact translation of the double meaning of "roasting someone", but it does come close while using a German idiom; it does, however, lose the, considering that the writer of these words is Gandalf, a wizard, very real possibility that Gandalf meant it verbatim (thus changing the perception of the character Gandalf, also considering the fact that Krege lets Gandalf use oral forms ("er's"; "wasch'") in a written letter).

With these idiomatic domestications of the text in his translation, it can be said that Krege's translation falls under the translation tradition of domestication, even though some "foreignized" forms already existing in the ST prevail (e.g. "Schwestersohn" as translation of "sister-son" instead of using "Neffe") and the reader will still be confronted with "otherness" in the text; However, this stems from the genre of Fantasy itself, which by definition confronts the readers with strange places and cultures.

5. Analysis

A theoretical framework, methodology and the general features of the German translations have now been established. With the groundwork thus being laid out, I will now begin the analysis of the changes in the reader's perception of characters across the three versions of *LotR* examined in this study.

Throughout my work with the three text versions, I noticed an abundance of character changes between the versions related to character perception. Some of these changes seem to be single cases, where a poor translator choice created a context which changed a character in this context, without additional, similar changes of perception of the same character appearing throughout the text; for example the following:

Tolkien 91	'But all the same, '	"Aber trotzdem",	"aber trotzdem" -
Carroux I:120	he added with a	fügte er mit einem	und er lachte
Krege 111	shamefaced	verlegenen	verlegen -, "ihm
	laugh, 'I am	Lachen hinzu, "habe	und seinen Hunden
	terrified of him	ich entsetzliche	möchte ich um jeden
	and his dogs.	Angst vor ihm und	Preis aus dem Weg
		seinen Hunden.	gehen.

Krege's translation is the only version of the text in which Frodo does not explicitly admit that he is terrified, instead stating that he wants to avoid Maggot and his dogs at any cost. However, this is not a part of a large-scale character change in Krege's translation which paints Frodo as someone who avoids admitting his own weaknesses, but a singular moment in the book.

Other character changes, however, pervade the text, with multiple examples from a lot of the scenes the character(s) in question appears in; other changes, again, pervade a certain scene, but the respective character shows (almost) no further changes in other scenes of the respective translation. Most of these changes are small, as they are made within translating from the same ST; however, there are exceptions I will show below.

5.1 THE BLACK RIDERS

One of the most significant changes in the reader's perception of characters between the three versions of *LotR* analyzed in this study is the change in perception of the Black Riders, Nazgûl, or "The Nine."

The Black Riders are initially described as human, since the first appearance of one of them is written from the perspective of the hobbits Frodo, Sam, and Pippin. In their eyes, they see a man riding on a horse, wearing a black cloak and hood. However, it becomes clear later in the story that the Black Riders are not just human, but powerful spirits taking the form of men through their garments. Due to their nature as spirits they often show powers or behaviours not attributed to normal humans and are shrouded in mystery, often supported by vague descriptions by other characters or the narrator.

One of these vague descriptions is already used in the Black Riders first appearance:

Tolkien 74 Carroux I:100 Krege 93	Round the corner came a black horse, no hobbit-pony but a full-sized horse; and on it sat a large man, who seemed to crouch in the saddle, wrapped in a great black cloak and hood, so that only his boots in the high stirrups showed below; his face was shadowed and invisible.	Um die Biegung kam ein schwarzes Pferd, kein Hobbitpony, sondern ein ausgewachsenes Pferd; und darauf saß ein großer Mensch, der sich auf dem Sattel niederzuducken schien, eingehüllt in einen großen schwarzen Mantel und eine Kapuze, so daß nur seine Stiefel in den hohen Steigbügeln unten herausschauten; sein Gesicht war beschattet und unsichtbar.	Um die Biegung kam ein schwarzes Pferd, kein Hobbitpony, sondern ein richtiger Gaul in voller Größe, und auf ihm saß ein großer Mensch, der sich im Sattel zu ducken schien, ganz eingehüllt in einen langen schwarzen Mantel mit Kapuze, sodass nur unten die Stiefel in den hohen Steigbügeln hervorschauten, während das Gesicht verhangen und nicht zu sehen war.
--	--	--	---

To note is the fact that both translations decide to translate the male "man" as gender-neutral "Mensch"; however, this could be explained by Tolkien's decision to use "Men" to

represent "Humanity" throughout *LotR*, so that "man" can be read as "human" here. E.g.: "Only the Elves still preserve any records of that vanished time, and their traditions are concerned almost entirely with their own history, in which Men appear seldom and Hobbits are not mentioned at all." (Tolkien 2); here (and throughout *LotR*) Tolkien uses "Men" to distinguish humans from the races of Middle-Earth, in this example Elves and Hobbits.

However, the main reason why this paragraph is interesting for this study is the last phrase: "his face was shadowed and invisible". In Carroux's translation the Rider's face is invisible, probably due to a shadow (presumably of the hood) falling on the face. This is very close to Tolkien's English text. Krege, on the other hand, changes this phrase: in his text the face is "verhangen und nicht zu sehen".

"Verhängen" means to hide something with a cloth or something similar. For example, if someone covers a painting with a tablecloth, that painting is "verhangen". The Black Rider's face in Krege's version, thus, is not hidden in shadows, but behind his hood. It is also not invisible, but "nicht zu sehen" – it cannot be seen.

If we consider the Black Rider's nature as a powerful spirit, Krege's version robs the reader of a possible interpretation showing the supernatural might of the Rider. Consider that hobbits are described as much smaller than humans and the Rider sits on top of a full-sized horse, while the hobbits crouch low, thus giving the hobbits a worm's eye view. This should make it easy to glance underneath the hood of the Rider and yet the Rider's face is supposedly invisible. In fact, it is later heavily implied that the Black Riders do not have (visible) faces in the first place. When the Witch King, leader of the Black Riders, reveals his "face" there is nothing between the crown he wears and his armor: "The Black Rider flung back his hood, and behold! he had a kingly crown; and yet upon no head visible was it set. The red fires shone between it and the mantled shoulders vast and dark" (Tolkien 829). It is not unreasonable to assume that all Black Riders share this invisible body, so that only their

garments give them a distinguishable form. Thus, when Frodo looks at the Rider, he is not only unable to see his face clearly, but also unable to see any facial features, like the shape of a nose, a chin, or any strand of hair.

Would it thus be unthinkable that the Black Riders use supernatural powers to conceal their quite literally invisible faces by not only using the natural shadow of their hood, but also by weaving the shadows unnaturally around their faces? Tolkien's text does not explain this invisible "state" of the Rider's face, due to the short and vague description, leaving it to the reader to construct whether it is really the shadow of the hood rendering the Rider's face invisible, or if it is the Rider's supernatural powers. It is of course possible, that the readers choose to think of the Riders as normal humans at this point of the text, and that the "invisible" face was the result of Frodo not looking long enough and/or Tolkien deciding to omit a lengthy description of barely visible shapes of facial features, which is also a possible explanation for this vague description. However, Krege's translation does not allow the supernatural interpretation, or at least not at this point in the text, robbing the reader of this possible construction and thus (possibly) changing the reader's perception of the Rider.

A second instance that can be observed in this passage is the translation of "horse": Carroux uses the word "Pferd", being the closest equivalent to "horse": a genderneutral noun describing the race of the animal. Krege's "Gaul", however, usually describes a working horse, like a draft horse or farm horse, but not a riding horse. It is also connoted with slow and stolid (and male) horses who are not fit to ride at a gallop, which will be important to come back to in the following passage.

In that paragraph Krege's translation changes the Riders in the opposite way: instead of concealing or removing a possible power, Krege's version gives the Riders a "power-up" in this paragraph:

Tolkien 213		They seemed to him		Sie schienen ihm		Wie ein Sturmwind
Carroux I:262		to run like the		dahinzufiegen wie		kamen sie

Krege 237

wind and to grow
swiftly larger and
darker, as their
courses converged
with his.

der Wind und rasch
größer und dunkler
zu werden, als sie
nun in derselben
Richtung ritten wie
er.

dahergerast, rasch
immer größer und
dunkler werdend, zu
dem Punkt hin, wo
ihre Bahnen sich
kreuzen mussten.

The important difference between the three versions here is that Krege does not translate "seemed to him". Thus, the Riders do not *seem* "to run like the wind and grow swiftly larger and darker", they *actually do* – which contradicts Krege's earlier translation that the Riders ride on a "Gaul", as no horse capable of keeping up with an apparently magically enhanced Elven-horse should be called a "Gaul".

The Rider's feat of increasing in size and darkness is on one hand a significant increase in the power of the Black Riders; on the other hand it is repeated throughout the *LotR* books that the mightiest weapon of the Black Riders is fear (e.g.: "their power is in terror"; Tolkien 174). Thus, this change in Krege's version also takes power away from the Black Riders. The reason why they seem to grow larger and their pursuit so fast to Frodo in Tolkien's and Carroux's text seems to be due to the deep fear the Riders instilled in him ("Then at once fear and hatred awoke in him."; "Fear now filled all Frodo's mind."; Tolkien 213). Krege's text takes away the Black Riders' aura of fear that creates a sort of hallucination of their power in the mind of their enemies and replaces it by giving the Riders the hallucinated powers for real. However, this trade-off is not consistent throughout Krege's translation. Whatever Krege's reason was to not translate "seemed to him" (or maybe it was a mistake), it does change the reader's perception of the Black Riders.

Carroux's translation, meanwhile, decreases the danger emanating from the Riders: in Tolkien, "their courses converge" with Frodo's and in Krege their courses cross ("ihre Bahnen sich kreuzen mussten"). In Carroux's version, however, they merely ride in the same direction as Frodo ("in derselben Richtung ritten wie er"). This eliminates the immediate threat: Tolkien's and Krege's version imply that the Riders are faster: they will converge with or

cross Frodo's way, thus they will, in the foreseeable future, be at the same place as Frodo. In Carroux's translation this is not implied, as they merely travel along the same path, without any implications about their relative speed.

A similar change can be observed on the very same page in the following excerpt:

<p>Tolkien 213 Carroux I:262 Krege 237</p>	<p>He could see them clearly now: they appeared to have cast aside their hoods and black cloaks, and they were robed in white and grey.</p>	<p>Er konnte sie jetzt deutlich sehen: offenbar hatten sie ihre Kapuzen und schwarzen Mäntel abgeworfen und waren nun weiß und grau gekleidet.</p>	<p>Er sah sie nun ganz deutlich. Sie hatten die schwarzen Mäntel und Kapuzen abgeworfen und trugen nun graue und weiße Gewänder.</p>
---	---	--	--

Here, both Krege and Carroux do not translate parts of the sentence: "appeared to". While it can be argued that Carroux's "offenbar" is meant to convey that this sentence is written exclusively from Frodo's perspective, I would argue that this is a suboptimal solution, as "offenbar" can also be read as "evidently", which is a factual statement.

Very similar to the previously untranslated "seemed to him" it is again a phrase showing uncertainty, a phrase that does not represent the factual state of the world, but only how it is perceived by a certain being or multiple beings. In this case, however, the German translators seem to have missed an important reason why Tolkien used "appeared to" in this context: The person perceiving the Black Riders, who appear "to have cast aside their hoods and black cloaks" in this sentence is Frodo. "[T]hey were robed in white and grey" shows that Frodo sees them in the same way as he did at the Weathertop when wearing the One Ring: "He was able to see beneath their black wrappings. ... In their white faces burned keen and merciless eyes; under their mantles were long grey robes; upon their grey hairs were helms of silver; in their haggard hands were swords of steel" (Tolkien 195). As previously mentioned, however, the Black Riders appear invisible without their garments to any normal person. The reason Frodo can "see beneath their black wrappings" in the excerpt above, without the Ring, is due to the concept of "fading" that is explained by Gandalf: "You were beginning to fade"

(Tolkien 219); "If they had succeeded [in fading Frodo], you would have become like they are ... You would have become a wraith under the dominion of the Dark Lord" (Tolkien 222). Hammond and Scull explain in the "Reader's Companion": "Gandalf explains in Book II, Chapter 1 that because of his wound Frodo was already on the threshold of becoming a wraith, and thus, even though he did not put on the Ring, he could see the Riders and they could see him." (195)

Thus, when Tolkien writes "He could see them clearly now", Frodo sees them as they are, as wraiths, since he himself is starting to become one. Any other character present in this scene, however, perceives the Black Riders as men hooded in black cloaks; thus, they only appear "robed in white and grey" to Frodo.

When the German translators do not translate "appear to" in this context, they present their readers with a weird situation: The Black Riders change clothes in the middle of their pursuit for seemingly no reason. It is virtually impossible for the reader to realize that only to Frodo it looks like they changed; and there will not be an "I see"-effect when Gandalf explains the concept of "fading" later on, solving this mystery. Due to these circumstances I would title this difference not just as a translation decision, but as a translation *mistake*.

A second translation mistake can be argued for in the following excerpt about the Witch King, leader of the Black Riders:

Tolkien 706 Carroux II:363 Krege 745	This way and that turned the dark head helmed and crowned with fear, sweeping the shadows with its unseen eyes.	Hierhin und dorthin wandte er voll Furcht den behelmten und gekrönten Kopf und suchte mit seinen unsichtbaren Augen die Schatten ab.	Hin und her drehte er den schwarzen Kopf mit der Schreckenskrone, durchkämmte die Schatten mit seinen unsichtbaren Augen.
---	---	---	---

As previously mentioned, their ability to instill fear is one of the chief weapons the Black Riders possess. Thus, I argue that when Tolkien writes "helmed and crowned with fear" he does not mean, as Carroux translates it, that the Witch King feels fear. In contrast I

would argue that Tolkien's text explains the relationship between the Riders and the emotion of fear: they rule over fear, as they can use fear as a weapon – thus they are "crowned with fear". The fear they instill in their enemies also keeps those enemies from harming them: even if these enemies had means to do so, their fear prevents them from attacking and thus using these potential means. Thus, the Black Riders are "helmed ... with fear", as the fear they instill is a protective measure as well.

Carroux's translation misses this metaphor completely. However, Krege's translation does not convey this metaphor as clearly as Tolkien's version either, as his translation pictures the Witch King with a dreadful crown (literally: "dread-crown" instead of "crowned with fear"). "Dread-crown" could be read as a metaphor, in context of the text, however, it seems to me to be a physical crown. This does fit the description of the Witch King Tolkien gives during the siege of Minas Tirith (Tolkien 829), but it does not allow easily for the reading of the metaphor that is available to the reader of the English text. Thus, we have a very different picture of the Witch King between all three versions of the text.

Besides the differences in the depictions of the Black Riders' powers as seen in the previous examples, one can also observe differences in the depictions of their animality and their character.

The Black Riders are depicted as animalistic already at their first appearance in the Shire: "I can't say why, but I felt certain he was looking or *smelling* for me" (Tolkien 75). Especially their reliance on their sense of smell is repeatedly described. But it is not the only animalistic behaviour they show:

Tolkien 173 Carroux I:216 Krege 196	Suddenly I shivered and felt that something horrible was creeping near: there was a sort of deeper shade among the shadows across the road, just beyond the edge of	Plötzlich überlief mich ein Schauer und ich spürte, daß etwas Entsetzliches näherkroch: da war sozusagen ein tieferer Schatten zwischen den Schatten jenseits	Auf einmal läuft mir's kalt über den Rücken und ich spüre, wie etwas Entsetzliches heranschleicht, eine Art dichter Schatten zwischen den Schatten auf
--	---	---	--

the lamplight. It slid away at once into the dark without a sound.	der Straße, gleich hinter dem Lichtkreis der Lampe. Er verschwand sofort geräuschlos im Dunkeln.	der andern Seite der Straße, dicht hinter dem Rand des Lichtkreises. Er huschte sofort weg in die Dunkelheit, lautlos.
---	--	--

Carroux pushes the animalistic behaviour here: Tolkien's "creeping" is not necessarily equivalent to the German "kriechen" (crawl, grovel, crouch) which Carroux uses; Krege's translation of "schleichen" (sneak, lurk, tiptoe) is also valid. In the end this comes down to translator preference: Carroux decides to give the Black Riders another animalistic trait by using "kriechen", while Krege stays neutral with "schleichen". Interestingly, both German translators also decide to translate the "It" at the start of the last sentence as "Er" (He). This means they translated it as a pronoun for "shade" which is grammatically male in the German language (though the German translation does lose the meaning of "shade" as "wraith", as German does not differentiate between "shade" and "shadow", using "Schatten" for both). However, the translators could have also translated "It" as "Es" (It), using it as a pronoun for "something horrible" ("etwas Entsetzliches" in both German translations). Using "Es" instead of "Er" could have further dehumanized the Black Riders, though due to "something horrible" being further away in the passage it does make sense to refer back to "shade" instead.

The most jarring differences in the reception of the Black Riders between the three versions is the reception of their character, in the sense of their mannerisms and how other characters talk about them.

These differences mainly stem from the retelling of Farmer Maggot's meeting with a Black Rider. When Frodo, Sam and Pippin arrive at Farmer Maggot's house, the farmer tells the other three hobbits of the Black Rider that came by earlier that day. In this retelling, the Black Rider appears, at least in Krege's translation, extremely uncouth:

Tolkien 94 Carroux I:122 Krege 113	Have you seen <i>Baggins</i> ?	Habt ihr <i>Beutlin</i> gesehen?	Hast du gesehn <i>Beutlin</i> ?
---	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------------

The differences between Krege's translation and Carroux's translation are immense, even in this short sentence. Firstly, the Black Rider uses "ihr" in Carroux's translation, while he uses "du" in Krege's. As was shown in Smith's article discussed earlier in this study, "du" is familiar speech, while "ihr" is deferential and, thus, polite. Since Maggot and the Black Rider are strangers and not relatives, spouses, friends, or equals in their occupation and neither is Maggot a child, the use of "du" of the Black Rider in Krege's version is very impolite. Addressing an adult stranger with "du" is universally considered bad manners. Using "Sie" is a basic rule to show respect (or "Ihr" in the case of Carroux's translation).

Thus, the Black Rider is rude in this excerpt in Krege's translation, while meeting the norm for talking to strangers in Carroux's translation. In contrast, Maggot uses "Sie" or "Ihr" respectively throughout the whole conversation, staying polite even when he gets angry at the Black Rider (Krege 113, Carroux 122).

However, this is not the only difference between the translations that makes the Black Rider impolite in Krege's translation. Krege also lets the Rider speak in an ungrammatical way, swapping verb and object in the sentence. This style of speech shows the Rider's lack of understanding of the language. Nowadays (in Germany), it is also often (negatively) connoted with low education and a migration background, and native speakers will use this style of speech to imitate and/or mock foreigners with little grasp of the German language.

Combine these connotations with the following excerpt from the same passage:

Tolkien 94 Carroux I:123 Krege 113	If he passes will you tell me? I will come back with gold.	Wenn er vorbeikommt, wollt Ihr es mir sagen? Ich komme mit Gold zurück.	Du sagst mir, wenn er des Weges kommt. Ich kehre wieder mit Geld.
---	---	---	--

Yet again, the Rider is polite in Carroux's translation, as he is in Tolkien's text. He uses "Ihr" and asks a question with the option for Maggot to decline. In Krege's translation, however, the Rider once again uses "Du", being impolite, and does not ask Maggot for

cooperation. Instead, Krege's translation rephrases the original question as an assumption, implying that Maggot will cooperate no matter what: "You tell me, when he passes. I will return with money." (re-translation by me; it is also worth mentioning that Krege uses "money" instead of "gold", which means his Rider is cheaper than Carroux's or Tolkien's).

In fact, the choice to make the Black Riders impolite removes (or changes) possible interpretations of the Black Riders' characters as well: the reader will in later chapters find out that the Black Riders are beings with supernatural powers. Questions then may arise, like: why did the Riders not use force, but resulted to polite information gathering (though their "otherness" gained them a lot of attention while doing so)? A possible explanation could be, that politeness was used to show civility and no desire to fight; and a possible explanation for that lacking desire to fight could be, that they were not sure how powerful the Ringbearer would turn out to be, as suggested in *The Hunt for the Ring* by Tolkien, as quoted in *A Reader's Companion* (Hammond and Scull 164). However, the Black Riders in Krege's translation are the opposite of polite, a behaviour that emanates hostility and brings about conflict. This could open up other interpretations the reader could construct of course; it does change the perception of the characters even later on in the book though, compared to Carroux's and Tolkien's versions.

Besides giving the Black Riders much worse mannerisms in his translation than in Carroux's or Tolkien's text, Krege also further pushes the migration background connotation of the Riders in this paragraph:

<p>Tolkien 95 Carroux I:123 Krege 113</p>	<p>If any of these black fellows come after you again, I'll deal with them.</p>	<p>Wenn irgendwelche von diesen schwarzen Gesellen noch einmal hinter Euch her sind, werde ich sie mir vornehmen.</p>	<p>Und wenn noch mal so ein Schwarzer nach dir fragt, dann werd' ich dem was erzählen!</p>
--	---	---	--

Krege translates "black fellow[s]" as "Schwarzer". "Schwarzer" is the word used in German to describe people of colour (literally: "black" (as a noun) or "black guy"; full

sentence re-translated: "If another black guy asks for you again, I'll tell him something [aggressively/threatening]"). Due to the native population in Germany being white, black skin colour is connoted with a migration background as well. Thus, Krege depicts the Black Rider in this scene as an uncouth foreigner and likens him to a person of colour.

This opens up a racism/xenophobia discussion in Krege's *LotR* translation. This is not to imply or argue for Krege being (or having been) racist, however. One should keep in mind that all of these descriptions are used in the retelling of the meeting between Maggot and the Black Rider, told from the perspective of Maggot. It is not the tale of the *actual* meeting, told by a neutral narrator that describes the meeting from the sidelines.

This is important to note since Maggot is described (in all three versions) as being extremely cautious or even hostile towards any kind of foreigner, especially Men or other non-hobbit folk, falling in line with the majority of Shire-folk. It is repeatedly stated that Hobbits do not mingle with foreigners: Bilbo is often described as "queer" for having "outlandish" relations (e.g. Tolkien 24) and Tolkien writes: "The Shire-hobbits referred to those of Bree, and to any others that lived beyond the borders, as Outsiders, and took very little interest in them, considering them dull and uncouth" (150).

It can thus be established that Shire-Hobbits show quite a bit of prejudice towards foreigners in the Shire. Thus, the additional framing of the Black Rider as foreign Krege employs in his translation can be read as a criticism of societies such as the Shire that tend to talk negatively about anyone not fitting into their community, based on race (Hobbits versus Men), looks (black clothing of the Riders versus bright colours of the Hobbits (Tolkien 2)) or manner of speech (ungrammatical question of the Rider versus grammatically correct speech by the Hobbits).

However you read Maggot's retelling of his meeting with the Black Rider, though, it is the case that this framing of the Black Riders is exclusive to Krege's translation, since neither Carroux's nor Tolkien's text support this kind of framing in a tangible way.

How should Maggot's increased xenophobia in Krege be read then? Maggot is the only Hobbit talking about a direct meeting with a Black Rider, and, as established prior, he shares a lot of characteristics with the "typical" Hobbit as described by Tolkien. Additionally, in 2.3 I paraphrased the popular theory in Tolkien criticism of the Shire being a representation of an England of the not-so-distant past, as described by Turner in *Translating Tolkien*. If the reader subscribes to this theory, the xenophobic Maggot in Krege is a representation of a stereotypical person in real life society. It is not clear, exactly which society's stereotypical older rural man Maggot is representing: in Tolkien, it may be rural England from around 1900; but in Krege's text the vernacular mannerisms of Maggot's speech may point towards a German speaking society, albeit the Shire in general is largely unchanged compared to Tolkien's template.

This is where the reader's construction of meaning comes in. As Greiner mentions in *Übersetzung und Literaturwissenschaft*, the reader's experience and expectation play a part in constructing the meaning of the text. A reader born and raised in Germany may see Maggot as a xenophobic German farmer, while someone experienced with other cultures who reads Krege's translation may attribute him to another society – one way or the other, the fact remains that Maggot can be read as a symbolism for xenophobia.

As a short tangent, I would like to bring in Stopfel's criticism of Krege's translation at this point, pointing out "homoerotic" erasure in his translation: "Where Carroux translated Tolkien's frequent uses of the words 'love' and 'dear' to describe relationships between characters as she found them, using their German equivalents without a sign of

embarrassment, Krege's vocabulary consistently eliminates anything suggesting strong emotion between males" (13).

Whether Stopfel's criticism is justified or not is, in my opinion, debatable; it is true, "dear" gets repeatedly translated with a form of "guter", but when we take a look at a passage where this happens (Tolkien 910, Krege 957), Frodo still lays down in Sam's arms, and Sam still kisses Frodo's forehead. A complete homoerotic erasure has not been undertaken, and a reasonable explanation for Krege's translation choices for "love" and "dear" could be a change in connotations of the German counterparts: friends may have told each other that they "love" each other in the past, but in current, and presumably also in 2000's German, this is a highly unusual phenomenon, presumably due to the rise of awareness of homosexuality, introducing the sheer possibility that a man telling another man he "loves" him in a public setting (like a published book) can be sexually connotated – though I am not a sociologist. One way or another, it is likely that Krege's "erasure" of the German equivalents to "love" and "dear" was not done by homophobic intent.

However, this is the same issue as Maggot's xenophobia in Krege's translation. In the end, following my theoretical framework, it is the reader's decision what meaning to construct from Krege's changes: whether it is a ironically non-self-aware text with criticism of xenophobia while pushing homophobia or whether the Black Riders are just wraiths with a weird manner of speech and the various male-to-male relationships are just good friends or family. Krege's part in this is offering the clues to these interpretations with his translation.

If one follows these clues, then, it will sensitize the reader to xenophobia and racism throughout *LotR*. Considering that Middle-Earth is the home to a huge variety of races (Men, Hobbits, Elves, Dwarves, Orcs, Trolls, sentient Eagles, Ents and more), the question of racist prejudices, xenophobia and how different races interact with each other in general is one that can be very interesting to the reader and of course shows parallels to our real world, where

racism and xenophobia still run wild (even though Tolkien himself denies any allegory to real world problems in *LotR* (Tolkien XXIII-XXV), this does not stop the reader from seeing these allegories).

To conclude my examination of the Black Riders: It can be said that across the three text versions the Black Riders have differing levels of power, sometimes (seemingly) gaining additional powers in one translation, sometimes losing them in another. The three text versions also differ in how animalistic the Riders are described, and, lastly, the Krege translation introduces xenophobic framing to the Riders. Due to these differences, the perception the reader may have of these characters may differ greatly between readers of the three different text versions, as the clues in the text changed greatly.

5.2 GOLLUM

<p>Tolkien 11 Carroux I:26 Krege 28</p>	<p>He was a loathsome little creature: he paddled a small boat with his large flat feet, peering with pale luminous eyes and catching blind fish with his long fingers, and eating them raw.</p>	<p>Das war ein widerwärtiges kleines Geschöpf: mit seinen großen Plattfüßen paddelte er in einem kleinen Boot, schaute mit blassen, leuchtenden Katzenaugen um sich und fing mit langen Fingern blinde Fische, die er roh verschlang.</p>	<p>Er war eine widerwärtige Kreatur: mit seinen breiten Plattfüßen paddelte er ein kleines Boot, spähte mit fahl leuchtenden Augen durch die Dunkelheit und schnappte mit seinen langen Fingern nach blinden Fischen, die er dann roh verzehrte.</p>
--	--	---	--

This excerpt is the first appearance of Gollum in *LotR* (the previous sentence being: "At the bottom of the tunnel lay a cold lake far from the light, and on an island of rock in the water lived Gollum" (Tolkien 11)). According to a famous saying, first impressions are everything: they may permanently define the image a person has of another person. This saying is consistent with current psychological research about first impressions, including first impressions in writing (e.g. Stanichi 2010).

However, the first impression readers may have after reading this introduction may vary between the three versions of the text. This is due to Carroux dehumanizing Gollum in her version, two-fold. While Tolkien and Krege introduce Gollum as "He" or "Er" respectively, Carroux uses "Das" (It/That). All three versions describe Gollum as "loathsome little creature", but Tolkien and Krege at least give Gollum the pronoun of a person, while Carroux uses an article that is definitely not used for a person, but for things or animals.

Speaking of animals, Carroux also describes Gollum's eyes as "Katzenaugen" (literally "cat's eyes", but also a German word for reflectors, e.g. on bicycles); while this is not to be taken literally, but as a description for the trait of Gollum's eyes to light up in the dark, it still furthers the reader's impression of Gollum as an animal.

Krege, on the other hand, translates Gollum in a more humanizing way than Carroux or even Tolkien, for example in these excerpts:

Tolkien 384 Carroux I:463 Krege 412	I wish I could lay my hands on the wretch.	Ich wollte, ich könnte diesen Wurm packen.	Wenn ich ihn nur zu fassen bekäme, den Halunken!
Tolkien 612 Carroux II:251 Krege 646	Like a nasty crawling spider on a wall.	Wie eine scheußliche krabbelnde Spinne auf einer Wand.	Wie eine krabbelnde Spinne an der Wand!
Tolkien 685 Carroux II:337 Krege 723	I marvel at the creature:	Ich staune über das Geschöpf:	Ich frage mich, was in dem Burschen vorgeht:
Tolkien 685 Carroux II:338 Krege 724	The creature is wretched and hungry	Das Geschöpf ist unglücklich und hungrig	Dem Kerl geht es elend, und er hat Hunger

Carroux's dehumanization of Gollum does not seem to continue, in contrast to the introductory paragraph. One could argue that using "Wurm" (worm) as translation for "wretch" in the first example listed here likens Gollum to an animal again, thus dehumanizing him, but I do not think this is necessarily the case in this context, as "Wurm" is commonly used to describe people in German, either when they are pitiable, despicable, or both (as is the case with Gollum).

Krege, however, shows a trend of humanizing Gollum. "Halunke" is unmistakably human; in the second example, Krege chooses to not translate "nasty", which shifts the statement of the sentence from emphasis on the (arguably) disgusting movements of a spider towards the possible interpretation of admiration: admiration of Gollum's skill in climbing; in the third and fourth example, Krege translates "creature" as "Bursche" and "Kerl", both describing male humans (both could be re-translated as e.g. chap, lad or bloke; in any case a word describing a (typically young) male). The only exception to this trend is when Sam talks about Gollum:

Tolkien 614 Carroux II:253 Krege 648	"Well, what's to be done with it?" said Sam. "Tie it up, so as it can't come sneaking after us no more, I say."	"Na, was soll nun mit ihm geschehen?" fragte Sam. "Fesseln, damit er uns nicht mehr nachschleichen kann, das sage ich."	"Na, was machen wir mit dem Biest?" sagte Sam. "Es anbinden, damit es uns nicht mehr nachschleichen kann, würd' ich sagen."
Tolkien 688 Carroux II:342 Krege 727	And nothing will ever be all right where that piece of misery is.	Und nichts wird jemals gutgehen, wenn dieses Häufchen Elend dabei ist.	Und nichts kommt wieder ins Reine, solange wir dieses Häufchen Dreck nicht los sind.

Sam does not like Gollum. This is evident to any reader of *LotR*, in any (of the three) version(s). Krege seems to have decided to show this very aggressively in his translation, as he inserts even more demeaning remarks by Sam than the text by Tolkien prescribes. In the first example, Krege adds "dem Biest" (the beast) instead of just translating "it", comparing Gollum to a wild animal or monster. In the second example, Krege does not translate "piece of misery" closely as "Häufchen Elend" (heap of misery) as Carroux does, but instead chooses to translate it as "Häufchen Dreck" (heap of filth/dirt). Carroux's "Häufchen Elend" is incredibly more human than Krege's translation, as "Häufchen Elend" is a German idiom commonly used to describe people in a pitiable state, often with an endearing connotation: a mother may for example refer to her child as "Häufchen Elend", for instance when that child is sad over a broken toy or a similar tragedy. From the context of Sam's usage of "Häufchen

Elend" any endearing factor can be easily dismissed; however, the fact prevails that this idiom is used to refer to a fellow human (or fellow hobbit-like creature in this case).

The same can not be said for "Häufchen Dreck". In fact it is quite the opposite: The aim of a person using "Häufchen Dreck" to describe another person is usually to deny that person's humanity and portray them as a sub-human creature who should not be treated as human or enjoy the same rights as a human. For example, it can be used to excuse a crime committed against that person, since a crime can't be committed against someone without rights.

With these translation decisions, Krege elevates Sam's hatred of Gollum to a new level: not only does he make some of Sam's remarks harsher, he also makes other people's comments about Gollum more kind. This creates a stronger contrast in the treatment of Gollum and makes Sam's hatred more pronounced to the reader. Thus, we see both a change of Gollum's and, indirectly, of Sam's character in Krege's translation: due to the elevation of Gollum as a character, the character of Sam becomes comparatively meaner.

The trend of humanizing Gollum even extends to Gollum's manner of speech. For example, read the following excerpt taken from the Prologue of *LotR*, Gollum's first appearance in the books:

Tolkien 12	We hates it	Wir hassen es auf	Wir hassen ihn auf
Carroux I:28	forever!	immerdar!	immerdar!
Krege 29			

In a linguistic thesis the focus would be the failure of both German translations to recreate the unique grammar uses in his speech with "We hates", using the third person singular verb form while speaking in the first person plural – a possible explanation would be that Gollum, due to his double persona references himself as "We", speaking of both personas, but uses third person singular since he is talking about himself in third person, as the single body Gollum, thus showing the awareness of the currently talking persona that two personas

("We") are living in a single body ("[he] hates"). In German, this could be translated as "Wir hasst ihn/es auf immerdar!". However, an explanation for why this was not done in either German translation is Gollum's habit of sometimes hissing in his speech ("Nice fissh" Tolkien 686; "He musstn't hurt Preciouss" Tolkien 943). Thus, the translators may have attributed the "s" in "hates" to hissing rather than to a unique way of addressing himself in third person singular and first person plural at the same time. Additionally, this unique grammar is not used consistently throughout *LotR* ("We hate it" Tolkien 613 opposed to "We hates them" on the same page just a paragraph later, which makes it unlikely that the "hate" and "hates" grammar are used by different personas)².

This study, however, is mainly interested in Gollum's use of pronouns between the two translations in this excerpt: Carroux uses "es" (it), following Tolkien's lead in the English text ("it" being Bilbo). Krege decides to translate "er" (he) instead. Thus, Gollum recognizes Bilbo as a person in Krege's text, while Bilbo is just a thing or animal in Tolkien's and Carroux's versions. By having Gollum elevate Bilbo to a person, Krege also elevates Gollum to a person in the reader's mind.

Gollum even falls less into "mindless" babbling compared to Tolkien and Carroux.

Consider the following examples:

<p>Tolkien 686 Carroux II:339 Krege 725</p>	<p>Fissh, nice fish. White Face has vanished, my precious, at last, yes. Now we can eat fish in peace. No, not in peace, precious. For Precious is lost; yes, lost. Dirty hobbits, nasty hobbits.</p>	<p>Fisch, netter Fisch. Weißes Gesicht ist endlich verschwunden, ja, Schatz. Jetzt können wir Fisch in Frieden essen. Nein, nicht in Frieden, Schatz. Denn Schatz ist verloren; ja, verloren. Dreckige</p>	<p>Fissch, lieber Fissch! Weißfratze ist verschwunden, mein Schatz, endlich, ja! Jetzt in aller Ruhe Fisch fressen. Nein, nicht in aller Ruhe, mein Schatz. Schatz ist weg, ja, weg. Dreckige Hobbits, garstige</p>
--	--	---	--

² It is possible that "hates" is consistently used when the object of hate is a plural form (them), while "hate" is used for singular form (with the same formular for other verbs as well); however, this was not paid further attention to in this study.

Tolkien 724
Carroux II:384
Krege 764

Gone and left us,
gollum; and
Precious is gone.
Only poor Sméagol
all alone. No
Precious. Nasty
Men, they'll take
it, steal my
Precious.
Thieves. We hates
them. Fissh, nice
fissh. Makes us
strong. Makes
eyes bright,
fingers tight,
yes. Throttle
them, precious.
Throttle them
all, yes, if we
gets chances.
Nice fissh. Nice
fissh!

We'll see. It may
well be, O yes,
it may well be
that when She
throws away the
bones and the
empty garments,
we shall find it,
we shall get it,
the Precious, a
reward for poor
Sméagol who
brings nice food.
And we'll save
the Precious, as
we promised. O
yes. And when
we've got it
safe, then She'll
know it, O yes,
then we'll pay
Her back, my
precious. Then
we'll pay
everyone back!

Hobbits, gräßliche
Hobbits. Weg und
haben uns
verlassen, *gollum*;
und Schatz ist weg.
Nur der arme
Sméagol ist ganz
allein. Kein
Schatz. Gräßliche
Menschen, sie
werden ihn nehmen,
werden meinen
Schatz stehlen.
Diebe. Wir hassen
sie. Fisch, netter
Fisch. Macht uns
stark. Macht Augen
scharf, Finger
kräftig, ja. Sie
erwürgen, Schatz.
Sie alle erwürgen,
ja, wenn wir
Gelegenheit haben.
Netter Fisch.
Netter Fisch!
Wir werden sehen, o
ja, es mag wohl
sein, wenn Sie die
Knochen und die
übriggebliebenen
Kleider wegwirft,
daß wir ihn finden,
ihn bekommen, den
Schatz, eine
Belohnung für den
armen Sméagol, der
nettes Essen
bringt. Und wir
werden den Schatz
retten, wie wir
versprochen haben.
O ja. Und wenn wir
ihn in Sicherheit
haben, dann wird
Sie es erfahren, o
ja, dann werden wir
es Ihr heimzahlen,
mein Schatz. Dann
werden wir es jedem
heimzahlen!

Hobbits! Gehen und
lassen uns allein,
gollum, und Schatz
ist weg. Und der
arme Sméagol ganz
allein. Kein
Schatz. Garstige
Menschen, die
nehmen ihn weg,
stehlen meinen
Schatz! Diebe! Wir
hassen sie. Fissh,
lieber Fissh!
Macht uns stark.
Macht Augen scharf
und Finger fest,
ja. Erwürgen,
Schatz, alle
erwürgen, ja, wenn
wir sie zwischen
die Finger kriegen!
Lieber Fissh,
lieber Fissh!

Mal sehn! Es könnte
sein, o ja, könnte
sein, dass wir ihn
finden, wenn SIE
die Knochen und die
Kleider wegwirft,
dass wir ihn
finden, den Schatz,
und dann kriegt ihn
der arme Sméagol
zum Lohn dafür,
dass er so feines
Futter bringt. Und
so retten wir ihn
ja, den Schatz, wie
versprochen. Und
wenn wir ihn erst
mal haben, dann
soll SIE's
erfahren! O ja,
dann zahlen wir's
IHR heim, mein
Schatz. Allen
werden wir's
heimzahlen!

These are just two of multiple examples of this sort of babbling monologue by Gollum (see also Tolkien 57/614, Carroux I:80/II:253, Krege 75/648). They do not only show an (arguably) untranslatable method of Tolkien to differentiate when Gollum refers both to the Ring (uppercase) and to himself (lowercase) as "Precious/precious" (see Hammond and Scull 38); but they also show that Krege's Gollum appears more thoughtful or concerned about his monologues.

Gollum in Tolkien's and Carroux's text babbles mindlessly. This is shown in the punctuation and syntax: Gollum uses a lot of short sentences in parataxe, at times not even using full sentences ("No Precious."; "Thieves."; "O yes."). This leads to a staccato of short utterances the reader can easily read over without paying attention to it, a train of thought with no brakes, so to speak. While there is an underlying logic to the monologue, as the content is not completely random, and jumps in topic are somewhat related ("Now we can eat in peace. No, not in peace, precious. For Precious is lost;"), the monologue has no point to make, as it is just Gollum talking to himself; not to evaluate his options to find a solution to a problem, but to describe his situation in relation to the Ring (first example) or to reiterate what he already decided (in the second example). Neither of these monologues results in a change of heart for Gollum. Thus, they have no greater purpose: Gollum is just babbling.

Krege's translation is, with all the liberties he is taking, still a rather faithful adaptation of the English text. As such, the content of Gollum's babbling is still the same in Krege's version, and it does not impact his character development, just like it didn't in Tolkien's text. However, the Krege Gollum seems to at least be more aware of his own monologue in Krege's version due to the differing punctuation: Tolkien (and following Tolkien, Carroux) use mainly dots to connect the babbling sentences. Krege, however, introduces additional exclamation marks (nine exclamation marks combined replacing dots in the two examples). These exclamation marks interrupt the reading flow of the reader more than a simple dot

would do it, thus separating the monotonous monologue of the English text into small bits the reader consciously reads. In the second example, Krege also translates the uppercase "She" as "SIE" in all capital letters, putting way more emphasis on Shelob than Carroux's "Sie".

In total, the Krege Gollum, thanks to the translation decisions in Krege's version, seems more human and, thus, more sympathetic than his counterparts. While all three versions show that Gollum once was a normal person who turned into an animalistic evil through the influence of the Ring, Gollum preserves more of his humanity in Krege's version: his mind seems clearer, and his past as a normal person shines through more compared to the other two versions. Of course, Krege's version is still a translation of Tolkien's text – thus Gollum does not change completely. He is still betraying Frodo and Sam by luring them into Shelob's lair and he is still addicted to the evil influence of the Ring, holding his Precious dearer than himself. But I believe that the changes Krege made may make it easier for the reader to understand why both Bilbo in *The Hobbit* and Frodo in *LotR* pity Gollum.

5.3 GALADRIEL

My third in-depth character analysis will be about the character of Galadriel, the Lady of Lórien. Galadriel is a prime example of a character with a very "concentrated" appearance in *LotR*, with the vast majority of her appearances being in the chapter "The Mirror of Galadriel" and the chapter directly following that chapter, "Farewell to Lórien".

Due to her character being mainly explored in these 26 pages (in Tolkien), with only short appearances or mentions throughout the rest of *LotR*, her depiction in this short part of *LotR* greatly influences her character perception.

Before the first mention of her name by a character, the name of Galadriel appears twice in *LotR*: once in a passing mention in the prologue, and the second time in the title of the chapter "The Mirror of Galadriel" before she gets mentioned in the text. Thus, this introduction by Haldir is the first real impression a reader gets of this character:

Tolkien 353 Carroux I:426 Krege 380	Here is the city of the Galadhrim where dwell the Lord Celeborn and Galadriel the Lady of Lórien.	Hier ist die Stadt der Galadrim, wo der Herr Celeborn und Galadriel, die Herrin von Lórien wohnen.	Dies ist die Stadt der Galadhrim, wo der Herr Celeborn und die Frau Galadriel wohnen, der Herr und die Herrin von Lórien.
--	---	--	---

As usual, Carroux mirrors Tolkien's semantics and syntax as closely as possible, while Krege shows some liberties again. This was criticized by Nagel: "It is obvious from [Tolkien] that Galadriel is ruler of Lórien, while Celeborn is not. He is called "Lord" as title of honour, but the qualification "of Lórien" is applied to Galadriel alone; thus, [Krege] overgeneralises" (36). Thus, Krege changes the standing of Galadriel. However, he does not do so in this excerpt alone: whenever Galadriel is mentioned by, exclusively, "Lady" outside of spoken conversation, Krege translates the title by simply writing "Galadriel" (compared to "Lady Galadriel", which he usually translates with "Frau Galadriel"); examples:

Tolkien 358 Carroux I:432 Krege 385	the Lady	die Herrin	Galadriel
Tolkien 359 Carroux I:433 Krege 386	the Lord and Lady	Den Herrn und die Herrin	Celeborn und Galadriel
Tolkien 361 Carroux I:436 Krege 389	the Lady	Frau Galadriel	Galadriel
Tolkien 363 Carroux I:438 Krege 390	the Lady	Frau Galadriel	Galadriel
Tolkien 366 Carroux I:441 Krege 393	the Lady	die Herrin	Galadriel
Tolkien 376 Carroux I:454 Krege 404	the Lady	die Herrin	Galadriel
Tolkien 376 Carroux I:454	the Lady	Frau Galadriel	Galadriel

Krege 404			
Tolkien 377 Carroux I:455 Krege 405	the Lady	die Herrin	Galadriel
Tolkien 377 Carroux I:455 Krege 405	of the Lady	der Herrin	Galadriels

As can be seen from these examples, Krege often replaces the title of Galadriel with her name in his translation, when the title is used outside of spoken sentences, while Galadriel retains her title in conversation³:

Tolkien 361 Carroux I:435 Krege 388	the Lord and Lady	den Herrn und die Herrin	den Herrn und die hohe Frau
Tolkien 361 Carroux I:436 Krege 382	the Lady of the Elves	die Herrin der Elben	die hohe Frau
Tolkien 362 Carroux I:437 Krege 389	Lady	Herrin	hohe Frau
Tolkien 366 Carroux I:442 Krege 394	Lady	Herrin	hohe Frau
Tolkien 375 Carroux I:452 Krege 403	Lady	Herrin	Hohe Frau
Tolkien 376 Carroux I:453 Krege 404	Lady	Herrin	Hohe Frau
Tolkien 376 Carroux I:454 Krege 404	Lady	Herrin	hohe Frau

³ The upper- and lowercase occurrences of "hohe/Hohe Frau" follow conventional German capitalization rules within their context.

All of these instances of "Lady" have been spoken by other characters (Frodo, Sam, Aragorn, Gimli). An explanation for why Krege (mostly) replaces Galadriels title outside of spoken utterances could be his "modernizing" of the text: perhaps Krege thought it outdated or strange for his readers to refer to characters as their title instead of their name while writing as the narrator, while characters referring to other characters by title fits the text-world. The "modernity" argument does fall flat, though, since "hohe Frau" is an extremely outdated title, that arguably feels more archaic than, whilst not improving on, Carroux's translation of "Herrin".

Krege was not throughout with these changes, however, leaving single occurrences of the title in the narrators' words. Most of these occurrences can be explained otherwise, however: either do they directly follow a mention of her name, while they cannot be replaced by a pronoun ("Sehr groß waren sie beide, Frau Galadriel nicht minder als Herr Celeborn, sehr schön und würdevoll. Gekleidet waren sie ganz in Weiß; das Haar der hohen Frau ..." Krege 382); or they are mentioned in indirect speech, thus indirectly being uttered by a character in the text-world ("Ein Weilchen sprachen die Reisenden noch ... über den Herrn und die Herrin der Galadhrim" Krege 385); or she is mentioned in a double mention after Celeborn was named directly ("An diesem Abend wurden die Gefährten abermals in Celeborns luftigen Palast hinaufberufen und vom Herrn und der Herrin aufs liebenswürdigste empfangen" Krege 395).

Carroux is equally (in-)consistent with the translations of the title, usually sticking to "Herrin", while at times using "Frau Galadriel", even when the English text only mentions "Lady" (and, in one instance, even translating "Frau Galadriel" when Tolkien only writes "Galadriel", without title). Unlike for Krege, I cannot access the English text Carroux translated from. Thus, it is possible that these inconsistencies stem from changes in the English *LotR* between Carroux's translation in 1969 and the 2004 edition I use in this study.

There are three additional occurrences of the title mentioned by the narrator in Krege's translation which can not be explained in the ways I mentioned above:

Tolkien 373	The Lady ended her	Die Herrin beendete	Frau Galadriel
Carroux I:450	song and greeted	ihr Lied und	beendete ihr Lied
Krege 401	them.	begrüßte sie.	und begrüßte sie.

There is no discernible reason why Krege would translate this particular instance of "Lady" with "Frau Galadriel" instead of just "Galadriel" as he does everywhere else in these two chapters. I will thus attribute this instance to an oversight. I will detail the second and third occurrence below.

What is the effect of these title translations, however? In Krege, the decision to almost exclusively mention any sort of title in spoken utterances of characters in the text-world leaves multiple viable interpretations to the reader. On the two far ends of the scale of interpretations, then, is either the interpretation that Krege's Galadriel is less awe-inspiring and/or less worthy of respect than the Galadriel in Carroux's and Tolkien's version; or the interpretation that the reader should realize the social standing, and maybe even that Galadriel deserves her social standing, through the behaviour of Galadriel herself and those around her, and not through the imposition of the author (and translator) by forcing ominous titles on the reader in passages written by the "neutral" narrator, thus this interpretation gives the most power to the reader.

Carroux, meanwhile, managed to mirror Tolkien's title very well: "Lady" is without a doubt a title; but at the same time, it is not very descriptive of Galadriel's specific position, as "Duchess", "Baroness", or "Queen" would do. With "Herrin", Carroux manages to capture this perfectly: it's an unspecific title, yet it is a title, thus showing the superior social standing of Galadriel.

At the same time, it is interesting to see that both German translations choose to translate the title as "Frau" when in combination with her name (as in "Lady Galadriel"),

instead of translating the title as usual (e.g. "(die) Herrin Galadriel" or "(die) hohe Frau Galadriel") respectively).

Two more title translations are also interesting to observe:

Tolkien 358 Carroux I:432 Krege 385	Elvish Lady	Elben-Herrin	Elbendame
Tolkien 361 Carroux I:436 Krege 389	Elf-lady	Elben-Herrin	Elbenfürstin

In the first example, Boromir talks about Galadriel and calls her "Elvish Lady". Carroux stays consistent with her translation of "Lady" (when the name "Galadriel" does not follow) and chooses to separate the title from the descriptor ("Elvish" or "Elben"), instead of creating a compound, as Krege does in his translation. Since this is an utterance by a character in the text-world, and not a passage by the narrator, this is not in line with his observed practice of handling the title. "Dame" is a word for a mature woman, usually connotated with respect. However, it is far from being a title on the level of "Herrin". This instance may say more about Krege's treatment of Boromir's character than that of Galadriel's, though. One could argue that Boromir chooses to not use the title in Krege's translation, as he is in disdain towards Galadriel's mind-reading in the context of this utterance (see also the translation of "To me it seemed exceedingly strange" (Tolkien 358) as "Ich fand es unerhört" (Krege 385) – re-translated: "I thought it outrageous").

The second instance, however, is a description by the narrator and is the second occurrence in which Krege breaks with his established practice. Not only does he translate the title in a narrator-passage (though it could be argued that it is again due to the name "Galadriel" appearing close-by when Galadriel names her "Mirror of Galadriel"), Krege even chooses a title implying nobility: "Fürstin". This is the title of a high-ranking noble woman, often translated as "Princess". Krege most likely intended the "Fürstin" to simply mean "ruler

(of Lórien)" instead of introducing an Elvish nobility system. However, his intention has no effect on the reader, who may now be left with unanswerable questions if the existence of a "Fürstin" also implies the existence of Elf-Dukes, Elf-Barons and Elf-Earls.

I can not give a satisfying explanation for Krege's translation choice in the last occurrence of breaking his practice either, however it does lead me away from the title discussion:

Tolkien 362	"Like as not," said	"Höchstwahrscheinli	"Na klar!" sagte
Carroux I:437	the Lady with a	ch", sagte die	die hohe Frau leise
Krege 389	gentle laugh	Herrin und lachte	kichernd
		leise	

Krege's translation of "gentle laugh" as "leise kichernd" has been repeatedly criticized, including Stopfel and Nagel: "[T]he translation of "'Like as not,' said the Lady with a gentle laugh" ... reads somewhat like "'Sure!' said the Lady giggling softly'" (Stopfel 13); "'Kichern" (*giggle*) is nowhere near within the span of meaning of "to laugh gently", and in this context ... provides the elven ruler with some kind of 'girlish' image" (Nagel 47). They both also criticize Galadriel's "Na klar!" (Nagel explicitly, Stopfel implicitly); however, this criticism is misguided, as Galadriel merely mocks Sam (gently, as we can see from the quote), who uses the respective words ("Like as not", "Höchstwahrscheinlich" and "Na klar!") right before Galadriel. Thus, criticizing Galadriel's use of Sam's words is equal to criticizing Krege's choice of Sam's words, but uttering "Na klar" fits Sam's character as portrayed in Krege and Tolkien.

Both German translations have trouble conveying the "gentle" part of Galadriel's laugh, however. This makes Galadriel meaner in both German translations, and in Krege's translation she even degrades, to use Nagel's comparison to an extreme, to a female High School bully, mocking Sam's simple manner of speech. In Tolkien's text, meanwhile, Galadriel is merely amused, without ill intent.

There are some other parts of Galadriel's character which were changed between translations. As with the Black Riders, Galadriel's powers were also changed:

<p>Tolkien 357 Carroux I:431 Krege 384</p>	<p>And with that word she held them with her eyes, and in silence looked searchingly at each of them in turn. None save Legolas and Aragorn could long endure her glance. Sam quickly blushed and hung his head. At length the Lady Galadriel released them from her eyes, and she smiled.</p>	<p>Und nach diesen Worten hielt Galadriel sie mit ihrem Blick gefangen und schaute schweigend der Reihe nach jeden einzelnen von ihnen forschend an. Keiner außer Legolas und Aragorn vermochte ihren Blick lange zu ertragen. Sam errötete gleich und ließ den Kopf hängen. Schließlich entließ Frau Galadriel sie aus ihrem Blick und lächelte.</p>	<p>Und mit diesen Worten fasste Galadriel sie ins Auge und sah sie einen nach dem andern forschend an, ohne ein Wort zu sagen. Niemand bis auf Legolas und Aragorn konnte ihrem Blick lange standhalten. Sam wurde gleich rot und senkte den Kopf. Dann entließ Frau Galadriel sie aus ihrem Blick und lächelte.</p>
---	--	---	--

On first glance, all three text versions appear to carry the same meaning. However, Carroux's use of the German idiom "Blick gefangen halten" subtly changes Galadriel's power: the idiom is similar to the English "catching your eye", in that it describes something you can not look away from. If a person catches your eye in the active sense, as is the case for Galadriel in this passage, it implies that this person locks eyes with you in a way that you can not avert your eyes voluntarily. Carroux's choice of words suggests a similar situation.

However, this is not what is happening in this passage, as the reader will notice from the context: Galadriel's gaze does not capture the body of the Fellowship, but their minds. The respective person being "held ... with her eyes" is able to turn away with their body, but they can not turn away from Galadriel's words in their mind. As the reader will read a few pages later, Galadriel tests the endurance and willingness of each member of the Fellowship to push on and continue their journey after the death of Gandalf in this passage. That's why

the Fellowship can turn away from Galadriel first and afterwards be released by her later: because her eyes are not holding them physically.

Krege's translation fits Tolkien's meaning better here. His translation states that Galadriel looks at them deeply and later releases them from her gaze. This captures the English meaning perfectly, arguably better than the English text itself.

Another change can be observed in this passage:

Tolkien 365	she said, divining	sagte sie und	sagte sie, seine
Carroux I:440	his thought,	erriet seine	Gedanken erratend
Krege 392		Gedanken.	

"Divining", according to the *Reader's Companion*, means "to determine or interpret by supernatural insight" (Hammond and Scull 324). Both German translations, on the other hand, translate it with "guessing his thoughts", eliminating any supernatural activity by Galadriel here, and instead leaving the impression of good guesswork. More fitting German translations, in my opinion, would have been "Gedanken erforschen" (explore thoughts) or "Gedanken (er)föhlen" (feel thoughts). This would have preserved Galadriel's power of touching on the mind of other people, which is lost in the German translations.

In total it appears that Galadriel has been subject to changes on two broad subjects: how her titles were handled, and how powerful her telepathic powers are. While the power translation falls into a category of close versus liberal reading already seen in this study, where small changes in the translation may result in small changes of a character, the title translations show a big challenge for translators: here cultures clash, as German translators attempt to find a cultural equivalent to an English title, which appears to not be perfectly doable. As an additional challenge, the title is that of a fictional culture, creating even more difficulties, as the standing of a "Lady" is not clearly defined in Elvish culture and the translator has to decide on a proper translation of the title in context of Galadriel's social standing in the text-world.

5.4 OTHER CHARACTERS AND SCENES

In this chapter, I will analyze additional characters and scenes with changes in character perception by the reader which are too small or few to warrant an own chapter. Even so, this chapter will not be comprehensive; listing every text-excerpt with meaningful differences in character perception (and more, see 3) would go beyond the scope of this thesis.

5.4.1 BOROMIR

Boromir's character is largely consistent throughout the three text-versions. Two observed differences were mentioned in the chapter concerning Galadriel, where he uses "Elbendame" instead of "Elben-Herrin" or "Elvish Lady" and "Ich fand es unerhört" instead of "Ich fand es überaus merkwürdig" or "To me it seemed exceedingly strange", respectively. The implications of these changes were touched on briefly in that chapter and require no additional comments.

However, there is another scene with remarkable changes to Boromir's character presentation between the three text-versions, namely the scene where he argues with Frodo about the futility of their endeavor and the "correct" way to use the Ring. First instance:

Tolkien 398	Boromir got up and	Boromir stand auf	Boromir stand auf
Carroux I:480	walked about	und schritt	und lief ärgerlich
Krege 426	impatiently.	ärgerlich auf und	hin und her.
		ab.	

At the point of this sentence, the reader does not fully know yet that Boromir is under the influence of the Ring and intends to take it from Frodo. It is implied, as Boromir already argues with Frodo at this point; yet it could also merely be a quarrel of opinions with multiple possible outcomes. Both German translators decide to translate "impatiently" in this situation with "ärgerlich". However, a conventional German-English dictionary will list "ungeduldig" as the most fitting translation, often as the only one.

Both translations seem fitting in the context, thus I am not arguing for a translation error of the German translators. It is remarkable, however, that both translators chose to go

with the more "aggressive" translation of the two viable translations available, increasing the foreshadowing of what is to come compared to the other option.

In the same passage, another word-choice is notable: in Carroux, Boromir "schritt", while in Krege, he "lief". "Lief", from "laufen", is the most immediate translation of "walked", merely describing the method of locomotion by using limbs. "Schritt", from "Schreiten", however, has a more noble connotation: it describes a conscious mode of movement; a prince on his way to his coronation may do so by "schreiten". It is a word often used in combination with words such as "dignified", "gracefully", "ceremoniously" etc.

With this word-choice, Carroux preserves Boromir's dignity as son of the Steward of Gondor and as the man he believes himself to be – even through this scene, where the influence of the Ring takes over and dictates his thoughts, leading to his quasi-monologue as he explains to Frodo why the destruction of the Ring is the wrong path:

Tolkien 398 Carroux I:480 Krege 426	<i>The fearless, the ruthless, these alone will achieve victory.</i>	<i>Die Furchtlosen, die Mitleidlosen allein werden den Sieg erringen.</i>	<i>Die Unerschrockenen, die Rücksichtslosen allein können den Sieg erringen.</i>
--	---	--	--

In this excerpt, the translators chose to translate "ruthless" very differently. While the translations of "fearless" are rather similar ("furchtlos" = "fearless", quite literally, while "unerschrocken" = "unfrightened"), there is a striking difference between "Mitleidlosen" and "Rücksichtslosen".

In my reading, the core difference between "Mitleidlos" and "Rücksichtslos" is the moral conviction: a "rücksichtslose" person may be willing to make sacrifices in a sort of utilitarian thinking, sacrificing few for a greater good. They may not even feel remorse for the victims along their path to the greater good. However, they are capable of empathy in general. A "mitleidlose" person, however, does not feel empathy in any given situation.

Not every German speaker may agree with this reading of "rücksichtslos" and "mitleidlos"; however, I as a reader feel like the Boromir in Carroux is simply insane, while the Boromir in Krege seems to be a hardliner, who may still have sanity left in him.

One could argue convincingly that Tolkien's Boromir at this point in the text is indeed insane, succumbing to the influence of the One Ring. We see the effect of that in the following excerpt:

<p>Tolkien 399 Carroux I:481 Krege 427</p>	<p>How it angers me! Fool! Obstinate fool! Running willfully to death and ruining our cause. If any mortals have claim to the Ring, it is the men of Númenor, and not Halflings. It is not yours save by unhappy chance. It might have been mine. It should be mine. Give it to me!</p>	<p>Wie mich das erbost! Narr! Dickköpfiger Narr! Wissentlich dem Tod in die Arme laufen und unsere Sache verderben! Wenn irgendwelche Sterblichen Anspruch auf den Ring haben, dann sind es die Menschen von Númenor, und nicht Halblinge! Du hast ihn nur durch einen unglücklichen Zufall erhalten. Er hätte mir gehören können. Er sollte mir gehören. Gib ihn mir!</p>	<p>Ich könnte rasen! Dummkopf! Du dickschädeliger Dummkopf! Vorsätzlich dem Tod in die Arme zu laufen und unsere Sache zuschanden zu machen! Wenn irgend Sterbliche auf den Ring einen Anspruch haben, dann die Menschen von Númenor und nicht die Halblinge. Er ist nur durch einen unglücklichen Zufall an dich gekommen. Er hätte mein sein können. Er sollte mein sein. Gib ihn her!</p>
---	--	---	---

If one remembers the babbling monologues of Gollum, one may find a striking semblance in this passage. While Boromir's manner of speech is not exactly in the same style as Gollum's monologues, the concatenation of short bursts of thought are similar. The most important difference to me, however, is the last sentence: "Give it to me!" Carroux translates it as "Gib ihn mir!", while Krege chooses "Gib ihn her!".

The important difference here is the implication; Carroux's Boromir wants the Ring for himself, just as Tolkien's: he wants Frodo to give the Ring to *him*. The Krege Boromir wants the Ring, without stating the purpose (the purpose in Tolkien being "to me"). This

omission of the egoistic centre of Boromir's motivation changes Boromir's character in comparison to the other two: in Krege, there is the slightest chance left that Boromir intends to use the Ring exclusively for the war of Minas Tirith and Mordor – this chance does not exist in Carroux and Tolkien. In their versions, the culminating "Give it to me!" makes it obvious that Boromir wants the Ring solely for himself, without thinking much further as to if or how to use it. It is clear that Boromir already lost to the manipulation of Sauron's Ring.

It is only a slight difference, yet it changes who Boromir is and stands for: The "[t]rue-hearted Men" who will "not be corrupted" (Tolkien 398) stand a chance in Krege. They do not in Tolkien and Carroux.

The difference in translation is minimal and, as always, reader-dependent; some would argue that "mein sein" is more possessive than "mir gehören", making Krege's Boromir more egoistic than Carroux's and maybe Tolkien's. As this is reader-dependent, however, it merely strengthens this study when multiple readings exist.

5.4.2 ARAGORN/STRIDER

The character of Aragorn is similarly largely consistent but shows several differences in his introduction scene in the "Prancing Pony", where he is still named "Strider".

Tolkien 156	"Him?" said the	"Der?" sagte der	"Der?" antwortete
Carroux I:196	landlord in an	Wirt und schielte	der Wirt,
Krege 177	answering whisper,	zu ihm hinüber,	gleichfalls
	cocking an eye	ohne den Kopf zu	flüsternd und
	without turning his	drehen.	zwinkerte warnend,
	head.		ohne den Kopf
			hinzuwenden.

Yet again, the reader is confronted with a first impression of a new character. Butterbur's behaviour is careful, giving a first hint of potential danger from this Strider person. However, I have difficulty imagining a "warning wink", which Krege introduces in his translation. This brings the reader to additional alert – the warning aspect is not existent in

any of the other two versions. At the same time, Butterbur's behaviour is less careful of Strider in Carroux's version: there he does not whisper, but just speaks.

Krege betrays the true affiliation of Strider in a subtle way early on, however. As mentioned in 4, Krege uses familiar pronouns much more often than deferential. If a deferential pronoun comes up in Krege's translation, it is a special sign of respect – and the enemies in Krege's translation would never use a deferential pronoun when speaking with Frodo – which Strider does in Krege's translation before the Hobbits (and the readers) figure out that Strider is a friend of Gandalf: "Sie sollten lieber schnell etwas tun!" (Krege 179). A careful reader will know at this point that Strider is not an enemy.

The most important difference in the presentation of Aragorn, however, is in the scene of his departure to the Paths of the Dead, when he rejects Éowyn:

<p>Tolkien 758 Carroux III:61 Krege 829</p>	<p>"Then wilt thou not let me ride with this company, as I have asked?" [...] "For that I could not grant without leave of the king and of your brother; and they will not return until tomorrow. [...] Farewell!"</p>	<p>"Willst du mich dann nicht mitreiten lassen in dieser Schar, wie ich gebeten habe?" [...] "Denn diese Bitte könnte ich nicht gewähren ohne die Erlaubnis des Königs und Eures Bruders, und vor morgen werden sie nicht zurückkehren. [...] Leb wohl!"</p>	<p>"Und willst du mich nicht mit deiner Schar reiten lassen, wie ich es erbeten habe?" [...] "Denn das könnte ich dir nicht ohne Erlaubnis des Königs und deines Bruders gewähren; und sie werden erst morgen zurückkommen. [...] Lebe wohl!"</p>
--	--	--	---

This scene is one of the very rare instances in the text, where Tolkien uses the old *thee*, *thou*. This passage is a representation of the situation described in the *Reader's Companion*:

Éowyn began [the prior] conversation with Aragorn using formal *you*, *your*, but ... pointedly changes to the intimate *thee*, expressing her feelings. When [this] conversation resumes the next [day], she continues to use *thee*, *thou*, but Aragorn consistently addresses her with *you*, *your*, painfully polite. (532)

This scene is a rejection scene, and the marker for the rejection is Aragorn's continued use of *you, your* ("your brother"), even after Éowyn starts using *thee, thou* ("wilt thou not"). Carroux mirrors this use of familiar and deferential pronouns: Éowyn uses "du", Aragorn "Ihr" ("Eures Bruders"). While not quite as striking as in Tolkien's version, due to both familiar and deferential pronouns still being used in modern German, unlike in English, the reader can still figure out what happens, as Carroux uses familiar pronouns very sparingly.

In Krege, this rejection is completely lost, as both characters use familiar "du" from the start. The switch in pronouns does not happen, and the rejection is not clear thanks to that. The reader can not even understand that this scene is a rejection of Éowyn's feelings, not just of her proposal to ride with Aragorn. This changes the dynamic of the whole Aragorn-Éowyn relationship.

This continues later, when Aragorn starts using *thee, thou*, as Éowyn accepts his rejection and bonds with Faramir (Tolkien 977), as Aragorn merely continues using "du" in Krege, instead of showing a switch of deferential to familiar pronouns as in Tolkien and Carroux.

5.4.3 DENETHOR

Another example of Tolkien using *thee, thou* can be found in Denethor's madness: while he used *you, your* when talking to Gandalf before (e.g. Tolkien 758), Denethor switches to *thee, thou* when his madness manifests during the siege of Gondor (e.g. Tolkien 854). Yet again, this switch of deferential to familiar pronouns, in this case out of disrespect instead of familiarity, does not exist in Krege, as Denethor uses "du" throughout the text, while Carroux can yet again show this switch in pronouns.

However, Krege finds an alternative way to show Denethors loss of respect before anyone: when talking about Aragorn, Denethor uses "Ranger of the North" in Tolkien (853), and "Waldläufer aus dem Norden" in Carroux (III:143); Krege translates it as "Waldschrat

aus dem Norden" (901). A "Schrat" is a mystical being in German and Austrian folklore (an example of Krege's domestication). They are spirits of nature, often attributed to cause nightmares, which fits with Denethor's perception of Aragorn, as the homecoming of the King is a nightmare for Denethor, who would lose his position of power.

In modern German, "Schrat" is usually not used to reference spirits of nature, however, but to describe a disheveled, uncivilized person. Thus, Krege introduces a clever polysemy, by which Denethor both insults Aragorn, as he does in Tolkien, even though he uses the correct title of "Ranger"; and at the same time sort of accepts Aragorn's claim on the throne as he describes him as a cause of nightmares.

6. Analysis: Results

In this study, I have taken an in-depth look at the changes in character perception between the three text-versions of *LotR* examined in this study, created by translation decisions by Carroux and Krege in their respective translations. I have explored the Black Riders, Gollum and Galadriel with increased care, as I found more, and more significant changes for these three characters, but I also shed light on the changes affecting other characters as well.

In this process, I found the most unique version to be the translation by Krege, as he translates taking more liberties than Carroux, who tries to mirror the semantics and syntax of Tolkien as closely as possible. As a logical consequence of his different approach, Krege's text shows more, and bigger deviations in character perception in general, though it does not follow that Carroux's translation perfectly encapsulates the character perceptions readers may have when reading Tolkien either.

While Carroux's differences compared to Tolkien are often minuscule, Krege's differences led to the clues for a discussion of xenophobia and homophobia in his translation, changed how human or how animalistic the readers may perceive Gollum or the Black Riders to be and changed Galadriel's social standing in Elvish society, as titles were translated differently. However, as was shown in the last section, these changes are not the only ones introduced, as additional differences were observed throughout the whole text of *LotR*.

Krege was found to be domesticating and dynamically equivalent in his translation, while Carroux was foreignizing in the sense that her text is obviously a translation, and formally equivalent. I suppose it makes sense, then, that Krege's version deviates more from the English text in terms of clues for differing possible constructions of meaning, as Carroux, in Schleiermacher's words "leaves the author in peace as much as possible and moves the

reader towards him", while Krege "leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author towards him" (quoted in Venuti 15).

6.1 RESULT 1: TRANSLATIONS IN LITERATURE STUDIES

In this section, I am going to talk about the impact I hope this study to will have in the future. The goal of this study was to show the implications of working with a translation in the field of literature studies. As established, a translation is not the exact repetition of the meaning of the ST in the TL, but an interpretation of the ST, written in the TL. In this case, it is Carroux's and Krege's interpretation of *LotR*, which leads to the changes examined in this study. The reader of these interpretations, then, constructs his own meaning based on the (changed) clues of the interpretations by Krege and Carroux, creating their own interpretation yet again.

Thus, a literature studies academic must be aware of these circumstances when working with translations: his reading of the relationship of, for example, Aragorn and Èowyn, may be vastly different depending on which version he is working with. When discussing a literary work, then, it is important that the participants of the discussion know which version of the text they are discussing: the mention of Maggot's xenophobia will puzzle the reader of Tolkien's English text.

Is this, then, an argument to not work with translations at all in literature studies? I do not think so: translations are the only widespread medium in which academics can find a complete interpretation of a literary work by a third person. This makes them case studies for hermeneutics. Thus, I would argue that this is an argument in favour of working with translations in literature studies.

Additionally, translations will have a cultural effect on the cultures speaking the language of the translation. The perception of *LotR* in Germany before the Krege translation and the movie trilogy was arguably more influenced by Carroux's translation than by

Tolkien's English text. This perception of *LotR*, then, may have influenced various German authors over the years.

Translations are, thus, a part of the intertextual relationship and as such cannot be ignored in academic fields working with texts. They are not only interesting for academics, however, as they influence generations of readers.

I argue that translators, then, should be ascribed a similar importance as authors. Even in the age of the Death of the Author, authors are still omnipresent when working with texts: people read the "new Tolkien" (or insert other author names) and academic texts will quote, for example, Tolkien 245. In this study, I consistently quoted Carroux's and Krege's translations as "Carroux 245" and "Krege 245". This was, on one hand, of course for practical reasons, as per quotation guidelines the author should be cited (symptomatic for the low importance assigned to translators), which is confusing as Tolkien would be the author for all three text versions. On the other hand, I believe there is an argument to cite translations like this in the future.

Lawrence Venuti first published *The Translator's Invisibility* in 1995, criticizing the under-representation of translators compared to the authors of the works they translate. He advocates for foreignization as the translation method to go for, to make translations noticeable as such, and thus to draw attention to the work of the translator:

An illusionism fostered by fluent translating, the translator's invisibility at once enacts and masks an insidious domestication of foreign texts, rewriting them in the transparent discourse that prevails in English and that selects precisely those foreign texts amenable to fluent translating. (Venuti 12)

In this passage, Venuti talks about the phenomenon that translators live in self-imposed invisibility: by translating "fluent", they hide the fact that the reader reads a translation, thus making their work as translator unnoticeable.

Even though my reasoning is different, I come to the same conclusion: the translators are under-represented, not only in society, as Venuti shows, resulting in low wages and contracts that do not give translators any rights to their translation, as these rights stay with the author of the original work (Venuti 9); but in academics too.

This may be symptomatic of the way literature studies departments are structured in various countries: universities may have an English department, a German department, a French department (or Germanic and Romance departments, respectively) etc.; and each of these departments almost exclusively works with novels or poetry originally written in the language(s) of the respective department. This most likely stems from the fact that literature studies departments want to work with literature that influenced (and still influence) the culture of their language. However, as this study has shown, translations are more than merely replacing an SL element with the equivalent TL element, resulting in a perfect representation of, e.g., the English text in German. Instead, they are interpretations, introducing a new point of view on the contents of the original work, and they influence the intertext of any culture translations are prevalent in. This influence of translations on the intertext should be extremely interesting for any literature studies department, thus making the translations themselves interesting, thus making the translator as interesting as the author. Translations and translators should then be included in the academic field of work of these departments.

Even when the author is dead, the work still influences; and if the translator is dead, the translation still influences.

In conclusion, I think there is merit in a closer collaboration of the academic fields of translation studies and literature studies; translations should not only be interesting for linguists, but for any academic in the field of literature studies as well, who will undoubtedly work with literary works of his chosen language that are influenced by translations of foreign

literary works. It follows that working with (influential) translations and translators should be included in the field of work of any literature studies department – and in their respective (under-) graduate programs.

6.2 RESULT 2: TOLKIEN STUDIES

A second main result of this study will ideally lead to a change, or at least the development of a parallel movement, in Tolkien studies. As any reader of this study will be aware of at this point, I do subscribe to the Death of the Author theory, or paradigm. While reading through various articles and books in Tolkien studies, I noticed that a lot of these articles and books operate under the idea of penetrating the text to reach the intention of the author, Tolkien. Examples of works cited in this study would be Allan Turner in *Translating Tolkien* to a certain extent, but mainly Rainer Nagel, who starts his comparison of Carroux's and Krege's translations with a look at "Tolkien's Intentions When Writing *The Lord of the Rings*" ("New One" 23).

While the fact that it is called "Tolkien studies" shows a certain fascination with the author Tolkien, which may make it unsurprising that the Death of the Author does not exist for huge parts of this academic community, I argue that this defiance of the Death of the Author is unnecessary. In fact, I succeeded in basing my comparisons in this study exclusively on Tolkien's, Carroux's and Krege's text, without any need to reference secondary literature; and when I did refer to the *Reader's Companion* it was either due to concise summaries of what the text expresses I could quote, explanation of words, or background information on possible constructed meanings available in the text itself without the use of secondary literature as well.

In other words: The intentions of Tolkien this academic community is so fond of when working with his texts, quoting his Letters and other works, are for the most part already expressed by the text, which makes it an unnecessary effort to prove these meanings

through third-party means. By clinging to Tolkien as authoritative figure, Tolkien studies at the same time create unnecessary work for themselves, and cripple themselves of additional, new readings of Tolkien's works.

This is even more significant when working with translations: by reducing translations into those that can convey Tolkien's intentions and those that cannot, dismissing the latter translations as "bad", Tolkien studies further narrow their scope. When Krege introduces a discussion about xenophobia and racism to Tolkien, why should it be dismissed when Tolkien created a world of a plethora of different races, which of course leads to racism being displayed – just look at the prejudices between Dwarves and Elves in *LotR*?

In conclusion, I argue that while Tolkien studies, as the name suggests, is centered around Tolkien and his works, it would profit of centering only around the works. The person and author J.R.R. Tolkien can still be one of many literary critics of his works, of course, instead of an authoritative figure. To explore Tolkien's intentions should not be the main driving force of the academic field of Tolkien studies. I do not suggest that there is no merit in doing so, but I do suggest that there is increased merit in allowing other points of view and methodologies in working with Tolkien's works.

7. Conclusion

In this study, I compared the two German translations of *LotR*, the 1969 translation by Margaret Carroux and the 2000 translation by Wolfgang Krege, to each other and the English text by Tolkien. The comparison focused on the change in the reader's perception of characters due to changed clues for possible constructed meanings resulting from differing translation decisions by the translators, as well as the fact that not every polysemic English word has an equally polysemic German counterpart.

I detected meaningful differences between character perceptions across the three examined text versions, leading to different characters in each text version. The translation of Krege deviates more from Carroux and Tolkien than those deviate from each other. This is a result of Krege's translation being dynamically equivalent and domesticating compared to the formally equivalent translation by Carroux.

With his dynamically equivalent translation strategy, Krege introduces new clues for possible constructed meanings, resulting in new possible interpretations. As noteworthy one can mention the xenophobia of Farmer Maggot towards the Black Riders and the change of character relationship between the (in comparison to both Tolkien and Carroux) more humanized Gollum and Sam, who is increasingly malicious towards Gollum in Krege's translation. On Carroux's side, a translation mistake allows for new interpretations of the hierarchy within the ranks of Mordor, implying a hierarchy governed by fear and oppression. Further differences of less significance were observed throughout the whole book, slightly changing various characters and character relationships between the three text versions.

Based on these results of the analysis of my findings, comparing character perception across all three text versions, I then argued for an increased heedfulness of translations in the academic field of literature studies, including the framing of translators, for example in citations of translations. I pointed out that translations impact the cultures of the target

languages and, thus, the future texts produced by these cultures, which implies that translations are very significant for any academic field working with literary works. I then emphasized the importance of literature studies departments frequently working with translations, instead of focusing on texts originally written in their respective language.

Furthermore, I argued for the killing of the author in Tolkien studies, a field that still frequently produces academic articles based on the assumption of Tolkien as an authoritative figure for his own work. By doing so, Tolkien studies defy the Death of the Author prevalent in other fields of literature studies. I further argued that by following the paradigm of the Death of the Author, Tolkien studies would benefit from a larger variety of approaches to Tolkien, which would enhance Tolkien studies as a whole, instead of defiling the purism of Tolkien's works.

Works Cited

PRIMARY SOURCES

Tolkien, J.R.R. *The Lord of the Rings*. 50th Anniversary Edition. HarperCollinsPublishers. 2004.

---. *Der Herr der Ringe. Die Gefährten*. Translated by Margaret Carroux and poems translated by E.-M. von Freyermann, 12th paperback Ed., Klett-Cotta, 1984.

---. *Der Herr der Ringe. Die Zwei Türme*. Translated by Margaret Carroux and poems translated by E.-M. von Freyermann, 12th paperback Ed., Klett-Cotta, 1984.

---. *Der Herr der Ringe. Die Rückkehr des Königs*. Translated by Margaret Carroux and poems translated by E.-M. von Freyermann, 12th paperback Ed., Klett-Cotta, 1984.

---. *Der Herr der Ringe*. Translated by Wolfgang Krege and poems translated by E.-M. von Freyermann, 1st Ed. of the new translation, 10th Ed., Klett-Cotta, 2002

SECONDARY RESOURCES

Greiner, Norbert. *Übersetzung und Literaturwissenschaft*. Tübingen, Gunter Narr Verlag 2004.

Hammond, Wayne G. and Christina Scull. *The Lord of the Rings. A Reader's Companion*. HarperCollinsPublishers, 2005.

"Margaret Carroux." *TolkienGateway*, 20 June 2014,

www.tolkiengateway.net/wiki/Margaret_Carroux, accessed 24 June 2021.

Nagel, Rainer. "'The New One Wants to Assimilate the Alien.'" Different Interpretations of a Source Text as a Reason for Controversy: The 'Old' and the 'New' German Translation of *The Lord of the Rings*." *Translating Tolkien: Text and Film.*, edited by Thomas Honegger, Walking Tree Publishers, 2004, pp. 21-52.

Nagel, Rainer. "Verschiedene Interpretationen eines Textes als Grundlage von Übersetzungsstrategien. Die "alte" und die "neue" deutsche HdR-Übersetzung." *Hither Shore*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2004, pp. 85-118.

Reiß, Katharina and Hans J. Vermeer. *Towards a General Theory of Translational Action. Skopos Theory Explained*. Routledge, 2014.

Ricœur, Paul. "The Task of Hermeneutics." *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences. Essays on Language, Action and Interpretation*. Cambridge, 2016, pp. 3-22.

Ricœur, Paul. "Metaphor and the central problem of hermeneutics." *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences. Essays on Language, Action and Interpretation*. Cambridge 2016, pp. 127-143.

Smith, Arden R. "*Duzen* and *Ihrzen* in the German Translation of *The Lord of the Rings*." *Mythlore: A Journal of J.R.R. Tolkien, C.S. Lewis, Charles Williams, and Mythopoetic Literature*, vol. 21, no. 1, 1995, pp. 33-40.

Stanchi, Kathryn M. "The Power of Priming in Legal Advocacy: Using the Science of First Impressions to Persuade the Reader." *Oregon Law Review*, vol. 89, no.1, 2010, pp. 305-351.

Stopfel, Susanne. "Traitors and Translators: Three German Versions of The Lord of the Rings." *Mallorn: The Journal of the Tolkien Society*, no. 43, 2005, pp. 11-14.

Turner, Allan. *Translating Tolkien. Philological Elements in The Lord of the Rings*. Peter Lang, 2005.

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*. 2nd ed., Abingdon, Routledge 2008.