

**UNIVERSITY OF TARTU
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH STUDIES**

**TWO ESTONIAN ALICES: COMPARING THE
TRANSLATIONS OF LEWIS CARROLL'S *ALICE IN
WONDERLAND***

BA thesis

MARI-LEEN LEESI

SUPERVISOR: *LECT.* KATILINA GIELEN

**TARTU
2021**

ABSTRACT

Alice in Wonderland is a book that many people around the world know and love. A great deal of research has been done about the translation difficulties of *Alice in Wonderland*, however, not much research has been done about translating the book into Estonian. This thesis compares two Estonian translations of the book, one translated by Linda Bakis and published in 1940 and the other by Jaan Kross, published in 1971. The thesis analyses the translation of proper nouns, wordplay and puns in *Alice in Wonderland*. Wordplay is notoriously difficult to translate and the analysis reveals how the Estonian translators have solved the translation issues of wordplay and puns in this book. The analysis also reveals the level of domestication and foreignization in these two translations and enables us to compare the authors's style from that perspective.

This thesis gives a brief overview of the Estonian translators, focusing a little more on Linda Bakis, as there is not that much known about her. Jaan Kross is a famous Estonian author and translator, who most Estonian readers are familiar with. When analysing these two translations, it is also important to keep in mind when they were published, as language evolves over time and older translations will become outdated at some point.

The first chapter of the thesis gives an overview of domestication and foreignization in translation and how that affects the reader's understanding of the text. Articles analysing the translation of *Alice in Wonderland* into other languages, especially those concerning the translation of proper nouns, wordplay and puns are briefly analysed in this thesis to identify the main problems when encountering those translation difficulties.

The second chapter first analyses the translation of proper nouns by Bakis and Kross, especially those that would seem foreign for Estonian readers, and tries to see whether the translators have domesticated or foreignized those proper nouns. The analysis then moves on to the translation of wordplay and puns in this book, and sees how or if the translators have managed to translate those into Estonian, while also briefly commenting the level of domestication or foreignization in the translation of wordplay and puns. This thesis also discusses other elements in the book that indicate whether the translations have been domesticated or foreignized.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	2
INTRODUCTION.....	4
ON TRANSLATING <i>ALICE IN WONDERLAND</i>	7
ANALYSIS OF PROPER NOUNS AND WORDPLAY	13
Methodology.....	13
Analysis of proper nouns	14
Analysis of wordplay and puns.....	19
Additional remarks about the translations	35
Discussion.....	36
CONCLUSION	38
REFERENCES.....	41
RESÜMEE	43

INTRODUCTION

Alice in Wonderland, published in 1865, is perhaps one of the most well-known children's books ever written and it has inspired numerous adaptations of all kinds. Although written during the Victorian era and full of historical and cultural references to that period, the book has stood the test of time and is still popular today. The enthralling adventures of Alice are still interesting to read, even if the historical and cultural references are not noticed or understood. In addition to the references, the book also contains many instances of wordplay, puns, parodies of songs and nonsense verse. For that reason, the author of *Alice in Wonderland*, Lewis Carroll (Charles L. Dodgson), was uncertain if the book could ever be translated (Park 2018). While certainly offering a challenge to any translator, the book has nevertheless been translated to many languages all over the world. Although a great deal of research has been done concerning the translation difficulties of *Alice in Wonderland*, such research has not been done about translating the book into Estonian. While every language is different, wordplay and puns, for example, are difficult to translate into any language. Different translation techniques can be used for that purpose and analysing the first two Estonian translations of *Alice in Wonderland* will reveal how these and other problematic parts have been solved. Due to the limitations of the BA thesis, parodies of songs and nonsense verse will not be discussed in this thesis and the focus will be on the translation of proper nouns, wordplay and puns.

This thesis analyses the Estonian translations by Linda Bakis (1940) and Jaan Kross (1971). Linda Bakis (née Luiga) was born in 1902 and she came from a well-respected and educated family, her father, Georg Eduard Luiga, being the chief editor of the newspaper *Eesti*

Päevaleht (Geni; Pakats 2018). All of his children received a higher education, and Linda and her sisters translated stories for *Eesti Päevaleht* as students (Pakats 2018). Bakis studied psychology at the University of Tartu, and later worked as a teacher (Pakats 2018; ISIK). In 1944, she emigrated to Germany with her husband Eduard Bakis and their children (EE). In 1949, they moved to the United States, where Linda Bakis died in 1992 (EE; Geni). As there is not much information on Linda Bakis, it is difficult to say how or why exactly she ended up translating *Alice in Wonderland*. There is a possibility that she was encouraged to do so by Ants Oras, the translator of song parodies and nonsense verse in Bakis's translation. Oras was a Professor of English Philology at the University of Tartu in the 1930s, when Linda Bakis was studying there (ISIK). It is also possible that they met through the Estonian student association EYS Veljesto, as Ants Oras was one of the founding members of Veljesto and Linda Bakis was its member (EYS Veljesto; Geni). Perhaps Bakis would have become a prolific translator had there been no Soviet occupation and had she not been forced to leave her country behind.

Jaan Kross (1920-2007) was a renowned and celebrated Estonian writer, poet and translator. His novels are one of the best-known among Estonian literature, and have been translated into many languages. He has won numerous awards for his work (EWOD). He had a long writing career and it is safe to say that he also had more translation experience compared to Linda Bakis. Kross translated mainly verse from Russian, English, French, Swedish, German, Finnish and Hungarian (EWOD). While Bakis might have decided to translate *Alice in Wonderland* as a kind of an experiment, for Kross it could have been part of his work. However, according to Kross himself, he was usually able to choose the books that he wanted to translate, although he certainly received commissions from publishers as well (Kross 1986). He would normally read a book to enrich his own worldview and if he found it

interesting or something that should be accessible to Estonian readers as well, he would translate it. Since Kross liked to translate verse, it is possible that he was drawn to *Alice in Wonderland* by the nonsense verse and song parodies.

When comparing the translations by Bakis and Kross, it is important to keep in mind the time period when these translations were published. Bakis published her translation in 1940, the year of the first Soviet occupation and it is likely that her translation was less influenced by the Soviet regime. Kross's translation was published in 1971, which is right in the middle of the Soviet occupation. Life in Estonia had changed considerably in these thirty years. Another important thing to note is that Kross had more experience as a writer and a translator when he published his translation. And lastly, as both of these translations were published decades ago, there are words and phrases that might seem strange and outdated to us at the present, because translations age and language has evolved. All of these factors should be taken into account.

The aim of this thesis is to compare and analyse the translations of *Alice in Wonderland* by Linda Bakis and Jaan Kross, more specifically focusing on instances of wordplay and proper nouns. The first part of this thesis gives a short overview of the two translation techniques domestication and foreignization, the approaches used for children's literature and the translation of wordplay and proper nouns. The second part of the thesis focuses on the comparison of the two Estonian translations and gives an insight into the translation styles used by the translators.

ON TRANSLATING *ALICE IN WONDERLAND*

Translating a text does not mean that the translator only needs to translate words in one language into another; it requires an understanding of the text. It is more important to convey the same idea, rather than the exact words. Translation can be thought of as a form of interpretation and is connected with linguistic, intertextual, psychological and narrative competence, as Eco (2000: 13) explains. In order to be able to translate a foreign text as accurately as possible, meaning that the idea or a feeling is conveyed in the same way, it is important for the translator to have a 'deep' sense of the text (Eco 2000: 14). Sometimes that can mean changing a few things in the translation to make it more understandable for the reader. A translator cannot always follow the source text faithfully as it can at times lead to confusions. As Eco (2000: 17) states, translation is not a shift between two languages, but between two cultures. Translation involves looking for similarities between languages and cultures in a sea of differences, but these differences should never be entirely lost in the translation, but preserved to show the contrast between the source and target cultures (Venuti 1995: 306).

There are essentially two ways how to approach the translation: domestication and foreignization, yet the two ways are by no means exclusive. A translator can use both elements of domestication and foreignization in their translation. Rarely is a translation completely domesticated or foreignized; it usually stays somewhere in the middle. Domestication is adapting the text in such a way to fit the target culture, that is, omitting the historical and cultural references or replacing them with references to the target culture; foreignization, on the other hand, leaves those references intact, which might create a certain

distance for the reader and make the text less relatable (Park 2018: 143; Nord 2003: 185). According to Venuti (2001: 240-241), the domestication strategy has been in use since ancient Rome, when Latin poets translated Greek texts, often omitting parts and adding references to Roman culture, and changing the texts to make it seem as if they were originally written in Latin. That, of course, is a rather extreme example of domestication. The early modern French and English translation traditions were also quite fond of the domestication strategy, although to a somewhat lesser degree; this strategy was used to promote aristocratic literary culture and nationalism (Venuti 2001: 241). Culture, politics and economy play a part in the domestication strategy, however, it is clear that domestication always involves following the domestic literary canons, both when choosing a foreign text to translate and a translation method (Venuti 2001: 241). According to Venuti (1995: 203), translation always involves some form of domestication, as it can never be completely literal; the translator always has to make little changes to ensure the text is understandable in the target culture.

Foreignization was first discussed and explained in Germany during the classical and Romantic periods, mostly by Friedrich Schleiermacher, who noted that most translation was domesticating, transforming the foreign text in such a way to fit the cultural values of the target culture; however, he actually preferred the foreignization strategy to stress the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text (Venuti 2001: 242). Foreignization is therefore in opposition with the domestic culture and literary canons. It involves following the foreign text closely, or literalism, which can eventually lead to the importation of foreign cultural forms (Venuti 2001: 242). With foreignization there is also a risk that the text could be incomprehensible if it differs greatly from native literary canons (Venuti 2001: 242). Foreignization strategy is a great way for translators to experiment with foreign texts and various translation methods to offer the reader a different reading experience.

A text as rich as *Alice in Wonderland* poses many difficulties for translators. There are different ways how to approach them. A translation usually depends on the target audience, the cultural norms and values in the target culture, limits set by the publisher, and the creativity and skill of the translator. According to Oittinen (2000: 5; 2003: 128-129) and Kibbee (2003: 307), when translating a book, the translator should always take into consideration the target audience. This is especially true regarding children's literature. Oittinen (2003: 129) also points out that children's literature actually has a dual audience, since it is the adults who write, translate, buy and choose the books for children to read. In a way, children's books must also be interesting enough to adults, so that the adults would buy or read the books to their children (Oittinen 2000: 64). While *Alice in Wonderland* may have been meant for children in the Victorian era, children nowadays would be unable to recognise the historical and cultural references, even if it is British children reading the original English version. When translating a book meant for child or young adult readers, it is important to keep in mind that it should not be too complicated.

When choosing between domestication or foreignization, it cannot be said that one way is better than the other – it all depends on the target audience. Domestication might be more suitable for children and foreignization for adults as Oittinen (2000: 142) suggests, especially in the case of *Alice in Wonderland*, where it is not necessary to understand the historical and cultural references to enjoy the rich fantasy and imagination of the story. Another key element for choosing between domestication and foreignization are proper nouns – translating, not translating or changing proper nouns, especially personal names. Changing personal names in the source text to those more common in the target culture is one way of domesticating the text and making it more relatable. There are different degrees and reasons for translating and changing proper nouns as, according to Nord (2003: 183-185), many

personal names in fiction have an informative function, for example, showing to which culture the character belongs, and they are usually chosen deliberately. Another important reason for changing personal names is pronunciation; often names are changed only slightly to make them easier to pronounce in the target culture (Nord 2003: 187). This is perhaps again more important for children's literature. *Alice in Wonderland* offers a variety of interesting personal names, which do tend to have a meaning behind them, and the works of Park (2018), Kibbee (2003), Vid (2008), Nord (2003) and Kaschula (2017) discuss the translation of proper nouns with examples from specific translations that constitute a good material for comparison with the Estonian translations. Out of these works, the article by Nord (2003) is the most comprehensive one, analysing the translation of proper nouns in eight translations of *Alice in Wonderland* and dividing the proper nouns into three categories: explicitly referring to the real world, implicitly referring to the real world, and names referring to fictitious characters; the other authors focus on certain specific instances. However, it is clear that there is no one proper way of translating proper nouns; it is up to the translator. The translation also depends on the restrictions set by the norms and culture, as both Weissbrod (1996: 221) and Oittinen (2000: 8-12, 134) explain, thus possibly limiting the options the translator has.

Another challenge for translators is wordplay and puns. There are many different types of wordplay, but all of them are practically impossible to translate, because languages are different and wordplay in one language usually does not work in another. One way of handling wordplay would be to translate it literally and explain it in annotations, but as Nord (2003: 195) points out, it would kill the joke. She also suggests that annotations might not be suitable for children's literature, as it may be confusing for them (Nord 2003: 195). However, that also depends on the story and the age group of the children. It is nearly impossible to translate wordplay, but it is possible to create new wordplay that looks similar to that used in

the source text by perhaps slightly changing the nature or the location of the wordplay. Díaz Pérez (1999) gives a good overview with examples about what to do with wordplay in translation and Weissbrod (1996) discusses the essential role of wordplay in an ambivalent text – a text that can be both children’s and adult literature. That is the reason why *Alice in Wonderland* can be enjoyed by adult readers as well.

As mentioned, there are different strategies for wordplay translation, and Díaz Pérez (1999: 362-369) lists them as follows: from pun to pun, where the target text includes a pun, but it is a different type of pun using different words; from pun to no pun, where there is no pun in the target text, as the source text words are translated literally and the pun is lost, because the same words in the target text do not have a double meaning; from pun to “punoid”, which tries to recreate the effect of the pun by using such means as repetition, rhyme, alliteration, etc., which are typical features of puns, but are alone not enough to form a pun, which is why they are referred to as “punoids”; “transference”, where the target text words or phrases are forced to take the source text meanings, although they do not exist in the target language, and they usually require an end- or footnote to explain the double meaning in the source text; from no pun to pun, where a target text pun may be presented as a translation of a source text fragment that does not have a pun; from nothing to pun, where there is a pun in the target text for which there is no corresponding textual material in the source text; omitting “without trace”, in which case the source text puns are completely lost without any attempt to compensate for them or explain them; “directly copied”, where the puns are copied as foreign source language words into the target text; and editorial techniques, which are commentaries on the translation, such as an introduction, an epilogue, footnotes, endnotes, parenthesis in the main text, etc., which are used to explain the puns.

Translating can often be a tricky task and how the translator approaches this task largely depends on the target audience. In the case of children's literature, there could be some merit in domesticating the translation to make it more relatable and understandable to children, but it also depends on the story. If the point of the story is not lost in the process of domestication and it does not suffer much because of it, then domestication could be a great option, especially for younger children. Translating wordplay, or rather inventing new similar wordplay to that what is used in the source text, requires a great deal of creativity from the translator. There are different solutions for handling wordplay, but in the end it largely depends on the possibilities of the target language. As can be seen, there are really no wrong or right methods for translation, it all depends on the source text and the translator – how they interpret the text, who is the target audience, and what they want the reader to take away from the translation.

ANALYSIS OF PROPER NOUNS AND WORDPLAY

The following part of the thesis analyses the translation of proper nouns and wordplay in the translations by Bakis and Kross. There are different ways how to handle wordplay in translation and comparing the methods used by the translators will reveal more about the translators' style. Comparing these different methods will also reveal how much domestication or foreignization the translators have used.

Methodology

The choice of analysing proper nouns for this thesis results from the fact that names are one of the first things people notice when reading a text. It is also one of the first indicators if a text has been domesticated or foreignized. As for wordplay, it demonstrates the translator's skill and creativity. However, wordplay can also show the level of domestication and foreignization. If a translator chooses to translate wordplay as it is and thereby loses the joke or explains it in footnotes, that could be seen as foreignization, as the text is closer to the original, yet "further away" from the reader, not in their culture context. Inventing your own wordplay to replace the original, however, would be domestication, as the translator has taken more liberties with the original text, bringing it "closer" to the target readers.

This thesis does not analyse all the proper nouns and wordplay found in *Alice in Wonderland*. Some of the proper nouns will be mentioned briefly as there is no need to analyse them thoroughly for the purposes of this thesis. The choice was made based on what names are the most recurring ones or which ones would stand out the most for Estonian

readers. As for wordplay, this thesis should cover most of them, as the most obvious and infamous ones are analysed, however, it is entirely possible that some minor ones went by unnoticed. For the analysis of wordplay, the taxonomy by Díaz Pérez (1999), discussed in the last chapter, is used as a guidance, however, it is not the focus of the analysis.

Analysis of proper nouns

Proper nouns, especially character names can reveal how domesticated or foreignized a translation is. Foreign names can often be very unfamiliar and difficult to pronounce, especially for children. For that reason, character names are sometimes slightly changed for easier understanding in the target culture. The author can also choose names for their characters based on certain connotations in the source culture, which could go unnoticed in the target culture unless explained. Additionally, proper nouns that refer to historical persons or locations or cultural phenomena can also be unfamiliar for readers in the target culture and might need to be explained as well. What the translator does with proper nouns and historical and cultural references in the text shows the level of domestication or foreignization they have used. This thesis analyses a selection of character names that appear frequently in the text or that could pose difficulties for Estonian readers. Some especially foreign-sounding proper nouns, mainly historical figures and locations, are also discussed.

The name of the main character, *Alice*, is not changed in either of the translations. This name is definitely foreign for Estonian readers, especially in the 1940s and 1970s, however, it is not very difficult to pronounce and both Bakis and Kross give the pronunciation of the

name in the endnotes. The fact that the main character's name was not domesticated is the first indication for the reader that the story most likely takes place in a foreign country.

The White Rabbit is translated as *valge kodujänes* by Bakis and *Valge Kiiulik* by Kross. This name is not particularly challenging; it is quite straightforward. The reason why Bakis chose *kodujänes* instead of *kiiulik* could be because it is an earlier translation and the word *kiiulik* came into use only in the 1930s (*Eesti etimoloogiasõnaraamat*). Perhaps it was not as widespread yet when Bakis was preparing her translation.

The Lory, which is a type of parrot, is translated as just *papagoi* by Bakis and *Loori* by Kross. While the word *loori* does exist in Estonian, it is used for both the bird from Oceania and Southeast Asia, lory, as well as for a type of primate in India, Sri Lanka and Southeast Asia, loris (*e-keelenõu*). That makes it unclear which animal is talked about in the story, although the Lory is minor character and whether the reader understands exactly who it is does not affect their understanding of the story. In any case, *loori* is not a widely used word in Estonian and the readers would probably have to look it up to see who it is, which is a sign of foreignization by Kross, although the translation is more accurate. *Papagoi*, however, should be clear to everyone and it is not that important to know what kind of parrot it is exactly. That shows that Bakis has domesticated this name.

The Cheshire Cat is translated as *Cheshire'i kass* by Bakis and *Irvik Kass* by Kross. Here it is Bakis who has used foreignization and Kross domestication. While more accurate, *Cheshire'i kass* is uncomfortable to pronounce for Estonians, even though Bakis gives the pronunciation and explanation of Cheshire in the endnotes. As Estonians would not know the saying about cats in Cheshire always grinning, it would have to be explained to Estonian readers anyway, which is probably why Kross came up with *Irvik Kass*. In fact, he does not mention Cheshire once in the story, even when the Duchess explains to Alice that the cat is

grinning because it is from Cheshire (Carroll 1994: 69-70). Instead, Kross explains that the cat is grinning because it is the grinning type (Carroll 1971: 48).

The March Hare is translated as *märtsijänes/Märtsijänes* by both Bakis and Kross respectively. This name is again very straightforward, the only thing to mention is that Estonian readers would not know the saying about hares being mad in March. Kross does not explain this to the readers, but Bakis does in the endnotes, which is an element of domestication in this case, as she is trying to explain the character's name.

The Hatter is translated as *veider vend* by Bakis and *Kübarsepp* by Kross. This is a rather odd choice by Bakis, but Estonian readers again would not know the saying "as mad as a Hatter", which might be the reason behind her choice. She might have tried to convey the fact that the Hatter was slightly odd and mad by making it clear in his name. In fact, she even leaves out a part in chapter eleven, when the King asks the Hatter to take off his hat when he is giving his evidence in the court (Carroll 1994: 131-132). It seems like Bakis did not want the readers to know that *veider vend* had anything to do with hats at all. By doing that she has domesticated the character's name.

The Dormouse is translated as *Unihir* by both Bakis and Kross, although Bakis omits the initial capital letter, as she tends to do with some of the character names. Dormice are known for their long periods of hibernation, a fact that Carroll exaggerates in his character. Although the correct term for *dormouse* would be *unilane (e-keelenõu)*, *Unihir* is a closer translation, in terms of explaining the character and making his behaviour more understandable to the reader, which is a sign of domestication.

The Queen of Hearts is translated as *ärtukuninganna* by Bakis and *Ärtu Kuningaemand* by Kross. Although this is only a slight difference, because *kuninganna* and *kuningaemand* mean the same thing, it shows that Kross has domesticated this name, as

emand is usually the name of the card in Estonian depicting a queen. Kross has been more successful in matching the character's name with the reference to a pack of cards.

The Mock Turtle is translated as *valekilpkonn/Valekilpkonn* by both Bakis and Kross. The character's name refers to mock turtle soup which Estonian readers would not know anything about. Bakis explains in the endnotes that this particular soup used to be made with calf meat instead of turtle meat (Carroll 1940: 115), because it was cheaper; Kross gives no explanation. What the soup is actually made of is made clearer by the illustrations in the original book, which depict the Mock Turtle with a calf's head, hind legs and tail (Carroll 1994). The illustrations in both Estonian translations show a regular turtle, which leaves it unclear how exactly is it a mock turtle. This is an element of foreignization in both of the translations, especially Kross's, as the reference to the soup is left unexplained.

The Gryphon is translated as *grüps/Grüps* by both Bakis and Kross. *Grüps* is now an outdated term in Estonian, nowadays the word *greif* is mostly used instead. In English as well it seems that *griffin* has become more common. Back in the 1940s and 1970s, a gryphon would not have been a very widely known creature in Estonian culture. Nowadays, however, after the popularity of the *Harry Potter* books, most people know what a gryphon is. Bakis explains in the endnotes what a gryphon looks like, Kross does not. The illustrations in both of the Estonian translations, however, show what a gryphon looks like. This would have been an element of foreignization when the translations were published, as the creature would have been foreign to Estonian readers, but it probably would not be the case nowadays.

Mary Ann, who is the White Rabbit's housemaid, is changed into *Ann* by Bakis, which is quite a common Estonian name, although pronounced slightly differently than the English *Ann*. In this case, Bakis has domesticated the name. Mary Ann was Alice's nurse in the real world (Nord 2003: 186), a fact which probably nobody besides Carroll and Alice and her

family would know anyway, so there is not much lost by domesticating *Mary Ann* into *Ann*. There is one instance in the translation by Bakis where it says *Mary Ann* instead of *Ann*, however, that seems to be an oversight (Carroll 1940: 30). Kross keeps the name *Mary Ann*, which is definitely foreign for Estonian readers, indicating that this is a foreignization. He does, however, give the pronunciation of the name in the endnotes.

Other character names, such as *Dinah*, *Ada*, *Mabel*, *Pat*, *Bill*, *Elsie*, *Lacie* and *Tillie*, are left the same by both Bakis and Kross. Bakis does not give the pronunciation of any of these names, whereas Kross gives the pronunciation of *Dinah*, *Mabel* and *Pat*, the other names not being as difficult to pronounce for Estonian readers, and the name *Ada* or usually *Aada* being in use in Estonia as well. This is a case of foreignization in both of the translations, with the exclusion of *Ada*, as these names sound foreign to Estonian readers. These names were chosen on purpose by Carroll, often referring to actual people, something that most readers of the book would not know. There probably would not be much lost by domesticating these names. *Pat*, for example, is most likely short for *Patrick*, and he could be Irish, as he seems to have an accent and it is explained in the original book that he pronounced “arm” as “arrum” (Nord 2003: 193; Carroll 1994: 45). His accent is often lost in translation, which is also the case with the Estonian translations, as neither Bakis or Kross try to give him an accent. *Elsie*, *Lacie* and *Tillie* refer to Alice and her sisters, *Elsie* and *Tillie* being nicknames and *Lacie* the anagram of Alice (Nord 2003: 189). This, again, would be lost to most readers, unless the reference is explained, and there would not be much lost by domesticating these names.

Place names and references to historical people, such as *Mercia*, *Northumbria*, *Canterbury*, and *Edwin*, *Morcar*, *Stigand*, *Edgar Atheling* and *Shakespeare* are left the same by both Bakis and Kross. Bakis explains who some of these people are, but does not give any

pronunciations. Kross, on the other hand, gives no explanations, but does give the pronunciation for all of them. *William the Conqueror* is *William Vallutaja* in both the Estonian translations, as this is the usual Estonian translation of the name. Both Bakis and Kross give the pronunciation of *William*, and Bakis also explains who he was. These names are very obviously foreign for Estonian readers, which points to foreignization in this case. However, most Estonians would know who William the Conqueror and Shakespeare are. If a translator wants to domesticate these names, they could use place names and historical figures from their own culture, which is what Vladimir Nabokov has done in his translation, using names from Russian history (Park 2018: 148).

Analysis of wordplay and puns

Translating wordplay and puns is probably one of the most difficult tasks for a translator, because most of the time the exact joke cannot be translated, so the joke is either lost or a new one has to be invented to replace it. Even if the joke is explained in the footnotes, it takes something away from it, it loses its cleverness. Often the translator has to add words or sentences to invent new wordplay or change something in the original text. However, adding new wordplay is a great way for preserving the author's style, even if it ends up being clumsier than the original. Analysing wordplay and puns shows us the creativity and skill of the translator and also the level of domestication or foreignization that they have used. The more domesticated the text is, the further away from the original the translation is, however, that also makes it easier for the reader to understand. The following analysis of wordplay and puns will reveal how the Estonian translators have handled it and how difficult or perhaps

even impossible to translate they proved to be. As neither of the translators used footnotes or endnotes to explain the jokes and mostly tried to invent their own, it can be said that they both have used mostly domestication when it comes to wordplay and puns, just different levels of it. Foreignized wordplay would be translated exactly as it is, without changing anything, which would mean, of course, that the joke is lost or it is explained somewhere. The examples are listed in chronological order.

The famous and grammatically incorrect phrase uttered by Alice “Curiouser and curiouser!” (Carroll 1994: 21) is translated by Bakis as “Taga veidramaks ja veidramaks asi läheb!” (Carroll 1940: 14) and “Järjest naljakamam ja naljakamam!” by Kross (Carroll 1971: 16). Although both translations convey the meaning of the phrase, Bakis has lost the pun by not making it grammatically incorrect, while Kross has been able to preserve the original style by doing just that. Even though *naljakamam* is not correct Estonian, neither is *curiouser* so the pun works in quite the same way both in English and Estonian.

When Alice and a group of birds and animals had managed to escape the pool of tears, they were all dripping wet and wondering how to get dry again, so the Mouse offered to tell them a story, saying “This is the driest thing I know” (Carroll 1994: 31). This is translated as “Järgmine on kõige kuivem asi, mida tean” by Bakis (Carroll 1940: 22) and “See on kõige kuivem asi, mida ma tean” by Kross (Carroll 1971: 23). The joke here being, of course, that the word *dry* can also be used to describe something boring, like the story the Mouse was going to tell. This is one of the puns that actually works in Estonian as well, so both the translators were able to keep the pun without having to invent anything new.

After the Caucus-race, Alice wanted the Mouse to tell her his history, to which the Mouse replied “Mine is a long and a sad tale!” and Alice, looking at the Mouse’s tail, said that “It is a long tail, certainly, /.../ but why do you call it sad?” (Carroll 1994: 36). This wordplay

plays with the words *tale* and *tail*, which are homophones. Bakis translated this part as “Ah, sel lool on kurb ja pikk saba taga!” and “Saba võib muidugi olla pikk, /.../ aga kuidas sabad võivad olla kurvad?” (Carroll 1940: 26-27). Kross translated it as “Minu jutt on pikk ja hale jutt” and “Ta on tõesti pikk, see sinu jutt, /.../ aga miks nimetad sa seda haledaks?” (Carroll 1971: 26). As there are no such homophones in Estonian, both translators have tried to make this pun work. Bakis added that the *tale* had a long *tail*, although this is not really a common phrase in Estonian, but that allowed her to not only keep the pun, but keep it also in the same location, using almost the same words. Kross has tried to use the word *jutt* as in the sense *sabajutt*; he even used the word *hännajutt* for *tail* in his translation to say that Alice was looking at the Mouse’s tail, probably to strengthen the pun. The problem is, of course, that *jutt*, as in *sabajutt*, is not pronounced quite the same way as *jutt*, a story; *jutt* in *sabajutt* is palatalised. This is probably the reason why he added the word *hännajutt* to make the pun clearer; he even extends the pun by saying that Alice “mõtles selle küsimuse üle ühtejutti edasi” (Carroll 1971: 26), which is the next sentence after Alice wonders why the Mouse is calling his tail sad. Instead of homophones he has used homographs, which is very clever, but unfortunately the pun does not work quite as well as in English. In this case it could be said that Bakis’s translation is more foreignized, as it is not a common phrase in Estonian and sounds a little strange. Both translators also extended the pun into the title of the chapter, *A Caucus-Race and a Long Tale*, Bakis translating it as *Segavõidujooks ja sabaga jutt* and Kross as *Kihutusjooks ja jutiga jutt*.

Alice had not been paying attention to the Mouse’s story and asked if he had got to the fifth bend with it, since in her mind the tale looked like a long winding tail, to which the Mouse replied “I had *not!*” and Alice exclaimed “A knot!”, offering to help undo it (Carroll 1994: 38). *Not* and *knot* are again homophones. Bakis has left this pun out completely,

translating “I had *not!*” as “Ei jõudnud!” (Carroll 1940: 28), referring to the Mouse getting to the fifth bend, and leaves out a few sentences that mention the knot. Kross also translated this part as “Ei jõudnud!”, but then instead of “A knot!” Alice replies “Oi, kas sõlm läks enne sisse?” (Carroll 1971: 27), referring to the fact that Alice was imagining that the Mouse’s story was winding like a tail. The wordplay with homophones is lost, but he has managed to keep half of the pun, however the pun no longer involves the words, but rather the image of the story in Alice’s head.

The title of the fourth chapter, *The Rabbit Sends in a Little Bill*, plays with the words *Bill*, the name of a character, and *bill*, an invoice. Bakis translated the title of this chapter as *Kodujänes saadab majja väikese Billi* and Kross as *Küülik saadab sisse pisikese Billi*. The only way to try and make this pun work would be to change the character’s name, but even then it would be difficult to find something in Estonian that could be used for a similar wordplay; perhaps something with *Arved* and *arve*. Since both translators kept the name *Bill*, they lost the pun. However, keeping the name *Bill* could have been a more natural choice in this case, as many other character names sound foreign to Estonian readers anyway and a very domesticated Estonian name could sound odd in this context. Furthermore, as *Bill the Lizard* plays a big part in this chapter, it makes sense to keep his name in the title, rather than something to do with a bill.

The title of the sixth chapter is *Pig and Pepper*. Although this is not exactly a pun, but a “punoid” according to Díaz Pérez (1999), since it uses only alliteration, it is still an interesting example to analyse. Bakis translated this as *Siga ja pipar* and Kross as *Põrsas ja pipar*. Even though *siga* is by no means a wrong translation in this context, it could have been better to use the word *põrsas* as Kross has done, because we have a suitable word in Estonian that we can use to keep the alliteration. Although *põrsas* usually refers to piglets and not so

much to pigs, it fits perfectly in this case, as the chapter talks about the Duchess's baby who turned into a piglet. Furthermore, Bakis herself uses the word *põrsas* in this chapter anyway.

As Alice is having a conversation with the Duchess, she worries what would happen to the day and night if the world went round faster than it does, and tells the Duchess that “You see the earth takes twenty-four hours to turn round on its axis – “, to which the Duchess replies “Talking of axes, /.../ chop off her head!” (Carroll 1994: 71). This pun again plays with homophones, this time *axis* and *axes*. Both translators had to change this part a little by adding a sentence to make the pun work. Bakis translated this part as “Maakeral läheb kakskümmend neli tundi, et pöörduda ümber telje. Ega see aeg siis pea lühemaks...” and “Pea lühemaks? /.../ Ei, pea maha. Raiu tal pea maha!” (Carroll 1940: 53). Kross translated it as “Maakeral läheb kakskümmend neli tundi, üks ole, et pöörata end ümber oma telje. Kui sealt peab maha võtma...” and “Sa räägid mahavõtmisest? /.../ Võtke tal pea maha!” (Carroll 1971: 50). It was necessary for the translators to make this part longer in order to keep the pun, as there are no suitable homophones for the word *telg* in Estonian in this context. Instead, Bakis played with the word *head* in the phrase *chop off her head*. Kross, on the other hand, played with the phrase *to chop off*. The translators extended the idea that if the world went round faster, the day and night would be shorter and there would be less time; this is what their added sentences refer to. They have solved this pun in different ways, but both of them work as the conversation with the Duchess was not a very logical one anyway and does not have to make that much sense.

Alice tells the Cheshire Cat that the Duchess's baby had turned into a pig, and the Cat asks “Did you say pig, or fig?” (Carroll 1994: 78). This pun plays with rhyming words. Bakis translated it as “Kas sa ütlesid “põrsaks” või “varsaks?”” (Carroll 1940: 57) and Kross “Kas sa ütlesid põrsaks või tursaks?” (Carroll 1971: 53). Both translators used the word *põrsas* in

this case, however, there is not a perfectly rhyming word in Estonian that would suit this context. The translators have tried to use words that sound similar enough to *põrsas*. Since the baby could have just as easily turned into a foal or a cod, it does not really matter what the translators chose, as long as it sounds similar.

When Alice visits the March Hare and the Hatter, she talks with them about Time and says “/.../ I know I have to beat time when I learn music” to which the Hatter replies “He won’t stand beating” (Carroll 1994: 84). Bakis translated this part as “/.../ ma tean, et pean lööma aega surnuks, kui õpin muusikat” and “Ta ei kannata löömist” (Carroll 1940: 64). Kross translated it as “/.../ ma tean, et kui ma muusikat õpin, lõõn sellega aega surnuks” and “Ta ei kannata niisugust kohtlemist” (Carroll 1971: 56). This pun plays with the phrase *to beat time*, which means *to follow a musical tempo*; in Estonian it would be *takti lööma*. As the Estonian phrase does not have anything to do with time, it cannot be used in this context. Luckily there is a phrase in Estonian concerning time and also beating, *aega surnuks lööma*, however, it has nothing to do with music, it means to *kill time*. Both translators have made use of this phrase, but the translation by Bakis sounds a little clumsier, saying that Alice has to kill time when she learns music. Leaving the *have to* part out, as Kross has done, makes more sense in Estonian. In any case, both translators were quite successfully able to keep the pun, so that it still includes *beating* and *time*.

When the Dormouse is telling Alice a story about the three little sisters living in a treacle well, he says that “/.../ they were learning to draw, you know –”, and Alice asks “What did they draw?” and the Dormouse replies “Treacle” (Carroll 1994: 88). This pun plays with the verb *to draw*, as in *to make a drawing* or *to extract liquid from somewhere*, like a well. Bakis translated this part as “/.../ nad õppisid nimelt vinnama –”, “Mida nad vinnasid?” and “Siirupit” (Carroll 1940: 67). Kross translated it as “/.../ nad õppisid vinnamist, teate...“,

“Mida nad vinnasid?” and “Siirupit” (Carroll 1971: 61). Both translators have lost the pun in this case and chose to translate *to draw* as *to extract liquid*. This choice probably makes more sense in this case, as the story is about the treacle well. Drawing or painting is not really the topic here and would not fit the context very well.

Alice is confused about the sisters drawing treacle from the well, because they were themselves inside the well. She says “But they were *in* the well” to which the Dormouse replies “Of course they were, /.../ – well in” (Carroll 1994: 89). This pun plays with the words *well*, completely, and *well*, a place to get water from. Bakis translated this as “Kuid nad olid ju kaevu sees” and “Muidugi nad olid, /.../ üleni sees, kuid see oli vinnkaev” (Carroll 1940: 68). Kross translated this as “Aga nad olid ju kaevu põhjas” and “Olid jah, /.../ sest see oli põhjalik kaev” (Carroll 1971: 61). Both translators tried to extend the pun to make it work. Bakis played with the words *vinnama* and *vinnkaev*, which is a type of well, *shadoof* or *well pole* in English. Kross played with the words *põhjas*, at the bottom, and *põhjalik*, thorough, in-depth. As the Dormouse’s reply does not make much sense, the translations do not have to either. Neither of the puns in Estonian work quite as well as in English, however, the translation by Kross is closer to the original in terms of giving the same effect.

The Dormouse goes on with his story, saying that the sisters were drawing everything that begins with an M, “such as mouse-traps, and the moon, and memory, and muchness” (Carroll 1994: 90). This is again not exactly a pun, but a “punoid”, using alliteration. Bakis translated this part as “näiteks mullikaid, mudilasi, monumente, mammasid, masajalgu, metsamaasikamoosi ja marjast” (Carroll 1940: 68). Kross translated it as “nagu mägralõks ja moon ja mälu ja mitmus” (Carroll 1971:62). Since it is not really important what the sisters were drawing as long as it starts with an M, the translators were more free in their choices. Both translators used the verb *vinnama* for *to draw* here to fit the context. Bakis has

completely domesticated this part, not even really translating, but just choosing words that start with an M and making the list even longer. Kross is following the original text more closely and comes up with some clever solutions. Instead of *mouse-traps* he used *mägralõks*, changing *mouse* to *badger*, as it starts with an M in Estonian. Instead of *the moon* in English, he uses *a poppy*, which is *moon* in Estonian, which is spelled exactly the same as *the moon* in English. He was also able to translate *memory* and *muchness*, as both *mälu* and *mitmus* also start with an M. This is definitely a closer translation and makes just as much sense as the original text.

As Alice was having a conversation with the Duchess during a game of croquet, talking about mustard, the Duchess said that “/.../ there’s a large mustard-mine near here. And the moral of that is – “The more there is of mine, the less there is of yours.”” (Carroll 1994: 107-108). This pun uses the homophones *mine*, an excavation for extracting minerals, and *mine*, a possessive pronoun. Bakis translated this part as “/.../ siin läheduses on suur sinepikaevandus. Ja sellest järgneb elutarkuse juhise: “Mida rohkem mul seda on, seda vähem seda jääb sinule.”” (Carroll 1940: 82). Kross translated it as “Siinsamas lähedal on suur sinepikaevandus ja mitu sinepiaita. Millest järgneb moraal: *Kui mulle aitab, siis sulle ei aita*” (Carroll 1971: 74). Bakis has lost the pun by translating this part exactly as it was, which means it is foreignized compared to Kross’s translation. Kross changed the text a little to make the pun work, adding *mitu sinepiaita*, mustard storehouses, and he changed the moral so that the pun would play with the words *ait*, storehouse, and *aitama*, be enough. As the Duchess’s moral does not make much sense anyway in this context, the translation does not have to either.

When Alice is listening to the Gryphon and the Mock Turtle talk about their schooldays in the sea, they mention that their schoolmaster was an old Turtle, but that was not

what they called him: “/.../ we used to call him Tortoise –“ and Alice asks “Why did you call him Tortoise, if he wasn’t one?” to which the Mock Turtle replies “We called him Tortoise because he taught us” (Carroll 1994: 112-113). This pun plays with the words *tortoise* and *taught us* as they sound very similar. Bakis translated this part as “/.../ meie hüüdsime teda hilpkonnaks –“, “Miks te panite talle niisuguse naljaka nime?” and “Sellepärast, et see konn peksis meid nii, et hilbud lendasid” (Carroll 1940: 87-88). Kross translated it as “/.../ meie hüüdsime teda Tilpkonnaks...”, “Miks te teda siis Tilpkonnaks kutsusite?” and “Sest ta tilbendas meil järjest kannul ja luuras iga meie sammu” (Carroll 1971: 77). Since in Estonian we can use the word *kilpkonn* for both *turtle* and *tortoise*, the translators played with the first half of the word *kilpkonn* to come up with a nickname for the old Turtle and an explanation for it. The puns by Bakis and Kross also play with sounds, but in a different way; both of them tried to find a rhyming word for *kilp* in *kilpkonn* and match the explanation with it somehow.

The Mock Turtle and the Gryphon start to list what they had to learn in school, “Reeling and Writhing, of course, to begin with, /.../ and then the different branches of Arithmetic – Ambition, Distraction, Uglification, and Derision” (Carroll 1994: 115). Bakis translated this part as “No üks muidugi kõigepealt sugemist ja kurjustamist, /.../ ja peale selle arvutamist kõigi nelja tehtega – kiitmisega, nahutamise, jorutamisega ja pragamisega” (Carroll 1940: 88). Kross translated it as “Kõigepealt muidugi sugemine ja hurjutamine, /.../ ja siis kehkenduse neli tehet – kiitmine, nahutamine, jorutamine ja pragamine” (Carroll 1971: 78). This pun plays with similar sounding words; the subject names in school and what they had to learn in them: reading and writing, and the different branches of arithmetic – addition, subtraction, multiplication and division. In Estonian they would be *lugemine* and *kirjutamine*, and the branches of arithmetic are *liitmine*, *lahutamine*, *korrutamine* and *jagamine*. Here it seems that Kross might have looked at Bakis’s translation as they are almost identical,

however, it was probably difficult to come up with something different than what Bakis had already done, which could be the reason Kross used the same translation. The difference is that for *kirjutamine* he used *hurjutamine* instead of *kurjustamine*. He also added a pun where there originally was none, *kehkenduse neli tehet* instead of *rehkenduse neli tehet*.

The conversation goes on and Alice wonders what Uglification is:

‘I never heard of “Uglification,”’ Alice ventured to say. ‘What is it?’
The Gryphon lifted up both its paws in surprise. ‘What! Never heard of uglifying!’ it exclaimed. ‘You know what to beautify is, I suppose?’
‘Yes,’ said Alice doubtfully: ‘it means – to – make – anything – prettier.’
‘Well, then,’ the Gryphon went on, ‘if you don’t know what to uglify is, you *are* a simpleton.’ (Carroll 1994: 115)

This pun plays with the words *to uglify* and *to beautify*. Since the Estonian translations could not use the word *uglification*, they could also not use *to beautify*. Both of them had to come up with something new for this part. Bakis translated it as:

„Kas teil nahutamine oli lubatud?” julges Alice tähendada. „Säärast asja ma pole elades kuulnud.”
Grüps ajas käpad üllatunult püsti. „Või pole kuulnud, et õpilased koolis üksteist nahutavad?” hüüdis ta põlgavalt. „Kuidas teie nahaga siis lugu oli? Kas te lihtsalt venitasite seanahka?” (Carroll 1940: 89)

And Kross translated it as:

„Oi, kas teil oli siis nahutamine lubatud?” sõandas Alice küsida.
Grüps tõstis üllatusest mõlemad käpad: „Muidugist. Kas teil siis pole? Kas teie olete puha nahavedamise peal väljas?” (Carroll 1971: 78)

Here, too, the translations by Bakis and Kross are quite similar. They play with the words *nahutama* and *nahavedamine*, which are both connected to the word *nahk*.

The conversation continues on the same topic and the Mock Turtle lists more subjects that they had to learn:

‘Well, there was Mystery,’ the Mock Turtle replied, counting off the subjects on his flappers, ‘– Mystery, ancient and modern, with Seaography: then Drawling – the Drawling-master was an old conger-eel, that used to come once a week: *he* taught us Drawling, Stretching, and Fainting in Coils.’ (Carroll 1994: 115)

The pun plays with the subjects history, geography, drawing, sketching, and painting in oils.

This part is also changed by the translators. Bakis translated it as:

„Eks muidugi mõista kringlis-keelt,” vastas valekilpkonn, lugedes ained üles oma käppadel, „kringlis-keelt, sõimlemist, iluharjutust, pugemist. Pugemise õpetajaks oli meil vana angerjas, kes käis meil kõigest kord nädalas. Ta õpetas meile pugemist, siis aga lisaks veel nõelamist, tükkimist, kudemist, kümblemist ja muud vesitööd.” (Carroll 1940: 89)

Bakis has changed this part considerably, she does not use any of the subjects mentioned in the original text and she has also added more subjects. She plays with the subjects *inglise keel*, *võimlemine*, *iluharjutus* and *pugemine*, which could refer to *lugemine* again. She also lists different handicrafts, such as *nõelumine*, *tikkimine*, *kudumine*, *õmblemine*, and *vesitööd* for *käsitööd*. Kross translated this part as:

„Noh, siis oli veel pajalugu,” vastas Valekilpkonn, lugedes aineid käppadel üles, „vana pajalugu ja uus pajalugu, ja reograafia ja kringliskeel ja sõimlemine ja musuõpetus ja ilupugemine. Ilupugemist õpetas meil vana meriangerjas, kes käis korra nädalas.” (Carroll 1971: 78)

Kross’s translation is closer to the original, but he does also add some subjects like Bakis had done. It also seems that he took some inspiration from Bakis’s translation again. He mentions subjects like *ajalugu*, *geograafia*, *inglise keel*, *võimlemine*, *usuõpetus* and most likely *ilulugemine*. As it was probably difficult to come up with something clever in Estonian for drawing, sketching and painting in oils, the translators added new puns to replace those subjects. In this case it could be said that Bakis’s translation is more domesticated, however, she very cleverly listed subjects connected to handicraft instead of art, and came up with some interesting puns.

The Gryphon goes on saying how he also went to the Classical master, who taught “Laughing and Grief” (Carroll 1994: 116), which refer to Latin and Greek. Bakis translated this part as “madinat ja kriukameelt” (Carroll 1940: 89), which would be *ladina ja kreeka keel* in Estonian. Kross translated it as “madina draamatikat” (Carroll 1971: 79), referring to Latin drama, *ladina draamatika* in Estonian, leaving out Greek entirely.

The Mock Turtle and the Gryphon talk about their lessons and how they did fewer of them every day; there were ten hours the first day, nine the next, and so on. And the Gryphon

explains that “That’s the reason they’re called lessons, /.../ because they lessen from day to day” (Carroll 1994: 116). This pun plays with the similar-sounding words *lesson* and *lessen*.

Bakis translated this part as:

„Esimesel päeval töötasime kümme tundi,” ütles valekilpkonn, „siis järgmisel üheksa ja nõnda edasi.”
 „Naljakas! Siis te jäite ju varsti hoopis tööta!” hüüdis Alice.
 „Selles asi just seisabki,” tähendas grüps. „Ega’s meie pool keegi liiga tööta! „Tööta” ju tähendabki „ilma tööta”, mis siis muud?” (Carroll 1940: 89-90)

Bakis plays with the words *töötama* and *tööta*. However, her translation does not quite explain so well why the lessons lessened every day. Kross translated this part as:

„Esimesel päeval kümme tundi,” vastas Valekilpkonn, „järgmisel üheksa ja nõnda edasi.”
 „Kui imelik tunniplaan! Miks teil siis tunde niimoodi vähemaks jäi?” imestas Alice.
 „Meil oli seal üks minu sugulane,” ütles Grüps, „üks palukärp, me palusime teda, ja tema neid siis kärpiski.”
 (Carroll 1971: 79)

Kross plays with the word *palukärp*, which is another name for *kivisisalik*, the sand lizard. He explains that *palu* in *palukärp* stands for *paluma* and *kärp* for *kärpima*, and the lizard is the reason their lessons lessened every day. Kross’s translation is definitely more inventive and he has a better pun for this part.

As the Mock Turtle and the Gryphon are teaching Alice the Lobster Quadrille, they also tell her about whittings, a type of fish, and they explain the origin of its name:

‘Do you know why it’s called a whiting?’
 ‘I never thought about it,’ said Alice. ‘Why?’
 ‘*It does the boots and shoes,*’ the Gryphon replied very solemnly.
 Alice was thoroughly puzzled. ‘Does the boots and shoes!’ she repeated in a wondering tone.
 ‘Why, what are *your* shoes done with?’ said the Gryphon. ‘I mean what makes them so shiny?’
 Alice looked down at them, and considered a little before she gave her answer. ‘They’re done with blacking, I believe.’
 ‘Boots and shoes under the sea,’ the Gryphon went on in a deep voice, ‘are done with whiting. Now you know.’ (Carroll 1994: 121-122)

This pun plays with the words *whiting*, a fish, and *blacking*, shoe polish. Bakis has left this part out entirely, not compensating for it in any way. However, this part is not very important to be able to understand the story, and the loss for the reader is not that great. Kross was able to come up with a pun of his own and translated this part as follows:

„Kas sa tead, miks neid kammeljateks hüütakse?”
 „Ma pole iial selle üle mõtelnud,” sõnas Alice. „Miks siis?”
 „Nendega kammitakse mererohtu,” ütles Grüps pühalikult.
 Alice oli suures hämmelduses. „Kas mererohtu siis rehadega ei rehitseta?” küsis ta.
 „Ei,” ütles Grüps, „seda kammitakse kamm-elajatega.” (Carroll 1971: 82-84)

Kross has used *kammeljas* instead of *whiting*, or *merlang* in Estonian, which allowed him to play with the words *kammeljas*, *kamm* and *kammima*. *Kammeljas* also sounds a little like *kamm-elajas*. Kross was very successfully able to keep this part of the story in and also include a pun.

The conversation about boots and shoes under the sea continues and Alice asks what they are made of, to which the Gryphon replies “Soles and eels, of course” (Carroll 1994: 122), which refers to soles and heels. *Sole*, a type of fish, and *sole*, the underside of a shoe, are homographs. Since Bakis left this part out and Kross’s translation does not mention boots or shoes, this pun is lost in the Estonian translations.

Alice is thinking about the Lobster Quadrille song and they have a conversation about its lyrics:

‘/.../ no wise fish would go anywhere without a porpoise.’
 ‘Wouldn’t it really?’ said Alice in a tone of great surprise.
 ‘Of course not,’ said the Mock Turtle: ‘why, if a fish came to *me*, and told me he was going a journey, I should say “With what porpoise?”’
 ‘Don’t you mean “purpose”?’ said Alice. (Carroll 1994: 122)

This pun plays with the words *porpoise* and *purpose*, which sound very similar. Bakis has again left this part completely out. And Kross managed to come up with a pun of his own:

„/.../ sest iga hästikasvatatud kala käib igal pool konnaga seltsis.”
 „Kas tõesti?!” küsis Alice suures imestuses.
 „Muidugi,” ütles Valekilpkonn. „Kui mõni kala tuleks minu juurde ja ütleks, et ta läheb reisima, ma küsiksin otsemaid: „Missuguse seltskonnaga?”
 „Aga sa ei mõtle ju n i i s u g u s t konna!” hüüdis Alice. (Carroll 1971: 84)

Kross used *frog* instead of *porpoise*, which allowed him to play with the words *konn* and *seltskond*, which decline the same way in the comitative case, *konnaga* and *seltskonnaga*.

When the Hatter is giving his evidence at the court, he talks about when he started his tea:

‘/.../ and the twinkling of the tea –’
 ‘The twinkling of the *what?*’ said the King.
 ‘It *began* with the tea,’ the Hatter replied.
 ‘Of course twinkling begins with a T!’ said the King sharply. (Carroll 1994: 134)

This pun plays with the word *tea* and the letter T, which are homophones. Bakis translated this part as:

‘/.../ ja kõik see tee tuigerdamine –’
 ‘Mille tuigerdamine?’ küsis kuningas.
 ‘See tõesti algas teega,’ vastas veider vend.
 ‘Muidugi tuigerdamine algab t-ga!’ kärkis kuningas teravalt. (Carroll 1940: 103)

This pun works basically the same way in Estonian as it does in English; *teega* and *t-ga* are also homophones. The only thing that had to be changed was *twinkling*. Bakis has used *tuigerdamine*, staggering, which does not seem to have much to do with tea. It is possible that she made another pun here with the Estonian words *tee*, tea, and *tee*, a road, which are homographs. Kross translated this part as:

‘/.../ ja see teetassi tinin...’
 ‘Mille tinin?’ küsis Kuningas.
 ‘See a l g a s teega...’ vastas Kübarsepp.
 ‘T i n i n algab muidugi t-ga!’ hüüdis Kuningas teravalt. (Carroll 1971: 91)

Kross has used the word *tinin* to say that the teacup was tinkling or clinking. This seems to fit the context a little better.

The Hatter keeps saying that he is a poor man when giving his evidence, and eventually the King has had enough of it and says “You’re a *very poor speaker*” (Carroll 1994: 135). Here the pun is with the word *poor* that can mean both impoverished and lacking in. Bakis has lost this pun, because she translated *poor man* as *vaene mees*, and the King’s reply as “Ja kehv kõneleja” (Carroll 1940: 104). It was probably difficult to find something clever for this pun in Estonian, and it does not play an important part in the story anyway.

Kross chose to translate *poor man* as *kehv mees* and the King's reply as "Te olete ülikehv k õ n e m e e s" (Carroll 1971: 94). This means he lost the sense *impoverished* and only kept *lacking in something*. It still is not much of a pun, however, it is closer to a pun than Bakis's translation.

When the Hatter was finished giving his evidence, and had been down on one knee for some time, the King said:

'If that's all you know about it, you may stand down,' continued the King.
'I can't go no lower,' said the Hatter: 'I'm on the floor, as it is.'
'Then you may *sit* down,' the King replied. (Carroll 1994: 135)

Here the pun is with the phrase *to stand down*, which means *to leave the witness box after giving evidence*. The Hatter misunderstands that and as he is already down on one knee, he thinks that he cannot go any lower. Both translators managed to come up with a pun for this part. Bakis translated it as:

„Kui sa paremat ei tea rääkida,” ütles kuningas, „siis lase jalga.”
„Kuid millega ma lasen?” kostis veider vend. „Mul pole laskeriista, ja pealegi ma ei julge te jalgu vigastada.”
„Ära tee siis jalgadega midagi, vaid istu maha,” käreatas kuningas. (Carroll 1940: 104)

The tone of Bakis's translation is somewhat more rude and less formal compared to the original text as it uses a more colloquial phrase. However, she was able to keep the pun in this part. The phrase *jalga laskma* usually means *to get lost*, but taken literally, it can also mean *to shoot in the leg*, which is what Bakis refers to in her translation. The pun works, but it is a little clumsy. Kross translated this part as:

„Kui see on kõik, mis te asjast teate, tehke sääred!” ütles Kuningas.
„Majesteet,” ütles Kübarsepp, „mina oskan ainult kübaraid teha.”
„Tehke siis, et te kaote!” hüüdis Kuningas.
„Ma olengi kadunud mees,” sõnas Kübarsepp, „aga see pole mu enese tehtud.” (Carroll 1971: 94)

Kross's translation is also less formal, but the pun works better compared to Bakis. The phrase *sääri tegema* usually means *to take off*, but in this case, the Hatter takes it literally and thinks the King is telling him to make legs, which is the literal translation of the phrase. Kross also

extends the pun a little by using the phrase *to make oneself scarce*, or literally, *make it so that you get lost*, to which the Hatter replies “I am a lost man, but it is not of my own making”.

When the King is going over the verses that were submitted as evidence in the trial, he comes across a part of a verse that says “*before she had this fit –*” and thinks it might be talking about the Queen, saying “/.../ you never had fits, my dear, I think?” (Carroll 1994: 144-145). The Queen denies it and the King then makes a pun “Then the words don’t *fit* you” (Carroll 1994: 145). The pun here plays with the words *fit*, an outburst of anger, and *to fit*, to match. The verse in Bakis’s translation is translated as “Kui suu tal vihast vahutas”, and the King asks the Queen “Ega sinul suu pole iialgi vahutanud vihast, kallim?”, and then remarked that “Siis sa ju oled äärmiselt külmavereline inimene” (Carroll 1940: 111). The pun is not really there any more, as she used the phrases *to foam at the mouth* and *a cold-blooded person*. However, the joke was not supposed to be very funny anyway, since nobody initially laughed at the King’s joke. Kross translated the verse as “Kui sel see raev käis peal”, and the King’s question to the Queen as “/.../ ega sul vist pole iial raev peal käinud, kallid?”, and then his remark as “Siis need sõnad sinu kohta ei käi ja *peame suud!*” (Carroll 1971: 100). Kross has also lost the pun in this case, saying that the Queen was raging and that the words do not fit her. However, he refers back to the set of verses, part of which he translated as “*Peame suud!*” (Carroll 1971: 99). This was yet another difficult pun that could not really work in Estonian and the translators did their best to make some kind of a joke in here.

Additional remarks about the translations

In addition to proper nouns, wordplay and puns, there are other words or phrases that can indicate whether a text has been domesticated or foreignized. One such indicator is the translation of measurements. Inches, feet, yards and miles are mentioned throughout *Alice in Wonderland*. Bakis has converted and translated those into centimetres, metres and kilometres. Miles are mentioned only once (Carroll 1940: 7). Kross, on the other hand, has not converted anything and translated the measurements as *tollid*, *jalad*, *jardid* and *miilid*. He explains in the footnotes what these are. In this regard, Bakis has used domestication and Kross foreignization, as inches, feet, yards and miles are definitely foreign for Estonian readers.

Another indicator is currency. The story mentions pounds, shillings and pence. Bakis converted and translated those into crowns and cents, which would probably have been still in use when she was preparing her translation. Kross left them as *naelad*, *šillingid* and *pennid*. He did not explain what these are. In this case, as well, we can see that Bakis has domesticated more than Kross.

We can recognise domestication and foreignization also by what language the characters are speaking. Whenever the text mentions *to speak English*, *speak good English* or something similar, both translators have tried to translate it as *speak understandably* or *speak our language*, for example. However, both of them have also left in some instances where the characters mention that they speak English. This could also have been an oversight. This shows us that they have, for the most part, domesticated that part of the text, but not entirely, since it is still obvious for the reader that the story takes place somewhere else and not in Estonia.

The text also mentions the English coast when Alice slipped into the pool of tears and thought she must have fallen into the sea. Both translators have kept the reference to the English coast, which is also a sign of foreignization, as that again informs the reader that the story takes place abroad.

Bakis's translation is by nowadays' standards definitely a little outdated. For example, the endnotes in her translation which explain some foreign words, also explain words that are commonly used in Estonian nowadays, such as *auster*, *flamingo*, *kakk*, *krabi*, *kärp* and *refrään*. Although these explanations are meant mostly for children who might not know all of these words, it still seems that children nowadays would know what *flamingo* and *krabi* are. Bakis also uses the terms *Uus-Merimaa* and *meresiga* instead of *Uus-Meremaa* and *merisiga*, which are the modern terms. This shows us how our language has evolved over time.

It also seems that Kross has used more adverbs of emphasis in his translation, which help with the fluency of the text. Fluency has long been an important part of translation, as Venuti (1995) also discusses. Fluency is achieved by domestication, because a text is fluent if it is translated according to the norms in the target culture. In that sense Kross's translation is a little more domesticated than Bakis's, because her translation seems somewhat rigid compared to Kross's, especially in terms of sentence structure. The sentence structure, at times, feels a little foreign.

Discussion

It seems that both Bakis and Kross have used domestication and foreignization but different levels of it and in different places. It is difficult to say whether one has domesticated

or foreignized more than the other. When it comes to proper nouns, they have translated them in different ways, both domesticating some names and foreignizing others. As for wordplay and puns, since both translators have tried to keep most of the puns, it shows that they have domesticated them up to a point. Had they foreignized the puns, they would have just translated the text as it was and would have lost the joke, which they did do in some cases where it was impossible to come up with a pun in Estonian. It also seems that Kross has domesticated more wordplay, since he left less of it out completely, like Bakis did in some cases, leaving out an almost entire page of puns: whiting/blacking, soles and eels and porpoise/purpose.

It must also be said, however, that it was probably easier for Kross to translate this book than it was for Bakis. First of all, Kross had considerably more experience with translation and writing fiction. He was able to come up with some very clever puns. However, he also had the translation by Bakis to get inspiration from. It is quite clear that he must have read the translation by Bakis, which could have helped him with his own translation, as he borrowed some puns from her text. Nevertheless, it seems that he did try to come up with his own puns wherever possible, instead of using Bakis's.

Alice in Wonderland definitely has some difficult wordplay and puns, but since the text is often nonsensical and the reasoning does not always make sense, the translators were able to get away with some not-so-logical or well-explained puns. As the original text is already strange, the translation can be a little strange as well. This might help to ensure that the translation retains the style of the original text. Despite the difficulties, both translators have found clever solutions and puns to make the translation as interesting and almost as witty as the original story.

CONCLUSION

Alice in Wonderland, although a fascinating book, is definitely a challenge for any translator and this thesis has illustrated what exactly the translation difficulties in this book are. The analysis of the two Estonian translations by Bakis and Kross has revealed how these two translators handled those difficulties and to what extent are their translations domesticated and foreignized.

It would be difficult to say which of the two translators domesticated or foreignized more; both of them used domestication and foreignization, but they often did so in different places. When it comes to proper nouns, they both domesticated some names and foreignized others. Both of them also left in cultural and historical references, such as names of historical figures from English history, which is a sign of foreignization, as these names would certainly sound foreign to Estonian readers and is a clear indication that the story takes place in a foreign country.

The analysis of wordplay translation revealed that both translators used mostly domestication in their translations, as they tried to come up with their own wordplay to replace the original one and they never explained the joke in footnotes or endnotes. However, both of them also left some wordplay out, as it proved to be impossible to translate. It would seem that Bakis left out more wordplay compared to Kross. In her case, she even left out almost an entire page of wordplay, without compensating for it in any way.

As for the other elements of translation that could indicate whether a text is domesticated or foreignized, such as measurements and currency, it was Bakis who domesticated those and Kross who had used foreignization. However, they both used

domestication and foreignization when the text mentioned the English language. From the perspective of style, Bakis's translation is a little more rigid and foreignized compared to Kross's, as it seems he has used more adverbs of emphasis in his translation, which help with the fluency of his text. Bakis's translation is also somewhat outdated by nowadays' standards, but that was to be expected, as it was published in 1940 and the Estonian language has definitely evolved during this time.

The analysis also revealed that Kross had most likely seen and read Bakis's translation, as he borrowed some puns from her for his own text. However, he did try to come up with his own wordplay whenever possible. In that sense, Kross was probably in a better position when he was preparing his translation, as he had the previous one to get inspiration from. He also had more experience as an author and a translator, which enabled him to come up with some clever puns. Despite the translation difficulties, both translators did their best to keep most of the wordplay and puns in the story and made sure the much-loved English children's book would be accessible to Estonian readers as well.

As the Estonian translations of *Alice in Wonderland* have not been previously researched that much, there is definitely potential for future research. This thesis analyses only the first two Estonian translations, but the more recent ones could be studied as well. Furthermore, this thesis does not discuss the translation of song parodies and nonsense verse in *Alice in Wonderland*, which is another very complex issue, but certainly a very interesting topic as well. Another area of research could also be the illustrations and how they relate to the text, as illustrations in children's literature often have an important role. The use of the original illustrations could also affect the translation if the translator wants the text and illustrations to match. As can be seen, *Alice in Wonderland* is a rich and intricate text that

offers multiple challenges to the translator, and it is the richness of this text that allows us to study and analyse it again and again from many different angles.

REFERENCES

Primary sources

- Carroll, Lewis. 1940. *Alice imedemaal* [Alice in Wonderland]. Trans. by Linda Bakis and Ants Oras. Tartu: Eesti Kirjastuse Kooperatiiv (Original work published in 1865).
- Carroll, Lewis. 1971. *Alice imedemaal* [Alice in Wonderland]. Trans. by Jaan Kross. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat (Original work published in 1865).
- Carroll, Lewis. 1994. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. London: Penguin Books (First published in 1865).

Secondary sources

- Díaz Pérez, Francisco Javier. 1999. Translating Wordplay: Lewis Carroll in Galician and Spanish. In Jeroen Vandaele (ed). *Translation and the (re) location of meaning: selected papers of the CETRA research seminars in translation studies, 1994-1996*, 357-373. Louvain: KU Leuven.
- e-keelenõu*. Eesti Keele Instituut. Loori. Available at <http://kn.eki.ee/?Q=loori>, accessed May 19, 2021.
- e-keelenõu*. Eesti Keele Instituut. Unilane. Available at <https://kn.eki.ee/?Q=unilane>, accessed May 19, 2021.
- Eco, Umberto. 2000. *Experiences in Translation*. Trans. by Alastair McEwen. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- EE (Eesti Entsüklopeedia). Bakis, Eduard. Available at http://entsyklopeedia.ee/artikkel/bakis_eduard, accessed April 20, 2021.
- Eesti etimoloogiasõnaraamat. Küülik. Available at <https://www.eki.ee/dict/ety/index.cgi?Q=k%C3%BC%C3%BClik&F=M&C06=et>, accessed May 19, 2021.
- EWOD (Estonian Writers' Online Dictionary). Jaan Kross. Available at <https://sisu.ut.ee/ewod/k/jaankross>, accessed April 21, 2021.
- EYS Veljesto. Ajalugu. Available at <http://www.veljesto.ee/ajalugu/>, accessed April 20, 2021.
- Geni. Linda Bakis. Available at <https://www.geni.com/people/Linda-Bakis/6000000002424366218>, accessed April 20, 2021.
- ISIK (Eesti biograafiline andmebaas). Luiga, Linda. Available at <http://www2.kirmus.ee/biblioserver/isik/index.php?id=1931>, accessed April 20, 2021.
- ISIK (Eesti biograafiline andmebaas). Oras, Ants. Available at <http://www2.kirmus.ee/biblioserver/isik/index.php?id=2523>, accessed April 20, 2021.
- Kaschula, Russell H. 2017. *Alice in Wonderland: translating to read across Africa*. *Journal of African Cultural Studies*, 29: 3, 276-291.
- Kibbee, Douglas A. 2003. When Children's Literature Transcends its Genre: Translating *Alice in Wonderland*. *Meta*, 48: 1-2, 307-321.
- Kross, Jaan. 1986. *Õhtutund kirjanikuga: Jaan Kross*. 15. [Television programme]. Estonia: ERR. Available at <https://arhiiv.err.ee/vaata/ohtutund-kirjanikuga-jaan-kross>, accessed May 19, 2021.

- Nord, Christiane. 2003. Proper Names in Translations for Children: *Alice in Wonderland* as a Case in Point. *Meta*, 48: 1-2, 182-196.
- Oittinen, Riitta. 2000. *Translating for children*. New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Oittinen, Riitta. 2003. Where the Wild Things Are: Translating Picture Books. *Meta: Translators' Journal*, 48: 1-2, 128-141.
- Pakats, Maarja. 2018. Perekond Luiga lugu. Kahe kange esivanema haritud järeltulijad. *Delfi*, February 19. Available at <https://www.delfi.ee/artikkel/81157175/perekond-luiga-lugu-kahe-kange-esivanema-haritud-jareltulijad>, accessed April 20, 2021.
- Park, Mee Ryoung. 2018. A Case Study of Russification in Two Translations of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* by Vladimir Nabokov and Boris Zakhoder. *Children's Literature in Education*, 49, 140-160.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 2001. Strategies of Translation. In Mona Baker (ed). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 240-244. London and New York: Routledge.
- Vid, Natalija. 2008. The Challenge of Translating Children's Literature: *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* Translated by Vladimir Nabokov. *ELOPE: English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries*, 5: 1-2, 217-227.
- Weissbrod, Rachel. 1996. 'Curiouser and Curiouser': Hebrew Translations of Wordplay in *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. *The Translator*, 2: 2, 219-234.

RESÜMEE

TARTU ÜLIKOOL
ANGLISTIKA OSAKOND

Mari-Leen Leesi

Two Estonian Alices: Comparing the translations of Lewis Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland*

Kaks eesti Alice'it: Lewis Carroll'i „Alice Imedemaal“ tõlgete võrdlus

Bakalaureusetöö

2021

Lehekülgede arv: 45

Annotatsioon:

„Alice Imedemaal“ on populaarne ja armastatud raamat paljude lugejate seas. Kuigi „Alice Imedemaal“ tõlkeraskusi on juba üsna palju uuritud, on sellekohaseid uurimusi eesti keeles väga vähe. Käesolev töö võrdleb „Alice Imedemaal“ kahte eestikeelset tõlget, esimene neist tõlgitud Linda Bakise poolt ja välja antud aastal 1940 ning teine Jaan Krossi poolt, mis anti välja aastal 1971. Antud töö analüüsib, kuidas on need kaks tõlkijat tõlkinud raamatus olevaid pärisnimesid ja sõnamängu. Ühtlasi analüüsib töö ka seda, kuidas on tõlkijad oma tõlkes kasutanud kodustamist ja võõrapärastamist.

Töö annab kiire ülevaate Linda Bakisest ja Jaan Krossist, keskendudes rohkem Bakisele, kuna tema elust ja tegemistest on vähem teada. Töö esimene peatükk annab ülevaate kodustamisest ning võõrapärastamisest tõlkes ning kuidas need mõjutavad lugeja arusaamist tekstist. Ühtlasi annab töö ka põgusa ülevaate artiklitest, mis uurivad „Alice Imedemaal“ tõlkimist teistesse keeltesse, keskendudes neile artiklitele, mis puudutavad just pärisnimede ja sõnamängu tõlkimist.

Töö teine peatükk analüüsib, kuidas Bakis ja Kross on tõlkinud raamatus olevad pärisnimed, tuues välja just need nimed, mis võiksid eesti lugejale võõrad tunduda. Lisaks uurib töö ka seda, kas tõlkijad on pärisnimesid kodustanud või võõrapärastanud. Peale selle analüüsib teine peatükk seda, kuidas ja kas üldse on tõlkijad hakkama saanud sõnamängu tõlkimisega. Analüüs toob ka välja, kuidas on sõnamängu tõlkimisel kasutatud kodustamist ja võõrapärastamist. Ühtlasi toob peatükk välja ka teised tõlkeelemendid, mis viitavad kas kodustamisele või võõrapärastamisele.

Uurimistöö tulemusena selgus, et nii Bakis kui Kross on oma tõlkes kasutanud kodustamist ja võõrapärastamist, kuid tihti erineval määral ning eri kohtades. On keeruline väita, kumb on rohkem kodustanud või võõrapärastanud. Pärisnimede tõlkimise puhul on mõlemad tõlkijad teatud nimed kodustanud ning teised võõrapärastanud. Sõnamängu puhul on mõlemad enamasti kasutanud kodustamist, kuna nad on üritanud luua ingliskeelsete sõnamängude asemele eestikeelseid sõnamänge. Siiski on Bakis veidi rohkem sõnamänge tõlkimata jätnud. Teiste tõlkeelementide puhul, näiteks mõõt- ja rahaühikud, on Bakis rohkem kodustamist kasutanud, kuid üldise stiili poolest, näiteks lauseülesehitus, on Bakise tõlge võõrapärasem.

Märksõnad:

Inglise keel ja keeleteadus, tõlkimine, pärisnimed, sõnamäng, kodustamine, võõrapärastamine

Lihtlitsents lõputöö reprodutseerimiseks ja lõputöö üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemiseks

Mina, Mari-Leen Leesi,

1. annan Tartu Ülikoolile tasuta loa (lihtlitsentsi) minu loodud teose
Two Estonian Alices: Comparing the translations of Lewis Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland*,
mille juhendaja on Katiliina Gielen,
reprodutseerimiseks eesmärgiga seda säilitada, sealhulgas lisada digitaalarhiivi DSpace
kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse lõppemiseni.
2. Annan Tartu Ülikoolile loa teha punktis 1 nimetatud teos üldsusele kättesaadavaks Tartu
Ülikooli veebikeskkonna, sealhulgas digitaalarhiivi DSpace kaudu Creative Commons'i
litsentsiga CC BY NC ND 3.0, mis lubab autorile viidates teost reprodutseerida, levitada
ja üldsusele suunata ning keelab luua tuletatud teost ja kasutada teost ärieesmärgil, kuni
autoriõiguse kehtivuse lõppemiseni.
3. Olen teadlik, et punktides 1 ja 2 nimetatud õigused jäävad alles ka autorile.
4. Kinnitan, et lihtlitsentsi andmisega ei riku ma teiste isikute intellektuaalomandi ega
isikuandmete kaitse õigusaktidest tulenevaid õigusi.

Mari-Leen Leesi

25.05.2021

Autorsuse kinnitus

Kinnitan, et olen koostanud käesoleva bakalaureusetöö ise ning toonud korrekselt välja teiste autorite panuse. Töö on koostatud lähtudes Tartu Ülikooli maailma keelte ja kultuuride kolledži anglistika osakonna bakalaureusetöö nõuetest ning on kooskõlas heade akadeemiliste tavadega.

/Digitaalselt allkirjastatud/

Mari-Leen Leesi

25.05.2021

Lõputöö on lubatud kaitsmisele.

/Digitaalselt allkirjastatud/

Katiliina Gielen

25.05.2021