

TARTU UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

**The reception of *Alice in Wonderland* and
Winnie-the-Pooh by Estonian children:
issues of translation and translatability**

Master's Thesis

Annika Aas

Supervisor: Prof. Krista Vogelberg

TARTU 2004

Preface

The present thesis focuses on the reception of two English children's books—*Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and *Winnie-the-Pooh*—by Estonian children, with special attention paid to the notion of translatability and to those aspects of translation which may have an influence on reception. The basis for the comparison of the reception of those two English classics lies in the distinction between a documentary and an instrumental translation. The aim of the study is to show that the documentary translation of *Alice* has been a major reason for the poor reception of the book by Estonian children, whereas the instrumental translation of *Pooh* has guaranteed a great success among Estonian children.

The first chapter of the paper is devoted to those topics which are most relevant for the study of reception. The theoretical analysis, based on research literature, provides the basis for the empirical study presented in the following chapter. Discussion of research in the fields of children's literature, reception theory, translation theory (including specifically the relevance theoretic approach) will emphasise their inter-relationships and the importance of their combination for the purposes of the present study. This chapter will also give an overview of the two English children's classics in focus and of their translations into Estonian.

The second chapter presents an empirical study which analyses, compares and contrasts the reception of *Alice* and *Pooh* by Estonian children. The data for the analysis was collected via interviews and questionnaires. The main focus will be on those aspects of translation which may have an influence on reception, especially the implied reader, cultural differences, function and relevance. By analysing data

provided by Estonian schoolchildren, some problems with documentary translation are pointed out and some suggestions for translating for children are made.

Table of Contents

Preface	2
Table of Contents	4
Introduction	5
Ch. 1 Theoretical analysis	
1.1 Children's literature as communication	11
1.2 Translating for children	15
1.3 <i>Alice in Wonderland</i> in translation	22
1.4 <i>Winnie-the-Pooh</i> in translation	29
1.5 Three theoretical models relevant for the present study	
1.5.1 <i>Scopos</i> theory	30
1.5.2 Reception theory	34
1.5.3 Relevance theory	41
1.6 Closer analysis and comparison of translations of <i>Alice</i> and <i>Pooh</i>	52
Ch. 2 Empirical study	
2.1 Research questions	64
2.2 Methods	67
2.2.1 Interviews with children	67
2.2.2 Questionnaire	68
2.3 Sample	69
2.4 Procedure	70
2.5 Results and Discussion	
2.5.1 Data analysis	
2.5.1.1 Data from the interviews with children	71
2.5.1.2 Data from the questionnaires	73
2.5.2 Comparison of data from different methods	86
Conclusion	92
References	98
Appendices	103
Summary in Estonian	131

Introduction

For a long time, children's literature was not considered a legitimate field of research in the academic world. However, since the publication of such seminal studies as Zohar Shavit's *Poetics of Children's Literature* (1986), Peter Hunt's *Criticism, Theory and Children's Literature* (1991), Maria Nikolajeva's *Children's Literature Comes of Age* (1996) and others, children's literature has gradually come to be accepted as literature *per se* and continues to struggle to be viewed as having equal status with adult literature. Meanwhile, though quickly gaining ground in American universities and in some English and Australian universities, children's literature research has still not achieved its rightful place in the Estonian academia. Whereas the history of Estonian school and pedagogics has deserved some attention, research related more directly to children's literature is still scanty, and reception studies are almost non-existent (Krusten 1995: 11).

The present study was inspired by observations and anecdotal evidence that revealed the difference in status of such world famous English children's classics as *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* (hereinafter *Alice*) by Lewis Carroll and *Winnie-the-Pooh* (hereinafter *Pooh*) by A.A. Milne in Estonia. Both books are considered children's classics and have been translated into many languages; their protagonists have become the friends of real children; and they have inspired many film and theatre productions. In Estonia, however, their status seems to differ greatly. Namely, in my view, in Estonia *Pooh* belongs to the canon of children's books, whereas *Alice* does not. For reasons this paper is going to tackle, *Alice* has not been accepted by Estonian children—at least not to the extent it has been accepted by children in its home country and some other countries.

It might well be claimed that, in the case of *Alice*, the time span between its original source language audience and the contemporary target language audience is significant, and the book has lost its appeal because it has become outdated. However, let us consider some factors concerning the books` potential to be well received by contemporary and future readers. Both *Alice* and *Pooh* have been called universal, *Alice* mostly because it deals with the question of identity, which is a frequent, as well as relevant, issue in books for young readers. Alice is often in confusion about who she is, what she knows, what she looks like or what she will become. If younger readers can enjoy the elements of fantasy—action in the underground, magic passages and objects, the circular nature of Alice`s adventures that bring her safely back home,¹ etc—readers in their early teens should sympathise with Alice`s quest for identity. In addition, the book humorously mocks the adult world with its rules and restrictions, which should also appeal to children. Finally, Alice is depicted as an intelligent girl, which would make it desirable for children to identify with her.

Pooh is also universal because it deals with such universal issues as play, friendship, growing up. Moreover, talking animals or toys are common to the genre of fantasy, and children are supposed to identify easily with them. If Carroll`s Alice is a perfect little girl with adult-like reasoning abilities, then Milne`s characters are depicted with all the small vices that are characteristic of the human nature: selfishness, ignorance, egotism, etc. which makes them all the more human and acceptable. Their home in the Hundred Acre Wood is a safe place, and the happy ending of each of their small adventures makes the book a perfect bed-time reading.

Now, having the books` potential in mind and comparing it to their real status in Estonian culture, various factors seem to point to the fact that *Alice* has not fulfilled

¹ For a more detailed analysis of fantasemes, or recurrent narrative elements inherent in fantasy as a genre, see Nikolajeva`s *The Magic Code* (1988).

its potential as a successful children's book, whereas *Pooh* belongs to the canon of children's classics. First of all, there is anecdotal evidence of this, but not only. *Pooh* has been reprinted several times after its translation appeared in 1968, *Alice* has appeared after 1971 only in the form of adaptations. Many sequels and modifications of the Pooh stories have been published, most notably by B. Hoff and J.T. Williams, which have evoked vivid discussions in the news media.² *Alice's* sequel *Through the Looking Glass and What Alice Found There* (1872) was first translated only in 1993 and very few children seem to know about it. *Alice* is included as obligatory reading only in some English-biased schools, *Pooh* is obligatory reading in various kinds of schools. The widely used learning environment on the Internet called *Miksike*³ lists *Pooh* among other classics but not *Alice*. *Pooh* has been staged several times in Estonian theatres⁴; the recent staging of *Alice* in Theater Vanemuine is a welcome endeavour, especially since—as the present paper is going to show—the book itself is not much appreciated by Estonian children.

The above analysis of the books' potential as successful children's classics versus their real status in Estonia is, of course, superficial, since it is not the main topic of the present paper. However, I do claim that both books have the potential of functioning in other cultures besides their source culture, but the mediation has to consider several important factors, such as aspects of translatability, particular translation problems, the distance between the text world and the real world of the readers, and the relevance of different elements as well as of the book as a whole.

² Especially the philosophical aspects and taoism have been in focus, see for example, Talts (1995) and Ruben (2001).

³ *Miksike* (www.miksike.com) is an integrated learning environment on the web for K-12 and homeschoolers used by both teachers and students. It includes, among other helpful material, worksheets that can be used by teachers for reading checks and by students in preparing for such tests. As the operators claim, during the autumn 2003, *Miksike* servers in Estonia got 80-100 000 pageviews per schoolday.

⁴ More recently in 1995 as a musical in „Estonia“ and in 1997 in Tartu Lasteteater.

Therefore, to account for various factors that have determined the difference in the reception of the two world classics, the present study will relate children's literature to the latest developments of translation and reception theories. Translation studies are of utmost importance in present-day Estonian society, since translations embrace a major part of the literature published. The absolute majority of translations comes from English. According to Tamm (2004), for more than a decade, translations have been the main shaping force of our spiritual life and, in a sense, we can even consider Estonian literary culture a translation culture. The results of the study will hopefully indicate various ways in which research into children's literature can greatly benefit other fields of research, like translation and reception studies, and can actually help to understand a culture. The study also hopes to contribute to a faster acceptance of children's literature research into the Estonian academia.

Similarly to children's literature, the study of reception, or reception aesthetics, has had to fight for the right to exist. To quote Michael Benton (1980:14),

[t]he subject of "the reader's response" is the Loch Ness Monster of literary studies. When we set out to capture it, we cannot even be sure that it is there at all and, if we assume that it is, we have to admit that the most sensitive probing with the most sophisticated instruments has so far succeeded only in producing pictures of dubious quality.

I, by no means, want to claim that children's responses to a book fully determine its quality and worth; however, if children are the implied readers of a book, their opinion is definitely worth considering. Reception studies, including the present thesis, should in some ways contradict, and in other ways complement, "the huge body of criticism that claims to know the `child` and what kind of literature is either good for it or appropriate /.../" (Walsh 2003: 27).

Although the need to consider the target audience is a commonplace for the translators and all translators probably make guesses concerning the possibilities of

different evaluations by readers, it has to be admitted that real-life readers' reactions are still largely unstudied (Leppihalme 1997: 132). In order to make the analysis of reception more tangible, it will be related to the notion of translatability and to the analysis of translation in order to account for crucial differences or similarities in reception by source and target culture readers. Although reception can be influenced by multiple factors and phenomena, good translation will be regarded as a major tool for a successful mediation of a literary work into another culture.

However, what is a good translation? Answers will be many and various. With the help of relevance theory, I will side with functionalist approaches to translation, taking Christiane Nord's distinction between a documentary and instrumental translation as my starting point. My preliminary hypothesis is that the translation of *Alice* tends toward documentary translation, whereas the translation of *Pooh* is instrumental. The hypothesis will be checked via a combination of theoretical analysis, a study of the translations under discussion and an empirical study in the form of interviews and questionnaires carried out among Estonian schoolchildren.

I will not claim, and neither does Nord, that a documentary translation is always bad or that an instrumental translation is always good. Kudu (2000: 774), for example, is happy that *Alice* is translated by the "grand old man" of Estonian literature, Jaan Kross, and I by no means want to question his literary or translational abilities. However, it seems that his rather literal (or documentary, to use Nord's term) translation has not fulfilled its function and has not reached the Estonian child audience. Therefore, I will claim that for the purposes of translating for children, an instrumental translation is more appropriate, particularly because children mostly read for pleasure and do not appreciate such nuances of style, content or form as can be preserved in a documentary translation. If the source and target cultures are so

different as to make the details in a literary work irrelevant for the target addressee, then functionalist adaptations are necessary to restore the work's relevance.

In the attempt to understand what would, and what would not, be relevant for a child reader of the target culture, relevance theory is found useful. The theory was incorporated into translation/interpretation studies relatively recently. However, Gutt (2000), who has made a strong claim for the importance of relevance theory in translation studies, has actually gone so far as to suggest that “relevance theory alone is adequate—there seems to be no need for a distinct translation theory” (vii). To put it very simply at this point, the basic premise of relevance theory is that whatever is totally familiar or totally unfamiliar to a communicant, will be irrelevant. With regard to translating for children, it is deemed important for the translator who aims at an instrumental translation to be aware of those aspects of the source text that might belong to either of these extremes and to consider ways of rendering them relevant for the target audience. In the empirical part of my work I made an attempt to tease out, in particular, children's perception of the relevance of the two texts compared.

Thus, the present study, by combining the fields of children's literature, translation, reception and relevance theories with an empirical study is trying to capture the Loch Ness Monster—or at least to make its hunters more confident of its existence— and to thus contribute to research in each of the fields.

CHAPTER 1. THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

1.1 Children's literature as communication

Roger D. Sell, who has tried to bring together literary pragmatics and children's literature, emphasises, in his various works, the idea of literature as communication which is "a form of interpersonal activity, which may bring about a change to the status quo" (2002: 3). He has even expressed the hope that research into children's literature could take a lead in re-humanising literary research in general (ibid). If Maria Nikolajeva emphasises, in her various works (see, for example, Nikolajeva 1996 & 2002) the study of children's literature as literature, then Sell turns his attention to its potential function, especially within language education. He emphasises the role of literary scholars, critics and teachers as mediators between particular real authors and particular real readers.

I would like to go one step further than Sell. The mediators he proposes function within one language area; however, when a text is transmitted into another language and culture, the first mediator will be the translator. Thus, in the triangular model of communication, as suggested by Gadamer (cited in Sell 2002: 3), where two parties communicate about some third entity, the parties will not be the author and the reader, but the translator and the reader, communicating about the text world. As any communication, so should this leave a trace and possibly bring a change to the status quo. Of course, communication between translator and reader must be preceded by an imaginary or perhaps real communication between the translator and the author, but the recognition of the translator as a communicator with an informative function should, according to Gutt (2000: 199), "prevent misunderstandings that arise from the

pretense that there is a direct act of communication between the original source and the receptor language audience.”

Moreover, as communication of any kind, so is literary communication co-adaptive. Sell (2002: 11) paraphrases Aristotle, who has noted that the most efficient rhetoricians meet their audience half-way. “They take considerable pains to present themselves as the kind of person the audience will feel at home with. However reluctantly, however briefly, they make concessions to the audience’s likely point of view, in the hope of winning concessions in return.” Assuming that communication is really give-and-take, then the thought of what the translation will achieve in return and what is the result of the communication initiated by translators should not be the least important consideration at all for a translator. And even if there are no pedagogical or didactic purposes to that communication, the translator should at least hope for the respondent to get *something* out of the text, be it “simply” pleasure or fun.

Furthermore, Sell (ibid 17) points out that two communicants entering into dialogue never share precisely the same positionality and this is why people communicate in the first place: to extend the amount of common ground. Sperber and Wilson (1986: 38ff) argue, similarly, that communication aims at enlarging the mutual cognitive environment of the communicants (see below p. 47). The same applies, in my view, to translation, and to an even greater extent. The fact that a text is chosen to be mediated into another language and culture is itself a sign that there is some need for communication between the source and target cultures. Sell (2002: 18) emphasises the communicants` obligation to make an effort of imaginative empathy in order to try and understand each other.

In the case of translation as communication, I think the translator, as the initiator of the dialogue, will have to be the first to make this effort, so that the respondents, the readers, would bother to make an effort of understanding and accepting. The translator should thus, as precisely as possible, get to know the recipient, since comprehension, according to Sell (ibid 19) often extends to matters of non-linguistic knowledge, presupposition, attitude and value. Sell (ibid 20) does not refrain from mentioning the higher goals besides the more down-to-earth ones; namely, that if children can read a foreign book as much as possible from the perspective of the book's implied reader, then they bring into play a world view which provides them with practice in imaginative empathy and thus promotes a fuller understanding of the foreign culture, ultimately enabling people of different cultural backgrounds to live in peaceful co-existence. Within the framework of intercultural understanding movement, Sell emphasises the role of teachers or co-reading adults as cultural mediators, but in the case of translated texts, I would like to stress, again, that the first mediator is actually the translator. Of course, Sell is by far not the only or the first one to emphasise interpretation of literature as communication. Sell's ideas were long preceded by Louis Rosenblatt's (1978) idea of reading as transaction between the reader and the text, and by Mikhail Bakhtin's (1990 [1963]) concept of dialogism. Bakhtin's ideas, especially, have often been applied by scholars of children's literature.

Just as there is, to borrow Bakhtin's terminology, a dialogue between the reader and the book, and by extension the author, in a translated text, there is a dialogue between the translator and the reader. It is important to note that in a dialogue, each communicant is responsible for the outcome. If the translator is responsible for his or her reading, both with respect to him/herself and with respect to

all the participants in the dialogic situation, as pointed out by Oittinen (2000: 30ff), then in a dialogue, the reader, too, is active and responsible for what and how she/he reads and understands. The reader, be it an adult or a child, should not be “a passive receptor who is not allowed to say no.” (ibid 30). However, as claimed by Sperber and Wilson (1986: 43), communication is still an asymmetric process and asymmetrical co-ordination is often easier to achieve (as in the case of their example, viz. ballroom dancing). Therefore, “[i]t is left to the communicator to make correct assumptions about the codes and contextual information that the audience will have accessible and be likely to use in the comprehension process.” This is why, without denying the role of the reader, I stress the responsibility of the translator, but also the responsibility of the publisher or any other initiator of the translation process who chooses to mediate a book from another culture.

In her interpretation of Bakhtin, Oittinen (2000: 31) concludes that as dialogics is always subjective and internal dialogue may become even more important than the text material, the same can happen in translation: “the original is left in a shadow, and the aim of the new interpretation is to convince its readers of its legitimacy.” Oittinen (ibid) believes that in the case of a functionalist translation, the rights of the original author and those of the future readers of the translation—the children—will not conflict, since the original author benefits if his or her books “are translated in a live, dialogic way so that they live on in the target culture.”

Last but not least, today when children are fascinated by computers and read less and less⁵, a very important, if not the most important function of a children's book, be it an original or translated text, is to initiate communication between the

⁵ The fact that for this year's “Nukits” competition for the best children's book of the last two years there were a few thousand children less voting for their favourite than in 2002 is quite telling. It might of course imply that there are simply less children, but more importantly, I think it implies that children do read less. For further discussion on this topic, see Mõttus (2004).

child and the book. In my opinion, books, and by extension, their authors and translators, do have the social responsibility to offer children relevant reading material in order not to alienate children from reading for good. A children's book that does not involve its readers is a useless book—a thought I share with the Estonian writer for children, Aidi Vallik (see Mõttus 2004).

The two children's books under discussion in this thesis have, like any other children's books, the full potential of functioning as communication, of bringing a change to the status quo of the respondents and even of increasing intercultural understanding. Their potential to function as communication in translation depends, to some extent, on their translatability, but to a great extent on the functionalism of their translation. Their translators will be viewed as having an essential role to play in securing successful communication. Whether the translations have succeeded in living on in the target culture and what have been the reasons for their success or failure will be focused on in the second chapter of the paper; the conclusions will be drawn from a combination of empirical research and theoretical considerations.

1.2 Translating for children

This part of the paper is, on purpose, called “translating *for* children”, not translating children's literature, because, together with many functionalist theorists, I consider it very important to keep the target audience in mind in the process of translation. Martin (2001), who lists six translation norms (that of understanding, accuracy, target language quality, quotability, rhythm and consideration of illustrations) admits that literature is a work of art and therefore not everything can be

accounted for by norms. She maintains (2001: 3) that “[o]therwise valid principles are occasionally overruled by what might be named a pursuit of the reader’s happiness—something that could itself be called a translation norm, since a translation overlooking it is often a failure.” Although there is no way of really controlling the future readers, I believe that the functionalism of a translation depends largely on the translator’s ability to assess the target audience and take its interests into consideration.

According to Chesterman (1997: 3), a translator must have a theory or translate blindly. I definitely agree with him, but in addition I would like to emphasise that the theory of translating for children may differ, in some important aspects, from a theory of translating for adults. It is of course impossible, as Klinberg (1986: 10) has it, to define a clear boundary between the problems of translating a book for children and a book for adults, but there are certain problems of translation which are accentuated when a children’s book is being translated. Oittinen (2003: 1), a translator of children’s books herself, points out that when, in the situation of translating for children, the translator asks the crucial question “For whom”, this will lead the translator to ponder on problems like reading aloud, the verbal and the visual, child images and domestication or foreignisation, which are special concerns for translators of children’s books. In my opinion, children’s books are works of art just as adult books are; therefore it might sometimes well be more important to keep the spirit of the work than to follow some pre-defined translation norms.

Contrary to common belief, translating for children might not be easier at all than translating for adults. Some scholars, for instance Maria Nikolajeva (1996), have even called children’s literature non-translatable because “children’s semiotic experience does not allow them to interpret the signs of an alien semiosphere.” (27).

She adds, however, that it is often non-translatable in a literal sense of merely substituting words for words, whereas the practice of translation shows that superb translations can be achieved. Lewis Carroll himself thought, when *Alice* was first translated into French, that his book was untranslatable (Kibbee 2003: 308). The fact is, however, that during the 20th century, *Alice* has been translated more often and into more languages than almost any other work except the Bible (Carpenter, Prichard 1984: 17).

Another children's literature scholar, Zena Sutherland (1981) has said that what may be a mild hazard for an adult may be an obdurate barrier for a child and that such barriers may be set up by an abundance of foreign names, titles, terms of measurement, complex syntax, or allusions to cultural heritage or common knowledge unfamiliar to members of the recipient culture. I definitely agree with Puurtinen (1995: 22) that the "special characteristics of the child readers, their comprehension and reading abilities, experience of life and knowledge of the world must be borne in mind so as not to produce overtly difficult, uninteresting translations that may alienate children from reading." The barriers that emerge can, to a great extent, be avoided in the process of introducing a work into the target culture, although this may sometimes result in producing a "new" text rather than a "translation". I would not agree though, that it would be better not to translate a book at all if the process results in a text rather different from the original, because that would deprive the target readers of the knowledge that such fictional characters and such a plot has existed. Even if *Alice* is known to Estonian children mostly through big-formatted adaptations with colourful pictures and little text, they are, at least, aware of such a world famous fictional character and plot. All this is not to imply that everything different or complicated should be removed from the target text; rather, such factors as translatability, potential

function and relevance should be assessed before determining the necessity and purpose of the translation.

Of course, we face a serious dilemma when we have to decide to what extent a work is untranslatable and to what extent its success depends on the skills of the translator. Relevance theory, discussed at greater length below (see p. 41ff) proves handy in helping to decide which elements in the source text can be rendered relevant for the target audience and which cannot and should perhaps rather be omitted. The relevance of the target text, in its turn, secures the text's readability. According to Kokkola (2002: 239), "a text actually has no inherent degree of readability /.../ Readability is a pragmatic variable, a property of both the text and the reader /.../". In other words, neither translatability nor readability are some inherent qualities of a text, but it is evident that some texts are much more difficult to translate and some texts require greater deviations from the source text to function successfully in the target culture.

Readability and translatability are closely related to the issues of reception. Reception studies can be useful when deciding upon the functionalism and relevance of a potential translation in the target culture. In the words of Nikolajeva (1996: 27), "[t]he way in which children's books cross boundaries into another cultural region is not merely a question of translation and publication in a new language. /.../ Semiotically, it has to do first of all with the young readers in the new country and their ability to accept and utilize the book. It is, in other words, a problem of reception." I agree with Maria Nikolajeva and Riitta Oittinen in that the best translation of a children's book is not necessarily the one that is most accurate and closest to the original. It might even be claimed that to consider issues of reception and reader response are much more important in the case of children's literature, since

“[m]uch more than in the case of adult literature, translations of children’s books require not simply the transmission of meaning but the ability to arouse in the reader the same feelings, thoughts and associations experienced by readers of the source text” (Nikolajeva 1996: 28). Nikolajeva believes that it is not only permitted but highly desirable to deviate from the source text if this is demanded by the reader’s response” (ibid).

Why should considering children’s interest in a book and pleasure from reading be such an important issue? Indeed, there are several other aims of translating for children. For example, as pointed out by Kleinberg (1986: 10), to make more literature available to them (which, in Kleinberg’s opinion, justifies a close adherence to the original) or to further the international outlook and understanding for children, which, again, in Kleinberg’s opinion, leads to the same requirement of adherence to the original. Although Kleinberg does allow for some revisions of the original if the aim of the translation is to give the readers a text they can understand, he emphasises that “[i]n principle the source text must have priority and cultural context adaptation ought to be the exception rather than the rule” (1986: 17).

I do not want to criticise the aims of making more literature available to children or furthering their international outlook; I do not think, however, that following these aims requires a close adherence to the original. Rather, if adherence to the original makes a text difficult to access, understand and enjoy, its outcome is more probably the opposite—children will not read the text at all or will consider the other culture alien, strange or boring. As already suggested above, the translator enters into a dialogic relationship with the author of the source text, the publisher and the future readers of the translation. If the translator refuses the dialogue, the translation is not directed toward the reader, and instead of becoming, as Bakhtin (1990) would put it,

“an internally persuasive discourse”, which is open and creative, it becomes “an alien world” and an “authoritarian discourse”. I agree with Puurtinen (1995: 23) that instead of aiming at an “adequate” translation, adhering to the linguistic and literary norms of the source system⁶, the translator should aim at an acceptable translation, since “children with their imperfect reading abilities and limited world knowledge are not expected to tolerate as much strangeness and foreignness as adult readers.” Puurtinen expresses clearly what was hinted at above, namely that “[f]rom the point of view of the child reader it is irrelevant whether a book is a translation or not—the main thing is that he or she enjoys it” (ibid). Not the least important is the fact that as translations embrace a very big part of what is published in Estonia today, children’s reading habits, likes and dislikes develop very much on the basis of translations.

Keeping in mind the target audience in the process of the translation does not mean, however, that the criterion of respecting and adhering to the original should be totally abandoned. I admit that even if it is mostly adults who appreciate variety and originality in fiction more than sameness and ease of reading, this is not to say that we should never offer children anything challenging to read. On the contrary, as Mendelsohn (1973: 38-9) has it, “[t]he objective is to be continually involved with the text, not to outgrow it /.../”. Moreover, translations tend to age quickly and making acceptability a prime concern may accelerate that process even more. As Puurtinen (1995: 231) aptly puts it, “[a] translation which conforms to the norms of the time of its publication, thus being highly acceptable in the objective case, may be disapproved by later generations who are likely to base their evaluations on new norms and consequently find the translation less acceptable.” However, the functionalist translation theorists emphasise the need to sketch out a hierarchy of functions; i.e. the

⁶ “Adequacy” is not used here in Reiss and Vermeer’s sense (see, e.g. Reiss and Vermeer 1985: 124ff) but rather in the sense of their “equivalence”. However, Reiss and Vermeer’s usage is itself at odds with that of other theorists.

translator has to decide what is the most important function of a text in a given situation, time and context: to be a living text—an instrument in the hands of its readers—or a document of a text that once lived in another culture.

A very good example of a translator who has considered the main function and the implied readers of the text and adapted his translation accordingly, is Vladimir Nabokov. In addition to translating his own works, he rendered Carroll's *Alice* into Russian, and Aleksandr Pushkin's *Eugene Onegin* into English. Kimmel (1998), who analyses reasons for his transformation from free translation of *Alice* into extreme literalism in *Eugene Onegin*, concludes that with *Alice*, "Nabokov was aiming at an audience of children, who would not have the patience to struggle through anything that causes them any intellectual difficulty", and therefore sought to create a translation that would be as accessible to the mind of a child as was at all possible. His translations of *Eugene Onegin*, on the contrary, was aimed primarily to the scholarly world, "who would want to be able to puzzle over every little aspect of the text" (2-3). Thus, consideration of what is relevant for the implied reader may greatly determine the acceptability and success of a translation.

Furthermore, the position of children's literature within the literary polysystem, as pointed out by Shavit (1986: 112ff), largely determines the behaviour of translating for children. For example, as long as the concept of didactic children's literature prevailed, the principle of adjusting the text to make it appropriate and useful for the child was dominant. Nowadays, the emphasis is different and the principle of adjusting the plot, characterisation and language to prevailing society's perceptions of the child's ability to read and comprehend is more dominant. Such a trend is in keeping with the general movement in translation theory from equivalence based translations toward more functionalist translations. More discussion about

different aspects of functionalist translation will be presented below (see p. 30ff). Closely related is the issue of relevance, which will also be discussed below (see p. 41ff).

1.3 Alice in Wonderland in translation

Lewis Carroll's (alias Charles Lutwidge Dodgson's) *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* was published in 1865. Two full translations of *Alice* have appeared in Estonian: in 1940, translated by Linda (Luiga) Bakis and Ants Oras (verses) and in 1971, translated by Jaan Kross. Recently, several adaptations have also been published. Although adaptations provide a very interesting subject for research as they reveal the society's prevailing norms and the concept of a child, a lengthy analysis of them remains out of scope of the present study. Nevertheless, as several respondents of my empirical study brought out differences in their attitudes to full version or adaptation, some attention will be paid to adaptations as well. For this paper, the translation by Kross will be of foremost importance, because this is the version most children questioned in the empirical part have read. The translation by Bakis and Oras will only be included in places to emphasise a difference from the translation by Kross. A more thorough comparative analysis between the two full translations would be a very interesting subject for future research, as it would reveal the norms and rules prevalent in the society at the time of their translations and the differences as well as similarities in attitudes toward children.

Another interesting subject for future research would be the illustrations, which are also largely out of the scope of the present paper. However, it is important

to keep in mind that illustrations and text ideally form a whole and illustrations can thus greatly influence the reception and understanding of a book; therefore, they will be paid some attention to also within the framework of the present study. The translation by Kross contains coloured illustrations by Vive Tolli.

Although *Alice* belongs to one of the most translated children's books in the world and to one of the most translated books overall, the fact is that many translators from various countries have considered *Alice* very difficult to translate. The poem parodies, puns (especially the frequent use of homophones), witty remarks and other ways of Carroll of creating nonsense make the book a real challenge for the translator. Moreover, as pointed out by O'Sullivan (2000: 346), "*Alice in Wonderland* ist durch eine grosse Anzahl expliziter und impliziter Kulturmarkierungen einer bestimmter (englischen) Kultur und einer bestimmten Epoche, dem viktorianischen England, zuzurodnen." The Russian translator of *Alice*, Boris Zakhoder, has said that for many years his friends had wondered: "Why don't you translate *Alice*?" whereupon he would answer: "It would be easier to transpose England." (qtd in Nikolajeva 1996). Whereas Carroll was described as "indulging in a kind of family joke within a closed community, the closed community being the English language, which provides the context and framework for much of his humour" (Rickard 1975: 54), Carroll himself admitted that the verses could pose the greatest difficulty and if the originals are not known in France, the parodies would be unintelligible and in that case they had better be omitted (Weaver 1964: 33).

The "untranslatability" of this seemingly simple tale requires a lot of creativity from the translator which is also proved by the fact that Carroll is more often than not translated by famous authors, who are seen as entitled to more liberty than professional translators. Such free translations have often also been more successful.

As for the numerous translations of *Alice* into French, for example, Bue, the first translator of the book into French in 1869, who is “one of the more adventurous of the translators in adapting the story for maximum effect on younger French readers”, apparently deserved the full approval by the author (Kibbee 2003: 308). Nord (2001: 95) considers Barbara Teutsch’s translation into German, in which she systematically used German songs and ballads as a basis for her translation of Carroll’s parodies, a success, since Teutsch “really conveys the playful spirit of the original.” Even Klinberg, who has claimed (1944: 17) that “cultural context adaptation ought to be the exception rather than the rule”, admits that the 1943 Swedish localisation of *Alice* “was intended to keep the luster of the original whereas a true translation would have been colourless” (ibid 24).

It is interesting to note that Estonia’s neighbours have translated *Alice* earlier than us: *Alice* appeared in Russian in 1879, in Finnish in 1906 and in Latvian in 1937. As mentioned above, the first full translation in Estonian appears in 1940 by Linda (Luiga) Bakis. Considering the late first translation into Estonian, Kalda (1988: 112) seems to question the spiritual affinity between the English and the Estonian cultures. The next full translation appears three decades later (1971) by Jaan Kross and these two translations remain the only full translations of *Alice* in Estonian (by comparison, there are four full translation into Finnish, twenty three into French, thirty one into German, nine into Swedish). Kalda (ibid) expresses the opinion that it was the absurd Soviet time that did not foster the translations of *Alice*. Moreover, if the beginnings of children’s literature in Western Europe can be traced back to the mid-eighteenth century, the emergence of Estonian children’s literature lagged behind by a century. Long after Carroll’s book “with no morals”, as he claimed, appeared in England, Estonian children’s literature was still very didactic, emphasising honesty, hard work,

chastity, abstinence. Fantasy was not favoured and as late as at the end of the nineteenth century, fairy tales were regarded by many as offering children horrible models and lies (Krusten 1995: 53).

Although Kalda (1988) does not say so explicitly, she implies that it has not been a good idea that Estonian have tried to illustrate the book themselves and not to use Tenniel`s beautiful and detailed pictures that closely follow the text. It is not clear who illustrated the 1940 translation, but the 1971 translation, in my opinion, displays an incongruency between pictures and text. Namely, as will be argued below, Kross`s translation follows the original very closely and, in offering quite a literal translation, is foreignising, whereas Tolli`s simplified illustrations are domesticating, depicting Alice as a typical Estonian girl. Meanwhile, as Kalda aptly puts it as well, the illustrators have emphasised the irreality of the book, and may have neglected the beauty and joy that surrounds the *Alice* stories.

The fact that *Alice* has appeared in many translations in some other languages is not to say that it has always been extremely popular in all those cultures. As pointed out by O`Sullivan (2000: 363), “[b]is in die 1970er Jahre galt *Alice in Wonderland* als ein von Deutschen kaum rezipiertes Buch” and “Frankreich erlebte ab 1930 eine intensive erwachsenenliterarische Rezeption von *Alice in Wonderland*” (ibid 374), mostly thanks to the influence of Surrealism. This is to say that the reception of a book, to a great extent, depends on the general cultural situation and literary trends prevailing in the culture, which nevertheless does not lessen, in my view, the essential role that the translator plays or can play in the process of mediation between two cultures. The fact that Carroll himself chose the translators for the first versions to appear in French (1869), German (1869) and Italian (1872), as well as

paid critical attention to their work (Carpenter, Prichard 1984:17), proves that he attributed great importance to the quality of the translations.

As for the poor reception of *Alice* by Germans, O'Sullivan (2000: 364) puts it down to the fact that “[n]onsense, der angeblich nur von Engländern verfasst und verstanden werden kann, wurde durch den englischen Nationalcharacter erklärt und galt als von Deutschen nicht verstandene und nicht geschätzte Literaturform.” Järv (1993: 109) also emphasises that for an ordinary Englishman, the absurd is always close. The readiness of Estonian children to accept and appreciate nonsense and absurd needs another study⁷, but what I want to emphasise is not that nonsensical elements of Carroll's book are untranslatable and unintelligible per se, but that the translator should be very well aware of the fact that what is comic and humorous is culture-specific and if the impression the original intends to make is playful and funny, that impression, and not the faithful rendering of jokes or word play, is what the translation should aim for. To make such a complex book as *Alice* well received by a culture, O'Sullivan (ibid 377) seems to support the functionalist and target-reader-oriented approach:

Dies wird bewerkstelligt durch einen kreativen, anspruchsvollen Umgang mit dem sprachlichen Material, der die Grundtendenz des Werkes nicht verfälscht, es für heutige Kinder jedoch rezipierbar werden lässt durch eine Neutralisierung des historischen und in einigen Fällen auch des kulturellen Kontextes.

Any translator who sets out to translate an “untranslatable” book should first acknowledge the fact that a functioning translation can be achieved only at the expense of some elements in the original, for example, at the expense of the particularly “British Alice” level of the story.

⁷ Kudu (2000: 774) suggests that it is exactly nonsense that makes children like *Alice* and adults dislike it, since only with humorous “nonsense-joke” can a child overcome the contradictions of the “nonsense-world” that adults try to hide from children till the last minute. Adults, on the other hand, cannot understand the book and thus ask their children to deal with something more useful.

Christiane Nord (2001: 97), one of the foremost advocates of functional approaches to translation, whose distinction between an instrumental and a documentary translation will be discussed in greater length below (see p. 31), has uttered the following opinion about *Alice*:

Although the real world of the English readers has certainly changed since Lewis Carroll's time, readers for whom the book is part of the literary canon know what the original situation was like. /.../ We might thus assume that English readers are still able to identify with features of this text in a variety of ways. An instrumental translation would try to make identification possible for target readers, whereas a documentary translation would create foreignness and cultural distance.

In short, the first and foremost task facing a translator of *Alice* should be to determine *who* is the intended addressee of the translation. The status of the original was ambivalent. Carroll wrote the very first version, *Alice's Adventures Under Ground* for Alice Liddell (10) and her sisters, but when his friends, including George MacDonald and Charles Kingsley, insisted that he publish it, Carroll seriously rewrote the book. According to Shavit (1986: 72ff) he aimed at giving the book a more ambivalent nature in order to appeal, besides children, to adults.⁸ In the third version, *The Nursery Alice*, Carroll extricated the text from its ambivalent status and made the book univalent again in order to appeal solely to children. The second version, which became so popular and was a great commercial success, appealed both to children and to adults, who bought it for their own reading. The text was conceived "as a turning point in the history of English children's literature" (ibid 75) because Carroll succeeded in breaking the prevailing norms in children's literature and bringing into it "the liberty of thought" (Darton, qtd by O'Sullivan 2000: 299). The *Court Circular* even read that "[i]f there be such a thing as perfection in children's tales we would be tempted to say that Mr. Carroll had reached it" (qtd in Carpenter, Prichard 1984: 17) and its adult admirers included Queen Victoria, W.H. Auden, Walter De La Mare,

⁸ Some critics even maintain that *Alice in Wonderland* and *Winnie-the-Pooh* are great books because they in actual fact are not children's books

Robert Graves. The son of MacDonalds wished that “there were sixty thousand volumes of it” (ibid 16). Martin Gardner (1985: 8) nevertheless claims that it is the adults who have made *Alice* immortal, and other scholars have also admitted that *Alice* is not an “invariable favourite with children, many of whom are frightened and puzzled by it” (Carpenter, Prichard 1984: 18).

Thus, the original text is ambivalent and whether its main addressees are children or adults is a question that remains open for discussion. In translation, several outcomes are possible. First of all, the ambivalent original may become a univalent translation or adaptation, being directed solely to children. Secondly, it may lose its ambivalent status but in the other direction and become intended for adult audience only. Thirdly, the most challenging option is probably to try and retain the ambivalent nature of the original and to appeal both to adult and child audience. Once again, before embarking on the translation task, the translator has to decide, considering the target culture situation, the purpose and function of the translation, which of those options he or she should resort to. In my opinion, an annotated version might be a good solution if, and only if, the target addressee is an adult. I think Klinberg (1986: 27) expresses it very aptly: “Perhaps *Alice* only can be transferred into another language in the form of an annotated, learned translation. But such a translation would hardly be of any use to children who only want to be amused by it.” Nord (2003: 195) also emphasises the importance of addressee-orientation in a decision for or against annotations:

The problem with the explanations of puns or jokes is that it kills them. A joke that has to be explained is *as dead as a Dodo*. /.../ The decision for, or against, annotations must be guided by addressee-orientation. For an adult readership, it may be interesting to read the two texts, either “side by side” or one after another. For children, one text will probably be sufficient.

1.4 *Winnie-the-Pooh* in translation

A.A. Milne's *Winnie-the-Pooh* appeared in 1926 and its sequel, *The House at Pooh Corner*, in 1928. For the purposes of this study, *Pooh* will include both of the two prose works, because they are mostly treated as a whole and have appeared together since *Pooh* was first translated into Estonian.

Pooh has appeared in Estonian translations in several editions. It was first published only in 1968, translated by Valter Rummel and Harald Rajamets (verses) and containing the original illustrations by Shepard. Since, it has been published in 1974, 1977 and 2000, translated by the same translators but varying the illustrations (the 1974 and 1977 editions were illustrated by A. Poret).

Although *Pooh*, just as *Alice*, has given rise to many interpretations and has frequently been viewed within a philosophical framework, much less has been written about the translations of *Pooh* into other languages than about the translations of *Alice*. Though both books have been considered by several scholars as being ambivalent in their implied reader (i.e. adult or child), *Pooh* evidently presents fewer problems for a translator than *Alice*.⁹ It contains fewer literary references and British realia; it is set in a familiar kind of forest; its characters are easily recognisable to any child who has played with toys; its collective protagonist provides the chance for any child to identify with one of the characters. But just like in *Alice*, there are aspects that are very difficult to render in translation—the book contains many poems that present the danger of losing their immediacy and humour in translation; it contains nonsensical dialogues, and the tone, just like in *Alice*, is funny and melancholy at the

⁹ It is interesting, though, that *Pooh* was only first translated into Estonian 42 years after its first publication in England, although the general cultural situation in Estonia could be considered much more favorable for *Pooh* than for *Alice*—consider the bulk and popularity of animal stories written for children.

same time. Both *Alice* and *Pooh* were inspired by real people, situations and loci, which potentially increases the distance between the text world and the real world of the target readers.¹⁰

1.5 Three theoretical models relevant for the present study

1.5.1 *Scopos* theory

Already in the 19th century, the German translator and theorist Friedrich Schleiermacher made a distinction between two kinds of translation—in the first kind, the reader is brought to the author, i.e. the translator tries to maintain the features of the source text, which requires a great deal from the reader; in the second kind, the author is brought to the reader, i.e. the translation aims at ordinary use of language so that it would be nice and easy to read. Schleiermacher himself preferred the first, foreignising kind. Before becoming ordinary terms in translation theory, domestication and foreignisation, the concepts were discussed as a philosophical question by J.W. von Goethe, Antoine Berman, Lawrence Venuti and others. Although the distinction between domestication and foreignisation does not correspond directly to the distinction between instrumental and documentary translation, there is some correlation. An instrumental translation often requires domestication—sometimes a foreignising translation could serve the function, though—whereas a documentary translation is often foreignising.

If Schleiermacher and equivalence-based theories preferred taking the reader to the author, then recently there has been a significant rise of functionalist theories,

¹⁰ Martin Gardner's *The Annotated Alice* (1960/85) is probably the best source for such clues for *Alice*, and Christopher Milne's *The Enchanted Places* (1976) is a good source for *Pooh*.

within which the role of the target text and target audience is paid much more attention to. As pointed out by Nord (2001: 26),

[t]he role of the source text in functionalist approaches is radically different from earlier linguistic or equivalence-based theories. /.../ The source text is no longer the first and foremost criterion for the translator's decisions, it is just one of the various sources of information used by the translator.

On the one hand, this provides the translator with greater freedom. On the other hand, such freedom, in its turn, increases the translator's responsibility and puts greater demands on his or her creativity and empathy.

In Oittinen's words (2000: 11), the functionalist approach requires that a translation be coherent in itself rather than compared with its original. Oittinen strongly believes in the vitality of functional translation theory but is very skeptical of Eugene A. Nida's proposition of dynamic or functional equivalence, which requires that the reactions of the readers of the source text should be just about the same as the reactions of the target readers. She thinks (ibid 9) it is not even possible for translators to have exactly or nearly the same effect on the readers as the original text had on the original readers. I do not claim that the original reader's response is the foremost criterion to consider in the translation process, but I do think that a positive reception by original readers is also worth aiming at with target readers, even if that requires certain changes or adaptations in the text.

Functionalist approaches support the idea of translation as a form of mediated intercultural communication. As early as 1978, Vermeer, one of the early advocates of the functionalist approach, considered translation a type of transfer where communicative verbal and non-verbal signs are transferred from one language to another (cited by Nord 2001: 11). By calling translation a type of human action which, in the framework of a comprehensive theory of human communication, needs a theory of culture to be specified and explained, Vermeer comes very close to one of

the main tenets of literary pragmatics as put forward by R.D. Sell (2000: 22): “/.../the writing, transmission and reading of literary texts really are human deeds, with a fully interpersonal valency.”

Vermeer calls his theory *Skopostheorie*, a theory of purposeful action. The word *Skopos* denotes the aim or purpose of translation and the *Skopos rule* basically reads that the end justifies the means. Nevertheless, as emphasised by Nord (2001: 29), following the *Skopos rule* does not mean that a good translation should *ipso facto* conform or adapt to target-culture behaviour or expectations, rather, that “the *Skopos* of a particular translation task may require a “free” or “faithful” translation, or anything between these two extremes, depending on the purpose for which the translation is needed.”¹¹ She does admit, however, that the reader, or the addressee, is the main factor determining the target-text *Skopos* which does not exclude philological or literal translations, because “[t]here are many cases where literalism is precisely what the receiver (or the client or the user) needs /.../”. Nabokov’s literal translation of *Eugene Onegin* was mentioned above (see p. 20).

In the present thesis, it will be assumed that whereas adults may, in cases, appreciate literal translations (for example, in order to learn about the structural particularities of the source language or to be constantly aware that they are reading a translation), children mostly read for pleasure. That is, children would not appreciate literal translation and they would like to read any book as they read a native text. This should be taken into account in the case of translating for children.

Nord (2001: 47) distinguishes between two types of translation processes: documentary and instrumental. “The first aims at producing in the target language a kind of *document* of (certain aspects of) a communicative interaction in which a

¹¹ Nord (2001: 125ff) also subjects the „end-justifies-the-means“ principle to a superordinate principle of loyalty, which means that the target-text purpose should be compatible with the original author’s intentions.

source-culture sender communicates with a source-culture audience via the source-text under source-culture conditions.” The instrumental translation process, on the contrary, aims at “producing in the target language an instrument for a new communicative interaction between the source-culture sender and a target-culture audience, using (certain aspects of) the source text as a model.”

Nord’s distinction proves very useful for the present study. Namely, it will be claimed that Jaan Kross’s translation of *Alice* reproduces the source text rather literally and belongs to the documentary kind of translation, whereas Rummel’s and Rajamets’s translation of *Pooh* could be called an instrumental and even equifunctional translation, which succeeds in achieving the same range of functions as the original text.

Nord (2001: 83) does not even question the communicative intentions of a translation, claiming that “[e]ven if a source text has been written without any particular purpose or intention, the translation is always addressed to some audience (however undefined it may be) and is thus intended to have some function for the readers.” In other words, the simple fact in itself that a work is chosen to be translated into another language and culture displays the will to initiate some kind of communication.

Knowing, on the one hand, *Alice* and *Pooh* as the great English children’s classics, and having, on the other hand, anecdotal evidence that *Alice*, as opposed to *Pooh*, is not appreciated by Estonian children, the question arose: what influences reception? Factors that can influence reception are very many: the cohesion and coherence of a text, the reader’s ability to bridge cultural gaps and to recognise subtexts, readers’ previous knowledge and information processing capacity, attitude, illustrations, even the physical format of the text. The scope of the present thesis,

however, limits the research mainly to factors related to aspects of translation, especially considering the fact that as both books are very popular in the English-speaking world, it might have been translation, more than anything else, that may have determined their reception by Estonian children.

Riitta Oittinen (1990: 49) argues against the assumption that denying or relativising the authority of the original inevitably leads to disrespect for it. I agree with her when she, as a follower of Bakhtin, claims that “a dialogic relationship rather than submission to the authority of the original means placing a high value on the original and finding ways to express the original in a fresh and living way for the reading child.” Although *Alice* can be regarded as having a dual audience, i.e. it is directed both to children and adults, Carroll originally wrote it for children and intended it to be amusing, funny, adventurous. The fact that Estonian children mostly find it boring, “strange”, or frightening (see the empirical part of the study), in my view, denotes more than just different spacial and temporal conditions of reception. I am afraid, it makes true Hellsing`s (cited by Oittinen 1990: 49) words that keeping strictly to the original means “murdering“ them as art. On the other hand, anecdotal evidence that Estonians who did not like the book as children but like it as adults may point to the fact that through translation the book has lost its dual audience and has become directed only toward the adult audience. Unfortunately, the scope of the present research does not allow the inclusion of adult respondents.

1.5.2 Reception theory

Long before functionalist translation theorists started arguing against the authority of the source text, reception theorists Jauss, Iser and their followers

advocated a shift “from a substantialist to a pragmatic text theory and thus from a concern with the effects of authorial intended meanings to a concern with meanings as created by readers” (Thompson 1993: 256). When reception aesthetics emerged in the early 1970s, it was really seen as a paradigm shift in the study of literature, because no one had developed a systematic theory of the role of the reader in the creation of literary meaning before (Fluck 2002: 253).

Hamilton and Schneider (2002: 641) claim that reception theory’s legacy has been unfortunate and that even its name has been a source of confusion. What they refer to is that in the 1970s, Wolfgang Iser, one of the earliest advocates of reception aesthetics, made a distinction between a theory of aesthetic response or *Wirkungstheorie*, and a theory of reception, or *Rezeptionstheorie*. According to Iser (1981: x), a theory of response has its roots in the text, while a theory of reception “deals with existing readers, whose reactions testify to certain historically conditioned experiences of literature.”¹² By maintaining that the reader is not merely told a story, but he or she has constantly to observe and deduce, Iser supports the view of the reader as an active, responsible partner in the dialogic reading situation. In fact, Iser goes as far as to emphasise the importance of indeterminacy or telling gaps in a work of literature, which incite the reader’s contribution in the process of reading.

Although Iser has later been severely criticised, some of his ideas forestall the topical idea of literature as communication and this is where, in my opinion, he still deserves attention. He argues (1981: 22) that central to the reading of every literary work is the interaction between its structure and its recipient and this is why “the study of a literary work should concern not only the actual text but also, and in equal measure, the actions involved in responding to that text.” Stanley Fish (qtd by

¹² Today, ‘reception theory’ and ‘reader response theory’ are most often treated as synonyms.

Hamilton and Schneider 2002: 641), who criticised Iser for never taking a side as to where exactly the production of meaning resided when it came to reading, seems to have overlooked Iser's words (1981: 54): "Now if the reader and the literary text are partners in a process of communication, and if what is to be communicated is to be of any value, our prime concern will no longer be the meaning of that text /.../ but its effect."

Jauss, another advocate of reception aesthetics, proposed to describe response and the impact of a work within "the definable frame of reference of the readers' expectations", which develops in the "best historical moment of its appearance from a previous understanding of the genre, from the form and themes of already familiar works, and from the contrast between poetic and practical language" (qtd by Tabbert 1980: 36). In other words, literary works first evoke and then frustrate the reader's expectations, thus (if the reader continues reading) gradually changing his frame of reference. Hence, as was suggested above, some kind of change in the status quo is achieved as a result of the communication. Although in this definition Jauss lists items that are more related to the book than to the reader, he did not deny that social conditions bearing on a reader could be considered as well.

Despite all the criticisms pointed against Iser, Jauss, and their followers, Fluck (2002: 253) contends that reception aesthetics starting premise—that literary texts need readers to acquire meaning—was, and remains, convincing. Fluck thus believes that "the original insights of reception aesthetics are still valid and continue to provide valuable suggestions for literary and cultural studies." Actually, as I see it, there is a direct link between modern reception theory and modern translation theory. Namely, modern theories of literary reception propagate a dynamic concept of text meaning and function, viewing a text as made meaningful by its receiver and for its receiver

(Nord 2001: 31). This is what functionalist theories also emphasise: a text should be made meaningful for its receivers. If a translator does not give his or her best to make a translation meaningful for the receiver, the latter, at least if it is a child reader, will not be capable of making a text meaningful either.

What are the implications of reception theory for studies of children's literature? Brian Alderson (1980) is rather skeptical about the use of reception studies in children's literature. He distinguishes (1980: 62ff) between four types of children's literature critics: the Educationalist, the Utilitarian, the Authoritarian and the Child Minder, the last one of whom is the critic "who measures the quality of work by how far he (or more usually she) believes children will enjoy it" (64). The problems with child centred criticism, as pointed out by Alderson, are that no man's experience is sufficiently universal and that different children and different groups of children can respond very differently to a work. I do agree with Alderson (ibid 66) in that "even with children it is possible to discern many subtle gradation of response"; however, the following claim of his, I think, needs to be viewed with some caution:

The critic of children's literature, as I see him, is a figure primarily concerned not with prophecies about the reception of a book by a child audience, but with the competence of the author, the illustrator, and even the publisher, who have produced the book. His first duty is toward the artifact in front of him and his work is a hard analysis of the skill with which it has been wrought /.../ (67)

John Stephens (1992: 58) is another scholar who claims that "uncovering the actual impact of books on real readers is practically impossible" and emphasises the gap between having an experience and articulating it. Maria Nikolajeva, one of the most productive and well known children's literature theorists, is also critical of scholars who apply reader-response ideas to "construct an abstract, ideal picture of a `child`" (2003: 6). As a fervent advocate of a narratological approach to children's literature, she considers reader response and pedagogical values arbitrary criteria, which change

throughout history. I believe that reception studies are of practical use but only as long as they include empirical research and let children speak their mind too. The present study includes empirical research exactly in order to avoid constructing just an abstract and arbitrary picture of Estonian children who do or do not enjoy the books under discussion.

Of course, there are other very important criteria besides children's response to be considered when evaluating a book, but why dismiss children as an audience with a valid enough opinion? If a book *is* written for children, why should it not be judged by children? And yes, more probably than not, there is no *one* opinion or response, but there is no one response to any adult book either. Norman N. Holland, as paraphrased by Tabbert (1980: 52) has said that perhaps it is not such a bad thing after all if we cannot find out what *the* impact of books is really like, since everybody responds individually. I am not arguing that the estimates of readers' response should be placed above "detailed considerations of the requirements of a text" (something that Alderson is so afraid of); what I am saying is that a children's book should not left to be judged only by adult critics, especially as they, as pointed out by Alderson himself, turn out to be, more often than not, an Educationalist, a Utilitarian or an Authoritarian-manqué. As Shavit (1986: 38) aptly puts it,

[t]he criteria for a positive evaluation of a children's book, if it is not an educational one, is its success in appealing to adults /.../ Whether or not the book "deeply moved" a child seems not to be taken into account at all. /.../ When it comes to evaluating children's culture, they [adults] ignore the child's opinion and focus on the adult's.

I totally agree with Shavit (ibid 37) in that society's expectation that the children's writer be appreciated both by adults (especially by "people in culture") and children is contradictory by nature because the tastes of children and adults are not only different, but often also incompatible. It is important to emphasise that the fact that their tastes can be incompatible does not mean that children's tastes and abilities are in any way

“worse” than adults`. On the contrary, as suggested by Oittinen (2000: 58), “many of our adult abilities turn out to be inabilities, and children’s “inabilities” make them better readers and listeners.” Children read on a more emotional level and have not yet, fortunately, been taught to ground their evaluation of a book on some “objective” literary criteria.

The contradictory tastes of adults and children also explain the fact that adults mostly condemn adaptations. However, as history has shown, the texts that are considered classics in children’s literature and are officially labeled as children’s literature, “often have to be rewritten (abridged and simplified) in order to be comprehensible and fully realized by children.” (Shavit 1986: 65). George Steiner has gone even so far as to claim that adaptations are the only way to keep the classics alive (cited by Oittinen 2000: 80) and Lennart Hellsing has rightly pointed out that many classics now exist only through adaptations for children (ibid). I would rather that children read a colorful and simplified adaptation and enjoy it than that they read a literal full version and hate it.

On the other hand, I also agree with Lev Vygotsky (1989), who has made a strong case for the child’s sociality and capability and has argued that teaching should always stay ahead of the development of the child, not lag behind. Nevertheless, if a book is too much “ahead”, or above the child’s comprehension, it fails to be fully realised, accepted and enjoyed. Yet involvement—or shall we call it enjoyment or pleasure—while reading is the basis for an enduring reading habit, as also pointed out by Oittinen (ibid 80). Vygotsky`s confidence in the child’s capability is actually, as I see it, in concordance with my belief that children should be allowed to express their opinion and make choices with regard to their reading material.

Another reason why children's responses to a book may be of special interest is that, as emphasised by Tabbert (1980: 43), children's books, more often than adult books, spring from real (or "pragmatic") communication between author and audience. In addition to *Alice* and *Pooh*, other such English classics as Lear's *Book of Nonsense*, Stevenson's *Treasure Island*, and Graham's *Wind in the Willows* have been inspired by real-life people and situations. As pointed out by Tabbert, the implied readers of these books are at least similar to their first real addressees, whose expectations and reactions definitely shaped the book, and thus also the future responses to the book.

Finally, with regards to translation, the translator needs to know or guess the expectations and possible responses of potential readers in order to produce a text that is at least likely to be meaningful to target-culture receivers. To understand what makes a text meaningful and why meaningfulness is essential, relevance theory is included in the present study. According to Nord (2001: 32), a translation should make sense in the communicative situation and culture in which it is received (intratextual coherence, as termed by Reiss and Vermeer). In short, translating means comparing cultures (Nord 2001: 34), but for that, I think, the voices of children as the prime audience of children's books, have to be heard.

To summarise, within the framework of viewing both literature and translation as dialogic communication, the critic of children's literature in his or her "determined attempt to assess it [a book] in terms of its own construction" (Alderson 1980: 71), should not forget to hold a dialogue with the real readers of the text, and the same requirement applies to the translator.

1.5.3 Relevance theory

The principle on which relevance theory, as developed by Sperber and Wilson, is based is that “all human beings automatically aim at the most efficient information processing possible” (1986: 49). Sperber and Wilson believe that every aspect of communication and cognition is governed by the search for relevance. They deny the Co-operative principle as proposed by Grice as well as the maxims of quantity, quality, manner and relevance; relevance, as they maintain, “is fundamental to communication not because speakers obey a maxim of relevance, but because relevance is fundamental to cognition” (Wilson 1994: 56).

To discuss relevance theory in the present thesis is important because it connects up with both reception and translation theories. Assuming, firstly, that a book has to be relevant for a child in order to be meaningful, interesting and worth reading, and secondly, that “the greater the processing effort, the lower the relevance” (Sperber and Wilson, 1986: 124), I claim that translation has a big role to play in rendering certain features and the book as a whole relevant for the target audience. The factor of translatability cannot be denied, of course. It has to be admitted that certain texts are “more translatable”, i.e. easier to translate than others. The spacial, temporal or cultural gaps between the source text and target text can be too big (or too small, for that matter) so as to make a text irrelevant for the target audience; in such cases, solutions such as adaptations, annotated versions, or not translating a text at all could be resorted to. However, it is the translator’s responsibility, first of all, to determine the degree of translatability of the text and to recognise potentially untranslatable elements in order not to increase the irrelevancy of a text for its target

audience and to make potentially irrelevant elements as relevant as possible for the target audience.

Sperber and Wilson (1986: 121) bring out three cases in which an assumption may lack contextual effects and thus be irrelevant in a context. In the first, the assumption may contribute new information, but this information does not connect up with any information present in the context¹³. In the second, the assumption is already present in the context and its strength is unaffected by the newly presented information which makes the information uninformative and thus irrelevant. In the third case, the assumption is inconsistent with the context and is too weak to upset it; therefore, processing the assumption leaves the context unchanged. Sperber and Wilson also admit, however, that “[r]elevance may be achieved by expressing irrelevant assumptions, as long as this expressive behaviour itself is relevant.” (ibid 121). This is the case, for example, with nonsense and irony, the former of which is strongly present in *Alice* and also in *Pooh*.

In other words, Sperber and Wilson define relevance in terms of contextual effects and processing effort, and bring out three ways in which contextual effects can be achieved when newly presented information interacts with a context of existing assumptions: by strengthening an existing assumption, by contradicting and eliminating an existing assumption, or by combining with an existing assumption to yield contextual implication. Sperber and Wilson claim that “newly presented information is relevant in a context when and only when it achieves contextual effects in that context, and the greater the contextual effects, the greater the relevance.” (Wilson 1994: 45). At the same time, contextual effects need some mental effort to derive, and the greater the effort needed to derive them, the lower the relevance will

¹³ Context is defined by Sperber and Wilson (1986: 15) as a psychological construct, „a subset of the hearer’s assumptions about the world. It is these assumptions /.../, rather than the actual state of the world, that affect the interpretation of an utterance.“

be. The processing effort depends on two main factors: the effort of memory and imagination to construct a suitable context and the psychological complexity. “Greater complexity requires greater processing effort; gratuitous complexity detracts from relevance” (Wilson 1994: 46). Thus, to see the intended relevance of an utterance means recovering the intended combination of content, context, attitude and implications. An utterance is optimally relevant if and only if it achieves enough contextual effects to be worth the hearer’s attention and it puts the hearer to no gratuitous processing effort in achieving those effects (ibid 47). However, it is important to note that an utterance does not actually have to be relevant in order to be acceptable and comprehensible as long as the hearer can see how the speaker might reasonably have expected it to be relevant (ibid 48).

Now, how does relevance theory relate to issues of translation and reception of *Alice* versus *Pooh*? What makes *Alice* so much more difficult to translate is the amount of its potentially irrelevant elements for the modern target audience. In addition, the Britishness of its text world puts the readers to great processing effort, which detracts from relevance. Whereas both *Alice* and *Pooh* could be called fantasies, *Pooh* is a much more universal one. Although *Alice* is a dream world, it is a very British dream world, full of culture-bound realia and behavioural conventions—the court, five-o’clock tea, croquet, etc. *Pooh*, on the other hand, exploits and makes fun of some very universal fairy tale conventions, or “functions” as termed by V. Propp. In his *Morphology of the Folktale*, Propp lists 31 functions, which make up the body of a fairy tale. Among these are, for example, the fact that the hero sets off to fulfill an assignment, that there is a villain to fight, that there is a magic thing or helpmate, that the hero wins the villain, etc. In the end, the hero is always amply rewarded—he gets the bride, the throne, and the riches—and is glorified for his deeds.

Pooh contains a lot of small “quests” the hero sets off to, and a lot of challenges to meet. Milne makes his characters very human with all their weaknesses and fears and plays around, consciously or unconsciously, with multiple fairy tale functions. For instance, Milne makes fun of the function of searching for something when the heroes of his book set off to find the North Pole, not even knowing what it is. When Pooh accidentally finds a “pole”, he is glorified for it. There are several instances of saving someone—but someone who is not even in real danger; for example, Pooh saving Piglet from the “flood”; the saving of Roo from the stream (where Roo is actually enjoying himself); Piglet saving Owl and Pooh from Owl’s destroyed house. The “heroes” often prove their courage by getting over their imaginary fears (the “Heffalump”). For every grand deed, Pooh composes a song to glorify the “hero” (who is often himself). As the songs are far from the high style expected from such songs, their function is to carry the parodic and humorous tone of the book. The humanising of the characters and the humorous glorification of their smallest deeds brings the book close to any reader and provides a liberating effect. In the words of Carpenter and Prichard (1984: 576), “Milne’s characters are archetypal and the books’ incidents endlessly useful as metaphors for daily life.”

To analyse *Alice* within the framework of the universal functions suggested by Propp is next to impossible. Although she leaves home as a typical hero(ine), it is very difficult to define the purpose of her adventure, if there is any at all. She is not really saving anyone, nor does she gain anything from her adventure, except for the memory of the dream. It is interesting to note that the makers of the movie version (1999) considered it important to provide a purpose for her adventure by adding a real-life framework in which Alice, before her dream, has to stand up in public with a song and she has a real stage fright. Her dream/adventure helps her to learn and grow

so much that she gets over that fear and performs excellently. The book, however, was liberating for children of Victorian England exactly because it provided no morals—or if it did, they were upside down morals—at a time when everything written for children was didactic.

Kaplinski (1996: 16) claims that the blending of rigid reality and fairy land is very common to British children's stories and aims at offering children a comforting and redeeming experience by making void the strict real-life limitations. This kind of redeeming effect has, however, lost much of its original power in contemporary Estonian society. To find out whether the book still has that effect on the British readers requires another study. Actually, even the assumption that it is was liberating or comforting for its first readers has been doubted by several scholars. As already pointed out above (see p. 28), many children are actually frightened and puzzled by it. There are scholars who do not doubt *Alice's* appeal to children, for example Maria Nikolajeva, who claims (2003) that we know by intuition that *Alice* is a children's book and it has always functioned as a children's book, although it does not match any conventional definitions. Urnov (1983: 19ff), on the other hand, believes that *Alice* is a masqueraded adult book, mainly because this allowed the author to express issues that could not be tackled within the atmosphere of Victorian bigotry. Meanwhile, during Milne's time, English literature had come of age and children's literature could be left just for children. Therefore, according to Urnov, Milne could not exploit the genre to express liberal ideas at the expense of children and created a "childlike book for children"¹⁴, whereas *Alice* is a non-childlike book for children. Urnov compares Christopher Robins's friendly and warm attitude toward his toys and his surroundings with *Alice's*, which is very different. In her adventures in

¹⁴ „детская книга для детей“

Wonderland and *Behind the Looking-Glass*, she meets many weird figures, and at closer look these appear to be adults in disguise, who taunt Alice through their riddles and stories. Alice practically has no friends, whereas Christopher Robin could not imagine better ones. Urnov's observations definitely have a point and even raise doubts about whether *Alice's* functionality and popularity as a children's book is not a myth.

Another important aspect that influences the translatability and relevance of the book is the distance between the text world and target-culture reality. According to Nord (2001: 87), there are three possible varieties of cultural distance. First of all, if the text world corresponds to source-culture reality, then the source text receivers can match it with their own world, but the target receivers cannot. Secondly, the text world does not correspond to source-culture reality, in which case the author has to give explicit descriptions of the peculiarities of the text world, which would also serve the target receivers. Thirdly, the text world corresponds to source-culture reality, but is 'deculturalised' by explicit references to another (unspecific) time and/or place. In this case the text world may be generalised or neutralised and the sociocultural environment loses its relevance for text reception. In other words, the source-text and target-text receivers will find themselves at more or less the same distance from the text world.

As Alice's adventures take place in a dream world, we might want to classify the book under the third distinction. However, despite the fact that the dream world does not correspond exactly to source-culture reality, the book contains many realia and its text world is quite closely related to the sociocultural environment of the source culture. *Pooh*, on the other hand, fits easily under the third category, for although we can deduce that the stories about Pooh and its friends are told in England,

the text world itself is generalised and the sociocultural environment has lost its relevance—it is set in the Hundred Acre Wood and its characters are toys brought into life. Therefore, source-text and target-text readers will find themselves at more or less the same distance from the text world. The real world of Estonian readers is definitely closer to the text world of *Pooh* than that of *Alice*. As pointed out by Nord (2001: 88), the relative familiarity of the text world plays an important role in achieving text effect, because when readers recognise a familiar text world, they are more easily able to identify with fictional characters and situations.

The familiarity of the text world is closely related to the concept of cognitive environment. According to Sperber and Wilson (1986: 39), “an individual’s total cognitive environment is a function of his physical environment and his cognitive abilities, it consists of not only all the facts that he is aware of, but also all the facts he is capable of becoming aware of, in his physical environment.” People never share their total cognitive environments, since physical environments are never identical and since cognitive abilities are affected by previously memorised information. It may be, thus, assumed that although the source and target audiences of *Pooh* do not share the physical environment, they do, at least to some extent, share the cognitive environment, since *Pooh* exploits universal folktale structures, as was discussed above. In the case of *Alice*, both the physical and cognitive environments are very different for source and target audiences, the more so since Estonians have a weak nonsense tradition¹⁵. Sperber and Wilson (1986: 41) bring out another important point, namely that two people’s sharing of a cognitive environment does not imply that they make the same assumptions, merely, that they are capable of doing so. If we interpret this in the context of reception theory, it would suggest that even if the

¹⁵ Among the few Estonian writers who have employed (elements of) nonsense or absurd in children’s literature are Kalju Kangur in poetry in 1960s and 1970s and Aino Pervik with her “Väikesed vigurijutud” (1972). More recently, Andrus Kivirähk is a nonsense writer for both adults and children.

cognitive environment would be the same for the source and the target audience, it would not immediately result in identical reception; it would, however, help make the text more relevant for the target audience and thus also influence reception.

Hence, although both *Alice* and *Pooh* are humorous, nonsensical, parodic—it is the universality of its main structures, the closeness of its fictional world to the target-culture reality and the shared cognitive environment of source and target culture readers that make *Pooh* more relevant and therefore also easier to translate. Or, vice versa—*Pooh* being easier to translate, it is easier to make it more relevant for the target audience. If the nonsensical poems, structures and realia of *Alice* were easy to recognise in Victorian England, those elements have lost much of their relevance for the present reader. This is not to say, however, that *Alice* could not be interesting for the modern Estonian child reader or that it should better not be translated at all. It is only to imply that, in such a case, a very instrumental translation is the only viable solution in order to make the book live on in the target culture.

Alice in Wonderland contains many poems and songs. Most of them were parodies of poems and songs well known in England at the time Carroll wrote the book. And many of them are still well known, not the least because Carroll made them famous by parodying them in his book. Most of the historical names mentioned are travesties of the then schoolbook texts. Moreover, as Carroll first wrote the book for a present to Alice Liddell, the 10-year old lovely daughter of his friend, the book is said to contain jokes private between Alice, her sisters and Carroll. Finally, in addition to parody, literary references, and private jokes, the book abounds in nonsense and absurd. I do not think children are not able to understand or enjoy intertextuality in books. Rather, as Watts (1991: 40) has it, “[i]t is not parody or intertextuality as such which evoke negative perceptions /.../ but rather the lack of

reverence paid to the original poem.” In other words, differently from English children, Estonian children do not have nursery rhymes and nonsense rhymes as intertext. They have not “grown up” on them. According to Nikolajeva (1996: 158), children without background knowledge can still enjoy a text but the reading experience is doubtless strengthened by such knowledge. The first thing to get lost for Estonian children without the necessary background knowledge is the humorous effect of *Alice*, which depends, to a large extent, on the reader having nursery and nonsense rhymes as intertext. The lack of background knowledge and the lack of pleasure seriously affect the degree of relevance and makes situations, characters and poems quite “pointless” for Estonian children—as was confirmed by my empirical research (see below p. 64ff). In addition to literary background knowledge, children’s own experiences are perhaps even more important for relevance. As Tabbert (1980: 38) points out, “/.../ if the concept of horizon of expectations is of any use for the understanding of children’s responses to books, it should be seen in connection with life experience rather than knowledge of literature and history.”

Children, just as adults, can enjoy novelty and extraordinariness. But children, more than adults, will actually be fascinated by a book’s predictability, by “the joy of recognition” (Nikolajeva 1996: 58). Therein lies an answer to the mystery why children like to read a book many times--while adults rarely do it—and to read many similar books in a row. By each reading, a text may thus become more, not less, relevant for a child reader, since “[t]exts create a flow of information in the mind of readers [and] the more the recipients are familiar with the canon, the richer the flow.” (ibid). The whole genre of *Alice*, however we choose to classify it, is unfamiliar to Estonian readers, whereas the British children have, in addition to Carroll and others, such a widely known and loved nonsense writer as Edward Lear.

Ants Oras, the translator of the poems in the 1940 translation of *Alice*, has said in his article “Mathematical humour” (1940: 174) that the simple fact that everyone in England, America, Australia and South Africa knows Carroll’s books and quotes them implies that they express some kind of basic Anglo-Saxon quality, that they touch, in every Englishman, some hidden part of the soul. Oras says that there probably is no nation who would not love fairy tales, fantasy or the pleasure of irreality, but “more than anywhere else, the interest toward nonsense is developed in an Englishman” (ibid). English and American children are brought up with nonsensical nursery rhymes and even more nonsensical limericks—neither of which we have in Estonia. The fact that Alice Liddell herself, for whom Carroll invented the Wonderland story, has hoped that “there will be nonsense in it” proves again that the nonsense element may be of special appeal for an English reader. To find out the attitude of Estonian children toward the absurd and nonsense needs another study.¹⁶ For the present paper, it will be enough to hypothesise that the poem parodies in *Alice* will not be relevant for Estonian children, as they present new information which does not connect up with any information present in the context. As for nonsense and the absurd, they appear limited and functionless in the translation, but it would be wrong to claim that Estonian children cannot or would not appreciate it in a book; rather, as the bases of nonsense and the absurd as used in *Alice* are unknown to Estonian children, such expressive behaviour remains irrelevant in that book.

Sperber and Wilson (op.cit: 121) also claim that the greater the processing effort, the lower the relevance. In the case of *Alice*, the processing effort must be much larger for Estonian children than for English children. Although Oras (1940:

¹⁶ For that, it might be especially fruitful and interesting to investigate the reception of Andrus Kivirähk’s nonsensical children’s books, for example „Sirli, Siim ja saladused“ (Sirli, Siim and the Secrets) (1999?) or „Kaelkirjak“ (Giraffe) (1995), which are both, like *Alice* and *Pooh*, quite ambivalent as to their implied reader.

178) argues that the reader feels pleasantly intrigued and happy when s/he succeeds to “discover” something in the book, for example that a nonsensical song is a parody of a popular moralising or sentimental ballad, Oras must be keeping in mind the English reader, because there is no way an Estonian child would know the originals behind the parodies. In addition to losing the pleasures from intertextuality, the processing effort, in trying to make the book meaningful, may be so large for Estonian child readers that the book becomes totally irrelevant and thus wholly or partly boring. Added to this is the fact that the unfamiliar situations and poems make the whole atmosphere of the book very “strange” for Estonian children, whereas the dreamy atmosphere and the fun of all kinds of discoveries make the original much sunnier for the English reader. Oras also claims that if there was no logic behind all the fantastic events, then the book would easily become chaos and start annoying the reader. Again, he does not seem to speak of the Estonian audience, because for an Estonian child, who does not recognise the parodies nor the language metaphors turned into life, it is very difficult to see a logic behind the absurdist fantasy. For an English child, the March Hare, the Mad Hatter, Humpty Dumpty, Cheshire Cat are well known figures, but what do they mean for an Estonian reader? Chaos and confusion is exactly what results for the Estonian readers, as, again, proved by the empirical research (see below). True, any book has to have “telling gaps”, as was pointed out above (see p. 35), in order to actively involve the reader. Nevertheless, if the level of unfamiliarity is too high, the text will fail to activate the reader by not achieving any contextual effects and thus remaining irrelevant.

1.6 Analysis and comparison of translations of *Alice* and *Pooh*

As the purpose of this paper is not to offer a full analysis of translation, but rather to point out such aspects of translation as may influence reception, this part of the paper will focus, in short, on the rendering of the tone, the vocabulary, the illustrations and finally, verses in *Alice*, since the verses carry several of the main themes of the book as well as contribute greatly to the humorous, parodic, and nonsensical tone of the text. In comparison, the same aspects will be discussed in the translation of *Pooh*.

First of all, I will say some words about the tone, as this is something the translator should definitely aim at conveying in the translation as well as something that certainly affects reception. The tone of the original is playful, humorous and parodic.¹⁷ English children will recognise, all through the book, situations and characters that are known to them from different sayings and rhymes. Sayings that have given life to Carroll's characters include "mad as a March hare", "mad as a hatter", "to grin like a Cheshire Cat", "as dead as a Dodo". The nursery rhyme "The Queen of Hearts" provides the theme for a whole chapter. Carroll presents the characters in such a way as to point out the peculiarities of language, its metaphors and sayings as well as the absurdity of rhymes.

As the translator has chosen faithfulness to the original over other possible (and more flexible) solutions, the tone of the translation, unfortunately, fails to be humorous and parodic for the Estonian child. The Estonian reader does not understand the playfulness behind such characters as the March hare or the Hatter; hence, the characters of the book seem to be just a bunch of weird figures and the

¹⁷ Alan Milne is known to have preferred Carroll to Edward Lear firstly because Carroll's rhymes were technically more masterful and secondly, because they were more cheerful (C. Milne 1974)

situations quite absurd, crazy and illogical. The tone could be described as serious rather than funny.

Secondly, the vocabulary of the original is rather colloquial; consider, for example, the following sentence: “/.../ never once considering how the world she was to get out again.” (26) Although written in the middle of the 19th century, the book contains no old-fashioned words. Most of the dialogues are typical informal discourses. Although the Estonian translation appeared only three decades ago, the vocabulary seems more outdated and even archaic than in the source text. (Strange enough, the vocabulary in the 1971 translation seems more old-fashioned than in the 1940 translation). To mention just a few examples, the translation contains such words as “jõude”, “päll”, “teps”, “leelõukal”, “uudishimu-uhal”, “nõrgvel-märjad”. Such words can, of course, enrich the vocabulary of the readers, which might have been one of the aims of the translator; they fail, however, to present the characters’ conversation as familiar, everyday discourse. As emphasised by Martin (2001: 9), though, readability and natural dialogue are of supreme importance in a book for children.

Above (see p. 30), such concepts as domestication and foreignisation were discussed. One foreignising aspect of the translation is the fact that the translator has chosen to retain the English terms of measurement, such as “toll” for “inch” and “jalg” for “foot”, explaining the measurements in footnotes. It makes it much harder to imagine, though, how tall or short Alice exactly is at the moment. The translator of 1940 edition has rendered the “inches” as “centimeters”, which is a more target-reader oriented solution. Retaining the English terms of measurement probably has a didactic reason—to make Estonian children familiar with the English measurement system—

but it lessens the children's ability to create the characters in their imagination, thus also probably decreasing the pleasure gained from reading.

The 1940 translation is uneven in that the text as translated by Bakis leaves a lot to criticise, especially as for word order (“/.../hingeldades, keele rippudes suust välja /.../”(39), whereas the verses as translated by Oras display a very high quality. But there are other aspects besides the terms of measurement that make it more target-audience friendly than the 1971 translation. The word “Lory”, for example, that has been retained as “loori” by Kross, has been rendered as “papagoi”—a bird recognisable for Estonian children. In general, the translation of proper names is a good indicator of a domesticating or foreignising translation. With few exceptions, Kross has chosen the strategy to reproduce the source language names without any changes in the form. Too many difficult names or words, however, may considerably increase the processing effort and thus reduce the relevance for the reader, which was proved by the empirical study (see below, p.71). Adaptation, or even substitution, of names might be a solution, especially if, as pointed out by Nord (2003: 187), “the characters are fictitious anyway [and] an adaptation allows for easier pronunciation and does not interfere with the identifying function.”

As for illustrations, the study of picture books and pictures is a whole separate field within the research of children's literature, but only a few remarks will be made here as the topic and space of the paper are limited. First of all, it has to be acknowledged that illustrations are of great importance in any children's book. Children generally love illustrations; moreover, the text and the illustration, at least ideally, form a whole, an iconotext, as coined by Kristin Hallberg (qtd by Nikolajeva 1996: 90). The text contributes to the illustrations and vice versa. The original illustrations by John Tenniel played a very important role in making Carroll's books

so famous. Moreover, Carroll himself took great pains to harmonise the illustrations with his text. The poem, “Father William”, for example, as pointed out by Martin (2001: 12) had no less than four Tenniel illustration, covering many details of the poem. The illustrations not only contributed to the understanding of the text, but added another layer to it, because Tenniel depicted several characters as topical political figures—let us not forget that he was, for a long time, an illustrator for the magazine “Punch”. Even though political satires age quickly, Tenniel’s highly idiosyncratic illustrations have been appreciated and loved ever since. The fact that illustrators for different publications have included such famous artists as Arthur Rackham, Salvador Dali and Tove Jansson also indicates the great importance attributed to the role of illustrations.

Estonians have chosen to go their own way. Neither the 1940 nor the 1971 translation contains Tenniel’s illustrations. The illustrator of 1940 translation is not known; the 1971 translation was illustrated by the Vive Tolli. It is not my point here to discuss the quality of the pictures, but their functionality is important for the reception of the book. What strikes me first of all in the 1971 translation is the contradiction between the text and the pictures. Namely, as has been mentioned several times, the translation itself keeps close to the original and is of a foreignising kind, clearly presenting the text world as typically English. The pictures, however, are of a domesticating kind—they present Alice as a typical blond Estonian girl, with a simple dress and haircut, and the Duchess looks like a red-cheeked Estonian grandmother with a grand dress, whereas some other characters, like the King, are presented with appropriate accessories like crowns, etc.

As will be discussed at greater length below (see p. 75), several children pointed out in the questionnaires that it was very hard to imagine what the Gryphon

looked like. In the original, when Gryphon is first mentioned in the text, a comment is added in parenthesis—namely, “if you don’t know what a Gryphon is, look at the picture”. And indeed, the next picture shows the Gryphon. In translation, a similar comment is added and the next picture, indeed, shows the Mock Turtle and the Gryphon, but it remains very hard to actually understand what the Gryphon looks like. He is supposed to have a lion’s body and an eagle’s head, but on the picture it looks something between a duck, a bird, and a cow. The illustrator has the right, of course, to interpret the text in his or her own way, like any reader, and to depict the characters in the way she chooses, but there should still be some kind of “dialogue” between the text and the illustrations. There are, of course, picture books in which illustrations are meant to contradict the text, but that solution evidently has no function in this book. The illustrations are so much simplified and exclude so many important details that they fail to offer visual help for the Estonian child in creating the necessary context/cognitive environment.

Another aspect of the translation, which may seem to be a minor, insignificant detail, but has been pointed out by several scholars as one of the aspects affecting reception, is the print. The font is small and the spacing dense, which makes it look more like an adult than a children’s book. According to Thompson (1993: 256), “[t]here is ample evidence that matters of edition, format, price, distribution outlet, and so on can have a considerable impact on who reads what, when, with what expectations, and to what purposes.”

Finally, the most complex part of the translation and the biggest challenge for the translator, is the verses. The book contains, in addition to the introduction, ten poems, all of them parodies of more or less well known verses and rhymes in Victorian England, except for the introduction and the White Rabbit’s song at the

trial. The Estonian translator has chosen the conservative approach and provided a rather linguistic, “faithful”, translation. Some of the translations are quite masterful and some of the poems even succeed in being funny, but the parodical side gets totally lost. This cannot be considered a minor loss, though, as the poems carry some major themes of the book—making fun of the orderly and at the same time absurd adult world with its rules and regulations, of life and death, babyhood and old age, the meaning(lessness) of life. There are examples in other languages (Russian, Swedish, German), where translators have chosen to parody well-known rhymes of the target culture. It is definitely very difficult to find suitable target culture rhymes to parody and to do it consistently, but translations which succeed in following that method will probably mean much more for the target culture reader. When *Alice* was first translated into French, Carroll himself was even so radical as to suggest leaving out the poem parodies, as he considered them untranslatable. The book would lose a lot, though, if all the poems were left out. At the same time, I do not deny the possibility for a masterful translator of being precise and faithful to the original but still funny for the target reader. Talking about the 1995 translation of *Alice* into Finnish, Oittinen (1999: 58) claims that it is paradoxically the preciseness, the translator’s attempt to cover and include everything, that makes this text very funny and very postmodern.

Krusten (1995: 121) claims that two important features that appeal to children in poems are their dynamic and pictorial qualities; in other words, their potential to create in the reader’s mind. Oras’s translation of poems is domesticating, as will be discussed in more detail below, but domestication in itself does not guarantee instrumentality or relevance. However, in addition to being domesticating, Oras’s translation seems to be more dynamic and pictorial than Kross’s, wherefore they can be thought to have a greater appeal to children.

Now, some words about each of the poems separately. The introduction, fairly poetic but easy to follow in the source text, remains confusing in the translation. To read it once is probably not enough to get the point. In addition to the poem's containing many old-fashioned words such as "jõude", "pelk", "tapitud", the second and third verse are especially confusing. Compare the four lines in the source text: "Ah, cruel Three! In such an hour,/ Beneath such dreamy weather,/ To beg a tale of breath too weak/ To stir the tiniest feather!" with the translation: "Õel kolmik! Juttu nõuda—nüüd/ kui rauguses ei kulge/ teps jutulaev, sest hingeõhk/ ei tõsta udusulge!" As for the third stanza, there is, indeed a footnote added, explaining whom the author meant by Prima, Secunda, and Tertia, but that does not do much to improve the impression as a whole.

The first poem in the source text, "How doth the little crocodile" is a parody of the didactic "Against Idleness and Mischief", which was the best-known poem (beginning with lines "How doth the little busy bee") by Isaac Watts, with which Carroll's contemporaries were well familiar (Gardner 1985: 38). The linguistic translation offered by Kross, if it manages to offer pleasure for the reader, fails to mean anything more to the Estonian audience.

The second poem in the source text "Fury said to a mouse" is an example of emblematic, or figured, verse. In the translation, the form of the poem has luckily been kept, but the poem has become considerably shorter, thus also perhaps harder to understand. In comparison, Oras has seen the need to make the poem longer than in the source text and somewhat more "narrative" or retelling, which makes it easier to follow and enjoy.

The third poem, "You are old, Father William" is a parody of Robert Southey's didactic poem and is considered a masterpiece of nonsense verse (Gardner

1985: 69). If we compare the translations by Oras and Kross, this poem exemplifies clearly the distinction between a domesticated versus foreignising translation. Oras has dropped the name William and rendered it just as “armas taat”, whereas Kross has faithfully retained the name, which, again, fails to convey any meaning for the Estonian child reader.

The fourth poem in the source text, “Speak roughly to your little boy” is, again, a burlesque of a once widely quoted didactic poem “Speak gently” (Gardner 1985: 85). In Estonian translation, again, the token of its parody remains uncoverable. The fifth poem “Twinkle, twinkle, little bat” parodies the first verse of the still famous poem by Jane Taylor, “The Star”, which is included as a song in several Estonian textbooks too. If the poem were also known in Estonian, it would have been the best solution, of course, to include a parody of it here; the translation as it is, though, cannot be recognised as a parody by Estonian readers.

In the sixth poem, the Mock Turtle’s song, “Will you walk a little faster”, Carroll parodies the first line and adopts the meter of Mary Howitt’s poem, “The Spider and the Fly” (Gardner 1985: 133). The seventh poem, “Tis the voice of the Lobster” is a parody of the opening lines of *The Sluggard*, a dismal poem by Isaac Watts, which was well known to Carroll’s readers (ibid 139). As the poems follow one another quite closely toward the end of the book and as they all lose the power of parody for Estonian readers, they also lose the point and the perplexed or bored reader is forced to ask: So what? In translation, the poems do not add anything to the story, neither do they provide the fun of recognition. They thus lose their relevance and will often be skipped by the bored Estonian child reader, as will be proved below.

The eighth poem, “Beautiful Soup”, is a parody of the popular song “Star of the Evening”, which was sung to Carroll, as he recorded in his diary, by the Liddell

sisters (Gardner 1985: 141). To an Estonian child it seems, of course, as “original” and weird as ever.

The ninth poem, “The Queen of Hearts”, although containing only four lines, provides the theme for the whole of the last but one chapter. It was originally a four-stanza poem that appeared in *The European Magazine*. The first stanza probably owes its present fame to its use by Carroll (Baring-Gould 1962: 149-50). I believe that just as it is in the power of the author to make a poem popular and loved by the audience, it is in the power of the translator to make the audience love and cite a poem. As the questionnaires in my experiment (see below) demonstrated, however, children who had read *Alice* only a month ago were not even able comment on the poems because they did not remember any.

The last poem, the White Rabbit’s evidence “They told me you had been to her” is taken in considerably revised form from Carroll’s own eight-verse nonsense poem *She’s All My Fancy Painted Him* (Gardner 1985: 158). The translation is just as confusing and “senseless” as the original, so it is hard to judge whether the English children get more out of it than Estonian. It is important, though, to notice the deliberate absurdity of it. The English children will probably enjoy the “nonsense in it”, whereas for Estonian child readers all the poems seem so absurd that the last one may easily lose its function as a real mind-boggler.

The Estonian children’s responses to the poems will be discussed in greater detail below (see p. 77), but the dominant attitude was negative and the most often used adjectives for the poems were “boring” and “unintelligible”. Estonia has many very good and famous children’s poets, as well as many lovely and loved children’s songs; therefore, I cannot believe that Estonian children are by nature incapable of enjoying rhymes or songs. I do believe, however, that the poem parodies in *Alice* fail

to prove relevant for Estonian children and the book as a whole loses enormously because of that.

Two solutions could be suggested for rendering the poems more relevant for the target audience of Estonian children. Firstly, the translator could parody concrete well-known Estonian poems as Teutsch did in her translation of *Alice* into German (see above, p. 24), which might, though, be a very difficult task. The second possibility is to imitate or parody not a specific existing model, but rather the dominant tone of children's poems in the target culture. Nord (2001: 97), who discusses an Italian and a Brazilian version of *Alice*, in which the poems have been adapted to a kind of prototype model, concludes that for natives, these translations sound as if they were typical children's songs. Such a solution could render the poems more familiar, and thus more relevant, to the target audience.

Now, let us turn our attention to *Pooh*. The way the tone of the original is rendered in translation leaves nothing to complain about. The author aims at creating a close, familiar and confiding relationship with his readers, and this intimacy, which is humorous and at times melancholy, comes across in translation as well. Moreover, children have been claimed to prefer dialogue to descriptions and this is where *Pooh* does not disappoint them. It is not so easy to render dialogues so that they would appear natural in the target language¹⁸, but the translation of *Pooh* has successfully completed that task: the many dialogues appear to be totally natural and speakable. That a children's book be suitable for reading aloud, however, is a very important factor. According to Puurtinen (1995: 23), speakability, i.e. the suitability of a text to be read aloud fluently, is one of the general requirements presented to children's books.

¹⁸ According to Eric Dickens (2004), who was awarded the 2004 Via Estica prize for the best translation of Estonian literature to English, translating dialogues is actually the most complicated part of translation.

Although the first translation of *Pooh* appeared three years before the full translation of *Alice* by Kross, the vocabulary in *Pooh* achieves the same level of conversationality as in the original, which is not the case with the translation of *Alice*. If Kross is inventive but rather old-fashioned, Rummel and Rajamets are inventive, but at the same time sound modern as well. Of course, *Pooh* first appeared in 1926 and *Alice* in 1865—a difference in time that is bound to make a difference in vocabulary, but as pointed out above, the source text of *Alice* sounds quite modern as opposed to its translation.

As for illustrations, the 1968 edition employed original illustrations by S. H. Shepard, the 1974 and 1977 editions included illustrations by A. Poret and the 2000 edition of *The Complete Pooh* again used Shepard's illustrations. In my view, the publishers' decision to turn back to the original illustration by Shepard in the 2000 edition was a right one, as Shepard's illustrations harmonise better with the funny aspect of the text. The 2000 edition fully uses the book's potential for the combination of text and pictures to enhance the effect of both, separately and in unison. However, A. Poret's illustrations also have a charm of their own.

As for the poems, translated by Harald Rajamets, again they leave nothing to complain about or criticise. They are instrumental in that they are dynamic and pictorial, often use full rhyme, and carry the humorous-nonsensical tone. Compare, for example, the first lines from Pooh's song "I lay on my chest": "I lay on my chest/And I thought it best/To pretend I was having an evening rest;/ I lay on my tum/ and I tried to hum/ But nothing particular seemed to come" with Rajamets's rendition: "Ma kukkusin maha/ ja mul oli paha/ ja ümin jäi kinni mu hammaste taha./ End rinnuli leidsin,/ kuid ehmatust peitsin/ ja näo tegin ette, et puhkama heitsin." The translation is fluent, speakable, and easily memorisable. *Miksike*, the study

environment in Internet that was mentioned above (see p. 7) includes the same poem with gaps and children are asked to fill in the gaps, which, as it seems to me, is a clear sign that the poems are ascribed an important role in the book and that children are assumed to remember (some of) the poems.

In conclusion, both the translation of *Alice* and that of *Pooh* offer ingenious solutions on text level; take, for example, “Irvikkass” for “Cheshire Cat” in *Alice* or “pusa” for “woozle” in *Pooh*. Both translations handle well the numerous word games (“tale/tail” has been rendered as “jutt/hännajutt” in *Alice*; “North Pole/stick in the ground” as “Põhjanaba/teivas kuskil põhjas...jõe põhjas /.../” in *Pooh*). Nevertheless, the 1971 full translation of *Alice* is predominantly documentary in that it remains source-culture oriented, foreignising, and considers equivalence on text level more important than equivalence on the functional level, which risks resulting in the loss of the parodic and humorous spirit of the source text, and in confusion and boredom for the Estonian child audience. The translation of *Pooh*, on the contrary, seems to be instrumental and even equifunctional, i.e. achieving the same effects on the target readers as the source text did on its readers.

CHAPTER 2. EMPIRICAL STUDY

2.1 Research questions

As claimed above (see p.13), a translator is an important mediator between the source and the target cultures and plays an essential role in securing successful communication between the author, the text and the target reader.

A distinction between an instrumental and a documentary translation was found useful for the purposes of the present study. Although a documentary translation is not, by definition, a bad translation, only an instrumental translation is regarded as serving the needs of children's literature, namely as ensuring the relevancy of the translated text for the target audience and its ability to function as a living text in the target culture.

Although translation studies have a long history and children's literature is a fast developing field of research, there are very few empirical studies conducted combining those two fields of research in Estonia to date. In order to contribute to filling the gap, the present study set as its aim to test empirically Estonian children's responses to two world famous English children's classics, so as to find out, through a comparative and contrastive analysis, which aspects might have influenced their reception by the Estonian audience and whether translation may have played a major role in it.

As English is the foremost foreign language learned and spoken in Estonia and as the majority of translations come from English, the present study also hopes to point out problems, dangers and possible solutions to any translator in the task of the mediation of cultures. Although reception studies are mostly concerned with cultural,

social, and individual differences between the source and target readers, it seemed challenging, as well as necessary, to relate issues of reception to issues of translation.

The hypotheses for the study were formulated as follows:

- 1) Both *Alice in Wonderland* and *Winnie-the-Pooh* are world-famous classics of children's literature written in English and both works have been translated to over 60 languages. There must be something in those books that has guaranteed them such a wide success not only in the English-speaking countries but all over the world. There is anecdotal evidence, however, that *Alice* has been received poorly in Estonia, whereas *Pooh* is the favourite of many children and adults. Although both *Alice* and *Pooh* are fantasies, or literary fairy tales, and there is no description of a real foreign milieu in either of the books, *Alice's* text world is much more specifically British and closer to the source audience than the text world of *Pooh*. *Pooh* makes use of universal folktale structures and Estonian target readers can therefore share, to considerable extent, the cognitive environment with its source readers which is not true of *Alice*. Although *Alice* has been called untranslatable by several translators and theorists, there is ample evidence that superb translations of it have appeared. Therefore, it was hypothesised that it is not the book itself that is totally untranslatable into Estonian, but, rather, the translation of *Alice* into Estonian has not initiated a successful communication and has not functioned as a living classic among Estonian children.
- 2) As several previous studies of translations of *Alice* into other languages have shown, often those translations that did not stick closely to the original, but aimed at conveying the playful, parodic tone of the book were most successful. It was hypothesised that it is mainly the equivalence-based,

documentary translation of *Alice* that has deprived the book of its rightful, positive reception, whereas the functional, instrumental translation of *Pooh* has secured a warm reception by Estonian child audience.

- 3) In order to explain why the documentary translation of *Alice*—or of any children's book, by extension—does not result in successful communication, it was hypothesised that a documentary, source text oriented translation fails to make the totally unfamiliar features of the book relevant for the target reader. And, if a book remains irrelevant, the child will get nothing or next to nothing out of the reading experience, which also means that the whole reading process becomes pointless; instead of motivating the child to read other books in the future, the effect will be the opposite. Moreover, a negative reading experience does by no means increase the understanding between cultures, but rather may create misunderstanding and incite intolerance toward the source culture.
- 4) Next, as was pointed out above (p. 49), in the case of children, the issue of relevance may be related more to their life experience than to their previous knowledge of literature and history. Hence, it was hypothesised that if children encounter something familiar, identifiable or recognisable in the book, either from their own life or from a film etc, they will already have some context for it, which makes the recognised object relevant for them. Conversely, if something is too unfamiliar and too difficult to understand, it will remain irrelevant.
- 5) As the translations of the poems in the 1940 translation of *Alice* by Ants Oras were found to be more domesticating and target audience oriented, it was

hypothesised that children will like Oras`s translation more and also find it more meaningful as well as relevant.

- 6) Finally, as illustrations complement Carroll`s text in very important ways, it was hypothesised that Vive Tolli`s simplified pictures, as opposed to Tenniel`s detailed and parodying ones, fail to provide Estonian child readers with the necessary help to understand and imagine certain characters in the text or to contribute to the humorous impression of the original text.

2.2 Methods

A combination of qualitative and quantitative analysis was considered necessary for the purposes of the study. Therefore, two different sources were chosen for eliciting data: interviews with children and questionnaires completed by children. It was hoped that the data gathered from these two different methods would be complementary, highlight issues related to reception, and help draw reliable conclusions.

2.2.1 Interviews with children

Interviews were open-ended and carried out in a free atmosphere. There was no rigidly determined set of questions that the interviewer had to ask. However, considering the aims of the study, there were certain questions that were asked, in one form or another, in each and every interview. These questions were the following:

- 1) What kind of books do you read?

- 2) What kind of books do you like? Why?
- 3) What kind of books don't you like? Why?
- 4) When and why did you read *Alice/Pooh*?
- 5) Did you like it? Why (not)?
- 6) Was the book difficult to read or to understand? If yes, then why?
- 7) Did you read the poems in the book and did you like them? Why (not)?
- 8) What kind of impression did the book leave?
- 9) Did you like the illustrations? Why (not)?
- 10) Who was your favourite character in the book and why?

The questions asked during the interviews are similar to the questions in the questionnaires. However, it was considered important not to limit the study to questionnaires, which are easier and less time-consuming to carry out, because interviews enable to get extended answers and to analyse data qualitatively.

2.2.2 Questionnaire

There is a questionnaire for *Alice* (see App.) and a questionnaire for *Pooh* (see App.), with very slight differences between them. Namely, as recently several adaptations of *Alice* have been published in Estonia, it was considered necessary to ask which version of *Alice* the respondent has read. In the questionnaire for *Pooh*, this question was replaced with the question about when the book was last read. As the questionnaire for *Alice* was carried out with groups who read *Alice* as part of obligatory reading, the answer to that question was already known. Furthermore, one more question was added to the questionnaire for *Alice*; namely, to read and compare

a poem from *Alice* as translated by Ants Oras and Jaan Kross. The poems differ for Group A and Group B for reasons pointed out below (see p. 82). In addition, the second group read the book after watching a film version of *Alice*, so it was considered useful to add two questions for that group: Whether they liked the film more or less than the book and why; and whether the film somehow helped to understand the book.

2.3 Sample

All in all, 80 children were involved in the empirical research. The interviewees were 16 volunteers between ages 9 and 14, who had read either *Alice* or *Pooh* or both. Out of sixteen children, ten had read both *Alice* and *Pooh*, two had read only *Alice* and four had read only *Pooh*. The interviewees included pupils from various schools in Tartu, for example Tartu Kommertsgümnaasium, Ülenurme Gümnaasium and Miina Härma Gümnaasium. Most interviews were carried out with each child individually; however, there were some children who were interviewed together with their friend. Several children had read *Pooh* as obligatory reading in Form 3 or Form 4.

The questionnaires were carried out with two classes of pupils (13/14 years old) from Form 7 at Miina Härma Gümnaasium. Being an English-biased school, its curriculum includes *Alice* to be read in Form 7 within the literature class. The questionnaires were carried out with two groups. Group A included 34 pupils (17 girls and 16 boys), who had all read *Alice* in the translation by Kross approximately a month ago (some of the respondents had read an adaptation of *Alice* in addition).

Group B included 31 pupils (19 girls and 12 boys), who had watched a film version of *Alice* a week before the questionnaire and had just finished the book by the time of the questionnaire. In the two groups, there were also eight children who completed the questionnaire for *Pooh*.

Although *Pooh* has also been read as obligatory reading by some younger classes in that school (some interviewees came from those classes), it was considered important that the respondents to questionnaires for *Alice* and questionnaires for *Pooh* would be the same, so as to better control the pragmatic variables—sex, age, social group, etc.

2.4 Procedure

The interviewees were promised that no one else besides the interviewer is going to listen to the recording and they were asked to be totally honest in their responses. They were also told that no questions asked had right or wrong answers, it was only their opinion that was important. The interviews lasted from 15 to 30 minutes. A friendly, supporting atmosphere was aimed at and was achieved in most interviews.

The questionnaires for *Alice* were completed in a classroom situation, but the respondents were assured that their teacher would not see the completed questionnaires and they were asked to be as honest and as precise as possible in their answers. They were also reminded not to forget to justify their answers if that was required by the question. The questionnaires for *Pooh* were completed at home by children and collected by the author of the present paper. Unfortunately, not all

children who had read *Pooh* and promised to fill in the questionnaire returned their questionnaires.

2.5 Results and discussion

2.5.1 Data analysis

2.5.1.1 Data from the interviews with children

As most interviewees—ten out of 16—had read both *Alice* and *Pooh*, the interviews provided a good chance to investigate and compare children’s responses to the two books under discussion.¹⁹ The interviews totally confirmed the general hypothesis that Estonian children like *Pooh* but not *Alice*. All of the interviewees who had read *Pooh*—14 in all—liked the book. Out of 12 interviewees who had read *Alice*, three children said that they liked the book. However, a very important factor to consider is that all of those three had read an adaptation—and all the adaptations that have appeared in Estonia²⁰ (except Warren’s) differ greatly from the full translation by including very little text and very large, colourful pictures. The fact that it was only the adaptations that deserved positive comments confirmed my belief that if adaptation is the only way to successfully mediate a text into another culture, adaptations should be encouraged not disdained.

In describing the full translation of *Alice*, the children commented that the names were weird and difficult, that the book was not very interesting, and that the book was too “contrived”(kuidagi liiga väljamõeldud) One girl said that it was a “dubious”(kahtlane) book, because she did not understand it and the characters were

¹⁹ For the transcript of one interview, see App.

²⁰ Transl. Anne Tamberg, illustr. Pierre Couronne, Sinisukk, 2000 (16 pages)

Transl. Orvi Käsper, Kirilill, 2002 (94 pages)

Adapted E.G. Warren, transl. Jana Linnart, illustr. Lea Kaster, ERSEN, 1999 (236 pages)

Transl. Karin Klaamas, Egmont Estonia, 1996 (96 pages)

very strange; the book sometimes got boring because the names were very difficult to understand and it was difficult to read. Another girl mentioned that she often had the feeling while reading *Alice* that she did not understand what was going on. It is important to notice that the fact that the names were difficult was brought out by five respondents. As already emphasised, the adaptations usually deserved positive comments. One girl (aged 9), who has read an adaptation by Warren claimed that she has read the book many times and knows it by heart, because it is easy to memorise.

In describing *Pooh*, children repeatedly brought out that it was “cool”(lahe) and funny and that it had sweet characters. The poems were also considered funny and great. One girl said about the poems that she would not skip them.

When asked to compare their response to *Alice* and *Pooh*, nine out of ten interviewees who had read both books pointed out that they liked *Pooh* more or much more than *Alice*. Many interviewees said that they did not like the poems nor the illustrations of *Alice*; that *Pooh* was funnier and more “child friendly”(lastesõbralikum); that *Pooh* is “written so that children could understand it”(kirjutatud nii, et lapsed aru saaksid); that they liked *Pooh* more because the characters and the plot were easier to understand. I would also like to draw attention to the fact that several times the respondents emphasised that they liked the characters in *Pooh*, because they were lovely and they matched well together, whereas the characters in *Alice* were called weird and hard to imagine or understand. Many children mentioned the White Rabbit as their favourite character in *Alice*. This supports the idea that the toys brought into life are much closer and more relevant to Estonian children than the strange characters in *Alice*, except for the Rabbit, who is a common animal in Estonia and in Estonian fairy tales as well.

2.5.1.2 Data from the questionnaires²¹

As several questions in the questionnaire were deliberately repetitive—to increase the reliability of the results—they will be discussed not one by one, but in “bundles”. Let us first look at the results of the questionnaire about *Alice*, which was completed by 64 children.

The first three questions are, in the most part, of an informative nature and give the researcher some necessary background information about the respondent. However, answers to the questions also have further implications. Most of the respondents (47 out of 64) have read *Alice* only once. Only one respondent has read Kross’s version twice; other respondents who have read the book twice or more, have actually first read an adaptation and then the version by Kross. What this implies is that an interesting adaptation can incite children to also turn to the full version; however, as some later answers revealed, the full version can be a disappointment. The fact that only one boy within two groups had read an adaptation in addition to the full version, whereas 14 girls had read an adaptation once or twice before the full version, shows that girls really do read more than boys. It is not only because *Alice* would be more of a “girl’s” book and that is why girls read it more; the interviews also implied the same tendency—most boys do not like to read.

Most respondents (58 out of 64) read Kross’s version as part of the obligatory reading for the literature class. It could be claimed that this factor has influenced their reading experience in a negative way; however, interviews with children revealed that most children do not have any negative prejudices toward obligatory reading and many actually like the books that are on the obligatory reading list. Moreover, several

²¹ See also App. for tables.

interviewees had read *Pooh* as obligatory reading in Form 3 or 4, but that did not affect their reception in a negative way. Two respondents read the book because they liked the film version, which is a significant fact in that it shows that watching films does not only pull children away from books but can also bring children to books.

Questions number 4 and 5 deal with expectations. Above (see p. 49), Jauss's concept of the horizon of expectations was discussed. According to Jauss, literary works first evoke and then frustrate the reader's expectations, thus gradually changing the reader's frame of reference. In Jauss's terminology, this "frustration" has a positive connotation and results in a positive outcome—some change in the status quo of the reader is achieved, which is the aim of any communicative situation. Expectations are closely related to attitude, which, as was suggested by Sell above (see p. 12) can strongly influence the reading experience as well as the understanding of a book.

The results of the questionnaire, interestingly, differ between the two groups. In Group A, the expectations were mostly negative (25 out of 33), whereas in Group B, 8 respondents had negative and 13 respondents positive expectations. The difference is likely to be due to the fact that many children, especially boys, watched the film before they read the book and the film created positive expectations and attitude. The impression compared to expectations, however, was predominantly negative (22 out of 33 in Group A and 19 out of 31 in Group B). There is a significant difference between boys and girls—not a single boy in the two groups had a positive impression of the book, whereas 9 girls within two groups had a positive impression. It shows first, again, that boys do not like to read as much as girls, and second, that boys are much more radical in their answers. The frustration was there, but probably not in exactly the same sense that Jauss implied.

Questions number 6, 11, 19, 20 and 22 all expand on question 5, by trying to find out the reasons for liking or disliking the book. The majority of respondents (42 out of 64) did not like the book and 4 respondents thought they would have liked it as a small child. The few positive comments included “interesting”(huvitav), “idiosyncratic” (omapärane), “adventurous” (seiklusterohke); it is important to draw attention to the fact that the girl who read the 1940 translation pointed out that it was “fun to read”(lõbus lugeda), which lends some support to my assumption that Oras` domesticating and dynamic poems manage to achieve relevance for the reader. As for the many negative comments, boys were brief: “very confusing” (väga segane), “strange”(imelik), “pointless” (mõttetu), “childish” (lapsik), “stupid” (nõme), “absurd” (jabur), “incoherent” (seosetu jutt). The word “boring”(igav) was mentioned 7 times by boys. The adjectives used to describe the book by girls included: “childish” (lapsik), “boring”(igav), “confusing”(segane), “meant for younger readers”(mõeldud noorematele), “absurd and full of too many inventions” (absurdne ja liiga väljamõeldisi täis). Girls pointed out explicitly that some parts of the books remained very confusing, especially the ending (the court), and the part of the Mock Turtle and the Gryphon. In question 11, where children were asked to choose between such adjectives as “exciting” (põnev), “boring” (igav), “tedious”(tüütu), “childish”(lapsik), “funny”(naljakas) or some other adjective to describe the book, “exciting” was mentioned only 3 times (and exclusively by girls), “boring” 25 times, “tedious” 21 times, “childish” 48 times, “funny” 11 times (8 times by girls). “Childish” was mostly viewed as a negative quality, as became clear from other answers. Boys also used some pretty strong words to tell their minds about the book.

Assuming that children, in general, often read books that they like over and over again (see above, p. 49), question number 20 inquired about whether children

intend to read the book again in the future. 49 respondents out of the total 64 replied no, only 6 answered yes, and the rest (9) were in two minds about the question. For the discussion to follow it is necessary to point out that two of those who answered positively implied that they hoped to understand the book better or differently than at the moment. Question 22 inquired about whether the respondents would recommend the book for others. Here, 27 respondents in the two groups answered negatively, 9 answered positively, and as many as 26 thought the book could be recommended for younger readers. It might be claimed that children aged 13 or 14 years have left behind the fairy tale and fantasy period and have reached the adventure story period. However, by that logic, they would not like *Pooh* much either, which is not the case. Two of the few who would recommend the book would do it not because it is an interesting or good book but because it is a “well-known” (*tuntud*) book and should therefore be read through. That implies that children are well aware of the book’s status as a classic and consider it useful to know it. On the one hand, such an opinion strengthens the book’s mythic status as a classic children’s book and guarantees its place in the obligatory reading list without serious consideration of its function or relevance for target readers. On the other hand, it refers to the need to mediate world-famous plots even if only through adaptations.

Assuming that if any of the characters or many aspects of the plot remain confusing, it influences the level of difficulty of the book, questions 7 and 8 were included to inquire about whether the book was difficult and if anything in it remained incomprehensible. The answers to those two questions seemed to be, at first sight, paradoxical. Namely, the majority (43 out of 64) did not think the book was difficult to read and 12 respondents pointed out that the book was difficult to read because it was boring. One respondent admitted that it was difficult because she could not

understand anything and another one complained that some parts were confusing and he could not properly create a picture of events in his mind. At the same time, although the majority did not consider it difficult, 25 respondents conceded that there were aspects in the book that remained incomprehensible, especially the story about the Mock Turtle, the last chapter, and the pictures. 6 respondents wondered why the book was written in the first place, which can be regarded as explicit a testimony of its irrelevance as possible. Several respondents conceded that most of the book was confusing and many things were not explained properly. It was also pointed out that without having seen the film, the book would have been even more confusing.

The main reason behind the fact that the majority considered the book confusing and incomprehensible, but not difficult, probably lies in the definition of “difficult” (*raske*). The book was not difficult in the sense that a textbook or perhaps a historical text can be. After all, it was termed to be “childish” (*lapsik*). At the same time, it is somewhat paradoxical that a book that is found to be so confusing and hard to understand is considered suitable reading material for younger children. Probably it is the aspects of the plot (the fascination with eating and drinking all kinds of strange stuff, the changes in size, the whole “wonderland” theme itself) that makes it more exciting for smaller children, whereas the characters and the text itself are far from easy. Moreover, by the time children reach their teenage years, they start to care more for realism in texts than for fantasy and fairy tale elements. Considering that Carroll wrote the Wonderland story for 10-year-old Alice Liddell, it might be suggested that the text should be treated with younger classes. However, for Alice, the text world was very close and easily recognisable, which is not the case with Estonian readers. It must also be kept in mind that interviewees from younger classes who had read the full translation of *Alice*, did not enjoy the book either, so the age factor cannot be of

considerable importance for the reception. The most likely explanation for the apparent “lack of difficulty” seems to lie in the fact that the respondents simply failed to recognise many of the layers or dimensions of the book – after all, cognition being relevance-oriented (see above), new information that is irrelevant usually escapes notice altogether (cf., e.g., Sperber and Wilson’s example 1986: 46-47). The translation is, therefore, easy to read on the surface level – the only one that is at least remotely relevant to Estonian children – while its real difficulty is actually mirrored by answers such as “confusing”, “boring”, “pointless”.

As suggested above (see p. 54), pictures have a significant role to play in a children’s book, and ideally, pictures and text form a credible coherent whole. Therefore, questions 9 and 10 were included in order to find out whether illustrations may have influenced the reception of the book in a positive or negative way. We can only hypothesise whether the use of the original illustrations by Tenniel would have positively influenced the reception, but the fact is that the majority of respondents (37 out of 64) did not like Tolli’s pictures and 34 did not find them in any way helpful for understanding the plot. The sole reader of the 1940 version liked the illustrations because they matched well with the text, whereas the illustrations in the 1971 translation were described as “not matching with the text” (*ei sobinud jutuga*), as being “confusing” (*segased*) or “hazy” (*hägused*), “ugly” (*koledad*), “not so detailed as the text” (*ei olnud nii täpsed, kui oli jutus kirjutatud*), “incomprehensible” (*arusaamatud*). In Group B there were more positive than negative answers from the boys, probably because boys did not care so much for the text and tried to “read” the story from the pictures. One boy even pointed out that he liked the pictures because they were “big”.

The next bundle of questions includes questions from 12 to 16 which tried to find out whether some of the characters or plot elements were familiar or related to the respondents life, so as to infer the relevance of the characters or plot as connected to the respondent's literary or life experience. As pointed out by Nikolajeva (2001) the foremost reason to read books is to find out about someone else's life and thoughts and it has often been emphasised that it is important for children to identify with someone in the book. In Group A, the majority (20 out of 33) admitted that they did not have a favourite character, whereas in Group B, there were only 4 girls out of 19 who did not have a favourite character. The girls in Group B in general seemed to have had a little bit more rewarding reading experience than the other respondents. A very interesting phenomenon, however, is that whereas one would expect Alice, as the protagonist, to be the favourite character of most children, the answers were much more varied and she was only mentioned 7 times, whereas such characters as could be considered more familiar to Estonian children were often mentioned—the (Cheshire) cat was mentioned 12 times, the Dormouse 4 times, the (White) Rabbit 3 times. The reasons brought out for liking the favourite character also support the assumption that characters that were more familiar and more understandable were thus also more relevant for the reader. Reasons for liking Alice included “she was the only reasonable one” (*ta oli ainus mõistlik*), “she was normal” (*ta oli normaalne*), “she was a small lovely girl” (*tore väike armas tüdruk*), “she was honest and friendly” (*ta oli aus ja sõbralik*), “she was brave” (*ta oli julge*). Reasons for liking the Cheshire Cat included that “it seemed logical” (*ta tundus loogiline*), “it was funny and cool” (*ta oli lõbus ja lahe tüüp*), “it had the least text” (*temal oli kõige vähem teksti*). Reasons for liking the Dormouse, Bill or March Hare mostly included that they were funny.

Most respondents (41 out of 64) admitted that they had not been familiar with any of the characters before; some said there was something familiar because they had seen the film or animation. The fact that three girls in Group B compared a character to persons in their real life testifies once again to readers' attempt to make a book meaningful and relevant. One girl mentioned that people of similar character and principles as the Queen live around us; another girl compared the Queen to her grandmother; and another girl compared the Dormouse to her little brother, who sleeps just as much.

The events that the respondents remember best were various; I find it quite telling, though, that 6 boys in Group A did not remember a single event particularly. A book has most probably not left an impression, not to mention a lasting impression, on the reader if one month after reading it the reader cannot recall anything. The event remembered best was falling down the rabbit hole, which was mentioned 19 times. One girl expanded on it by saying that she remembered the beginning because it was "understandable" (*arusaadav*). The next best remembered event was the mad tea party, because "it was properly described", as mentioned by one respondent.

As suggested above (see p. 49), in the case of children's books it is especially important that the book would somehow be related to child's own life in order to render the book relevant. Question 16 asked whether the book was somehow connected with the respondent's own life or experience—61 out of 64 responded negatively to that question. One respondent compared the book to dreams, where often confusing situations occur.

As poems play a great role in the book, questions 17 and 18 were included in order to find out children's opinion. The poems were described as "interesting" (*huvitavad*) 8 times, notably including 6 times by girls in Group B. They were

described as “difficult”(rasked) 4 times, but as “incomprehensible” (*arusaamatud*) 30 times, as “funny” (*naljakad*) 9 times, notably only by girls, as “boring”(igavad) 31 times. Other adjectives used to describe the poems were “pointless” (*mõttetu*) (3 times), “horrible”(õudsed), “not rhymed”(riimist väljas) (sic!), “stupid” (*nõmedad*), and “dubious” (*kahtlased*). Not a single positive adjective was mentioned among the additional comments. The next question was even more revealing. Namely, it occurred that out of 64 respondents, only 21, i.e. one third, had read all the poems in the book. In Group B, not a single boy had read all the poems. 26 respondents had skipped some poems, and 16 respondents had skipped all the poems. Thus, the poems were not much liked—they were found to be incomprehensible and boring.

Question number 23 asked children to write any comments they would like to add. The answers confirmed the results already pointed out above. There was only one comment that could be considered positive (“The book was, at times, pretty interesting and funny”/ *See raamat oli kohati ka üsna huvitav ja naljakas*), few that could be considered neutral (“typical children’s book”/ *tüüpiline lasteraamat*, “could have had better pictures”/ *normaalsemad pildid oleks võinud olla*, “The book may have a very deep meaning, but probably to get it you have to be older and read it in English”/ *Selles raamatus võib olla väga sügav mõte, aga ilmselt sellest arusaamiseks tuleb olla veidi vanem ja lugeda inglisekeelset varianti*). The majority of the comments were negative: “strange”(veider), “bad and boring and I can’t understand why it belongs to obligatory reading” (*paha ja halb ja igav raamat ja ma ei saa aru, miks see on meie kohustuslikus kirjanduses*), “pointless” (*mõttetu*), “stupid” (*nõme*), “the worst book I’ve ever read”(kõige hullem raamat, mida ma lugenud olen), “just boring” (*lihtsalt igav*), “stupid English humour” (*nõme inglise huumor*), “To the rubbish bin!” (*Prügikasti!*), “Burn it!” (*Raamat põlema panna!*), “I

couldn't see the point, except that it was a big confusion" (*Mina igatahes ei leidnud sellel raamatul erilist mōtet, peale selle, et see üks suur segadus oli*). One girl suggested the book should belong to the obligatory reading of younger classes, because by Form 7 everyone has heard so much about it that no one wants to read it.

Question number 24 derived from the observation that the poems in 1940 version, translated by Ants Oras, were often found to be domesticating and more comprehensible and dynamic than Kross's; they were therefore hypothesised to be more instrumental and thus also more relevant for the Estonian child audience. Children in Group A were asked to compare the poem "I passed by his garden, and marked, with one eye" (of which, interestingly, only the first two lines are given in the original) in translation by Kross and Oras. The results, however, did not quite confirm the hypothesis—6 boys and 9 girls liked Kross's translation more as opposed to 5 boys and 6 girls who preferred Oras's; 5 children did not like either of them and 2 considered could not choose. The comments added were, actually, quite contradictory: several claimed that Kross's poem was "easier to understand" (*arusaadavam*), several others claimed the opposite. Although numbers spoke against Oras, his translation gathered more positive comments: "more understandable" (*arusaadavam*), "more interesting" (*huvitavamalt kirjutatud*), "better worded" (*paremini sõnastatud*), "clearer" (*selgemate sõnadega*), "easier to get" (*sellele sai paremini pihta*). As the results to that question were somewhat contradictory, a different poem was chosen for the questionnaire of Group B. They were asked to compare the translation of "You are old, Father William" by Kross and Oras, because Oras's translation in the case of this poem is quite clearly more domesticating than Kross's—Oras, for example, leaves out the name "William" altogether, uses the Estonian monetary unit "kroon" instead of the English "pence"

and “box” instead of the English weight unit “pound”. The answers, in this case, were more revealing—17 respondents preferred Oras’s translation as opposed to 11 who preferred Kross, 2 boys did not like either of them and one girl liked both. Preference for Kross was justified by claiming it was “funnier” (*naljakam*) (4 times), but Oras’s translation was repeatedly claimed to be “easier to understand” (*arusaadavam*) (7 times), “more interesting” (*huvitavam*), “rhymed” (*riimis*), “little bit more true to life” (*veidi tõetruum*), “more poetic” (*luulelisem*), “better worded and more logical” (*paremini sõnastatud ja loogilisemalt*), “funnier” (*naljakam*). These results seem to have two main implications. First of all, they confirm the hypothesis that Oras’s domesticating translation was more instrumental in that particular case and thus managed to be more relevant as well. Secondly, it must be admitted, however, that comprehensibility is not always the first or only criterion by which children judge a text or text element and incomprehensibility does not prevent a text element from being funny. This is in concordance with Sperber’s and Wilson’s idea (above, p. 42) that relevance may be achieved by expressing irrelevant assumptions as long as the expressive behaviour itself is relevant. That is, a poem might be confusing or senseless, but as long as children manage to see the deliberate nonsense of it, they will be able to find it relevant and enjoy it.

As Group B watched a film a week before discussing the book in class, it provided a good chance to include questions that asked to compare the experience gained from watching the film and reading the book. Question 25 revealed that 23 respondents preferred the film to the book, as against 4 children who thought the opposite. Two boys did not like either of them and two girls liked both in equal manner. The film was described as being “more exciting” (*põnevam*), “more understandable” (*arusaadavam*), “clearer” (*selgem*); “it gave a better picture of the

plot” (*andis selgema pildi tegevusest*), “it made the characters easier to understand” (*sai tegelaskujudest paremini aru*). One girl pointed out that if you have seen/read both, it is easier “to get the point” (*kui oled mõlemat näinud/lugenud, siis on pointile kergem pihta saada*). Girls turned out to be more confident that the film helped to understand the book—14 girls and 5 boys answered positively to the last question, as opposed to 3 girls and 5 boys who did not find that the film helped to understand the book. Comments praising the film included that “in the film, everything was understandable” (*filmis oli kõik väga arusaadav*), “the characters did not speak in such a confusing manner” (*tegelased ei räägi nii segaselt*), “helped to imagine the plot” (*aitas paremini sündmustikku ette kujutada*), “the parts of the book that remained confusing became clear thanks to the film” (*osadest kohtadest raamatus ei saanud aru, kuid filmis olid need selged*). The film was also preferred because “nothing could be understood from the book” (*raamatust ei saanud midagi aru*) and “the pictures in the book were confusing” (*raamatu pildid ajasid segadusse*). I find these results very revealing since they confirm once again, firstly, that both the plot and the characters in the book were confusing and difficult to understand, and secondly, that the film helped to make both the plot and the characters more understandable and thus more relevant for the respondents, which resulted in a little more positive reception of the book by Group B as compared to Group A, who did not watch the film.

The results of the questionnaire for *Pooh* will be discussed jointly for Group A and B since there were only 8 respondents all in all, 5 boys and 3 girls. If out of 64 respondents only one had read the full version of *Alice* twice, the first question in the questionnaire for *Pooh* already revealed the greater popularity of *Pooh* among children: out of 8 respondents, 3 have read it twice. None of the respondents read *Pooh* because they had to—they were motivated by interest. Accordingly, their

expectations were mostly positive (5 respondents) or neutral, none had negative expectations. Absolutely all of the respondents liked the book and the reasons were as follows: “it was great and funny” (*see oli vahva ja naljakas*), “it had beautiful covers and pictures” (*raamat oli ilusate kaante ja piltidega*), “the characters were nice and understandable” (*toredad, arusaadavad tegelased*) “they were all friends and I liked the characters a lot” (*seal olid kõik sõbrad ja tegelased meeldisid mulle väga*). As an answer to question 11, “exciting” was mentioned 5 times, “boring” once, “childish” 6 times. All respondents considered it “funny”, whereas none found it “tedious”. Comparing *Pooh* to other books, it was termed to be “more exciting” 3 times, “funnier” 5 times. Three respondents would read the book again in the future, 4 would not, one respondent is not sure. It is interesting to note that if in describing *Alice*, the word “childish” was only used in a negative sense, one girl points out here that she will definitely read *Pooh* again since it is “simple and childish and sincere” (*lihtne ning selline mõnusalt lapsik ja siiras*). All girls and two boys would recommend the book to others. Seven respondents did not find the book difficult to read, and one admitted it was a little difficult. None claimed that the book or any part(s) of the book were incomprehensible. Seven respondents liked the pictures and one “quite” liked them. Half of the respondents admitted that the pictures helped to understand the text. If many respondents did not have a favourite character in *Alice*, most children (6 respondents) had one in *Pooh*—Piglet (“sweet”/*larmas*), Pooh (“clumsy”/*lkohtmakas*) and Tigger (“energetic, always in a good mood”/*lvirk ja kraps ning alati hea tuju*) were mentioned. Two children claimed that there was something familiar in *Pooh*; the comment that the characters were “ordinary people” (*tavalised inimesed*) seems funny at first, because of course they are animals (or more exactly, toys brought into life), not people, but it clearly refers to the fact that it was easy for children to identify with

the characters and recognise in them human qualities. On the other hand, children did not find the book related to their own life. Three children had read all the poems, 4 had skipped some and one respondent had skipped all of them. The poems were described as “funny” 5 times, “interesting” once, “difficult” once and “incomprehensible” once; no respondent found them boring. On the one hand, it shows the tendency that in general children do not care for poems very much; on the other hand, the fact that “funny” was mentioned by more than half of the respondents testifies that the poems in *Pooh*, despite their often absurd content, succeeded in being relevant for the Estonian child audience. Additional comments about the book included: “the characters had interesting names” (*tegelastel olid huvitavad nimed*), “it was a good book” (*see oli hea raamat*) and “there could be more books like that” (*samalaadseid raamatuid võiks rohkem olla*).

2.5.2 Comparison of data from different methods

Although the sample for *Pooh* was much smaller than for *Alice*, the difference in opinion about the two books became clear. The anecdotal evidence, together with the analysis of the translations, that initiated the study found support both in interviews and questionnaires—the reception of the two English classics by Estonian children differs greatly. Though there are some children who like *Alice* or parts of it, the majority has a very negative opinion of it, finding it boring and confusing. *Pooh*, on the other hand, is liked by most and is the favourite book of several; children consider it funny and sweet.

The confirmation of the initial assumption, however, is far from being enough for the purposes of the present study—the aim is to point out the reasons behind such a difference in reception of the two world-famous books. Coming back to the first hypothesis formulated above (see p. 65), it must be admitted that it is very hard, if not impossible, to exactly determine to what extent the blame on the poor reception could be put down to the high degree of “untranslatability” of *Alice* and to what extent it could be put down to the translation itself. It is clear that the text world of *Alice* is farther from the real world of the Estonian audience than the text world of *Pooh*. Nevertheless, the fact that several respondents liked adaptations of *Alice* but not the full version and many respondents liked the film version but not the book seem to point to the possibility of the mediation of the plot and of the characters into Estonian culture and to the potential of successful communication. This conclusion is further strengthened by the fact that several children actually appreciated the originality of the plot and found the characters interesting. Therefore, the book might be termed “untranslatable” in the strict, word-for-word sense of translation that emphasises equivalence and faithfulness to the original. However, if it is considered important not to provide just a “document” of the book in Estonian, but to make it a living object, an “instrument” in the target culture, there are ways out of the seemingly insoluble situation—either in the form of adaptations, or in the form of a very instrumental translation or perhaps in the form of other media that provide a better chance for a successful dialogue.

This brings me to the second hypothesis formulated above (see p. 65); namely, that compared to the instrumental translation of *Pooh*, it is mainly the documentary, equivalence-based translation of *Alice* that has influenced the poor reception of the book by the Estonian child audience. The book was not considered to be difficult to

read, which suggests that its text world is still accessible for Estonian readers, and its plot was even considered to be too childish for Form 7. However, the book was regarded as confusing and incomprehensible, which also meant that it did not fulfill its function as an enjoyable children's classic, as a masterpiece in nonsense, but, on the contrary, evoked indignant protests against its pointlessness, boringness and the "stupid English humour". *Poo* was not found to be difficult, but neither was it found to be confusing or incomprehensible, although the dialogues in *Poo* are often also nonsensical and absurd. Although children seem not to much like poems in books and they were skipped by many in both *Alice* and *Poo*, the poems in *Poo* deserved mostly positive comments and were described as funny, whereas the poems in *Alice* were mostly found to be boring and pointless. Taking all this into consideration, I dare to conclude that translation has played a role in the reception and I claim that in the case of children's literature, instrumental translations that succeed in functioning as living texts in the target culture should be preferred to documentary translations. It might seem paradoxical, but in the case that the text world is too different from the real world of the target audience, only a very instrumental or a very documentary translation is possible; in that case, however, the documentary translation does not serve the children, but is of interest to adults, who have more developed and purposeful literary interests.

There is no direct connection between a documentary translation and irrelevance. Nevertheless, according to the third hypothesis, the reason why the documentary translation of an alien text world fails to serve the interests of the child audience lies in the fact that it fails to make the text world or elements of the text world recognisable or familiar to the reader, which means that they do not result in any contextual effects for the reader and thus remain irrelevant. The questionnaires,

but especially the interviews revealed that there was nothing familiar or recognisable to children in *Alice*, that the characters had very difficult names, that there were too many difficult words in the poems, and that it was very difficult to imagine the characters. The poems were not seen as having any point, as they were not, of course, recognised as parodies of the once famous didactic poems. I suggest that for an instrumental translation, the poems could be replaced by parodies of poems and songs well known to Estonian children or if that is too difficult a task, some of them could well be left out. True, some of them do carry the main themes of the plot, but others mainly function as carriers of the parodic and humorous tone. Failing to amuse the reader, they achieve an opposite function and become simply tedious.

The fourth hypothesis was confirmed as well. No matter whether the respondents of Group B watched the film before or after reading the book, it became quite clear from their answers that the film helped to understand the book. The film, in general, was liked much more than the book (23 respondents preferred the film and 4 preferred the book). Explanations for preferring the film included that the characters were easier to understand, that it gave a good idea about the plot, that it was clearer than the book. One girl explicitly claimed that if you have both read the book and seen the film, it is easier “to get the point”. Liking, however, facilitates understanding and vice versa. In addition, the medium that was exploited first created the necessary context for the medium that followed. The fact that there was an equal number of boys who affirmed and denied the statement that the film helped to understand the book may be accounted for by suggesting that those five who denied it were not much interested in understanding either the film or the book. By claiming that the film helped to understand the book, because the characters were already known, one boy aptly testified that the existence of some kind of context is essential for the new

information to become relevant. But as emphasised above (see p. 13), active participation of each member in a communicative act is important. Most girls believed that the film helped to understand the book. In addition to claiming that the film helped because the characters were already known, they maintained that the confusing parts of the book became clear thanks to the film, that the characters were easier to understand, and that the plot was easier to imagine and to understand. As already observed above, the girls in Group B were the least negatively minded group among the respondents. As many as 9 girls in that group started reading the book with positive expectations, as against 3 who were negatively minded. The film may well have had a role in that. Two boys also pointed out that they read the book because they liked the film. In short, it is good to encourage children to read books but children should not be deprived of the fun of watching films or playing computer games, since these media can also bring children to books and prepare the context as well.

The hypothesis that children will like Oras`'s translation of poems more than Kross`'s was only partly confirmed. Judging simply by numbers, it is difficult to maintain that children like Oras`'s version more. In Group A, 15 respondents liked Kross`'s version more as opposed to 11 who preferred Oras`'s. However, as admitted above (p. 82), the choice of a poem for comparison in that group was not very good, because Kross`'s and Oras`'s versions of that particular poem did not differ so much on the domestication-foreignisation or instrumental-documentary scale. Also, the fact that children were already acquainted with Kross`'s version and that Kross`'s version was listed first might have influenced the choice.

As mentioned above (p. 82), a different poem was chosen for the questionnaire of Group B. Oras`'s version of that poem is, in my opinion, definitely more

domesticating. Domestication does not immediately mean instrumentality of translation, as was also pointed out above (see p. 30), and a translation can be instrumental by being foreignising, exotic, difficult, but at the same time being, for example, funny—if achieving a funny effect is the main function of the poem. However, that domestication and dynamism characteristic of Oras` translation of this poem helps to make it more relevant for the reader, was confirmed by 13 girls who preferred Oras` translation against 5 who preferred Kross`s. The ratio for boys was 4 to 6, but it can be assumed from their brief comments that they did not take the task very seriously. All in all, 7 respondents claimed that Oras` translation was more understandable; other explanations included that it was more interesting, funnier, more true to life, more poetic, better and more logically worded. At the same time, Kross`s translation was considered funnier by 4 respondents. It was already observed that difficulty in understanding a text does not always prevent it from being funny; this is why absurd is funny in the first place—it is its utter stupidity and pointlessness that makes it funny. It is evidently not enough to take one or two poems out of the text for comparison to make any far-reaching conclusions about the whole text. Therefore, a more thorough comparative analysis is needed to formulate an informed opinion about the different translations, their instrumentality or relevance.

If the comparison of Kross`s and Oras`s translation of a poem evoked more questions than provided answers, then the last hypothesis was confirmed by the research. The majority did not like the pictures nor found them helpful for the reading experience. Several respondents pointed out explicitly that they did not understand many characters in the book and the pictures were of no use for helping to imagine the characters. Some even thought that the pictures “made things worse”, i.e. did not match the text and thus made the characters even more confusing. These results have

several implications. First of all, they suggest that any publisher of a translation should carefully consider whether it is more functional and instrumental to use original illustrations or to produce new ones. If the latter decision is found to be more functional, the illustrator should definitely hold a dialogue with the text and aim at the most instrumental combination of text and pictures. Last but not least, the implied reader as seen by the translator and the illustrator should be the same for the best outcome.

Conclusion

As to date, studies concerning children`s literature and its reception in Estonia are few, the present thesis was aimed at contributing to research in these fields. It concentrated on the analysis of the reception of two English children`s classics—*Alice in Wonderland* and *Winnie-the-Pooh*—and on the interrelationships between the notions of translatability, documentary versus instrumental translation and relevance.

The first part of the paper presented an analysis of topics that are related to the study of reception; namely, the specifics of translating for children, the historical background and present situation of reception aesthetics, and relevance theory. The second part of the paper presented the empirical study of reception completed by the author. The hypotheses formulated for the empirical research were inspired by the anecdotal evidence that *Alice* has encountered a poor reception in Estonia. This piece of research involved a contrastive analysis of Estonian child readers` responses to *Alice* and *Pooh* in Estonian translation. It was assumed that more than *Alice`s* high degree of untranslatability and its text world`s great distance from the target

addressees' real world, it has been the documentary, equivalence-based translation that has deprived the book of a positive reception among children, whereas the instrumental translation of *Pooh* has guaranteed the book the status of a living classic.

Two different and complementary methods were employed for eliciting empirical data—interviews and questionnaires. Both methods had their advantages and disadvantages. In the case of interviews, the sample was small but the procedure enabled to carry out qualitative analysis. In the case of questionnaires, the sample was large and made quantitative estimations possible, but did not allow for much in-depth analysis. The results elicited from the interviews and the questionnaires were in concordance and confirmed, in the most part, the hypotheses that were set up.

The hypothesis that *Alice* is not inherently untranslatable into Estonian but its translation has played an important role was confirmed, since only the full translation by Kross provoked negative comments, whereas shorter and longer adaptations were mostly appreciated by young readers. *Alice* might thus be regarded as untranslatable only within the narrow definition of translation which advocates close adherence to the original and excludes the appropriateness of or necessity for deviating from the original to a smaller or greater degree. The author of the present paper believes that all translation includes adaptation and that, if such a choice should be necessary, it is better to provide children with an enjoyable adaptation than with a boring and tedious full version. It has to be admitted, though, that in comparison with *Pooh*, *Alice*'s level of untranslatability is much higher, which also implies that greater adaptations might be necessary for the translation of *Alice* to function in the target culture.

The hypothesis that it is mostly the documentary translation of *Alice* versus the instrumental translation of *Pooh* that has failed to initiate a successful dialogue in the target culture was confirmed by the finding that respondents were disturbed by the

abundance of difficult names in *Alice* and by the confusion to understand or imagine some of the characters or aspects of the plot. *Alice* appeared to have a potential for positive reception, though, as several respondents appreciated its adventurous plot and idiosyncratic characters; unfortunately, that potential was nullified by their sense of confusion and by their inability to see the parody and humour behind the poems and the characters. A more instrumental translation of poems that would have fully realised their parodic or nonsensical element for the Estonian reader may be assumed to have received a more positive reaction.

Relevance theory, as developed by Sperber and Wilson, helped to define the disadvantages of the documentary translation of *Alice* for Estonian children. The uniqueness and Britishness of the text world of *Alice* together with its documentary translation has resulted in creating no contextual effects for the Estonian child reader and thus rendering the text irrelevant. Keeping more to the spirit of the book than to the letter would have diminished the preciseness of the text, as well as its level of Britishness and intertextuality—which would probably have irritated adult critics—but would have perhaps rendered the book more relevant and acceptable to child readers. The conclusion is supported by the more positive attitude toward adaptations, revealed by the empirical data.

Considering the importance and omnipresence of the principle of relevance in human communication, it is no surprise that children who could draw connections between their own life and the book, or watched the film before reading the book, were able to find more pleasure and sense in the book. Empirical data proved that some pre-existing context helped render the text relevant.

Regarding the hypothesis that children like Oras's translation of poems more than Kross's, the author has to admit that the empirical method used was not

sufficient to draw valid conclusions, and a more thorough analysis is needed. The empirical data did confirm, however, that a more target reader oriented translation, including avoidance of too many foreignisms (e.g. proper names), helps to make a text, in this case a poem, more relevant and enjoyable for the child reader. What remained unclear was whether the 1940 translation *as a whole* is more instrumental and thus more relevant than the 1971 translation. The empirical data also revealed that not everything has to be understood in order to be relevant. As suggested by Sperber and Wilson (above, see p. 42), irrelevant assumptions can achieve relevance as long as the expressive behaviour itself is relevant, which is exactly the case with nonsense. If children find a poem confusing, but still find it funny, it signifies that the translator has managed to successfully mediate the nonsensical nature of the poem.

Although illustrations were not the main topic of the study, some attention was paid to illustrations as well, since they, without doubt, influence reception. Empirical data proved the hypothesis that the illustrations in the 1971 version of *Alice* fail to support the reader in the reading process and provide him or her with necessary visual help. The empirical data clearly pointed to the necessity of seriously considering what was stated in the theoretical analysis; namely, that the text and the pictures (i.e. the author/translator and the illustrator) have to sustain a dialogue.

In conclusion, several important suggestions can be made on the basis of the analysis presented above. First of all, any translator for children should determine the main purpose, the function of the intended translation before launching into the translation process. This might seem a commonplace, but still needs repeating. I maintain that in the case of translating for children, an instrumental translation will be able to render a text relevant for children, whereas a documentary translation might render several aspects of the text irrelevant for the child reader. In case the implied

reader of a book is ambivalent, however, and the translator wants to retain the ambivalence and opts for a documentary translation, he or she should be aware of risking losing the child audience. Moreover, even for the adult audience, establishing the relevance of the text may probably require explanatory comments.

The second suggestion concerns obligatory reading in schools, more particularly such texts that children find uninteresting, confusing and/or irrelevant. It is highly recommended to treat such texts in combination with other media, for example together with film, cartoons, animations, theatre, computer games, etc. Additional material enlarges the cognitive environment and fosters understanding, thus helping to render elements of the text and the text as whole (more) relevant for children.

Thirdly, very often adult mediators, teachers, translators, parents, and others base their judgments of texts on some “myth” of their fame, and the real responses of the target audience child readers are not regarded as worth considering and analysing. As Nikolajeva (1996: 19-20) has it, we tend to overestimate the significance of classics, but “the simple fact that a book counts as a “classic”/.../ is in itself no guarantee of either quality or sustainability as reading for modern young readers.” It might be claimed that children are not yet able to make informed choices or to offer knowledgeable opinions; moreover, their responses can be very diverse. However, I maintain that reception studies are important, *inter alia*, in order to uncover cases when the effect of a book is contrary to what could be expected or desired (for example, generating contempt instead of facilitating intercultural understanding) and to detect the reasons behind such a result. Reception studies, as I see it, should facilitate a dialogue between a translator and the target audience.

Fourthly, in connection with the previous item, it is definitely important to investigate translating for children as compared to translating for adults. Although, for the most part, the process involves similar problems, the consideration of why children read books and what is relevant for children as compared to adults might highlight issues that need special attention when translating for children. It is also worth considering whether the long-cherished criterion of an artistic translation is the most important one during times when major effort should be spent on sustaining an interest toward reading in children. Let us remember the saying that only the best is good enough for children when trying to provide them with relevant and interesting reading material.

References

Primary Sources

1. *Alice in Wonderland*. 1999. By L. Carroll. Dir. N. Willing. Videocassette. Hallmark.
2. Carroll, L. 1994 [1865]. *Alice in Wonderland*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.
3. Carroll, L. 1971. *Alice imedemaal*. Transl. J.Kross, illustr. V. Tolli. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat.
4. Carroll, L. 1940. *Alice imedemaal*. Transl. L. Bakis and A. Oras (poems). Tartu: Eesti Kirjastuse Kooperatiiv.
5. Milne, A.A. 1983. *Winnie-the-Pooh, The House at Pooh Corner, When We Were Very Young, Now We Are Six*. Moscow: Raduga Publishers.
6. Milne, A.A. 2000. *Täielik Puhh*. Transl. V. Rummel and H. Rajamets (poems), illustr. E.H. Shepard. Tallinn: Olympia.

Secondary Sources

1. Alderson, B. 1980. Literary Criticism and Children's Books; or Could Be Worse. In G. Fox and G. Hammond (eds.) *Responses to Children's Literature*. (New York: K.G.Saur Publishing Inc.), 59-75.
2. Bakhtin, M. 1990 [1963]. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Transl. C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Ed. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
3. Baring-Gould, W. & C. 1962. *The Annotated Mother Goose*. New York: Bramhall House.
4. Benton, M. 1980. Children's Responses to the Text. In G. Fox and G. Hammond (eds), *Responses to Children's Literature*. (New York: K.G.Saur Publishing Inc), 13-33.
5. Carpenter, H. and M. Prichard. 1984. *The Oxford Companion to Children's Literature*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
6. Chesterman, A. 1997. *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
7. Dickens, E. 2004. Kirjanduslik tõlge ja emakeel. *Sirp*, 26.03, 5.

8. Fluck, W. 2002. The Role of the Reader and the Changing Functions of Literature: Reception Aesthetics, Literary Anthropology, *Funktionsgeschichte. European Journal of English Studies*, **6** (3), 253-271.
9. Gardner, M. 1985 [1960]. *The Annotated Alice*. Bungay, Suffolk: Richard Clay (The Chaucer Press) Ltd.
10. Gutt, E.-A. 2000. *Translation and Relevance. Cognition and Context*. Manchester & Boston: St. Jerome Publishing.
11. Hamilton, C. A. and R. Schneider. 2002. From Iser to Turner and Beyond: Reception Theory Meets Cognitive Criticism. *Style*, **26** (4), 640-658.
12. Hunt, P. 1991. *Criticism, Theory and Children's Literature*. Oxford: Blackwell.
13. Iser, W. 1981[1978]. *The Act of Reading. A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore/London: John Hopkins University Press.
14. Järv, R. 1993. Seletuseks. In L. Carroll, *Alice peeglitagusel maal ja mida ta seal nägi*. Printall, 108-112.
15. Kalda, M. 1988. Mis keeles kass naeratab? *Keel ja kirjandus*, (8), 460-465.
16. Kaplinski, J. 1996. Inglaesed ja prantslased. In J. Kaplinski *See ja teine*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli kirjastus.
17. Kibbee, D.A. 2003. When Children's Literature Transcends Its Genre: Translating *Alice in Wonderland*. *META*, **48** (1-2), 307-321.
18. Kimmel, L. 1998 [1989]. Nabokov as Translator. An examination of his changing doctrine of translation.
<http://www.geocities.com/Athens/3682/nabokov2.html>
19. Klinberg, G. 1986. *Children`s Fiction in the Hands of the Translators*. Lund: CWK Gleerup.
20. Kokkola, L. 2002. Early Immersion Reading: the Narrative Mode and Meaning-Making. In R.D. Sell (ed.), *Children`s Literature as Communication*. (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company), 237-262.
21. Krusten, R. 1995. *Eesti lastekirjandus*. Tartu: Elmatar.
22. Kudu, R. 2000. Üks kõigi, kõik ühe eest. *Looming*, (5), 773-775.
23. Leppihalme, R. 1997. *Culture Bumps: An Empirical Approach to the Translation of Allusions*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
24. Martin, A. 2001. A Translator`s View of Translation Norms.
http://www.eng.helsinki.fi/hes/Translation/a_translator.htm

25. Mendelsohn, L.R. 1973. Sophisticated Reading For Children: the Experience of the Classical Jewish Academy. *Children's Literature*, (2), 35-39.
26. Milne, C. 1974. *The Enchanted Places*. London: Eyre Methuen.
27. Mõttus, A. 2004. Kes õpivad lastekirjandust? *Õpetajate Leht*, 16.04, 9.
28. Nikolajeva, M. 1988. *The Magic Code: Use of Magical Patterns in Fantasy for Children*. Stockholm: Almqvist.
29. Nikolajeva, M. 1996. *Children's Literature Comes of Age. Toward a New Aesthetic*. New York/London: Garland Publishing, Inc.
30. Nikolajeva, M. 2001. Imprints of the mind: The Depiction of Consciousness in Children's Fiction. *Children's Literature Association Quarterly*, **26** (4), 173-187.
31. Nikolajeva, M. 2002. *The Rhetoric of Character in Children's Literature*. Lanham: Scarecrow.
32. Nikolajeva, M. 2003. Beyond the Grammar of Story, or How Can Children's Literature Criticism Benefit From Narrative Theory. *Children's Literature Association Quarterly*, **28** (1), 5-16.
33. Nord, C. 2001 [1997]. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity. Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.
34. Nord, C. 2003. Proper Names in Translations for Children: Alice in Wonderland as a Case in Point. *META*, **48** (1-2), 182-195.
35. O'Sullivan, E. 2000. *Kinderliterarische Komparastik*. Heidelberg.
36. Oittinen, R. 1990. The Dialogic Relation Between Text and Illustration: a Translatological View, *TEXTconTEXT* **5** (1), 40-53.
37. Oittinen, R. 1999. Big and Small: three Alices in Finland. In L.O.Pasternak (ed.) *Female/male. Gender in Children's Literature*. (Visby: Baltic Centre for Writers and Translators), 47-60.
38. Oittinen, R. 2003. Personal correspondence, materials for minisymposium *EnGendering Translation Theory*, Dec 15, 2003 Danish University of Education, Copenhagen.
39. Oittinen, R. 2000. *Translating for Children*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
40. Oras, A. 1940. Matemaatiline humor. *Akadeemia*, (3), 174-180.

41. Propp, V. 1975 [1968]. *Morphology of the Folktale*. Austin & London: University of Texas Press.
42. Puurtinen, T. 1995. *Linguistic Acceptability in Translated Children's Literature*. Joensuu: University of Joensuu.
43. Reiss, K. ,and Vermeer, H. J. 1984. *Grundlegungen einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
44. Rickard, P. 1975. Alice in France or Can Lewis Carroll Be Translated. *Comparative Literature Studies*, **12** (1), 45-66.
45. Rosenblatt, L. M. 1978. *The Reader, the Text, the Poem: The Transactional Theory of the Literary Work*. Carbondale & Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
46. Ruben, A. 2001. Igale Puhhile jäägu tema meepott. *SL Õhtuleht*, 19.10, 24.
47. Sell, R.D. 2000. *Literature as Communication*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
48. Sell, R.D. 2002. *Children's Literature as Communication*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
49. Shavit, Z. 1986. *Poetics of Children's Literature*. Georgia: University of Georgia Press.
50. Sperber, D. and D. Wilson. 1986. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
51. Stephens, J. 1992. *Language and Ideology in Children's Fiction*. London/New York: Longman.
52. Sutherland, Z., D.L.Monson and M.H. Arbuthnot. 1981. *Children and Books*. 6th ed. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
53. Tabbert, R. 1980. The Impact of Children's Books: Cases and Concepts. In G. Fox and G. Hammond (eds.), *Responses to Children's Literature*. (New York: K.G. Saur Publishing), 34-58.
54. Talts, M. 1995. Karupoeg Puhh kui taoismi tähtteos. *Päevaleht*, 17.03, 12.
55. Tamm, M. 2004. Mida tõlkida? *Sirp*, 09.01, 4.
56. Thompson, M. P. 1993. Reception Theory and the Interpretation of Historical Meaning. *History and theory*, **32** (3), 248-272.
57. Urnov, A. 1983. Пребисловие "Мир игрушечного медведя". *Winnie-the-Pooh, The House at Pooh Corner, When We Were very Young; Now we are Six*. Moscow: Raduga Publishers.

58. Vygotski, L.S. 1989. *Thought and Language*. Trans. A. Kozulin. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
59. Walsh, S. 2003. Irony?—But Children Don't Get It, Do They? The Idea of Appropriate Language in Narratives for Children. *Children's Literature Association Quarterly*, **28** (1), 26-36.
60. Watts, R.J. 1991. Cross-Cultural Problems in the Perception of Literature. In R.D. Sell (ed.), *Literary Pragmatics*. (New York: Routledge), 26-43.
61. Wilson, D. 1994. Relevance and Understanding. In G. Brown et al (eds.), *Language and Understanding*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 37-58.

Appendices

KÜSIMUSTIK raamatu "Alice imedemaal" kohta (7a)

Sugu:

Vanus:.....

1. Mitu korda oled lugenud raamatut "Alice imedemaal"?
2. Millist versiooni oled lugenud? Tõmba ristike õigesse kasti (kastidesse):
 - Jaan Krossi tõlge/Vive Tõlli pildid
 - Disney versioon
 - Klassikavaramu versioon
 - Inglisekeelne originaal
 -(muu)

NB! Kui oled lugenud mitut varianti, vasta palun küsimustikus igäihe kohta eraldi!

3. Miks sa seda raamatut lugesid?
4. Missuguste mõtete, tunnete või ootustega asusid raamatut lugema?
5. Kas raamat vastas ootustele?
6. Kas see raamat meeldis sulle? Miks (mitte)?
7. Kas seda raamatut oli raske lugeda? Kui jah, siis miks?

8. Kas midagi selles raamatut jäi arusaamatuks või segaseks? Kui jah, siis mis?

9. Kas sulle pildid meeldisid? Miks (mitte)?

10. Kas pildid aitasid raamatut või tegelasi paremini mõista? Kui jah, siis kuidas?

11. Tõmba ristike õigesse kasti (või kastidesse):

“Alice imedemaal” on _____ raamat

põnev

igav

tüütu

lapsik

naljakas

..... (muu)

12. Kas sul oli mõni lemmiktegelane? Kui jah, siis kes?

13. Miks ta sulle meeldis?

14. Kas mõni tegelane tuli sulle tuttav ette? Miks?

15. Missugune sündmus sulle kõige paremini meelde jäi? Miks?

16. Kas see raamat oli kuidagi seotud sinu enda elu või kogemus(t)ega?

17. Tõmba rist õigesse kasti.

Raamatus “Alice imedemaal” on palju luuletusi. Need on _____

- huvitavad
- rasked
- arusaamatud
- naljakad
- igavad
- (muu)

18. Tõmba rist õigesse kasti.

- Lugesin kõiki luuletusi
- Jätsin mõned luuletused vahele
- Jätsin kõik luuletused vahele

19. Võrreldes teiste hiljuti loetud raamatutega oli “Alice imedemaal”

- põnevam
- igavam
- naljakam
- (muu)

20. Kas kavatsed seda raamatut tulevikus veel lugeda? Miks (mitte?)

21. Kui jah, siis kas inglise või eesti keeles? Miks?

22. Kas sa soovitaksid seda raamatut teistele? Miks (mitte)?

23. Kirjuta siia kõik, mis sa veel "Alice'i" kohta öelda tahaksid.

24. Palun loe läbi need kaks luuletust ja vasta lõpus olevale küsimusele:

1. Tema aeda kord läksin ja nägin: eks kae!-
seal panter ja päll justap jaotasid prae:
jäi pantrile kõik selle mahlakas tai,
ainult lakutud liua päll endale sai.
Ja ütles siis panter, kui söödud sai praad:
"Aukingiks, päll, lusika endale saad!"-
ning möirates haaras nii kahvli kui noa
ja peale sõi [pällu kui magusroa]
2. Kui kord salaja piilusin ussaia prakku,
nägin praadi seal jagamas ilvest ja kakku.
Nägin, ilves sai liha—kõik narmad ja kiud
ja veel kastme—ja kakule jäi ainult liud.
Kuid et asi ei läheks liig koledaks kisaks,
andis ilves veel kakule lusika lisaks,
võttes kahvli ja noa, ütles: "Kaua ei pinni
ma sind, kakk, armas vennas, vaid pistan su-

Kumb luuletus sulle rohkem meeldib ja miks?

KÜSIMUSTIK raamatu "Alice imedemaal" kohta (7b)

Sugu:

Vanus:.....

1. Mitu korda oled lugenud raamatut "Alice imedemaal"?
2. Millist versiooni oled lugenud? Tõmba ristike õigesse kasti (kastidesse):
 - Jaan Krossi tõlge/Vive Tolli pildid
 - Disney versioon
 - Klassikavaramu versioon
 - Inglisekeelne originaal
 -(muu)

NB! Kui oled lugenud mitut varianti, vasta palun küsimustikus igäihe kohta eraldi!

3. Miks sa seda raamatut lugesid?
4. Missuguste mõtete, tunnete või ootustega asusid raamatut lugema?
5. Kas raamat vastas ootustele?
6. Kas see raamat meeldis sulle? Miks (mitte)?
7. Kas seda raamatut oli raske lugeda? Kui jah, siis miks?

8. Kas midagi selles raamatut jäi arusaamatuks või segaseks? Kui jah, siis mis?

9. Kas sulle pildid meeldisid? Miks (mitte)?

10. Kas pildid aitasid raamatut või tegelasi paremini mõista? Kui jah, siis kuidas?

11. Tõmba ristike õigesse kasti (või kastidesse):

“Alice imedemaal” on _____ raamat

põnev

igav

tüütu

lapsik

naljakas

..... (muu)

12. Kas sul oli mõni lemmiktegelane? Kui jah, siis kes?

13. Miks ta sulle meeldis?

14. Kas mõni tegelane tuli sulle tuttav ette? Miks?

15. Missugune sündmus sulle kõige paremini meelde jäi? Miks?

16. Kas see raamat oli kuidagi seotud sinu enda elu või kogemus(t)ega?

17. Tõmba rist õigesse kasti.

Raamatus “Alice imedemaal” on palju luuletusi. Need on _____

- huvitavad
- rasked
- arusaamatud
- naljakad
- igavad
- (muu)

18. Tõmba rist õigesse kasti.

- Lugesin kõiki luuletusi
- Jätsin mõned luuletused vahele
- Jätsin kõik luuletused vahele

19. Võrreldes teiste hiljuti loetud raamatutega oli “Alice imedemaal”

- põnevam
- igavam
- naljakam
- (muu)

20. Kas kavatsed seda raamatut tulevikus veel lugeda? Miks (mitte?)

21. Kui jah, siis kas inglise või eesti keeles? Miks?

22. Kas sa soovitaksid seda raamatut teistele? Miks (mitte)?

23. Kirjuta siia kõik, mis sa veel “Alice’i” kohta öelda tahaksid.

24. Palun loe läbi need kaks luuletust ja vasta lõpus olevale küsimusele:

1. Ütles poiss: ”Oled rauk, isa William, ja juus päris valge on juba sul peas, tiritamme kuid teha korda kolmkümmend kuus nagu sina—kas võib sinu eas?
“Noorest peast,” sõnas taat, “olin kartlik ja peps, et ehk ajusid rikub mul see, aga nüüd, kus ma tean, et mul pole neid teps, tean, et tiritamm halba ei tee.”

2. “Armas taat,” ütles poiss, “juuksed hallid su peas nii et ootaks, et nõrgalt sead samme. Kas see sünnis on, isa, et sellises eas aina kasvatad veel tiritamme?”
“Kui ma noor olin, siis oli kartus mul kole, ütles taat, ”et mu aju saab viga, aga nüüd, mil ma tean, et mul peas seda pole, alles algab mu vallatu iga.”

Kumb luuletus sulle rohkem meeldib ja miks?

25. Kas sulle meeldis rohkem film või raamat? Miks?

26. Kas film aitas raamatut paremini mõista? Kui jah, siis kuidas?

KÜSIMUSTIK raamatu “Karupoeg Puhh” kohta (7a+7b)**Sugu:****Vanus:**.....

1. Mitu korda oled lugenud raamatut “Karupoeg Puhh”?
2. Millal sa seda viimati lugesid?
3. Miks sa seda raamatut lugesid?
4. Missuguste mõtete, tunnete või ootustega asusid raamatut lugema?
5. Kas raamat vastas ootustele?
6. Kas see raamat meeldis sulle? Miks (mitte)?
7. Kas seda raamatut oli raske lugeda? Kui jah, siis miks?

8. Kas midagi selles raamatus jäi arusaamatuks või segaseks? Kui jah, siis mis?

9. Kas sulle pildid meeldisid? Miks (mitte)?

10. Kas pildid aitasid raamatut või tegelasi paremini mõista? Kui jah, siis kuidas?

11. Tõmba ristike õigesse kasti (või kastidesse):

“Karupoeg Puhh” on _____ raamat

põnev

igav

tüütu

lapsik

naljakas

..... (muu)

12. Kas sul oli mõni lemmiktegelane? Kui jah, siis kes?

13. Miks ta sulle meeldis?

14. Kas mõni tegelane tuli sulle tuttav ette? Miks?

15. Missugune sündmus sulle kõige paremini meelde jäi? Miks?

16. Kas see raamat oli kuidagi seotud sinu enda elu või kogemus(t)ega?

17. Tõmba rist õigesse kasti.

Raamatus “Karupoeg Puhh” on palju luuletusi. Need on _____

huvitavad

rasked

arusaamatud

naljakad

igavad

..... (muu)

18. Tõmba rist õigesse kasti.

Lugesin kõiki luuletusi

Jätsin mõned luuletused vahele

Jätsin kõik luuletused vahele

19. Võrreldes teiste hiljuti loetud raamatutega oli “Karupoeg Puhh”

põnevam

igavam

naljakam

..... (muu)

20. Kas kavatsed seda raamatut tulevikus veel lugeda? Miks (mitte?)

21. Kui jah, siis kas inglise või eesti keeles? Miks?

22. Kas sa soovitaksid seda raamatut teistele? Miks (mitte)?

23. Kirjuta siia kõik, mis sa veel "Puhhi" kohta öelda tahaksid.

**ALICE
7a (33)**

**POISID
(16)**

**TÜDRUKUD
(17)**

1. Mitu korda?	1 kord	2 korda	pool			1 kord	2 korda	3 korda		
	14	1	1			9	6	2		
2. Mis versioon?		Kross	Disney			Kross	Kross & Disney			
		15	1			15	2			
3. Miks lugesid?		Kohustuslik				Kohustuslik	Kohus. + huvi			
		16				16	1			
4. Ootused	Positiivsed	Negatiivsed	Neutraalsed			Positiivsed	Negatiivsed	Neutraalsed		
	1	13	2			4	12	1		
5. Mulje	Positiivne	Negatiivne	Ei tea			Positiivne	Negatiivne	Posit ja neg	Parem kui arvasin	
	0	15	1			4	7	4	2	
6. Meeldis?	Jah	Ei				Jah	Ei	Enam-vähem	Lapsena oleks meeldinud	Ei oska öelda
	1	15				3	8	1	4	1
Miks?						päris lõbus ja tore, huvitav, omapärane				
Miks mitte?	igav (5), lapsik, titekas, nõme, seosetu jutt jabur					mõeldud väiksematele, titekas, liiga lapsik, mitte kõige hullem, kiskus segaseks, pikk mõttetu jutt, igav, võiks olla noortepärasem				
7. Raske lugeda?	Jah	Ei	Igav, seetõttu raske			Jah	Ei	Mõned kohad		
	1	9	6			0	16	1		
8. Kas oli arusaamatu?	Jah	Ei	Miks see raamat üldse kirjutati?			Jah	Ei	Miks üldse kirjutati?		
	3	8	5			5	11	1		
Mis oli arusaamatu?	miks ükski lugu ära ei lõppenud					kilpkonn (3), pildid (2)				

9. Kas pildid meeldisid?	Jah	Ei	Ei mäleta			Jah	Ei	Enam-vähem		
	5	10	1			6	10	1		
10. Kas pildid aitasid mõista?	Jah	Ei	Võib-olla/ei mäleta			Jah	Ei	Natuke		
	5	9	2			3	10	4		
11. Raamat on...	põnev	igav	tüütu	lapsik	naljakas	põnev	igav	tüütu	lapsik	naljakas
(mainitud kordade arv)	0	10	9	14	1	0	4	2	15	0
Muu	nõme (3), jura, tittede, vördjate, tavaline, mõttetu					lõbus, huvitav, lasteaia, huvitava sisuga				
12. Lemmiktegel	Jah	Ei				Jah	Ei	Ei mäleta		
	5	11				7	9	1		
13. Miks meeldis?										
	Kass--sest temal oli kõige vähem teksti Märtsjänes--sest ta tegelaskuju oli väga naljakas Alice--sest ta oli ainuke mõistlik					Irvik Kiisu--Ta oli lõbus ja lahe tüüp Alice--sest temast sai raamatu vältel palju teada Alice--uudishimulik, aus, heasüdamlik Alice--tore väike armas tüdruk				
14. Ked/mid. tuttavat?	Jah	Ei				Jah	Ei	Jah, multikast	Ei sa aru	
	3	13				1	11	4	1	
15. Sündmus										
	Raamatu algus (2); mitte midagi (6); lõpp, kuna raamat lõppes ära Kohus; jook, mis väikseks tegi; kui Alice majja kinni jäi					Kriketimäng (2); teejoomine (4); raamatu lõpp; kihutusjooks; Raamatu algus (4); Alice rooside aias; küülikuurst alla (2)				
16. Seotud enda eluga?	Jah	Ei				Jah	Ei	Mitte eriti		
	0	16				1	15	1		
17. Luuletused	Huvitavad	Rasked	Arusaamatud	Naljakad	Igavad	Huvitavad	Rasked	Arusaamatud	Naljakad	Igavad
	1	1	3	0	13	1	2	8	4	6
Muu	mõttetud (2), tavalised, riimist väljas					kentsakad, õudsed, mõttetud, nõmedad				
18. Kas lugesid kõiki luuletusi?	Kõiki	Mõned vahele	Kõik vahele			Kõiki	Mõned vahele	Kõik vahele		

	5	4	7		9	6	2		
19. Võrreldes teiste rmt-ga...	põnevam	igavam	naljakam		põnevam	igavam	naljakam		
	0	13	1		0	16	0		
Muu	Mõttetum, nõmedam, lapsikum				veidi lapsik				
20. Tulevikus loeks?	Jah	Ei	Võib-olla		Jah	Ei	Võib-olla		
	1	14	1		1	12	4		
21. E.k või i.k?	Eesti	Inglise			Eesti	Inglise	Mõlemad		
	2	5			3	6	1		
22. Soovitaksid teistele?	Jah	Ei	Noorematele	Suurematele	Jah	Ei	Noorematele		
	1	9	5	1	1	3	13		
23. Lisakommentaar	Kõige hullem raamat, mida ma lugenud olen Prügikasti! Lihtsalt igav raamat Mina igatahes ei leidnud sellel raamatul erilist mõtet, peale selle, et see üks suur segadus oli Raamat põlema panna!				Sorry, aga see oli NIIL igav! See raamat oli kohati ka üsna huvitav ja naljakas igav, lapsik, igav, igav...				
24. Kumb luul.?	1.	2.	Mitte kumbki	Ei tea	1.	2.	Mitte kumbki	Ühesug.	
	6	5	4	1	9	6	1	1	
Miks 1.?	see oli jaburam; sain sellest paremini aru; sellest sai midagi aru				arusaadavam; lustakam; sest ma ei saanud sellest aru :); tundub teistest veidi huvitavam				
Miks 2.?	see oli selgem; see tundus huvitavam; 1. oli mingi jama; see on arusaadavam				2. oli arusaadavam; sõnad on arusaadavamad ja kuidagi huvitavamalt on kirjutatud; jätab laheda mulje; huvitavam; 1.on segane; sellele sain paremini pihta ja see oli huvitavam; 1. luuletuses olid mõned arusaamatud sõnad, kuigi nad olid riimis; see oli selgemate sõnadega				

ALICE 7b (31)

POISID (12)

TÜDRUKUD (19)

1. Mitu korda?	1 kord	2 korda				1 kord	2 korda	Pooleli		
	12					12	6	1		
2. Mis versioon?		Kross	Disney			Kross	Kross & Disney	1940		
		10	2			16	2	1		
3. Miks lugesid?		Kohustuslik	Film oli hea			Kohustuslik	Kohus. + huvi	Huvi		
		10	2			16		3		
4. Ootused	Positiivsed	Negatiivsed	Puudusid	Muu		Positiivsed	Negatiivsed	Puudusid	Muu	
	4	5	2	1		9	3	5	2	
5. Mulje	Positiivne	Negatiivne	Muu			Positiivne	Negatiivne	Keskmine		
	0	11	1			5	8	6		
6. Kas meeldis?	Jah	Ei	Muu			Jah	Ei	Mitte väga		
	0	11	1			7	8	4		
Miks?	loetav					fantaasiarikas ja huvitav, tore, seiklusterohke, lõbus lugeda (1940)				
Miks mitte?	väga segane, igav (2), imelik, segane, mõttetu, lapsik, midagi ei saanud aru, tittedele					mõned kohad jäid väga segaseks, ei saanud sellest kohtuistungist, valekilpkonna ja Grüpsi jutuajamisest aru, suhteliselt segane oli osa raamatust, ei saanud lõpust aru, mõned kohad olid imelikud, absurdne ja liiga väljamõeldisi täis				
7. Raske lugeda?	Jah	Ei	Igav, seetõttu raske			Jah	Ei	Igav, seeõttu raske	Mitte eriti	
	1	7	4			3	11	2	3	
	mõni koht oli segane ja korralikult ei tulnud pilti sündmustest silme ette kui luul-i mõttega ei lugenud, siis esimese korraga aru ei saanud					Midagi ei saanud aru; Jah, sest ma jäin magama seda lugedes; Jah, uni ja igavus tulid kohutavalt peale; ainult lõppu oli raske lugeda, sest ma ei saanud sellest aru				
8. Kas oli arusaamatu?	Jah	Ei				Jah	Ei			
	5	7				12	7			
Mis?	kohtuosa; lõpp, sest see oli imelikult seletatud; enamus oligi segane					viimane peatükk; kui filmi poleks näinud, oleks olnud arusaamatum; see valekilpkonna lugu oli väga segane; segaseks jäi, miks Valekilpkonn oli valekilpkonn; Kõik oligi seal väga segane ja päris hästi polnud ära seletatud				

9. Kas pildid meeldisid?	Jah	Ei				Jah	Ei	Mitte eriti		
	7	5				5	12	2		
	Pildid olid lahedad, kuigi nad ei sobinud jutuga; jah, need olid hästi suured; jah, need olid väga arusaadavad					Läksid jutuga hästi kokku (1940); need olid hägused, ei loonud selget pilti; need olid halvasti arusaadavad; koledad; liiga segased; need ei olnud nii täpsed, kui oli jutus kirjutatud; arusaamatud				
10. Kas pildid aitasid mõista?	Jah	Ei				Jah	Ei	Kohati/vähe		
	6	6				3	9	7		
	Aitasid küll, sest näiteks Valekilpkonnast ei saanud enne aru, kui pilti nägin; jah, sest vahepeal ei saanud aru, kes on kes					Mitte väga, kuid Grüpsi ma küll ei osanud ette kujutada; võib-olla natuke, sest ei kujutanud ette Grüpsi või mõnda muud elukat				
11. Raamat on...	põnev	igav	tüütu	lapsik	naljakas	põnev	igav	tüütu	lapsik	naljakas
(mainitud kordi)	0	7	5	7	2	3	4	5	12	8
Muu	nõme (2), totter, pointless					seiklusterohke, mõttetu				
12. Lemmiktegel	Jah	Ei				Jah	Ei			
	5	7				15	4			
Kes?	Unihiiir, Bill, Alice, Valge Kүүлik, Hertsoginna, Irvitav Kass					Irvikkass (7), Unihiiir (3), Jänes (2), Alice				
13. Miks meeldis?										
	Unihiiir--oli kohati naljakas Bill--ta oli naljakas Alice--ta oli julge Valge Kүүлik--sest ta tundus kohusetundlik Hertsoginna--ta tahtis teistel päid maha võtta					Irvikkass--ta tundus loogiline Alice--ta oli vahva tüdruk, kes oli väga aus ja sõbralik Unihiiir--sest ta oli naljakas; armas Alice ja ta õde--sest nad olid normaalsed Valge Jänes--armas; tundus arukas				
14. Ked/mid. tuttavat?	Jah, multikast	Jah, filmist	Ei			Jah	Ei	Jah, multikast	Jah, filmist	
	2	1	9			4	8	3	4	
						Kuninganna--siukse iseloomu ja elupõhimõtetega inimesi on meie ümber; Kuninganna--nagu minu vanaema; Unihiiir--meenutas venda				
15. Sündmus										
	Kuninganna aias; teejoomine (3); kohtuistung; krocket (2) August alla kukkumine (4)					Teejoomine (5)--sest seda kirjeldati korralikult Krocket; väikseks/suureks muutumine (3); kohtuistung				

	Kroket (2)					Algus (5)--see oli arusaadav				
16. Seotud enda eluga?	Jah	Ei				Jah	Ei			
	0	12				1	18			
17. Luuletused	Huvitavad	Rasked	Arusaamatud	Naljaked	Igavad	Huvitavad	Rasked	Arusaamatud	Naljaked	Igavad
	0	1	7	0	6	6	0	12	5	6
18. Kas lugesid kõiki luuletusi?	Kõiki	Mõned vahele	Kõik vahele			Kõiki	Mõned vahele	Kõik vahele	Enamus vahele	
	0	8	4			7	8	3	1	
19. Võrreldes teiste rmt-ga...	põnevam	igavam	naljakam			põnevam	igavam	naljakam	igavam+naljakam	
	0	10	1			2	13	0	3	
20. Tulevikus loeks?	Jah	Ei	Võib-olla			Jah	Ei	Võib-olla		
	0	11	1			4	12	3		
	Võib-olla suuremana saan sellest rohkem aru; Sest tahan sellest teisiti aru saada kui praegu									
21. E.k või i.k?	Eesti	Inglise	Ei tea	Ei loe		Eesti	Inglise	Mõlemad	Ei tea	Ei loe
	1	1	1	9		1	8	1	1	8
	[Inglise] sest ükskõik kui meisterlikult tõlkija on tõlkinud, läheb tõlkes ikkagi osa kaotsi, eriti luuletuste puhul Kindlasti inglise, sest siis on huvitavam Vist inglise, sest siis saan sõnamängudest aru									
22. Soovitaksid teistele?	Jah	Ei	Noorematele	Ei tea		Jah	Ei	Noorematele	Võib-olla	
	2	8	1	1		5	5	7	2	
	jah, sest see on väga tuntud raamat ja selle peaks läbi lugema					see on tuntud ja isegi kasulik raamat, millest ka seltskonnas rääkida				
23. Lisakommentaar	pointless; nõme; igav					veider, imelik; tüüpiline lasteraamat (3) paha ja halb ja igav raamat ja ma ei saa aru, miks see oli meie kohustuslikus kirjanduses; Normaalsemad pildid oleks võinud olla; Selles raamatus võib olla väga sügav mõte, aga ilmselt sellest				

					aru saamiseks tuleks olla veidi vanem ja lugeda inglisekeelset varianti					
24. Kumb luul.?	1.	2.	Mitte kumbki			1.	2.	Mõlemad		
	6	4	2			5	13	1		
Miks 1.? Miks 2.?	arusaadav; naljakam arusaadavam; natuke huvitavam; arusaadav; kuna teine on haige luuletus					naljakam (3); mõtekam; arusaadavam; naljakam; lühem ja paremini saan sellest aru; arusaadavam (3); sest see oli riimis; võib-olla veidi tõetruum; luulelisem; kuidagi paremini sõnastatud ja loogilisemalt				
25. Film või raamat?	Film	Raamat	Mitte kumbki			Film	Raamat	Mõlemad		
	9	1	2			14	3	2		
Film	sisukam (2); põnevam; seda ei pidanud lugema; kuna sealt sai midagi aru					seal olid tegelased lihtsamini arusaadavad see andis väga hea ettekujutuse veidi oli selgem kui raamatus asjast oli kergem aru saada				
Raamat Mõlemad	sest seal ei olnud seda kassi naeratust näha					kui oled mõlemat näinud/lugenud, on lihtsam pointile pihta saada				
26. Film aitas mõista?	Jah	Ei	(Vastamata)			Jah	Ei	(Vastamata)		
	5	5	2			14	3	2		
	Jah, sest filmis oli kõik väga arusaadav Jah, sest filmis tegelased ei räägi nii segaselt Aitas küll, nii sain asjadest paremini aru Jah, sest tegelased olid tuttavad Raamatust ei saanud midagi aru					Jah, sest tegelased olid tuttavad ja kui muidu oleks mõni koht arusaamatu olnud, siis tänu filmile oli arusaadavam Tegelasi oli hästi kujutatud Nii oli [raamatust] parem aru saada [Film] andis selgema pildi tegevusest Sai tegelaskujudest paremini aru Tegi selgemaks Aitas paremini sündmustikku ette kujutada Aitas küll, sest osadest kohtadest raamatus ei saanud aru, kuid filmis olid need selged Raamatu pildid ajasid segadusse				

PUHH
7a +7b

POISID
(5)

TÜDRUKUD
(3)

1. Mitu korda?	1 kord	2 korda				1 kord	2 korda			
	3	2				2	1			
2. Viimati?	6-aastaselt	4 a tagasi				1 a tagasi	Paar a tagasi	Ammu		
	1	4				1	1	1		
3. Miks lugesid?	Huvi	Ema soovitas	Ei mäleta			Huvi				
	3	1	1			3				
4. Ootused	Positiivsed	Muu	Ei mäleta			Positiivsed	Neutraalsed			
	3	1	1			2	1			
5. Mulje	Positiivne	Enam-vähem				Positiivne	Enam-vähem			
	4	2				2	1			
6. Kas meeldis?	Jah					Jah				
	5					3				
Miks?	Sest see oli vahva ja kohati naljakas Raamat oli ilusate kaante ja piltidega Toredad, arusaadavad tegelased				Muidugi meeldis, hea raamat on Seal olid kõik sõbrad ja tegelased meeldisid mulle väga					
7. Raske lug?		Ei					Ei	Natuke		
		5					2	1		
8. Arusaamatu?		Ei					Ei			
		5					3			
9. Pildid meeldisid?	Jah					Jah	Suhteliselt			
	5					2	1			
10. Kas pildid aitasid mõista?	Jah	Ei	Ei oska öelda	Mingil määral		Jah	Ei oska öelda			
	2	1	1	1		2	1			

11. "Karupoeg Puhh" on ...	põnev	igav	tüütu	lapsik	naljakas	põnev	igav	tüütu	lapsik	naljakas
(mainitud kordi)	2	1	0	3	5	3	0	0	3	3
Muu	huvitav									
12. Lemmik-tegelane	Jah	Ei				Jah				
	3	2				3				
Kes?	Tiiger, Notsu, Puhh					Puhh, Notsu, Tiiger				
13. Miks meeldis?										
	Tiiger--ta oli äge Notsu--ta oli nii armetu Puhh--ta oli peategelane ja ta oli kohmakas. Tal olid nunnud kõrvad ja ilus särk					Notsu--sest ta oli sõbralik ja muidu südamlilik ning armas tegelane Tiiger--sest ta oli selline virk ja kraps ning alati hea tujuga				
14. Ked/mid. tuttavat?	Jah	Ei	Vastamata				Ei	Vastamata		
	2	2	1				2	1		
	Jah, tavalised inimesed									
15. Sündmus										
	Tiiger ja Kängu ronisid kõrge puu otsa ja ei saanud sealt enam alla Kui Puhh peaga kinni jäi mesilaspeessa (2) Nad ajasid kedagi taga (2)					See, kus nad pusasid ja susasid (või kes need olidki) taga ajasid, sest see oli (kohutavalt) naljakas Kus Puhh jäi kitsikusse (sic!)				
16. Seotud enda eluga?		Ei	Vist mitte				Ei	Vist mitte		
		4	1				2	1		
17. Luuletused	Huvitavad	Rasked	Arusaamatud	Naljakad	Igavad	Huvitavad	Rasked	Arusaamatud	Naljakad	Igavad
	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	0
18. Kas lugesid kõiki luuletusi?	Kõiki	Mõned vahele	Kõik vahele			Kõiki	Mõned vahele			
	1	3	1			2	1			
19. Võrreldes teiste rmt-ga...	põnevam	igavam	naljakam			põnevam	igavam	naljakam	Vastamata	

Muu	3	0	3			0	0	2	1	
	lõbusam									
20. Tulevikus loeks?	Jah	Ei				Jah	Ei tea			
	1	4				2	1			
	Ei, kuna see on mulle nüüd lapsik Kindlasti loen seda ise. Aga võib-olla loen tulevikus seda oma lastele					Jah, sest see on tore raamat Lihtne ning selline mõnusalt lapsik ja siiras				
21. E.k või i.k?	Eesti	Inglise	Ei loe			Eesti	Ei tea			
	1	1	3			1	2			
22. Soovitaksid teistele?	Jah	Ei	Lastele	Vastamata		Jah				
	2	1	1	1		3				
23. Lisakommentaar										
	See oli hea raamat					Tegelastel olid huvitavad nimed. Põhjanaba kaart oli hästi armas Samalaadseid raamatuid võiks rohkem olla				

INTERVJUU TRANSKRIPTSIOON

Tiina (12) ja Evelin (12)* 6.klassist

Rääkige mulle siis esiteks, mis raamatuid teile üldse meeldib lugeda.

T: Ajalooramatuid ei meeldi lugeda. Mingi "Meelis" ja "Tasuja" ja siuksed

E: Mulle meeldib neid lugeda, mida näiteks mingi sõbranna või keegi soovitab, et see on hea raamat, et huvitav või seiklused või midagi. Kui on huvitav, siis loen lõpuni, kui ei ole, siis jätan pooleli.

On sul mõni selline raamat olnud mille sa oled pooleli jätnud? Mäletad sa mõnda?

E: "Kevadet" ei viitsinud enam lugeda.

T: "Tasuja"

Jätsid pooleli?

T: Jah.

Aga kuidas teile muidu kohustuslik kirjandus meeldib?

E: Sõltub raamatust.

T: Tegelikult on üsna normaalne.

No nimetage mõni raamat kohustuslikust, mis on teile meeldinud?

T: "Kuidas elad, Ann?" oli.

E: Ja "Fotosüüdistus". Ja "Pal-tänava poisid" oli ka üsna normaalne.

Kas teil kohustuslik kirjandus algas alles sel aastal?

E: Eelmisel aastal oli ka, aga hästi minimaalne. Sellel aastal on nagu rohkem.

Kas seda on liiga palju või on see mõistlik?

T ja E: Parajalt.

Aga millal te "Alice'it" lugesite?

T: Inglise keeles oli praegu.

E: Aga muidu mingi 8-7 aastaselt.

Inglise keeles oli see teil õpikus või?

E: Mhm. See oli mingi kolm peatükki.

Aga rääkige mulle kõigepealt sellest eestikeelsest. Tiina, millal sina seda lugesid?

T: Ma kodus vahepeal vaatan seda nagu. Ma ei mäleta, kuna ma seda põhjalikult lugesin.

Kas teil on selline raamat [Krossi/Tolli]?

T & E: Ei, meil on selline suur

Sinine? [Klassikavaramu väljaanne/adaptatsioon]

T & E: Jah

Ma räägin siis kõigepealt Tiinaga. Tiina, kuidas sulle meeldis?

T: Ma väiksena ei saanud sellest eriti aru. Et nendest kassidest ja kes seal olid. Need olid kuidagi nii imelikud. Nagu üldse ei saanud hästi sellest raamatust aru, aga meeldis ikka ta. Huvitavad tegelased olid. See oli nagu teistest raamatutest teistsugune.

Aga oled sa hiljem ka veel seda lugenud?

T: Jah, ma olen nagu vaadanud seda raamatut. See on mul riulis.

Kas siis oled paremini aru saanud?

T: Jaa.

Aga multikat oled ka näinud?

T: Ja.

Kuidas see meeldis?

T: Mmm... meeldis.

Kas multikas aitas sellest raamatust paremini aru ka saada või?

T: Jaa. See oli nagu... Sai parema ettekujutuse. Tegelt raamatus olid suured pildid ka. Aga ikkagi multikas oli parem.

Kas see häiris sind, kui sa lugesid, et sa ei saanud kõigest aru?

T: Ei häirinud.

Ja sulle, Evelin?

E: Väiksena olid võib-olla need nimed liiga rasked. Näiteks Alice ja... noh, siis ei olnud nagu kõige parem lugeja ka ja. Aga tegelased olid jah huvitavad. Igast triibulised kassid ja. Aga nüüd viimasel ajal olen mingile väiksele sugulasele ette lugenud. Siis on jälle nagu veids rohkem aru saanud. Väiksena oli suht siuke tunne, et ei tea, mis seal nüüd toimub.

Aga kas sulle meeldis muidu see raamat?

E: Jaa, üsna huvitav oli. Tegelased omaette olid juba huvitavad.

Aga mis te siis teete, kui te aru ei saa? Te loete ikka edasi või jätate pooleli või hüppate üle ka?

E: Vahepeal loen selle lõigu uuesti lihtsalt. Vahel, kui loed midagi ja keegi teine kõrvalt segab, siis ei saa mitte midagi aru.

Aga kas selles suures raamatus on luuletusi ka sees?

E: Mingid üksikud vist olid.

Kuidas teile need meeldisid?

E: Ma arvan, et meeldisid...

T: Ma ei mäleta neid, aga.. see oli üsna tükk aega tagasi, kui lugesin.

Kui klassis teie õpetaja küsis, kuidas teile “Alice” meeldis, siis sina Tiina ütlesid, et oli “siuke kahtlane” raamat. Miks sa nii ütlesid?

T: Sellepärast et... tegelased olid mingid imelikud. Ei saanud hästi aru.

E: Näiteks olid mingi kaks lehekülge ära lugenud ja midagi aru ei saanud, siis mõtlesid peale raamatu lugemist natuke aega, siis jõudis kohale.

Aga mis tegelane teile kõige rohkem meeldis?

T: Jänes

E: Meeldis see kass, kes seal puu otsas magas. See triibuline.

Kas sa mäletad, kuidas selle kassi nimi oli?

E: Ei mäleta.

Kuidas teile pildid meeldisid?

T: Ilusad värvilised

E: Olid jah, hästi suured ja. Jumala hea oli näha, piasjasju ja.

Kas need pildid aitasid nagu mõista seda teksti paremini?

T: Ja.

E: Kui on ilma piltideta raamat, siis nagu räägitakse, et triibuline kass ja nii, aga kui näed pildi pealt, siis saad ikka parema ettekujutuse.

Oli veel mõni tegelane, kes meeldis?

T: Alice ise ka. Ja need kaardid, kes seal need valvurid olid, need olid ka toredad.

E: Ja siis see paks mutike sealt lossist.

Kui te lugesite, siis saite aru ka, et tegemist oli kaartidega?

E: Mhm. Seal olid pildid.

T: Muidu ma arvan oleks ka aru saanud.

Mis mulje sellest raamatust jäi? Oli ta naljakas või kurb või imelik või hirmus või...?

T: Tore

E: Natuke vahelduv. Vahepeal Alice nagu nuttis seal kuskil, siis oli nagu kurb ja pärast oli jälle lõbus, kui neil see kohviõhtu oli nende jänestega.

Kas mõni selline tegelane ka oli, kes üldse ei meeldinud?

T: Ma ei mäleta praegu neid tegelasi. Aga keegi oli sealt hästi tige, see mulle ei meeldinud.

Aga kas te uuesti tahaksite seda raamatut lugeda?

T: Seda suurt piltidega võiks küll lugeda.

E: Ma ei tea, praegu on võib-olla seda suurt piltidega juba igav lugeda.

Kui te esimest korda lugesite, siis ei hakanud igav? Oli selline põnev raamat?

E: No üsna jah. Kuigi ega kiiresti läbi ei lugenud. Vahepeal jõudsin juba muud lugema hakata, aga lõpuni ikka jõudis kuidagi.

Aga miks vahepeal igav hakkas?

T: Sellepärast et nendest nimedest ei saanud aru, inglisekeelsed nimed. Siis oli nagu raske lugeda seda teksti. Ei saanud aru.

Kas "Karupoeg Puhhi" olete ka mõlemad lugenud?

T & E: Jaa.

T: Aga põhimõtteliselt ma ei mäleta midagi. Ma olen multikaid näinud.

E: Mingit paksu raamatut olen lugenud, aga mitte eriti palju. "Karupoeg Puhhi unejutud" olid, siis ma neid lugesin natuke.

Miks sul pooleli jäi?

E: Ma ei tea... tuli vist mingi kohustuslik kirjandus vahele. Siis enam ei jõudnud lugeda.

Millal see oli, kui sa lugesid seda "Karupoeg Puhhi"?

T: Äkki mingis teises või kolmandas klassis.

Aga oli siis igav või?

T: Ei oskagi öelda... Võib-olla siis oli isegi natuke igav, aga ikkagi tahtsin lõpuni lugeda. Aga siis tuli midagi ette.

E: Ma mäletan, et sellepärast jätsin väiksena pooleli, et liiga paks oli. Siis ma nagu ei viitsinud... siuke tunne oli, et ei tulegi lõppu.

Kas need pildid meeldisid?

E: Seal ei olnud eriti pilte. Mul oli siuke vanem versioon.

Aga kas "Karupoeg Puhh" on selline raamat, mida te tahaksite lugeda kunagi tulevikus?

E: Jah, selle võiks küll uuesti lugeda, saaks rohkem aru. Need tegelased olid hästi toredad. Mulle meeldis Notsu kõige rohkem.

Miks sulle Notsu meeldis?

E: Siuke väike ja armas oli.

Kui te nüüd võrdlete omavahel "Puhhi" ja "Alice'it", siis kumb raamat on parem?

E: "Puhh"

T: Jah, minu arust ka "Puhh".

Aga miks?

T: Seal olid arusaadavamad tegelased ja nagu sellest tegevusest sai jah aru.

E: Mõnes mõttes meeldis "Alice" rohkem, sest seal oli nagu pilte ja... vahepeal vaatasid pilti ja siis lugesid edasi, selles mõttes oli nagu huvitavam. Aga "Puhh" ...ma ei tea...väiksena need mänguasjad, need karud ja tiigrid, need olid hästi armsad.

T: Kindlasti meeldis "Puhh" rohkem. Nagu hästi äge tegevus oli. Puhh oli siuke paksuke ja.

E: Mulle meeldis see koht, kui ta mingi jänese juurde läks, sõi nii palju ja siis kõik tõmbasid teda seal ja.

On veel mõni selline koht meeles?

E: See ka, kui ta värvis õhupalli mudaga kokku ja tahtis näidata, et see on pime pilv. Tegelt läks meevargile. (*naer*) Põhiliselt oligi mingi mee söömine igal pool. See oli kurb koht, kus ta vaatas kõiki oma potte ja nägi, et kõik on tühjad.

Kas ta oli selline naljakas raamat? Et kui lugesid, siis hakkasid vahepeal naerma?

E: Mul on tavaliselt, et raamat võib naljaks olla, aga ma kõvasti naerma ei hakka. Nagu enda sees naeran või nii.

Kas Alice'is oli ka selliseid kohti, mis naerma ajasid?

T: Ei olnud vist.

E: See, kui see jänes seal mingi kannu katki tegi ja mässasid seal laua ümber.

E: Aga "Puhhis" oli ikka rohkem nagu.

T: Puhh oli jah siuke naljakam. See oli rohkem –mulle tundus—selline lastesõbralikum. Et olid lahendamad tegelased.

Mis tegi need tegelased lahendamaks?

T: Välimus äkki. Need kassid ja need ["Alice'is"] olid kuidagi hästi imelikud ja...

Et "Puhhis" olid võib-olla reaalsemad tegelased?

T: Mhm.

E: Värv oli lahe, et Tiiger oli täiesti oranž ja. Seal olid nagu mänguasjad elama pandud, nagu kollane karu, kellel olid riided seljas

Kas "Alice'i" lõpus, kui aru saite, et see oli uni, kas see oli pettumus ka, et ei toimunudki päriselt?

E: Ei olnud vist, võib-olla see tegi asja üldse põnevamaks. Kui midagi päriselt siukest oleks olnud, oleks võib-olla isegi igavam olnud.

Mis on järgmine raamat, mille te tahate kätte võtta?

T: Ei teagi, peab "Meelist" lugema.

Ja see ei meeldi jah?

T & E (naer)

E: Ei ole üldse tahtmist alustadagi. Järgmisena ma vist loen selle "Kuidas elad, Ann?" teise osa läbi. "Klatšimoorid" pidid ka lahedad olema.

T: Mingid noorsoojutud, need on kõige huvitavamad. Need on uued raamatud.

Kas peale kohustusliku kirjanduse jääb aega ka muud lugeda?

E: Vahel ikka. Kui raamat on kiiresti läbi loetud, siis jääb teise jaoks ka aega.

Aitäh teile!

* Nimed muudetud

Resümee

TARTU ÜLIKOOL

INGLISE FILOLOOGIA ÕPPETOOL

Annika Aas

“Alice imedemaal” ja “Karupoeg Puhhi” retseptsioon Eesti laste seas: tõlke ja tõlgitavuse probleemid

Magistritöö

2004

133 lk

Kokkuvõte

Käesoleva magistritöö teema on kahe lastekirjanduse klassiku—“Alice imedemaal” ja “Karupoeg Puhh”—retseptsioon Eesti laste seas. Nende kahe teose retseptsiooni uurimine seostatakse tõlkimise, tõlgitavuse ja relevantsuse teemadega. Magistritöö põhieemärgid on uurida tegureid, mis on mõjutanud raamatu “Alice imedemaal” negatiivset retseptsiooni Eestis, vastupidiselt “Karupoeg Puhhile”, mis on tõusnud kanoniseeritud staatusesse. Tõlkimist käsitletakse kui kommunikatsiooniakti ning vastavalt relevantsusteooriale on nii kognitsiooni kui kommunikatsiooni aluseks relevantsus. Seetõttu pööratakse tähelepanu aspektidele, mis tõlkes võivad sihtlugejaskonna jaoks relevantsuse kaotada ning seega mõjutada teose retseptsiooni.

Rõhutatakse relevantsuse printsiibi arvestamise olulisust tõlkimisel ning dialoogi vajalikkust tõlkija ja sihtlugejaskonna vahel.

Töö esimene osa analüüsib retseptsiooniga seotud valdkondi—lastekirjanduse tõlkimise spetsiifikat, relevantsusteooriat, retseptsiooniteooriat—ning rakendab neid teooriaid läbivalt „Alice imedemaal“ ja „Karupoeg Puhhi“ tõlgete ja tõlgitavuse analüüsiks. Vaadeldakse erinevaid faktoreid, mis võivad lastekirjanduse vahendamisel teise kultuuri oluliselt retseptsiooni mõjutada. Funktsionaalse tõlketeooria raames tuuakse välja instrumentaalse ja dokumentaalse tõlke erinevused ning rõhutatakse instrumentaalse tõlke tähtsust lastekirjanduse vahendamisel. Teoste tõlkevõrdluses pööratakse erilist tähelepanu nende tundetooni, sõnavara, illustatsioonide ja värsside vahendamisele ja edasiandmisele.

Töö teine osa esitab autori võrdleva empiirilise retseptsiooniuuringu, mis hõlmab intervjuusid ja küsimustikke 80 kooliõpilasega vanuses 9 kuni 14 aastat. Empiiriliste andmete põhjal analüüsib autor Eesti laste arvamusi „Alice`i“ ja „Puhhi“ kohta ning püüab leida vastust küsimustele, miks lastele need teosed meeldivad või ei meeldi ning mis põhjustel eelistatakse üht raamatut teisele.

„Anekdootliku“ tõendusmaterjali ning tõlgete analüüsi põhjal püstitab autor põhihüpoteesi, et „Alice`i“ dokumentaalne tõlge on raamatu kehva retseptsiooni peamiseks põhjuseks. Autor mõonab, et võrreldes „Puhhiga“ on „Alice“ raskemini tõlgitav; samas viitab see fakt selgelt vajadusele instrumentaalsema tõlke järele, mis arvestaks rohkem sihtlugejaskonnaga. „Alice`i“ tekstimaailm on tihedalt seotud inglise keele, kultuuri ja realiaga, mistõttu dokumentaalses, lähtekeeles ustavas tõlkes kaotavad paljud aspektid Eesti lapse jaoks relevantsuse, mida tõestas ka autori poolt läbiviidud empiiriline uuring. Autor arvab, et „Alice`it“ saab Eesti lapsele edukalt vahendada ainult väga instrumentaalse tõlkena või adaptatsioonina, kuna

empiiriline uuring näitas, et vähesed positiivsed kommentaarid „Alice´ile“ puudutasid peaaegu eranditult adaptatsioone. Dokumentaalne tõlge võib end õigustada juhul, kui tõlkija otsustabki suunata teose ainult täiskasvanud lugejale. „Puhhi“ tekstimaailm on Eesti lapsele lähedasem ning uuringu tulemused tõestasid, et raamatu tõlget võib pidada instrumentaalseks ja isegi ekvifunktsionaalseks, kuna raamat funktsioneerib sama edukalt Eestis kui oma sünnimaal.

Töö lõpuosas teeb autor mõned ettepanekud. Esiteks peaks iga tõlkija enne tõlkima asumist otsustama raamatu põhifunktsiooni ja sihtlugejaskonna üle, mis aitab muuta lähteteksti potentsiaalselt irrelevantseid aspekte sihtlugejaskonna jaoks relevantseks. Teiseks peab autor soovitavaks käsitleda kohustuslikku kirjandust koolis võimalusel alati koos muu meediaga (filmid, arvutimängud, teatrietendused jms), mis aitaks laiendada kognitiivset keskkonda ning muuta lapse jaoks ebahuvitavaid, segaseid ja irrelevantseid tekste huvitavamaks ja relevantsemaks. Kolmandaks peab autor oluliseks laste arvamuse arvestamist lugemismaterjali valikul. Kohustusliku kirjanduse raames ei tohiks ülemäära tähtsustada „klassikute“ käsitlemist, vaid tuleks laste lugemishuvi äratamise või kasvatamise huvides pakkuda neile ka kaasaegset ja relevantset lugemist. Neljandaks peab autor tingimata vajalikuks uurida, lisaks täiskasvanukirjandusele, eraldi lastekirjanduse tõlkimist. Kuigi lastele ja täiskasvanuile tõlkimisel paljud probleemid kattuvad, on siiski aspekte, mis lastele tõlkimise puhul vajavad erilist tähelepanu, kuna laste ja täiskasvanute lugemise põhjused ja eesmärgid on tihti erinevad.

Käesolev uurimustöö loodab anda panuse lastekirjanduse ja selle retseptsiooni ning tõlkimise uurimisse Eestis.

Märksõnad: lastekirjandus, tõlkimine, retseptsioon, relevantsus