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1 INTRODUCTION

Translating classics, translating children's classics and above all retranslating famous children's classics is one of the ways a translator of our times can gain visibility. Lewis Carroll's *Alice* books are among the very best-known works written for children, although their long life rests not only on the original works but on numerous abbreviated and adapted forms, not the least influential being the famous Disney film of 1951. While translating *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* (*Alicen seikkailut ihmemaassa*, 1995) and *Through the Looking-Glass* (in progress) it has been necessary to realize that the translations will eventually be looked at with more than usually critical and inquisitive eyes. In such a situation, the question arises: how is one to proceed so as not to end up in failure?

In literary translation, the subject of this study, as in other fields of life, the ideas of failure and success readily connect with the concept of norms. Andrew Chesterman, having pointed out that a translator must have a theory or translate blindly (1997:39), sees theory as of practical use and connected with commonly accepted norms (see ib. p. 67); and norms are intersubjective and recognized only because of their social existence (ib. p. 54). So, if the aim is to achieve success with a translation presented to the public, finding the appropriate generally accepted norms is of vital importance. Indeed, this study focusses on norms: it discusses six central norms of literary translation as listed by Martin (2001), and seeks to find them corroborated by comparative material gathered by means of a brief questionnaire (2.5.).

Translators, on the whole, like to concentrate on translating rather than draw attention to themselves. It seems almost a prerequisite on the profession that one must be prepared to put another person first, i.e. the author. This is not to say that translators lack character and colour of their own. What it does lead to, however, is that professionals seldom take the time to write about their own work. Some recent examples to the contrary by Finnish translators might indicate that this is changing, but for the time being, they can be regarded as exceptions. (See Juva 2002, Rikman 2005, Kapari-Jatta 2008.)
It is no surprise, then, that while there has been a fair amount written about Finnish translations of Carroll, especially by Riitta Oittinen, little has been written by translators themselves. Kirsi Kunnas has a short piece on the poems in *Through the Looking-Glass* (Carroll 1974b:275–283), and some details of both poetry and prose are discussed by Martin (2001). This study takes the opportunity, therefore, to fill in a gap in our understanding of Carroll translation by writing a more sustained account of translating two long passages of *Through the Looking-Glass* (TLG). Part I of this study closes with a look at Chapter III, "Looking-Glass Insects", and half of Chapter VI, "Humpty Dumpty", giving detailed comments on translating these chapters. Part II presents the translations themselves.

With Carroll, it is easy to focus on the poetry parodies and puns, while ignoring the bread-and-butter of his work, the narrative prose and no-nonsense dialogue (there is some); comments will therefore be made on these "ordinary" aspects of his text as well as those commonly deemed of the greatest interest. Such remarks may also apply to a wider section of literary translation than those focussing on wit specifically. Kersti Juva has pointed out that translation scholars often focus on the problems occurring in translation, the "activity" (rather than the "pauses") (Chesterman 1997:89), the non-routine tasks, rather than the periods when work goes smoothly (Juva 2002:10). I shall therefore make whatever remarks on the translation I think are of general use and interest, not concentrating solely on the invented names, jokes etc.

In this study I shall draw from my experience as a translator, particularly of Carroll, and almost twenty years as editor of translations of general fiction at the publishing house of Werner Söderström Osakeyhtiö in Helsinki, hoping this has provided insight into the whole process of publishing translated literature. I am bound to say that some of the thoughts expressed are either common knowledge or subjects of frequent discussion among the translating and publishing professions, and it is therefore impossible to give a source for every point. I hope to be able to verbalize some of the tacit knowledge of these fields as well, and thereby capture some points of view that are not widely known. Despite hopes of a measure of general applicability I must stress that all the opinions here expressed are my own.
2 THE ROLE OF NORMS IN TRANSLATION

In the first half of this study I shall focus on the role of norms in literary translation. The practical value of norms was pointed out earlier; another reason for addressing the question is the dichotomy between translation norms as seen in Translation Studies (TS) and norms as a part of actual translation activity. The starting point should be finding out what is meant by norms, particularly as it is possible that two separate concepts are involved here. In ordinary usage, a norm is 'a standard of proper behaviour or principle of right and wrong; rule’ and the adjective normative means 'explaining, stating or urging obedience to a rule; prescriptive’ (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1982, s.v. norm and normative). Being ”normative” in this sense seems to be not quite respectable nowadays, even outside the field of academic study, so it is interesting to ask why this is so, norms being an inescapable fact of life in translating and publishing.

Chesterman (1997) and Toury (1995), on the other hand, both regard norms (as part of TS) from the descriptive point of view: one could say they wish to describe that which prescribes. In practical translating and publishing, a norm is just what is understood by the word in everyday language: a guideline for doing things in a prescribed way. (See section 2.1. on who it is that does the prescribing.) Even in TS there has, as Toury puts it, been a strong tendency, thanks to the ”overriding orientation toward practical application”, to prefer prescription over description, explanation and prediction (1995: 2). If we are to look at real norms in translational behaviour and be able to describe them, we must first find out what they are. As a means of doing so, Toury suggests reconstruction of norms by studying translated texts (1995:65). To this textual approach an extratextual one can be added: asking people who spend their working time applying translation norms to discuss and explicate them. There is a risk involved in such an introspective procedure: might not some norms that are applied subconsciously or automatically go unnoticed? On the other hand, it could be interesting to hear which norms translators of a given time value and attempt to follow, even though there might also be other ones that they apply unwittingly.
This study is an attempt at explicating the norms that Finnish professional literary translators are conscious of and that enjoy wide acceptability in the Finnish Target Culture (TC). It sets about it in three ways: 1) by expressing what I see as central norms on the basis of my professional experience, and further developing the ideas in Martin 2001 and 2005; 2) by asking a number of translators what they regard as the most important rules concerning their work (2.5.), and 3) by reflecting on and describing the process of translating Carroll. By including comparative material gathered from colleagues, I hope to ease certain obvious misgivings concerning over-subjectivity, such as are described by Toury (ib. 65–66). I hope my self-reflections (see fraser 1996:67) on translating TLG, even if they are to be taken *cum grano salis* as translation research, will be acceptable as data and be of possible use to future TS scholars.

Where do norms come from and why are they norms? At the beginning of his book *Memes of Translation* Andrew Chesterman writes: ”A norm describes a kind of consensus of opinion about what something should be like, how it should be done. A norm-statement describes what such a consensus is, not what it *should* be.” (1997:3, original italics.) Later in the same work he talks of norms in a purely descriptive sense, as showing the actual practice in a given field (such as translation). Norms are indeed prescriptive in that they are ways of ensuring that social activities work successfully; to have the power to do so they are connected with sanctions. Norms are intersubjective, i.e. inherent in them is the idea of general agreement among a group of people: there is no such thing as a private or secret norm. (See Chesterman 1997:54.)

The idea of determining which norms are actually in existence from looking at real texts is therefore sound enough. If texts are produced by adhering to certain norms, presumably those norms leave traces in them, making it possible to infer which norms have been effective. There are problems, however. Is everything present in a text governed by norms? Surely not. There is a degree of free variation, as seen in the simple fact that no two translators will produce identical translations of the same text, however high their professional standards. It seems that literary translation is such a complex activity that no exhaustive description from the
single viewpoint of norms, even though it is such a widely applicable concept, will be attainable.

Janet Fraser describes a variety of introspective methods of data elicitation in TS (1996: 66–67). The method applied in the parts of this study concerning Carroll is self-observation, "a (usually) retrospective inspection by the subject of his/her own behaviour or strategies used in the allocated task" (ib. 67). As Aileen seikkailut peilintakamaassa (APT) is still in progress, comments on it cannot be called entirely retrospective (see however 4.1.1. on placing the reporting clause); when caught in the middle of making a change or having a new idea, they rather belong to what Fraser calls self-revelation, "an unedited account of concurrent activity on the allocated task" (ib. 67). Section 4.3. could be presented as an example of self-revelation in its entirety.

Translation as an activity is certainly not entirely and necessarily conscious all the time. The idea of flow as a mode of work is well-known; the highly esteemed Finnish translator Kersti Juva, for example, feels she must be in a state of flow to work satisfactorily (2005:21). When a person works between two languages s/he thoroughly knows, it isn't necessary to be continually looking at the job in an analytical way or making conscious problem-solving decisions. I would suggest that the function of norms in translation is to work as part of an alerting mechanism: an experienced translator may be able to go on in a trance-like state of flow much of the time, but when problems arise, s/he is alerted. It is then that the system of norms can be actively consulted and used in seeking solutions.

Considering that literature is an art form and therefore also translation of literature is an art in the sense of the Finnish word 'taide’, it is hardly surprising if there is a high level of subconscious activity. I see Juva’s "flow” as connected to translation as art in this sense, but there is also the other meaning of art, as represented by Finnish 'taito’, craft. Do norms only apply to that part of translation work which can be described as artisanship, and which is always present, whether the element of taide-art is significant or not? As regards my description of the role of norms as part of an alerting mechanism, this may indeed be so. But if we consider norms as an inherent part of all translation work and its acceptance, then it is also necessary
to account for the element of art as a necessity from the point of view of TC acceptability. Not all literature raises expectations of giving readers an artistic experience, but when it does, a rendering falling short of what is expected may lead to sanctions in the form of negative criticism, not only from actual critics but from readers, too. Without speculating on when such expectations are likely to arise or not, their existence should be noted.

2.1. Ten setters of translation norms

Academically, it is possible to look at norms descriptively, but for parties concerned with applying them to everyday work, some of the norms, at any rate, are seen as binding, therefore prescriptive – even to the extent of appearing in contracts that must be signed. There are many parties involved in generating norms, however, and not all of them are equally powerful. It may as well be remembered that points stated in contracts can be ignored, while the spoken word can at times have great influence. In 2.3., I shall present a list of norms of literary translation current in present-day Finland, as drawn from my experience as a translator, publisher’s reader, editor, teacher of translation (on occasion) and of course reader and member of the public. I have no inside experience of producing literary criticism on translation, only of reading it, and to a slight extent of having my own work written about. But before listing actual norms, let us look at their possible sources.

The following is an attempt at listing norm-setters, i.e. interested parties who have a role in forming the norms alive in literary translation. Norms are mainly not explicitly set down in any detail, even in contracts; rather, they find their articulation in the expectations and degrees of satisfaction expressed over actual translation work. I shall state what I see as the interests of each party and also what seems to be its ability to sanction the work of translators. The list sets them down in chronological albeit overlapping order following the process of a translation coming into being. Note that not all of the following are involved in every translation commission.
1. **Representatives of the Source Culture (SC).** These can be individuals making suggestions as to what ought to be published, but also organizations, often representing other than English-speaking cultures, e.g. The Hungarian Cultural and Scientific Centre in Helsinki, or the Finnish FILI; financial support for translators and/or publishers can be involved. SC representatives wish to make the SC better-known abroad. Because they are experts of the SC rather than the TC, they are not necessarily regarded as competent judges of translation into the Target Language (TL). Their power to sanction is limited to disapproval afterwards; this may, sometimes affect the prospects of a translator who is seen to have caused disappointment.

It is more typical, at least for big publishers, for the publishing initiative to come through a *literary agent* than a SC representative. Agencies need not represent the SC: they can be large firms working on an international basis. Agents selling translation rights and *scouts* employed by big publishing houses to discover material suitable for the TC market are often involved in the decision to publish a work in the TL, but they seldom have anything directly to do with the choice of translator, nor with sanctioning existing translations. See however 2. and 3. below.

2. **The author** wishes to distribute his or her own work successfully within the TC and to make money. Some authors now demand (by contract; see 3. below) the right to approve the translation before printing, which usually means a trusted person in the author’s country checks the translation; in such a case, the author may insist that corrections are made before the right to publish is granted. Whether this process results in any substantial improvement of the work depends on the skills of the trusted person. TC publishers and translators find this extra control cumbersome and would prefer to be trusted as competent professionals.

3. **The publishing contract** made between the TC publisher and the author or, more typically, the agent representing the author, is a formal statement involved in every professional translation job. It is mentioned here as a separate entity for the sake of clarity and for its role in verbalizing demands made on the translation. What publishing contracts say about translation varies slightly in wording and amount of detail. For this study, I have looked half a dozen contracts in the files of WSOY,
all made in 2003 by different agents from a number of countries; the language used by all was English. The actual translator was usually not mentioned, the passive "the translation shall be made…" being used instead. When the translator was mentioned, it was with the demand that s/he be "competent" or "of the highest standard". The common denominator concerning translation quality in all contracts was, predictably, the phrase "faithfully and accurately". This was specified by forbidding "abbreviations and alterations" and sometimes also "additions and deletions" without the author’s written approval.

One agent's contracts further included a clause demanding that the choice of translator be submitted to the author’s approval and the completed translation itself also be sent to be approved, giving the author five weeks’ time to acquaint her/himself with it. This seems to be something put down in case need arose, rather than a routine that was always followed. Checking a translation in a foreign language is a formidable task, and though it has on occasion been done – though hardly by the author concerned –, not all authors with this clause in their contracts demand it be carried out.

4. The publisher making the commission wishes to acquire a translation acceptable in the TC within a given time and without paying more than necessary, and to make a profit with it. The publisher chooses the translator. All literary translation in Finland is done by free-lance translators working for however many publishers they can and wish to. The publisher also has the power of sanction: power (via editors) to demand changes in the translation until a point of satisfaction is reached. Time being limited an element of compromise is often involved. In the last resort, though such extreme cases are rare, the publisher can refuse to publish the translation altogether (paying for the work done, however). The fact that the translator is dependent on the publisher for future employment is not a problem when all goes smoothly, and some publishers honour the tradition of publishers' responsibility towards their translators even when temporary difficulties arise. Nevertheless, dependency does make for the translator’s vulnerability.

5. The translation contract made between the translator and the TC publisher is a formal statement that parties used to working together often regard as a mere
formality. Its main point lies in specifying dates, payments and copyright matters. It also states that "the translation must be made carefully, without additions or deletions contrary to good translation practice. The publisher is entitled to suggest improvements. Decisions as to the final form of the translation depend on the translator's copyright, on the publisher's duty to guard the copyright of the original work, and on good translation practice."

(Translation from the relevant paragraph of the contract form used at WSOY by A. M). The phrase "good translation practice" remains undefined.

It is interesting to note that style is not explicitly mentioned in the wording of either of the contracts. Is this an indication that style is a by-product, something that accumulates when the more palpable elements of the work are all in order, or an admission that it is an evasive quality best left unmentioned?

6. *The translator* wishes to produce a translation acceptable in the TC within a given time and without more effort than necessary, to be paid as well as possible, and to gain positive response from all concerned to ensure employment in the future. The translator also wishes to find pleasure in doing the work and to satisfy his or her professional and artistic ambition thereby. Professional translators are familiar with and adhere to the norms of translation current in the TC. The translator's position is one of trust, particularly so when the Source Language (SL) is one little known by the other people involved or by members of the TC.

7. *The editor* wishes to find the translator’s work of high quality, but works to his/her best understanding to improve it until it reaches at least basic acceptability in the TC. The editor is the main judge of translation quality and the key person in the question of sanctions and continuing employment: s/he wields the power entrusted by the publisher. There is usually only one editor involved in a given translation commission. It is vitally important that the editor and the translator be able to co-operate successfully; for both professions this ability is a necessary qualification. They should also agree at least implicitly about most translation norms.
8. *The community of translators* keeps up a discussion on current norms, reads and discusses new translations in the TC and is quick to note (and often disapprove of) tendencies towards norm change. Sanctioning is unofficial but not without effect, as reputation is an important factor in publishers' choices of translators. It is important to note that the Finnish system of grants (and prizes) given by state-controlled organizations and private foundations puts a number of translators, sometimes anonymously, in positions of trust, requiring that they make decisions affecting the financial situation of their colleagues. Not all translators actively participate in the community, but this doesn't make them immune to the effects of collegial judgement.

9. *The critics* tend to review translations as if they were originally written in the TL, i.e. they pay little notice to the fact of translation in what they write, with the exception of retranslations, translations by authors, and translations of poetry (the last two often coincide). Even retranslation as such is no guarantee of critical notice, as was seen e.g. with the relative silence over the new translation of Orwell's *1984* by Raija Mattila in 1999. Present-day critics no longer tend to focus on single translation errors, but neither do they often have much to say about the translation; they tend to review translated books as original works. Much of what Venuti says about translation criticism in America and its fluency demands applies to Finnish criticism as well (2002:4–5, 10); a translator who draws little attention to him/herself is approved of, but not found very interesting, so there is not much need to comment on the translator's way of doing the job. Another way of disregarding the work of translators is the recent tendency to pick out books that have aroused international interest before they have been translated into Finnish, review the originals and then ignore the translations when they are available to the Finnish reading public.

10. *The public* wishes to be able to read interesting works originally written in other languages, and takes the fact of translation for granted, again with perhaps the same three exceptions as above (see point 9.). In spite of not being interested in translation as such, readers do know what to expect: an accurate and reliable representation of the Source Text (ST). Sometimes readers suspect that ST elements have been quite left out of the Target Text (TT). This common
assumption I can bear witness to, having long been at the receiving end of readers' comments sent to a big publishing house. Readers are not powerless to sanction translation work: letters of complaint, if reasonable, are taken seriously. If not reasonable, they still focus attention on the work criticized.

Readers are of course the ultimate reason for the whole activity of publishing, whether commercial or idealistic.

These ten parties all have a possible role in forming translation norms. It should be remembered that the above mosaic is a generalized picture, and individual varieties of behaviour take place on all levels. Group behaviour is a factor of importance not only in the case of translators; editors, too, form a community of their own trying, developing sets of shared norms to ease their work. The groups also intermingle and exchange views on matters of common interest, and there are individuals like myself who belong to more than one group.

2.2. Hierarchy of norms

Forming a set of norms is a process of learning, of absorbing potentially useful material from all sources available. A translator is probably always on the lookout for influences possibly relevant to his/her work – the job at hand produces a dominance of interest, a filter helping to pick out ideas in the flood of information. New thoughts that may develop into norms or affect existing ones need not always come from professional sources. Indeed, norms can very well be described as an instance of memes in the sense borrowed by Chesterman (1997:6) from the sociobiologist Dawkins (1976:206), who mentions ”tunes, ideas, catch-phrases, clothes fashions, ways of making pots or building arches” as examples of memes (as quoted by Chesterman, ibid.).

I propose here the following sketch for a translator’s set of norms from the point of view of generality and compulsory vs. voluntary application.
1. Norms imposed upon the translator by employers and as part of possible translator training are cumulative, but stable and general.

2. Norms seen as relevant by the translator when aiming to keep norms of type (1) and to satisfy his/her own intelligence and professional ambition are cumulative but in constant change, and more specific than (1).

3. Norms relevant to a particular case but not to others, thus applying a limitation to norms of type (2), are actively developed and even more specific than (2).

4. Debatable norms which may be experimented on are an expression of change (cf. Toury 1995:54) and may be in contradiction to earlier norms, including those of type (1). Norms of this type could also be labelled strategies, but from the individual translator's point of view they may carry an element of obligation, even if this obligation is self-imposed by the translator and only applies to a single commission. If an experiment succeeds, such a norm may eventually establish itself more firmly and gain intersubjectivity.

I thus suggest a hierarchy of norms ranging from highly general and binding to highly specific and debatable. To start by looking at norms of the first kind, they are so binding that a translator breaks them at the risk of losing further commissions. In order to keep in work a translator must at least

- keep one’s deadline,
- not leave significant ST material unrepresented in the TT,
- be fairly accurate (cf. Toury’s ‘adequate translation’ and adhering to ‘source norms’ 1995:55–56) and
- be acceptable to the TC.

The imposed and binding norms I referred to in point 1. above are closely connected to the demands of accuracy and faithfulness stated in the publishing and translating contracts. They are of so general a nature that in practice, each translator must needs gather a whole toolbox of norms of the kind under point 2. above in order to fulfill their demands. I expect these “tool-norms” can vary very much from one person and commission to another, while the attempt to translate in a way that approximates both the matter and manner of the ST is a generally accepted norm. Examples of norm-type 3. will come up in connection with Carroll.
2.3. Introducing six norms of literary translation

The following list of six norms was presented in Martin (2001), and it represents the understanding and personal view of one translator. It is not, however, a private view, but an attempt at charting standards valid to the whole profession working in present-day Finland. The norms are presented in order of bindingness (see 2.2.) The first two, norms of understanding and "faithfulness" can be described as compulsory, and the norm of TL quality is almost as important. Rhythm is a rather intangible matter connected with the reading experience, not always consciously considered even by the translator, nor easily reachable by sanctions. The norm concerning text and illustration naturally doesn't apply to all texts. Finally, the norm of quotability is a special case and has, as far as I know, not been described before Martin (ib.).

2.3.1. The norm of understanding

One of the most fundamental facts about translation is that one cannot do it properly unless one understands what is to be said. While this may sound blatantly obvious, examples of words strung together without really thinking about the meaning are not hard to find in translated texts. The need for true understanding applies to translation as it does to all forms of writing that aim at producing meaningful texts: with original writing what is to be expressed comes from the author's mind, while the translator draws the thought from the ST (as understood by the translator), processes it in his/her own mind and expresses in in another language and in his/her own words. The form of understanding involved in translation is far from being neutral and unproblematic (see e.g. Venuti 1995:24), but I shall not go further into this question here. For everyday translation purposes, adequate translation requires that both the ST and the TT make sense to the translator, even though the meaning given to the TT may be one of a number of alternatives and imply the discarding of other possible interpretations.

Reading as an ordinary reader would is not enough for the translator. It is necessary to develop a professional way of reading in order to analyse the ST in as
much detail and depth as possible. Kapari-Jatta describes her two ways of reading, first with "ordinary eyes" and then her "translator's eyes" (2008:10–11). While it is not part of a translator's job to explain the work to outsiders, let alone be as vocal about it as a literature scholar or a critic might, understanding, and at the very least, not misunderstanding, is vital.

Understanding covers every level of language and information, and it also covers matters of style. Metaphors and symbols need to be recognized: metaphors taken literally usually reveal themselves as inadequate solutions in translation. A particular form of the norm of understanding is that a translator should strive to grasp what function an element has in the ST: having found it out, s/he is on surer ground in seeking the corresponding element for the TT, whether it be a twisted Shakespeare allusion or a clue to the murderer's identity. It seems worth paying relentless attention to passages which are initially puzzling, because it is often there that the traps are, and the keys as well.

When there is an expression unknown to the translator, an inexperienced translator tends to interpret it as the author's creativeness. This is seldom the case; it is more likely that the expression is preformed (Leppihalme 1997:35) though maybe rare – or, indeed, simply a weak spot in the translator's own command of the SL. Taken as unique, the SL expression often gets translated literally, resulting in a TL solution that is either clumsy or too original and innovative. (The line of thought in favour of this is discussed in 2.4.) Such a solution may also simply not fit the logic of the TT.

With Carroll, there are not a great many understanding problems, as the text was, after all, written to be understood by children. What with the 130 years that have passed since Carroll wrote, however, cultural differences and dialogue can pose problems. What, for instance, is the precise meaning of the exclamations "first boy" and "next boy" in the following:
They looked so exactly like a couple of great schoolboys, that Alice couldn't help pointing her finger at Tweedledum, and saying "First Boy!" — —
"Next Boy!" said Alice, passing on to Tweedledee. — — (TLG, Ch.4.)

One way of seeking the answer would be to find material describing authentic 1800s school dialogue and establish whether it was typical in the 1860s to address schoolboys like this. Looking at the expressions in 2008, they seem strange. Above all, a direct translation is in no way amusing, whereas the ST is obviously meant to be. For the time being, therefore, this remains a point where I have not been able to keep the norm of understanding to my satisfaction.

Consider another example, where Humpty Dumpty has just heard that Alice is seven and a half years old:

"Now, if you'd asked my advice, I'd have said 'Leave off at seven' — but it's too late now."
"— — one can't help growing older."
"One can't, perhaps", said Humpty Dumpty, "but two can. With proper assistance, you might have left off at seven." (TLG, p. 162.)

The grim implication of the nature of help needs to be consciously understood, as it cannot be translated directly into Finnish. Here is a translation turning the joke into a pun:

"— — olisin sanonut: 'Jätä seitsemään' — mutta nyt se on myöhäistä." 
"— — ei sille mitään mahda että ikää tulee, yksin tein."
"Ei kai, jos yksin teit", Nakkelis Kokkelis sanoi, "mutta kaksin tekemällä se onnistuu. Jos olisit saanut sopivasti apua, olisit voinut jättää seitsemään."
(APT, p. .)

Here Alice uses the idiomatic phrase yksin tein 'simply, without delay', but Humpty Dumpty takes yksin for 'alone' and tein, a form of the noun tie, as the 1st
p. sg. past tense of the verb *tehdä*, resulting in 'I did it alone', and uses it for his own purposes.

2.3.2. The norm of accuracy, reliability, loyalty: a question of equivalence

The relation of ST and TT is a matter of continuing interest and mystification. It involves the translator's "black box", which nobody has yet been able to open. We can choose to call this relation between the two texts by many names, depending on the angle we take (consider the aspektual differences between *faithfulness*, *fidelity*, *accuracy*, *equivalence*, *loyalty* and *reliability*, all of which have been used when discussing the relation), without knowing precisely what we are talking about. What we do know, however, is that the question of translation equivalence, theoretically a most problematic concept (see Halverson 1997), is yet very much a part of everyday translation work. It may be just here that theory and practice meet – or clash uncomfortably. While it is useful for a translator to question the concepts of faithfulness and loyalty (to what, to whom), to deny their importance and implications means giving up the benefits of discipline. A state of impulsiveness and ad hoc decisions hardly seems professional, though one can imagine it leading to the occasional brilliant TL rendering. Usually, however, it is accuracy in representing the ST that publishers demand, and it is what the public expects – and believes it is getting – when reading published translations. As a practicing translator, then, this is a principle I adhere to, as regards both the semantic content of the text and its form and style. This involves such issues as looking for expressions of the same register and frequency, and avoiding anachronisms and idiosyncracies.

I do not wish to credit the high status of this norm to outside influences alone. On the contrary, it seems entirely natural to members of the translators' community to aim at an accurate representation of the ST in the way described above. That a translation never reaches entire correspondence with the original is a fact that does not invalidate this aim.

Riitta Oittinen's in many ways delightful book *Kääntäjän karnevaali* (1995) questions the status of the ST and any idea of sameness between ST and TT. While
she makes many interesting points (e.g. how the influence of previous texts on the ST complicates the question of what exactly counts as the translator's ST, 1995:88–90), her basic view of translation seems at a distance from the practice of the mainstream translating community. That liberties can and must be taken is obvious; that liberty is all there is is harder to accept. What makes translating so exciting to me is the challenge of freedom within strict limits, of making a camel go through the needle's eye and come out alive and kicking.

What can be seen as the many limitations a translator has to work with are another facet of the various loyalties involved: loyalty to the ST author, to the ST itself, to the SC, to the receiving community and the TC, to the quality of the TL, to the translator's self. All of these are important, and I would not say that being more loyal to, say, readers means there is a need to be less so to the author. There is no less: there is only more. Keeping all the strands together to produce a satisfying piece of work is the translator's right and duty. It does mean that translation is a demanding job, perhaps more so than in earlier times, but remembering the various loyalties can be seen as a help, rather than an encumbrance.

While it is a commonplace that there is no such thing as the one and only correct translation, it remains true that not all possible ways of expressing the same thing are equally apt in a given context. Limitations posed by somewhat conflicting loyalties help to eliminate alternatives and save the translator much floundering in the sea of language. Levý puts it nicely: "The choice is more limited ('easier'), if the number of possible alternatives is smaller, or if it is restricted by context." (1967:1172.) With Lewis Carroll, for instance, I have found it useful to consider the context provided by what we know of his life and opinions, of Victorian times, attitudes to children, etc.

In my Carroll translations as in the bulk of mainstream translation in present-day Finland, the norm of accuracy or even equivalence (illusory though it may be), can be said to be the cornerstone, in that it touches every aspect of every job and applies to every type of translation, as well as enjoying a wide consensus concerning its importance.
2.3.3. The norm of TL quality

Loyalty to the TL, in this case, Finnish, I see as the need for a translator to be as good a writer as possible, able to use the language's resources and avoid poor Finnish, which among other things involves keeping SL interference to a minimum and steering clear of translationese. The influence on Finnish of Indo-European languages is so overwhelming that the struggle may seem futile and idealistic, but the readership of translated literature is large enough for the quality of its language to carry some weight. Particularly when translating for children, there may be a sense of social responsibility for TL purity at play. Venuti, in criticizing the domesticating tendency and demand for fluency current in translation into English in the USA and UK, writes from the opposite end of the continuum, from the dominant culture and language. Indeed, Finnish translators might do well to make use of a little imperialistic domestication when translating English-language texts. (See Venuti (1995) 2002:15.)

The Finnish tradition known as *kielenhuolto*, language care or maintenance, rests on the notion that language should be consciously looked after and developed, particularly by those using it publicly and professionally. The whole idea is anathema to many, as it can be seen as an attempt to fetter the natural life and free development that language should have and to bring in a whiff of the schoolroom. While I agree that language resembles a forest more than a topiary garden, conscious maintenance has its uses. It trains the eye to spot not only grammatical error but also ambiguity and obscurity, problems a translator should watch out for. Though stylistic matters in a literary sense do not come under the auspices of this discipline, on the whole it provides a Finnish translator with many excellent tools. It can be complemented by watching out for language usage, practicing a sort of commonsense contrastive analysis, which means being continually on the alert for differences and similarities in one's working languages.

Obviously, a translation must use natural and correct TL grammar, not SL structures disguised in TL words; this is the current mainstream norm. (For disagreement, mainly concerning poetry, see Lehto (2005:201).) There are also examples of choosing less than idiomatic variants of expression in this study, see
e.g. comment (33). I shall not go into the subject of minimal, compulsory changes, those necessary when two languages differ grammatically so much that it is impossible to find a corresponding structure, and the choice of a different grammatical structure is a compulsory one. Learning to deal with such problems is an important part of a translator's apprenticeship but not the subject here. In the following examples from Alice's Adventures in Wonderland (AIW) and Alicen seikkailut ihmemaassa (ASI), the ST could be translated literally without being downright ungrammatical, but the structural changes chosen (out of several possibilities) seem to render the TT more natural. Consider the alternative weak or unacceptable translations (*) as well.

English adverbs do not always coincide with Finnish ones:

Really you are very dull! (AIW Ch. IX)
Sinähän tyhmä olet! (ASI 99)
*Olet todella tyhmä!/Todella, olet hyvin tyhmä!

"No wise fish would go anywhere without a porpoise."
"Wouldn't it, really?" Alice said in a tone of great surprise. (AIW Ch. X)
"Kukaan järkevä kala ei mene minnekään ilman seitää."
"Ei vai?" Alice sanoi ällikällä lyötynä. (ASI 108)
*Eikö tosiaan(kaan)/todellakaan?/Eikö se menisi, todellakaan?

Here there is no attempt to find an adverb equivalent for really, but an idiomatic solution is sought instead.

In books for small children, readability and natural dialogue are of supreme importance, and achieving this does not necessarily imply loss of meaning. In Carroll, I have tried to retain the long sentences and what may seem like old-fashioned syntax of the narration (see 2.3.4. below), but keep a balance by giving the dialogue many features of spoken language, e.g. "Et sanonut mitään sinne pääinkään" or "sitä nyt vain vanhenee" or "Tai niin no", (see Part II). None of these are new expressions, rather, they represent long-standing Helsinki vernacular.
Choices in favour of idiomacy like those described above seldom get noticed, but when consistently made and added up, they have a huge effect on the style. They often concern quite simple and recurring phenomena, so the solutions may become automatic. Finding good answers to recurring problems is of course easily worth the trouble.

2.3.4. The norm of rhythm

Rhythm is a factor some translators consider the most important of all. It is pervasive, appearing at every rank of language, from within the word to the scope of the paragraph and even further. What is not so clear is whether the important thing is to preserve the ST rhythms or produce effective TT ones; indeed, the whole concept sometimes seems to be regarded as a mystical truth only understood by the chosen. Below, I shall focus on the sentence as a rhythm unit, but hope in the translation commentary to show rhythm operating on other levels as well. For good or ill, I have as a translator almost exclusively kept to the sentence length of the original. Since varying sentence length is a major stylistic feature, this has seemed a way of preserving a significant part of the original rhythm. Consider the following example from Carroll.

She had just succeeded in curving [her neck] down into a graceful zigzag, and was going to dive in among the leaves, which she found to be nothing but the tops of the trees under which she had been wandering, when a sharp hiss made her draw back in a hurry: a large pigeon had flown into her face, and was beating her violently with its wings. (AIW Ch. V)

Hän oli juuri taivutellut sen ylhäältä alaspäin siroon siksak-kuvioon ja aikoi sukeltaa lehtimereen, eli kuten hän nyt tajusi, niiden puiden latvuksiin, joiden alla hän oli vähän aikaisemmin harhaillut, kun ilkeä sihahdus sai hänet nykäisemään päänsä takaisin: hänen silmilleen oli lehahtanut iso kyyhkynen, joka pieksi häntä siivillään minkä jaksoi. (ASI 54)

Considering the content of the sentence, its form can be seen as iconic: the syntax mirrors Alice's long zigzagging neck – one would not want to cut it. Although the
result is lengthy for Finnish, it seems to work smoothly: the trouble it took the translator is not visible. The aim here and elsewhere was to preserve Carroll's rhythm without burdening the reader; that is, by achieving a rhythm natural to the TL. The translation was not specifically aimed at small children, so long sentences with a certain amount of complex syntax (in the manner of Carroll himself, of course) were not out of the question. Changing the length of paragraphs never crossed my mind as a possibility, but see Oittinen (1997:112–115) for a discussion of this as a rhythm factor in Finnish Carroll translations.

The choice of words according to their length and syllabic structure is an important rhythmical factor, so is word order. One way of wrecking the rhythm of a translation is to be over-faithful and translate every single pronoun and detail of grammar to be found in the English. See e.g. commentary, (24).

2.3.5. The norm of quotability

The problem of translating allusions and quotations is one that an editor encounters more often than the individual translator does. When translating Alice in Wonderland, a much-quoted classic, I bore this seemingly marginal question in mind. There is a generally accepted practice that if a quoted text already exists in Finnish translation, this translation should be used, or at least sought out and considered. Unfortunately the procedure does not always work. The problem is as follows: Translating A, you discover in it a quotation from (or allusion to) B. You identify it, find B is available in Finnish, then find the relevant passage will not fit in the context of A in Finnish, for various reasons: the translation may either be too free, or it may miss the point it was chosen for in A, or it may be clumsy and not bear singling out. The Carroll translations by Swan (Carroll 1984b) and Kunnas and Manner (Carroll 1974b) are both problematic in this respect, Swan with her omissions, Kunnas with her carnivalistic freedom (see Oittinen 1997:126–127, 129). I therefore felt I could do a small service to Finnish translators and editors by including quotability as an aim when translating Carroll. By quotability I mean that any ST passage can be found to be represented by a TT passage resembling it in as many ways as possible, so that the translated passage can be used in the same function as the original.
It is often Carroll's puns and parodies that bring about the quoting problems. Since they cannot be translated literally, they make for a freer type of translation than ordinary texts. My translation aims to translate pun for pun, keeping each one in its original position and on a topic as closely related to the original as possible. Look at the following examples, on the subject of school:

"– – the different branches of Arithmetic – Ambition, Distraction, Uglification and Derision."

"I never heard of 'Uglification', Alice ventured to say. "What is it?"
– – "Never heard of uglifying! – – You know what to beautify is, I suppose?"

"Yes, – – it means – to – make – anything – prettier." (AIW Ch IX)

"– – sitten kaikki mahalaskutavat: ei-yhtäänlasku, ähellyslasku, velkomataulu ja pakkolasku. Jotkut etevämmät pääsivät jopa hyytelön rumentamiseen asti."

"Hyytelön rumentamisesta en ole kuullutkaan", Alice erehtyi sanomaan."Mitä se on?"
– – "Mitä! Et ole kuullut hyytelön rumentamisesta! - - Tiedät kai sentään mitä sieventäminen on?"

"Tiedän, – – se tarkoittaa, että... tehdään jotain kauniimmaksi." (ASI 100–101, emphasis added)

One form of mathematics (yhtälön sieventäminen) had to be added in order to translate the joke on uglifying, and to fit it into the dialogue required a whole new sentence. Though additions are not desirable, they are more quotable than omissions, for obvious reasons. But full quotability is hard to reach; consider a case of somebody mentioning uglification on its own. For an English-speaking person, it is obvious what is being referred to, but try to use ASI for a Finnish version, and you get either rumentaminen, which is perfectly ordinary Finnish and doesn't stand out as an allusion, or hyytelön rumentaminen, which very probably would stand out far too much, as the idea of 'jelly' certainly won't fit all contexts.
To return to the full passage, let us look at the Kunnas and Manner version of the same text for comparison:

– – laskua päässä kun vesi oli jäässä, mutta muulloin laskimme helmillä.
– Mistä te helmiä saitte?
– Helmisimpukoista tietysti. Etkö sinä tiedä, että kaikki meren laulut muuttuvat simpukoissa helmiksi? (Carroll 1974b:100)

The distance between the ST and this passage with its final excursion into romance (‘Don't you know that all the songs of the sea are turned into pearls – – ’) is such that a translator in need of a preformed quotation might well be in trouble. Indeed, Carroll is typically translated by famous authors, who are seen as entitled to more liberty than translators. This is also evident in the canonized Hungarian version of AIW by Kosztolányi (1974a).

I have actually only once encountered a person in any way expressing recognition of the norm of quotability. The eminent Finnish translator Seppo Loponen turned out to have thought about the matter, saying that if a sentence had the signs of ‘a bewinged expression’, then he would try to translate it as such, so that the result would be a recognizable “package” in the translation. (Loponen, personal communication.) He was referring to isolated passages or phrases, not taking the idea to apply to anything like an entire book, and indeed, trying to apply the norm of quotability in all translation would certainly be taking it too far and causing many unnecessary problems.

2.3.6. The norm of harmony between translation and illustration

Riitta Oittinen has written much on the effect of illustration on translation (1995:92-137). Illustration is the part of the original that cannot be changed in translation, so it is the text that must accommodate. In children's books with pictures, it is of course important to keep the text and illustrations in harmony, as child readers are critical and easily note discrepancies.
My Carroll translation of 1995, ASI, probably reflects some aspects of Justin Todd's (Carroll 1984a) colour illustrations, which were originally to accompany the translation. His image of Alice herself, based on Charles Dodgson's photographs of Alice Liddell, certainly supported my conception of the protagonist as an intelligent child.

After Todd was rejected by the Finnish publisher WSOY, there were plans to publish the translation unillustrated. These did not last long enough for me to realize the freedom it might have given. For instance, in the Hungarian translation by Kosztolányi, which obviously pre-existed Tamás Szecskő's illustrations, the Cheshire Cat is a dog, *Fakutya*, literally 'wood/tree dog' – a solution impossible to anyone working with Tenniel in mind (see Carroll 1974a:47,51). (The explanation lies in the idiom *vigyorog mint a fakutya*, 'grin like a bootjack', the word for bootjack being literally 'wooden dog'.)

In the end, it was the familiar Tenniel illustrations that were used with my translation and with which I had to harmonize my text. As they don't cover every detail of the book and Dodgson himself took great pains to harmonize the illustrations with his text, this was not as great a problem as it might have been. It did, however, mean retaining certain features, of the poems in particular, that might otherwise have been changed. "Father William" has no less than four Tenniel illustrations, covering many details of the poem. For the first verse of "'Tis the Voice of the Lobster" there's a lobster illustration; the second verse continues on the same theme of eating your companion, but changes the characters to an owl and a panther. These are not illustrated. My translation takes advantage of this, and the second verse is about the same characters as the first, the lobster and the shark, as the first (see ASI 108-110). Having no sign of either owl or panther is admittedly against the norm of quotability (2.3.5.).

2.4. Norms and change

As an instance of change in translation norms, let me bring up the case of Pentti Saarikoski (1937–1983) and quote Arto Schroderus’ essay on his own retranslation
of J. D. Salinger’s *The Catcher in the Rye*, the first and famous translation of which was Saarikoski’s work (1961). "Saarikoski’s *Sieppari* is full of evidence proving that as a translator, he didn’t understand what he read particularly well. He was also careless, and what he failed to understand, he would either replace by making something up or leave out altogether. In short, he did all that a present-day professional is forbidden to do. The scale of errors ranges from little misunderstandings to brick-dropping. – A translator adhering to the methods used by Saarikoski in *Sieppari* would currently be out of work in no time.” (WSOY 2005:87, tr. A. M.) Schroderus also modestly reminds the reader that Saarikoski’s translation was and is much-loved and has affected Finnish culture far more than his own version is likely to. This is probably true, but Schroderus forgets that Saarikoski had the privilege of introducing the *book*, not only his translation. As a case of translators’ visibility, might Schroderus not then be considered the winner: his *Sieppari ruispellossa* in 2004 was regarded solely as a translation event, while Saarikoski had to share the attention he got with Salinger.

Without actually mentioning norms, what Schroderus is actually writing about is current norms in translation as compared to those in effect in Saarikoski’s day, and the change that has taken place.

Saarikoski was perhaps allowed a freer rein than other translators even of his own time. What is expected of a famous author as translator is likely to differ from what a so-called mere professional translator is supposed to do. Author-translation is perhaps seen as a nature force akin to the production of original literature. This idea embodies a division of translators into artists and artisans. It would be interesting to know whether the impression that at least prose translation has been mostly taken over by professionals over the last decades is correct: consider the authors Markku Lahtela and Eeva-Liisa Manner as well as Saarikoski, prolific also as translators; they don’t seem to have counterparts in present-day Finland. However, the question can only be settled by quantitative survey and this not the aim here. If I am right in seeing such a tendency, it is connected with the whole idea of translation becoming more professional, its practitioners specially trained and with perhaps a clearer sense of professional identity.
Since this development of the last fifty years has been going on and moving in the same direction as regards norms – the demand of more solid SL understanding and greater accuracy (and leading to a certain amount of retranslation), where are we now? I have been feeling for some time that the development is coming to a head – that translators cannot become any better in the present sense, cannot go further in the direction of more precision. But no human activity can stop at its zenith forever.

There may be signs of a turning point being reached in the development of Finnish translation norms: it is not impossible that the consensus about solid professional work will begin to crumble and freer experiments will sprout up. Adoptions may reappear and become a common and acceptable form of translation again. The position of English as a lingua franca could make itself felt in the process, and a form of Finnish strongly tinted with English offered (as it already has, though it has been turned down) as a legitimate language of translation into Finnish. What in the present consensus is regarded as incompetence and lack of SL skill may then present itself as a new way of looking at language and the cultural interplay involved in translation. Signs of this tendency have been visible for quite some time. There are the thoughts expressed by Walter Benjamin (1991 [1923]); there is postcolonial non-imperialistic translation with the idea that texts translated from small languages into English, for example, ought not to be deprived of their inherent character and made to read as "normal" English. Leevi Lehto wrote in favour of "clumsy word-for-word translation" in the same vein in his afterword to his 1990s' translation of Ashbery's *Flow Chart* (Lehto s.a.:217) and his essay "Varjot korvissamme" (2005:201).

As an editor, I have confronted proposed translations seriously manifesting the idea that the SL should be visible in the translation, resulting in what according to traditional norms is very bad translation that among other faults looks as if the translator didn't recognize SL idioms but translated them word for word. The idea of change and possible disruption is probably never welcomed by those settled in the mainstream (Toury 1995:62). Gatekeepers will no doubt keep big publishers and thus the bulk of translated literature to current norms for a very long time hence, even if my prediction does prove to carry some conviction. From the point
of view of norms as an intellectual matter, however, new questions will always want to be asked. An art form which has reached a consensus such as Finnish literary translation has does leave something to be desired from the intellectual point of view: a very human need to discover something new. At best, the attempt to gain acceptance for new translation norms may lead to translation as an activity becoming more visible and bring about heightened interest among readers.

2.5. Six translators' views on good translation

In 2004, I sent a modest questionnaire to the Finnish literary translators' mailing list Konteksti, asking colleagues to express their views on what translations should be like. I wanted to get at their idea of norms, but did not use the actual word normi, as I felt it might be understood in an even more severely judgmental way than in English. I received a correspondingly modest seven answers, one of which I discarded as being both enormously long and written by a person whose professional status was uncertain at the time. The six others who answered my questions were all well-established professional translators of English to Finnish. For one or two, translation was a part-time job, the rest worked full time.

In my questions, I focussed on the communal, intersubjective aspect of norms, hoping to gather proof of what I believed was the consensus the profession lives by. The questions were as follows:

What do you see as principles of translation work generally accepted among members of the translation profession? Do literary translators (into Finnish) share ideals of translation? What is a good translation like?

1 Both the questions and answers were in Finnish and are given here in my translation. The original questions were as follows: Mitkä Sinun nähdäksesi ovat käännöstyön periaatteita, jotka ovat ammattikunnassa yleisesti hyväksyttyjä? Onko suomentajilla yhteisä ihanteita, joihin pyritään? Millainen on hyvä suomennos?
As the questions were of a general nature, it is no surprise that there was no dramatic disagreement between the answers. The norm of accuracy was *de facto* mentioned by all under various expressions. The words "uskollisuus" (faithfulness) and "tarkkuus" (accuracy) as well as even "täsmällisyys" (precision) and "vastaavuus" (equivalence) were used. Pleasure in reading was mentioned as an aim, with the modification that it was an appropriate aim only if the ST was also a pleasure to read. Describing the aim of making the TT a work of art produced varying expressions but was seen as important. The relationship between ST and TT was constantly present in the answers. Producing good Finnish (norm of TL quality) was mentioned several times. One person said translating for children ought to be done specially well, pointing out that children could be baffled and intimidated by difficulties in the text. Quotability and the norm of harmony between TT and illustration didn't come up.

I shall proceed to report the answers of my respondents, calling them A, B, C, D, E, and F. Though the answers differed from each other greatly in form and length and detail, it was easy to see that the first four norms of my norm list (2.3.1.–2.3.4.) were referred to over and over again. The following is a brief drawing-up of the remarks made. I have picked out what can be understood as norm-statements and found they show general agreement amongst professionals at least on this level of generality. I shall finally consider whether the replies contained points that need to be added to the list.

1. **Understanding.** Respondent A pointed out that the translator must understand the ST through and through, even though conveying all the details in the TT may be impossible. B’s point of view is problem-solving: details not fully understood must be ferreted out by using all necessary sources of information (Konteksti mailing list, Internet, telephone, experts, books, newspapers, universities etc.). B added that sensitivity in grasping the idea of the ST and conveying it in the TT makes for a good translation. C mentioned the perpetual fear of not understanding ST nuances well enough.

2. **Accuracy, fidelity, equivalence.** This aspect was mentioned in every one of the answers. A said the TT must convey the style and meaning [Finnish: *pitää vastata*]
of the ST. Names, years and other facts must be checked, taking care not to correct mistakes made on purpose by the author. B made the interesting point that every thought verbally expressed in the ST should be translated (emphasis added; what about reading between lines?). The style of the ST must be visible in the TT, B also said. For C, the ideal is to strive towards equivalence with the ST as far as it is humanly possible. D's translator tries to convey the content and atmosphere of the ST to the readers as faithfully as possible [and] – – to translate the work as the author would have written it had s/he written it in Finnish to begin with. E underlined faithfulness to the SL: it is necessary to understand the words of the ST, take in its style, feel its atmosphere, grasp the author's intentions. The translation should be exact but not too precise, it should not translate word for word, but leave space for interpretation. The translator should not explain, add views of his own or iron things out. Small errors are excusable if the translator catches the author's style and purpose. F said simply that ST meanings are translated as accurately as possible, everything in the ST must be translated and facts must be checked. It was F who pointed out that equivalence does not always lead to fluency, stating that if the ST is idiomatic, the TT must also be.

3. TL quality. Language, the bricks and mortar of the house of translation, was also discussed by everybody. A and C said the TT must be good Finnish (if the ST is good SL, added A). B stressed the inherent nature of the TL, saying the translation must work in a way that respects this. C warned against allowing one's own linguistic mannerisms and preferences to show in the translation. Idiomacy of the TT was underlined by D, who said it shouldn't be possible to see "through" the TT what it says in the ST. According to D, the translator mustn't play unnecessary tricks but should nevertheless convey the possible originalities of the ST in a creative way. E mentioned faithfulness to the Finnish language and exhorted the use of good, nuanced language. [E also described a case of using correct TL where incorrect forms might have been appropriate, and debated whether "correct Finnish" should be regarded a general norm.] F mentioned that spelling and grammatical points must be checked, and maintained that it is vitally important to be idiomatic.
4. *Rhythm.* Not surprisingly, rhythm was mentioned by only three translators, and even then, their points of view differed. A's angle was that some (not all) translators of poetry try to capture the rhyme scheme and metrics of the ST. E took a more general view: The text must breathe. The last respondent wrote that part of the manner of the ST to be conveyed is the rhythm. If the TT, in addition to conveying the meaning of the ST, were also to sound like it, it would be rather a fine achievement. Differences between languages cannot be helped, but if one could retain some kind of basic rhythm, it would be likely to please the author. And the reader too. This was the view of respondent F.

As mentioned before, questions of illustration (cf. 2.3.6.) or of quoting specific passages (cf. 2.3.5.) did not come up in the answers. There was much description of the translation process and of points relating to translation commissions, so not all that was written actually related to norms. One new, extratextual norm can, however, be drawn from the answers; it seems worth mentioning, as it came up several times. Let us call it the norm of integrity, and add it as number 7. to the list of six norms we have already discussed.

7. *The norm of integrity.* To quote A: "I wish no one would undertake / have to undertake to translate a text that is against his or her moral, religious, philosophical or other such principles. -- A good translation gives the reader a feeling of trust, of the translator knowing his or her business." B wrote that one should know one's limits and not take a job that is too difficult or that one hasn't time to do properly, while C said: "One mustn't undertake to translate a book that goes badly against the grain [*joka on pahasti ristiriidassa omien sisukalujen kanssa*]: it can't succeed. And even if the SL is one you know, you mustn't get involved with a SC completely unknown to you."

In other words, a translator should, before taking a commission, make sure that s/he will be professionally, and also mentally and emotionally, up to the job. It is often said that you can tell whether the translator has enjoyed doing the translation, even loved it. Helen Cixous comments on translation as an act of love: "-- to read -- to translate -- well, we have to go to the country of the text and bring back the earth of which the language is made. -- If we work on a text we don't love, we are
automatically at the wrong distance" (1997:227). Riitta Jääskeläinen, in looking at
the translator's attitude to the task at hand, agrees that personal involvement seems
to have a positive effect on the result (1999:207, 237). When forced to work in
contradiction to one's own personality and principles, there can hardly be
enjoyment for the reader to share, whereas a state of harmony between a
competent translator and the ST leads to happier results. Commitment as an
important element of a commission is also discussed in Martin (2001).
3 THROUGH THE LOOKING-GLASS

It is time to move on to looking at Lewis Carroll, or the writings of the Revd. Charles Lutwidge Dodgson published under that name. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* was published in 1865 by Macmillan, London. It took Charles Dodgson six years to complete his second Alice story, *Through the Looking-Glass*, which finally came out as a Christmas book at Macmillan's in 1871. Dodgson was very particular over questions of illustration; one reason for the delay was that John Tenniel first refused to illustrate the second book. (See Cohen 1995:131–132.) TLG is based on a game of chess played all over Looking-glass land, with Alice taking part as one of the Queens. Carroll also takes the opportunity to play around with issues debated at the time of writing, such as the theories of language behind some of Humpty Dumpty's remarks.

3.1 *Through the Looking-Glass* in Finland

Though *Alice in Wonderland* has, thanks to its first translator, children's author Anni Swan, been known to Finnish readers since 1906 (Carroll 1984b), *Through the Looking-Glass* was not translated before 1974, when the joint effort of Eeva-Liisa Manner and Kirsi Kunnas was published. Manner (1921–1995) was a prominent Modernist poet and prolific translator, and Kunnas (b. 1924), while also an important poet and translator, is best known and loved for her children's poetry. They had previously published a translation of AIW in 1972. Both their Carroll translations were published as a single volume under the title *Liisan seikkailut ihmemaassa ja Liisan seikkailut peilimaailmassa* in the Gummerus series of classics, with an afterword by Paavo Lehtonen, himself a well-known translator (Carroll 1974b).

As is often the case with sequels, the later book has never been as widely read in Finland as the former, but the Kunnas and Manner translation of "Jabberwocky", particularly its first verse, could be regarded as a classic in its own right. English-writing authors have a well-known penchant to quoting from Carroll. Because of this tendency in STs, if for no other reason, Finnish translators from English are
familiar with the Finnish version, *Liisan seikkailut peilimaailmassa*, and it is considered correct to quote from this work rather than translate the relevant snippets oneself. The translation seems only to have been reprinted once, in 1996. Although the book as a book doesn't seem to have become well-known in Finland, TLG lives on in various forms here too. At the 2005 Avanto Festival in Helsinki, for example, there was an installation inspired by Carroll, where my translation of "Jabberwocky" could be heard via earphones as part of the installation. See comment (77) in 4.2.2. for a discussion on the name.

3.2. Carroll and the retranslation hypothesis

Kaisa Koskinen and Outi Paloposki have looked at the question of retranslation from several points of view. In particular, they have tested what is known as the retranslation hypothesis, according to which new translations tend to be closer to their STs than older versions; they have found that the "picture is more complex and varied than discussions on retranslation have accounted for" (2005:194). They mention several extratextual forces that support or hinder retranslation, such as publishing policy, commercial interests, and financial or legislative incentives (ib. p. 195). The translation history of AIW, which has been a small part of their material, certainly supports the view that the need for retranslation does not necessarily arise from textual motives only.

My translation of AIW (ASI, Carroll 1995) is the third of four complete translations of the book into Finnish so far. When accepting the commission I naturally gave thought to the relation of my prospective work to the two earlier versions, both by formidable predecessors. The reason I accepted the challenge can in retrospect be related to changes in norms. By the 1990s, it was possible to translate a children's classic such as AIW applying the norms that were generally valid in literary translation, rather than those specific to children's literature. Domesticating seemed mostly unnecessary, and so did the kind of textual changes that come about when aiming a translation at a child audience; I knew, then, from the start, that any version of Carroll produced by me would be fundamentally

---

2 The fourth is *Liisa Ihmemaassa* by Tuomas Nevanlinna (Carroll 2000).
different from the earlier ones, without seeking change for the sake of change alone.

It was left for me to decide which approach to take; all the publisher actually wanted was a new translation to publish with a set of new colour illustrations by Justin Todd (Carroll 1984a, 1986), alongside which, they decided, the seventy-year-old Swan translation (the rights of which WSOY was in possession of) would look old-fashioned and out of place (see Oittinen 1997:35). Had it been possible for WSOY to use the Gummerus-owned Kunnas and Manner translation for this purpose, it is unlikely a new translation would have been commissioned, but in the circumstances, what with rival publishers having their own territorial proprieties, they apparently felt I might be the answer.

Riitta Oittinen has amply compared the three versions throughout her book *Liisa, Liisa ja Alice* (1997), and I accept her general picture of Swan (Carroll 1984b) as domesticating and Kunnas and Manner (1974b) as free. Both are clearly aimed at a child audience, which has meant using domesticating strategies including omission of elements deemed too foreign or difficult. Oittinen gives each translation a label according to her view of its place in translation history, philosophical background, and inherent theory of translation: Swan is cannibalistic, Kunnas and Manner carnivalistic, and Martin post-modern (ib. pp. 126, 128–129, 132). I leave it to others to discuss these. But though Oittinen's views are often very much to the point, it is also true from my simple translator's point of view that I saw AIW matter-of-factly as one translation job among others, and subject to general translation norms. If ASI turned out to be a post-modern translation, this happened without the help of any consciously post-modern view or theory. As it relies on mainstream translation norms, there is nothing unusual or remarkable in not leaving out the passage describing Victorian bathing machines (Carroll 1995:22–23) or translating the blue caterpillar as blue (ib. p. 44), even though both the earlier Finnish versions did make the omission, and painted the blue caterpillar green. (See Oittinen 1996:57, 54.)

There seemed no reason to cut Finnish readers off from as much of Carroll’s wit as could possibly be translated into Finnish in a recognizably Carrollesque way. ASI
is indeed an openly admitted return to the ST, because it seemed to me this was a journey that had not yet been made in our TC. I would claim, however, that I would have translated it in exactly the same way had there been no previous translations (let us ignore the point that Finnish culture and its effects on present-day translators would not be precisely what it is had Swan and Kunnas and Manner not done their own part at the time). ASI is my translator's view of AIW, not an antithesis to its predecessors.

Paloposki and Koskinen point out that while there are examples to support the retranslation hypothesis in Finnish translation history, the story of AIW translation has been newly complicated by the fourth, once again more domesticating translation by Nevanlinna (Paloposki and Koskinen 2004:33). They discuss questions of whether datedness leads to retranslation, pointing out facts that do not fit this idea (ib. 34). Is it true that retranslation becomes necessary or at least possible when there has been a shift in translation norms since the appearance of a previous translation? This is hard to say, but such a shift did take place in Finland in the late 20th century: consider the growing demand for translation accuracy. The question of the retranslation hypothesis is, however, complicated by questions of translation ownership, rendering new translations necessary because older ones still within copyright are not available to other than their original publishers. New illustrations can also provide a motive for retranslation.

On the other hand, the Finnish children’s publisher Kustannus-Mäkelä published an edition of the Kunnas and Manner translation Liisan seikkailut ihmemaassa with Anthony Browne’s illustrations (Carroll 1989). While big general publishers must apparently each have their own translation of such a classic, it seems that a specializing publisher such as Kustannus-Mäkelä was able to make an arrangement to use a translation belonging to one of the large ones, Gummerus in this case.

Whether retranslation is ever actually necessary is a good question, and the answer is probably no. To the list of possible reasons for retranslation I might add yet one more, the fact that translators want to translate. While most retranslations are no doubt genuine commissions, there are cases of translators themselves persuading
publishers into showing cultural goodwill and ordering new renderings of old favourites. Getting such a job is considered extremely fortunate among the profession.
4 COMMENTARY ON TRANSLATING CARROLL

In this part of the study I propose to present comments on my translations of one and a half chapters of TLG: the whole of Chapter III, "Looking-Glass Insects", and the first half of Chapter VI, "Humpty Dumpty". (The translations are to be found in Part II.) Both chapters are of course included in the Kunnas and Manner translation (Carroll 1974b), thereby making my version a retranslation. When completed, the book *Alicen seikkailut peilintakamaassa* will also include the first Finnish translation of the passage known as "A Wasp in a Wig". This passage was discarded at Tenniel’s instigation (Cohen 1995:216) and lost until rediscovered in 1974 and published 1977 (see Carroll 1992:210 for the history). Cohen regards the passage as one of Carroll’s self-portraits, as one of his attempts to deal with his necessary parting of ways with Alice Liddell – an interpretation lending force and feeling to these pages. In this study only the title of the passage will be discussed (in 4.3.) as an example of self-revelation (see Fraser 1996:67).

Chapter III consists of a railway journey poking fun at geography textbook lingo and making lively dialogue, followed by Alice’s discussion with a pun-loving Gnat describing the ways of looking-glass insects, and ending with Alice passing through the wood where things have no names and meeting the Fawn. Chapter VI centres on the well-known nursery rhyme "Humpty Dumpty" coming to life and on Alice’s annoying and riddle-beriddled discussion with its protagonist. "Jabberwocky" and Humpty Dumpty’s elucidation of it are not included in this study, apart from the poem’s title.

The following chapters are part of my forthcoming translation, to be published by WSOY (© Alice Martin). The text presented here remains subject to change, and may not be quoted as the finished text. Although decisions still need to be made about the final details of the translation, the present version provides material for discussing norms and gives an opportunity for comments that may be useful in looking into the translation process.
Cohen points out that Carroll departed in many respects from the way of writing for children usual in the 1860s and '70s. One of his characteristics was not to explain what he meant or shun the use of words child readers might need to ask about (Cohen 1995:142–143). Consider the word *proboscis*, hardly part of every child’s vocabulary (TLG 129). This point I rush to enlist in support of my own strategy of not writing 'down'. For *proboscis*, there was no harder word to be found than *imukäärsa*, but note that *kärsa* might have been used, were it not for this point known about Carroll's writing. TLG is nevertheless a children’s book and should not be written ’up’ any more than down. Translations of Carroll’s jokes must not be too far-fetched or rely on inordinately rare vocabulary.

I shall take up certain general or recurrent points here, before going on to the actual translation commentary, which concentrates on smaller details.

4.1. Commentary on "Looking-glass insects"

4.1.1. Placing of the reporting clause

Carroll often interrupts a sentence of quoted speech by inserting the reporting clause in the middle. This is a common phenomenon in English: "The medial placing of the reporting clause is very frequent" (Quirk 1972:785). Consider the example

"What's the use of their having names," the Gnat said, "if they wo'n't answer to them?"

But in Finnish, this is not a common feature. Hakulinen gives three pages to the placing of the reporting clause, but there is only a single example and no separate description of *välijohtolause* (2004:1417), so presumably it is considered a minor phenomenon. It is a point of debate among translators whether all medially placed ST reporting clauses should in the TT be placed either at the beginning or the end of the sentence, so as not to break it off in the middle.
In Chapter III of TLG there are in my opinion nine speeches which, if straightforwardly translated, have the reporting clause in a place unnatural for Finnish. These clauses are all marked in the translation with (A). Of these nine, six break off at a subordinate clause, as in the above example. Looking at my own translation in retrospect I find that of the nine cases, four have been rendered with normal Finnish syntax, changing the place of the reporting clause, while five retain Carroll's sentence break. Consider the following five:

"Noin pienen lapsen", sanoi vastapäätä istuva herrasmies (hän oli pukeutunut valkoiseen papeeriin), "pitäisi tietää minnepän on menossa, vaikkei tiedäkään omaa nimeään!"

"Jaloissasi ryömii", surviainen sanoi (ja sai Alicen vetämään äkkiä jalat koukkuun) "jos vain katsot, voileipäkuoriainen.

"No jos hän sanoi ’neiti’ eikä muuta”, surviainen huomautti, ”sitten ei olisi muuta, ei tuntiakaan.

"Sinun ei pitäisi keksia vitsejä”, Alice sanoi, ”jos tulet niistä noin surulliseksi.”

"No ainakin on ihanaa, kun on ollut niin kuuma”, hän sanoi juuri kun astui puiden siimekseen, ”päästä tänne – tänne – tänne minne?” hän jatkoi.

Four of these five are examples of Carroll suspending information – note particularly the dramatic effect in the voileipäkuoriainen example – and have consequently been translated using Carroll's structure. The fourth example, about jokes, is more neutral and will be changed to normal Finnish syntax in the full text of the chapter.

There is a general point to be made here. Where an author frequently uses a linguistic feature that does not readily translate into the TL but seems too important to be disregarded throughout, it is a strategy worth considering to translate a substantial number of the instances in a non-salient way, and a limited
number so as to retain signs of the SL feature. In this way the TC reader gets a clear enough picture of the author's style without being encumbered and possibly annoyed by continually recurring features that seem out of place in the TL.

4.1.2. Multiple-compound insect names

Names of looking-glass insects (marked (B) in the translation) follow a pattern:

real insect's name: compound word Y + Z

looking-glass insect's name: a triple compound word X + Y + Z, in which X + Y form a compound word nothing to do with insects and bringing about the joke

e.g. horse-fly – rocking-horse-fly

What makes translating these jokes exceedingly difficult is Tenniel's contribution, as there is a detailed illustration of each of these imaginary creatures. As a votary of the norm of harmony between text and illustration (see 2.3.6. and Martin 2001, 2005) I cannot disregard these, at least not before going to considerable effort to keep the norm.

The Hungarian translation by Tamás Révbíró has only one illustration, the rocking-horse fly. Two of the three insects are rendered as triple-compounds of the kind described above, while the third, zsemlepke, is different. It is formed by an overlap of zsemle 'roll, sämpylä' and lepke 'butterfly. (Carroll 1980:30–32.) This seems to me an acceptable way of handling the problem, if using the same punning mechanism as Carroll himself doesn't work.

There is also a question relating to the frequency of words in the SL and TL. The search for insects with compound names ought to be limited to common ones, those that children could be expected to know, lest the joke might go unnoticed. Carroll himself starts with the very common insect names horse-fly, dragon-fly and butterfly, 'paarma, sudenkonto, perhonen'. Even the word hevoskärpän is
not right in this respect. Horsefly is *paarna*, a common summer nuisance, but *hevoskärpänen* is an insect limited to pestering horses, thus not of the same generality. Still, it can be regarded transparent enough to pass muster, considering that the translator – and the reader – is faced with Tenniel’s picture of an unmistakable rocking-horse with wings.

*Snap-dragon-fly* involves the old Christmas game of snapdragon (see Carroll 1985:223), and that explains the details of Tenniel's picture. My first attempt at translating it led to the immediately discarded version *leipäsudenkorento*. Carroll would, judging by all I have read about his attitudes, have found it unthinkable to use a word of as dubious morals as *leipäsusi*, 'common-law wife or husband; mistress'. Here we see in operation a norm that could be verbalized as ”don’t violate the author’s moral views”. It is an example of norm-type 3, norms relevant to a particular case but not necessarily all others (see hierarchy of norms 2.2.).

*Kananlentomuurahainen* (‘plan that fell flat’ + ‘winged ant’) is satisfactory as a joke in itself, but jars badly with the illustration and the references to Christmas. Either the insect name or how the picture is verbally interpreted by the Gnat will have to be changed in the final APT.

The third insect name, *Bread-and-butter-fly*, with the Gnat's explanation, is not a very good joke in English, and the Finnish is unsatisfactory. *Leipäkuoriainen*, transparent as the word is, is an insect not widely enough known. Incorporating *voileipä*, 'sandwich', covers this fault somewhat.

4.1.3. Comments on specific points 1–40

(1) *mehiläistä mailin päästä*: bees a mile off. Here *maili* is chosen rather than *kilometri* for the sake of alliteration and rhythm. In ASI (p. 53) the expression *kilometrikaupalla kaulaa* was used for the same reason. See Oittinen for a discussion on the existing translations' ways of treating measurements (1997:38–39).
(2) *pysäytti itsensä: checked herself.* The Finnish is not entirely idiomatic, but was chosen because it expresses Alice's conscious control over herself. *Pysähtyi 'stopped' would be a neutral alternative, *otti itseään niskasta kiinni* an even more salient one.

(3) *kun kysytään oliko mukava kävely: when they ask me how I liked my walk.* The translation aims at natural TL, not reproducing unnecessary personal pronouns, and uses the passive, where Carroll has Alice's mysterious adult group *they,* which if translated *he* makes unidiomatic Finnish, when the referents are unknown.

(4) *hihii: Ø.* The interjection is added because of the phrase *what fun: and what fun it'll be when they ask...* Translating *entäs miten hauskaa on sitten kun kysytään...* would have made the sentence too full.

(5) *heilautti päätään tutulla tavalla: here came the favourite little toss of the head.* Good TL requires a verbal rather than a nominal construction.

(6) *juoksi mäkeä alas kuutta pikku puroa kohti ja hyppäsi ensimmäisen yli: ran down the hill, and jumped over the first of the six little brooks.* To avoid the stiff, translation-smacking construction *hyppäsi kuudesta pikku purosta ensimmäisen yli,* or even worse, *hyppäsi ensimmäisen kuudesta pikku purosta yli,* the picture is slightly altered to show the Finnish reader first the six brooks and then the jump.

(7) *Näytähän lapsi lippusi! – – Älä lapsi viivytä häntä! – Show your ticket, child! – Don't keep him waiting, child!* Addressing a person by name or nominal expression is far less common in Finnish than English. Placing the address form thus makes it more natural than having it at the end.

(8) *tuhat puntaa: a thousand pounds.* The rhythmical chanting repeated four times works better with *puntaa* than it would with *markkaa,* though *markka* was used in ASI (p. 26). The assonance with the *u* sound recurs with the words *tuuma, tupru,* and finally with Alice's thought, *tuhat puntaa unta.*
(9) ei ollut lipunmyyntiä: there wasn't a ticket-office. While lipunmyynti as a place seems rather a modern concept, it is used because of its neutrality and familiarity and in the belief that it will not stand out as much as a period word might.

(10) hirveä ääni: a hoarse voice. As the little voice suggests, Alice could make a joke about hirvi and hirveä. The problem is that hirveä 'terrible' conveys the wrong meaning: there is nothing frightening about the character. A construction based on kakoa, 'cough', and kako 'nutcase' is not adequate as kako is a slang word and would hardly fit the dialogue. A good solution remains yet to be found. Tenniel fortunately didn't produce a horse illustration.

(11) Lapsia – varovasti: Lass, with care. Here Finnish offers a pun almost more readily than English.

(12) hänellä on jo valmiiksi kuningattaren pää: she's got a head on her. This reference to stamps with the head of Queen Victoria conveys one of Carroll's morbid jokes on mortality but also hints at Alice's intelligence and her future as a Queen. The translation chooses to underline the last of these meanings. If the reader gets a glint of the guillotine, it is hardly off the point.

(13) Älä viitsi kiusata: Don't tease so. Viitsiä is one of the uniquely Finnish elements mentioned by Tirkkonen-Condit (2005:123–124). Translators have long been aware of such elements and favoured them when possible to keep them "alive"; the verb fits the purpose here very naturally.

(14) Alice olisi sanonut sille jotain myötätuntoista ja lohduttavaa, "jos se vain huokaisi niin kuin muut ihmiset!": Alice would have said something pitying to comfort her, "if it only would sigh like other people!" Carroll occasionally uses sentences that change midway from reported thought to quoted thought. They have been translated in the same manner, as they seem one of the elements of Carroll's personal style.
(15) *Eikä aikaakaan kun: in another moment.* The Finnish is a phrase occurring in folk tales and older children's literature. It was also used in ASI (pp. 15, 34 for example) and is here used as one of the linking elements between the two books.

(16) *Siellä mistä minä tulen ne eivät puhu mitään: None of them ever talk, where I come from.* What is denied differs slightly from ST to idiomatic TT, but this seems to change the meaning very little. Italics being one of Carroll's style markers they are used in the translation more than is typical in original Finnish texts.

(17) *mitä iloa: what use.* The idiomatic Finnish phrase is chosen in preference to the ever-present expression *mitä hyötyä.*

(18) *anna kuulua niitä hyönteisiä: go on with your list of insects.* As Alice hasn't yet started her list, a literal translation such as *jatka hyönteislueteloasi* would seem odd and would hardly carry any necessary addition of meaning.

(19) *Se täyttää mahansa puruilla ja mahlalla: Sap and sawdust.* A literal translation *(mahlalla ja sahanpurulla)* seemed feeble in comparison to the ST, so the proximity of the words *sahanpuru* and *mahanpurut* 'tummy-ache' was used as well as the resemblance of *maha* and *mahla* 'sap'.

(20) *Entä jos sitä ei löytyisikään?: Supposing it couldn't find any?* It is more idiomatic to use the Finnish verb *löytyä* with *tea* etc. as subject than to translate "*entä jos se ei löytäisikään sitä/niitä*", which would also have required two demonstrative pronouns to appear in the same sentence, since *any* has no Finnish equivalent that works here.

(21) *vähän aikaa: for a minute or two.* English seems to express imprecise times more precisely than Finnish, so minutes are not mentioned.

(22) *Et kai haluaisi hukata nimeäsi: I suppose you don't want to lose your name?* The verb *lose* is a common translation problem, as the semantic fields of the English and Finnish verbs involved do not coincide. Carroll may mean Alice to understand 'lose your reputation'; if so, the TL verb would be *menettää* and the
structure to use would be "menettää hyvän nimensä". As the story goes on, however, it is really a question of losing or mislaying one's name, for which the natural verb is *hukata*. *Kadottaa* is also possible but a touch too literary for the overall style chosen.

(23) *kotiopettajatar; palveluskunta: governess; servants.* Details of the kind of life a Victorian girl of Alice Liddell's class would have led, as referred to by Carroll, are translated without any attempt at domestication. This is in accordance with the overall norm of accuracy and is almost taken as a matter of course.

(24) *Ei silti, en tiedä...: And yet I don't know...* The paragraph provides an opportunity to illustrate the effect of mechanical, over-faithful translation. Consider the following:

"*Ei silti, en tiedä*, surviainen jatko huolettomalla äänellä: "ajattele vain kuinka kätevää olisi, jos onnistuisit menemään kotiin ilman sitä! Esimerkiksi jos kotiopettajatar haluaisi kutsua sinua tunneille, hän huutaisi 'Tule tänne – – ', ja siihen hänen täytyisi lopettaa, koska ei olisi mitään nimeä jonka hän voisi huutaa, ja tietenkään sinun ei tarvitsisi mennä, tiedäthän."

I find this speech too full of words to be pleasing, so have dropped some references to person and taken a few short cuts, also using the common idiomatic Finnish verb *päästä* to cover "manage to go".

(25) *oli tainnut huokaista itsensä hengiltä: really seemed to have sighed itself away.* The SL seems reminiscent of sorrowing lovers, and the word *really* seems to say, "they're always sighing themselves away, but this Gnat really did it and disappeared altogether". As there is no such Finnish verbal tradition to fall back on, the passage has been translated 'sighed itself to death'. The verb *taitaa* is a frequent one in spoken Finnish, non-literary but in my opinion well suited to the style here; it makes it unnecessary to use an explanatory adverb such as *ilmeisesti*. 
(26) edessä aukeni niitty: she very soon came to an open field. Cf. *hän tuli pian
avoimen niityn luo. In Finnish, the landscape traditionally comes to meet the
wanderer.

(27) kun astun puitten alle: when I go in. The translation "kun menen sisäään" is
impossible, "kun menen sinne" weak, so Alice 'steps under the trees' in the TT.

(28) totelee nimeä Viima: answers to the name of "Dash". The TT verb structure
is the idiomatic equivalent of the ST one, but somewhat outdated. It also presents a
problem later, when Alice thinks of finding her own name; in English, the verb to
answer is used in its basic meaning there, while the verb totella cannot do a like
semantic shift. Though the translation is not entirely satisfactory as to this point,
the problem does not seem too serious.

The dog's name Dash, at least to the modern reader, plays mildly with the idea of a
dash in place of a lost name; Viiva doesn't work as a dog name, so Viima is chosen.
It seems possible that this may remain a joke to be enjoyed by the translator alone.

(29) päästä tänne – tänne – tänne minne? get into the – into the – into what? Alice
asks herself two very rhythmical (dactylic) questions, so the Finnish attempts at
something similar. The problem lies with grammatical differences, as the TT
structure employs the illative and genitive cases and points at the missing words
"metsäään; puun alle", where the ST structure in both cases is preposition + X.

(30) Ihan varmasti se alkaa L:llä!: L, I know it begins with L! What Alice thinks
she means was left as a mystery by Carroll, but see Martin Gardner's three
explanations (Carroll 1985:226). A translator must be wary of such details, as
something vaguely pointed at in the ST may not work at all if simply repeated as
such in the TT. Because my translation uses Alice's original first name, repetition
seems the sensible thing to do here, however. The earlier translation, where the
name is Liisa, says "I, minä tiedän, että se alkaa I:llä!" (Carroll 1974b:171) taking
the cue from the second letter of the name, as L would be the right letter and thus
wouldn't get the point.
(31) Silloin vastaan tuli pieni kauris: Just then a Fawn came wandering by. Such simple sentences can be far from easy to get right. For the time being, I have chosen the typical folk-tale phrasing vastaan tuli + subject. It gets the direction wrong, as the paths of the Fawn and Alice meet and join to go in the same direction, out of the wood. The idiomaticity of the phrase makes it unlikely that the literal meaning should surface much.

The proper noun for the Fawn is not easy to decide, as the taxonomy of kauris, peura, hirvi and poro is rather vague to many Finns, nor are they familiar with the kind of deer so well-known in England. The word that would come most naturally when speaking to Finnish children might even be bambi. This being inappropriate, kauris, pieni kauris and kauriinvasa are all used.

(32) Tule, tule!: Here now! Here now! Exclamations are notoriously difficult to translate. Tuku tuku (the polite way of addressing a sheep or lamb) could also be considered as an alternative. The possibility comes to mind that Alice may be using an English phrase usually spoken to dogs, which would be inappropriate and funny; this possibility should be either eliminated or established.

(33) Miksi sinä sanot itseäsi?: What do you call yourself? The English idiom is used several times by Carroll, and here it seems literal translation is necessary, as it draws attention to Alice's ability to identify herself verbally. Just above, the same phrase was used of a tree and translated there Miksikä sitä sanotaan?, using a more natural TL phrasing.

(34) kulki kädet rakkaasti kauriin kaulan ympärillä: with her arms clasped lovingly round the soft neck of the Fawn. Clasp is a verb often difficult to translate into Finnish, as nearly all equivalent expressions require the particle kiinni as well as a verb. Tenniel's illustration of just this moment is not to be ignored, and the Finnish expresses the picture very simply. It avoids using rakastavasti, preferring the more poetic and archaic rakkaasti. It also could not accommodate the idea of softness without going over the top with sweetness: particularly the adjective pehmoinen, common enough in the language of children, would have ruined what is an unusually touching moment with Carroll.
(35) Sen suloisin ruskeisin silmiin väähtyssä säikähdyssä, ja samassa se oli jo pinkaisiut tiehensä täyttää laukkaa: A sudden look of alarm came into its beautiful brown eyes, and in another moment it had darted away at full speed. The TT aims at expressing suddenness by means of rhythm: väähtyssä säikähdyssä incorporates the meaning of seven ST words. The adverb jo has been added, as it is extremely common in Finnish and often gives a passage the rhythmical balance it needs. (Conversely, it is likely that Finnish texts incompetently translated into English contain far too many instances of already to seem natural.)

(36) tienviitoista: finger-posts. There is no Finnish equivalent giving the idea of a hand-shaped post, which may have been a neutral word in the 19th century (see OED s.v. finger-post). I have tried to discover whether the way the text is presented in The Annotated Alice (Carroll 1985:228), within frames with little hands attached, counts as a Tenniel illustration: the Norton edition (Carroll 1992:137) has the text of the posts merely amidst the text, and so do Carroll 1921 and Carroll 1937. As the Finnish tienviitta seems colourless, the verb viitata is used additionally for underlining the meaning (mikään ei viitannut siihen...); see also (37).

(37) seisoi kaksi tienviittaa kuin nakutettuna: there were sure to be two finger-posts. The idiom kuin nakutettu 'sure as anything' seems well suited to describe posts that have been hammered into the ground. The phrase belongs to easy-going spoken language but not slang.

(38) Tätä tietä Töttörömin taloon/Töttöröön taloon tätä tietä: To Tweedledum's house/To the house of Tweedledee. Carroll uses both English genitives, so the Finnish adds tätä tietä to enable varying word order without resorting to e.g. *Taloon Töttöröön, a phrasing out of the question for finger-posts.

(39) sanon päivää: say 'How d'ye do?' The Finnish gives Alice's planned greeting as reported speech, which looks more natural than marking it as a quotation.
Niin hän kulki... : So she wandered on... Carroll strings clauses together, giving a pleasant meandering effect and not really marking Alice's shock stylistically; the translation, however, seemed to require a dash to mark the surprise. In the ST, Alice turns a sharp corner; note that in the TT, it is the road that turns. Finnish fairytale woods seem to be alive, a feature that may find its way into translations as well.

4.2. Commentary on "Humpty Dumpty" (first half)

4.2.1. Humpty Dumpty's style

In translating Humpty Dumpty's speech, I must have formed a subconscious image of him as a language user, for looking at the TT after quite a long interval, I find I have given him many expressions that are far from neutral. Consider the rather literary tavattoman kiusallista and mitä kiusallisinta, palataanpa viimeistä edelliseen replikkiin, or voipi olla ettet koskaan tapaa toista samanmoista, or kuitenkaan kaikitenkaan. On the other hand, he also uses clearly spoken forms such as puliset itseksesi, jaa, vai niin!, et sanonut mitään sinne päinkään!, no niin oli!, minäpä osaan hallita koko revohkaa, nääs, and anna kuulua. It is to be hoped that the overall impression is appropriately balanced: using either literary or spoken language on its own would both probably have spoilt the chapter, the one by making it too convoluted and annoyingly learned, the other by going to the other extreme. One must also note that Carroll doesn't really give his characters strongly distinguishing speech styles. Humpty Dumpty differs, however, from e.g. the White Knight, by being seen entirely from the outside: the repartee gives no cause for empathy of sensitivity, though Alice's worry for Humpty Dumpty's welfare is mentioned a couple of times. His Finnish speech style therefore aims rather at being vivid and funny, self-centered and unemotional, in order to convey the picture I have of the character.

4.2.2. Comments on specific points 41–77

(41) suureni suuremistaan ja ihmisty ihmistymistään: got larger and larger, and more and more human. A typically Finnish verbal construction is used here,
one that I give preference to over phrases with e.g. enemmän ja enemmän, which though not incorrect are used more than necessary in translations from English to Finnish. The construction is iconic and expresses continuance or abundance by means of repetition (Hakulinen 2004:1635). The verb ihmistyää glances (frivolously) at Job 11:12, "onttopäinen mies voi viisastua ja villiaasin varsa ihmistyää" (1938 translation).

(42) Nakkelis Kokkelis: Humpty Dumpty. Carroll uses the well-known nursery rhyme, underlining that Alice knows the rhyme as a matter of course and recognizes its central character when she meets him. (It might be worth checking what visual representations of Humpty Dumpty were around before Tenniel's version, and whether Carroll could have been referring to these.) Kunnas discusses the history of the character and mentions the Finnish version of the riddle, "Lilleri lalleri" (Carroll 1974b:280–281). The alternatives for APT were thus Lilleri lalleri, Tyyris Tyllerö or a completely new translation. Lilleri lalleri has no element of arrogance, and the Finnish rhyme doesn't mention the king's horses and men. Tyyris Tyllerö (as in Carroll 1974b) belongs, as it were, to Kirsi Kunnas, because it first appeared in her translation of English nursery rhymes, Hanhiemon iloinen lipas (2006:48). It was natural for Kunnas and Manner to use it, but not for me. Granted that tyyris is an excellent word to describe the character of Humpty Dumpty, I have always been bothered with the change of sex involved in using tyllerö, a word usually meaning a plump little girl.

The new translation chosen alludes both to pride and to eggs. Nakkelis may bring to mind the phrase nakella niskojaan (used e.g. in ASI, p. 73 and APT about Humpty Dumpty himself), a gesture of annoyance and arrogance, as well as the verbs nakella and nakata referring to throwing and thereby also falling. Kokkelis recalls munakokkeli, 'scrambled eggs'. Put together, the two evoke the idea of eggs being thrown and smashed (and resemble a sentence: "nakkelis kokkeliks"). They also echo the idiom mukkelis makkelis, an onomatopoeic children's expression (cf. topsy-turvy) used when somebody trips up and falls, also appearing here in the translation of the nursery rhyme itself. What with the elements of pride (hump) and downfall (dump) and eggs (inherent in the tradition of the rhyme), it seems that Nakkelis Kokkelis is not an unsatisfactory solution, considering that it was
impossible to rely on a preformed version of the rhyme, and that no traditional elements could therefore be summoned.

(43) jalat turkkiäiseen tapaan ristissä: his legs crossed like a Turk. Mentioning Turks is not necessary for meaning, but the reference is retained as part of the historical backdrop of the Alice books; consider the Crimean war and Turkey's role in the history of Dodgson's time.

(44) näytätte munalta: you looked like an egg, Sir. Alice is a child with good manners, and she calls the stranger Sir to begin with. Hence the Finnish verb form expressing politeness.

(45) Muurin päällä...: Humpty Dumpty.... The translation is a new one. To compensate a little for the loss or non-existence of common background that the ST displays, the well-known humorous phrase ratsuväki saapuu is included: it brings to mind just the kind of rescue party required. The overlong last line imitates Carroll, who doesn't use the best-known form of the poem. (See Carroll 1992:159, footnote, included in the Appendix of this study.)

(46) Mitä sinä siinä itseksesi puliset: Don't stand chattering to yourself like that. I discarded the translation Älä seiso siinä pulisemassa itseksesi, choosing one that is more idiomatic, rude and sharp.

(47) epävarmana: doubtfully. See second instance further down. The choice of word underlines the balance of power between Alice and Humpty Dumpty; cf. the effect of epäluuloisena (suspecting that one is being deceived), and epäileväisenä (similar, but with a taste of philosophical doubt involved). Epävarma puts one in a position of weakness.

(48) nauraa päräytti: with a short laugh. Such hardly noticeable, frequent ST expressions are worth giving a thought. Consider nauran lyhyesti, which is slightly odd as well as lacking in vigour. Let this comment not be taken to mean that I approve of adding colour; rather, it seems the Finnish two-verb expression is quite a precice equivalent of the ST. Which Finnish onomatopoeic verb to use in
the second place is a matter of taste, and the more idiomatic nauraa hörähti would certainly be possible, were it not for the good-naturedness inherent in hörähtää.

(49) hän oli vain huolissaan: simply in her good-natured anxiety. Fitting in a verbal equivalent for good-natured made the passage sound Sunday-schoolish; taking care of another is virtuous enough in itself, so I chose the simple solution.

(50) "Ratsuväki saapuu", Alice erehtyi pistämään väliin.: "To send all -- ", Alice interrupted, rather unwisely. Here Alice gets the opportunity to use the well-known phrase on its own. Note the reporting clause's use of erehtyi. In translating ASI, I discovered this verb, which seemed to be the very thing to translate Carroll's verb venture with: it carries the same element of immediate regret.

(51) Luin sen kirjasta -- Maamme historia, siis.: It's in a book -- History of England, that is. This passage I do not yet understand to my satisfaction. The idea of a future event appearing in a history book suits looking-glass logic perfectly, but there may be more to it. Translating the first remark as 'I read it in a book' makes idiomatic Finnish, but it may be necessary to go back to a more literal translation.

(52) kurottihe eteenpäin: he leant forwards. Chances to use -- and keep alive -- Finnish reflexive verb forms are few and far between. I am not yet persuaded that they ought to be given up completely, though there are only a few forms of the paradigm that people understand anymore.

(53) kurottihe -- (ja lähestulkoon putosi -- ) ja ojensi Alicelle kättään: he leant forwards (and -- nearly fell off -- ) and offered Alice his hand. Whether the repetition of ja makes for a rhythmically satisfying sentence is doubtful. I do not much like to use the second infinitive instructive (here it would be ojentaen), but here it may be worth considering.

(54) Alice tarttui siihen mutta piti häntä huoilestuneena silmällä: She watched him a little anxiously as she took it. What to do with basic sentences like this? The changes in the order and way of presenting the events must be automatic; consider
a direct translation: *Hän tarkasteli häntä vähän huolestuneena kun hän otti sen – Alice tarkasteli häntä vähän huolestuneena kun tarttui käteen – Alice tarkasteli häntä huolissaan tarttueessaan käteen. The versions keep improving, but even the last one is dull translationese. The solution chosen makes the concrete action, taking the hand, the centre, which seems natural in Finnish. Ending the sentence with Alice's watching also leads neatly on to the next sentence.

(55) Kamala jos se lähtisi irti! I'm afraid it would come off! The translation borrows a phrase from typical little girls' speech; it might be considered too free. *Pelkään että se lähtisi irti is, however, out of the question.

(56) ratsuväki: kaikki kuninkaan hevoset ja miehet: all his horses and all his men. I have added here a reference to the original Humpty Dumpty rhyme, which will probably be recognizable to many Finnish readers, despite the fact that it has no fixed verbal form in Finnish, and the original Kunnas translation also leaves the cavalry out ("eikä Tyyristä Tylleröä milloinkaan / voi kukaan parantaa", Hanhiemon iloinen lipas, 2006:48).

(57) he panisivat asiat järjestykseen yhdessä hujauksessa!: They'd pick me up again in a minute, they would! The TT goes for idiomacy, as I have so far not found a satisfactory translation for pick me up. Yhdessä hujauksessa is an expression also used in ASI, pp. 10, 33, so it is a linking element between the two books.

(58) riemuitsi: exclaimed triumphantly. ST verb + adverb are rendered with a single TT verb. Finnish offers many verbs that lend themselves to this kind of compact writing. The choice of riemuita is probably an echo from Laila Järvinen's translations of Tove Jansson's Moomin books.

(59) selitti -- sanoi -- eikä sanonut mitään: explained -- said -- said nothing. When the ST reporting clause is neutral, so is the TT. Touching up an author's style, particularly by translating recurrent reporting clauses (he said) by using different speech verbs every time, was notoriously practiced by former generations of translators, and is avoided by those working now.
(60) *Ylpeys ei salli, vai?: Too proud?* Again, literal translation seemed unsatisfactory, and a rather literary formula was chosen. Finnish has several ways of marking questions; merely adding a question mark to a declaratory clause is not always the best, though its use is on the increase.

(61) *Mokomasta vihjauksesta Alice närkästyi yhä enemmän: Alice felt even more indignant at this suggestion.* Alice's indignation goes back to the remark before, and the direct word order (*Alice närkästyi – – vihjauksesta*) didn't give the right emphasis in context, though the sentence was acceptable as such.

(62) See 2.3.1.

(63) *Hei, onpa sinulla hieno vyö! What a beautiful belt you've got on!* *Hei* is another element of spoken Finnish made use of here. It marks a change of topic.

(64) *nasti polven toisen päälle ja kädet polven päälle: crossed one knee over the other and clasped his hands round it.* Physical gestures and postures are notoriously difficult to translate. The verb *clasp* has already been discussed in comment (34). The TT here aims more at effective rhythm and the visual effect of piling limbs on top of each other than at neutral idiomacy.

(65) *ei ole oma syntymäpäivä: it isn't your birthday.* *Oma* is added in order to avoid using the second person singular; *oma* and *own* behave in rather different ways in the two languages.

(66) *Syntymäpäivälahjat ovat kivempia: I like birthday presents best.* The comparative, rather than the superlative, is of course used here, and Alice's preference is expressed in what seems a more idiomatic TT phrasing than *pidän enemmän syntymäpäivälahjoista*, which is by no means wrong. The reason for the choice may lie in the tendency of Finnish to underline the "experiencing person" less than English: it is one of my standard practices to leave a great many "I"s untranslated, as the person is often implicitly clear in Finnish anyway. Another
point worth noting here is that the verb *pitää* requires the elative case, so using it would make the long word yet a syllable longer.

(67) The calculation: I mention this because one does not always notice that non-verbal elements are part of the whole and may also require translating. Here a Finnish reader would need to see a minus sign, so I have added one.

(68) *Sinulla on se nurinpäin kädessä! You're holding it upside down!* Holding is expressed by mentioning a hand. The TT is what I heard when asking myself the question 'how would I actually say it in Finnish?' Note that this meant not using the active second-person verb form.

(69) *En oikein ymmärrä mitä tarkoitat riemulla: I don't know what you mean by 'glory*. An example of a slightly less than idiomatic translation, this looks forward to the approaching discussion of the nature of meaning, centering on the idea that a person actively gives a word its meaning. Note that the inverted commas marking *glory* are not necessary in Finnish.

(70) *kumpi määrää: which is to be master.* From the point of view of the norm of understanding, it is necessary to realize the power struggle is not between Humpty Dumpty and Alice, but between a word and its speaker. *Kumpi määrää* is a strong expression; no TL phrase bringing in a closer equivalent of 'master' could be found.

(71) *on niillä sisua: they've a temper. Sisu,* though almost a domesticating element, is used, though it adds the idea of 'guts' to that of *temper.*

(72) *verbit ovat koppavimpia: they're the proudest.* While Finnish has an extraordinary number of vivid expressions denoting every shade of pride, it will be necessary to look at pride as a factor in this chapter as a whole, and consider whether using a single word might be advisable after all.
(73) adjektiivit saa suostumaan mihin tahansa, verbejä ei: adjectives you can do anything with, but not verbs. The TT is more strongly personifying than the ST, but this seems in harmony with what is being said about them.

(74) nyt riittää tästä aiheesta: we've had enough of that subject. The ST expresses who has had enough, whereas the TT doesn't need to explicate it.

(75) – – loppuääksesi: – – rest of your life. This long speech by Humpty Dumpty has a satisfying rhythm that I have tried not so much to reproduce as recreate. The TT manages to accommodate the phrase kuitenkaan kaikitenkaan, a typical (and potentially annoying) mannerism of some speakers of Finnish.

(76) Olet selvästi etevä selittämään sanoja: You seem very clever at explaining words, Sir. Here the earlier TT solution for Sir (see (44)) doesn't work. The conversation has been such that continuing to use the polite Finnish te-form would have been impossible, nor is it at all natural that Alice should suddenly revert to it here. Adding the adverb kohteliaasti or tahdikkaasti to the following reporting clause is a possible solution. When making an addition it is important, however, to make sure it does not lead to accidental repetition.

(77) Monkerias: Jabberwocky. My translation for both the name of the poem "Jabberwocky" and the dragonish creature in it is Monkerias; Kunnas and Manner call their poem "Pekoraali", which is an existing literary term of abuse meaning a bombastic piece of writing containing ignorant mistakes; their monster is Pekoralisti (Carroll 1974:146–146, 209). (Before coming across the literary term pekoraali, I saw in the name the elements pekoni 'bacon' and koraali 'hymn', 'choral' – indeed, they are there, even if the complete word also exists.) I cannot emulate such erudite joking, but hope readers will recognize the -ias ending familiar from the Finnish name of the Iliad, and pick up on the connotations of eels and contorted jabbering (ankerias, mongertaa).
4.3. Seeking a title: "A Wasp in a Wig"

The passage called "A Wasp in a Wig", now placed at the end of some editions of TLG (e.g. Carroll 1992:211–214) was written along with the rest of the book and discarded at the insistence of John Tenniel as impossible to illustrate (Cohen 1995:216). It was lost for a hundred years, but though rediscovered in the 1970s, it hasn't gained its original place at the end of Chapter VIII and is only to be found in academic editions of the book. My forthcoming translation will be the first Finnish rendering of this episode.

The phrase of the heading seemed at first quite impossible to translate satisfactorily. In English it is simple, natural, neatly alliterative; in Finnish, the common words that come to mind produce the flat-sounding *ampiainen peruukissa*. The construction itself is problematic. The Finnish inessive case used to express ‘wearing sth’, e.g. *nainen punaisessa takissa*, is common but not the only alternative, cf. *Puss-in-Boots: Saapasjalkakissa; man in evening dress: frakkipukuinen mies or mies frakki päällä/yllä(än)*. With the inessive, there is a notion of ”insideness” not called for – picture *poika isänsä hatussa* as a little boy sitting in his father’s hat. This may be slightly far-fetched, but consider that with an insect in question, the phrase *ampiainen peruukissa* certainly first brings to mind a wasp tangled into somebody's wig, rather than a wig-sporting wasp.

The most favoured way of putting the notion of a wasp wearing a wig would be *peruukkipäinen ampiainen*, 'wig-headed wasp'. This is a flatly serious phrase; why would Carroll write about somebody like that? Let us see whether a more satisfactory wording can be found by listing possible Finnish ingredients:
WASP:
ampiainen
mehiläinen
kimalainen
mettiäinen
herhiläinen
pörriäinen
vaapsahainen
vaaksiainen (daddy-long-legs)

WIG:
peruukki
valetukka
tekotukka
kiharat
valkki
hiuslisäke
irtokiharat/-tukka/-lisäke

There seems to be plenty of scope for alliteration. *Kiharainen kimalainen.*
*Herhiläinen hiuslisäkkeessä.* *Ampiaisen ateljeekampaus. Pörriäinen peruukissa.*
*Pistiäinen peruukissa. Valetukkainen vaapsahainen. Valkkipää vaapsahainen.*
*Vaaksiainen valkki päässä. Irtokiharat/-tukka/-lisäke.*

The next move is to cut down the alternatives. *Mehiläinen* ’bee’ is too nice,
mettiäinen even worse with its poetic summer-sweet connotations. *Kimalainen*
’bumble-bee’ and *pörriäinen*, a children’s word for a friendly buzzing insect, are
not suitable for describing an emaciated and peevish old creature. Both
vaapsahainen and *herhiläinen* are kinds of wasps, and wasps (*ampaiaiset*) belong to
the family *myrkkyapistiäiset*. *Pistiäinen* is, then, a higher-level concept than the rest,
but inclusive of our particular sub-category *wasp*. The insect list gives four near-
synonyms without even using poetic licence, which would not be out of the
question with Carroll. It may be noted that that since Tenniel refused to illustrate
this passage, there is nothing to stop calling the creature a dragon-fly or a worm, should this provide a satisfactory solution.

Can the inessive construction be avoided? *Peruukkipäinen pistiäinen* is a possibility. The combination *herhiläinen + hiuslisäke* seems promising, but a satisfactory adjectival construction cannot be formed (*hiuslisäkkeinen* or *hiuslisäkkeellinen herhiläinen*) and besides, *herhiläinen* ‘hornet’ carries connotations of wildly restless movement and the idea of bothering somebody, whereas this particular wasp is a character sitting quietly on the ground and wanting to be left alone. As a last attempt to use *herhiläinen* let us consider *herhiläisen hiuslisäke*. Alas, the wig is not the centrepiece of the chapter, and this expression gives it too much weight.

Is *vaapsahainen valetukassa* a possibility? This insect is not quite so familiar as the others; it presents no clear image. What is in favour of this solution is the proximity of the formation *x valepuvussa*, ’x in disguise’, an inessive construction much used. On the other hand, the adjectival *valepukuinen x*, is familiar, too. *Valetukkainen vaapsahainen*, then? Is the resemblance in alliteration, V – V to Carroll’s W – W, a point in its favour? *Peruikki* is of course the most neutral equivalent for ‘wig’, but *peruukkipäinen pistiäinen* is over-sonorous, thanks to the rhyme -päinen/-äinen.

What would be the natural, spontaneous way of describing the wasp image in present-day Finnish? Children use the abbreviated form *amppari* for *ampiainen*. But though *peruukkiamppari* has a good rhythm, using an almost slang word in a Carroll translation seems unsatisfactory, since the word is an obvious anachronism. Forming a compound word can also lend a concept a sense of permanence, as if it were a term in its own right. Yet compounds are a typically Finnish form of expression and can be used as nonce-words as well as permanent formations.

Of all the alternatives, *vaapsahainen*, with an element of onomatopoeic doddering about it, is my final choice. And to pair with it I choose an equally doddering word
meaning hair, hapset, naming the chapter Valehapsivaapsahainen in honour of Finnish compound words, alliteration and ambitious little readers.

The above is a detailed description of making one's mind up about a single expression. It can be said to be representative of the kind of convoluted thought processes involved in translating, although they are usually not written down. Many of the arguments apply to a number of similar problems, so once a translator has a fair amount of experience and routine, they can flash through the mind with semi-automatic swiftness.

After coming to the above conclusion, it should be pointed out that "A Wasp in a Wig" is in fact not a chapter name chosen by Carroll. It refers to the four-page passage cut from the end of Chapter VIII which did not have a heading given by the author. The title was used by Tenniel in a letter to Carroll, and seems to have been taken over by scholars. Nor does the phrase occur in the text of the passage, but both wasps and wigs do, and the question remains whether the words valehapset and vaapsahainen would actually fit in every instance of the English words throughout the scene. A translator would do well to consider the context and function of a ST item before taking much trouble to translate it; instances of repetition should also be noted. The above is, however, a true example of Fraser's self-revelation (1996:67) and a realistic illustration of the way a translator's mind works. Translators now and then also go on wild goose-chases.
5. CONCLUSION

I have attempted in this study to shed light on the process of translating and of the role of norms in this process. The need for shared norms is obvious, though it is likely that much of the agreement about norms among translators is implicit rather than clearly verbalized. As gathered from my experience of both translating and publishing I have presented ten sources or setters of these norms, explaining the various viewpoints and interests of each. The hierarchy of norms from binding ones to matters of choice – shading from norm to strategy – is described before going on to list the norms themselves. There are six norms I have sifted out of the whole thought-process involved in making a translation fill the bill: the norms of understanding, accuracy, target language quality, rhythm, quotability, and harmony between translation and illustration.

While drawing extensively on my own experiences and patterns of problem-solving, I have also looked into the views of a number of colleagues who answered a short questionnaire for me, and have been able to corroborate some of my statements by this means. During the process of completing this study, I have not found reason to change my overall views concerning the state of the translation profession in present-day Finland, though the picture has become clearer and more detailed. The change that has taken place in the last half-century has been towards a stronger demand for accuracy, which is not surprising, considering how much the knowledge of foreign languages and the accessibility of information have improved. It remains to be seen how translation norms will continue to develop in the future; I have described what signs of change I have noted over the years, sketching one possible direction that at least a small section of the profession may be headed for.

In Finland, literary translation is considered a demanding but desirable and respected profession, although it is not well paid. There is a wide consensus over the norms that guide decision-making, and this consensus is shared not only by translators but also by publishers and readers.
Finally, the translated sections of *Through the Looking-Glass* and the comments thereon are presented as a surface reflecting many types of translation problems and the ways the various norms discussed earlier can help to solve them. The commentaries discuss aspects of grammar and vocabulary that could also appear in translations more typical than TLG, in the hope that these too may be of use to future translation scholars and translators. While perhaps stressing these generally applicable processes, I have also discussed translating the well-known Carroll characteristics of punning and made-up words.

It was suggested at the beginning of this study that translators can become visible by retranslating such classics as Lewis Carroll's *Alice* books. Another way for translators to forgo their invisibility is to step out from behind the author's back and even out of their own translations, and to speak out about their work. Giving thought to questions of Translation studies and trying to express one's own experience through even a modestly theoretical prism are exercises useful not only to scholars, but also to practicing translators.
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PART II

1 "Peilihyönteisiä", a translation of "Looking-glass insects"

© Alice Martin 2008

Kolmas luku
Peilihyönteisiä


Se oli kuitenkin kaikkea muuta: itse asiassa se oli norsu, kuten Alicelle pian valkeni, vaikka ajatus sai hänet aluksi huutaa ja meni alas. ”Ja kukkien täytyy olla ihan valtaivat!” hän tuumi seuraavaksi. ”Vähän kuin mökkejä, joista on nostettu katto pois, ja alle pantu varsi – ja mitä määrät hunajaa ne saavat tehtyä!

Taiden mennä alas ja – ei, en menekään ihan vielä”, hän pysäytti itsensä (2) juuri kun oli lähdössä juoksemaan alamäkeen, ja koetti keksiä verukkeen sille että arkuus iski niin yllättäen. ”Ei parane mennä alas niiden joukkoon ilman kunnon risua jolla voin huiskia niitä pois – ja entäs kun sitten kysytään oliko mukava kävely (3), hiihi (4), minä sanon: ’Oikein mukava muuten –’ (ja hän heilautti päätään tutulla tavalla (5) ’’paitsi että oli kamalan kuumaa ja pölyistä – ja norsut pyörivät kimpussa koko ajan!’

Menenkin alas toista kautta”, hän sanoi hetken päästään, ”ehkä voin käydä katsomassa norsuja myöhemmän. Sitä paitsi tekisi jo mieli sinne kolmanteen ruutuun!”
Sillä verukkeella hän sitten juoksi mäkeä alas kuutta pikku puroa kohti ja hyppäsi ensimmäisen yli (6).

"Liput, olkaa hyvä!" sanoi konduktööri ja pisti päänsä sisään ikkunasta. Samassa jokainen ojensi lippuaan häntä kohti: ne olivat suunnilleen samankokoisia kuin matkustajatkin, ja tuntuivat täyttävän koko vaununosaaston.
"Kas niin! Näytähän lapsi lippusi (7)!” konduktööri jatkoivat katsoen Alicea vihaisesti. Ja joukko ojensi lippuaan häntä kohti: ne olivat suunnilleen samankokoisia kuin matkustajatkin, ja tuntuivat täyttävän koko vaununosaaston.
"Älä lapsi (7) viivyttä häntä! Hänen aikansa on kallista, maksaa tuhat puntaa minuutti (8)!”
"Anteeksi, mutta minulla ei ole lippua”, Alice sanoi pelästyneenä, ”siellä mistä tulin ei ollut lipunmyyntiä (9).” Ja taas äänet kuorivat yhdessä: ”Älä lapsi (7) viivyttä häntä! Hänen aikansa on kallista, maksaa tuhat puntaa minuutti (8)!”
"Älä selitä”, konduktööri sanoi. ”Sinun olisi pitää ostaa lippu veturinkuljetusajalta.” Ja jälleen kerran äänet kuorivat: ”Siis mieheltä joka ajaa veturin. Hoh, pelkkä savukin maksaa tuhat puntaa tupru (8)!”
Alice mietti: ”Sitten ei maksaa vaivaa puhoa.” Tällä kertaa äänet pysyivät hiljaa, mutta Alicen hämmästyksessä ne kaikki ajattelivat kuorossa (toivottavasti sinä ymmärrät mitä kuorossa ajatteleminen tarkoittaa – koska täytyy tunnustaa että minä en ainakaan): ”Viisainta olla sanomatta yhtään mitään. Kieli maksaa tuhat puntaa sana (8)!”
"Minä näen ensi yönä tuhat puntaa unta (8), se on varmaa!” ajatteli Alice. Konduktööri oli kaiken aikaa katsonut häntä, ensin kaukoputkella, sitten mikroskoopilla ja sitten teatteriikkarilla. Viimein hän sanoi: ”Olet menossa väärään suuntaan”, sulki ikkunan ja meni matkoihinsa.
"Noin pienien lapsen”, sanoi vastapäätä istuva herrasmies (hän oli pukeutunut valkoiseen paperiin), ”pitäisi tietää minnepään on menossa, vaikkei tiedä itään omaa nimeää!” (A)
Vuohi, joka istui valkopukuisen herran vieressä, ummisti silmänsä ja sanoi kovalla äänellä: ”Hänen pitäisi osata lipunmyynti, vaikkei hän osaakaan aakkosia!”
Vuohen vieressä istui koppakuoriainen (vaununosastossa oli kaiken kaikkiaan merkillinen kokoelma matkustajia), ja koska näytti kuuluvan asiaan että jokainen puhui vuorollaan, hän jatkoivat: "Hän saisi palata matkatavarana!"

Alicen ei onnistunut nähdä, kuka istui koppakuoriaisen tuolla puolen, mutta seuraavaksi kuului hirveä ääni. "Vaihtakaa veturia –" se sanoi, ja sitten se alkoit kõhü ja joutui jättämään sanottavansa kesken.

Se kuulostaa hirveltä", Alice tuumi itsekseen. Ja mahdolloman pieni ääni sanoi ihan hänen korvansa juuresta: "Voisit keksiä siitä vitsin – jotain hirvestä ja hirveästä, he!"

Sitten tavattoman vieno ääni kaukka: "Hänelle pitää sen kiinnittää lappu: 'Lapsia – varovasti.' (11)"

Ja sen jälkeen muut äänet jatkoivat juttua. ("Onpa täällä yhdessä vaununosastossa paljon väkeä!") ajatteli Alice.) Ne sanoi: "Hänet pitää panna postiin, koska hänenä on jo valmiiksi kunningattaren päällä (12) –" "hänet pitää lähettää lendättimellä –" "Hän saa itse vetää lopun matkaan –" ja niin edelleen.

Mutta valkoiseen paperiin pukeutunut herra kumartui Alicea kohti ja kuiskasi hänen korvansa juuriesta: "Älä välitä heidän puheistaan, kultaseni, vaan osta menopaluu joka kerta kun juna pysähtyy."

"Enkä osta!" Alice sanoi aika herpaantuneena. "Minä en kuulu sille junamatkalle – olin metsässä vielä hetki sitten – voi kun päätän sinne metsään takaisin!"

"Voisit keksiä siitä", sanoi pieni ääni hänen korvansa juuressa taas. "Jotain sellaista on..." "koko matka meni metsää", sanoi Alice ja tähyili ympärilleen nähdäkseen mistä ääni oli peräisin, mutta turhaan. "Jos haluat niin kovasti että keksitään vitsit, mikset keksi niitä itse?"

Pieni ääni huokaisi syvään. Se oli selvästi hyvin onneton, ja Alice oli sanonut sille jotain myötätuntoista ja lohduuttavaa, "jos se vain huokaisi niin kuin muut ihmiset!" (14) hän ajatteli. Mutta huokaus oli niin ihmeellisen pieni, ettei hän olisi kuullut sitä laisinkaan, ellei se olisi lähenenyt aivan hänen korvansa vierestä. Siitä seurasi, että se kutitti hänen korvansa mahdollomasti ja vei ajatuksen kokonaan pois pikku olennon murheista.

"Tiedän että sinä olet ystävä", pikku ääni jatkoivat. "Rakas ystävä ja vanha ystävä. Etkä tee minulle pahaa, vaikka olenkin hyönteinen.”
"Minkälainen hyönteinen?" Alice kysyi hiukan huolestuneena. Oikeastaan hän halusi tietää, oliko se pistävää lajia vai ei, mutta hänestä tuntui ettei sellaista oikein ollut kohteliasta kysyä.

"Ai, etkö sinä sitten –" pieni ääni aloitti, mutta samassa se hukkui veturin kimeään kiljaisuun, ja kaikki hyppäisivät sääkähtäneinä pystyyn, Alice muiden mukana. Hirvi, joka oli pannut päänsä ulos ikkunasta, veti sen rauhallisesti sisään ja sanoi: "Ei mitään, meidän pitää vain hypätä puron yli." Kaikki tuntuivat tytytyvän siihen, vaikka Alicea hiukan hermostutti ajatus että junat hyppäsivät ylipäänsä minnekään. "Ei silti, sitten päästään neljänten ruutuun, se hyvä puoli siinä ainakin on!" hän sanoi itsekseen. Eikä aikaakaan kun (15) hän tunsii vaunun kohoaan suoraan ilmaan, ja peloissaan hän tarrasi kiinni siihen mikä ensiksi käteen sattui, ja se sattui olemaan vuohen pukinparta.

* * * * * * * * * *

Mutta parta tuntui sulavan olemattomiin hänen kosketuksestaan, ja hän huomas'i istuvansa kaikessa rauhassa puun alla – kun taas surviainen (sillä surviainen hänen puhekumppaninsa juuri oli) tasapainoili pikku oksalla hänen päähän päällä ja leyhytteli häntä siivillään. Se oli toisiaankin iso ollakseen surviainen, ”melkein kanan/kananpojan kokoinen”, Alice ajatteli. Hän ei kuitenkaan osannut arastella sitä, kun he olivat puhelleet keskenään niin pitkään. 

”—etkö sinä sitten pidä kaikista hyönteisistä?” surviainen jatkoi niin hiljaa kuin mitään ei olisi tapahtunut. 

"Pidän, jos ne osaavat puhua", Alice sanoi. " Siellä mistä minä tulen ne eivät puhu mitään(16)."

"Millaisista hyönteisistä sinä riemuitset siellä mistä sinä tulet?" surviainen tiedusteli. 

"En minä riemuistä hyönteisistä ollenkaan", Alice selitti, ”koska minä pelkään niitä aika lailla – ainakin isoja lajeja. Mutta voin kyllä kertoa minkäminisiä niitä on.”

"Ja ne tietenkin tottelevat nimeään?" surviainen heitti välliiin.

"Eivät minun tietääkseni.”
"Mitä iloa (17) niillä sitten on nimistä, jos ne eivät tottele niitä?" surviainen kysyi.

(A) "Ei mitään iloa niille", Alice sanoi; "mutta kai siitä on iloa ihmisille jotka ovat nimet antaneet. Jos ei olisi, miksi asioida edes olisi nimet?"

"En osaa sanoa", surviainen vastasi. "Tuonnempana, tuolla metsässä, niillä ei olekaan nimiä – mutta anna kuulua niitä hyönteisiä (18), sinä haaskaat aikaa."

"No, on hevoskärpänen", Alice aloitti ja laski sormillaan.

"Selvä", sanoi surviainen. "Puoliväliässä tuota pensasta, jos katsot, näet keinuhevoskärpäsen (B). Se on kokonaan puuta ja liikkuvat keinuttamalla itseään oksalta oksalle."

"Millä se elää?" Alice kysyi uteliaana.

"Se täytyy mahansa puruilla ja mahlalla (19)", sanoi surviainen. "Kerro lisää nimiä."

Alice katsoi kiinnostuneena keinuhevoskärpästä ja tuli siihen tulokseen että se oli vasta maalattu uudestaan, kun se näytti niin kiiltävältä ja tahmealta, ja sitten hän jatkoi.

"Sitten on lentomuurahainen."


"Ja millä se elää?" Alice kysyi kuten ennenkin.

"Uunipuurolla ja hedelmäpiiraalla", surviainen vastasi, "ja se pesii joululahjakorissa."

"Ja sitten on leipiäkuoriainen", Alice jatkoi katsottuaan tarkasti hyönteistä, jonka päähavsi, ja miettityään: "Siksiköhän hyönteiset niin hanakasti lentävät kynsiläisille – että muuttuisivat kananlentomuurahaisiksi?"

"Jaloissasi ryömii", surviainen sanoi (ja sai Alicen vetämään äkkiä jalat koukkuun)

"jos vain katsot, voileipäkuoriainen (A) (B). Sen siipinä on ohuet voileivät, sen vartalona on leivänkuori, ja päänä on sokeripala."

"Ja millä se sitten elää?"

"Laihalla teellä, jossa on kermaa."

Alicen mieleen juolahti uusi pulma. "Entä jos sitä ei löytyisikään?" (20) hän esitti.

"Sitten se tietysti kuolisi."

"Mutta niin kai käy aika usein", Alice huomautti mietteläään.
"Niin käy aina", sanoi surviainen.

Sen jälkeen Alice oli vähän aikaa (21) vaita ja mietti. Surviainen hurvitteli surraamalla hän päänsä ympärillä; viimein se istui takaisin oksalle ja sanoi: "Et kai haluaisi hukata nimeäsi?" (22)

"En todellakaan", Alice sanoi hiuksen hätäntyen.


"Siitä ei tulisi mitään, olen ihan varma", Alice sanoi. "Kotiopettajatar ei ikinä päästää sinua tunneista tuollaisen syyyn takia. Jos hän ei muista, nimeäntä, hän sanoi 'neiti' niin kuin palveluskunta (23) sanoo."

"No jos hän sanoi 'neiti' eikä muuta", surviainen huomautti pään ympärillään, "sitten ei olisi muuta, ei tuntiakaan. (A) Se oli vitsi. Kunpa sinä olisit keksinyt sen."

"Miksi toivot että minä oisin keksinyt sen?" Alice kysyi. "Se oli tosi huono vitsi."

Mutta surviainen vain huokasi syvään, ja kaksi suurta kyyneltä vieri sen poskia pitkin.

"Sinun ei pitäisi kerota vitsejä, jos tulet niistä noin surulliseksi", Alice sanoi. (A) Sitten kuului taas haikea pieni huokaus, ja tällä kertaa surviainen oli tainnut huokaista itsensä hengiltä (25), sillä kun Alice kohotti katseensa, oksalla ei näkynyt yhtään mitään, ja kun häntä oli alkanut viluttaa siinä istuskellessa, hän nousi ja lähti jatkamaan matkaa.

Eipä aikaakaan kun edessä aukeni nitty (26), jonka takana oli metsä; se näytti ensimmäistä metsää paljon synkemmältä, ja Alicea pikkuisen hirvitti mennä sinne. Tarkeimmilla ajatellen hän päätti kuitenkin uskaltaa, "sillä takaisin minä en ainakaan mene", hän ajatteli iseikkään, ja tämä oli ainoa tie kahdeksanteen ruutuun.

"Tämä on varmaa metsä jossa asioilla ei ole nimiä", hän sanoi mietteliäänä isekseen. (A) "Kuinkahan minun nimeni käy kun astun puitten alle? (27) En tahtoisi hukata sitä – sitten minulle pitäisi antaa uusi nimi, ja melkein varmasti saisín ruman. Mutta se hauska puoli siinä olisi, että saisit etsää senellä vanha nimeni on! Ihana kuin ilmoituksissa, kun ihmiset ovat hukanneet koiransa – 'tottelee niemä Viiva (28), viimeksi nähty messinkipanta kaulassa' – ajatteles, kutsua nyt kaikkea vastaan tulevaa Aliceksi kunnes joku vastaa! Mutta eivät ne vastaisi mitään, jos niillä olisi järki päässä."
Hänens ajatuksensa harhailivat tähän tapaan kun hän tuli metsänrantaan: metsässä näytti vilpoiselta ja varjoisalta. "No ainakin on ihanaa, kun on ollut niin kuuma", hän sanoi juuri kun astui puiden siimekseen, ”päästä tänne – tänne – tänne minne?” (A) hän jatkoi, hämmentyneenä siitä ettei saanut sanaa päähänsä.
"Tarkoitan että pääsee tämän – tämän – tämän alle näin!” (29) Ja hän painoi kämmensä puun runkoa vasten. ”Miksikä sitä sanotaan? Sillä ei toden totta taida olla nimeä – ei, ei varmasti ole!”
Silloin vastaan tuli pieni kauris (31), se katso Alicea suurilla lempeillä silmillään, muttei näyttänyt yhtään pelkoisalta. ”Tule! Tule!” (32) Alice sanoi ja ojensi kättään silittääkseen kaurista, mutta se vain perääntyi aavistuksen verran ja jäi sitten taas katsomaan häntä.
"Mieti vielä”, kauris sanoi, ”tuo ei kelpaa.”
Alice mietti, mutta ei se mitään auttanut. ”Kiltti, etkö kertoisi miksi sinä sanot itseäsi”, hän sanoi arasti. ”Minusta tuntuu että se voisi auttaa.”
"Kerron, jos tulet vähän matkaa tännepiin”, kauris sanoi. ”En muista tääällä.”
Niin he jatkoivat matkaa halki metsän, ja Alice kulki kädet rakkaasti kauriin kaulan ympärillä (34), kunnes edessä oli toinen avara niitty, ja silloin kauris yhtäkkiä loikkasi ilmaan ja ravistautui vapaaksi Alicen otteesta. ”Minä olen kauriinvasa!” se huusi riemukkaalla äänellä. ”Ja hui sentään, sinä olet ihmislapsi!” Sen suloisin ruskeisiin silmiin välähti säikähdys, ja samassa se oli jo pinkaisut tiehensä täyttä laukkaa. (35)
Alice seisoa katsellen sen perään itku kurkussa, kun oli menettänyt rakkaan matkakumpaninsa niin äkkiä. ”No, ainakin tiedän nimeni nyt”, hän sanoi; ”se lohduttaa vähäisen. Alice – Alice – en unohta sitä toiste. Entä nyt, kumpaa näistä tienviitoista (36) minun pitäisi seurata?”
Kysymys ei ollut kovin vaikea, koska metsässä kulki vain yksi tie, ja kumpikin tienviitta osoitti juuri sille. ”Voin ratkaista asian sitten, kun tie haarautuu ja ne osoittavat eri suuntau”, Alice sanoi itsekseen. (A) Mutta mikään ei viitannut siihen että niin kävisi. Hän kulki kulkemistaan, mutta joka kerta kun tie haarautui, seiso kaksi tienviittaa kuin nakutettuna (37) osoittamassa samaan suuntaan, ja toisessa luki:

Tätä tietä Töttörömin taloon

ja toisessa

Töttöröön taloon tätä tietä. (38)

”Minusta alkaa tuntuu että he asuvat samassa talossa!” Alice sanoi lopulta. (A) Ihme etten tullut sitä aikaisemmin ajatelleeksi – mutta en voi viipyä heidän luonaan kauan. Kurkistan sisään ja sanon päivää (39) ja kysyn mitä tietä metsästä pääsee. Kun vain pääisin kahdeksanteen ruutuun ennen pimeää!” Niin hän kulki yhä eteenpäin ja puheli itsekseen kulkiessaan, kunnes teki jyrkän mutkan ja hänen edessänsä oli äkkiä kaksi pientä paksua miestä (40) – niin äkkiä ettei hän voinut olla harppaamatta taaksepäin, mutta hetkessä hän jo rauhoittui, sillä hän oli varma että tässä olivat nyt

[Neljäs luku

Töttörömin ja Töttöröö]
Muna kuitenkin vain suureni suurenemistaan ja ihmistyvihmistään (41). Kun Alice oli siitä enää muttaman metrin päässä, hän näki että sillä oli silmät ja nenä ja suu, ja vielä lähemmäs tultuaan hän näki selvästi että se oli NAKKELIS KOKKELIS (42) ilmelevänä. ”Kukaan muu se ei voi olla!” hän sanoi itsekseen. ”Varmemmaksi ei tulisi vaikka nimen voisi lukea suoraan naamasta!”

Nimen olisi hyvinkin mahtunut lukemaan naamasta vaikka sataan kertaan, niin valtava se naamataulu oli. Nakkelis Kokkelis istui jalat turkkilaiseen tapaan ristissä (43) korkean muurin harjalla – niin kapeassa paikassa, että Alice ihmetti kuinka hän ollenkaan pystyi tasapainoilemaan siinä – ja kun hänen katseensa oli kiinnittynyt tiiviisti vastakkaiseen suuntaan eikä hän kiinnittänyt Aliceen mitään huomiota, Alice ajatteli että hän oli sittenkin topattu hahmo.

”Että osaa näyttää täsmälleen munalta!” hän sanoi ääneen, seisten muurin alla kädet ojossa valmiina ottamaan vastaan, sillä hänestä näytti että toinen tipahtaisi minä hetkenä hyvänsä. ”On tavattoman kiusallista”, Nakkelis Kokkelis sanoi pitkän hiljaisuuden päättäen keskusteluun ja Aliceesta, ”kun nimitellään munaksi – tavattoman!”

”Sanoin että te näyttäte munalta”, (44) Alice selitti sävyisästi. ”Ja jotkut munathan ovat hirveän sieviä”, hän jatko toivoen että huomautuksen saisi vielä pelastettua jonkinlaiseksi kohteliaisuudeksi.

”Jotkut ihmiset”, sanoi Nakkelis Kokkelis katsoen tapansa mukaan poispäin hänestä, ”eivät ymmärrä vauvankaan vertaa!” Alice ei tiennyt mitä olisi sanomut: tilanne ei ollenkaan muistuttanut keskustelua, kun toinen ei sanonut yhtään mitään hänelle; viime huomautuksenenkin hän oli selvästi kohdistanut yhdelle puulle – ja niin Alice vain lausui hiljaa itsekseen:

© Alice Martin

Kuudes luku
Nakkelis Kokkelis
Muurin päällä Nakkelis Kokkelis
istui ja putosi mukkelis makkelis.
Ratsuväki saapui linnasta kuninkaan,
muttei saanut kokkelista enää ehjää Nakkelista ollenkaan. (45)

"Viimeinen säe on runoon ihan liian pitkä”, hän lisäsi melkein ääneen,
muistamatta että Nakkelis Kokkelis kuulisi.
"Mitä sinä siinä itseksesi puliset”, (46) Nakkelis Kokkelis sanoi ja katsoi
esimmäisen kerran suoraan häneen. ”Kerro minulle nimesi ja asiasi.”
"Nimeni on Alice, mutta –”
"Tyhmä nimi ainakin!” Nakkelis Kokkelis keskeytti ärhäkästi. "Mitä se
tarkoittaa?”
"Täyttyykö nimen tarkoittaa jotain?” Alice kysyi epävarmana. (47)
"Totta kai täyttyy”, Nakkelis Kokkelis sanoi ja nauraa päräytytti. (48) ”Minun nimeni
tarkoittaa sitä minkä muotoinen olen – komea muoto se onkin. Tuonniminen kuin
sinä voisi olla melkein minkä muotoinen tahansa.”
"Miksi istut täällä ypöyksin?” Alice kysyi kun ei halunnut ruveta kinastelemaan.
"No kun minulla ei ole ketään mukana!” huusi Nakkelis Kokkelis. ”Luulitko etten
tuohon osaisi vastata? Kysy toinen.”
"Eikö tuntuisi turvallisemmalta olla täällä alhaalla maassa?” Alice jatkoi aikomatta
esittää toista arvoitusta: hän oli vain huolissaan (49) miten hänen omituisen
kumppaninsa kävisi. ”Muuri on niin kovin kapea!”
"Miten käsittämättömän helppoja arvoituksia sinä kysyt!” Nakkelis Kokkelis
murahti. ”Tietenkiään ei tuntuisi! Hah, jos minä jonain kauniina päivänä sattuisin
putoamaan – eikä siitä ole pelkoa – mutta jos sattuisin –” ja hän puristi suunsa
suppuun ja näytti niin mahtavalta ja juhlalliselta, että Alicen oli vaikea pysyä
vakavana. ”Jos minä putoaisin”, hän jatkoi, ”niin kuningas on luvannut minulle –
oo, kalpene vain jos mieli tekee! Et arvannutkaan että sanoisin näin! Kuningas on
luvannut minulle – omalla kuninkaallisella suillaan – että – että –”
"Ratsuväki saapuu”, Alice erehtyi pistämään vällin. (50)
"No tuo menee jo liian pitkälle!” Nakkelis Kokkelis huudhti äkkiä suunnaltaan
raivosta. ”Olet salakuunnellut ovien raossa – puiden takana – savupiippujen
nenässä – tai et olisi voinut tietää sitä!”
"En kylläkään ole!" Alice sanoi hillitysti. "Luin sen kirjasta."

"Jaa, vai niin! Kirjaan sellaista voi kirjoittaakin", Nakkelis Kokkelis sanoi tyynempänä. "Sellaiseen kuin Maamme historia, siis. (51) Katsopa nyt minua oikein tarkkaan. Minä poika se olen puhunut kuninkaan kanssa; voipi olla ettet konsaan tapaa toista samanmoista, ja jotta näet eten ole siitä ylpistynyt, saat puristaa minun kättäni!" Ja hänen hymyinsä levisi melkein korvasta korvaan kun hän kurottihe (52) eteenpäin (ja lähestulkoon putosi muurilta saman tien) ja ojensi Alicelle kättään. (53) Alice tarttui siihen mutta piti häntä huolestuneena silmällä. (54) "Jos hän hymyilisi vielä vähänkin leveämmän, ties vaikka suupielet kohtaisivat takana", hän ajatteli, "enkä uskalla ajatellakaan miten hänen päänsä kävisi! Kamala jos se lähtisi irti!" (55)


"Siinä tapauksessa aloitetaan alusta", sanoi Nakkelis Kokkelis, "ja nyt on minun vuoroni valita puheenaihe —" ("Hän puhuu kuin me pelaisimme jotain peliä!" Alice ajatteli.) "Tässä sinulle kysymys. Kuinka vanha sanoitkaan olevasi?"

Alice teki pienen laskutoimituksen ja sanoi: "Seitsemän vuotta ja kuusi kuukautta."

"Väärin!" riemuitsi Nakkelis Kokkelis. (58) "Et sanonut mitään sinne päinkään!"

"Luulin että tarkoitet: 'Kuinka vanha olet?'" Alice selitti.


"Epämukava ikä. Jos taas olisit kysynyt minulta neuvoa, olisin sanonut: 'Jätä seitsemään' — mutta nyt se on myöhäistä."

"En minä ikinä kysy neuvoa kasvamiseen", Alice sanoi närkästyneenä.

"Ylpeys ei sali, vai?" toinen kysyi. (60)

Mokomasta vihjauksesta Alice närkästyi yhä enemmän. (61) "Tarkoitan että sitä nyt vain vanhenee", hän sanoi. Ei sille mahda mitään, ikää tulee, yksin tein."

"Ei kai, jos yksin teit", Nakkelis Kokkelis sanoi, "mutta kaksin tekemällä se onnistuu. Jos olisit saanut sopivasti apua, olisit voinut jättää seitsemään." (62)
"Hei, onpa sinulla hieno vyö!" (63) Alice sanoi yhtäkkiä. (Hänen mielestään iästä oli puhuttu aivan tarpeeksi, ja jos oli tarkoitus keksiä puheenaiheita vuorotellen, nyt oli hänensä vuoronsa.) "Tai niin no", hän korjasi tarkemmin ajatellen, "hieno kravatti, piti sanomani – ei, vaan vyö, tarkoitan – anteeksi vain!" hänen lisäsi nolona, sillä Nakkelis Kokkelis näytti perin juurin loukkaantuneelta, ja Alice toivoi jo ettei olisi valinnut juuri sitä aihetta. "Kun vain tietäisi", hän tuumi itsekseen, "kumpi on kaula ja kumpi vyötärö!"


"Ihan totta?" Alice sanoi mielissään siitä, että oli kuin olikin valinnut hyvän puheenaiheen.

"He antoivat sen minulle”, Nakkelis Kokkelis jatkoit miettiväisenä, nosti polven toisen päälle ja kädet polven päälle. (64) "He antoivat sen minulle – syntymättömyyssäiväljahaksi."

"Anteeksi?" Alice sanoi hämmentyneenä.

"Et sinä minua loukannut”, sanoi Nakkelis Kokkelis.

"Ei vaan mikä se sellainen syntymättömyyssäiväljahja on?"


"Kolmesataakuusikymmentäiviisi”, Alice sanoi.

"Entä montako syntymäpäivää sinulla on?"

"Yksi."

"Ja jos vähennät yhden kolmestaadastakudastakymmenestäiviistä, mitä jää?" "Kolmesataakuusikymmentänellä tietysti.”
Nakkelis Kokkelis näytti epävarmalta. (47) ”Saisinko nähdä sen paperilla?” hän pyysi.
Alicea hymyillytti, mutta hän otti esiin muistikirjansa ja laski näin:
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Nakkelis Kokkelis otti kirjan ja tutki sitä tarkasti. ”Näyttää olevan oikein –” hän aloitti.
"Sinulla on se nurinpäin kädessä!” (68) Alice keskeytti.
"No niin oli!” Nakkelis Kokkelis sanoi vailla huolen häivää, kun Alice käänsi kirjan oikeinpäin. ”Näyttikin hieman omituiselta. Niin kuin olin sanomassa, lasku näyttää olevan oikein – vaikken ehtinyt vielä tarkastella sitä juurta jakain – ja siitä näkee että on kolmesataakuusikymmentänäljä päivää, jolloin on mahdollista saada syntymättömyyspäivälahjoja –”
"Kyllä”, sanoi Alice.
"Ja vain yksi päivä syntymäpäivälahjoille. Mikä riemu!”
"En oikein ymmärrä mitä tarkoitat riemulla”, (69) Alice sanoi.
Nakkelis Kokkelis hymyili halveksivasti. ”Etpä niin – et ennen kuin minä kerron. Tarkoitin että ’siinä vasta hieno perustelu joka vie sinulta jalat alta!’”
"Mutta ei riemu tarkoita ’hienoa perustelua joka vie jalat alta’”, Alice pani vastaan.
"Kun minä käytän sanaa”, Nakkelis Kokkelis sanoi ja nakkeli niskojaan, ”se tarkoittaa täsmälleen sitä mitä minä päätän sen tarkoittavan, ei enempää eikä vähempää.”
"Kysymys kuuluu”, Alice sanoi, ”voiko sanat panna tarkoittamaan niin monia eri asioita.”
"Kysymys kuuluu”, sanoi Nakkelis Kokkelis, ”kumpi määràää (70) – siinä kaikki.”
Alice oli niin hämmentynyt ettei voinut sanoa mitään, mutta hetken päästä Nakkelis Kokkelis aloi taas puhua. "On niillä sisua (71) muutamilla, varsinkin verbeillä: verbit ovat koppavimpia (72) – adjektiivit saa suostumaan mihin tahansa, (73) verbejä ei – mutta minäpä osaan hallita koko revohkaa! Läpitunkemattomuus! Sen minä vain sanon!"
"Olisitko kiltti ja kertoisit mitä se tarkoittaa?" Alice kysyi.
"Nyt alat kuulostaa järkevältä lapselta", sanoi Nakkelis Kokkelis selvästi mielissään. "Kun sanoin läpitunkemattomuus, tarkoitin että nyt riittää (74) tästä aiheesta, ja olisi vallan paikallaan jos kertoisit mitä aiot seuraavaksi, koska et kuitenkaan kaikitenkaan aio jäädä tänne koko loppuiäksesi." (75)
"Aika paljon panit yhden sanan tarkoittamaan", Alice sanoi mietteliäästi.
"Kun panen sanan tekemään paljon työtä tuolla lailla, maksan sille aina ylimääristä", Nakkelis Kokkelis sanoi.
"Ai!" sanoi Alice. Hän oli niin hämmentynyt ettei pystynyt sanomaan muuta.
"Näkisit, kun ne tulevat lauantai-iltaisin käymään", Nakkelis Kokkelis sanoi nyökytellen päätään totisena puolelta toiselle. "Hakemaan palkkaansa nääs."
(Alice ei rohjennut kysyä millä hän niille maksoi, siksi minäkään en pysty kertomaan sitä sinulle.)
"Olet selvästi etevä selittämään sanoja", (76) Alice sanoi. "Olisitko kiltti ja kertoisit mitä tarkoittaa runo 'Monkerias'?" (77)
"Anna kuulua", sanoi Nakkelis Kokkelis. "Minä selitän minkä tahansa runon joka koskaan on keksitty – ja koko joukon niitä joita ei ole keksitty ihan vielä."
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1 INTRODUCTION

Translating classics, translating children's classics and above all retranslating famous children's classics is one of the ways a translator of our times can gain visibility. Lewis Carroll's *Alice* books are among the very best-known works written for children, although their long life rests not only on the original works but on numerous abbreviated and adapted forms, not the least influential being the famous Disney film of 1951. While translating *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* (*Alicen seikkailut ihmemaassa*, 1995) and *Through the Looking-Glass* (in progress) it has been necessary to realize that the translations will eventually be looked at with more than usually critical and inquisitive eyes. In such a situation, the question arises: how is one to proceed so as not to end up in failure?

In literary translation, the subject of this study, as in other fields of life, the ideas of failure and success readily connect with the concept of norms. Andrew Chesterman, having pointed out that a translator must have a theory or translate blindly (1997:39), sees theory as of practical use and connected with commonly accepted norms (see ib. p. 67); and norms are intersubjective and recognized only because of their social existence (ib. p. 54). So, if the aim is to achieve success with a translation presented to the public, finding the appropriate generally accepted norms is of vital importance. Indeed, this study focusses on norms: it
discusses six central norms of literary translation as listed by Martin (2001), and seeks to find them corroborated by comparative material gathered by means of a brief questionnaire (2.5.).

Translators, on the whole, like to concentrate on translating rather than draw attention to themselves. It seems almost a prerequisite on the profession that one must be prepared to put another person first, i.e. the author. This is not to say that translators lack character and colour of their own. What it does lead to, however, is that professionals seldom take the time to write about their own work. Some recent examples to the contrary by Finnish translators might indicate that this is changing, but for the time being, they can be regarded as exceptions. (See Juva 2002, Rikman 2005, Kapari-Jatta 2008.)

It is no surprise, then, that while there has been a fair amount written about Finnish translations of Carroll, especially by Riitta Oittinen, little has been written by translators themselves. Kirsi Kunnas has a short piece on the poems in *Through the Looking-Glass* (Carroll 1974b:275–283), and some details of both poetry and prose are discussed by Martin (2001). This study takes the opportunity, therefore, to fill in a gap in our understanding of Carroll translation by writing a more sustained account of translating two long passages of *Through the Looking-Glass* (TLG). Part I of this study closes with a look at Chapter III, "Looking-Glass Insects", and half of Chapter VI, "Humpty Dumpty", giving detailed comments on translating these chapters. Part II presents the translations themselves.

With Carroll, it is easy to focus on the poetry parodies and puns, while ignoring the bread-and-butter of his work, the narrative prose and no-nonsense dialogue (there *is* some); comments will therefore be made on these "ordinary" aspects of his text as well as those commonly deemed of the greatest interest. Such remarks may also apply to a wider section of literary translation than those focussing on wit specifically. Kersti Juva has pointed out that translation scholars often focus on the problems occurring in translation, the "activity" (rather than the "pauses") (Chesterman 1997:89), the non-routine tasks, rather than the periods when work goes smoothly (Juva 2002:10). I shall therefore make whatever remarks on the
translation I think are of general use and interest, not concentrating solely on the invented names, jokes etc.

In this study I shall draw from my experience as a translator, particularly of Carroll, and almost twenty years as editor of translations of general fiction at the publishing house of Werner Söderström Osakeyhtiö in Helsinki, hoping this has provided insight into the whole process of publishing translated literature. I am bound to say that some of the thoughts expressed are either common knowledge or subjects of frequent discussion among the translating and publishing professions, and it is therefore impossible to give a source for every point. I hope to be able to verbalize some of the tacit knowledge of these fields as well, and thereby capture some points of view that are not widely known. Despite hopes of a measure of general applicability I must stress that all the opinions here expressed are my own.
2 THE ROLE OF NORMS IN TRANSLATION

In the first half of this study I shall focus on the role of norms in literary translation. The practical value of norms was pointed out earlier; another reason for addressing the question is the dichotomy between translation norms as seen in Translation Studies (TS) and norms as a part of actual translation activity. The starting point should be finding out what is meant by norms, particularly as it is possible that two separate concepts are involved here. In ordinary usage, a norm is 'a standard of proper behaviour or principle of right and wrong; rule' and the adjective normative means 'explaining, stating or urging obedience to a rule; prescriptive' (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1982, s.v. norm and normative). Being ”normative” in this sense seems to be not quite respectable nowadays, even outside the field of academic study, so it is interesting to ask why this is so, norms being an inescapable fact of life in translating and publishing.

Chesterman (1997) and Toury (1995), on the other hand, both regard norms (as part of TS) from the descriptive point of view: one could say they wish to describe that which prescribes. In practical translating and publishing, a norm is just what is understood by the word in everyday language: a guideline for doing things in a prescribed way. (See section 2.1. on who it is that does the prescribing.) Even in TS there has, as Toury puts it, been a strong tendency, thanks to the ”overriding orientation toward practical application”, to prefer prescription over description, explanation and prediction (1995: 2). If we are to look at real norms in translational behaviour and be able to describe them, we must first find out what they are. As a means of doing so, Toury suggests reconstruction of norms by studying translated texts (1995:65). To this textual approach an extratextual one can be added: asking people who spend their working time applying translation norms to discuss and explicate them. There is a risk involved in such an introspective procedure: might not some norms that are applied subconsciously or automatically go unnoticed? On the other hand, it could be interesting to hear which norms translators of a given time value and attempt to follow, even though there might also be other ones that they apply unwittingly.
This study is an attempt at explicating the norms that Finnish professional literary translators are conscious of and that enjoy wide acceptability in the Finnish Target Culture (TC). It sets about it in three ways: 1) by expressing what I see as central norms on the basis of my professional experience, and further developing the ideas in Martin 2001 and 2005; 2) by asking a number of translators what they regard as the most important rules concerning their work (2.5.), and 3) by reflecting on and describing the process of translating Carroll. By including comparative material gathered from colleagues, I hope to ease certain obvious misgivings concerning over-subjectivity, such as are described by Toury (ib. 65–66). I hope my self-reflections (see Fraser 1996:67) on translating TLG, even if they are to be taken cum grano salis as translation research, will be acceptable as data and be of possible use to future TS scholars.

Where do norms come from and why are they norms? At the beginning of his book Memes of Translation Andrew Chesterman writes: "A norm describes a kind of consensus of opinion about what something should be like, how it should be done. A norm-statement describes what such a consensus is, not what it should be." (1997:3, original italics.) Later in the same work he talks of norms in a purely descriptive sense, as showing the actual practice in a given field (such as translation). Norms are indeed prescriptive in that they are ways of ensuring that social activities work successfully; to have the power to do so they are connected with sanctions. Norms are intersubjective, i.e. inherent in them is the idea of general agreement among a group of people; there is no such thing as a private or secret norm. (See Chesterman 1997:54.)

The idea of determining which norms are actually in existence from looking at real texts is therefore sound enough. If texts are produced by adhering to certain norms, presumably those norms leave traces in them, making it possible to infer which norms have been effective. There are problems, however. Is everything present in a text governed by norms? Surely not. There is a degree of free variation, as seen in the simple fact that no two translators will produce identical translations of the same text, however high their professional standards. It seems that literary translation is such a complex activity that no exhaustive description from the
single viewpoint of norms, even though it is such a widely applicable concept, will be attainable.

Janet Fraser describes a variety of introspective methods of data elicitation in TS (1996: 66–67). The method applied in the parts of this study concerning Carroll is self-observation, "a (usually) retrospective inspection by the subject of his/her own behaviour or strategies used in the allocated task" (ib. 67). As Alice seikkailut peilintakamaassa (APT) is still in progress, comments on it cannot be called entirely retrospective (see however 4.1.1. on placing the reporting clause); when caught in the middle of making a change or having a new idea, they rather belong to what Fraser calls self-revelation, "an unedited account of concurrent activity on the allocated task" (ib. 67). Section 4.3. could be presented as an example of self-revelation in its entirety.

Translation as an activity is certainly not entirely and necessarily conscious all the time. The idea of flow as a mode of work is well-known; the highly esteemed Finnish translator Kersti Juva, for example, feels she must be in a state of flow to work satisfactorily (2005:21). When a person works between two languages s/he thoroughly knows, it isn't necessary to be continually looking at the job in an analytical way or making conscious problem-solving decisions. I would suggest that the function of norms in translation is to work as part of an alerting mechanism: an experienced translator may be able to go on in a trance-like state of flow much of the time, but when problems arise, s/he is alerted. It is then that the system of norms can be actively consulted and used in seeking solutions.

Considering that literature is an art form and therefore also translation of literature is an art in the sense of the Finnish word 'taide', it is hardly surprising if there is a high level of subconscious activity. I see Juva’s “flow” as connected to translation as art in this sense, but there is also the other meaning of art, as represented by Finnish ‘taito’, craft. Do norms only apply to that part of translation work which can be described as artisanship, and which is always present, whether the element of taide-art is significant or not? As regards my description of the role of norms as part of an alerting mechanism, this may indeed be so. But if we consider norms as an inherent part of all translation work and its acceptance, then it is also necessary
to account for the element of art as a necessity from the point of view of TC acceptability. Not all literature raises expectations of giving readers an artistic experience, but when it does, a rendering falling short of what is expected may lead to sanctions in the form of negative criticism, not only from actual critics but from readers, too. Without speculating on when such expectations are likely to arise or not, their existence should be noted.

2.1. Ten setters of translation norms

Academically, it is possible to look at norms descriptively, but for parties concerned with applying them to everyday work, some of the norms, at any rate, are seen as binding, therefore prescriptive – even to the extent of appearing in contracts that must be signed. There are many parties involved in generating norms, however, and not all of them are equally powerful. It may as well be remembered that points stated in contracts can be ignored, while the spoken word can at times have great influence. In 2.3., I shall present a list of norms of literary translation current in present-day Finland, as drawn from my experience as a translator, publisher’s reader, editor, teacher of translation (on occasion) and of course reader and member of the public. I have no inside experience of producing literary criticism on translation, only of reading it, and to a slight extent of having my own work written about. But before listing actual norms, let us look at their possible sources.

The following is an attempt at listing norm-setters, i.e. interested parties who have a role in forming the norms alive in literary translation. Norms are mainly not explicitly set down in any detail, even in contracts; rather, they find their articulation in the expectations and degrees of satisfaction expressed over actual translation work. I shall state what I see as the interests of each party and also what seems to be its ability to sanction the work of translators. The list sets them down in chronological albeit overlapping order following the process of a translation coming into being. Note that not all of the following are involved in every translation commission.
1. *Representatives of the Source Culture (SC).* These can be individuals making suggestions as to what ought to be published, but also organizations, often representing other than English-speaking cultures, e.g. The Hungarian Cultural and Scientific Centre in Helsinki, or the Finnish FILI; financial support for translators and/or publishers can be involved. SC representatives wish to make the SC better-known abroad. Because they are experts of the SC rather than the TC, they are not necessarily regarded as competent judges of translation into the Target Language (TL). Their power to sanction is limited to disapproval afterwards; this may, sometimes affect the prospects of a translator who is seen to have caused disappointment.

It is more typical, at least for big publishers, for the publishing initiative to come through a *literary agent* than a SC representative. Agencies need not represent the SC: they can be large firms working on an international basis. Agents selling translation rights and *scouts* employed by big publishing houses to discover material suitable for the TC market are often involved in the decision to publish a work in the TL, but they seldom have anything directly to do with the choice of translator, nor with sanctioning existing translations. See however 2. and 3. below.

2. *The author* wishes to distribute his or her own work successfully within the TC and to make money. Some authors now demand (by contract; see 3. below) the right to approve the translation before printing, which usually means a trusted person in the author’s country checks the translation; in such a case, the author may insist that corrections are made before the right to publish is granted. Whether this process results in any substantial improvement of the work depends on the skills of the trusted person. TC publishers and translators find this extra control cumbersome and would prefer to be trusted as competent professionals.

3. *The publishing contract* made between the TC publisher and the author or, more typically, the agent representing the author, is a formal statement involved in every professional translation job. It is mentioned here as a separate entity for the sake of clarity and for its role in verbalizing demands made on the translation. What publishing contracts say about translation varies slightly in wording and amount of detail. For this study, I have looked half a dozen contracts in the files of WSOY,
all made in 2003 by different agents from a number of countries; the language
used by all was English. The actual translator was usually not mentioned, the
passive "the translation shall be made…" being used instead. When the translator
was mentioned, it was with the demand that s/he be "competent" or "of the highest
standard". The common denominator concerning translation quality in all contracts
was, predictably, the phrase "faithfully and accurately". This was specified by
forbidding "abbreviations and alterations" and sometimes also "additions and
deletions" without the author’s written approval.

One agent’s contracts further included a clause demanding that the choice of
translator be submitted to the author’s approval and the completed translation itself
also be sent to be approved, giving the author five weeks’ time to acquaint
her/himself with it. This seems to be something put down in case need arose,
rather than a routine that was always followed. Checking a translation in a foreign
language is a formidable task, and though it has on occasion been done – though
hardly by the author concerned –, not all authors with this clause in their contracts
demand it be carried out.

4. The publisher making the commission wishes to acquire a translation acceptable
in the TC within a given time and without paying more than necessary, and to
make a profit with it. The publisher chooses the translator. All literary translation
in Finland is done by free-lance translators working for however many publishers
they can and wish to. The publisher also has the power of sanction: power (via
editors) to demand changes in the translation until a point of satisfaction is
reached. Time being limited an element of compromise is often involved. In the
last resort, though such extreme cases are rare, the publisher can refuse to publish
the translation altogether (paying for the work done, however). The fact that the
translator is dependent on the publisher for future employment is not a problem
when all goes smoothly, and some publishers honour the tradition of publishers’
responsibility towards their translators even when temporary difficulties arise.
Nevertheless, dependency does make for the translator’s vulnerability.

5. The translation contract made between the translator and the TC publisher is a
formal statement that parties used to working together often regard as a mere
formality. Its main point lies in specifying dates, payments and copyright matters. It also states that "the translation must be made carefully, without additions or deletions contrary to good translation practice. The publisher is entitled to suggest improvements. Decisions as to the final form of the translation depend on the translator's copyright, on the publisher's duty to guard the copyright of the original work, and on good translation practice." (Translation from the relevant paragraph of the contract form used at WSOY by A. M). The phrase "good translation practice" remains undefined.

It is interesting to note that style is not explicitly mentioned in the wording of either of the contracts. Is this an indication that style is a by-product, something that accumulates when the more palpable elements of the work are all in order, or an admission that it is an evasive quality best left unmentioned?

6. The translator wishes to produce a translation acceptable in the TC within a given time and without more effort than necessary, to be paid as well as possible, and to gain positive response from all concerned to ensure employment in the future. The translator also wishes to find pleasure in doing the work and to satisfy his or her professional and artistic ambition thereby. Professional translators are familiar with and adhere to the norms of translation current in the TC. The translator's position is one of trust, particularly so when the Source Language (SL) is one little known by the other people involved or by members of the TC.

7. The editor wishes to find the translator's work of high quality, but works to his/her best understanding to improve it until it reaches at least basic acceptability in the TC. The editor is the main judge of translation quality and the key person in the question of sanctions and continuing employment: s/he wields the power entrusted by the publisher. There is usually only one editor involved in a given translation commission. It is vitally important that the editor and the translator be able to co-operate successfully; for both professions this ability is a necessary qualification. They should also agree at least implicitly about most translation norms.
8. *The community of translators* keeps up a discussion on current norms, reads and discusses new translations in the TC and is quick to note (and often disapprove of) tendencies towards norm change. Sanctioning is unofficial but not without effect, as reputation is an important factor in publishers’ choices of translators. It is important to note that the Finnish system of grants (and prizes) given by state-controlled organizations and private foundations puts a number of translators, sometimes anonymously, in positions of trust, requiring that they make decisions affecting the financial situation of their colleagues. Not all translators actively participate in the community, but this doesn’t make them immune to the effects of collegial judgement.

9. *The critics* tend to review translations as if they were originally written in the TL, i.e. they pay little notice to the fact of translation in what they write, with the exception of retranslations, translations by authors, and translations of poetry (the last two often coincide). Even retranslation as such is no guarantee of critical notice, as was seen e.g. with the relative silence over the new translation of Orwell's *1984* by Raija Mattila in 1999. Present-day critics no longer tend to focus on single translation errors, but neither do they often have much to say about the translation; they tend to review translated books as original works. Much of what Venuti says about translation criticism in America and its fluency demands applies to Finnish criticism as well (2002:4–5, 10); a translator who draws little attention to him/herself is approved of, but not found very interesting, so there is not much need to comment on the translator’s way of doing the job. Another way of disregarding the work of translators is the recent tendency to pick out books that have aroused international interest before they have been translated into Finnish, review the originals and then ignore the translations when they are available to the Finnish reading public.

10. *The public* wishes to be able to read interesting works originally written in other languages, and takes the fact of translation for granted, again with perhaps the same three exceptions as above (see point 9.). In spite of not being interested in translation as such, readers do know what to expect: an accurate and reliable representation of the Source Text (ST). Sometimes readers suspect that ST elements have been quietly left out of the Target Text (TT). This common
assumption I can bear witness to, having long been at the receiving end of readers’ comments sent to a big publishing house. Readers are not powerless to sanction translation work: letters of complaint, if reasonable, are taken seriously. If not reasonable, they still focus attention on the work criticized.

Readers are of course the ultimate reason for the whole activity of publishing, whether commercial or idealistic.

These ten parties all have a possible role in forming translation norms. It should be remembered that the above mosaic is a generalized picture, and individual varieties of behaviour take place on all levels. Group behaviour is a factor of importance not only in the case of translators; editors, too, form a community of their own trying, developing sets of shared norms to ease their work. The groups also intermingle and exchange views on matters of common interest, and there are individuals like myself who belong to more than one group.

2.2. Hierarchy of norms

Forming a set of norms is a process of learning, of absorbing potentially useful material from all sources available. A translator is probably always on the lookout for influences possibly relevant to his/her work – the job at hand produces a dominance of interest, a filter helping to pick out ideas in the flood of information. New thoughts that may develop into norms or affect existing ones need not always come from professional sources. Indeed, norms can very well be described as an instance of memes in the sense borrowed by Chesterman (1997:6) from the sociobiologist Dawkins (1976:206), who mentions ”tunes, ideas, catch-phrases, clothes fashions, ways of making pots or building arches” as examples of memes (as quoted by Chesterman, ibid.).

I propose here the following sketch for a translator’s set of norms from the point of view of generality and compulsory vs. voluntary application.
1. Norms imposed upon the translator by employers and as part of possible translator training are cumulative, but stable and general.

2. Norms seen as relevant by the translator when aiming to keep norms of type (1) and to satisfy his/her own intelligence and professional ambition are cumulative but in constant change, and more specific than (1).

3. Norms relevant to a particular case but not to others, thus applying a limitation to norms of type (2), are actively developed and even more specific than (2).

4. Debatable norms which may be experimented on are an expression of change (cf. Toury 1995:54) and may be in contradiction to earlier norms, including those of type (1). Norms of this type could also be labelled strategies, but from the individual translator's point of view they may carry an element of obligation, even if this obligation is self-imposed by the translator and only applies to a single commission. If an experiment succeeds, such a norm may eventually establish itself more firmly and gain intersubjectivity.

I thus suggest a hierarchy of norms ranging from highly general and binding to highly specific and debatable. To start by looking at norms of the first kind, they are so binding that a translator breaks them at the risk of losing further commissions. In order to keep in work a translator must at least

- keep one’s deadline,
- not leave significant ST material unrepresented in the TT,
- be fairly accurate (cf. Toury’s ‘adequate translation’ and adhering to ‘source norms’ 1995:55–56) and
- be acceptable to the TC.

The imposed and binding norms I referred to in point 1. above are closely connected to the demands of accuracy and faithfulness stated in the publishing and translating contracts. They are of so general a nature that in practice, each translator must needs gather a whole toolbox of norms of the kind under point 2. above in order to fulfill their demands. I expect these “tool-norms” can vary very much from one person and commission to another, while the attempt to translate in a way that approximates both the matter and manner of the ST is a generally accepted norm. Examples of norm-type 3. will come up in connection with Carroll.
2.3. Introducing six norms of literary translation

The following list of six norms was presented in Martin (2001), and it represents the understanding and personal view of one translator. It is not, however, a private view, but an attempt at charting standards valid to the whole profession working in present-day Finland. The norms are presented in order of bindingness (see 2.2.)

The first two, norms of understanding and "faithfulness" can be described as compulsory, and the norm of TL quality is almost as important. Rhythm is a rather intangible matter connected with the reading experience, not always consciously considered even by the translator, nor easily reachable by sanctions. The norm concerning text and illustration naturally doesn't apply to all texts. Finally, the norm of quotability is a special case and has, as far as I know, not been described before Martin (ib.).

2.3.1. The norm of understanding

One of the most fundamental facts about translation is that one cannot do it properly unless one understands what is to be said. While this may sound blatantly obvious, examples of words strung together without really thinking about the meaning are not hard to find in translated texts. The need for true understanding applies to translation as it does to all forms of writing that aim at producing meaningful texts: with original writing what is to be expressed comes from the author's mind, while the translator draws the thought from the ST (as understood by the translator), processes it in his/her own mind and expresses in in another language and in his/her own words. The form of understanding involved in translation is far from being neutral and unproblematic (see e.g. Venuti 1995:24), but I shall not go further into this question here. For everyday translation purposes, adequate translation requires that both the ST and the TT make sense to the translator, even though the meaning given to the TT may be one of a number of alternatives and imply the discarding of other possible interpretations.

Reading as an ordinary reader would is not enough for the translator. It is necessary to develop a professional way of reading in order to analyse the ST in as
much detail and depth as possible. Kapari-Jatta describes her two ways of reading, first with "ordinary eyes" and then her "translator's eyes" (2008:10–11). While it is not part of a translator's job to explain the work to outsiders, let alone be as vocal about it as a literature scholar or a critic might, understanding, and at the very least, not misunderstanding, is vital.

Understanding covers every level of language and information, and it also covers matters of style. Metaphors and symbols need to be recognized: metaphors taken literally usually reveal themselves as inadequate solutions in translation. A particular form of the norm of understanding is that a translator should strive to grasp what function an element has in the ST: having found it out, s/he is on surer ground in seeking the corresponding element for the TT, whether it be a twisted Shakespeare allusion or a clue to the murderer's identity. It seems worth paying relentless attention to passages which are initially puzzling, because it is often there that the traps are, and the keys as well.

When there is an expression unknown to the translator, an inexperienced translator tends to interpret it as the author's creativeness. This is seldom the case; it is more likely that the expression is preformed (Leppihalme 1997:35) though maybe rare – or, indeed, simply a weak spot in the translator's own command of the SL. Taken as unique, the SL expression often gets translated literally, resulting in a TL solution that is either clumsy or too original and innovative. (The line of thought in favour of this is discussed in 2.4.) Such a solution may also simply not fit the logic of the TT.

With Carroll, there are not a great many understanding problems, as the text was, after all, written to be understood by children. What with the 130 years that have passed since Carroll wrote, however, cultural differences and dialogue can pose problems. What, for instance, is the precise meaning of the exclamations "first boy" and "next boy" in the following:
They looked so exactly like a couple of great schoolboys, that Alice couldn't help pointing her finger at Tweedledum, and saying "First Boy!" – – "Next Boy!" said Alice, passing on to Tweedledee. – – (TLG, Ch.4.)

One way of seeking the answer would be to find material describing authentic 1800s school dialogue and establish whether it was typical in the 1860s to address schoolboys like this. Looking at the expressions in 2008, they seem strange. Above all, a direct translation is in no way amusing, whereas the ST is obviously meant to be. For the time being, therefore, this remains a point where I have not been able to keep the norm of understanding to my satisfaction.

Consider another example, where Humpty Dumpty has just heard that Alice is seven and a half years old:

"Now, if you'd asked my advice, I'd have said 'Leave off at seven' – but it's too late now."
"– – one can't help growing older."
"One can't, perhaps", said Humpty Dumpty, "but two can. With proper assistance, you might have left off at seven." (TLG, p. 162.)

The grim implication of the nature of help needs to be consciously understood, as it cannot be translated directly into Finnish. Here is a translation turning the joke into a pun:

"– – olisin sanonut: 'Jätä seitsemään' – mutta nyt se on myöhäistä."
"– – ei sille mitään mahda että ikää tulee, yksin tein."
"Ei kai, jos yksin teit", Nakkelis Kokkelis sanoi, "mutta kaksin tekemällä se onnistuu. Jos olisit saanut sopivasti apua, olisit voinut jättää seitsemään."
(APT, p. .)

Here Alice uses the idiomatic phrase yksin tein 'simply, without delay', but Humpty Dumpty takes yksin for 'alone' and tein, a form of the noun tie, as the 1st
p. sg. past tense of the verb *tehdä*, resulting in 'I did it alone', and uses it for his own purposes.

2.3.2. The norm of accuracy, reliability, loyalty: a question of equivalence

The relation of ST and TT is a matter of continuing interest and mystification. It involves the translator's "black box", which nobody has yet been able to open. We can choose to call this relation between the two texts by many names, depending on the angle we take (consider the aspectual differences between *faithfulness*, *fidelity*, *accuracy*, *equivalence*, *loyalty* and *reliability*, all of which have been used when discussing the relation), without knowing precisely what we are talking about. What we do know, however, is that the question of translation equivalence, theoretically a most problematic concept (see Halverson 1997), is yet very much a part of everyday translation work. It may be just here that theory and practice meet – or clash uncomfortably. While it is useful for a translator to question the concepts of faithfulness and loyalty (to what, to whom), to deny their importance and implications means giving up the benefits of discipline. A state of impulsiveness and ad hoc decisions hardly seems professional, though one can imagine it leading to the occasional brilliant TL rendering. Usually, however, it is accuracy in representing the ST that publishers demand, and it is what the public expects – and believes it is getting – when reading published translations. As a practicing translator, then, this is a principle I adhere to, as regards both the semantic content of the text and its form and style. This involves such issues as looking for expressions of the same register and frequency, and avoiding anachronisms and idiosyncracies.

I do not wish to credit the high status of this norm to outside influences alone. On the contrary, it seems entirely natural to members of the translators' community to aim at an accurate representation of the ST in the way described above. That a translation never reaches entire correspondence with the original is a fact that does not invalidate this aim.

Riitta Oittinen's in many ways delightful book *Kääntäjän karnevaali* (1995) questions the status of the ST and any idea of sameness between ST and TT. While
she makes many interesting points (e.g. how the influence of previous texts on the ST complicates the question of what exactly counts as the translator's ST, 1995:88–90), her basic view of translation seems at a distance from the practice of the mainstream translating community. That liberties can and must be taken is obvious; that liberty is all there is is harder to accept. What makes translating so exciting to me is the challenge of freedom within strict limits, of making a camel go through the needle's eye and come out alive and kicking.

What can be seen as the many limitations a translator has to work with are another facet of the various loyalties involved: loyalty to the ST author, to the ST itself, to the SC, to the receiving community and the TC, to the quality of the TL, to the translator's self. All of these are important, and I would not say that being more loyal to, say, readers means there is a need to be less so to the author. There is no less: there is only more. Keeping all the strands together to produce a satisfying piece of work is the translator's right and duty. It does mean that translation is a demanding job, perhaps more so than in earlier times, but remembering the various loyalties can be seen as a help, rather than an encumbrance.

While it is a commonplace that there is no such thing as the one and only correct translation, it remains true that not all possible ways of expressing the same thing are equally apt in a given context. Limitations posed by somewhat conflicting loyalties help to eliminate alternatives and save the translator much floundering in the sea of language. Levý puts it nicely: "The choice is more limited ('easier'), if the number of possible alternatives is smaller, or if it is restricted by context." (1967:1172.) With Lewis Carroll, for instance, I have found it useful to consider the context provided by what we know of his life and opinions, of Victorian times, attitudes to children, etc.

In my Carroll translations as in the bulk of mainstream translation in present-day Finland, the norm of accuracy or even equivalence (illusory though it may be), can be said to be the cornerstone, in that it touches every aspect of every job and applies to every type of translation, as well as enjoying a wide consensus concerning its importance.
2.3.3. The norm of TL quality

Loyalty to the TL, in this case, Finnish, I see as the need for a translator to be as good a writer as possible, able to use the language's resources and avoid poor Finnish, which among other things involves keeping SL interference to a minimum and steering clear of translationese. The influence on Finnish of Indo-European languages is so overwhelming that the struggle may seem futile and idealistic, but the readership of translated literature is large enough for the quality of its language to carry some weight. Particularly when translating for children, there may be a sense of social responsibility for TL purity at play. Venuti, in criticizing the domesticating tendency and demand for fluency current in translation into English in the USA and UK, writes from the opposite end of the continuum, from the dominant culture and language. Indeed, Finnish translators might do well to make use of a little imperialistic domestication when translating English-language texts. (See Venuti (1995) 2002:15.)

The Finnish tradition known as kielenhuolto, language care or maintenance, rests on the notion that language should be consciously looked after and developed, particularly by those using it publicly and professionally. The whole idea is anathema to many, as it can be seen as an attempt to fetter the natural life and free development that language should have and to bring in a whiff of the schoolroom. While I agree that language resembles a forest more than a topiary garden, conscious maintenance has its uses. It trains the eye to spot not only grammatical error but also ambiguity and obscurity, problems a translator should watch out for. Though stylistic matters in a literary sense do not come under the auspices of this discipline, on the whole it provides a Finnish translator with many excellent tools. It can be complemented by watching out for language usage, practicing a sort of commonsense contrastive analysis, which means being continually on the alert for differences and similarities in one's working languages.

Obviously, a translation must use natural and correct TL grammar, not SL structures disguised in TL words; this is the current mainstream norm. (For disagreement, mainly concerning poetry, see Lehto (2005:201).) There are also examples of choosing less than idiomatic variants of expression in this study, see
e.g. comment (33). I shall not go into the subject of minimal, compulsory changes, those necessary when two languages differ grammatically so much that it is impossible to find a corresponding structure, and the choice of a different grammatical structure is a compulsory one. Learning to deal with such problems is an important part of a translator's apprenticeship but not the subject here. In the following examples from *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* (AIW) and *Alicen seikkailut ihmemaassa* (ASI), the ST could be translated literally without being downright ungrammatical, but the structural changes chosen (out of several possibilities) seem to render the TT more natural. Consider the alternative weak or unacceptable translations (*) as well.

English adverbs do not always coincide with Finnish ones:

- Really you are very dull! (AIW Ch. IX)
  Sinähän tyhmä olet! (ASI 99)
  *Olet todella tyhmä! / Todella, olet hyvin tyhmä!

- "No wise fish would go anywhere without a porpoise."
  "Wouldn't it, really?" Alice said in a tone of great surprise. (AIW Ch. X)
  "Kukaan järkevä kala ei mene minnekään ilman seitä."
  "Ei vai?" Alice sanoi ällikällä lyötyänä. (ASI 108)
  *Eikö tosiaan(kaan)/todellakaan? / Eikö se menisi, todellakaan?

Here there is no attempt to find an adverb equivalent for *really*, but an idiomatic solution is sought instead.

In books for small children, readability and natural dialogue are of supreme importance, and achieving this does not necessarily imply loss of meaning. In Carroll, I have tried to retain the long sentences and what may seem like old-fashioned syntax of the narration (see 2.3.4. below), but keep a balance by giving the dialogue many features of spoken language, e.g. "Et sanonut mitään *sinne päänkään*" or "*sitä* nyt vain vanhenee" or "*Tai niin no*", (see Part II). None of these are new expressions, rather, they represent long-standing Helsinki vernacular.
Choices in favour of idiomacy like those described above seldom get noticed, but when consistently made and added up, they have a huge effect on the style. They often concern quite simple and recurring phenomena, so the solutions may become automatic. Finding good answers to recurring problems is of course easily worth the trouble.

2.3.4. The norm of rhythm

Rhythm is a factor some translators consider the most important of all. It is pervasive, appearing at every rank of language, from within the word to the scope of the paragraph and even further. What is not so clear is whether the important thing is to preserve the ST rhythms or produce effective TT ones; indeed, the whole concept sometimes seems to be regarded as a mystical truth only understood by the chosen. Below, I shall focus on the sentence as a rhythm unit, but hope in the translation commentary to show rhythm operating on other levels as well. For good or ill, I have as a translator almost exclusively kept to the sentence length of the original. Since varying sentence length is a major stylistic feature, this has seemed a way of preserving a significant part of the original rhythm. Consider the following example from Carroll.

She had just succeeded in curving [her neck] down into a graceful zigzag, and was going to dive in among the leaves, which she found to be nothing but the tops of the trees under which she had been wandering, when a sharp hiss made her draw back in a hurry: a large pigeon had flown into her face, and was beating her violently with its wings. (AIW Ch. V)

Hän oli juuri taivutellut sen ylhäältä alaspäin siroon siksak-kuvioon ja aikoi sukeltaa lehtimereen, eli kuten hän nyt tajusi, niiden puiden latvuksiin, joiden alla hän oli vähän aikaisemmin harhaiillut, kun ilkeä sihahdus sai hänet nykäisemään päänsä takaisin: hänen silmilleen oli lehahtanut iso kyyhkynen, joka pieksi häntä siivillään minkä jaksoi. (ASI 54)

Considering the content of the sentence, its form can be seen as iconic: the syntax mirrors Alice's long zigzagging neck – one would not want to cut it. Although the
result is lengthy for Finnish, it seems to work smoothly: the trouble it took the translator is not visible. The aim here and elsewhere was to preserve Carroll's rhythm without burdening the reader; that is, by achieving a rhythm natural to the TL. The translation was not specifically aimed at small children, so long sentences with a certain amount of complex syntax (in the manner of Carroll himself, of course) were not out of the question. Changing the length of paragraphs never crossed my mind as a possibility, but see Oittinen (1997:112–115) for a discussion of this as a rhythm factor in Finnish Carroll translations.

The choice of words according to their length and syllabic structure is an important rhythmical factor, so is word order. One way of wrecking the rhythm of a translation is to be over-faithful and translate every single pronoun and detail of grammar to be found in the English. See e.g. commentary, (24).

2.3.5. The norm of quotability

The problem of translating allusions and quotations is one that an editor encounters more often than the individual translator does. When translating Alice in Wonderland, a much-quoted classic, I bore this seemingly marginal question in mind. There is a generally accepted practice that if a quoted text already exists in Finnish translation, this translation should be used, or at least sought out and considered. Unfortunately the procedure does not always work. The problem is as follows: Translating A, you discover in it a quotation from (or allusion to) B. You identify it, find B is available in Finnish, then find the relevant passage will not fit in the context of A in Finnish, for various reasons: the translation may either be too free, or it may miss the point it was chosen for in A, or it may be clumsy and not bear singling out. The Carroll translations by Swan (Carroll 1984b) and Kunnas and Manner (Carroll 1974b) are both problematic in this respect, Swan with her omissions, Kunnas with her carnivalistic freedom (see Oittinen 1997:126–127, 129). I therefore felt I could do a small service to Finnish translators and editors by including quotability as an aim when translating Carroll. By quotability I mean that any ST passage can be found to be represented by a TT passage resembling it in as many ways as possible, so that the translated passage can be used in the same function as the original.
It is often Carroll's puns and parodies that bring about the quoting problems. Since they cannot be translated literally, they make for a freer type of translation than ordinary texts. My translation aims to translate pun for pun, keeping each one in its original position and on a topic as closely related to the original as possible. Look at the following examples, on the subject of school:

"– – the different branches of Arithmetic – Ambition, Distraction, Uglification and Derision."

"I never heard of 'Uglification', Alice ventured to say. "What is it?"

– – "Never heard of uglifying! – – You know what to beautify is, I suppose?"

"Yes, – – it means – to – make – anything – prettier." (AIW Ch IX)

"– – sitten kaikki mahalaskutavat: ei-yhtäänlasku, ähellyslasku, velkomataulu ja pakkolasku. Jotkut etevämmät pääsivät jopa hyytelön rumentamiseen asti."

"Hyytelön rumentamisesta en ole kuullutkaan", Alice erehtyi sanomaan. "Mitä se on?"

– – "Mitä! Et ole kuullut hyytelön rumentamisesta! - - Tiedät kai sentään mitä sieventäminen on?"

"Tiedän, – – se tarkoittaa, että... tehdään jotain kauniimmaksi." (ASI 100–101, emphasis added)

One form of mathematics (yhtälön sieventäminen) had to be added in order to translate the joke on uglifying, and to fit it into the dialogue required a whole new sentence. Though additions are not desirable, they are more quotable than omissions, for obvious reasons. But full quotability is hard to reach; consider a case of somebody mentioning uglification on its own. For an English-speaking person, it is obvious what is being referred to, but try to use ASI for a Finnish version, and you get either rumentaminen, which is perfectly ordinary Finnish and doesn't stand out as an allusion, or hyytelön rumentaminen, which very probably would stand out far too much, as the idea of 'jelly' certainly won't fit all contexts.
To return to the full passage, let us look at the Kunnas and Manner version of the same text for comparison:

– – laskua päässä kun vesi oli jäässä, mutta muulloin laskimme helmillä.
– Mistä te helmiä saitte?
– Helmisimpukoista tietysti. Etkö sinä tiedä, että kaikki meren laulut muuttuvat simpukoissa helmiksi? (Carroll 1974b:100)

The distance between the ST and this passage with its final excursion into romance ('Don't you know that all the songs of the sea are turned into pearls – – ') is such that a translator in need of a preformed quotation might well be in trouble. Indeed, Carroll is typically translated by famous authors, who are seen as entitled to more liberty than translators. This is also evident in the canonized Hungarian version of AIW by Kosztolányi (1974a).

I have actually only once encountered a person in any way expressing recognition of the norm of quotability. The eminent Finnish translator Seppo Loponen turned out to have thought about the matter, saying that if a sentence had the signs of 'a bewinged expression', then he would try to translate it as such, so that the result would be a recognizable "package" in the translation. (Loponen, personal communication.) He was referring to isolated passages or phrases, not taking the idea to apply to anything like an entire book, and indeed, trying to apply the norm of quotability in all translation would certainly be taking it too far and causing many unnecessary problems.

2.3.6. The norm of harmony between translation and illustration

Riitta Oittinen has written much on the effect of illustration on translation (1995:92-137). Illustration is the part of the original that cannot be changed in translation, so it is the text that must accommodate. In children's books with pictures, it is of course important to keep the text and illustrations in harmony, as child readers are critical and easily note discrepancies.
My Carroll translation of 1995, ASI, probably reflects some aspects of Justin Todd's (Carroll 1984a) colour illustrations, which were originally to accompany the translation. His image of Alice herself, based on Charles Dodgson's photographs of Alice Liddell, certainly supported my conception of the protagonist as an intelligent child.

After Todd was rejected by the Finnish publisher WSOY, there were plans to publish the translation unillustrated. These did not last long enough for me to realize the freedom it might have given. For instance, in the Hungarian translation by Kosztolányi, which obviously pre-existed Tamás Szecskő's illustrations, the Cheshire Cat is a dog, Fakutya, literally 'wood/tree dog' – a solution impossible to anyone working with Tenniel in mind (see Carroll 1974a:47,51). (The explanation lies in the idiom vigyorog mint a fakutya, 'grin like a bootjack', the word for bootjack being literally 'wooden dog').

In the end, it was the familiar Tenniel illustrations that were used with my translation and with which I had to harmonize my text. As they don't cover every detail of the book and Dodgson himself took great pains to harmonize the illustrations with his text, this was not as great a problem as it might have been. It did, however, mean retaining certain features, of the poems in particular, that might otherwise have been changed. "Father William" has no less than four Tenniel illustrations, covering many details of the poem. For the first verse of "'Tis the Voice of the Lobster" there's a lobster illustration; the second verse continues on the same theme of eating your companion, but changes the characters to an owl and a panther. These are not illustrated. My translation takes advantage of this, and the second verse is about the same characters as the first, the lobster and the shark, as the first (see ASI 108-110). Having no sign of either owl or panther is admittedly against the norm of quotability (2.3.5.).

2.4. Norms and change

As an instance of change in translation norms, let me bring up the case of Pentti Saarikoski (1937–1983) and quote Arto Schroderus’ essay on his own retranslation
of J. D. Salinger’s *The Catcher in the Rye*, the first and famous translation of which was Saarikoski’s work (1961). "Saarikoski’s *Sieppari* is full of evidence proving that as a translator, he didn’t understand what he read particularly well. He was also careless, and what he failed to understand, he would either replace by making something up or leave out altogether. In short, he did all that a present-day professional is forbidden to do. The scale of errors ranges from little misunderstandings to brick-dropping. – A translator adhering to the methods used by Saarikoski in *Sieppari* would currently be out of work in no time.” (WSOY 2005:87, tr. A. M.) Schroderus also modestly reminds the reader that Saarikoski’s translation was and is much-loved and has affected Finnish culture far more than his own version is likely to. This is probably true, but Schroderus forgets that Saarikoski had the privilege of introducing the book, not only his translation. As a case of translators’ visibility, might Schroderus not then be considered the winner: his *Sieppari ruispellossa* in 2004 was regarded solely as a translation event, while Saarikoski had to share the attention he got with Salinger.

Without actually mentioning norms, what Schroderus is actually writing about is current norms in translation as compared to those in effect in Saarikoski’s day, and the change that has taken place.

Saarikoski was perhaps allowed a freer rein than other translators even of his own time. What is expected of a famous author as translator is likely to differ from what a so-called mere professional translator is supposed to do. Author-translation is perhaps seen as a nature force akin to the production of original literature. This idea embodies a division of translators into artists and artisans. It would be interesting to know whether the impression that at least prose translation has been mostly taken over by professionals over the last decades is correct: consider the authors Markku Lahtela and Eeva-Liisa Manner as well as Saarikoski, prolific also as translators; they don’t seem to have counterparts in present-day Finland. However, the question can only be settled by quantitative survey and this not the aim here. If I am right in seeing such a tendency, it is connected with the whole idea of translation becoming more professional, its practitioners specially trained and with perhaps a clearer sense of professional identity.
Since this development of the last fifty years has been going on and moving in the same direction as regards norms – the demand of more solid SL understanding and greater accuracy (and leading to a certain amount of retranslation), where are we now? I have been feeling for some time that the development is coming to a head – that translators cannot become any better in the present sense, cannot go further in the direction of more precision. But no human activity can stop at its zenith forever.

There may be signs of a turning point being reached in the development of Finnish translation norms: it is not impossible that the consensus about solid professional work will begin to crumble and freer experiments will sprout up. Adaptions may reappear and become a common and acceptable form of translation again. The position of English as a lingua franca could make itself felt in the process, and a form of Finnish strongly tinted with English offered (as it already has, though it has been turned down) as a legitimate language of translation into Finnish. What in the present consensus is regarded as incompetence and lack of SL skill may then present itself as a new way of looking at language and the cultural interplay involved in translation. Signs of this tendency have been visible for quite some time. There are the thoughts expressed by Walter Benjamin (1991 [1923]); there is postcolonial non-imperialistic translation with the idea that texts translated from small languages into English, for example, ought not to be deprived of their inherent character and made to read as "normal" English. Leevi Lehto wrote in favour of "clumsy word-for-word translation" in the same vein in his afterword to his 1990s' translation of Ashbery's Flow Chart (Lehto s.a.:217) and his essay "Varjot korvissamme" (2005:201).

As an editor, I have confronted proposed translations seriously manifesting the idea that the SL should be visible in the translation, resulting in what according to traditional norms is very bad translation that among other faults looks as if the translator didn't recognize SL idioms but translated them word for word. The idea of change and possible disruption is probably never welcomed by those settled in the mainstream (Toury 1995:62). Gatekeepers will no doubt keep big publishers and thus the bulk of translated literature to current norms for a very long time hence, even if my prediction does prove to carry some conviction. From the point
of view of norms as an intellectual matter, however, new questions will always want to be asked. An art form which has reached a consensus such as Finnish literary translation has does leave something to be desired from the intellectual point of view: a very human need to discover something new. At best, the attempt to gain acceptance for new translation norms may lead to translation as an activity becoming more visible and bring about heightened interest among readers.

2.5. Six translators' views on good translation

In 2004, I sent a modest questionnaire to the Finnish literary translators' mailing list Konteksti, asking colleagues to express their views on what translations should be like. I wanted to get at their idea of norms, but did not use the actual word normi, as I felt it might be understood in an even more severely judgmental way than in English. I received a correspondingly modest seven answers, one of which I discarded as being both enormously long and written by a person whose professional status was uncertain at the time. The six others who answered my questions were all well-established professional translators of English to Finnish. For one or two, translation was a part-time job, the rest worked full time.

In my questions, I focussed on the communal, intersubjective aspect of norms, hoping to gather proof of what I believed was the consensus the profession lives by. The questions were as follows:

What do you see as principles of translation work generally accepted among members of the translation profession? Do literary translators (into Finnish) share ideals of translation? What is a good translation like?

______________________________

3 Both the questions and answers were in Finnish and are given here in my translation. The original questions were as follows: Mitkä Sinun nähdäksesi ovat käännöstyön periaatteita, jotka ovat ammattikunnassa yleisesti hyväksyttyjä? Onko suomentajilla yhteisistä ihanteita, joihin pyritään? Millainen on hyvä suomennos?
As the questions were of a general nature, it is no surprise that there was no dramatic disagreement between the answers. The norm of accuracy was de facto mentioned by all under various expressions. The words "uskollisuus" (faithfulness) and "tarkkuus" (accuracy) as well as even "täsmällisyys" (precision) and "vastaavuus" (equivalence) were used. Pleasure in reading was mentioned as an aim, with the modification that it was an appropriate aim only if the ST was also a pleasure to read. Describing the aim of making the TT a work of art produced varying expressions but was seen as important. The relationship between ST and TT was constantly present in the answers. Producing good Finnish (norm of TL quality) was mentioned several times. One person said translating for children ought to be done specially well, pointing out that children could be baffled and intimidated by difficulties in the text. Quotability and the norm of harmony between TT and illustration didn't come up.

I shall proceed to report the answers of my respondents, calling them A, B, C, D, E, and F. Though the answers differed from each other greatly in form and length and detail, it was easy to see that the first four norms of my norm list (2.3.1.–2.3.4.) were referred to over and over again. The following is a brief drawing-up of the remarks made. I have picked out what can be understood as norm-statements and found they show general agreement amongst professionals at least on this level of generality. I shall finally consider whether the replies contained points that need to be added to the list.

1. Understanding. Respondent A pointed out that the translator must understand the ST through and through, even though conveying all the details in the TT may be impossible. B's point of view is problem-solving: details not fully understood must be ferreted out by using all necessary sources of information (Kontekstti mailing list, Internet, telephone, experts, books, newspapers, universities etc.). B added that sensitivity in grasping the idea of the ST and conveying it in the TT makes for a good translation. C mentioned the perpetual fear of not understanding ST nuances well enough.

2. Accuracy, fidelity, equivalence. This aspect was mentioned in every one of the answers. A said the TT must convey the style and meaning [Finnish: pitää vastata]
of the ST. Names, years and other facts must be checked, taking care not to correct mistakes made on purpose by the author. B made the interesting point that every thought verbally expressed in the ST should be translated (emphasis added; what about reading between lines?). The style of the ST must be visible in the TT, B also said. For C, the ideal is to strive towards equivalence with the ST as far as it is humanly possible. D's translator tries to convey the content and atmosphere of the ST to the readers as faithfully as possible [and] –– to translate the work as the author would have written it had s/he written it in Finnish to begin with. E underlined faithfulness to the SL: it is necessary to understand the words of the ST, take in its style, feel its atmosphere, grasp the author's intentions. The translation should be exact but not too precise, it should not translate word for word, but leave space for interpretation. The translator should not explain, add views of his own or iron things out. Small errors are excusable if the translator catches the author's style and purpose. F said simply that ST meanings are translated as accurately as possible, everything in the ST must be translated and facts must be checked. It was F who pointed out that equivalence does not always lead to fluency, stating that if the ST is idiomatic, the TT must also be.

3. TL quality. Language, the bricks and mortar of the house of translation, was also discussed by everybody. A and C said the TT must be good Finnish (if the ST is good SL, added A). B stressed the inherent nature of the TL, saying the translation must work in a way that respects this. C warned against allowing one's own linguistic mannerisms and preferences to show in the translation. Idiomacy of the TT was underlined by D, who said it shouldn't be possible to see "through" the TT what it says in the ST. According to D, the translator mustn't play unnecessary tricks but should nevertheless convey the possible originalities of the ST in a creative way. E mentioned faithfulness to the Finnish language and exhorted the use of good, nuanced language. [E also described a case of using correct TL where incorrect forms might have been appropriate, and debated whether "correct Finnish" should be regarded a general norm.] F mentioned that spelling and grammatical points must be checked, and maintained that it is vitally important to be idiomatic.
4. *Rhythm*. Not surprisingly, rhythm was mentioned by only three translators, and even then, their points of view differed. A's angle was that some (not all) translators of poetry try to capture the rhyme scheme and metrics of the ST. E took a more general view: The text must breathe. The last respondent wrote that part of the manner of the ST to be conveyed is the rhythm. If the TT, in addition to conveying the meaning of the ST, were also to sound like it, it would be rather a fine achievement. Differences between languages cannot be helped, but if one could retain some kind of basic rhythm, it would be likely to please the author. And the reader too. This was the view of respondent F.

As mentioned before, questions of illustration (cf. 2.3.6.) or of quoting specific passages (cf. 2.3.5.) did not come up in the answers. There was much description of the translation process and of points relating to translation commissions, so not all that was written actually related to norms. One new, extratextual norm can, however, be drawn from the answers; it seems worth mentioning, as it came up several times. Let us call it the norm of integrity, and add it as number 7. to the list of six norms we have already discussed.

7. *The norm of integrity*. To quote A: "I wish no one would undertake / have to undertake to translate a text that is against his or her moral, religious, philosophical or other such principles. – – A good translation gives the reader a feeling of trust, of the translator knowing his or her business." B wrote that one should know one's limits and not take a job that is too difficult or that one hasn't time to do properly, while C said: "One mustn't undertake to translate a book that goes badly against the grain [*joka on pahasti ristiriidassa omien sisuskalujen kanssa*]: it can't succeed. And even if the SL is one you know, you mustn't get involved with a SC completely unknown to you."

In other words, a translator should, before taking a commission, make sure that s/he will be professionally, and also mentally and emotionally, up to the job. It is often said that you can tell whether the translator has enjoyed doing the translation, even loved it. Helen Cixous comments on translation as an act of love: " – – to read – to translate – well, we have to go to the country of the text and bring back the earth of which the language is made. – – If we work on a text we don't love, we are
automatically at the wrong distance" (1997:227). Riitta Jääskeläinen, in looking at the translator's attitude to the task at hand, agrees that personal involvement seems to have a positive effect on the result (1999:207, 237). When forced to work in contradiction to one's own personality and principles, there can hardly be enjoyment for the reader to share, whereas a state of harmony between a competent translator and the ST leads to happier results. Commitment as an important element of a commission is also discussed in Martin (2001).
3 THROUGH THE LOOKING-GLASS

It is time to move on to looking at Lewis Carroll, or the writings of the Revd. Charles Lutwidge Dodgson published under that name. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* was published in 1865 by Macmillan, London. It took Charles Dodgson six years to complete his second Alice story, *Through the Looking-Glass*, which finally came out as a Christmas book at Macmillan's in 1871. Dodgson was very particular over questions of illustration; one reason for the delay was that John Tenniel first refused to illustrate the second book. (See Cohen 1995:131–132.) TLG is based on a game of chess played all over Looking-glass land, with Alice taking part as one of the Queens. Carroll also takes the opportunity to play around with issues debated at the time of writing, such as the theories of language behind some of Humpty Dumpty's remarks.

3.1 *Through the Looking-Glass* in Finland

Though *Alice in Wonderland* has, thanks to its first translator, children's author Anni Swan, been known to Finnish readers since 1906 (Carroll 1984b), *Through the Looking-Glass* was not translated before 1974, when the joint effort of Eeva-Liisa Manner and Kirsi Kunnas was published. Manner (1921–1995) was a prominent Modernist poet and prolific translator, and Kunnas (b. 1924), while also an important poet and translator, is best known and loved for her children's poetry. They had previously published a translation of AIW in 1972. Both their Carroll translations were published as a single volume under the title *Liisan seikkailut ihmemaassa ja Liisan seikkailut peilimaailmassa* in the Gummerus series of classics, with an afterword by Paavo Lehtonen, himself a well-known translator (Carroll 1974b).

As is often the case with sequels, the later book has never been as widely read in Finland as the former, but the Kunnas and Manner translation of "Jabberwocky", particularly its first verse, could be regarded as a classic in its own right. English-writing authors have a well-known penchant to quoting from Carroll. Because of this tendency in STs, if for no other reason, Finnish translators from English are
familiar with the Finnish version, *Liisan seikkailut peilimaailmassa*, and it is considered correct to quote from this work rather than translate the relevant snippets oneself. The translation seems only to have been reprinted once, in 1996. Although the book as a book doesn't seem to have become well-known in Finland, TLG lives on in various forms here too. At the 2005 Avanto Festival in Helsinki, for example, there was an installation inspired by Carroll, where my translation of "Jabberwocky" could be heard via earphones as part of the installation. See comment (77) in 4.2.2. for a discussion on the name.

3.2. Carroll and the retranslation hypothesis

Kaisa Koskinen and Outi Paloposki have looked at the question of retranslation from several points of view. In particular, they have tested what is known as the retranslation hypothesis, according to which new translations tend to be closer to their STs than older versions; they have found that the "picture is more complex and varied than discussions on retranslation have accounted for" (2005:194). They mention several extratextual forces that support or hinder retranslation, such as publishing policy, commercial interests, and financial or legislative incentives (ib. p. 195). The translation history of AIW, which has been a small part of their material, certainly supports the view that the need for retranslation does not necessarily arise from textual motives only.

My translation of AIW (ASI, Carroll 1995) is the third of four complete translations of the book into Finnish so far⁴. When accepting the commission I naturally gave thought to the relation of my prospective work to the two earlier versions, both by formidable predecessors. The reason I accepted the challenge can in retrospect be related to changes in norms. By the 1990s, it was possible to translate a children's classic such as AIW applying the norms that were generally valid in literary translation, rather than those specific to children's literature. Domesticating seemed mostly unnecessary, and so did the kind of textual changes that come about when aiming a translation at a child audience; I knew, then, from the start, that any version of Carroll produced by me would be fundamentally

---

⁴ The fourth is *Liisa Ihmemaassa* by Tuomas Nevanlinna (Carroll 2000).
different from the earlier ones, without seeking change for the sake of change alone.

It was left for me to decide which approach to take; all the publisher actually wanted was a new translation to publish with a set of new colour illustrations by Justin Todd (Carroll 1984a, 1986), alongside which, they decided, the seventy-year-old Swan translation (the rights of which WSOY was in possession of) would look old-fashioned and out of place (see Oittinen 1997:35). Had it been possible for WSOY to use the Gummerus-owned Kunnas and Manner translation for this purpose, it is unlikely a new translation would have been commissioned, but in the circumstances, what with rival publishers having their own territorial proprieties, they apparently felt I might be the answer.

Riitta Oittinen has amply compared the three versions throughout her book *Liisa, Liisa ja Alice* (1997), and I accept her general picture of Swan (Carroll 1984b) as domesticating and Kunnas and Manner (1974b) as free. Both are clearly aimed at a child audience, which has meant using domesticating strategies including omission of elements deemed too foreign or difficult. Oittinen gives each translation a label according to her view of its place in translation history, philosophical background, and inherent theory of translation: Swan is cannibalistic, Kunnas and Manner carnivalistic, and Martin post-modern (ib. pp. 126, 128–129, 132). I leave it to others to discuss these. But though Oittinen's views are often very much to the point, it is also true from my simple translator's point of view that I saw ASI matter-of-factly as one translation job among others, and subject to general translation norms. If ASI turned out to be a post-modern translation, this happened without the help of any consciously post-modern view or theory. As it relies on mainstream translation norms, there is nothing unusual or remarkable in not leaving out the passage describing Victorian bathing machines (Carroll 1995:22–23) or translating the blue caterpillar as blue (ib. p. 44), even though both the earlier Finnish versions did make the omission, and painted the blue caterpillar green. (See Oittinen 1996:57, 54.)

There seemed no reason to cut Finnish readers off from as much of Carroll’s wit as could possibly be translated into Finnish in a recognizably Carrollesque way. ASI
is indeed an openly admitted return to the ST, because it seemed to me this was a journey that had not yet been made in our TC. I would claim, however, that I would have translated it in exactly the same way had there been no previous translations (let us ignore the point that Finnish culture and its effects on present-day translators would not be precisely what it is had Swan and Kunnas and Manner not done their own part at the time). ASI is my translator's view of AIW, not an antithesis to its predecessors.

Paloposki and Koskinen point out that while there are examples to support the retranslation hypothesis in Finnish translation history, the story of AIW translation has been newly complicated by the fourth, once again more domesticating translation by Nevanlinna (Paloposki and Koskinen 2004:33). They discuss questions of whether datedness leads to retranslation, pointing out facts that do not fit this idea (ib. 34). Is it true that retranslation becomes necessary or at least possible when there has been a shift in translation norms since the appearance of a previous translation? This is hard to say, but such a shift did take place in Finland in the late 20th century: consider the growing demand for translation accuracy. The question of the retranslation hypothesis is, however, complicated by questions of translation ownership, rendering new translations necessary because older ones still within copyright are not available to other than their original publishers. New illustrations can also provide a motive for retranslation.

On the other hand, the Finnish children’s publisher Kustannus-Mäkelä published an edition of the Kunnas and Manner translation Liisan seikkailut ihmemaassa with Anthony Browne’s illustrations (Carroll 1989). While big general publishers must apparently each have their own translation of such a classic, it seems that a specializing publisher such as Kustannus-Mäkelä was able to make an arrangement to use a translation belonging to one of the large ones, Gummerus in this case.

Whether retranslation is ever actually necessary is a good question, and the answer is probably no. To the list of possible reasons for retranslation I might add yet one more, the fact that translators want to translate. While most retranslations are no doubt genuine commissions, there are cases of translators themselves persuading
publishers into showing cultural goodwill and ordering new renderings of old favourites. Getting such a job is considered extremely fortunate among the profession.
4 COMMENTARY ON TRANSLATING CARROLL

In this part of the study I propose to present comments on my translations of one and a half chapters of TLG: the whole of Chapter III, "Looking-Glass Insects", and the first half of Chapter VI, "Humpty Dumpty". (The translations are to be found in Part II.) Both chapters are of course included in the Kunnas and Manner translation (Carroll 1974b), thereby making my version a retranslation. When completed, the book Aicken seikkailut peilintakamaassa will also include the first Finnish translation of the passage known as "A Wasp in a Wig". This passage was discarded at Tenniel’s instigation (Cohen 1995:216) and lost until rediscovered in 1974 and published 1977 (see Carroll 1992:210 for the history). Cohen regards the passage as one of Carroll’s self-portraits, as one of his attempts to deal with his necessary parting of ways with Alice Liddell – an interpretation lending force and feeling to these pages. In this study only the title of the passage will be discussed (in 4.3.) as an example of self-revelation (see Fraser 1996:67).

Chapter III consists of a railway journey poking fun at geography textbook lingo and making lively dialogue, followed by Alice’s discussion with a pun-loving Gnat describing the ways of looking-glass insects, and ending with Alice passing through the wood where things have no names and meeting the Fawn. Chapter VI centres on the well-known nursery rhyme "Humpty Dumpty" coming to life and on Alice’s annoying and riddle-beriddled discussion with its protagonist. "Jabberwocky" and Humpty Dumpty’s elucidation of it are not included in this study, apart from the poem’s title.

The following chapters are part of my forthcoming translation, to be published by WSOY (© Alice Martin). The text presented here remains subject to change, and may not be quoted as the finished text. Although decisions still need to be made about the final details of the translation, the present version provides material for discussing norms and gives an opportunity for comments that may be useful in looking into the translation process.
Cohen points out that Carroll departed in many respects from the way of writing for children usual in the 1860s and '70s. One of his characteristics was not to explain what he meant or shun the use of words child readers might need to ask about (Cohen 1995:142–143). Consider the word proboscis, hardly part of every child's vocabulary (TLG 129). This point I rush to enlist in support of my own strategy of not writing 'down'. For proboscis, there was no harder word to be found than imukärsä, but note that käräs might have been used, were if not for this point known about Carroll's writing. TLG is nevertheless a children's book and should not be written 'up' any more than down. Translations of Carroll’s jokes must not be too far-fetched or rely on inordinately rare vocabulary.

I shall take up certain general or recurrent points here, before going on to the actual translation commentary, which concentrates on smaller details.

4.1. Commentary on "Looking-glass insects"

4.1.1. Placing of the reporting clause

Carroll often interrupts a sentence of quoted speech by inserting the reporting clause in the middle. This is a common phenomenon in English: "The medial placing of the reporting clause is very frequent" (Quirk 1972:785). Consider the example

"What's the use of their having names," the Gnat said, "if they wo'n't answer to them?"

But in Finnish, this is not a common feature. Hakulinen gives three pages to the placing of the reporting clause, but there is only a single example and no separate description of välijohtolause (2004:1417), so presumably it is considered a minor phenomenon. It is a point of debate among translators whether all medially placed ST reporting clauses should in the TT be placed either at the beginning or the end of the sentence, so as not to break it off in the middle.
In Chapter III of TLG there are in my opinion nine speeches which, if straightforwardly translated, have the reporting clause in a place unnatural for Finnish. These clauses are all marked in the translation with (A). Of these nine, six break off at a subordinate clause, as in the above example. Looking at my own translation in retrospect I find that of the nine cases, four have been rendered with normal Finnish syntax, changing the place of the reporting clause, while five retain Carroll's sentence break. Consider the following five:

"Noin pienen lapsen", sanoi vastapäätä istuva herrasmies (hän oli pukeutunut valkoiseen papperiin), "pitäisi tietää minnepäin on menossa, vaikkei tiedäkään omaa nimeään!"

"Jaloissasi ryömii", surviainen sanoi (ja sai Alicen vetämään äkkiä jalat koukkuun) "jos vain katsot, voileipäkuoriainen.

"No jos hän sanoi ’neiti’ eikä muuta”, surviainen huomautti, "sitten ei olisi muuta, ei tuntiakaan.

"Sinun ei pitäisi keksiä vitsejä”, Alice sanoi, "jos tulet niistä noin surulliseksi."

"No ainakin on ihanaa, kun ollut niin kuuma”, hän sanoi juuri kun astui puiden siimekseen, "päästä tänne – tänne – tänne minne?” hän jatko.

Four of these five are examples of Carroll suspending information – note particularly the dramatic effect in the voileipäkuoriainen example – and have consequently been translated using Carroll's structure. The fourth example, about jokes, is more neutral and will be changed to normal Finnish syntax in the full text of the chapter.

There is a general point to be made here. Where an author frequently uses a linguistic feature that does not readily translate into the TL but seems too important to be disregarded throughout, it is a strategy worth considering to translate a substantial number of the instances in a non-salient way, and a limited
number so as to retain signs of the SL feature. In this way the TC reader gets a clear enough picture of the author's style without being encumbered and possibly annoyed by continually recurring features that seem out of place in the TL.

4.1.2. Multiple-compound insect names

Names of looking-glass insects (marked (B) in the translation) follow a pattern:

real insect’s name: compound word Y + Z

looking-glass insect’s name: a triple compound word X + Y + Z, in which X + Y form a compound word nothing to do with insects and bringing about the joke

e.g. horse-fly – rocking-horse fly

What makes translating these jokes exceedingly difficult is Tenniel’s contribution, as there is a detailed illustration of each of these imaginary creatures. As a votary of the norm of harmony between text and illustration (see 2.3.6. and Martin 2001, 2005) I cannot disregard these, at least not before going to considerable effort to keep the norm.

The Hungarian translation by Tamás Révbíró has only one illustration, the rocking-horse fly. Two of the three insects are rendered as triple-compounds of the kind described above, while the third, zsemlepke, is different. It is formed by an overlap of zsemle 'roll, sämpylä' and lepke 'butterfly. (Carroll 1980:30–32.) This seems to me an acceptable way of handling the problem, if using the same punning mechanism as Carroll himself doesn't work.

There is also a question relating to the frequency of words in the SL and TL. The search for insects with compound names ought to be limited to common ones, those that children could be expected to know, lest the joke might go unnoticed. Carroll himself starts with the very common insect names horse-fly, dragon-fly and butterfly, 'paarma, sudenkoento, perhonen'. Even the word hevoskärpänen is
not right in this respect. Horsefly is *paarma*, a common summer nuisance, but *hevoskärpänen* is an insect limited to pestering horses, thus not of the same generality. Still, it can be regarded transparent enough to pass muster, considering that the translator – and the reader – is faced with Tenniel’s picture of an unmistakable rocking-horse with wings.

Snap-dragon-fly involves the old Christmas game of snapdragon (see Carroll 1985:223), and that explains the details of Tenniel's picture. My first attempt at translating it led to the immediately discarded version *leipäsdunkenkorento*. Carroll would, judging by all I have read about his attitudes, have found it unthinkable to use a word of as dubious morals as *leipäsus*, 'common-law wife or husband; mistress'. Here we see in operation a norm that could be verbalized as ”don’t violate the author’s moral views”. It is an example of norm-type 3, norms relevant to a particular case but not necessarily all others (see hierarchy of norms 2.2.).

*Kananlentomuurahainen* (‘plan that fell flat’ + ‘winged ant’) is satisfactory as a joke in itself, but jars badly with the illustration and the references to Christmas. Either the insect name or how the picture is verbally interpreted by the Gnat will have to be changed in the final APT.

The third insect name, *Bread-and-butter-fly*, with the Gnat's explanation, is not a very good joke in English, and the Finnish is unsatisfactory. *Leipäkuoriainen*, transparent as the word is, is an insect not widely enough known. Incorporating *voileipä*, 'sandwich', covers this fault somewhat.

4.1.3. Comments on specific points 1–40

(1) *mehiläästä mailin päästä*: bees a mile off. Here *maili* is chosen rather than *kilometri* for the sake of alliteration and rhythm. In ASI (p. 53) the expression *kilometrikaupalla kaulaa* was used for the same reason. See Oittinen for a discussion on the existing translations' ways of treating measurements (1997:38–39).
(2) *pysäytty itsensä:* checked herself. The Finnish is not entirely idiomatic, but was chosen because it expresses Alice's conscious control over herself. *Pysähtyi* 'stopped' would be a neutral alternative, *otti itsäätä niskasta kiinni* an even more salient one.

(3) *kun kysytään oliko mukava kävely:* when they ask me how I liked my walk. The translation aims at natural TL, not reproducing unnecessary personal pronouns, and uses the passive, where Carroll has Alice's mysterious adult group *they*, which if translated *he* makes unidiomatic Finnish, when the referents are unknown.

(4) *hihii:* Ø. The interjection is added because of the phrase *what fun: and what fun it'll be when they ask...* Translating *entäs miten hauskaa on sitten kun kysytään...* would have made the sentence too full.

(5) *heilautti päätään tutulla tavalla:* here came the favourite little toss of the head. Good TL requires a verbal rather than a nominal construction.

(6) *juoksi mäkeä alas kuutta pikku puroa kohti ja hyppäsi ensimmäisen yli:* ran down the hill, and jumped over the first of the six little brooks. To avoid the stiff, translation-smacking construction *hyppäsi kuudesta pikku puorosta ensimmäisen yli*, or even worse, *hyppäsi ensimmäisen kuudesta pikku puorosta yli*, the picture is slightly altered to show the Finnish reader first the six brooks and then the jump.

(7) *Näytän lapsi lippusi! – Älä lapsi viivyttä häntä! – Show your ticket, child! – Don't keep him waiting, child!* Addressing a person by name or nominal expression is far less common in Finnish than English. Placing the address form thus makes it more natural than having it at the end.

(8) *tuhat puntaa:* a thousand pounds. The rhythmical chanting repeated four times works better with *puntaa* than it would with *markkaa*, though *markka* was used in ASI (p. 26). The assonance with the *u* sound recurs with the words *tuuma, tupru,* and finally with Alice's thought, *tuhat puntaa unta.*
(9) ei ollut lipunmyyntiä: there wasn't a ticket-office. While lipunmyynti as a place seems rather a modern concept, it is used because of its neutrality and familiarity and in the belief that it will not stand out as much as a period word might.

(10) hirveä ääni: a hoarse voice. As the little voice suggests, Alice could make a joke about hirvi and hirveä. The problem is that hirveä 'terrible' conveys the wrong meaning: there is nothing frightening about the character. A construction based on kakoa, 'cough', and kako 'nutcase' is not adequate as kako is a slang word and would hardly fit the dialogue. A good solution remains yet to be found. Tenniel fortunately didn't produce a horse illustration.

(11) Lapsia – varovasti: Lass, with care. Here Finnish offers a pun almost more readily than English.

(12) hänellä on jo valmiiksi kuningattaren pää: she's got a head on her. This reference to stamps with the head of Queen Victoria conveys one of Carroll's morbid jokes on mortality but also hints at Alice's intelligence and her future as a Queen. The translation chooses to underline the last of these meanings. If the reader gets a glint of the guillotine, it is hardly off the point.

(13) Älä viitsi kiusata: Don't tease so. Viitsiä is one of the uniquely Finnish elements mentioned by Tirkkonen-Condit (2005:123–124). Translators have long been aware of such elements and favoured them when possible to keep them "alive"; the verb fits the purpose here very naturally.

(14) Alice olisi sanonut sille jotain myötätuntoista ja lohduttavaa, "jos se vain huokaisi niin kuin muut ihmiset!": Alice would have said something pitying to comfort her, "if it only would sigh like other people!" Carroll occasionally uses sentences that change midway from reported thought to quoted thought. They have been translated in the same manner, as they seem one of the elements of Carroll's personal style.
(15) *Eikä aikaakaan kun: in another moment.* The Finnish is a phrase occurring in folk tales and older children's literature. It was also used in ASI (pp. 15, 34 for example) and is here used as one of the linking elements between the two books.

(16) *Siellä mistä minä tulen ne eivät puhu mitään: None of them ever talk, where I come from.* What is denied differs slightly from ST to idiomatic TT, but this seems to change the meaning very little. Italics being one of Carroll's style markers they are used in the translation more than is typical in original Finnish texts.

(17) *mitä iloa: what use.* The idiomatic Finnish phrase is chosen in preference to the ever-present expression *mitä hyötyä.*

(18) *anna kuulua niitä hyönteisiä: go on with your list of insects.* As Alice hasn't yet started her list, a literal translation such as *jatka hyönteisluetteloasi* would seem odd and would hardly carry any necessary addition of meaning.

(19) *Se täyttää mahansa purulla ja mahlalla: Sap and sawdust.* A literal translation *(mahlalla ja sahanpurulla)* seemed feeble in comparison to the ST, so the proximity of the words *sahanpuru* and *mahanpurut* 'tummy-ache' was used as well as the resemblance of *maha* and *mahla* 'sap'.

(20) *Entä jos sitä ei löytyisikään?: Supposing it couldn't find any?* It is more idiomatic to use the Finnish verb *löytyä* with *tea* etc. as subject than to translate "*entä jos se ei löytäisikään sitä/niitä*," which would also have required two demonstrative pronouns to appear in the same sentence, since *any* has no Finnish equivalent that works here.

(21) *vähän aikaa: for a minute or two.* English seems to express imprecise times more precisely than Finnish, so minutes are not mentioned.

(22) *Ei kai haluaisi hukata nimeäsi: I suppose you don't want to lose your name?* The verb *lose* is a common translation problem, as the semantic fields of the English and Finnish verbs involved do not coincide. Carroll may mean Alice to understand 'lose your reputation'; if so, the TL verb would be *menettää* and the
structure to use would be "menettää hyvän nimensä". As the story goes on, however, it is really a question of losing or mislaying one's name, for which the natural verb is hukata. Kadottaa is also possible but a touch too literary for the overall style chosen.

(23) kotiopettajatar; palveluskunta: governess; servants. Details of the kind of life a Victorian girl of Alice Liddell's class would have led, as referred to by Carroll, are translated without any attempt at domestication. This is in accordance with the overall norm of accuracy and is almost taken as a matter of course.

(24) *Ei silti, en tiedä...: And yet I don't know...* The paragraph provides an opportunity to illustrate the effect of mechanical, over-faithful translation. Consider the following:

"Ei silti, en tiedä", surviainen jatki huolettomalla äänellä: "ajattele vain kuinka kätevää olisi, jos onnistuisit menemään kotiin ilman sitä! Esimerkiksi jos kotiopettajatar haluaisi kutsua sinua tunneille, hän huutaisi 'Tule tänne – – ', ja siihen hänen täytyisi lopettaa, koska ei olisi mitään nimeä jonka hän voisi huutaa, ja tietenkään sinun ei tarvitsisi mennä, tiedäthän."

I find this speech too full of words to be pleasing, so have dropped some references to person and taken a few short cuts, also using the common idiomatic Finnish verb *päästä* to cover "manage to go".

(25) *oli tainnut huokaista itsensä hengiltä: really seemed to have sighed itself away.* The SL seems reminiscent of sorrowing lovers, and the word *really* seems to say, "they're always sighing themselves away, but this Gnat really did it and disappeared altogether". As there is no such Finnish verbal tradition to fall back on, the passage has been translated 'sighed itself to death'. The verb *taitaa* is a frequent one in spoken Finnish, non-literary but in my opinion well suited to the style here; it makes it unnecessary to use an explanatory adverb such as *ilmeisesti*. 
(26) edessä aukeni niitty: she very soon came to an open field. Cf. *hän tuli pian avoimen niityn luo. In Finnish, the landscape traditionally comes to meet the wanderer.

(27) kun astun puitten alle: when I go in. The translation "kun menen sisäään" is impossible, "kun menen sinne" weak, so Alice 'steps under the trees' in the TT.

(28) tottelee nimeä Viima: answers to the name of "Dash". The TT verb structure is the idiomatic equivalent of the ST one, but somewhat outdated. It also presents a problem later, when Alice thinks of finding her own name; in English, the verb to answer is used in its basic meaning there, while the verb totella cannot do a like semantic shift. Though the translation is not entirely satisfactory as to this point, the problem does not seem too serious.

The dog's name Dash, at least to the modern reader, plays mildly with the idea of a dash in place of a lost name; Viiva doesn't work as a dog name, so Viima is chosen. It seems possible that this may remain a joke to be enjoyed by the translator alone.

(29) päästä tänne – tänne – tänne minne? get into the – into the – into what? Alice asks herself two very rhythmical (dactylic) questions, so the Finnish attempts at something similar. The problem lies with grammatical differences, as the TT structure employs the illative and genitive cases and points at the missing words "metsäään; puun alle", where the ST structure in both cases is preposition + X.

(30) Ihan varmasti se alkaa L:lät!: L, I know it begins with L! What Alice thinks she means was left as a mystery by Carroll, but see Martin Gardner's three explanations (Carroll 1985:226). A translator must be wary of such details, as something vaguely pointed at in the ST may not work at all if simply repeated as such in the TT. Because my translation uses Alice's original first name, repetition seems the sensible thing to do here, however. The earlier translation, where the name is Liisa, says "I, minä tiedän, että se alkaa I:lät!" (Carroll 1974b:171) taking the cue from the second letter of the name, as L would be the right letter and thus wouldn't get the point.
(31) Silloin vastaan tuli pieni kauris: Just then a Fawn came wandering by. Such simple sentences can be far from easy to get right. For the time being, I have chosen the typical folk-tale phrasing vastaan tuli + subject. It gets the direction wrong, as the paths of the Fawn and Alice meet and join to go in the same direction, out of the wood. The idiomacy of the phrase makes it unlikely that the literal meaning should surface much.

The proper noun for the Fawn is not easy to decide, as the taxonomy of kauris, peura, hirvi and poro is rather vague to many Finns, nor are they familiar with the kind of deer so well-known in England. The word that would come most naturally when speaking to Finnish children might even be bambi. This being inappropriate, kauris, pieni kauris and kauriinvasa are all used.

(32) Tule, tule!: Here now! Here now! Exclamations are notoriously difficult to translate. Tuku tuku (the polite way of addressing a sheep or lamb) could also be considered as an alternative. The possibility comes to mind that Alice may be using an English phrase usually spoken to dogs, which would be inappropriate and funny; this possibility should be either eliminated or established.

(33) Miksi sinä sanot itseäsi?: What do you call yourself? The English idiom is used several times by Carroll, and here it seems literal translation is necessary, as it draws attention to Alice's ability to identify herself verbally. Just above, the same phrase was used of a tree and translated there Miksikä sitä sanotaan?, using a more natural TL phrasing.

(34) kulki kädet rakkaasti kauriin kaulan ympärillä: with her arms clasped lovingly round the soft neck of the Fawn. Clasp is a verb often difficult to translate into Finnish, as nearly all equivalent expressions require the particle kiinni as well as a verb. Tenniel's illustration of just this moment is not to be ignored, and the Finnish expresses the picture very simply. It avoids using rakastavasti, preferring the more poetic and archaic rakkaasti. It also could not accommodate the idea of softness without going over the top with sweetness: particularly the adjective pehmoinen, common enough in the language of children, would have ruined what is an unusually touching moment with Carroll.
Sen suloisin ruskeisin silmiin välähti säikähdys, ja samassa se oli jo pinkaisu tiehensä täyttä laukkaa: A sudden look of alarm came into its beautiful brown eyes, and in another moment it had darted away at full speed. The TT aims at expressing suddenness by means of rhythm: välähti säikähdys incorporates the meaning of seven ST words. The adverb jo has been added, as it is extremely common in Finnish and often gives a passage the rhythmical balance it needs. (Conversely, it is likely that Finnish texts incompetently translated into English contain far too many instances of already to seem natural.)

(36) tienviitoista: finger-posts. There is no Finnish equivalent giving the idea of a hand-shaped post, which may have been a neutral word in the 19th century (see OED s.v. finger-post). I have tried to discover whether the way the text is presented in The Annotated Alice (Carroll 1985:228), within frames with little hands attached, counts as a Tenniel illustration: the Norton edition (Carroll 1992:137) has the text of the posts merely amidst the text, and so do Carroll 1921 and Carroll 1937. As the Finnish tienviitta seems colourless, the verb viitata is used additionally for underlining the meaning (mikään ei viitannut siihen...); see also (37).

(37) seisoi kaksi tienviittaa kuin nakutettuna: there were sure to be two finger-posts. The idiom kuin nakutettu 'sure as anything' seems well suited to describe posts that have been hammered into the ground. The phrase belongs to easy-going spoken language but not slang.

(38) Tätä tietä Töttörömin taloon/Töttöröön taloon tätä tietä: To Tweedledum's house/ To the house of Tweedledee. Carroll uses both English genitives, so the Finnish adds tätä tietä to enable varying word order without resorting to e.g. *Taloon Töttöröön, a phrasing out of the question for finger-posts.

(39) sanon päivää: say 'How d'ye do?' The Finnish gives Alice's planned greeting as reported speech, which looks more natural than marking it as a quotation.
Niin hän kulki... : So she wandered on... Carroll strings clauses together, giving a pleasant meandering effect and not really marking Alice's shock stylistically; the translation, however, seemed to require a dash to mark the surprise. In the ST, Alice turns a sharp corner; note that in the TT, it is the road that turns. Finnish fairytale woods seem to be alive, a feature that may find its way into translations as well.

4.2. Commentary on "Humpty Dumpty" (first half)

4.2.1. Humpty Dumpty's style

In translating Humpty Dumpty's speech, I must have formed a subconscious image of him as a language user, for looking at the TT after quite a long interval, I find I have given him many expressions that are far from neutral. Consider the rather literary tavattoman kiusallista and mitä kiusallisinta, palataanpa viimeistä edelliseen replikkiin, or voipi olla ettet koskaan tapaa toista samanmoista, or kuitenkaan kaikitenkaan. On the other hand, he also uses clearly spoken forms such as puliset itsekesi, jaa, vai niin!, et sanonut mitään sinne päinkään!, no niin oli!, minäpä osaan hallita koko revohkaa, nääs, and anna kuulua. It is to be hoped that the overall impression is appropriately balanced: using either literary or spoken language on its own would both probably have spoilt the chapter, the one by making it too convoluted and annoyingly learned, the other by going to the other extreme. One must also note that Carroll doesn't really give his characters strongly distinguishing speech styles. Humpty Dumpty differs, however, from e.g. the White Knight, by being seen entirely from the outside: the repartee gives no cause for empathy of sensitivity, though Alice's worry for Humpty Dumpty's welfare is mentioned a couple of times. His Finnish speech style therefore aims rather at being vivid and funny, self-centered and unemotional, in order to convey the picture I have of the character.

4.2.2. Comments on specific points 41–77

(40) suureni suurenemistaan ja ihmisty ihmistymistään: got larger and larger, and more and more human. A typically Finnish verbal construction is used here,
one that I give preference to over phrases with e.g. *enemmän ja enemmän*, which though not incorrect are used more than necessary in translations from English to Finnish. The construction is iconic and expresses continuance or abundance by means of repetition (Hakulinen 2004:1635). The verb *ihmistyä* glances (frivolously) at Job 11:12, "onttopäinen mies voi viisastua ja villiaasin varsa ihmistyä" (1938 translation).

(42) *Nakkelis Kokkelis: Humpty Dumpty.* Carroll uses the well-known nursery rhyme, underlining that Alice knows the rhyme as a matter of course and recognizes its central character when she meets him. (It might be worth checking what visual representations of Humpty Dumpty were around before Tenniel's version, and whether Carroll could have been referring to these.) Kunnas discusses the history of the character and mentions the Finnish version of the riddle, "Lilleri lalleri" (Carroll 1974b:280–281). The alternatives for APT were thus *Lilleri lalleri*, *Tyyris Tyllerö* or a completely new translation. *Lilleri lalleri* has no element of arrogance, and the Finnish rhyme doesn't mention the king's horses and men. *Tyyris Tyllerö* (as in Carroll 1974b) belongs, as it were, to Kirsi Kunnas, because it first appeared in her translation of English nursery rhymes, *Hanhiemon iloinen lipas* (2006:48). It was natural for Kunnas and Manner to use it, but not for me. Granted that *tyyris* is an excellent word to describe the character of Humpty Dumpty, I have always been bothered with the change of sex involved in using *tyllerö*, a word usually meaning a plump little girl.

The new translation chosen alludes both to pride and to eggs. *Nakkelis* may bring to mind the phrase *nakella niskojaan* (used e.g. in ASI, p. 73 and APT about Humpty Dumpty himself), a gesture of annoyance and arrogance, as well as the verbs *nakella* and *nakata* referring to throwing and thereby also falling. *Kokkelis* recalls *munakokkel*, 'scrambled eggs'. Put together, the two evoke the idea of eggs being thrown and smashed (and resemble a sentence: "nakkelis kokkeliks"). They also echo the idiom *mukkelis makkelis*, an onomatopoeic children's expression (cf. *topsy-turvy*) used when somebody trips up and falls, also appearing here in the translation of the nursery rhyme itself. What with the elements of pride (*hump*) and downfall (*dump*) and eggs (inherent in the tradition of the rhyme), it seems that *Nakkelis Kokkelis* is not an unsatisfactory solution, considering that it was
impossible to rely on a preformed version of the rhyme, and that no traditional
elements could therefore be summoned.

(43) jalat turkkilaiseen tapaan ristissä: his legs crossed like a Turk. Mentioning
Turks is not necessary for meaning, but the reference is retained as part of the
historical backdrop of the Alice books; consider the Crimean war and Turkey's
role in the history of Dodgson's time.

(44) näytätte munalta: you looked like an egg, Sir. Alice is a child with good
manners, and she calls the stranger Sir to begin with. Hence the Finnish verb form
expressing politeness.

(45) Muurin päällä...: Humpty Dumpty.... The translation is a new one. To
compensate a little for the loss or non-existence of common background that the
ST displays, the well-known humorous phrase ratsuväki saapuu is included: it
brings to mind just the kind of rescue party required. The overlong last line
imitates Carroll, who doesn't use the best-known form of the poem. (See Carroll
1992:159, footnote, included in the Appendix of this study.)

(46) Mitä sinä siinä itseksesi puliset: Don't stand chattering to yourself like that. I
discarded the translation *Älä seiso siinä pulisemassa itsekseesi, choosing one that
is more idiomatic, rude and sharp.

(47) epävarmana: doubtfully. See second instance further down. The choice of
word underlines the balance of power between Alice and Humpty Dumpty; cf. the
effect of epäluuloisena (suspecting that one is being deceived), and epäileväisenä
(similar, but with a taste of philosophical doubt involved). Epävarma puts one in a
position of weakness.

(48) nauraa pääräytti: with a short laugh. Such hardly noticeable, frequent ST
expressions are worth giving a thought. Consider *nauraen lyhyesti, which is
slightly odd as well as lacking in vigour. Let this comment not be taken to mean
that I approve of adding colour; rather, it seems the Finnish two-verb expression is
quite a precise equivalent of the ST. Which Finnish onomatopoeic verb to use in
the second place is a matter of taste, and the more idiomatic nauraa hörähti would certainly be possible, were it not for the good-naturedness inherent in hörähtää.

(49) hän oli vain huolissaan: simply in her good-natured anxiety. Fitting in a verbal equivalent for good-natured made the passage sound Sunday-schoolish; taking care of another is virtuous enough in itself, so I chose the simple solution.

(50) "Ratsuväki saapuu", Alice erehtyi pistämään väliin.: "To send all -- " , Alice interrupted, rather unwisely. Here Alice gets the opportunity to use the well-known phrase on its own. Note the reporting clause's use of erehtyi. In translating ASI, I discovered this verb, which seemed to be the very thing to translate Carroll's verb venture with: it carries the same element of immediate regret.

(51) Luin sen kirjasta –– Maamme historia, siis.: It's in a book -- History of England, that is. This passage I do not yet understand to my satisfaction. The idea of a future event appearing in a history book suits looking-glass logic perfectly, but there may be more to it. Translating the first remark as 'I read it in a book' makes idiomatic Finnish, but it may be necessary to go back to a more literal translation.

(52) kurottihe eteenpäin: he leant forwards. Chances to use – and keep alive – Finnish reflexive verb forms are few and far between. I am not yet persuaded that they ought to be given up completely, though there are only a few forms of the paradigm that people understand anymore.

(53) kurottihe –– (ja lähestulkoon putosi –– ) ja ojensi Alicelle kättään: he leant forwards (and -- nearly fell off -- ) and offered Alice his hand. Whether the repetition of ja makes for a rhythmically satisfying sentence is doubtful. I do not much like to use the second infinitive instructive (here it would be ojentaen), but here it may be worth considering.

(54) Alice tarttui siihen mutta piti hääntä huoletuneena silmällä: She watched him a little anxiously as she took it. What to do with basic sentences like this? The changes in the order and way of presenting the events must be automatic; consider
a direct translation: *Hän tarkasteli häntä vähän huolestuneena kun hän otti sen –
Alice tarkasteli häntä vähän huolestuneena kun tarttui käteen – Alice tarkasteli
häntä huolissaan tarttuessaan käteen. The versions keep improving, but even the
last one is dull translationese. The solution chosen makes the concrete action,
taking the hand, the centre, which seems natural in Finnish. Ending the sentence
with Alice's watching also leads neatly on to the next sentence.

(55) Kamala jos se lähtisi irti! I'm afraid it would come off! The translation
borrows a phrase from typical little girls' speech; it might be considered too free.
*Pelkään että se lähtisi irti is, however, out of the question.

(56) ratsuväki: kaikki kuninkaan hevset ja miehet: all his horses and all his men.
I have added here a reference to the original Humpty Dumpty rhyme, which will
probably be recognizable to many Finnish readers, despite the fact that it has no
fixed verbal form in Finnish, and the original Kunnas translation also leaves the
cavalry out ("eikä Tyyristä Tylleröä milloinkaan / voi kukaan parantaa",

(57) he panisivat asiat järjestykseen yhdessä hujauksessa!: They'd pick me up
again in a minute, they would! The TT goes for idiomacy, as I have so far not
found a satisfactory translation for pick me up. Yhdessä hujauksessa is an
expression also used in ASI, pp. 10, 33, so it is a linking element between the two
books.

(58) riemuitsi: exclaimed triumphantly. ST verb + adverb are rendered with a
single TT verb. Finnish offers many verbs that lend themselves to this kind of
compact writing. The choice of riemuita is probably an echo from Laila Järvinen's
translations of Tove Jansson's Moomin books.

When the ST reporting clause is neutral, so is the TT. Touching up an author's
style, particularly by translating recurrent reporting clauses (he said) by using
different speech verbs every time, was notoriously practiced by former generations
of translators, and is avoided by those working now.
(60) *Ylpeys ei salli, vai?: Too proud?* Again, literal translation seemed unsatisfactory, and a rather literary formula was chosen. Finnish has several ways of marking questions; merely adding a question mark to a declarative clause is not always the best, though its use is on the increase.

(61) *Mokomasta vihjauksesta Alice närkästyi yhä enemmän:* *Alice felt even more indignant at this suggestion.* Alice's indignation goes back to the remark before, and the direct word order (*Alice närkästyi – vihjauksesta*) didn't give the right emphasis in context, though the sentence was acceptable as such.

(62) See 2.3.1.

(63) *Hei, onpa sinulla hieno vyö!* *What a beautiful belt you've got on!* *Hei* is another element of spoken Finnish made use of here. It marks a change of topic.

(64) *nosti polven toisen päälle ja kädet polven päälle:* *crossed one knee over the other and clasped his hands round it.* Physical gestures and postures are notoriously difficult to translate. The verb *clasp* has already been discussed in comment (34). The TT here aims more at effective rhythm and the visual effect of piling limbs on top of each other than at neutral idiomacy.

(65) *ei ole oma syntymäpäivä:* *it isn't your birthday.* *Oma* is added in order to avoid using the second person singular; *oma* and *own* behave in rather different ways in the two languages.

(66) *Syntymäpäivätähjat ovat kivempia:* *I like birthday presents best.* The comparative, rather than the superlative, is of course used here, and Alice's preference is expressed in what seems a more idiomatic TT phrasing than *pidän enemmän syntymäpäivätähjistä,* which is by no means wrong. The reason for the choice may lie in the tendency of Finnish to underline the "experiencing person" less than English: it is one of my standard practices to leave a great many "I"s untranslated, as the person is often implicitly clear in Finnish anyway. Another
point worth noting here is that the verb *pitää* requires the elative case, so using it would make the long word yet a syllable longer.

(67) The calculation: I mention this because one does not always notice that nonverbal elements are part of the whole and may also require translating. Here a Finnish reader would need to see a minus sign, so I have added one.

(68) *Sinulla on se nurinpäin kädessä!* You're holding it upside down! *Holding* is expressed by mentioning a hand. The TT is what I heard when asking myself the question 'how would I actually say it in Finnish?' Note that this meant not using the active second-person verb form.

(69) *En oikein ymmärrä mitä tarkoitat riemulla:* I don't know what you mean by 'glory'. An example of a slightly less than idiomatic translation, this looks forward to the approaching discussion of the nature of meaning, centering on the idea that a person actively gives a word its meaning. Note that the inverted commas marking *glory* are not necessary in Finnish.

(70) *kumpi määräät:* which is to be master. From the point of view of the norm of understanding, it is necessary to realize the power struggle is not between Humpty Dumpty and Alice, but between a word and its speaker. *Kumpi määräät* is a strong expression; no TL phrase bringing in a closer equivalent of 'master' could be found.

(71) *on niillä sisua:* they've a temper. *Sisu*, though almost a domesticating element, is used, though it adds the idea of 'guts' to that of *temper*.

(72) *verbit ovat koppavimpia:* they're the proudest. While Finnish has an extraordinary number of vivid expressions denoting every shade of pride, it will be necessary to look at pride as a factor in this chapter as a whole, and consider whether using a single word might be advisable after all.
(73) **adjektiivit saa suostumaan mihin tahansa, verbejä ei:** adjectives you can do anything with, but not verbs. The TT is more strongly personifying than the ST, but this seems in harmony with what is being said about them.

(74) **nyt riittää tästä aiheesta:** we've had enough of that subject. The ST expresses who has had enough, whereas the TT doesn't need to explicate it.

(75) **-- loppuiäksesi:** -- rest of your life. This long speech by Humpty Dumpty has a satisfying rhythm that I have tried not so much to reproduce as recreate. The TT manages to accommodate the phrase *kuitenkaan kaiittenkaan*, a typical (and potentially annoying) mannerism of some speakers of Finnish.

(76) **Olet selvästi etevä selittämään sanoja:** You seem very clever at explaining words, Sir. Here the earlier TT solution for *Sir* (see (44)) doesn't work. The conversation has been such that continuing to use the polite Finnish te-form would have been impossible, nor is it at all natural that Alice should suddenly revert to it here. Adding the adverb *kohteliaasti* or *tahdikkaasti* to the following reporting clause is a possible solution. When making an addition it is important, however, to make sure it does not lead to accidental repetition.

(77) **Monkerias: Jabberwocky.** My translation for both the name of the poem "Jabberwocky" and the dragonish creature in it is *Monkerias*; Kunnas and Manner call their poem "Pekoraali", which is an existing literary term of abuse meaning a bombastic piece of writing containing ignorant mistakes; their monster is *Pekoralisti* (Carroll 1974:146–146, 209). (Before coming across the literary term *pekoraali*, I saw in the name the elements *pekoni* 'bacon' and *koraali* 'hymn', 'choral' – indeed, they are there, even if the complete word also exists.) I cannot emulate such erudite joking, but hope readers will recognize the -*ias* ending familiar from the Finnish name of the *Iliad*, and pick up on the connotations of eels and contorted jabbering (*ankerias, mongertaa*).
4.3. Seeking a title: "A Wasp in a Wig"

The passage called "A Wasp in a Wig", now placed at the end of some editions of TLG (e.g. Carroll 1992:211–214) was written along with the rest of the book and discarded at the insistence of John Tenniel as impossible to illustrate (Cohen 1995:216). It was lost for a hundred years, but though rediscovered in the 1970s, it hasn't gained its original place at the end of Chapter VIII and is only to be found in academic editions of the book. My forthcoming translation will be the first Finnish rendering of this episode.

The phrase of the heading seemed at first quite impossible to translate satisfactorily. In English it is simple, natural, neatly alliterative; in Finnish, the common words that come to mind produce the flat-sounding ampiainen peruukissa. The construction itself is problematic. The Finnish inessive case used to express 'wearing sth’, e.g. nainen punaisessa takissa, is common but not the only alternative, cf. Puss-in-Boots: Saapasjalkakissa; man in evening dress: frakkipukuinen mies or mies frakki päällä/yllä(än). With the inessive, there is a notion of "insideness” not called for – picture poika isänä hatussa as a little boy sitting in his father's hat. This may be slightly far-fetched, but consider that with an insect in question, the phrase ampiainen peruukissa certainly first brings to mind a wasp tangled into somebody's wig, rather than a wig-sporting wasp.

The most favoured way of putting the notion of a wasp wearing a wig would be peruukkipäinen ampiainen, 'wig-headed wasp'. This is a flatly serious phrase; why would Carroll write about somebody like that? Let us see whether a more satisfactory wording can be found by listing possible Finnish ingredients:
WASP:
ampiainen
mehiläinen
kimalainen
mettiäinen
herhiläinen
pörriäinen
vaapsahainen
vaaksiainen (daddy-long-legs)

WIG:
peruukki
valetukka
tekotukka
kiharat
valkki
hiuslisäke
irtokiharat/-tukka/-lisäke


The next move is to cut down the alternatives. Mehiläinen 'bee' is too nice, mettiäinen even worse with its poetic summer-sweet connotations. Kimalainen 'bumble-bee' and pörriäinen, a children’s word for a friendly buzzing insect, are not suitable for describing an emaciated and peevish old creature. Both vaapsahainen and herhiläinen are kinds of wasps, and wasps (ampiaiset) belong to the family myrkkypiistiäiset. Pistiäinen is, then, a higher-level concept than the rest, but inclusive of our particular sub-category wasp. The insect list gives four near-synonyms without even using poetic licence, which would not be out of the question with Carroll. It may be noted that that since Tenniel refused to illustrate
this passage, there is nothing to stop calling the creature a dragon-fly or a worm, should this provide a satisfactory solution.

Can the inessive construction be avoided? *Peruukkipäinen pistiäinen* is a possibility. The combination *herhilaïnen* + *hiuslisäke* seems promising, but a satisfactory adjectival construction cannot be formed (*hiuslisäkkeinen* or *hiuslisäkkeellinen herhilaïnen*) and besides, *herhilaïnen* 'hornet' carries connotations of wildly restless movement and the idea of bothering somebody, whereas this particular wasp is a character sitting quietly on the ground and wanting to be left alone. As a last attempt to use *herhilaïnen* let us consider *herhilaïsen hiuslisäke*. Alas, the wig is not the centrepiece of the chapter, and this expression gives it too much weight.

Is *vaapsahainen* *valetukassa* a possibility? This insect is not quite so familiar as the others; it presents no clear image. What is in favour of this solution is the proximity of the formation *x valepuvussa*, 'x in disguise’, an inessive construction much used. On the other hand, the adjectival *valepuuniksen x*, is familiar, too. *Valetukkainen vaapsahainen*, then? Is the resemblance in alliteration, V – V to Carroll’s W – W, a point in its favour? *Peruukki* is of course the most neutral equivalent for ‘wig’, but *peruukkipäinen pistiäinen* is over-sonorous, thanks to the rhyme -päinen/-äinen.

What would be the natural, spontaneous way of describing the wasp image in present-day Finnish? Children use the abbreviated form *amppari* for *ampiainen*. But though *peruukkiamppari* has a good rhythm, using an almost slang word in a Carroll translation seems unsatisfactory, since the word is an obvious anachronism. Forming a compound word can also lend a concept a sense of permanence, as if it were a term in its own right. Yet compounds are a typically Finnish form of expression and can be used as nonce-words as well as permanent formations.

Of all the alternatives, *vaapsahainen*, with an element of onomatopoeic doddering about it, is my final choice. And to pair with it I choose an equally doddering word
meaning hair, hapset, naming the chapter Valehapsivaapsahainen in honour of Finnish compound words, alliteration and ambitious little readers.

The above is a detailed description of making one's mind up about a single expression. It can be said to be representative of the kind of convoluted thought processes involved in translating, although they are usually not written down. Many of the arguments apply to a number of similar problems, so once a translator has a fair amount of experience and routine, they can flash through the mind with semi-automatic swiftness.

After coming to the above conclusion, it should be pointed out that "A Wasp in a Wig" is in fact not a chapter name chosen by Carroll. It refers to the four-page passage cut from the end of Chapter VIII which did not have a heading given by the author. The title was used by Tenniel in a letter to Carroll, and seems to have been taken over by scholars. Nor does the phrase occur in the text of the passage, but both wasps and wigs do, and the question remains whether the words valehapset and vaapsahainen would actually fit in every instance of the English words throughout the scene. A translator would do well to consider the context and function of a ST item before taking much trouble to translate it; instances of repetition should also be noted. The above is, however, a true example of Fraser's self-revelation (1996:67) and a realistic illustration of the way a translator's mind works. Translators now and then also go on wild goose-chases.
5. CONCLUSION

I have attempted in this study to shed light on the process of translating and of the role of norms in this process. The need for shared norms is obvious, though it is likely that much of the agreement about norms among translators is implicit rather than clearly verbalized. As gathered from my experience of both translating and publishing I have presented ten sources or setters of these norms, explaining the various viewpoints and interests of each. The hierarchy of norms from binding ones to matters of choice – shading from norm to strategy – is described before going on to list the norms themselves. There are six norms I have sifted out of the whole thought-process involved in making a translation fill the bill: the norms of understanding, accuracy, target language quality, rhythm, quotability, and harmony between translation and illustration.

While drawing extensively on my own experiences and patterns of problem-solving, I have also looked into the views of a number of colleagues who answered a short questionnaire for me, and have been able to corroborate some of my statements by this means. During the process of completing this study, I have not found reason to change my overall views concerning the state of the translation profession in present-day Finland, though the picture has become clearer and more detailed. The change that has taken place in the last half-century has been towards a stronger demand for accuracy, which is not surprising, considering how much the knowledge of foreign languages and the accessibility of information have improved. It remains to be seen how translation norms will continue to develop in the future; I have described what signs of change I have noted over the years, sketching one possible direction that at least a small section of the profession may be headed for.

In Finland, literary translation is considered a demanding but desirable and respected profession, although it is not well paid. There is a wide consensus over the norms that guide decision-making, and this consensus is shared not only by translators but also by publishers and readers.
Finally, the translated sections of Through the Looking-Glass and the comments thereon are presented as a surface reflecting many types of translation problems and the ways the various norms discussed earlier can help to solve them. The commentaries discuss aspects of grammar and vocabulary that could also appear in translations more typical than TLG, in the hope that these too may be of use to future translation scholars and translators. While perhaps stressing these generally applicable processes, I have also discussed translating the well-known Carroll characteristics of punning and made-up words.

It was suggested at the beginning of this study that translators can become visible by retranslating such classics as Lewis Carroll's Alice books. Another way for translators to forgo their invisibility is to step out from behind the author's back and even out of their own translations, and to speak out about their work. Giving thought to questions of Translation studies and trying to express one's own experience through even a modestly theoretical prism are exercises useful not only to scholars, but also to practicing translators.
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PART II

1 "Peilihyönteisiä", a translation of "Looking-glass insects"

© Alice Martin 2008

Kolmas luku
Peilihyönteisiä


Se oli kuitenkin kaikkea muuta: itse asiassa se oli norsu, kuten Alicelle pian valkeni, vaikka ajatus sai hänet aluksi haukkomaan henkeään. "Ja kukkien täyttyy olla ihan valtavia!" hän tuumi seuraavaksi. "Vähän kuin mökkejä, joista on nostettu katto pois, ja alle pantu varsi – ja mitkä määrät hunajaa ne saavat tehtyä! Taidan mennä alas ja – ei, en menekään ihan vielä", hän pysäytti itsensä (2) juuri kun oli lähdössä juoksemaan alamäkeen, ja koetti keksiä verukkeen sille että arkuus iski niin yllättäen. "Ei parane mennä alas niiden joukkoon ilman kunnon risua jolla voin huiskia niitä pois – ja entäs kun sitten kysytään oliko mukava kävely (3), hihi (4), minä sanon: 'Oikein mukava muuten –'" (ja hän heilautti päätään tutulla tavalla (5)) "’paitsi että oli kamalan kuumaan ja pölystistä – ja norsut pyörivät kimpussa koko ajan!’

Menenkin alas toista kautta", hän sanoi hetken päästä, "ehkä voin käydä katsomassa norsuja myöhemin. Sitä paitsi tekisi jo mieli sinne kolmanteen ruutuun!"
Sillä verukkeella hän sitten juoksi måkeä alas kuutta pikku puroa kohti ja hyppäsi ensimmäisen yli (6).

*Liput, olkaa hyvä!" sanoi konduktööri ja pisti päähää sisään ikkunasta. Samassa jokainen ojensi lippuaan häntä kohti: ne olivat suunnilleen samankokoisia kuin matkustajatkin, ja tuntuivat täytävän koko vaununosaston.

"Kas niin! Näytähän lapsi lippusi (7)!" konduktööri jatko katsoen Alicea vihaisesti. Ja Jouko aänii sanoja yhdessä ("kuin laulun kertosäkeessä", Alice ajatteli) "Älä lapsi (7) viivyttä häntä! Hänellä aikansa on kallis, maksaa tuhat puntaa minuutti (8)!"

"Anteeksi, mutta minulla ei ole lippua", Alice sanoi pelästyneenä. "Siellä mistä tulin ei ollut lipunmyyntiä (9)." Ja Taas äänen kuoro jatko: "Siellä mistä hän tuli ei ollut tilaa. Maa maksaa siellä tuhat puntaa tua (8)!"


Alice mietti: "Sitten ei maksaa vaivaa puhua." Tällä kertaa äänet pysyivät hiljaa, mutta Alice nätkävä last maliksi ne kaikki ajatteli kuorossa (toivottavasti sinä ymmärrät mitä kuorossa ajatteleminen tarkoittaa – koska täytyy tunnustaa että minä en ainakaan): "Viisainta olla sanomatta yhtään mitäan. Kieli maksaa tuhat puntaa sana (8)!"

"Minä näen ensi yönä tuhat puntaa unta (8), se on varmaa!” ajatteli Alice. Konduktööri oli kaiken aikaa katsonut häntä, ensin kaukoputkella, sitten mikroskoopilla ja sitten teatterikiikarilla. Viimein hän sanoi: "Olet menossa väärään suuntaan", sulki ikkunan ja meni matkoihinsa.

"Noin pienen lapsen”, sanoi vastapäästä istuva herrasmies (hän oli pukeutunut valkoiseen paperiin), "pitäisi tietää minnepäin on menossa, vaikkei tiedäkaan omaa nimeään!” (A)

Vuohi, joka istui valkopukuisen herran vieressä, ummistu silmänsä ja sanoi kovalla äänellä: "Hänyn pitäisi osata lipunmyyntiä, vaikkei hän osaakaan aakkosia!"
Vuohen vieressä istui koppakuoriainen (vaununosastossa oli kaiken kaikkiaan merkillinen kokoelma matkustajia), ja koska näytti kuuluvan asiaan että jokainen puhui vuorollaan, *hän* jatkoi: "Hän sais palata matkatavarana!"

Alicen ei onnistunut nähdä, kuka istui koppakuoriaisen tuolla puolen, mutta seuraavaksi kuului hirveä (10) ääni. "Vaihtakaa veturia—" se sanoivat, ja sitten se alkoihin kohdi ja joutui jättämään sanottavansa kesken.

Se kuulostaa hirveltä", Alice tuumi itsekseen. Ja mahdollisesti pieni ääni sanoi ihan hänen korvansa juuresta: "Voisit keksiä siitä vitsin — jotain hirvestä ja hirveästä, hein."

Sitten tavattoman vieno ääni kaukaa: "Häneen pitää sitten kiinnittää lappu: 'Lapsia — varovasti.' (11)"

Ja sen jälkeen muut äänet jatkoivat juttua. ("Onpa täällä yhdessä vaununosastossa paljon väkeää"); ajatteli Alice.) Ne sanoivat: "Hän pitää panna postiin, koska hänellä on jo valmiiksi kuningattaren pääl" (12) — "hänet pitää lähettää lennättimellä —" "Hän saa itse vetää junaa lopun matkaa —" ja niin edelleen. Mutta valkoiseen paperiin pukeutunut herra kumartui Alicea kohti ja kuiskasia hänen korvansa. "Älä välitä heidän puheistaan, kultaseni, vaan osta menopaluu joka kerta kun juna pysähtyy."

"Enkä osta!" Alice sanoi aika herpaantuneena. "Minä en kuulu koko tälle junamatkalle — olin metsässä vielä hetki sitten — voi kun pääsisinkin sinne metsään takaisin!"

"Voisit keksiä vitsin siitä", sanoi pieni ääni hänen korvansa juuressaa. "Jotain sellaista kuin 'koko matka meni metsään'."

"Älä viitsi kiusata(13)"); sanoi Alice ja tähyili ympärilleen nähdäkseen mistä ääni oli peräisin, mutta turhaan. "Jos haluat niin kovasti että keksitään vitsejä, mikset keksi niitä itse?"

Pieni ääni huokaisi syvään. Se oli selvästi hyvin onneton, ja Alice oli sanonut sille jotain myöttäntoista ja lohduttavaa, "jos se vain huokaisi niin kuin muut ihmiset!" (14) hän ajatteli. Mutta huokaus oli niin ihmeellinen pieni, ettei hän olisi kuullut sitä laisinkaan, ellei se olisi lähtenyt *aivan* hänen korvansa vieraestä. Siitä seurasi, että se kutitti hänen korvaansa mahdollomasti ja vei ajatuksen kokonaan pois pikku olennon murheista.

"Tiedän että sinä olet ystävä", pikku ääni jatkoi. "Rakas ystävä ja vanha ystävä. Etkä tee minulle pahaa, vaikka olenkin hyönteinen."
"Minkälainen hyönteinen?" Alice kysyi hiukan huolestuneena. Oikeastaan hän halusi tietää, olko se pistävää lajia vai ei, mutta hänestä tuntui ettei sellaista oikein ollut kohteliasta kysyä.

"Ai, etkö sinä sitten –" pieni ääni aloitti, mutta samassa se hukkui veturin kimeään kiljaisuun, ja kaikki hyppäisivät sääkähtäneinä pystyyn, Alice muiden mukana. Hirvi, joka oli pannut päänsä ulos ikkunasta, veti sen rauhallisesti sisään ja sanoi:

"Ei mitään, meidän pitää vain hypätä puron yli." Kaikki tuntuivat tyytyvän siihen, vaikka Alicea hiukan hermostutti ajatus että junat hyppäsivät ylipäänsä minnekään. "Ei silti, sitten päästään neljänneen ruutuun, se hyvä puoli siinä ainakin on!" hän sanoi itsekseen. Eikä aikaakaan kun (15) hän tunsi vaunun kohoavan suoraan ilmaan, ja peloissaan hän tarrasi siinä siihen mikä ensiksi käteen sattui, ja se sattui olemaan vuohen pukinparta.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Mutta parta tuntui sulavan olemattomiin hänen kosketuksestaan, ja hän huomasi istuvansa kaikessa rauhassa puun alla – kun taas surviainen (sillä surviainen hänen puhkekumppaninsa juuri oli) tasapainoi oli pikku oksalla hänen päänsä päällä ja leyhytteli häntä siivillään.

Se oli tosiaankin iso ollakseen surviainen, ”melkein kanan/kananpojan kokoinen”, Alice ajatteli. Hän ei kuitenkaan osannut arastella sitä, kun he olivat puhelleet keskenään niin pitkään.

"—etkö sinä sitten pidä kaikista hyönteisistä?" surviainen jatkoi niin hiljaa kuin mitään ei olisi tapahtunut.

"Pidän, jos ne osaavat puhua", Alice sanoi. " Siellä mistä minä tulen ne eivät puhu mitään(16)."

"Millaisista hyönteisistä sinä riemuitset siellä mistä sinä tulet?" surviainen tiedusteli.

"En minä riemuitse hyönteisistä ollenkaan", Alice selitti, "koska minä pelkään niitä aika lailla – ainakin isoja lajeja. Mutta voin kyllä kertoa minkänimisiä niitä on."

"Ja ne tietenkin tottelevat nimeään?" surviainen heitti vällin.

"Eivät minun tietääkseen."
"Mitä iloa (17) niillä sitten on nimistä, jos ne eivät tottele niitä?" surviainen kysyi.

"Ei mitään iloa niille", Alice sanoi; "mutta kai siitä on iloa ihmisille jotka ovat nimet antaneet. Jos ei olisi, miksi asiioilla edes olisi nimet?"

"En osaa sanoa", surviainen vastasi. "Tuonnempana, tuolla metsässä, niillä ei olekaan nimia – mutta anna kuulua nimia hyönteisiä (18), sinä haaskaat aikaa."


"Millä se elää?" Alice kysyi uteliaana.

"Se täytää mahansa puruilla ja mahlalla (19)", sanoi surviainen. "Kerro lisää nimiä."

Alice katsoi kiinnostuneena keinuhevoskärpästä ja tuli siihen tulokseen että se oli vasta maalattu uudestaan, kun se näytti niin kiiltävältä ja tahmealta, ja sitten hän jatkoi.

"Sitten on lentomuurahainen."


"Ja millä se elää?" Alice kysyi kuten ennenkin.

"Uunipuurola ja hedelmäpiiraalla", surviainen vastasi, "ja se pesii joululahjakorissa."

"Ja sitten on leipääkuoriainen", Alice jatkoi katsottuaan tarkasti hyönteistä, jonka päähavais, ja mietittyään: "Siksiköhän hyönteiset niin hanakasti lentävät kynttilänliekkiksi – että muuttuisivat kananlentomuurahaisiksi?"

"Jaloissasi ryömii", surviainen sanoi (ja sai Alicen vetämään äkkiä jalat koukkuun) "jos vain katsot, voileipääkuoriainen (A) (B). Sen siipinä on ohuet voileivät, sen vartalona on leivänkuori, ja päänä on sokeripala."

"Ja millä se sitten elää?"

"Laihalla teellä, jossa on kermaa." Alice mieleen juolahti uusi pulma. "Entä jos sitä ei löytyisikään?" (20) hän esitti.

"Sitten se tietysti kuolisi."

"Mutta niin kai käy aika usein", Alice huomautti mietteliään.
"Niin käy aina", sanoi surviainen. 

Sen jälkeen Alice oli vähän aikaa (21) väitä ja mietti. Surviainen hurvitteli surraamalla hän päänsä ympärillä; viimein se istui takaisin oksalle ja sanoi: "Et kai haluaisi hukata nimeäsi?" (22) 


"Siitä ei tulisi mitään, olen ihan varma", Alice sanoi. "Kotioppetajatar ei ikinä päästäisi minua tunneista tuollaisen syyn takia. Jos hän ei muistaisi nimeäni, hän sanoi ‘neiti’ niin kuin palveluskunta (23) sanoo.” 


Mutta surviainen vain huokasi syvään, ja kaksi suurta kyyneltä vieri sen poskia pitkin. "Sinun ei pitäisi kertoa vitsejä, jos tulet niistä noin surulliseksi”, Alice sanoi. (A) 

Sitten kuului taas haikea pieni huokaus, ja tällä kertaa surviainen oli tainnut huokaista itsensä hengiltä (25), sillä kun Alice kohotti katseensa, oksalla ei näkynyt yhtään mitään, ja kun häntä oli alkanut viluttaa siinä istuskellessa, hän nousi ja lähti jatkamaan matkaa. 

Eipä aikaakaan kun edessä aukeni nitty (26), jonka takana oli metsä; se näytti ensimmäistä metsää paljon synkemmältä, ja Alicea pikkuisen hirvitti mennen sinne. 

Hänen ajatuksensa harhailivat tähän tapaan kun hän tuli metsänrantaan: metsässä näytti vilpoiselta ja varjoisalta. "No ainakin o on ihanaa, kun on ollut niin kuuma", hän sanoi juuri kun astui puiden siimekseen, "päästä tänne – tänne – tänne minne?" (A) hän jatkoi, hämmentyneenä siitä ettei saanut sanaa päähänsä.


"Miksi sinä sanot itseäsi?" (33) kauris kysyi lopulta. Olipa sillä kaunis vieno ääni!

"Kun tietäisinkin!" Alice-parka ajatteli. Hän vastasi apeasti: "En minulla sen tietää, mitä en ole antanut."

"Kerron, jos tulet vähän matkaa tännepäin", kauris sanoi. "En muista täällä."

Niin he jatkoivat matkaa halki metsän, ja Alice kulki kädet rakkaasti kauriin kaulan ympärillä (34), kunnes edessä oli metsälaatuista täällä ja ravistautui vapaaksi Alicen otteesta. "Minä olen kauriinvasa!" se huusi riemukkaalla äänellä. "Ja havaitaan, sinä olet ihmislapsi!"

Sen suolaisiin ruskeisiin silmiin välähti säikähdys, ja samassa se oli jo pinkaisse laukka. (35)

Alice seisoit katsellen sen perään itku kurkussa, kun oli menettänyt rakkaan matkakumpaninsa niin äkkiä. "No, ainakin tiedän nimeni nyt", hän sanoi; "se lohduttaa vähäsä. Alice – Alice – en unohda sitä toiste. Entä nyt, kumpaa näistä tienviitoista (36) minun pitäisi seurata?"
Kysymys ei ollut kovin vaikea, koska metsässä kulki vain yksi tie, ja kumpikin tienviitta osoitti juuri sille. "Voin ratkaista asian sitten, kun tie haarautuu ja ne osoittavat eri suuntiin", Alice sanoi itsekseen. (A)

Mutta mikään ei viitannut siihen että niin kävisi. Hän kulki kulkemistaan, mutta joka kerta kun tie haarautui, seisoi kaksi tienviittaa kuin nakutettuna (37) osoittamassa samaan suuntaan, ja toisessa luki:

Tätä tietä Töttörömin taloon

ja toisessa

Töttöröön taloon tätä tietä. (38)

"Minusta alkaa tuntua että he asuvat samassa talossa!" Alice sanoi lopulta. (A)

Ihme etten tullut sitä aikaisemmin ajatelleeksi – mutta en voi viipyä heidän luonaan kauan. Kurkistan sisään ja sanon päivää (39) ja kysyn mitä tietä metsästä pääsee. Kun vain pääsisin kahdeksanteen ruutuun ennen pimeää!" Niin hän kulki yhä eteenpäin ja puheli itsekseen kulkiessaan, kunnes tie teki jyrkän mutkan ja hänen edessään oli äkkiä kaksi pientä paksua miestä (40) – niin äkkiä ettei hän voinut olla harppaamatta taaksepäin, mutta hetkessä hän jo rauhoittui, sillä hän oli varma että tässä olivat nyt

[Neljäs luku
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2 "Nakkelis Kokkelis", translation of "Humpty Dumpty" (first half)
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Nakkelis Kokkelis

Muna kuitenkin vain suureni suurenemistaan ja ihmisty ihmistymistään (41). Kun Alice oli siitä enää muutaman metrin päässä, hän näki että sillä oli silmät ja nenä ja suu, ja vielä lähemmäs tultuaan hän näki selvästi että se oli itse NAKKELIS KOKKELIS (42) ilmielävänä. "Kukaan muu se ei voi olla!" hän sanoi itsekseen. "Varmemmaksi ei tulisi vaikka nimen voisi lukea suoraan naamasta!"

Nimen olisi hyvinkin mahtunut lukemaan naamasta vaikka sataan kertaan, niin valtava se naamataulu oli. Nakkelis Kokkelis istui jalat turkulaiseen tapaan ristissä (43) korkean muurin harjalla – niin kapeassa paikassa, että Alice ihmetteli kuinka hän ollenkaan pystyi tasapainoilemaan siinä – ja kun hänen katseensa oli kiinnittynyt tiiviisti vastakkaiseen suuntaan eikä hän kiinnittänyt Aliceen mitään huomiota, Alice ajatteli että hän olisi sittenkin topattu hahmo.

"Että osaa näyttää täsmälleen munalta!" hän sanoi ääneen, seisten muurin alla kädet ojossa valmimina ottamaan vastaan, sillä hänestä näytti että toinen tipahtaisi minä hetkenä hyvänsä. "On tavattoman kiusallista", Nakkelis Kokkelis sanoi pitkän hiljaisuuden päätteeksi katsellen poispäin Alicesta, "kun nimitellään munaksi – tavattoman!"


"Jotkut ihmiset", sanoi Nakkelis Kokkelis katsoen tapansa mukaan poispäin hänestä, "eivät ymmärrä vauvankaan vertaa!"

Alice ei tiennyt mitä olisi sanonut: tilanne ei ollenkaan muistuttanut keskustelua, kun toinen ei sanonut yhtään mitään hänelle; viime huomautuksenkin hän oli selvästi kohdistanut yhdelle puulle – ja niin Alice vain lausui hiljaa itsekseen:
Muurin päällä Nakkelis Kokkelis
istui ja putosi mukkelis makkelis.
Ratsuväki saapui linnasta kuninkaan,
muttei saanut kokkelista enää ehjää Nakkelista ollenkaan. (45)

"Viimeinen säe on runoon ihan liian pitkä”, hän lisäsi melkein ääneen,
muistamatta että Nakkelis Kokkelis kuulisi.
"Mitä sinä siinä itseksesi puliset", (46) Nakkelis Kokkelis sanoi ja katsoi
ensimmäisen kerran suoraan häneen. "Kerro minulle nimesi ja asiasi.”
"Nimeni on Alice, mutta –”
"Tyhmä nimi ainakin!” Nakkelis Kokkelis keskeytti ärhäkästi. "Mitä se
tarkoittaa?”
"Täyttykö nimen tarkoittaa jotain?” Alice kysyi epävarmana. (47)
"Totta kai täyttyy”, Nakkelis Kokkelis sanoi ja nauraa päräytytti. (48) "Minun nimeni
tarkoittaa sitä minkä muotoinen olen – komea muoto se onkin. Tuonniminen kuin
sinä voisi olla melkein minkä muotoinen tahansa.”
"Miksi istut täällä ypöyksin?” Alice kysyi kun ei halunnut ruveta kinastelemaan.
"No kun minulla ei ole ketään mukana!” huusi Nakkelis Kokkelis. "Luulitko etten
tuohon osaisi vastata? Kysy toinen.”
"Eikö tuntuisi turvallisemmalta olla täällä alhaalla maassa?” Alice jatkoi aikomatta
esittää toista arvoitusta: hän oli vain huolissaan (49) miten hänen omituisen
kumppaninsa kävisi. "Muuri on niin kovin kapea!”
"Miten käsittämättömän helppoja arvoituksia sinä kysyt!” Nakkelis Kokkelis
murahti. "Tietenkään ei tuntuisi! Hah, jos minä jonain kauniina päivänä sattuisin
putoamaan – eikä siitä ole pelkoa – mutta jos sattuisin –” ja hän puristi suunsa
suppuun ja näytti niin mahtavalta ja juhlalliselta, että Alicen oli vaikea pysyä
vakavana. ”Jos minä putoaisin”, hän jatkoi, ”niin kuningas on luvannut minulle –
oo, kalpene vain jos mieli tekee! Et arvannutkaan että sanoisin näin! Kuningsas on
luvannut minulle – omalla kuninkaallisella suullaan – että – että –”
"Ratsuväki saapuu”, Alice erehtyi pistämään välilin. (50)
"No tuo menee jo liian pitkälle!” Nakkelis Kokkelis huudahti äkkiä suunnaltaan
raivosta. ”Olet salakuunnellut ovien raossa – puiden takana – savupiippujen
nenässä – tai et olisi voinut tietää sitä!”
"En kylläkään ole!" Alice sanoi hillitysti. "Luin sen kirjasta."

"Jaa, vai niin! Kirjaan sellaista voi kirjoittaakin", Nakkelis Kokkelis sanoi tyynempänä. "Sellaiseen kuin Maamme historia, siis. (51) Katsopa nyt minua oikein tarkkaan. Minä poika se olen puhunut kuninkaan kanssa; voipi olla ettet konsaan tapaa toista samanmoista, ja jotta näet etten ole siitä ylpistynyt, saat puristaa minun kättäni!" Ja hänen hymynsä levisi melkein runkoon ja lähestulkoon putosi saman tien ja ojensi Alicelle kättään. (53) Alice tarttuivat pitäen mutta piti häntä huolestuneena silmällä. (54) "Jos hän hymyili vielä vähänkin leveämmin, ties vaikka suupielet kohtaisivat takana", hän ajatteli, "enkä uskalla ajatellakaan miten hänen päänsä kävisi! Kamala jos se lähtiirti"(55)


"Ikkää kyllä minä en taida ihan muistaa sitä", Alice sanoi kohteliaasti. "Siinä tapauksessa aloitetaan alusta", sanoi Nakkelis Kokkelis, "ja nyt on minun vauron valita puheenaihe –" ("Hän puhuu kuin me pelaisimme jotain peliä!" Alice ajatteli.) "Tässä sinulle kysymys. Kuinka vanha sanoitkan olevasi?"

Alice teki pienen laskutoimituksen ja sanoi: "Seitsemän vuotta ja kuusi kuukautta!"

"Väärin!" riemuitsi Nakkelis Kokkelis. (58) "Et sanonut mitään sinne päinkään!"

"Luulin että tarkoittit: 'Kuinka vanha olet?" Alice selitti.

"Jos olisin tarkoittanut, olisin sanonut niin", Nakkelis Kokkelis sanoi. Alice ei halunnut joutua taas kinastelemaan, eikä hän sanonut mitään. (59)

"Seitsemän vuotta ja kuusi kuukautta!" Nakkelis Kokkelis toisti miellettävästi.

"Epämukava ikä. Jos taas olisit kysynyt minulta neuvoa, olisin sanonut: 'Jätä seitsemään' – mutta nyt se on myöhäistä."

"En minä ikinä kysy neuvoa kasvamisen", Alice sanoi närkästyneenä.

"Ylpeys ei sali, vai?" toinen kysyi. (60)

Mokomasta vihjauksesta Alice närkästyi yhä enemmän. (61) "Tarkoitan että sitä nyt vain vanhenee", hän sanoi. Ei sille mahda mitään, ikää tulee, yksin tein."

"Ei kai, jos yksin teit", Nakkelis Kokkelis sanoi, "mutta kaksinkertaista tekemällä se onnistuu. Jos olisit saanut sopivasti apua, olisit voinut jättää seitsemään." (62)
"Hei, onpa sinulla hieno vyö!" (63) Alice sanoi yhtäkkiä. (Hänen mielestään iästä oli puhuttu aivan tarpeeksi, ja jos oli tarkoitus keksiä puheenaiheita vuorotellen, nyt oli hän vuoronsa.) "Tai niin no", hän korjasi tarkemmin ajatellen, "hieno kravatti, pitä sanomani – ei, vaan vyö, tarkoitan – anteeksi vain!” hän lisäsi nolona, sillä Nakkelis Kokkelis näytti perin juurin loukkaantuneelta, ja Alice toivoi jo ettei olisi valinnut juuri sitä aihetta. "Kun vain tietäisi", hän tuumi itsekseen, "kumpi on kaula ja kumpi vyötärö!"


"Ymmärrän että olen kovin tietämätön", Alice sanoi niin nöyrästi että Nakkelis Kokkelis heltyi. "Se on kravatti, lapsi hyvä, ja kaunis onkin, kuten sanoit. Olen saanut sen lahjaksi Valkoiselta kuninkaalta ja kuningattareltta. Siinä kuulit!"

"Ihan totta?" Alice sanoi mielissään siitä, että oli kuin olikin valinnut hyvän puheenaiheen. "He antoivat sen minulle”, Nakkelis Kokkelis jatko mieltäväisenä, nosti polven toisen päälle ja kädet polven päälle. (64) "He antoivat sen minulle – syntymättömyyspäivälahjaksi.”

"Anteeksi?" Alice sanoi hämmentyneenä. "Et sinä minua loukannut”, sanoi Nakkelis Kokkelis. "Ei vaan mikä se sellainen syntymättömyyspäivälahja on?”


"Kolmesataakuusikymmentäviisi”, Alice sanoi. "Entä montako syntymäpäivää sinulla on?”

"Yksi.” "Ja jos vähennät yhden kolmestaastakuudestakymmenestä, mitä jää?” "Kolmesataakuusikymmentäneljä tietysti.”

Alicea hymyilytti, mutta hän otti esiin muistikirjansa ja laski näin:

\[
365 - 1
\]

\[
364 \quad (67)
\]

Nakkelis Kokkelis otti kirjan ja tutki sitä tarkasti. "Näyttää olevan oikein —" hän aloitti.

"Sinulla on se nurinpäin kädessä!" (68) Alice keskeytti.

"No niin oli!" Nakkelis Kokkelis sanoi vailla huolen häivää, kun Alice käänsi kirjan oikeinpäin. "Näyttikin hieman omituiselta. Niin kuin olin sanomassa, lasku näyttää olevan oikein – vaikken ehtinyt vielä tarkastella sitä juurta jaksin – ja siitä näkee että on kolmesataakuusikymmentä neljä päivää, jolloin on mahdollista saada syntymättömyyspäivälahjoja –"

"Kyllä", sanoi Alice.

"Ja vain yksi päivä syntymäpäivälahjoille. Mikä riemu!"

"En oikein ymmärrä mitä tarkoitat riemulla", (69) Alice sanoi.

Nakkelis Kokkelis hymyili halveksivasti. "Etpä niin – et ennen kuin minä kerron. Tarkoittin että ’siinä vasta hieno perustelu joka vie jalat alta!’"

"Mutta ei riemu tarkoita ”hienoa perustelua joka vie jalat alta”", Alice pani vastaan.

"Kun minä käytän sanaa", Nakkelis Kokkelis sanoi ja nakkeli niskojaan, "se tarkoittaa täsmälleen sitä mitä minä päättän sen tarkoittavan, ei enempää eikä vähempää."

"Kysymys kuuluu", Alice sanoi, "voiko sanat panna tarkoittamaan niin monia eri asioita."

"Kysymys kuuluu", sanoi Nakkelis Kokkelis, "kumpi määrä (70) – siinä kaikki.”
Alice oli niin hämmentynyt ettei voinut sanoa mitään, mutta hetken päästä Nakkelis Kokkelis aloi taas puhua. "On niillä sisua (71) muutamilla, varsinkin verbeillä: verbit ovat koppavimpia (72) – adjektiivit saa suostumaan mihin tahansa, (73) verbejä ei – mutta minäpä osaan hallita koko revohkaa! Läpitunkemattomuus! Sen minä vain sanon!"

"Olisitko kiltti ja kertoisit mitä se tarkoittaa?" Alice kysyi.

"Nyt alat kuulostaa järkevältä lapselta", sanoi Nakkelis Kokkelis selvästi mielissään. "Kun sanoin läpitunkemattomuus, tarkoitin että nyt riittää (74) tästä aiheesta, ja olisi vallan paikallaan jos kertoisit mitä aiot seuraavaksi, koska et kuitenkaan kaikisten ajan jäädän tänne koko loppuiäksesi." (75)

"Aika paljon panit yhden sanan tarkoittamaan", Alice sanoi mietteliäästi.

"Kun panen sanan tekemään paljon työtä tuolla lailla, maksan sille aina ylimääriästä", Nakkelis Kokkelis sanoi.

"Ai!" sanoi Alice. Hän oli niin hämmentynyt ettei pystynyt sanomaan muuta.

"Näkisit, kun ne tulevat lauantai-iltaisin käymään", Nakkelis Kokkelis sanoi nyökytellen päätään totisena puolelta toiselle. "Hakemaan palkkaansa nääs."

(Alice ei rohjennut kysyä millä hän niille maksoi, siksi minäkään en pysty kertomaan sitä sinulle.)

"Olet selvästi etevä selittämään sanoja", (76) Alice sanoi. "Olisitko kiltti ja kertoisit mitä tarkoittaa runo 'Monkerias'?" (77)

"Anna kuulua", sanoi Nakkelis Kokkelis. "Minä selitän minä tahansa runon joka koskaan on keksitty – ja koko joukon niitä joita ei ole keksitty ihan vielä."
APPENDIX

Source texts

THROUGH THE LOOKING-GLASS: CHAPTER III AND CHAPTER VI
(first half)
Chapter III
LOOKING-GLASS INSECTS

Of course the first thing to do was to make a grand survey of the country she was going to travel through. "It's something very like learning geography," thought Alice, as she stood on tiptoe in hopes of being able to see a little further. "Principal rivers—are none. Principal mountains—I'm on the only one, but I don't think it's got any name. Principal towns—why, what are those creatures, making honey down there? They can't be bees—nobody ever saw bees a mile off, you know——" and for some time she stood silent, watching one of them that was bustling about among the flowers, poking its proboscis into them, "just as if it was a regular bee," thought Alice.

However, this was anything but a regular bee: in fact, it was an elephant—as Alice soon found out, though the idea quite took her breath away at first. "And what enormous flowers they must be!" was her next idea. "Something like cottages with the roofs taken off, and stalks put to them—and what quantities of honey they must make! I think I'll go down and—no, I won't go just yet," she went on, checking herself just as she was beginning to run down the hill, and trying to find some excuse for turning shy so suddenly. "It'll never do to go down among them without a good long branch to brush them away—and what fun it'll be when they ask me how I liked my walk. I shall say 'Oh, I liked it well enough——' (here came the favourite little toss of the head), 'only it was so dusty and hot, and the elephants did tease so!'"

"I think I'll go down the other way," she said after a pause; "and perhaps I may visit the elephants later on. Besides, I do so want to get into the Third Square!"

So, with this excuse, she ran down the hill, and jumped over the first of the six little brooks.

* * * * * * * * * * *

"Tickets, please!" said the Guard, putting his head in at the window. In a moment everybody was holding out a ticket: they were about the same size as the people, and quite seemed to fill the carriage.

"Now then! Show your ticket, child!" the Guard went on, looking angrily at Alice. And a great many voices all said together ("like the chorus of a song," thought Alice) "Don't keep him waiting, child! Why, his time is worth a thousand pounds a minute!"
"I'm afraid I haven't got one," Alice said in a frightened tone: "there wasn't a ticket-office where I came from." And again the chorus of voices went on. "There wasn't room for one where she came from. The land there is worth a thousand pounds an inch!"

"Don't make excuses," said the Guard: "you should have bought one from the engine-driver." And once more the chorus of voices went on with "The man that drives the engine. Why, the smoke alone is worth a thousand pounds a puff!"

Alice thought to herself "Then there's no use in speaking." The voices didn't join in, this time, as she hadn't spoken, but, to her great surprise, they all thought in chorus (I hope you understand what thinking in chorus means—for I must confess that I don't), "Better say nothing at all. Language is worth a thousand pounds a word!"

"I shall dream about a thousand pounds to-night, I know I shall!" thought Alice.

All this time the Guard was looking at her, first through a telescope, then through a microscope, and then through an opera-glass. At last he said "You're traveling the wrong way," and shut up the window, and went away.

"So young a child," said the gentleman sitting opposite to her, (he was dressed in white paper,) "ought to know which way she's going, even if she doesn't know her own name!"

3. There is nothing in the text to make it appropriate that in Tenniel's drawing the man dressed in paper unmistakably resembles Benjamin Disraeli, unless it is his advice to take a return ticket every time the train stops. Disraeli had briefly been prime minister in 1868, was replaced in that year by Gladstone, and did not return to office until 1874.
A Goat, that was sitting next to the gentleman in white, shut his eyes and said in a loud voice, "She ought to know her way to the ticket-office, even if she doesn't know her alphabet!"

There was a Beetle sitting next the Goat (it was a very queer carriage—full of passengers altogether), and, as the rule seemed to be that they should all speak in turn, he went on with "She'll have to go back from here as luggage!"

Alice couldn't see who was sitting beyond the Beetle, but a hoarse voice spoke next. "Change engines—" it said, and there it choked and was obliged to leave off.

"It sounds like a horse," Alice thought to herself. And an extremely small voice, close to her ear, said, "You might make a joke on that—something about 'horse' and 'hoarse,' you know."

Then a very gentle voice in the distance said, "She must be labeled 'Lass, with care,' you know—"

And after that other voices went on ("What a number of people there are in the carriage!" thought Alice), saying "She must go by post, as she's got a head—on her——" "She must be sent as a message by the telegraph——" "She must draw the train herself the rest of the way——," and so on.

But the gentleman dressed in white paper leaned forwards and whispered in her ear, "Never mind what they all say, my dear, but take a return-ticket every time the train stops."

"Indeed I sha'n't!" Alice said rather impatiently. "I don't belong to this railway journey at all—I was in a wood just now—and I wish I could get back there!"

"You might make a joke on that," said the little voice close to her ear, "something about 'you would if you could,' you know."

"Don't tease so," said Alice, looking about in vain to see where the voice came from. "If you're so anxious to have a joke made, why don't you make one yourself?"

The little voice sighed deeply. It was very unhappy, evidently, and Alice would have said something pitying to comfort it, "if it would only sigh like other people!" she thought. But this was such a wonderfully small sigh, that she wouldn't have heard it at all, if it hadn't come quite close to her ear. The consequence of this was that it tickled her ear very much, and quite took off her thoughts from the unhappiness of the poor little creature.

"I know you are a friend," the little voice went on: "a dear friend, and an old friend. And you won't hurt me, though I am an insect."

"What kind of insect?" Alice inquired, a little anxiously. What she really wanted to know was, whether it could sting or not, but she thought this wouldn't be quite a civil question to ask.

4. I.e., "Glass, with care."
5. Mid-nineteenth-century postage stamps bore a portrait of the head of Queen Victoria.
"What, then you don't—" the little voice began, when it was drowned by a shrill scream from the engine, and everybody jumped up in alarm, Alice among the rest.

The Horse, who had put his head out of the window, quietly drew it in and said "It's only a brook we have to jump over." Everybody seemed satisfied with this, though Alice felt a little nervous at the idea of trains jumping at all. "However, it'll take us into the Fourth Square, that's some comfort!" she said to herself. In another moment she felt the carriage rise straight up into the air, and in her fright she caught at the thing nearest to her hand, which happened to be the Goat's beard.

* * * * * * * *
* * * * * * * *

But the beard seemed to melt away as she touched it, and she found herself sitting quietly under a tree—while the Gnat (for that was the insect she had been talking to) was balancing itself on a twig just over her head, and fanning her with its wings.

It certainly was a very large Gnat: "about the size of a chicken," Alice thought. Still, she couldn't feel nervous with it, after they had been talking together so long.

"—then you don't like all insects?" the Gnat went on, as quietly as if nothing had happened.

"I like them when they can talk," Alice said. "None of them ever talk, where I come from."

"What sort of insects do you rejoice in, where you come from?" the Gnat inquired.

"I don't rejoice in insects at all," Alice explained, "because I'm rather afraid of them—at least the large kinds. But I can tell you the names of some of them."

"Of course they answer to their names?" the Gnat remarked carelessly.

"I never knew them do it."

"What's the use of their having names," the Gnat said, "if they wo'n't answer to them?"

"No use to them," said Alice; "but it's useful to the people that name them, I suppose. If not, why do things have names at all?"

"I ca'n't say," the Gnat replied. "Further on, in the wood down there, they've got no names—however, go on with your list of insects: you're wasting time."

---

6. Alice here plays with another theory of language, later to be developed by Humpty Dumpty: that names are arbitrary designations imposed on things for the convenience of humans.
"Well, there's the Horse-fly," Alice began, counting off the names on her fingers.

"All right," said the Gnat. "Half way up that bush, you'll see a Rocking-horse-fly, if you look. It's made entirely of wood, and gets about by swinging itself from branch to branch."

"What does it live on?" Alice asked, with great curiosity.

"Sap and sawdust," said the Gnat. "Go on with the list."

Alice looked at the Rocking-horse-fly with great interest, and made up her mind that it must have been just repainted, it looked so bright and sticky; and then she went on.

"And there's the Dragon-fly."

"Look on the branch above your head," said the Gnat, "and there you'll find a Snap-dragon-fly. Its body is made of plum-pudding, its wings of holly-leaves, and its head is a raisin burning in brandy."
“And what does it live on?” Alice asked, as before.
“Frumenty7 and mince-pie,” the Gnat replied; “and it makes its nest in a Christmas-box.”
“And then there’s the Butterfly,” Alice went on, after she had taken a good look at the insect with its head on fire, and had thought to herself, “I wonder if that’s the reason insects are so fond of flying into candles—because they want to turn into Snap-dragon-flies!”
“Crawling at your feet,” said the Gnat (Alice drew her feet back in some alarm), “you may observe a Bread-and-butter-fly. Its wings are thin slices of bread-and-butter, its body is a crust, and its head is a lump of sugar.”

“And what does it live on?”
“Weak tea with cream in it.”
A new difficulty came into Alice’s head. “Supposing it couldn’t find any?” she suggested.
“Then it would die, of course.”
“But that must happen very often,” Alice remarked thoughtfully. “It always happens,” said the Gnat.
After this, Alice was silent for a minute or two, pondering. The Gnat amused itself meanwhile by humming round and round her head: at last it settled again and remarked “I suppose you don’t want to lose your name?”
“No, indeed,” Alice said, a little anxiously.
“And yet I don’t know,” the Gnat went on in a careless tone: “only think how convenient it would be if you could manage to go

7. Frumenty is a dessert made of boiled wheat flavored with sugar, spice, or raisins.
home without it! For instance, if the governess wanted to call you to your lessons, she would call out 'Come here——,' and there she would have to leave off, because there wouldn't be any name for her to call, and of course you wouldn't have to go, you know."

"That would never do, I'm sure," said Alice: "the governess would never think of excusing me lessons for that. If she couldn't remember my name, she'd call me 'Miss,' as the servants do."

"Well, if she said 'Miss,' and didn't say anything more," the Gnat remarked, "of course you'd miss your lessons. That's a joke. I wish you had made it."

"Why do you wish I had made it?" Alice asked. "It's a very bad one."

But the Gnat only sighed deeply, while two large tears came rolling down its cheeks.

"You shouldn't make jokes," Alice said, "if it makes you so unhappy."

Then came another of those melancholy little sighs, and this time the poor Gnat really seemed to have sighed itself away, for, when Alice looked up, there was nothing whatever to be seen on the twig, and, as she was getting quite chilly with sitting still so long, she got up and walked on.

She very soon came to an open field, with a wood on the other side of it: it looked much darker than the last wood, and Alice felt a little timid about going into it. However, on second thoughts, she made up her mind to go on: "for I certainly won't go back," she thought to herself, and this was the only way to the Eighth Square.

"This must be the wood," she said thoughtfully to herself, "where things have no names. I wonder what'll become of my name when I go in? I shouldn't like to lose it at all—because they'd have to give me another, and it would be almost certain to be an ugly one. But then the fun would be, trying to find the creature that had got my old name! That's just like the advertisements, you know, when people lose dogs—'answers to the name of 'Dash': had on a brass collar'—just fancy calling everything you met 'Alice,' till one of them answered! Only they wouldn't answer at all, if they were wise."

She was rambling on in this way when she reached the wood: it looked very cool and shady. "Well, at any rate it's a great comfort," she said as she stepped under the trees, "after being so hot, to get into the—to into the—into what?" she went on, rather surprised at not being able to think of the word. "I mean to get under the—under the—under this, you know!" putting her hand on the trunk of the tree. "What does it call itself, I wonder? I do believe
it's got no name—why, to be sure it hasn't!"

She stood silent for a minute, thinking: then she suddenly began again. "Then it really has happened, after all! And now, who am I? I will remember, if I can! I'm determined to do it!" But being determined didn't help her much, and all she could say, after a great deal of puzzling, was "L, I know it begins with L!" 8

Just then a Fawn came wandering by: it looked at Alice with its large gentle eyes, but didn't seem at all frightened. "Here then! Here then!" Alice said, as she held out her hand and tried to stroke it; but it only started back a little, and then stood looking at her again.

"What do you call yourself?" the Fawn said at last. Such a soft sweet voice it had!

"I wish I knew!" thought poor Alice. She answered, rather sadly, "Nothing, just now."

"Think again," it said: "that wo'n't do."

Alice thought, but nothing came of it. "Please, would you tell me what you call yourself?" she said timidly. "I think that might help a little."

8. Liddell begins with L.
"I'll tell you, if you'll come a little further on," the Fawn said. "I ca'n't remember here."

So they walked on together through the wood, Alice with her arms clasped lovingly round the soft neck of the Fawn, till they came out into another open field, and here the Fawn gave a sudden bound into the air, and shook itself free from Alice's arm. "I'm a Fawn!" it cried out in a voice of delight. "And, dear me! you're a human child!" A sudden look of alarm came into its beautiful brown eyes, and in another moment it had darted away at full speed.

Alice stood looking after it, almost ready to cry with vexation at having lost her dear little fellow-traveler so suddenly. "However, I know my name now," she said: "that's some comfort. Alice—Alice—I wo'n't forget it again. And now, which of these finger-posts ought I to follow, I wonder?"

It was not a very difficult question to answer, as there was only one road through the wood, and the two finger-posts both pointed along it. "I'll settle it," Alice said to herself, "when the road divides and they point different ways."

But this did not seem likely to happen. She went on and on, a long way, but, wherever the road divided, there were sure to be two finger-posts pointing the same way, one marked "TO TWEEDELDUM'S HOUSE," and the other "TO THE HOUSE OF TWEEDEDEE."

"I do believe," said Alice at last, "that they live in the same house! I wonder I never thought of that before—But I ca'n't stay there long. I'll just call and say 'How d'ye do?' and ask them the way out of the wood. If I could only get to the Eighth Square before it gets dark!" So she wandered on, talking to herself as she went, till, on turning a sharp corner, she came upon two fat little men, so suddenly that she could not help starting back, but in another moment she recovered herself, feeling sure that they must be
Chapter VI
HUMPTY DUMPTY

However, the egg only got larger and larger, and more and more human; when she had come within a few yards of it, she saw that it had eyes and a nose and a mouth; and, when she had come close to it, she saw clearly that it was HUMPTY DUMPTY himself. “It can’t be anybody else!” she said to herself. “I’m as certain of it, as if his name were written all over his face!”

It might have been written a hundred times, easily, on that enormous face. Humpty Dumpty was sitting, with his legs crossed like a Turk, on the top of a high wall—such a narrow one that Alice quite wondered how he could keep his balance—and, as his eyes were steadily fixed in the opposite direction, and he didn’t take the least notice of her, she thought he must be a stuffed figure after all.

“And how exactly like an egg he is!” she said aloud, standing with her hands ready to catch him, for she was every moment expecting him to fall.

“It’s very provoking,” Humpty Dumpty said after a long silence, looking away from Alice as he spoke, “to be called an egg—very!”

“I said you looked like an egg, Sir,” Alice gently explained. “And some eggs are very pretty, you know,” she added, hoping to turn her remark into a sort of compliment.

“Some people,” said Humpty Dumpty, looking away from her as usual, “have no more sense than a baby!”

Alice didn’t know what to say to this: it wasn’t at all like conversation, she thought, as he never said anything to her; in fact, his last remark was evidently addressed to a tree—so she stood and softly repeated to herself:

“Humpty Dumpty sat on a wall,
Humpty Dumpty had a great fall.
All the King’s horses and all the King’s men
Couldn’t put Humpty Dumpty in his place again.”

“That last line is much too long for the poetry,” she added, almost out loud, forgetting that Humpty Dumpty would hear her.

8. This nursery rhyme, which again Dodgson takes over in one of its traditional forms, is very old and common in several languages. It is, as Ion and Peter Opie point out in The Oxford Dictionary of Nursery Rhymes (Oxford, 1951: pp. 213–16), a riddle, which may explain why Humpty Dumpty does not know or will not admit that he is an egg, and begins his conversation with Alice with a riddling context. The usual last line is “Couldn’t put Humpty together again.” Alice’s misremembering of the line not only gives it two additional syllables, as she notices, but also charitably protects Humpty from a graphic description of his fate.
"Don't stand chattering to yourself like that," Humpty Dumpty said, looking at her for the first time, "but tell me your name and your business."

"My name is Alice, but—"

"It's a stupid name enough!" Humpty Dumpty interrupted impatiently. "What does it mean?"

"Must a name mean something?" Alice asked doubtfully.

"Of course it must," Humpty Dumpty said with a short laugh: "my name means the shape I am—and a good handsome shape it is, too. With a name like yours, you might be any shape, almost."

"Why do you sit out here all alone?" said Alice, not wishing to begin an argument.

"Why, because there's nobody with me!" cried Humpty Dumpty. "Did you think I didn't know the answer to that? Ask another."

"Don't you think you'd be safer down on the ground?" Alice went on, not with any idea of making another riddle, but simply in her good-natured anxiety for the queer creature. "That wall is so very narrow!"

"What tremendously easy riddles you ask!" Humpty Dumpty growled out. "Of course I don't think so! Why, if ever I did fall off—which there's no chance of—but if I did—" Here he pursed up his lips, and looked so solemn and grand that Alice could hardly help laughing. "If I did fall," he went on, "the King has promised me—ah, you may turn pale, if you like! You didn't think I was going to say that, did you? The King has promised me—with his very own mouth—to—to—"

"To send all his horses and all his men," Alice interrupted, rather unwisely.

"Now I declare that's too bad!" Humpty Dumpty cried, breaking into a sudden passion. "You've been listening at doors—and behind trees—and down chimneys—or you couldn't have known it!"

"I haven't indeed!" Alice said very gently. "It's in a book."

"Ah, well! They may write such things in a book," Humpty Dumpty said in a calmer tone. "That's what you call a History of England, that is. Now, take a good look at me! I'm one that has spoken to a King, I am: mayhap you'll never see such another: and, to show you I'm not proud, you may shake hands with me!" And he grinned almost from ear to ear, as he leant forwards (and as

---

9. Humpty Dumpty here advances the theory that names have something to do with the nature of the thing they name. Later, in his remarks about "glory," he picks up the other theory. Dodgson plays with in this book, that words are wholly arbitrary signs.
nearly as possible fell off the wall in doing so) and offered Alice his hand. She watched him a little anxiously as she took it. “If he smiled much more the ends of his mouth might meet behind,” she thought: “And then I don’t know what would happen to his head! I’m afraid it would come off!”

“Yes, all his horses and all his men,” Humpty Dumpty went on. “They’d pick me up again in a minute, they would! However, this conversation is going on a little too fast: let’s go back to the last remark but one.”

“I’m afraid I can’t quite remember it,” Alice said, very politely. “In that case we start afresh,” said Humpty Dumpty, “and it’s my turn to choose a subject——” (“He talks about it just as if it was a game!” thought Alice.) “So here’s a question for you. How old did you say you were?”

Alice made a short calculation, and said “Seven years and six months.”

“Wrong!” Humpty Dumpty exclaimed triumphantly. “You never said a word like it!”

“I thought you meant ‘How old are you?’” Alice explained. “If I’d meant that, I’d have said it,” said Humpty Dumpty.
Alice didn’t want to begin another argument, so she said nothing.

"Seven years and six months!" Humpty Dumpty repeated thoughtfully. "An uncomfortable sort of age. Now if you’d asked my advice, I’d have said ‘Leave off at seven’—but it’s too late now."

"I never ask advice about growing," Alice said indignantly.

"Too proud?" the other enquired.

Alice felt even more indignant at this suggestion. "I mean," she said, "that one can’t help growing older."

"One can’t, perhaps," said Humpty Dumpty; "but two can. With proper assistance, you might have left off at seven."

"What a beautiful belt you’ve got on!" Alice suddenly remarked. (They had had quite enough of the subject of age, she thought: and, if they really were to take turns in choosing subjects, it was her turn now.) "At least," she corrected herself on second thoughts, "a beautiful cravat, I should have said—no, a belt, I mean—I beg your pardon!" she added in dismay, for Humpty Dumpty looked thoroughly offended, and she began to wish she hadn’t chosen that subject. "If only I knew," she thought to herself, "which was neck and which was waist!"

Evidently Humpty Dumpty was very angry, though he said nothing for a minute or two. When he did speak again, it was in a deep growl.

"It is a—most—provoking—thing," he said at last, "when a person doesn’t know a cravat from a belt!"

"I know it’s very ignorant of me," Alice said, in so humble a tone that Humpty Dumpty relented.

"It’s a cravat, child, and a beautiful one, as you see. It’s a present from the White King and Queen. There now!"

"It is really?" said Alice, quite pleased to find that she had chosen a good subject, after all.

"They gave it me," Humpty Dumpty continued thoughtfully, as he crossed one knee over the other and clasped his hands round it, "they gave it me—for an un-birthday present."

"I beg your pardon?" Alice said with a puzzled air.

"I’m not offended," said Humpty Dumpty.

"I mean, what is an un-birthday present?"

"A present given when it isn’t your birthday, of course."

Alice considered a little. "I like birthday presents best," she said at last.

"You don’t know what you’re talking about!" cried Humpty Dumpty. "How many days are there in a year?"

"Three hundred and sixty-five," said Alice.

"And how many birthdays have you?"
we've had enough of that subject, and it would be just as well if you'd mention what you mean to do next, as I suppose you don't mean to stop here all the rest of your life."

"That's a great deal to make one word mean," Alice said in a thoughtful tone.

"When I make a word do a lot of work like that," said Humpty Dumpty, "I always pay it extra."

"Oh!" said Alice. She was too much puzzled to make any other remark.

"Ah, you should see 'em come round me of a Saturday night," Humpty Dumpty went on, wagging his head gravely from side to side, "for to get their wages, you know."

(Alice didn't venture to ask what he paid them with; and so you see I can't tell you.)

"You seem very clever at explaining words, Sir," said Alice. "Would you kindly tell me the meaning of the poem called 'Jabberwocky'?

"Let's hear it," said Humpty Dumpty. "I can explain all the poems that ever were invented—and a good many that haven't been invented just yet."

This sounded very hopeful, so Alice repeated the first verse:

"'Twas brillig, and the slithy toves
Did gyre and gimble in the wabe:
All mimsy were the borogoves,
And the mome raths outgrabe."

"That's enough to begin with," Humpty Dumpty interrupted: "there are plenty of hard words there. 'Brillig' means four o'clock in the afternoon—the time when you begin broiling things for dinner."

"That'll do very well," said Alice: "and 'slithy'?

"Well, 'slithy' means 'lithe and slimy.' 'Lithe' is the same as 'active.' You see it's like a portmanteau1—there are two meanings packed up into one word."

"I see it now," Alice remarked thoughtfully: "and what are 'toves'?"

"Well 'toves' are something like badgers—they're something like lizards—and they're something like corkscrews."

"They must be very curious-looking creatures."

"They are that," said Humpty Dumpty; "also they make their nests under sundials—also they live on cheese."

1. A portmanteau is a traveling bag that opens, like a book, into two equal compartments. For a further discussion by Dodgson of the portmanteau words of "Jabberwocky," see the preface to The Hunting of the Snark, on pp. 219-20 of this edition.