UNIVERSITY OF VAASA

Faculty of Humanities

Department of English

Miia Ollila

A Rickety Trolley, Virginian Wolfsnake and Yeeka: Lexical Explications, Wordplay and Nonsense Utterances in *A Series of Unfortunate Events* and Their Translation into Finnish

Vaasa 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VAASAN YLIOPISTO
Humanistinen tiedekunta
Laitos: Englannin kielen laitos
Tekijä: Miia Ollila
Pro gradu tutkielma: A Rickety Trolley, Virginian Wolfsnake and Yeeka: Lexical Explications, Wordplay and Nonsense Utterances in *A Series of Unfortunate Events* and Their Translation into Finnish
Tutkinto: Filosofian maisteri
Valmistumisvuosi: 2008
Työn ohjaaja: Sirkku Aaltonen ja Jukka Tiusanen

TIIVISTELMÄ:

Lastenkirjallisuuden arvostus ei ole koskaan ollut samalla tasolla kuin aikuisille suunnatun kirjallisuuden arvostus, lukuun ottamatta muutamia poikkeuksia kuten Carrollin Liisa ihmemaassa. Sama arvostuksen puute on ollut ongelmana myös lastenkirjallisuuden käännöksessä ja sen kääntämiseen onkin suhtauduttu usein ylimalkaisesti tai alentuvasti. Lastenkirjallisuutta kääntäessä kääntäjällä on ollut suurempi vapaus tehdä muutoksia kuin muuta kirjallisuutta käännettäessä. Muutoksia on tehty siten, että teoksen vieras alkuperä on kadonnut ja se on saatu vaikuttamaan alun perin suomalaiselta, teoksia on siis kotoutettu Suomeen.

Surkeiden sattumusten sarja on amerikkalainen lastenkirjasarja, joka on ilmestynyt vuosina 1999—2006 ja se on käännetty suomeksi. Kirjoissa käytetty kieli on tyyliltään hyvin persoonallista, se sisältää paljon sanaleikkejä, viittauksia ja nokkeluuksia. Tässä pro gradu-tutkielmassa tutkittiin kolmea eri piirrettä, jotka ovat tyypillisiä Surkeiden sattumusten sarjalle, ja sitä miten ne piirteet on käännetty suomeen. Tutkitut piirteet ovat sanaston selitykset, sanaleikki ja nonsense-ilmaisut. Materiaalina olivat sarjan kaksi ensimmäistä kirjaa.

Teoria, jota käännöksen tutkimiseen sovellettiin oli James S. Holmesin ajatukset käännöksen kotouttamisesta ja vieraannuttamisesta. Käännös voidaan tehdä joko siten, että se kotoutetaan kohde kulttuuriin ja sen vierasperäisyys eliminoidaan tai siten, että käännös vieraannutetaan eli sen vieras alkuperä säilytetään. Lastenkirjallisuudessa ensin mainittu on perinteisesti ollut vallitseva tapa kääntää.

Koska Surkeiden sattumusten sarja on niin uusi kirjasarja lähdettiin siitä olettanuksesta, että sen käännöksessä ei ole ollut yhtä suurta tarvetta kotouttavalle käännökselle kuin aiempina vuosikymmeninä on ollut. Nykyajan lasten vieraiden kulttuurien tuntemus on huomattavasti parempi kuin aikaisemmin on ollut. Tutkimuksessa kävi ilmi, että sanaston selitysten ja sanaleikkien käännöksessä kotouttaminen oli ollut minimaalista kun taas nonsense-ilmausten käännöksessä se oli suositumpi käännösstrategia. Yleisesti ottaen kotouttaminen ei kuitenkaan ollut vallitseva käännöstapa.

AVAINSANAT: children’s literature, wordplay, nonsense

1 INTRODUCTION

Traditionally children's literature has not been much valued by researchers and other scholars. Until the last few decades it has been regarded as an inferior, second-rate, branch of literature. Children's books have been seen to have lower standards than adult literature, the few exceptions being the so-called canonized children's books such as Lewis Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland* and Richard Adams's *Watership Down* (Nikolajeva 1997:7-8, 21). However, the appreciation of children's literature has increased in the recent years. A reason for this may be the vast popularity and media coverage achieved by children's literature such as the *Harry Potter* books by J.K. Rowling. *A Series of Unfortunate Events* (which will be from now on abbreviated to *SUE*) is also a series of children's books that has benefited from the increasing interest that adults and children have towards literature. In addition to being popular children's books, the *SUE* books have stylistic features that are fairly unique to their use of language, which makes them an interesting target for study.

Children's literature is different from adult literature. It has a different audience whose opinion about the literature produced to them is not easy to take into account. It is an audience that does not have complete freedom to read whatever they desire; it is an audience controlled by adults; parents, teachers, publishers and governments. What children are allowed to read and what they want to read is defined by others. Children's literature balances between many goals being set for it; it functions as a vehicle for educational, religious and moral purposes and the teaching of literacy (Lathey 2006:6). The notion of what is suitable for children to read has changed over the centuries. For example in the Victorian era children's literature was sometimes highly moralizing. Culture also has an impact on what is proper children's reading; which can be seen in the way children's books are translated from one culture to another. (Lathey 2006: 6—7.)

Since children's books are different from adult literature, then it is quite logical to assume that translating children's literature is also different from translating adult

literature. Some scholars support this notion and others do not. Some see translating to children as being no different from translating to adults whereas some see a considerable difference there. According to Gillian Lathey translating children's literature is different from translating adult literature in two fundamental ways:

> Firstly, there is the social position of children and the resulting status of literature written for them, and, secondly, the developmental aspects of childhood that determine the unique qualities of successful writing for children and that make translating for them an imaginative, challenging and frequently underestimated task (Lathey 2006:4)
> .

So the undervaluation of children's literature and the many imaginative features it possesses more than adult literature make translating it especially challenging. Göte Klingberg and Riitta Oittinen belong to the scholars that support the previous notion. The present study also supports the view of translating children's literature being different from translating adult literature.

The present study sets out to determine what kind of translation strategies have been used in translating, three stylistic features that are specific to *SUE* stories, from English to Finnish. The material consist of the two first books of the series and their Finnish translations, the books will be presented in more detail in chapter 1.1 and the stylistic features in chapter 2. The aim of this study is to find out whether the translation strategy has been naturalizing, having emphasis on re-creation, or exoticizing, with emphasis on retention. Re-creation and retention are ideas presented by James Holmes. Re-creation means that the translation is changed so that it feels like it is original to the target culture. That is the culture of the language to which the text is being translated to. Retention means that the translation reveals the foreign origin of the text, it is not altered so that the foreign origin is lost. The translation respects the source culture, which is the culture of the original text. Retention and re-creation will be discussed in more detail in chapter 1.4. Traditionally the tendency of translating children's literature has been to naturalize children's literature, to make them feel more like a part of the target culture's own literature. This claim is quite strongly supported by a study, made by Riitta Oittinen, of the three different translations of *Alice in the Wonderland* into Finnish at different times; the first being from the early 20th century and the last from

1990s (Oittinen 1997). Historically translators have treated children's literature in an indifferent way, making changes that would not as likely be made in translations for adults (Lathey 2006: 8). The question to be answered by this study is whether naturalization, which is the traditional translation strategy in translating children's literature, or exoticizing, which is an ever more common translation strategy in all literature these days, is the translation strategy used in the translation of three specific stylistic features of the *SUE* stories. Since the *SUE* stories are contemporary books it is fairly likely that there is not as much of a need to naturalize them, as there has been in the past. Children of today are more familiar with foreign cultures and languages from an increasingly young age. Internationality is an important part of children's education, children are also exposed to foreign languages and cultures through television and the internet. Also in Finland the proportion of translations of published children's literature is substantial so the readers should be, at least to some extent, used to foreign influences (Puurtinen 2001: 90).

The material of this study consists of the first and second book of *A Series of Unfortunate Events* written by Lemony Snicket (Daniel Handler). The books are *The Bad Beginning* written in 1999 and translated into Finnish as *Ankea Alku* [The Bleak Beginning] in 2003 by Mika Ojakangas, and *The Reptile Room*, also written in 1999 and translated as *Käärmekammi*o [The Snake Chamber] into Finnish in 2003 by Ulla Lempinen. They were chosen as the material because some of the stylistic features of the books can be a challenge to a translator. What exactly are being studied are three stylistic features that are very characteristic to the *SUE* books. The features are wordplay, lexical explications and nonsense utterances. By wordplay is meant many different types of language play, mostly language that is somehow amusing and witty. Lexical explications are a feature that is very specific to the *SUE* books, they are explanations of words and phrases given by either by some of the characters or by the narrator. Nonsense utterances are parts of the youngest character's dialogue The features will be discussed in more detail in chapters 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3. All the cases of these features will be identified from the text, they will be categorized accordingly, analysed and discussed.

Wordplay can be an important stylistic feature in many types of text. It is always a challenge to the translator translate wordplay regardless of the type of the text. There is even debate if it is at all possible to translate wordplay. Some previous studies that have been made on translating wordplay, have concluded that though it is challenging, it is also possible. Annina Ojala (2006) has studied the translation of wordplay in *Mutts*-comics. In her study she found out that the most common translation strategy in translating wordplay was to translate it as wordplay, whereas omitting wordplay or replacing it with a rhetoric device was not very common. As Ojala, also Maarit Koponen (2004) has studied wordplay in comics. The study was about the translation of wordplay in *Donald Duck* comics. The study included translations made in the 1950s, 70s and 90s. Koponen found out that wordplay had become an increasingly important part of the comics and their translations during the decades, so much that there were actually many added cases of wordplay in the newer translations. Marja-Liisa Tiusanen (1996) has studied the translation of wordplay in *Alice in the Wonderland*. This study showed that even though wordplay cases in English and Finnish seemed quite similar, they in fact were not. Same kinds of wordplay were used in both languages but the actual jokes were seldom based on similar items. Tatja Kemppainen (2005) has studied the translation of wordplay in Terry Pratchett's *Wyrd Sisters* and *Reaper Man*. The material of the study contained several different types of wordplay and she used an application of Delabastita's methodology of categorizing the translation strategies. She found out that surprisingly many cases of wordplay of the original were omitted in the translation. Riitta Oittinen (1997) has also studied wordplay in the *Alice* books and its three translations into Finnish. She found out that there was a noticeable difference in the way the three translators translated wordplay. Most strikingly different from the original being Kirsi Kunnas and Eeva-Liisa Manner's translation from 1974, because Kunnas's emphasis is on being more loyal to the readers i.e. children than the form of the original.

On the basis of the previous studies on wordplay, it is possible to draw the conclusion that translating wordplay is possible, but there are many ways of doing it. One can try to

stay very faithful to the original, or one can choose to be more creative, of course, depending on the type of the text. For example translating wordplay in comics is challenging because the text and the picture work together, and the content of the picture has an effect on the choices one has in the translation. Also locating wordplay can be challenging, not all cases are clear. This was one of the reasons why so many wordplay cases had not been translated in Kemppainen's (2005) material. Terry Pratchett's parodistic fantasy books are known for having a lot of wordplay in them; wordplay that are very hard to notice if you are not familiar with the genre or the literary works that are being parodied. Wordplay can be translated with wordplay, or by omitting the wordplay, or by using some other device, just to mention some translation strategies that have been used in translating wordplay.

Nonsense has been studied by Mirva Saukkola (1997, 2001) in her two books based on her licentiate work. She focuses on the British tradition of children's and nonsense literature of the Victorian era and its effects on Finnish children's literature. She concludes for example that Carroll's *Alice* books have had an important impact on Finnish children's literature and especially the nonsense elements in it. Tove Jansson, Kirsi Kunnas, Oiva Paloheimo and Marjatta Kurenniemi belong to writers whose works have been influenced by Carroll. She makes a point about Kirsi Kunnas's poems often having new created words in them, a characteristic which is very typical to nonsense (Saukkola 2001: 153). Wim Tigges (1988) has also studied nonsense comprehensively. He talks about literary nonsense, and sees nonsense as more than just a device; he sees it as a genre. His concept of nonsense reaches much further than the simple nonsense expressions that are part of the present study. Saukkola's research points out that there are many kinds of nonsense and that nonsense is a common characteristic of children's literature, like it is in the *SUE* books.

1.1 A Series of Unfortunate Events

A Series of Unfortunate Events consists of thirteen books. The first part of the originally American series was published in 1999 and the last one of them, appropriately called *The End*, was published in 2006. The books have been very popular in the US, topping sales charts when ever a new book was published. The books have succeeded well on bestseller lists of *The New York Times* and *Wall Street Journal*, where they compete with adult literature; and the series has been translated into 32 languages (Finanz Nachrichten 2004). All thirteen books have been translated into Finnish. A Hollywood film, directed by Brad Silberling and starring Jim Carrey as Count Olaf, has also been made in 2004 based on the first three books of the series (IMDb.com).

A Series of Unfortunate Events has been written by Daniel Handler under the pseudonym of Lemony Snicket. He has written three adult books under his own name but he is best known for the *SUE* books (Robinson 2005). Lemony Snicket is the narrator of the books and according to him: "I made a solemn vow to research and summarize the entire Baudelaire case, and no amount of misery, horror, shame or tedium can dissuade me (Robinson 2005)". The narrator is also one of the characters in the books, so the pseudonym personality has been thoroughly developed. Handler has even given interviews as Snicket. The gloomy and mysterious tone of the books is also present in the interviews.

The series tells about the Baudelaire siblings Violet, Klaus and Sunny. At the beginning of the first book the children become orphans when their parents die in a fire. They are left with a big fortune which they will receive when Violet becomes of age. An old friend of their parents, Mr. Poe, is set to take care of the fortune; he also decides where the children should live. The orphans are placed in the care of a distant relative called Count Olaf, who turns out to be an evil man whose greatest ambition is to get hold of the Baudelaire fortune. During the series the children are placed in the custody of numerous caretakers but somehow Count Olaf always manages to find them. Every time he has a plan how to get his hands on their fortune. The children always have to be

smarter than the adults in the books and save themselves because the adults are always fooled by Count Olaf's disguises.

All the children have a special characteristic. The eldest of the children, the fourteen-year-old Violet, is an inventor. She is good with machines and mechanics, and she likes to invent all sorts of gadgets, some of which help them in tight spots. The middle one, the twelve-year-old Klaus, likes to read. He remembers almost everything he has ever read and can use his knowledge in solving problems. The youngest of the siblings is Sunny, who is still just a baby. Sunny has incredibly sharp teeth and she likes to bite things. She also speaks in one or two word nonsense utterance that only her siblings can understand.

The *SUE* books are children's books, but they have been written also keeping in mind adults who might read the books to their children or with their children. The narration style of the books is very distinct, which is something one notices as soon as one starts reading the books. The writer uses formal language for example by addressing the reader as "dear reader", he explains words or phrases that he thinks the reader might have difficulty understanding, very often he explains something that could be interpreted in two different ways. He makes intrusive comments here and there, often to a hilarious effect, like in *The Reptile Room* where Violet is making a lock pick from a socket of a lamp:

> We all know, of course, that we should never , ever, ever, ever, ever --- (there is a full page of "evers", altogether 209), *ever* fiddle around in any way with electric devices. *Never*. There are two reasons for this. One is that you can get electrocuted, which is not only deadly but very unpleasant, and the other is that you are not Violet Baudelaire, one of the few people in the world who know how to handle such things. (Snicket 1999b: 153—155.)

In the above example the narrator makes clear his opinion about the dangers of playing with electric devices. Though this is not one of the lexical explications that are so prominent in the books, one can see the patronizing attitude that the narrator, and also other grown up characters in the books adopt towards children. Wordplay and other kinds of linguistic wit have quite a big role in the *SUE* books. Handler comments in an

interview on the large amount of linguistic wit and references to other literature that the *SUE* books have:

> The thing with the literary references and other in-jokes is that some young people get them and some old people get them, and some young people don't and some old people don't, so I'm always loath to make generalizations about what is for children and what isn't. Certainly children's literature as a genre has some restrictions, so certain things will never pop up in a Snicket book. --- I'm happy that adults are reading them as well as children. But I think there are probably just as many adults who would miss the *humor* of these books, if not more, as there are children. (Robinson 2005)

Handler also tells that he has no experience of writing to children before he started writing the series after being encouraged by a publisher, but he had written to adults before, so that probably has had its effect on the peculiar style of the books.

The series parodies gothic novels that are known for their mysteriousness and gloominess. The gothic novel is defined as a literary genre where the prevalent features are doom, decay and mystery, the supernatural (The University of Adelaide Library 2006). The books could be called pseudo gothic novels. In all of the books the writer emphasizes how dreadful, worrying and sad the destiny of the Baudelaire children is, although at least an adult reader will realise that the style of the writer is exaggerated. The books are filled with allusions to gothic writers for example Edgar Allen Poe, Virginia Woolf and Charles Baudelaire and writers of other genres as well.

The stylistic peculiarity of the *SUE* books is not restricted to their language but the books as objects are thoroughly matched to the style that the books parody. Covers of the books are charming; they imitate an old ornamental style. The covers are beige but the back of the book is of another colour, each book has their own colour, for example *The Bad Beginning* is navy blue and *The Reptile Room* is auburn. The inside of the cover is decorated with an ornamental, old fashioned print and there is an ex-libris. The books have been illustrated by Brett Helquist. His illustrations are skilled and detailed cross-hatched pencil renderings. He has produced all the covers and illustrations inside the books. Since the *SUE* books are not intended for the smallest children, there are not that many illustrations. In addition to the cover of the book there

are some full page illustrations in book and then other small illustrations at the beginning of each chapter. The illustrations depict the events of the chapter but they do not affect the text or its translation like illustrations in children's books often do.

Nonsense appears in the *SUE* stories not only in the nonsense utterances of one of the characters but also in the logic of many of the adult characters. As an example of this logic can be used the logic by which the children are placed in the care of their distant relative Count Olaf. Mr. Poe, the children's executor, rationalises it as follows:

> "I have made arrangements," he said finally, "for you to be raised by a distant relative of yours who lives on the other side of town. His name is Count Olaf." ---
> "Your parents' will," Mr. Poe said, "instructs that you be raised in the most convenient way possible. Here in the city, you'll be used to your surroundings, and this Count Olaf is the only relative who lives within the urban limits."
> Klaus thought this over for a minute as he swallowed a chewy bit of bean. "But our parents never mentioned Count Olaf to us. Just how is he related to us, exactly?"---
> "He is either a third cousin four times removed, or a fourth cousin three times removed. He is not your closest relative on the family tree, but he is the closest geographically. That's why –" (Snicket 1999: 14—15.)

For a normal person it is obvious that there is no sense in placing the children in care of Count Olaf merely because he happens to live closest to where the children used to live, but that is not the case with Mr. Poe. The reader feels the same kind of confusion as Alice felt at the Mad Hatter's tea party in Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. The universe of the books has a logic all of its own, that goes against the logic of the real world. This naturally creates humorous effects that amuse both child and adult readers as well.

1.2 Children's Literature

Since the books being studied are meant for children as their main audience it is necessary to define what is children's literature and who is a child. Also since the view presented in this study is that translating children's literature is special and different

from translating adult literature, background on translating to children is given in this chapter

It is hard to define what is children's literature and who is a child because they are both such vague concepts, and it often depends on the context what is meant by a child or children's literature. First, Oittinen's definition of children's literature is: "I see children's literature as literature read silently by children and aloud to children" (Oittinen 1993: 3). That is quite a broad definition and it does not take into account the fact that not everything read by children or for children can be seen as children's literature. Children can read Tolstoy but one would not call it children's literature on the basis of that. Nikolajeva has also made this observation and points out that there is a difference between children's literature and children's reading. Not everything read by children is children's literature and not everything written about children is children's literature. Nikolajeva concludes that "as a working definition we must therefore accept children's literature as literature written, published, marketed and treated by specialists with children as its primary target" (Nikolajeva 1997: 9). When features of both definitions are combined the concept of what is children's literature is defined fairly well. It is literature written, published and marketed to children; and it is also literature read by children and for children.

There are problems also in defining who is a child. Nikolajeva states that: "By children we mean people between 0 and 18 years" (Nikolajeva 1997: 9). Nikolajeva's definition of children is a very broad one. Lathey reminds that it is adults who define the boundaries of childhood. She also makes the point that:

> Childhood, since it was first designated as a discrete phase of life, has always been a flexible period that is adjusted to meet economic necessity. In the global market of the early 21st century, concepts of childhood depend increasingly on the initiatives of the fashion, games and toy industries, and marketing strategies divide childhood into phases: the 'pre-schooler', the 'pre-teen', the 'adolescent', the 'young adult' and so on. (Lathey 2006: 5.)

Some centuries ago childhood was not even seen as a separate phase of life. Children were even dressed like small adults. Being a child or being an adult is not a sudden

change but a gradual one, and that has to be taken into account in defining who is a child, that is why people have come up with concepts listed in the above quote. A thirteen-year-old is a child but a very different kind of child than a six-year-old. And in the eyes of law a person who is under 18 years old is a child who does not have the same rights and responsibilities as an adult has. So reaching a clear definition of who is a child is not simple. A child is a fluid concept that needs to be defined according to the needs of the situation.

The boundary between children's literature and adult literature is not a clear one. Books that were originally meant for children like *Alice in Wonderland*, have found their way to adult literature and vice versa like Swift's *Gulliver's travels*, which was originally meant for adults but has found its way to children's literature through many abridgements and adaptations (Shavit 2006). O'Connell (2006: 17—18) gives four focal characteristics of children's literature as a genre. The first characteristic is that children's books address actually two audiences: children, who want to be entertained and maybe learn something, and adults, who have heir own ideas about what literature should be like. O'Connell refers to Puurtinen who points out that adults are the group that clearly is the more influential one of the two. It is adults who decide what is written and what is published. Secondly, she points out that many children's books are ambivalent texts which children can read on a literal level and which adults can read on a more satirical or sophisticated level. This second characteristic can easily be detected to be true about *A Series of Unfortunate Events*. The third characteristic is that children's literature is not written by members of the group that the books are directed to but, of course, by adults. O'Connell criticizes the fact that some children's authors write more to please the parents, critics and teachers than the child readers. As the final characteristic O'Connell quotes Puurtinen who sees children's literature as an unusual genre because it belongs at the same time to the literary system and the social-educational system. This means that it is not read only for entertainment and literary experience but it is also used as a means for education and socialization. The characteristics O'Connell lists emphasize the differences of adult and children's literature and make it a little clearer what is so special about children's literature. The

characteristics acknowledge the fact that in some cases the distinction can be obscure, and works that are considered children's literature can have a level that adults enjoy.

As it was concluded the concept "child" covers a wide range of ages from zero to 18 years of age. Different stages between those ages have various names like "toddler", "pre-schooler", "pre-teen" and so on. On this basis it is clear that the child's age has an impact on what he reads or what is read to him, and what is the content of the books he is exposed to. The child's age has an effect on both the language of the books as well as on the themes of the books. A child's first book is most likely a picture book with no or little text. Gradually the amount of text increases and the books start to have some kind of a plot. The themes often have something to do with the everyday life of a child like going to the kindergarten, playing with your friends and learning new skills. At this stage the language and sentence structure of the books is still fairly simple but they become more complex over time. Nursery rhymes and sing-song books are also popular among small children. The themes that children's books deal with are various. But there are a number of taboos that have traditionally been shunned. Maria Fernández López (2006: 41) quotes Ann Scott MacLeod's list of taboos that have been avoided in American children's literature, yet the list applies to children's literature all over the world. Violence can be presented in a story only if the writer does not allow it to breed more violence; children do not die unless they are martyrs or heroes. The death of parents happens before the beginning of the story. Themes like divorce, alcoholism, mental illnesses, suicide and sex are avoided. Murder is uncommon, but thieves are allowed; there are no racial conflicts or they are only referred to in passing, and the story has a happy ending. The *SUE* books break more than one of these taboos. There is murder in many of the books, their parents die as do several of their guardians, and there is never a happy ending.

Censorship of children's literature has always existed. The previous paragraph listed themes that have been avoided in children's literature. However, López points out that the criteria for censorship of children's literature has changed over the years. Children's literature can include sex, vulgar language and liberal views nowadays, racism and

socio-political incorrectness are things that are censored in the 21st century (López 2006: 42). Adults' views of what is suitable for children to read do not always concur with each other. A good example of this is the *Harry Potter* series by J.K. Rowling which is the world's most popular series of children's books at the moment. The books have been criticised by several religious groups, parents and teachers all around the globe for promoting unchristian values and supporting witchcraft. The series is seventh on the American Library Association's (ALA) "The 100 Most Frequently Challenged Books of 1990-2000" list (ALA 2007). The impressive sales numbers of the *Harry Potter* books seem to support the notion that majority of people believe that the books are a positive phenomenon because they encourage children to read nowadays when reading books has got more competition from computers, video games and television than ever. For example a well-known American author Judy Blume defends the *Potter* books in her column published in the *New York Times* in 1999. She points out that there have always been people who have wanted to ban books for several reasons and that the people who want to ban *Harry Potter* are just carrying on this tradition. Blume herself has five of her books on the ALA's list of most challenged books.

From the time that children's literature arose as an independent branch of literature, it has been used as a way of teaching children. It has been used in teaching children values, religion, and literacy. Children's literature is very seldom free of any kind of pedagogic purpose. Both Nikolajeva and Oittinen recognize the pedagogic nature of children's literature. In Nikolajeva opinion the most important difference between criticism of main stream and children's literature is that whereas mainstream literature has been studied in relation to the history of ideas, philosophy and aesthetics, children's literature has been related to education. Books have been classified as 'unsuitable' or 'not good' for children. (Nikolajeva 1997: 7.) Also Oittinen points out that:

> Ever since childhood was "discovered," in Europe in the 17th and 18th centuries, pedagogy has been the main purpose of children's books. This is demonstrated in the way children are depicted in the stories and in the way they are addressed as the implicit readers of the text (Oittinen 1993: 100.)

This supports the common notion that children should learn many things from the books that they read. Specialists of children's literature do not agree on the pedagogic function of children's literature, some are of the opinion that there should be a pedagogic function, others are of the opinion that there should not be one. Oittinen (2000) presents these differing opinions; Lennart Hellsing is of the opinion that children's literature should not be pedagogic, still he admits that children's literature can teach children language, understanding of time and place and social orientation. In Møhl and Shack's view children's literature should be both entertaining and didactic, informative, therapeutic and it should help a child's growth and development. Children's literature should also develop the child's feelings of empathy. Oittinen also presents Tabbert's opinion which is that children's literature is divided into two functions and categories: they are didactic and creative. He thinks that a reader can read creative text in his own way, but this does not apply to didactic texts. When reading didactic texts the reader simply adopts lessons and morals, whereas when reading a creative text the reader has to fill in gaps of the text, think outside the box. Oittinen makes a point about the pedagogic goals of children's literature often having a smothering effect on the reading experience. Emphasising the pedagogic goal takes all the fun out of it. (Oittinen 2000: 65—67.) The pedagogic function of children's literature clearly evokes many kinds of opinions. Some think that it is a good thing, others disagree, but there is no denying that pedagogy is an inseparable part of children's literature.

Children's literature has always been undervalued. It has not received the same valuation as more prestigious types of literature. O'Connell confirms the notion that children's literature is not appreciated in the same way as adult literature is:

> the public critical perception seems to be that works of children's literature , with a few notable and usually time-honoured exceptions, do not really deserve to be called 'literature' at all, and are generally somehow second-rate and functional rather than of high quality, creative and deserving of critical attention in the way that serious adult literature clearly is (O'Connell 2006:16).

This has been the traditional part of children's literature for as long as it has existed as an independent branch of literature. Very much like other new literatures e.g. women's literature, children's literature has been regarded, at worst, as peripheral, and, at best, as

not truly central in a cultural system. Children's books are often criticized for being very formulaic and stereotypical. They are seen as contributing nothing or very little new to literature. The repeated similarities in structure, language and characters in children's books have deemed children's literature as being inferior to other types of literature. (O'Connell 2006: 18—19.)

On the basis of this chapter, definitions of who is a child and what is children's literature, the *SUE* books can be classified as children's literature. They are promoted and advertised as children's literature in bookstores and on websites by both their American and Finnish publishers. In the US the books are published by HarperCollins and by WSOY in Finland. In Finnish libraries they can be found either in the section for children's books or in the section for teenagers. The *SUE* books are not the most usual children's books since they deal with topics not usually employed in children's books. There is death and murder, always an unhappy ending and the main characters' happiness never lasts for long. They are not targeted for very small children but for children between the ages of 9 and 14. The educational nature of children's literature can be noticed in the *SUE* books, probably most clearly in the form of the lexical explications. However, the lexical explications can also be seen as a parody of the educational function that children's literature is supposed to have. The explications are there as much to create humour as they are to serve a pedagogical function. When reading the *SUE* books one can sense an ironic and parodying undertone that the child readers might miss. The Baudelaire children also are the most well-behaved children in the first few books of the series even though they are treated very badly sometimes. If they break the rules that they are expected to follow they feel really bad about it. But as the series goes on they realise that they have to bend the rules to survive. Even then they always justify breaking the rules very well; usually they have no other option. The extremely well-behaved children can be seen as a parody of the norm that child characters in children's books are supposed to set a good example for the child reader.

1.3 Translating Children's Literature

Translating children's literature can be seen as being no different from translating adult literature but many esteemed scholars of children's literature and its translation agree that translating children's literature is special. Translating children's literature has several problems that translating adult literature does not have. Naturally, translating children's literature is affected by the translator's conventions and ideologies as is translation of adult literature but there are many aspects that have to be taken into consideration in translating children's literature that are not as relevant when translating for adults. When translating children's literature the translator has to balance between many different expectations. The translator has to take into consideration the original writer of the book, he has to be able to retain the original author's style in another language; he also has to take into account the child reader and his sometimes very limited knowledge of the world. The translator also has to take into consideration what is considered proper by the adults of the target language and culture.

Like any translator, the translator of children's literature is keenly aware of the fact that translating is a balancing act between faithfulness to the original and the intelligibility of the translation. Translation is not only translation from one language to another but from one culture, source culture, to another, the target culture. Cultural norms of what is appropriate, especially for children, vary a lot. Stolt (2006) gives a good example of this when a pile of dung in one of Astrid Lindgren's Emil stories has been replaced with a pile of leaves in the American version. Time is also a factor here, other things are considered 'not good' for children nowadays than fifty years ago. Back then for example characters that could be understood as gay were omitted or modified to not being homosexual whereas nowadays children are encouraged to accept diversity, for example being homosexual.

Translators of children's literature have to be aware of the fact that child readers cannot be expected to have acquired extensive knowledge of other cultures, languages and geography as adult readers have. Lathey points out that since footnotes do not work as a solution to this problem in children's literature, localization is an often used but

contentious strategy in children's texts. She says that Klingberg's concept 'cultural context adaptation' has been adopted as an umbrella term for a vast selection of strategies that move the original text closer to the target text child. (Lathey 2006: 7.) Klingberg (1986) introduces the concept 'degree of adaptation' to show how much a text has been adapted to meet the needs of the child reader. He also recognizes the problem that children do not have as good a knowledge of the culture of the original book as adults do. So when translated very faithfully a book can become too difficult to understand or less interesting to the readers of the translation than the original to its readers. (Klingberg 1986: 11-12.) Klingberg is of the opinion that adaptation should be restricted to details, there should be as little manipulation of the original as possible (Klingberg 1986: 17).

Translating children's literature differs from translating adult literature also in the respect that the translator of children's literature has more freedom. Shavit (2006) supports this claim. According to her, the translator of children's literature can have more liberties in his work because of children's literature's peripheral position in the literary system. The translator is allowed to manipulate the text in many different ways, for example by changing, enlarging, abridging it or by deleting or adding to it. However, all the modification is allowed only if the translator follows two principles that govern the translation of children's literature. Firstly, an adjustment of the text is permitted when it makes the text useful and appropriate to the child, according to what is seen in the society as educationally good for the child. Secondly, adjustment of the plot, characterization and language to meet the idea of the prevailing society of the child's ability to read and understand is acceptable. (Shavit 2006: 26.) Puurtinen also confirms that in children's literature the translation norms usually permit more manipulation of the original than in translating adult literature. This is because in children's books the emphasis is often on understandability and appropriateness (pedagogic and ideological). Children's literature has conflicting translation norms, readability and educational norms can contradict one another. On one other hand the readability of texts that are meant for children is emhasized, on the other we want to teach children new, even difficult words and sentence structures through literature.

(Puurtinen 2001: 82—83.) Balancing between these different expectations makes translating children's literature a real challenge.

Historically translators have treated children's literature in an uncaring way. They have made changes that are very unlikely to take place in translating adult literature. (Lathey 2006: 8.) Of course, not all changes made by translators in the past are examples of not caring but they are merely the result of the period's translation norms. A study by Riitta Oittinen (1997) illustrates well how children's literature has been translated in a more localizing way not too long ago. She studied three different translations, all from very different times, of Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland* into Finnish and concluded that translation strategies of children's literature have changed over the years. In her study she found out that the way of translating has moved from a strongly domesticating translation to translation that could be described as foreignizing. Anni Swan's translation from 1906 has been domesticated by eliminating cultural allusions and by replacing foreign items with domestic ones for example by changing the names of places and persons. In the latest translation by Alice Martin in 1995 domestication is minimal, for example the name of the main character has been retained in the original form for the first time. Kirsi Kunnas and Eeva-Liisa Manner's translation from the year 1972 is probably the most different from all the others because as a translator Kunnas likes to be faithful to the audience i.e. to children. In Kunnas's view it is important how a translation works in the target language in the hands of a target language reader. Her translations are quite free and she pays special attention to what the text is going to sound like when read aloud. (Oittinen 1997.) In a study of the Finnish translation of Grahame's *The Wind in the Willows* Irma Hagfors (2001) has made the same observation as Oittinen that translating children's literature used to be more domesticating than it is nowadays. *The Wind in the Willows* was translated in 1949 and most culture specific items in it were domesticated by replacing them with a Finnish equivalent or a less specific term. According to Hagfors the norms of translated children's literature in Finland were different then and translated children's books were domesticated to make them a part of Finnish children's literature. Another reason for

domesticating children's literature was that people's, both the translators' and readers'; knowledge of foreign cultures was not as good as it is today. (Hagfors 2001.)

1.4 Retention and Re-creation

One of the most basic concepts of translation is 'equivalence'. It has many different names depending on the theory or school of translation. It can be called "faithfulness", "adequacy", "correctness" among others. It is used to describe how well the translation corresponds with the original, it is also often used as an indicator of how 'good' a translation is. Equivalence is a concept that has always interested translation scholars and created debate. One scholar to take part in this debate is Andrew Chesterman. He writes about memes of translation; a meme is "a unit of cultural transmission, or a unit of imitation (Chesterman 1997: 5)." Chesterman introduces five translation supermemes, he includes equivalence as one of them. Equivalence can be divided into numerous subtypes, one of them is Nida's division of equivalence into formal and dynamic equivalence. Formal equivalence focuses on the message; it aims for the same form and meaning as the original, whereas dynamic equivalence focuses on the reception of the message; it aims for the same effect as the original. Chesterman proceeds to conclude that all translations are equivalent on some level, and instead of lingering on the matter of equivalence people can focus on the different relations that a translation and its source have. (Chesterman 1997: 7—8.)

The method used in analyzing the material of this study is James S. Holmes's theory about retention and re-creation. The stylistic features: wordplay, lexical explications and nonsense utterances; are analysed on the basis of the translation strategy either being retention or re-creation. Holmes writes about translating poetry but his theory is applicable to other genres of literature too. He presents three levels of problems that a translator can face: the linguistic context of the text, the literary intertext and the socio-cultural situation. The linguistic level means the specific language in which the translator expresses himself; the literary intertext means that a text is linked with other texts in the same literary tradition, finally the socio-cultural situation means that a text

exists in a socio-cultural situation, where objects, symbols, and abstract concepts work in a way that is never completely the same in another society or culture. He claims that when translating, a translator can make choices on the axis of "exoticizing" versus "naturalizing" and "historicizing" and "modernizing". Holmes says that theorists often argue that translation choices should be either all exoticizing and historicizing, emphasizing retention, or all naturalizing and modernizing, emphasizing re-creation. Emphasizing retention means that the translation is kept as similar to the original as possible while re-creation means that the translation can be more "creative" or "free". Holmes points out that in his experience translations that are clearly exoticizing and historicizing or naturalizing and modernizing rarely if ever exists. A translator uses retentive choices at some point and re-creative at another. (Holmes 1988: 47-48.) The present study sets out to find out whether retention or re-creation has been the more prevailing choice of translation strategy. Since the *SUE* books are contemporary works of literature and have been translated very soon after their original versions' appearance, the present study will concentrate only on the axis exoticizing versus naturalizing.

Holmes is not the only scholar who has identified translation strategies like "naturalizing" and "exoticizing". Other scholars have observed the same phenomenon as Holmes, they only have called it by another name. As early as 1813 Friedrich Schleiermacher argued that there were only two translation strategies. "Either the translator leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader towards him; or he leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author towards him" (cited in Venuti 1995:19-20). Venuti explains that Schleiermacher gave the translator a choice between a domesticating method and a foreignizing method. In the domesticating method the translated text is an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to match the target language's cultural values, whereas in the foreignizing method the translation is ethnodeviant and its linguistic and cultural difference as a foreign text is appreciated. So one can see that exoticizing and foreignizing are the same thing as are domesticating and naturalizing. Both Schleiermacher and Venuti strongly promote foreignization. Venuti sees foreignizing translation as a good way of resisting the cultural imperialism of the modern English-language world. While Venuti is a strong

supporter of foreignizing translation there are also those who prefer domesticating translation. Venuti (1995:21) cites Nida "A translation of dynamic equivalence aims at complete naturalness of expression". To Nida the good readability of the translation is more important than loyalty to the original. Nida's criteria of an accurate translation differ from those of Venuti. Nida wants the translation to produce an equivalent effect in the target culture as in the original whereas Venuti wants it to be clear to the reader that he is reading a translation. (Venuti 1995: 19—22.)

Venuti's preferences about the reader always being aware of that he is reading a translation is criticized by Gillian Lathey, in her view it would be very unlikely that it would be adopted to translating children's literature:

> His arguments that easy readability renders the translator invisible and is exploitative in 'putting the foreign to domestic uses' is a persuasive one in a number of historical instances, but it does not, of course, take account of the young inexperienced reader. (Lathey 2006: 11—12.)

Lathey's claim does have a firm basis in the history of translating children's literature, and though domesticating or naturalizing is still fairly common when translating for children, the trend is slowly changing. Children may not have all the knowledge that an adult has but as Astrid Lindgren has written:

> I believe that children have a marvellous ability to re-experience the most alien and distant things and circumstances, if a good translator is there to help them, and I believe that their imagination continues to build where the translator can go no further (cited in Stolt 2006: 69).

As long as children have their vivid imaginations, they will be alright even though the text would seem a little strange and foreign.

Retention and re-creation were chosen as the theory of this study after careful consideration. Other theories were also considered but it is not easy to find a theory that can be applied to all three features studied. They are all so different from each other. The writer did not want to have three separate theories: that would have made the different parts of the study seem too disconnected. This theory can also easily be adopted to meet different needs. As the standard of equivalence in defining what is retention and what re-creation the writer's personal judgement as a competent reader

was used. Translator's work is always a question of personal choices, the translator's liking and experience have an effect on the result. The same is true about the analysis of translation strategy. The language of children's literature is rich with wordplay and imagination. Retaining the richness of the language is of utmost importance. Retaining the lexical explications, wordplay and nonsense utterances is the most important criteria of equivalence in this study. The degree to which the three stylistic features had been retained or re-created could best be analysed with this theory.

2 LEXICAL EXPLICATIONS, WORDPLAY AND NONSENSE UTTERANCES

This chapter provides more information about the material of this study.

2.1 Lexical Explications

Of the three stylistic features studied lexical explications is the feature that is the probably most characteristic of the language of the *SUE* stories. There is about eighty of them already in the first two books that are only about 180 pages long each. They are about the average length that books for children between ages 10 and 14 are. The lexical items that are explicated can vary substantially. They can be single words of any word class or longer phrases such as idioms or sayings. They appear in all kinds of passages of the books, in dialogue, in general description, in carrying the story forward.

The lexical explications can either be given by one of the characters to another character or by the narrator to the reader. The lexical items being explicated are usually words or phrases that in the explainer's opinion can be hard for children (both children in the stories and actual children reading the books) to understand. Most often the explainer is one of the adult characters in the stories, such as the executor of the children's assets Mr. Poe, or Count Olaf, or the narrator of the stories (Lemony Snicket). Often the lexical items, being explained to the three main characters by another character, are not very hard words or phrases. In many cases the explaining adult character manages to make a fool of himself by underestimating the intelligence of the children. The lexical items explained by the narrator are more often truly such words or phrases that may require explanations. An example of an adult character explaining a word he considers difficult to the Baudelaire children is when Mr. Poe appears at Briny Beach at the first chapter of *The Bad Beginning*. He tells the children how their parents died:

> "Your parents," Mr.Poe said, "have perished in a terrible fire."---
> "'Perished,'" Mr. Poe said, "means 'killed.'"
> "We *know* what the word 'perished' means," Klaus said, crossly."
> (Snicket 1999:8.)

Mr. Poe feels that he has to clarify to the children what the less commonly used word 'to perish' means even though the children are aware of the word's meaning. An

example of the narrator explaining a word to the reader of the book can be found on the second page of *The Bad Beginning*:

> and occasionally their parents gave them permission to take a rickety trolley – the word "rickety," you probably know, here means "unsteady" or "likely to collapse" – alone to the seashore (Snicket 1999:2.)

In this example the clarification is not directed at the child characters of the stories but at the young readers of the stories. As an example of a longer phrase that the narrator explains the following phrase can be used: "they were of two minds, a phrase which here means "they felt two different ways at the same time." (Snicket 1999:133.) It is completely possible that a young reader of the *SUE* stories might not know exactly what 'being of two minds' means, so a clarification is in order. In the explications the explainer usually uses a more commonly used synonym for the 'difficult' word to explain it like 'to be killed' in explaining 'to perish'. The word or phrase can also be clarified in more words like it has been done in the other example above.

Not all the lexical explications are proper explanations or clarifications of a word or a phrase, there are also some pseudo-explications among them. In these cases the word or phrase is not explicated as in the previous examples with synonyms or more words but the item that is being explained results not being explained at all but for example the explainer veers off to something completely different like in the following example:

> "--- Do you three know what the word 'preempt' means?"
> "No," Violet said, "but –"
> "It means that I think this Stephano is going to steel my snake," Uncle Monty said. (Snicket 1999b:70.)

Uncle Monty begins to explain the word "pre-empt to the children but he is so much entwined in his own worries that he does not actually explain what the word means but proceeds to speak out his own suspicions.

Opinions about the lexical explications vary quite notably from one reader to another. Some readers appreciate the lexical explications whereas others are of the opinion that there are too many of them or that they are boring. These views can be detected from the comments the members 'mutta', 13-years old, and 'Henne-', 14-years old, have

posted on the '*Series of Unfortunate Events*' forum of a popular Finnish internet community called IRC-galleria:

> <mutta> ainoo huono juttu näis kirjois on, et siin selitetää ihan liian paljon vertauskuvia.. muuten nää on ihhania<3 [*the only bad thing about these books is that they explain way too many metaphors.. otherwise they are lolovely<3*]
> <Henne-> Vertauskuvien jaarittelu on toissalta ihan hyvä ,koska mulle ei ainkaan tulis monesti ees mieleen miettiä, kirjaa lukiessa, mitä vertauskuva tarkoittaa. [*rambling on about the metaphors is on the other hand quite good, because many times, when I'm reading the book, it wouldn't even cross my mind to think about what a metaphor means.*](http://irc-galleria.net/channel.php?channel_id=706328 2006)

The comments above confirm that even the young readers of the stories have noticed this quite specific stylistic feature. The comments reveal the ambiguous opinions that the readers have of this stylistic feature. They appear frequently in the books, even so frequently that they work against themselves but they also provoke young readers to think more carefully about what they are reading.

The origin of the lexical explications can lay in the native culture of the books i.e. the United States of America. This stylistic feature may have a greater importance in the original books and their original culture, where a large vocabulary is a sign of being well educated, than in Finland and Finnish. Of course, Finnish parents also want their children to have a vast vocabulary, but it is not emphasized as much as in USA. The introduction of new and difficult words in the written form also helps in developing a child's spelling skills. The arbitrary and historical spelling of the English is clearly more difficult than spelling Finnish. Finnish is one of the few languages that are spelled almost phonetically. The literacy in Finland is according to PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment, 2006) top rate whereas the United States rank only exactly above the average of the OECD (Organization for Economic co-operation and Development) countries. The reasons for this can be debated forever; the quality of schooling in the United States can be questioned but also the language's spelling may also have an effect. The importance of spelling has created a cultural phenomenon that is fairly unique to the English speaking North America i.e. spelling bees. Spelling competitions, such as the *Scripps National Spelling Bee* (www.spellingbee.com), are

highly appreciated. The finals are even televised and the winners get cash prizes and also scholarships to top universities. So in the USA there definitely is demand for books that help in developing the vocabulary of one's child. The lexical explications of the *SUE* stories contribute to this with all the lexical explications.

2.2 Wordplay

Wordplay is a common stylistic feature in both children's and adult literature. It is used to create humour, to amuse the reader and to make a text more interesting. In children's literature wordplay can be used to make the book more interesting to adults by including wordplay that works on more than one level. People have always enjoyed wordplay, in both speaking and writing. A good wordplay can make a dull day funnier, connect strangers and give intellectual stimulation. Wordplay can create the same kind of effects as nonsense, because it also uses language in a way that deviates from standard language. Wordplay is a term that has several different definitions depending on the people who are doing the defining. Definitions can vary from a very limited definition to a very broad one: e.g. *Collins Concise Dictionary* (1999: 1716) defines wordplay as "verbal wit based on the meaning of words; puns, repartee, etc." and Chiaro (1992: 5) defines wordplay as "the use of language with intent to amuse". These are quite broad definitions of wordplay; Dirk Delabastita gives another definition:

> Wordplay is the general name for the various *textual* phenomena in which *structural features* of the language(s) used are exploited in order to bring about a *communicatively significant confrontation* of two (or more) linguistic structures with *more or less similar forms* and *more or less different meanings*. (Delabastita 1996:128)

All of these definitions bring out the notion that wordplay is witty and based on using language in a peculiar way. There are so many different types of wordplay that it is hard to capture all of them into one definition. The types of wordplay found in the material of this study are various so it is necessary to have a broad definition of wordplay to be able to classify them all as wordplay. Both Chiaro's and Delabastita's definitions suit the

present study. Another commonly used term meaning wordplay is pun. The *OED* defines pun as:

> The use of a word in such a way as to suggest two or more meanings or different associations, or of two or more words of the same or nearly the same sound with different meanings, so as to produce a humorous effect; a play on words.

The terms pun and wordplay are synonyms. They can be used interchangeably and so they will be in the present study, although the term wordplay is used more frequently.

The basic ways that wordplays function are brought forward in the definitions of Delabastita and *OED*. Much of wordplay is based on having the possibility to interpret meanings in multiple ways. Almost all words have multiple meanings and they can be interpreted in many different ways, people like to amuse themselves and tease each other by twisting each others' words to mean something that was not intended by the speaker. Delabastita (1996:128-129) manages to clarify this opposition of similar form and different meanings well: "The pun contrasts linguistic structures with **different meanings** on the basis of their **formal similarity**." There are many kinds of formal similarity. The degree can vary from complete to partial similarity. There are four types of formal similarity. The first one is *homonymy*, in which the sound and spelling are identical. The second is *homophony*, where the sounds are identical but the spelling is different. Then there is *homography*, in which the spelling is the same but the sounds are different. Finally comes *paronymy* where there are small differences in both spelling and sound.

Wordplay can also be viewed from the point of their location in the text. It can be divided into vertical and horizontal wordplay. If the two formally similar linguistic structures occur in the same place in the text, then it is called vertical wordplay. On the other hand, if the similar linguistic structures follow each other in the text, then it is horizontal wordplay. In horizontal wordplay the components of the pun being near each other can be enough to make the wordplay work, whereas in vertical wordplay the other component is not materially there but it has to be triggered by something in the context. Like in an example of vertical wordplay "Come in for a faith lift" (Delabastita 1996:

128) is immediately associated in one's mind with cosmetic surgery just because the words "faith" and "face" sound very alike.

Although a large part of wordplay is based on the similarity of form and the difference in meaning; that is not the only way of creating wordplay. There are types of wordplay found in the material of the present study that cannot be fitted in the types that Delabastita has given, they form a good base for the theory but it is necessary to broaden the base and add more types to it. Also whether the wordplays are horizontal or vertical will not be analysed in this thesis.

One of the types of wordplay that can be found in the *SUE* stories is alliteration. Alliteration is defined in *Collins Concise Dictionary* as "the use of the same consonant (consonantal alliteration) or of a vowel (vocalic alliteration), at the beginning of each word or stressed syllable in a line of verse" for example "*Li*bby *li*ves in *Li*sbon". Alliteration is used avidly in verse, nursery rhymes, popular culture and children's literature. It is an effective way of getting the reader's attention and interest. The repetitive nature of alliteration makes it catchy and easy to remember. It is no wonder that so many characters in children's books and comics have alliterative names e.g. *Donald Duck*, *Mickey Mouse* and *Porky Pig*. Alliteration is often used for effect in headlines of newspaper articles and tabloids. Alliteration is also popular in the titles of books and films, for example the films *Bend it like Beckham* and *The Grass Grows Green* (IMDb 2008), also names of all the *SUE* books are alliteration e.g. *The Bad Beginning* and *The Grim Grotto*. The cases of alliteration in the material of this study are mostly names of fictional places and books like "Briny Beach" and "Inheritance Law and Its Implications". They create a humorous effect and amuse the reader, so fitting perfectly Chiaro's definition of wordplay being the use of language with intent to amuse.

Earlier the terms homophony, homography, homonymy and paronymy were introduced but they do not cover all the similarities of form. Polysemy or a polyseme is "a word or lexical unit that has several and multiple meanings" as defined by the *OED*. Several

scholars, including Chiaro, point out that there is a fine line between homonyms and polysemes. Polysemes have several related meanings where as homonyms are words that have the same spelling but unrelated meanings and origins (OED 2007). An example of polyseme is foot, as in "a dog hurt its foot" and "the forest at the foot of the hills". The meanings are related; in the first one 'foot' refers to the bottom part of a dog and in the latter it refers to the bottom part of hills, when one compares this to the homonym 'bank' which can be 'a ridge' or 'a place to keep your money', meanings that are in no way related, the difference becomes clearer. Polysemes can often be interpreted in several different ways, which is a good way to create humour. The meaning being not the first one that usually comes to mind when thinking of a word.

So far when talking about wordplay we have only covered wordplay that happens on one level, types of wordplay that are funny because a word is similar to another word, a word that has several different meanings or the word is just in one way or other witty or it rhymes with something, but there is more to wordplay than that. It can also be created by alluding to idioms, phrases, literature, popular culture, politics, music, movies etc. things and phenomena that are familiar to people. This kind of wordplay is called allusive wordplay. Leppihalme has studied the translation of allusive wordplay. She introduces the term 'frame' and explains that "it refers to a combination of words that is more or less fixed conventionally in the minds of a group of language users" (1996: 200). To these frames are included idioms, proverbs, catchphrases and allusions to many sources. We can create wordplay by shaping these frames for example by using lexical substitution, syntactic modification, reduction and addition. Sometimes a frame can be used to create wordplay even without modifying it, depending on context. An example of allusive wordplay by modifying the frame given by Leppihalme is "a small step for a man, a giant tumble for mankind". It refers to the first words said when man set foot on moon. Leppihalme explains that the function of allusive wordplay is to create co-operation between the reader and the author, to involve the reader somehow in a game of solving a puzzle. Leppihalme emphasises that allusive wordplay is highly culture-specific. Allusive wordplay is not only hard to translate because of the culture-specificity but it is also not easy to notice it. A translator can miss allusive wordplay

completely if he does not have comprehensive knowledge of the culture where the translation is coming from. Replacing the original source-culture allusive wordplay with an allusion to target-culture does not often work because many references have to be changed and passages rewritten making it all too complicated. (Leppihalme 1996: 199—218.)

2.3 Nonsense utterances

One of the areas of study in the present thesis are the nonsense utterances used in the *SUE* books by the youngest of the main characters, Sunny Baudelaire. These nonsense utterances are a very distinctive feature of the books, they appear frequently in them and they are an important characteristic of one of the main characters as well as the style of the books. The utterances appear as a part of normal dialogue and usually they are explained by the author or the character's siblings, who are the only people who can understand her. A humorous effect is achieved when Sunny's short one-or two-word utterances are explained to have a lot of information in them, for example at the first chapter of *The Bad Beginning* the children are on a beach and Sunny keeps on saying "Gack" which is explained by the author to probably mean "Look at that mysterious figure emerging from the fog." (Snicket 1999: 4).

Nonsense is a fairly recent phenomenon in literature. It originated in Britain in the Romantic and the Post-Romantic era, i.e. the 19th century in the works, which are considered its canon, of Edward Lear and Lewis Carroll's (Tigges 1988:2-3). But its use extends back to the works of Shakespeare and the stories collected by Brothers Grimm and other folklorists around Europe (Saukkola 1997: 35). The most prominent and well-known examples of nonsense literature, however, are Lewis Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland* and Edward Lear's *The Book of Nonsense*. Carroll's *Alice*-books, written during the Victorian period, can be seen as the pioneers of nonsense; they gave the genre the form that it is known for and in which it has been applied ever since. (Saukkola 1997: 39.)

Nonsense is a broad concept which is the reason why scholars and researchers have always had trouble creating a definition for it. Tigges defines nonsense as:

> a genre of narrative literature which balances a multiplicity of meaning with a simultaneous absence of meaning. This balance is affected by playing with the rules of language, logic, prosody and representation, or a combination of these. (1988: 47.)

Nonsense is about using language in an unusual way; a way that we are not used to, it creates surprises and tampers against the logic that we are familiar with. Often it is a combination of more than one nonsensical element. The presented view of nonsense is a very broad one; nonsense is seen as a genre. The opinion that nonsense is merely a device or a feature in a text is criticized. Anthologies of nonsense include texts that have this nonsensical quality as a dominant one. These texts can be referred to as "nonsense verse", "nonsense poetry" and "nonsense stories". Tigges rejects these because "nonsense" is often in these cases used as an equivalent of words like "funny" and "topsy-turvy". The essence of nonsense is the unresolved tension which it represents. Literary nonsense is characterized by four essential elements: firstly by the unresolved tension between presence and absence of meaning, secondly by the lack of emotional involvement, thirdly by play like presentation and finally by an emphasis upon its verbal nature. (Tigges 1988: 47—55.) This view of nonsense being something bigger than a mere device used to create humour, is much broader than is necessary for this study. In this study the nonsense used in the books is seen as a device to create humour and a stylistic feature characteristic to these books.

Nonsense can also be seen as a collection of words or events that do not fit together in the conventional sense because of the way they are arranged; this is Elizabeth Sewell's definition which Saukkola presents. The world of nonsense exists only in literature (Saukkola 1997: 36.) Saukkola says that nonsense is very much involved with language and it is based on grammar. It is tightly present all the time but nonsense applies rules of grammar in a paradoxical or parodistic way. (Saukkola 1997: 37.)

Nonce words are a part of nonsense; they are new words that are invented in the moment. It is possible that they are only used that once. There is no implication that the

newly invented word should become a part of the standard language. David Crystal points out that nonce words are being used for many different reasons. They can be used for language play, they can help to overcome a communicative breakdown when the word we need is just on the tip of our tongue but will not come out. In this case an invented word can get the message across. Nonce words can also be deliberately invented to be clever or funny or to fill a void of a word in a language. Nonce words like this are totally different from the previously mentioned nonce words that are used to fill a communicative gap. We often have the feeling that there is a word missing for a notion which may inspire us to create a totally new concepts. An example of such a word is "fluddle" which has been invented by someone to describe a pool of rainwater in the middle of a road, which is bigger than a puddle but smaller than a flood. (Crystal 2001: 30—33).

Crystal calls words like, the previously mentioned "fluddle", nonce-coinages whereas Tigges provides this device of creating nonsense an actual name. It is called the portmanteau, "in which two meanings are "melded" into one, as a form of conjunctivity."(Tigges 1988: 65). The portmanteau was introduced by Carroll in *Through the Looking Glass*. One of the most well-known portmanteau words is Carroll's "slithy" which Humpty Dumpty explains in chapter six of *Through the Looking Glass* to apply to a creature that is both "lithe and slimy" (Carroll 1871) .

Another device of nonsense is neologism. *Collins Concise Dictionary's* definition of a neologism is "a newly coined word, or a phrase or familiar word used in a new sense". According to Tigges: "the neologism has the advantage that no connotations or associations are attached to it" (1988: 67). He quotes Petzold who thinks that the neologism has to seem to make sense and appear to be a "normal" word, by following the rules of syntax, morphology and phonetics. A variant of the neologism proper is the use of a word in an "original", no longer current sense. Tigges comments that it is in the realm of these "meaningless" words that the writer of nonsense is almighty. He can give his own meaning to a word he has created or revived. Neologisms are often used to denote non-existent creatures such as a "Snark" in Carroll's poem *The Hunting of the*

Snark. Tigges explains that the term neologism is strictly speaking not the correct term when talking about nonsense words. Neologism suggests the introduction of a new word into the language. This word can acquire a definition, and develop the connotations and associations that any word in the language has. Tigges presents who Redfern combines the categories of neologism and portmanteau, this is understandable in the sense that a portmanteau is indeed a "new" word. However, there is a clear difference between a neologism and a portmanteau, the latter can be traced back to its root-words of which it is combined of whereas a neologism should be a completely made-up word, which has no etymological history because it is freely invented by its first user. (Tigges 1988: 66—67.) All the nonsense words appearing in the *SUE* books are inventions of the writer and probably have never been used before so Tigges' definition of neologism fits them nicely.

3 FINDINGS

The questions raised in the first chapter will be answered in this chapter. The lexical explications and their findings will be presented first, since they constitute the largest part of the material and are the most significant feature of the style of *A Series of Unfortunate Events*. They are analyzed as being either retained or re-created based on the method that has been discussed in chapter 1.4 of this study.

Wordplay constitutes the second largest part of the material therefore it will also be analyzed second. Wordplay material will be analyzed on the basis of the types of wordplay. Different types of wordplay have been identified from the original, the degree of retention or re-creation is defined by what type of wordplay has been used in the translation. Since the stylistic feature is considered more important in this study than the actual meaning of the wordplay, choosing to translate a wordplay as something that is not wordplay is problematic. It has to be taken into consideration that in some cases the meaning of the original wordplay can be essential to the understanding of the story, and in some such cases it may not be possible to achieve a result that would preserve both the wordplay and the meaning. Whether eliminating wordplay is retention or re-creation has to be defined depending on the case.

Lastly the nonsense utterance findings will be presented. Nonsense utterances form the smallest part of the material, though they are no less significant than the two other. The nonsense cases that have been taken into account in this study are limited to the nonsensical utterances of the youngest of the main characters. Still the *SUE* books contain plenty of other features that can be considered as nonsense in a broader sense such as logic of the adult characters and most of the turns of events in the stories, however they have not been taken into consideration, because this study is only interested in the three stylistic features that are specific to the language of the books, not the plot or the logic of the books.

Traditionally children's literature has been a branch of literature where the translator has had more freedom in modifying the original than in adult literature. The trend has also been to naturalize books that have been translated, to make them seem less foreign and as being a part of the target culture's canon. Thus this study tries to find out if also the *SUE* books have been naturalized in order to make them more approachable and readable for Finnish children. Yet it is taken into consideration that children of today have more comprehensive knowledge of other cultures and languages than for example their parents had at the same age, so there may not be as much of a need to naturalize children's literature when they are translated nowadays. The more comprehensive knowledge of other cultures and languages is the result of an increasingly global world, the internet, travelling and international contacts.

3.1 Lexical Explications' Findings

The lexical explications are a significant stylistic feature of the *SUE* stories. They are a device that is quite particular to these books; such explications, or certainly not as many as in the *SUE* stories, are not common in children's literature. There are many sides to their function in the stories. They can be seen as having an educational value; they give explanations to difficult or rare words thereby expanding a child's vocabulary and improving their spelling skills. The lexical explications are also used as a device to create humour. The patronizing tone of some of the explications; underestimating children's wit, is an excellent device to amuse people.

The material for this section consists of all lexical explications found in *The Bad Beginning* and *The Reptile Room* and their Finnish translations *Ankea alku* and *Käärmekanmmio*. The material was systematically examined for explications; they were assembled and then analyzed in order to define what kind of translation strategies have been used in translating the lexical explications into Finnish, whether the choices made have been exoticizing, meaning retention, or naturalizing, meaning re-creation. A total of 83 explications were found in the two books, 37 in *BB* and 46 in *RR*, however one of

these is an added explication in *Ankea Alku*, the translation of *The Bad Beginning*, there is no explication at that section in the original. The number of lexical explications is fairly high when taking into consideration the fact that *The Bad Beginning* has only 162 pages and *The Reptile Room* 190 pages and the books are only 13x18,5 cm in size.

The lexical explications vary significantly in length, in what is being explained and how it is being explained. Their translations vary as much as the originals. The explications can be a single word being explained, or a longer unit, such as a saying or an idiom. A vast majority of the explications in the originals were cases of a single word being explained; only about a third of the explications were explaining a longer unit. The same ratio applies also to the translations. Also a third of the translations were longer units and two thirds were one word being explained. However, even if the original was a single word being explained, it may have been translated as a longer phrase. This does not automatically mean that the translation is re-creation, it may be just a difference between the two languages. Different languages have different ways of expressing matters. Something that can be expressed in a single word in English can require a long phrase in Finnish and vice versa. So the degree of retention or re-creation cannot be defined simply by comparing the number of words in the original and the translation, meaning of the words and phrases involved is more important. If the two expressions mean the same thing in the two languages; they have as similar connotations as possible; and the readers in both language react to them in the same way, they are equivalent then even if one were be expressed with a single word and the other by several.

Though English and Finnish are two languages very different to each other; when comparing the original and the translation, the translators of the *SUE* books have managed to retain the difficulty level and the spirit of the original books quite impressively, especially in case of the lexical explications. The function these explications have in the original i.e. to create humour and to have educational value, have been successfully retained in the translation. For the most part the original and the translation correspond as well as it is at all possible but some changes of course have

had to be made. The correspondences and the changes will be analyzed in the following parts of this chapter.

3.1.1 Retention in Translating Lexical Explications

The vast majority of both single words and longer phrases or idioms being explained were retained, that means that they were translated in such a way that they are either very close to the meaning of the original or they mean exactly the same as the original. Of the total 83 cases only 16 were considerably changed compared to the original. That means that 67 cases were completely or for the most part retained. Retention being the more popular translation strategy in translating the lexical explications indicated that the traditional naturalizing way of translating children's literature does not apply, at least, to this part of the material. Retention is the translation device of exoticizing, of not adapting to the target culture but keeping the translation foreign and not trying to make it seem like it is original to the target culture. Re-creation is limited to 16 cases of 83, which is only about a fifth of the total. That is quite little, still reasons for the re-creation will be looked into in more detail.

Firstly the retained cases will be studied in more detail. It is fairly easy to retain the translation similar to the original when the explication is a noun that is not particularly culturally bound to a specific culture. Many of the single word explications found in the material fall into this category. In chapter four of *The Bad Beginning* the Baudelaire children have to make dinner for Count Olaf and his theatre group, they decide to make puttanesca sauce, which includes capers, garlic, anchovies and tomatoes. The following extract contains four lexical explications:

> Then, at the supermarket, they purchased garlic, which is a sharp-tasting bulbous plant; anchovies, which are small salty fish; capers, which are flower buds of a small shrub and taste marvelous; and tomatoes, which are actually fruits and not vegetables as most people believe. (Snicket 1999: 42.)

All of the above mentioned ingredients are nouns that are easy to define and not specific to just one culture even though puttanesca is an Italian food course. At least in Finnish there is no trouble in translating them:

> Supermarketista he ostivat vuorostaan kynsilaukkaa; joka on väkevämakuinen sipulikasvi; anjoviksia, jotka ovat pieniä suolaisia kaloja; kapriksia, jotka ovat pienen pensaan kukannuppuja ja maistuvat uskomattoman hyviltä; sekä tomaatteja, jotka ovat itse asiassa hedelmiä eivätkä vihanneksia kuten usein luullaan. (Snicket 2003: 50.)
> [From the supermarket in turn they bought garlic, which is a gutsy-tasting bulbous plant; anchovies, which are small salty fish; capers, which are flower buds of a small shrub and taste unbelievably good; and tomatoes, which are actually fruits and not vegetables as is often though.]

The explications of the example serve well the educational function that they have in the books. It is true that many people do not know that tomatoes are fruit and what capers actually are. As has been concluded earlier that there may not be as big of a demand for these lexical explications in Finnish as there is in English, since Finnish does not have as many "difficult" words as English does. So that the educational value would be fulfilled, it has been taken into account in the translation of the above example. The Finnish word for 'garlic' in the example is 'kynsilaukka' which does mean 'garlic' but is not a very commonly used word, a more commonly used word for 'garlic' is 'valkosipuli'. The more commonly used word 'valkosipuli' when translated directly means 'white onion', and the definition 'sipulikasvi' meaning 'bulbous plant' is directly translated 'onion plant'. So it makes sense to use the more uncommonly used word 'kynsilaukka' because it does not reveal in its name what kind of a plant it is, so explaining that it is an 'onion plant' is sensible, and helps to develop a child's vocabulary. Thus retention has been the translation strategy of choice here.

Something that is often very hard to translate from one language to another is words that have multiple meanings. It is usual that a word, which has multiple meanings that may not even be related to each other in one language, does not have those same multiple meanings in another language. A good example of this is the Finnish word 'kuusi' which can either mean the tree 'spruce' or the number 'six'. There is probably no other language that has those two meaning for that one word. There are some cases of words with multiple meanings in this part of the material. They are cases where the narrator uses one of the meanings of the word and in the explanation adds that the word has also another meaning but it is not the meaning that is used in this case. Even though

translating these multiple meaning cases is difficult and often does not work without eliminating one of the meanings; they have been successfully translated in the *SUE* books. In chapter eleven of *The Reptile Room* Violet makes a lock pick from some wire so that she could open a locked suitcase:

> --- but in fact what Violet had made was a crude – the word "crude" here means "roughly made at the last minute" rather than " rude or ill-mannered" – lockpick. (Snicket 1999b: 156.)

The word 'crude' has the above mentioned two meanings in English but luckily the same applies to its Finnish translation:

> --- mutta itse asiassa Violet oli tehnyt karkean – sana "karkea" tarkoittaa tässä "nopeasti tehtyä" eikä "pahatapaista tai töykeää" – tiirikan. (Snicket 2003b: 164) [but in fact Violet had made a crude – the word "crude" here means "quickly made" and not "ill-mannered or rude"- lockpick.]

The Finnish word 'karkea' has the same meanings as the English word 'crude' which works well in favour of the translator. There were three other such cases in the material, they were all in the second book, and all of them had been translated so that the multiple meanings work in both of the languages.

Though the translator had been able to retain all of the multiple meaning cases, some modification had to be done in order for the case to work. In one case the original single word expression had to be replaced with a longer expression in the translation, because Finnish does not have a single word that has the same multiple meanings as the original. The word 'dumbly' has been 'translated as 'kuin kielensä nielaisseina' [as if they had swallowed their tongues]. The original functions on the double meaning of the word 'dumbly':

> --- the Baudelaire orphans sat dumbly in Violet's room – the word "dumbly" here means "without speaking," rather than "in a stupid way" – for the rest of the night. (Snicket 1999b: 86.)

The English word 'dumbly' can mean both things explained in the above example, but there is no such word in Finnish. 'Dumbly' could be translated into Finnish as 'mykkinä' [as silent] or as 'tyhminä' [as stupid], but neither of them has another meaning that would work; so the translator has solved this problem by using a longer phrase:

> --- lapset istuivat loppuillan Violetin huoneessa kuin kielensä nielaisseina. ”Kielensä nielaisseina” tarkoittaa tässä ”hiljaisina”, eikä sitä että he olisivat oikeasti syöneet kielensä. (Snicket 2003b: 94.) [the children sat the rest of the night in Violet’s room as if they had swallowed their tongues. “As if swallowed their tongues” here means “silent”, not that they would have really eaten their tongues.]

The translation works in that it can be understood in two ways, concretely or abstractly. It does not have exactly the same kind of multiple meanings as the original does but still it serves the same function of educating a child reader, enriching his vocabulary. Instead of enriching it with understanding that a word has several meanings, it teaches to think on a more abstract level.

Another feature that is hard to translate from one language to another is idioms and sayings. They both are also often very culturally bound and it may be that they will not work in another language when translated directly, word for word. In some cases there may be a similar saying or idiom in the target language, but it is possible that it still differs from the original in one way or another. Quite many explications in the material are either sayings or idioms, in some cases it can be unclear which it which. “An idiom” is defined in *Collins Concise Dictionary* as “a group of words whose meaning cannot be predicted from the constituent words” and “a saying” is defined in *OED* as “something commonly said; a proverb; *occas.* a current form of speech.”. So it is quite difficult to differentiate between an idiom and a saying; things that at first are fashionable sayings can in time turn into idioms whose origin nobody even remembers, people just know what they mean.

In translating these idioms and sayings the translators have managed to retain the largest part of them. In a few of them some minor changes were made in their Finnish translations. An example of a saying that can be found in both Finnish and English in the exactly same form and meaning is found in *The Reptile Room*:

> It is very difficult, experts have told us, to find a needle in a haystack, which is why “needle in a haystack” has become a rather hackneyed phrase meaning “something that is difficult to find”. (Snicket 1999b: 161.)

The saying “needle in a haystack” is also in common use in Finnish so the translator did not have to agonize about the translation of this passage of text:

> Asiantuntijat ovat kertoneet, että neulan löytäminen heinäsuovasta on vaikeaa ja siksi “neula heinäsuovassa” on muuttunut kuluneeksi sanonnaksi, joka tarkoittaa ”jotakin, jota on vaikea löytää”. (Snicket 2003b: 168—169.) [Experts have told that finding a needle in a haystack is difficult and that is why “a needle in a haystack” has become a hackneyed phrase which means “something that is difficult to find”.]

Cases like the above example are fairly rare, not many cases can be translated without any modification. An example of a saying that is basically the same in both Finnish and English, but which has had a minor modification in the translation, can also be found from the material:

> When one feels useless and unable to help, one can use the expression “feeling like a fifth wheel,” because if something has four wheels, such as a wagon or a car, there is no real need for a fifth. (Snicket 1999b: 113).

There is a similar saying in Finnish, it has the same meaning, but there are fewer wheels:

> Kun tuntee itsensä hyödyttömäksi eikä pysty olemaan avuksi kenellekään, käytetään usein sanontaa “olla kolmantena pyöränä”, koska jos jossakin on kaksi pyörää kuten vaikkapa polkupyörässä tai mopossa, ei kolmas pyörä ole tarpeen. (Snicket 2003b: 121.) [When one feels useless and cannot be of help to anyone, often is used a saying ”to be a third wheel”, because if something has two wheels like a bicycle or a moped, a third wheel is not necessary.]

Both of the examples in this paragraph are considered as retention, though there was a small change in the latter, it still had been translated as close to the original as possible. There is no knowing why certain sayings and idioms work in both languages. Some of them can be very old expressions that have been loaned to the other language such a long time ago that they are not known to be loaned.

In some cases of translating idioms or sayings, the translation could be totally different from the original but still the translation was considered as retention, because the translation had the same meaning as the original. This is possible because of the fact that different languages have different ways of expressing the same thing. A common

English saying is used by the narrator in *The Reptile Room*: “To add insult to injury — a phrase which here means “forcing somebody to do an unpleasant task when they’re already very upset”—“ (Snicket 1999b:94). The Finnish saying that is used in the translation has considerably different words in it but nevertheless it has the same meaning as the original, and the same saying is also used in English with almost the same words:

> Lisätäkseen suola haavoihin — se on sanonta, joka tässä tarkoittaa: “pakottaa joku tekemään jotakin ikävää, vaikka hän jo tuntee olonsa surkeaksi” — (Snicket 2003b: 103). [To add salt to the wounds — it is a saying which here means: “to force somebody to do something unpleasant, eventhough she already feels miserable”—]

Though the original saying talks about “insult and injuries” and the translation about “salt and wounds”, they still mean the same thing; making a situation even worse than it already is. The explication that is given by the narrator does not explain the saying to mean exactly that, but, as very often, he uses the specific expression “here means”, which can be understood to mean the situation in the story. In the context of the events of the story, the explication makes sense. In this particular case the Baudelaire children have just come face to face with their nemesis Count Olaf, who is in disguise. The children recognise him, but their guardian does not believe them, and tells them not to be rude to their new guest. Not being able to do anything about the situation the children are also forced to help their enemy to carry his bags inside the house; something that they really do not want to do.

It is not easy to define what is retention and what re-creation when a section in a book has been modified in the translation. The case has to be studied closely in order to define which has been the translation strategy of choice. A case which has been quite significantly modified can be found at the end of *The Bad Beginning* when Mr. Poe and his wife come to wish the children good luck before a play, the expression explained is used a little further on in the conversation in another sense:

> “Polly and I just wanted to tell you to break a leg.”
> “What?” Klaus said, alarmed.
> “That’s a theater term,“ Mr. Poe explained, “meaning ‘good luck on tonight’s performance.’---“

> --- “I wish we *could* break a leg,” Klaus whispered to Violet, and Mr. Poe left. “You will, soon enough,” Count Olaf said,--- (Snicket 1999: 139—141.)

Mr.Poe uses a quite commonly know theater slang expression “break a leg” meaning “good luck”, and Klaus comments that he wishes they could actually break a leg, because of their hopeless situation. In the translation the translator has chosen to translate the situation with some modification:

> “Polly ja minä halusimme sanoa ‘potkuja’.”
> “Mitä?” Klaus sanoi hätääntyneenä.
> “Se on teatteritermi”, herra Poe selitti, “joka tarkoittaa ’onnea illan esitykseen’.”
> --- ”Toivon, että me todella voisimme potkaista jotakuta”, Klaus kuiskasi Violetille herra Poen poistuessa paikalta.
> ”Pitäkää varanne, ettette potkaise *tyhjää*”, kreivi Olaf sanoi---” (Snicket 2003: 150—151).
> [”Polly and I just wanted to say ’kicks’.” ”What?” Klaus said alarmed. “It is a theater term”, Mr. Poe explained, “which means ‘good luck on tonight’s performance’.---” ---“I wish we could really kick someone”, Klaus whispered to Violet as Mr. Poe was leaving. “Be careful so that you don’t kick *empty/the bucket*.” Count Olaf said---]

The expression “break a leg” has been translated as “potkuja” which means “kicks”. While “break a leg” is a way of the very superstitious actors’ way of wishing each other good luck in English speaking countries, in Finland actors have been known to wish each other good luck by literally kicking each other for good luck (spoken communication with J. Tiusanen). This implies that the translator has inside knowledge of Finnish theatre world. A direct translation of “break a leg” “katkaise jalka” has been known to be used in Finnish too but not very commonly. Using the translation “potkuja” “kicks”, enables the translator to use the phrase “potkaista tyhjää” which means to ”to die” “to kick the bucket/empty” later on in the dialogue. It is a threat that is a degree more serious than the original. Also translating the expression as “kicks” creates a strong association with another Finnish expression that has the word “kick” in it, which is “saada potkut”[get kicked] meaning “to get fired”. The association further helps to retain the strong sense of misery of the original expression. The explication in the original and the translation are the same although there has been some changes that are somewhat naturalizing it can be concluded that it hard to think of a closer translation. Though more than one thing has been changed the paragraph still works and

though “kicks” is a Finnish way of wishing good luck it is not widely known so the naturalizing effect it has is minimal. All in all this case is considered retention.

3.1.2 Re-creation in Translating Lexical Explications

As already said the translators of the first two *SUE* books have succeeded very well in retaining the translation as close to the original as possible, so the re-creating translation strategy has been in minimal use. There are very few cases which have been completely changed, and if there have been changes, there has been a good reason for them. In the following the changes that have been made will be studied in more detail.

The most distinct cases of re-creation could be found at the end of *The Reptile Room*. There is a series of explications which are related to one another. All of the words that are explained in the original have been changed in the translation. When one compares the original and the translation it is apparent that the changes are well justified and necessary. The situation where the explications appear is after the children’s guardian Uncle Monty has been murdered by Count Olaf and the children are trying to prove that he is guilty. Count Olaf claims that Uncle Monty was accidentally killed by a poisonous bite of Mamba du Mal. Klaus finds contradicting evidence in an encyclopaedia about snakes:

> Klaus smiled for an answer and began to read out loud from the book he was holding. “’The Mamba du Mal,’” he read, “’ is one of the deadliest snakes in the hemisphere, noted for its strangulatory grip, used in conjunction with its deadly venom, giving all of its victims a tenebrous hue, which is ghastly to behold.’”
> “Strangulatory? Conjunction? Tenebrous? Hue?” Violet repeated. “I have no idea what you’re talking about.”
> “I didn’t either, “ Klaus admitted, “until I looked up some of the words. ‘Strangulatory’ means ‘having to do with strangling.’ ‘In conjunction’ means ‘together.’ ‘Tenebrous’ means ‘dark.’ And ‘hue’ means ‘color’. So the Mamba du Mal is noted for strangling people while it bites them, leaving their corpses dark with bruises.” (Snicket 1999b: 133.)

All of the above mentioned words that Violet had trouble understanding and which Klaus explained, are counted as separate cases, so there are four explications in the example above. All of the words were hard to comprehend for the characters, but that is

probably the case with the readers too, so some clarification is in order. This would not be the situation if one were to translate the words directly into Finnish; their Finnish translations would be quite easy for the readers to understand since, as concluded before, Finnish does not have as many "difficult" words as English has. If "strangulatory" were to be translated into Finnish as such it would be "kuristus" [strangling], "in conjunction" would be "yhdessä" [together], "tenebrous" would be 'tumma'[dark], and "hue" would be "värisävy"[shade of colour]. None of them seem to have a synonym that would be harder to understand, all of the direct translations would be easy to understand. So the translator has chosen to change all of them to serve the function the explications have of enriching children's vocabulary:

> Klaus hymyili vastaukseksi ja alkoi lukea ääneen pitelemästään kirjasta. "'Musta Mamba'", hän luki, "'on yksi hemisfäärimme tappavimmista käärmeistä ja tunnettu erityisesti kuristavasta otteestaan, joka yhdessä letaalin myrkyn kanssa antaa uhrin iholle tumman valöörin, jota on kauhea katsella.'"
> "Hemisfääri? Letaali? Valööri?" Violet toisti. "En ymmärrä sanaakaan."
> "En minäkään ymmärtänyt", Klaus tunnusti, "ennen kuin katsoin sanakirjasta. 'Hemisfääri' tarkoittaa 'sillä on jotakin tekemistä maapallon kanssa', 'letaali' tarkoittaa 'tappavaa' ja 'valööri' tarkoittaa 'värisävyä'.(Snicket 2003b: 140—141.)
>
> [Klaus smiled for an answer and began to read out from the book he was holding. "'Black Mamba'", he read, "' is one of the deadliest snakes in our hemisphere, it is especially known for its stranglehold, which together with lethal venom gives the victim's skin a shade of tenebrousness, which is horrible to look at.'" "Hemisphere? Lethal? Shade of tenebrousness?" Violet repeated. "I don't understand a word." "I didn't understand either", Klaus confessed, "until I looked from a dictionary. 'Hemisphere' means 'it has something to do with the earth', 'lethal' means 'deadly' and 'tenebrous' means 'shade of colour'.]

In the original there are four explications in this extract but there are only three in the translation, so one explication has been completely omitted and the others have been changed. These translation strategies are considered re-creation. However, the reason for the re-creation must be taken into consideration. Although the words being explained have been changed, the information — which is critical for the development of the story — it provides has not been tampered with. The reader still gets to know the most important thing that Mamba du Mal strangles as well and bites and leaves bodies bruised. The words explained in the translation 'hemisfääri, 'letaali' and 'valööri', are "difficult" words in Finnish; they are of foreign origin and are not used in colloquial

language. Only ‘valööri’ of them somewhat corresponds to ‘tenebrous’ but not exactly, ‘hemisfääri’ appears in the original as well but is not explained in it, ‘letaali’ also appears in the original as ‘deadly’ but it is not explained in it either. So the translator has not invented the words explained in the translation from thin air but has chosen to use different words, that were already given in the original. These words have a more “difficult” synonym that requires explaining. Though the translation strategy is re-creation, the translation still retains the same function as the original has, and also the same degree of difficulty and the same information.

Another case of re-creation in the translation can also be found in *The Reptile Room*. There a case of omission, or maybe rather a case of deletion of culturally bound material, has happened with an English saying that does not have a completely similar counterpart in Finnish. The original goes as follows, the narrator explains that:

> “Meanwhile, back at the ranch” is a phrase used to link what is going on in one part of the story to what is going on in another part of the story, and it has nothing to do with cows or with horses or with any people who work in rural areas where ranches are, or even with ranch dressing, which is creamy and put on salads. Here, the phrase “meanwhile, back at the ranch” refers to what Violet was doing while Klaus and Sunny were in the Reptile Room. (Snicket 1999b: 127—128.)

It is highly unlikely that there were a Finnish idiom that has “ranch” i.e. “maatila”, “farmi” or “karjatila” in it that would also have the same functions as “ranch” has in the original. There is an expression that means “meanwhile, elsewhere” and it has been used in the translation, but the translator has chosen to eliminate the long part about ranches that appear in the original:

> “Samaan aikaan toisaalla” on ilmaisu, jota käytetään yhdistämään tarinan yksiä tapahtumia tarinan toisiin tapahtumiin. Tässä se viittaa siihen mitä Violet puuhasteli sillä aikaa kun Klaus ja Sunny olivat Käärmekammiossa. (Snicket 2003b: 135.) [”Meanwhile elsewhere” is an expression used to link one event of the story to other events of the story. Here it refers to what Violet was doing while Klaus and Sunny were in the Reptile Room.]

About four lines of text have been eliminated in the translation. From the point of view of information the original explication and the translation do not differ that much; they both explain the same thing; that the expression is used to link two parts of a story

together. However the Finnish expression is considerably easier to understand as such an expression because it does not mention a ranch, which has nothing to do with the story. Of course, for a person who understands the expression to be a 'hackneyed cliché', as it is called by Lemony Snicket, it is clear that there is no ranch, but that may not be the case with a child reader. "A ranch" is something that is very specific to American culture. The American origin of the books is usually not brought out in them, for the most part they could be from any Western country, but this example is an exception. And in translating it, the traditional way of translating children's literature by making them more at home in the target culture, the culturally specific part was eliminated. Still this is a single instance of omission in the books so it can be concluded that it has not been the prevailing translation strategy but more a necessity.

The lexical explications are a strong stylistic feature specific to the *SUE* books and there is one case that supports that claim even further. There is a single case of added lexical explication in the material, it appears at the end of *The Bad Beginning* when Count Olaf is staging a play with his theatre troupe. The children are also involved in it against their will. Mr. Poe and his wife have come to wish the children good luck. There is no explication in the original: "--- the children turned to see and Mr. Poe, dressed very formally and accompanied by his wife (Snicket 1999: 139)." The translator has added an explication to the translation:

> --- ja kun lapset kääntyivät, he näkivät hyvin muodollisesti – sana joka tässä tarkoittaa "teatteri-iltaa juhlistavalla tavalla"– pukeutuneen herra Poen ja hänen vaimonsa. (Snicket 2003: 149.) [and as the children turned they saw very formally – a word which means "in a way that celebrates a night at the theatre" – dressed Mr.Poe and his wife.]

The translator has chosen to explain what the word "muodolisesti" i.e."formally" means. The explication has been added very subtly. The explanation follows the form often used by the narrator "a word which here means", the word explained could very possibly have been explained in the original. If one is not familiar with the original version, one can not detect that this explanation is added. That the translator has decided to add an explanation to the translation to a place where he sees a possibility to do so emphasizes how characteristic these explications are in the *SUE* books. No explications

were omitted from *The Bad Beginning*, so the addition is not there to compensate a loss but to affirm the importance of this stylistic feature to the books.

All in all there was very little re-creation in the translation of the lexical explications. Most of them were retained, others were retained completely unchanged and others had been retained with some modifications. In cases where changes had been made, the changes were usually well justified. Although Finnish and English are two very different languages, even explications that had multiple meaning were retained successfully.

3.2 Wordplay Findings

Wordplay is the second largest part of this study's material. Fifty-four cases of wordplay were identified from *The Bad Beginning* and *The Reptile Room* and there were also some additional wordplay cases in their translations. Several different types of wordplay were identified from the material. The two largest groups of wordplay are formed by alliteration and allusive wordplay. Together they constitute about half of all the cases. Wordplay on polysemy of words was quite a popular type. Also, a number of types of wordplay appear only as single cases, such as anagram and play on the similarity of words.

3.2.1 Alliteration Findings

Alliteration is the most common type of wordplay found in the two books. There is some debate whether alliteration actually is a type of wordplay, sometimes it is considered merely a stylistic device, like rhyming. However in the present study alliteration is considered wordplay, because its function in the stories is to amuse the reader and to create humour. There are 23 different cases of alliteration in the originals and a couple of added cases in the translation. If the same case of alliteration appeared

more than once, which was the case with many place names, it was only taken into account once.

Alliteration is a type of wordplay that is completely founded on the sound of the words, as defined earlier alliteration is (according to OED) “The commencing of two or more words in close connexion, with the same letter, or rather the same sound.” Alliteration is only alliteration when the two or more words begin with the same letter or sound. A well-known example of alliteration is the traditional nursery rhyme “Peter Piper Picked a Peck of Pickled Pepper”. The repetition of the /p/ sound makes the nursery rhyme both memorable and challenging to say, which makes it also a fun tongue twister. So in translating wordplay based on alliteration, it s considered in this study, that retaining alliteration in the translation is the most important factor when defining whether the translation strategy has been re-creative or retaining. Retaining the meaning of the original is of secondary importance, unless the meaning is somehow critical to the understanding of the story.

There is a clear function for which alliteration is used in the *SUE* books. It is used in the names of fictional places, animal species and books. Twenty of the 23 cases are used in this way, only three cases are used for some other function. Using alliteration in names makes them easier to remember, and funnier. Though no alliteration has been used in the character names in the *SUE* books, it is fairly common to have alliteration in children’s literature in the names of characters; like for example in *Harry Potter* books there are characters that are called Cho Chang, Luna Lovegood and Severus Snape (Potter’s Realm 2008).

Three different strategies were used in the translation of the alliteration cases found in the material. The first of the strategies was retention of both alliteration and the meaning of the original. The second strategy was retaining alliteration with some minor changes in the meaning. The third strategy was retaining the meaning of the original but omitting the alliteration. There were no cases where the meaning would have been completely changed. The first two strategies are more faithful to the original than the third is, still

the third strategy cannot be seen as re-creation because the meaning of the case is important to the story. If the alliteration has not been retained this can only be seen as loss of wordplay but not as re-creation.

The choice of translation strategy distributed fairly evenly between the three different strategies; both alliteration and meaning were retained in eight of the 23 cases, alliteration was retained with some minor changes in the meaning in eight of the 23 cases, and in seven cases the alliteration had been omitted. This means that alliteration was retained in 15 of 23 cases, which is about two thirds. Alliteration, as well as meaning, has been retained relatively well in translation from English to Finnish when taking into account how very different the two languages are.

A good example of a case where both alliteration and meaning were retained can be found on the very first page of *The Reptile Room*. Mr. Poe is driving the children to their new guardian and they pass a place called “Hazy Harbor”(Snicket 1999b: 1). The name of a fictional place “Hazy Harbor” has been translated into Finnish as “Sumusatama” (Snicket 2003b: 9) [Fog harbour] . “Harbor” is “satama” in Finnish and there happens to be a word in Finnish that begins with an “s” and means “hazy”, so it is possible to retain both alliteration and meaning. Another example where both meaning and alliteration have been retained appears also on the first page of *The Reptile Room*, Mr. Poe drives on a miserable road, in the countryside, which in called “Lousy Lane” (Snicket 1999b: 1). In the translation the name of the road is “Kurjakuja” (Snicket 2003b: 9) [Lousy Lane]. Both words of the original happen to have corresponding words in Finnish that not only mean exactly the same but also alliterate with one another. Retention of both meaning and alliteration in the translation had been possible in six cases.

There were nine cases where alliteration had been retained but the meaning of the original has been slightly changed in the translation. For instance the name of one the children’s second guardian’s, Dr. Montgomery’s, snakes has been somewhat changed in the translation, in the original there is a creature that is called a Mongolian Meansnake:

“Olaf smiled at them in the same way Uncle Monty’s Mongolian Meansnake would smile when a white mouse was placed in its cage each day for dinner” (Snicket 1999b: 45). In the translation Mongolian has become Indian:

> Olaf hymyili lapsille kuin Monty-sedän Intialainen Ilkikäärme, kun häkkiin laitettiin sen päivittäinen ateria, valkoinen hiiri (Snicket 2003b :52—53).[Olaf smiled at the children like Uncle Monty’s Indian Meansnake, when his daily dinner, a white mouse, was placed in the cage.]

In the translation “Mongolian” has been replaced by “Indian” in order to retain the alliteration. “Meansnake” translates quite naturally as “Ilkikäärme” in Finnish; since there is no word in Finnish that stands for “mean” beginning with an “m”, it is logical that the part of the original that is not necessary to the story could be changed. Functions that are necessary to the understanding of the paragraph and the nature of the story are the two facts that; it has to be a snake, and that is has to be mean, like Count Olaf is. Both of these are retained in the original. The only thing changed is the irrelevant “nationality” of the snake. This case is retention because it performs the same functions as the original in both meaning and alliteration.

Another example of retained alliteration with small changes in the meaning appears in the early pages of *The Bad Beginning*; the children are spending their day at a beach called “Briny Beach” (Snicket 1999: 2). The name of the beach has been translated as “Rapuranta” (Snicket 2003: 10) [Crab Beach]. The word “briny” means “salty water” but there is no word with such meaning in Finnish that would alliterate with “ranta” [a beach], so the translator has chosen to change it completely to “rapu” [crab] which does alliterate with “ranta”. This case is considered retention because meanings and functions that are significant to the story have been retained; alliteration has been retained as well as the place. Whether it is a salty beach or a beach inhabited by crabs, makes no difference.

A third of the alliteration cases were translated without retaining alliteration, only the meaning of the original has been retained. When it comes to wordplay based on alliteration it is fairly important to retain the alliteration in order for the wordplay to work. The wordplay can also be replaced by some other type of wordplay if it is not

possible to use the same type of wordplay as in the original. In the translation of these books the loss of alliteration has not been replaced with another type of wordplay. In seven cases the wordplay has been omitted completely. Alliteration has been lost for example in the name of a bank where the children go to look for Mr. Poe. In the original the bank is called "Subservient Financial Services" (Snicket 1999: 62), in the translation the meaning of the name has been retained but there is no alliteration "Nöyrä rahapalvelu" (Snicket 2003: 69) [Humble Money Service]. Though the alliteration has been lost it is not considered re-creation because the meaning of the name as some significance for the story.

There was not always critical information important to the understanding of the story in the cases where wordplay had been lost. In some cases the translator has just decided to translate the meaning without retaining alliteration. An example of such a case can be found in *The Reptile Room*, on the way to their new guardian's house the children cross the "Grim River"(Snicket 1999:1), the alliteration in this case n not complete but partial yet it has been taken into account as a regular alliteration case, in the Finnish translation it is called "Synkjoki" (Snicket 2003: 9) [Grim River]. The meaning of the name has stayed the same as in the original, but there is no alliteration. The Finnish word for "grim" in the translation is a more poetic form of the word "synkkä" [grim, gloomy], but there is no wordplay. Though there is no wordplay, the slightly poetic style of the translation fits the pseudo gothic style of the *SUE* books well. Also, the narrator always emphasizes how terrible and sad the children's situation is, and all elements in the books are used to highlight that like the name of a river so maintaining the name's meaning at the cost of alliteration may have been a good choice. Since the meaning of the original has been retained and the style of the translation has also been captured well, this case can neither be seen as pure re-creation, but merely as loss of wordplay.

As noted earlier, alliteration has mostly been used in the names of places, animal species and books in *The Reptile Room* and *The Bad Beginning*, but there are a couple of exceptions. Alliteration as wordplay has been used also in a regular line of dialogue. At the end of *The Bad Beginning* Violet is trying to rescue her little sister Sunny from

Count Olaf's captivity. She is caught by one of Olaf's assistants who notifies his boss about the situation with the following line: ""Boss, it's me," he said. "your *blushing bride* just climbed up here to try and rescue the *biting brat*."" (Snicket 1999: 125) (italics added by me). The alliteration of the titles that are used for the girls seem to emphasize the fact that they are siblings and that now they both are in trouble. There is no alliteration in the translation:

> "Pomo, minä täällä", hän sanoi. "Rusoposkinen morsiamesi kiipesi juuri tänne ylös ja yritti vapauttaa purevan kakaran." (Snicket 2003: 135.) ["Boss, it's me", he said. "Your rosy-cheeked bride just climbed up here and tried to free the biting brat."].

The meaning of the original is retained mainly unchanged, only a minor change from "blushing" to "rosy-cheeked", but the alliteration is lost. The reasons for this may be various but most likely it is just because the alliteration is not as obvious as in the other cases since it is in a line of dialogue and not as specific as a name.

The names of the two books that are the material of the present study are also counted as cases of alliteration. Actually, all of the *SUE* books' titles are alliterative, except the last one that is called merely *The End*. All of the titles have also been translated with alliteration, like the two first books *Ankea Alku* and *Käärmekammio*. Some slight changes have been necessary, like in the names of the two first books, but all in all it has been possible to retain both alliteration and meaning in the titles.

In addition to the alliteration cases found in the original books some added alliterations were found in the translations; altogether four such cases were found. The added alliterations were not names like most of the alliterations in the original but they were inserted into an ordinary line of dialogue, where an opportunity to use an alliterative expression had emerged. An example of such a case appears in *The Bad Beginning* when Count Olaf and his troupe come home for a dinner that the children have prepared, in the original a regular expression is used: ""Let's have some dinner!" someone shouted from the dining room" (Snicket 1999:50). A more colourful expression that happens to alliterate has been used in the translation: "Pötyä pöytään!" joku huusi ruokasalista" (Snicket 2003:58). ["Boloney to the table!" shouted someone

from the dining room]. “Pötyä pöytään” is a Finnish saying that means “to put some food on the table”. “Pöty” is a word that has an interesting double meaning; it can mean “cock-and-bull story” or “something small to eat”. It is a vernacular expression and, in the context that it is used in the book, not a polite one. The Finnish translation of the series name is also a case of added alliteration. *A Series of Unfortunate Events* has been translated into Finnish as *Surkeiden sattumusten sarja* [miserable incidents’ series]. The original does not have any alliteration whereas the Finnish translation alliterates very well, The alliterative name of the series is also in accordance with the alliterative book titles.

As a summary of wordplay based on alliteration it can be noted that the translators’ intention seems to have been to retain alliteration as well as possible, even with some changes in the meaning if it is necessary in order to retain alliteration. Still, if alliteration could not be retained, and only the meaning of the original was retained, the lost alliteration was not replaced with any other type of wordplay. Also some cases of added alliteration could be found in the translation where the original text gave basis for an alliterative expression in Finnish. In the end no cases were seen as re-creation, though the alliteration had been lost in some cases.

3.2.2 Allusive Wordplay Findings

A Series of Unfortunate Events is a series for children, yet the books have many allusions to different novels, plays, writers and popular culture. Allusions, references to literature and culture, are highly culture specific, and very hard to a translator even to notice or to translate to another language and culture like Leppihalme has pointed out (Leppihalme 1996: 199). Altogether twelve different cases of allusive wordplay were found in *The Bad Beginning* and *The Reptile Room*. A vast majority of them, nine out of twelve, were references to literature; the three others were references to popular culture. There was no case of added allusive wordplay in the translation, but some changes in the allusion could be found. Many of them were names of characters that allude to a

writer, a play or popular culture. Some of them were names of animal species and some were also part of dialogue. Some of the allusions were harder to notice than others because of the unfamiliarity of the literary work being alluded to.

Three different strategies were found in the translation of allusive wordplay. Firstly there were cases where the allusive wordplay had been retained completely the same as in the original, secondly there were cases where allusive wordplay had been retained but the reference had been changed; and thirdly there were cases where allusive wordplay had been completely omitted. The first two strategies are considered retention, because, as with alliteration, it is more important to retain the wordplay than what it actually means, if retaining the meaning is not somehow critical to the understanding and development of the story. Omitting allusive wordplay will be discussed as re-creation because the wordplay is lost and like with other types of wordplay retaining the wordplay is considered more important than the meaning.

The allusion was retained exactly the same in the translation as in the original in seven of the twelve cases. The executor of the children's affairs, Mr. Poe, has two sons Edgar and Albert (Snicket 1999:13). The names have not been changed in the translation; they are most likely an allusion to the 19th century American writer Edgar Allan Poe. The style of the *SUE* books actually parodies the style of Poe's works with the exaggerated gloominess and the misfortunes that the children face. Even the names of the main characters are an allusion. The last name 'Baudelaire' is a reference to the 19th century French poet Charles Baudelaire (Hynönen 2002). Also the first names of two of the main characters are a reference to real persons; Sunny and Klaus are most likely an allusion to Sunny and Claus von Bülow. Sunny von Bülow was an American heiress and Claus was her husband. In 1980 Sunny sank into an irreversible coma; her husband was accused of attempting to murder her but was later on acquitted (Gribben 2007). A film called *Reversal of Fortune* was made about the case in 1990 starring Jeremy Irons and Glenn Close (Internet Movie Data Base 2007).

There are also two allusions to Shakespeare's play *The Tempest*. In *The Reptile Room* Count Olaf disguises himself as the new assistant of Dr. Montgomery and calls himself 'Stephano', they also intend to sail to Peru on a ship called 'Prospero'. Both 'Stephano' and 'Prospero' are characters in the play. The allusion has stayed the same in the translation, only 'Stephano' is spelled with an "f" instead of "ph". The name of the children's second guardian Dr. Montgomery Montgomery, he has the same first and last name, is probably an allusion to the popular British comedy group Monty Python (Pytholine 2008). Dr. Montgomery is called Uncle Monty by the children and he happens to be a herpetologist, someone who studies snakes. The allusion to Monty Python has also been retained.

Over half of the cases were retained exactly the same as in the original, but there were also three cases where the allusion had been changed. One example of such case appears in *The Reptile Room*, in the original Uncle Monty has many peculiar reptiles and the children learn to take care of them, among others: "and to never, under any circumstances let the Virginian Wolfsnake near a typewriter" (Snicket 1999b: 35—36). In the original the name of the snake clearly alludes to the English Modernist writer Virginia Woolf. The allusion has been changed in the translation:

> ja että Hermann Hössökäärmettä ei saa koskaan eikä missään olosuhteissa päästää lähelle kirjoituskonetta (Snicket 2003b: 43). [and that never under any circumstances to let Hermann Fuss-snake near a typewriter]

In the translation there is an allusion but it is to a German writer Hermann Hesse instead of Virginia Woolf. Virginia Woolf's name is easy to shape into a name of an animal species in English due to the fact that her last name means an animal. If the name 'Virginian Wolfsnake' were to be translated into Finnish directly, there would be no allusion: 'virginialainen susikäärme', would not ring any bells in peoples' minds. But changing the allusion to Hermann Hesse by slightly shaping his name creates the same reaction in the reader as the original does. The change in the allusion probably has nothing to do with one writer being more well-known by the readers but merely the difference in the two languages that sometimes require changes in order for the

wordplay to work. Since allusive wordplay is retained and the reader's reaction is the same, this case is considered retention.

Another case of retained allusive wordplay where the allusion has been changed can also be found in *The Reptile Room*. The children need to create a distraction to be able to go through Count Olaf's things. Sunny creates the distraction with one of the snakes, by pretending to be attacked by the snake, seeing this Mr. Poe goes into a panic and starts to babble: ""Goodness!" he cried. "Golly! Good God! Blessed Allah! Zeus and Hera! Mary and Joseph! Nathaniel Hawthorne!" (Snicket 1999b:146). Last name on the list is a 19th century American writer Nathaniel Hawthorne whose best-known work is probably *The Scarlet Letter* from the year 1850 (Merriman 2007). In the translation Nathaniel Hawthorne has been replaced by a Finnish writer:

> "Voi Luoja!" hän huusi. "Hyvät hykkyrät! Hyvä Jumala! Siunattu Allah! Zeus ja Hera! Maria ja Joosef! Elmer Diktonius!"[Oh God!" he screamed. (Snicket 2003b: 154). ["Oh God!" he screamed. "Goodness gracious! Good God! Blessed Allah! Zeus and Hera! Mary and Joseph! Elmer Diktonius!"]

There is no Hawthorne in the translation but a Finnish Swede modernist poet and writer Elmer Diktonius (Nurmijärvi's municipality 2007). Why the change has been made, one can only guess. Allusive wordplay has been retained but the content of the translation is very clearly naturalizing. An allusion to the books' original American culture has been replaced by an allusion to a distinctly Finnish writer. When it comes to the function this case is retained, whereas the meaning has been re-created, but because the allusion has no significance to the story, this case is considered retention.

There were two cases of allusive wordplay where the allusion has been completely eliminated; there is no allusion in the translation. These cases naturally fall in the category of re-creation as the chosen translation strategy. The two allusive wordplay cases were actually lines of the character Sunny's dialogue. In the first two books Sunny still speaks only in nonsense expressions, which also form a part of this study's material, in the later books Sunny grows up a little and starts to speak in one or two word sentences, but so far all that is said by her is explained by the narrator of the books or her siblings. Since her lines are usually nonsense, it is easy to camouflage some of

them into allusive wordplay; like when Violet tells her sister to keep watch in *The Reptile Room*: ““Ackroid!” Sunny said, which probably meant something like “Roger!”” (Snicket 1999b.126). The line is an allusion to a well-known novel by Agatha Christie called *The Murder of Roger Ackroyd* (Official Agatha Christie Website 2008). The translation does not retain the allusion to the Christie book: ““Iaa!” Sunny sanoi ja tarkoitti luultavasti: ”“Ai-ai!”” (Snicket 2003b:134). [“Iaa!” Sunny said and probably meant: ”Ay- ay!”]. The allusion has been completely eliminated in the translation, most likely due to the fact that there is no corresponding expression in Finnish. The translation resembles Sunny’s other nonsense expressions, in that nothing reveals that there was an allusion in the original.

Altogether the allusive wordplay has been fairly well retained in the translation. There are twelve of them; in seven of them both the original and translation alluded to the same thing; in three of them there was an allusion but it had been changed and in two cases the allusive wordplay had been eliminated. Since the first two strategies are considered retention, the degree of retention is very high in allusive wordplay.

3.2.3 Other Wordplay Types’ Findings

Though alliteration and allusive wordplay were the two biggest categories of the wordplays found in the material, there are still many other types of wordplay that appear a couple of times or only once. This section will have a closer look at these cases. There were a total of 54 cases in the original books and 58 in the translations. Alliteration and allusive wordplay form decidedly over a half of all the cases. The types of wordplay, which appear only a few times or once, include polysemy, anagram, rhyme, paronymy and wordplay on opposites.

In some cases wordplay can be of more than one type at a time. There are a couple of such cases in *The Reptile Room* in chapters seven and eight when Mr. Poe arrives to bring the children their luggage, the moment is not good for the disguised Count Olaf,

who has just murdered Dr. Montgomery. He is nervous about the sudden arrival of Mr. Poe and has trouble remembering his name. He calls him names that rhyme with his real name but they are also words that can, in the situation, be interpreted in many ways. Olaf calls Mr. Poe first “Mr. Foe”, then “Mr. Doe”, even “Mr. Toe” and after that “Mr. Yoe” (Snicket 1999b: 101, 103, 106, 114). All of the wrong names rhyme with Mr. Poe, but three of them also mean something, the first one “Mr. Foe” suits the situation perfectly because that is exactly how Olaf sees Mr. Poe, as an enemy who is going to ruin his plans. In the translation the names have been kept mostly the same as in the original, only one of them has been changed. The ones that have been retained the same of course rhyme with Mr. Poe so that part of the wordplay has been retained but then again, the meaning of the wrong names is lost on the reader who does not know English. The only name that has been changed is “Mr. Yoe” which is “herra Koe” (Snicket 2003b: 122) in the translation, the name rhymes with the original and it also means “Mr. Test” in Finnish. Of the two types of wordplay, rhyme seems to be the more prevailing one, because not all of the wrong names have a meaning that is tied with the story. The translator has also seen rhyming as is more important to retain than the meanings, the only case changed was the one that Finnish children might have trouble reading since “y” is always a vowel in Finnish. All things taken into consideration these cases are seen as retention.

There is a single case of paronymy in *The Bad Beginning,* it is wordplay on the similarity of words; there are small differences in both the spelling and the sound. Mr. Poe has only moments ago told the Baudelaires that their parents have died: “Although he said he was the executor, Violet felt like Mr. Poe was the executioner” (Snicket 1999:9). Paronymy is not easy to translate from one language to another, because the chances of two languages, especially two as different as Finnish and English, having expressions that work in both languages retaining both the meaning and the wordplay. Still, in this case the paronymy and the meaning for the most part have been retained:

> Vaikka hän sanoi olevansa uskottu mies, Violetista tuntui että herra Poe oli miehistä uskomattomin (Snicket 2003: 17—18). [Although he said he was the executor (trusted/believed man), Violet felt like Mr. Poe was the most unbelievable of men.]

The translation plays on the similarity of the Finnish expressions “uskottu mies” and “uskomattomin mies”. The first one is an official term for ‘executor’ in Finnish but if one translated it directly into English it means ‘a trusted man’, “uskottu” is derived from the Finnish word “uskoa” “to believe, to trust”. The latter meaning deviated from the original, it does not mean “executioner” but “most unbelievable of men”, unbelievable in the sense that Violet cannot believe what she is hearing, exactly like in the original. The reaction created by the translation corresponds with the original, as does the wordplay type and meaning to the extent that this case is considered retention.

Anagram is a type of wordplay where the letters of a word are transpositioned so that a new word is created (OED 2007). One case of this type of wordplay can be found in *The Bad Beginning*, the characters perform a play written by “the great playwright Al Funcoot (Snicket 1999: 75)”. “Al Funcoot” is, of course, an anagram of Count Olaf. There is wordplay in the translation also but it is not the same type of wordplay. In the translation the playwrights name is “Fuoco al Turcka (Snicket 2003: 83)”; the name is an allusion to a famous Finnish director Jouko Turkka (IMDb 2008). Anagram has been changed into allusive wordplay; the reasons for this may be various, it is completely possible that the translator did not even realise that the name is an anagram and that is why chose he to translate it as allusive wordplay. The Finnish version for Count Olaf “kreivi Olaf” would have been good material for several different anagrams like “Leif Korvia” which actually sounds like a real Finnish name. The translation of the name is clearly naturalizing if one considers the being alluded to, on the other hand the name resembles a foreign name and as such is not clearly naturalizing, also wordplay has been retained although the type of wordplay is not the same as in the original. The wordplay type has been changed but as a whole this case is regarded as retention.

There are several cases in *The Bad Beginning* where the wordplay is based on opposites, such as literally and figuratively, and left and right. The two words are not only contrasted by their opposites but they are also interpreted both on the concrete and abstract level. For example in the end of chapter five in *The Bad Beginning* the narrator first explains how important it is to learn the difference between the concepts

"figuratively" and "literally", then he proceeds to explain the situation with the two opposites he has just previously clarified:

> *Figuratively*, they escaped from Count Olaf and their miserable existence. They did not *literally* escape, because they were still in his house and vulnerable to Olaf's evil in loco parentis ways. But by emerging themselves in their favorite reading topics, they felt far away from the predicament, as if they had escaped. In the situation of the orphans, figuratively escaping was not enough, of course, but at the end of a tiring and hopeless day, it would have to do. Violet, Klaus and Sunny read their books and, in the back of their minds, hoped that soon their figurative escape would eventually turn into a literal one. (Snicket 1999: 69)

The difference of "literally" and "figuratively" is pointed out many times and the contrast of them is made clear. The wordplay is maybe not the funniest case but it is witty usage of language, therefore it is regarded as wordplay. This case has been an easy one to retain since the word "literally" and "figuratively" have Finnish correspondents that have exactly the same meanings; "kirjaimellisesti" and "kuvaannollisesti". The previous notion applies to another similar case where the wordplay is on the opposition of the words "wrong" and "right":

> It is very unnerving to be proven wrong, particularly when you are really right and the person who is really wrong is the one who is proving you wrong and proving himself, wrongly, right. Right? (Snicket 1999b:109.)

The extract is a real thought twister, one has to carefully think it through to actually understand what is being said. The original version is demanding but the translation is even more demanding due to the fact that the Finnish word for "really" is "oikeasti" and it is very similar to the word "right" which is "oikea":

> On masentavaa, että sinun todistetaan olevan väärässä, varsinkin jos oikeasti olet oikeassa ja se joka on oikeasti väärässä on, se joka todistaa että sinä olet väärässä ja että hän itse on väärin perustein oikeassa. Menikö oikein? (Snicket 2003b: 117.) [It is depressing that you are proven wrong, especially if you are really right and the one who is really wrong, is the one who is proving that you are wrong and that he himself is, on false pretense, right. Did that go right?]

The opposite adjectives "right" and "wrong" and their adverbial forms create an amusing passage that requires some concentration from the reader to keep track of what is being said. Retaining such an example is rather simple since the words have the same meanings in both languages.

It is clear that the level of retention in the translation of wordplay in the two *SUE* books has been very high. Wordplay has been retained wherever it has been possible, but in some cases it is just not possible because the wordplay includes information that is vital for understanding the story. Such a case can be found in *The Bad Beginning*. When Mr. Poe is drives the children to their new guardian's house they also meet their new neighbour who introduces herself:

> "I am Justice Strauss."
> "That's an unusual first name," Klaus remarked.
> " It is my title," she explained, "not my first name. I serve as a judge on the High Court." (Snicket 1999: 20.)

This is a case of polysemy, "justice" can be both "a judge" and be someone's first name. In the example Klaus interprets it as their neighbour's name, though it is actually a title. Justice is not the most common first name but still it is a completely possible interpretation of the situation. In Finnish there is no term that would have the same dual meanings as the original "Justice", and also the fact that she is a justice has an important part in the plot of the story, so the wordplay has been lost in the translation:

> "Minä olen Oikeusneuvos Strauss."
> "Oikeusneuvos?" Klaus kysyi.
> "Se on arvonimi", hän selitti, "ei etunimeni. Minä työskentelen tuomarina Ylioikeudessa." (Snicket 1999: 28.) ["I am Justice Strauss." "Justice?" Klaus asked. "It is a title", she explained, "not my first name. I work as a judge at the superior court of justice."]

In the translation Klaus's remark about justice being an unusual name has been turned into a confused question, as if Klaus did not know what a justice is. Still the reaction is justifiable because the Finnish word for "justice" "oikeusneuvos" is quite a difficult word for even a clever Finnish speaking child.. The effect that Klaus's question creates is completely different when compared to the quite witty remark in the original. In the original Klaus is witty, in the translation only confused. But the changing of the remark is completely acceptable due to the differences in English and Finnish languages, and the need to retain the fact that she is a judge.

Retaining wordplay has clearly been the most popular translation strategy in the translation of the two *SUE* books. In translating the two biggest groups of wordplay cases the alliterations and allusive wordplay retaining the original wordplay type was effectively the most popular one. The same notion applies also to the other less usual types of wordplay. The number of cases where no wordplay at all was retained was very low. Naturalization that has traditionally been very prevalent in children's literature has been kept to the minimum.

3.3 Nonsense Utterances Findings

Nonsense is a versatile and common feature in children's literature. It has been a part of children's literature since *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and *Winnie-the-Pooh*. Nonsense can appear in many forms, the events of the story can be nonsensical, the logic of the whole world of the story or the characters in it can be nonsensical, and so can the language. *A Series of Unfortunate Events* books have almost all of these nonsensical elements in them to some extent, but this study focuses simply on the nonsense utterances of the youngest of the Baudelaire siblings, Sunny Baudelaire. Her one word nonsense expressions are interpreted either by her siblings or the narrator to mean quite a lot, like in *The Reptile Room* Sunny says: ""Tadu," Sunny murmured solemnly, which probably meant something along the lines of "It's a loathsome situation in which we find ourselves.""(Snicket 1999b:83). Sunny usually speaks out to "comment" on the situation they are in. Sunny learns to speak better later on in the series, in the seventh book that is called *The Vile Village,* before that on some rare occasions she utters words that actually mean something like in *The Reptile Room*: ""Brilliant!" Sunny shrieked, in mid-crawl, and her siblings smiled down at her, surprised she had uttered a word that everyone could understand"(Snicket 1999b:186). But besides these few occasions of saying something understandable she speaks in nonsense utterances.

The two *SUE* books together contain 39 utterances by Sunny, but only 32 of them were taken into account in this section of the material because either they were not nonsense or because they were cases of allusive wordplay. There were considerably more nonsense utterances in *The Reptile Room* than in *The Bad Beginning*; there were only ten nonsense utterances in *The Bad Beginning* whereas there were 22 cases in *The Reptile Room*. There were no added nonsense utterances in the translations; neither had any of them been omitted. Three different translation strategies were identified in the translations; firstly the nonsense utterance could be retained completely the same as in the original, with no changes in the way it is written. Secondly, the nonsense utterance could be naturalized; keeping the nonsense very similar to the original but changing the spelling to make them more Finnish. And thirdly the nonsense utterance could be replaced by a completely different one in the translation. Nonsense utterances is the only section of the material where there is a significant difference in the translation strategy that has been chosen compared to the two other sections of the material. When it came to the translation strategy of choice in the lexical explications and wordplay, there were no significant differences between the two books and two different translators. In the case of nonsense utterances there are considerably more changes made in translating *The Reptile Room* than *The Bad Beginning*; of 18 cases where the translation strategy was to replace the original with a completely different one 16 of the cases were from *The Reptile Room*.

There are seven cases where there have been no changes in the translation. The written form of the word has been retained like in a case from *The Bad Beginning* where the Baudelaire siblings are trying to cheer themselves up: “Jook!” Sunny shrieked, banging on the table with her oatmeal spoon” (Snicket 1999: 32-33). The nonsensical shriek has been translated without any changes: “Jook!” Sunny kirkaisi hakaten samalla pöytää puurolusikalla” (Snicket 2003:41). Many of the cases that have been retained completely unchanged contain qualities that are relatively typical of Finnish, such as long double vowels and double consonants in the middle of the word. There is a long double vowel in the example above and also in a couple other cases like “Neepo” (Snicket 1999:153) and “Meeka” (Snicket 1999b:17). The double consonant in the

middle of a word can be found in *The Reptile Room* “Tikko” (Snicket 1999b:82). It is worth noticing that though the written form of the utterance has not been changed, the way that the readers pronounce the words is very different depending on whether the reader is English or Finnish speaking. If the reader is Finnish speaking he pronounces the word as it is written, in this case /jo:k/ whereas an English speaking reader pronounces it /dʒu:k/. Nevertheless the difference in the pronunciation, this translation strategy is seen as retention. The original has been completely retained in the translation, in so being as faithful to the original as possible.

Whereas in the previous translation strategy the original was retained without any changes resulting in a different pronunciation in the translation, in the second translation strategy there have been some changes made compared to the original. In this section the translation strategy has been to change the spelling of the original cases to be “more Finnish”. It has been taken into consideration in the translation how the original was pronounced in English, also some letters that are not very common to Finnish language have been changed to letters that are more common in Finnish. Some examples are needed to make it clearer what has actually been done in the translation of these cases. There are nine cases that belong to this translation strategy out of the total 32. A good example of a case where the pronunciation of the original has been taken into account can be found in the first chapter of *The Bad Beginning*: “For instance, this morning she was saying “Gack!” over and over which probably meant, “Look at that mysterious figure emerging from the fog!” (Snicket 1999: 4). It has been translated as follows:

> Esimerkiksi tänä aamuna hän sanoi uudelleen ja uudelleen ”Gäk!”, joka kenties tarkoitti, ”Katso tuota sumusta ilmestyvää outoa hahmoa!” (Snicket 2003:12). [For instance this morning she was saying over and over ”Gäk!”, which perhaps meant, ”Look at that strange figure emerging from the fog!”]

In the translation the original version’s /a/ has been turned into /ä/, which corresponds to the way the /a/ is pronounced in the original, and a /c/, has been eliminated, it being a relatively uncommon letter in Finnish. So the translation “gäk” and the original “gack” are both pronounced /gæk/, which means that the translation has retained the original, albeit with some naturalization. Another example of such a case can be found in *The Reptile Room* where Sunny utters the word “Yinga” (Snicket 1999b: 65) it has been

translated as “Jinga” (Snicket 2003b: 73). In this case a “y” has been replaced by a “j” in the translation; the letter “j” is pronounced in Finnish in the same way as “y” is at the beginning of a word in English, in Finnish “y” is always pronounced as a vowel. So by making the change, the pronunciation of the original is retained and reading the word is made easier for the Finnish reader.

The previous examples showed how changes in the spelling have helped in retaining the pronunciation of the original. In some cases of this category the pronunciation of the original was not retained by the changes made in the spelling but the words were made easier for a Finnish reader by changing letters that are not that common in Finnish to others that are. A couple of such examples are found in the material. Letters like “w”, “x” and “b” are not too common in Finnish, mostly they appear only in words that have been loaned from other languages. So these letters have been replaced in the translation with letters or letter combinations that are more common in Finnish, in this case “v”. “ks” and “p”. This has been done in three nonsense cases that all appear in *The Bad Beginning*, “Hux!” (Snicket 1999: 50) has been translated as “Huks!” (Snicket 2003: 58), “Gibbo!” (Snicket 1999: 59) as “Gippo!” (Snicket 2003: 67), and “Wipi!” (Snicket 1999: 85) as “Vipi!” (Snicket 2003: 93). The original versions would not have been too difficult for a Finnish reader but the changes certainly make them appear more Finnish than the original. Although there is some naturalization in this translation strategy, the cases still remain so similar to the original that they are not considered re-creation in this study, but retention.

Though the two first translation strategies of translating nonsense utterances were seen as retention, that is certainly not the case with the third translation strategy, complete replacement, employed in the translation. This section was clearly the one with most changes in the translation compared to the original. Sixteen cases of nonsense fall into this category; making the percentage of cases completely replaced fifty percent. Also, a vast majority of the cases are from *The Reptile Room*, only two cases are from *The Bad Beginning*. Most of the cases in this section have been completely re-created in the translation, so that they do not resemble the original at all; as is the case with a few

examples from *The Reptile Room*. In the original Sunny says: “Gerja!” (Snicket 1999b: 40) but in the translation Sunny’s comment is “Merka!” (Snicket 2003b: 47). In the previous example there are still some sounds that are the same as in the original; unlike in the next one: ““Afoop!” Sunny shrieked, which probably meant “No.”” (Snicket 1999b: 120). In the translation “Afoop” has been recreated as ““Jeip!”” (Snicket 2003b: 128), there is no similarity between the original and the translation. The reasons for such a drastic change can only be speculated, but nevertheless the translation strategy chosen has been to recreate the nonsense utterance completely. A case where the translation does not resemble the original at all can also be found at the end of The *Reptile Room* when Mr. Poe asks the children if anyone of them should have a cloth: ““Not me, “ Klaus said. “Not me,” Violet said. “Guweel!” Sunny said.”” (Snicket 1999b: 172). In the translation Sunny’s comment has been translated as ““Aijjook!”” (Snicket 2003b: 178). Again there is no similarity between the original and the translation it seems the translator has chosen to be free and creative in translating the nonsense utterances. Some of the cases in this section still somewhat resemble the original yet they have been changed to the extent that they can only be seen as re-created cases as is the case with a nonsense utterance by Sunny at the end of *The Reptile Room*, she agrees with something her brother said so she says: “”Roofik!”” (Snicket 1999b: 168). In the translation she says: “”Ruuf!”” (Snicket 2003b: 174), the translation in quite close to the original but the spelling has been modified to be more Finnish, like had been done in many cases in the previous translation strategy, but in this case some letters have been eliminated all together so this case is seen as recreation since the changes made are so extensive.

A question arises from the creative way the translator has chosen to translate the nonsense utterances, whether they need to be translated at all. Why have they all not been retained as similar to the original since the words do not have any meaning in either of the languages. In fact, it makes no difference what the nonsense utterance is. Certainly some letter combinations found in the original are quite uncommon in Finnish so some modification may be in order to make the words slightly easier for the child reader to read. But why have re-creation as a popular translation strategy in this section

when it has not been the chosen strategy in the other sections where the meaning of the words actually has importance.

As a summary of the nonsense utterance findings it can be said that re-creation was clearly a more popular translation strategy in this section than in wordplay or lexical explications. Half of the cases in this section were re-created whereas only few cases were re-created in the other sections. There was a lot more re-creation in the translation of *The Reptile Room* than *The Bad Beginning*, also *The Reptile Room* has many more nonsense cases than the first book, of the 32 cases only ten are from *The Bad Beginning*. This is the only section where there is a clear distinction between the two different translators' choice of translation strategy. Why Ulla Lempinen has chosen to recreate more than Mika Ojakangas, can only be speculated but maybe the translator felt that the situation enabled her to have more creative freedom than usually. Taking creative freedom has traditionally been quite accepted in the translation of children's literature, but this is the only section where that tradition has been in use in translating the *SUE* books. Also half of the nonsense utterances were retained, seven were retained in exactly the same form as the original, and nine cases were retained with some modification in their spelling.

4 CONCLUSIONS

This study set out to define what kind of translation strategies have been used in translating, from English to Finnish, three stylistic features specific to *A Series of Unfortunate Events*. The goal was to find out whether the prevalent translation strategy had been retention or re-creation. In retention the translation is kept as close to the source culture as possible, so the translation is exoticizing, the foreign origin of the translation is apparent. In re-creation the translation is made to seem like an original of the target culture by naturalizing it, the foreign origin of the translation is obscured.

The three stylistic features studied were lexical explications, wordplay and nonsense utterances. All of them are in their own way specific to *A Series of Unfortunate Events* style. Lexical explications have a humorous effect and they serve an educational purpose as well. Wordplay also creates humour and wit to the language of the books. Nonsense utterances are a personal way of one of the characters to communicate, but they also create humour. The material of the study was collected from the two first books of *SUE*, *The Bad Beginning* and *The Reptile Room* and their Finnish translations *Ankea alku* and *Käärmekammio*.

The standpoint of this study was that translating children's literature is different from translating adult literature. Translator of children's literature faces problem's that a translator of adult literature does not have. In translating children's literature there are always present, not only the demands of the child reader, but the demands of parents, publishers, teachers and the government as well. Children's literature has a dual audience, where the secondary audience has all the power over the primary audience. Children's books also often use language in challenging ways and have more imaginative events than adult literature, which can be very demanding for the translator. A translator of children's literature also always has to take into consideration the fact that a child reader does not have as good a knowledge of other cultures as an adult reader can be expected to have. This creates a problem when translating children's books from one language and culture to another. Traditionally naturalizing has been a

popular translation strategy in the translation of children's literature. This study wanted to find out if this was the case with contemporary translation of children's literature as well. However, it was speculated that nowadays there was not such a need to naturalize children's literature in the translation thanks to the better knowledge of other languages and cultures children today have. Children's literature also almost always has a pedagogic function in addition to the entertaining function. Adult books are not valued good or bad on the basis of how much one can learn from them, unlike children's literature, where the pedagogic function is one important criterion on defining a book as suitable for children. The lexical explications in the *SUE* books serve a pedagogic function by helping in expanding a child's vocabulary. But they can also be seen as a parody of the pedagogic function. Many children's books can function on two levels, one that is entertaining o the child and another that is entertaining for the adult that is reading the book, like the *SUE* books do.

The material was analysed one feature at a time. Lexical explications being the largest group were analysed first and nonsense utterances being the smallest group were analysed last. The analysis proved that retention had been the more popular translation strategy in translating lexical explications and wordplay, whereas re-creation had been more popular in translating the nonsense utterances.

In translating lexical explications retention had been possible completely or with some minor adjustments in eighty percent of the cases, which is very impressive considering how different languages Finnish and English are. The lexical explications were the most prominent to the *SUE* books of all the features studied: the translator had even added one explication. In translating the lexical explications the traditional way of naturalizing children's literature in the translation was not the dominating translation strategy, instead retention was the more prevalent one. Even fairly culturally bound explications like idioms and saying had been retained. The educational function of the explications also had been retained by maintaining the same degree of difficulty in the translated lexical explications as the original explications had.

Retention was the more popular translation strategy in translating wordplay as well. Alliteration and allusive wordplay were the two most common types of wordplay. In translating alliteration the original wordplay type as well as the meaning of the wordplay cases had been retained in two thirds of the cases. Even in the translation of allusive wordplay, which is highly culture specific, the allusion had been retained unchanged in over half of the cases, allusion had been modified in three cases and lost in only two cases. Retention was successful also in the translation of wordplay types that were not as prevalent. So the traditional way of translating children's literature did not apply to translation of wordplay either. The wit and richness of language that wordplay creates in children's literature had been retained beautifully. The translations are just as rich in wordplay as the original.

Translation of nonsense utterances was the only section where re-creation was the more popular of the two strategies. This section is also the only one where there was a clear difference in the translation strategy of the two books. There was more re-creation in the translation of *The Reptile Room* than in the translation of *The Bad Beginning*. Here the translator's possibility to translate children's literature in a more free way than other literature had been employed. The reason for this is not clear. The nonsense utterances formed the smallest section of the material so though re-creation was more popular in the translation it still does not overrule the fact that the translations of *The Bad Beginning* and *The Reptile Room* have not followed the traditional naturalizing way of translating children's literature.

The problems that this study faced were the difficulties in defining what is considered retention and what re-creation. It has to be said that in the end the way of classifying problematic cases as either retention or re-creation was based on the writer's personal judgement of what she as a competent reader felt to be the function of each translation strategy.

The translation of children's literature is still a relatively new field of study and there is always room for more study. *A Series of Unfortunate Events* as well as many other

children's books are potential material for many studies to come. One could study in more detail the other types of nonsense that appear in the books besides the nonsense utterances. The later books of the series provide even more material for the study of wordplay There is an especially big potential to the study of allusive wordplay in the books, because there are even more of them in the remaining eleven books.

WORKS CITED

Primary Sources:

Snicket; Lemony (1999). *The Bad Beginning*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Snicket , Lemony (1999). *The Reptile Room*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Snicket, Lemony (2003). *Ankea alku*. (*The Bad Beginning*, translated by Mika Ojakangas). Juva: WS Bookwell Oy.

Snicket, Lemony (2003). *Käärmekammio*. (*The Reptile Room*, translated by Ulla Lempinen). Juva: WS Bookwell Oy.

Secondary Sources:

Agatha Christie Limited (2008). *The Murder of Roger Ackroyd*. Cited 31.03.2008: http://uk.agathachristie.com/site/find_a_story/stories/The_Murder_of_Roger_Ackroyd.php

American Library Association (2007). *The 100 Most Challenged books of 1990-2000*. Cited 17.5.2007: http://www.ala.org/ala/oif/bannedbooksweek/bbwlinks/100mostfrequently.htm

Blume, Judy (1999). *Is Harry Potter Evil ?*. Cited 17.05.2007: http://www.judyblume.com/articles/harry_potter_oped.html

Carroll, Lewis (1871). *Through the Looking Glass (And What Alice Found There).* Cited 17.05.2008: http://www.literature.org/authors/carroll-lewis/through-the-looking-glass/

Chesterman, Andrew (1997). *Memes of Translation. The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theor*y. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Chiaro, Delia (1992). *The Language of Jokes. Analysing Verbal Play*. London: Routledge.

Collins Concise Dictionary (2000). Fourth Edition. Glasgow: HarperCollins Publishers.

Crystal, David (2001). *Language Play*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press

Delabastita, Dirk (1996). Introduction. *The Translator*. Volume 2: Number 2, 127-139. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Fernández López, Marisa (2006). Translation Studies in Contemporary Children's Literature: A Comparison of Intercultural Ideological Factors. In: *The Translation*

of Children's Literature: a Reader, 41—53. Edited by Gillian Lathey. Clevendon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Finanz Nachrichten (2004). *Lemony Snicket's The Grim Grotto Surpasses 1.1 Million Copies Sold.* Cited 31.03.2008: http://www.finanznachrichten.de/nachrichten-2004-10/artikel-3983143.asp

Gribben, Mark (2007). *The Claus von Bulow Case*. Cited: 21.01.2007: http://www.crimelibrary.com/notorious_murders/family/bulow/1.html

Hagfors, Irma (2001). A *Journey to Another Time and Place: How a British Victorian Children's Classic Was Translated in Postwar Finland*. The Electronic Journal of the Department of English at the University of Helsinki, Volume 1. cited 21.11.2006: http://www.eng.helsinki.fi/hes/Translation/volume1.htm

Holmes, James S. (2008). *Translated!: Papers on Literary Translation and Translation studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Hynönen, Antti (2002). *Paradoksien mies*. [A Man of Paradoxes] Cited 06.03.2008: http://www.kiiltomato.net/index.php?rcat=K%E4%E4nn%F6skirjallisuus&rid=321

Internet Movie Database (2008). *Daniel Handler*. Cited 21.01.2008: http://www.imdb.com/name/nm1274516/

Internet Movie Database (2008). Jouko Turkka. Cited 18.03.2008: http://imdb.com/name/nm0877209/

Internet Movie Database (2008). *Reversal of Fortune*. Cited 21.01.2008: http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0100486/

Irc-galleria (2006). *Surkeiden Sattumusten Sarja*. [A Series of Unfortunate Events] Cited 11.12.2006: http://irc-galleria.net/channel.php?channel_id=706328 2006

Kemppainen, Tatja (2005). There's Many a Slip 'Twixt Dress and Drawers': A Study of How Wordplay in Terry Pratchett's *Wyrd Sisters* and *Reaper Man* Has Been Translated into Finnish. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Oulu.

Klingberg, Göte (1986). *Children's Fiction in the Hands of the Translators*. Studia psychologica et pedagogica series altera LXXXII. Lund: Gleerup

Koponen, Maarit (2004). Wordplay in Donald Duck Comics and Their Finnish Translations. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Helsinki.

Lathey, Gillian (2006). Introduction. In: *The Translation of Children's Literature: a Reader,* 1—12. Edited by Gillian Lathey. Clevendon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Leppihalme, Ritva (1996). Caught In the Frame. A Target Culture Viewpoint on Allusive Wordplay. *The Translator*. Volume 2: Number 2, 1999-218. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Merriman, C.D. (2007). Nathaniel Hawthorne. Cited 21.02.2008: http://www.online-literature.com/hawthorne/

Monty Python (2008). *Pythonline*. Cited 18.03.2008: www.pythonline.com

National Spelling Bee (2008). Scripps National Spelling Bee. Cited 12.02.2008: http://spellingbee.com/

Nikolajeva, Maria (1997). *Introduction to the Theory of Children's Literature*. Second, Revised and Enlarged Edition. Tallinn: Tallinn Pedagogical University.

Nurmijärven kunta (2007). *Runoilija ja säveltäjä Elmer Diktonius (1896-1961)*. [Poet and Composer Elmer Diktonius (1896-1961)] Cited 21.02.2008: http://www.nurmijarvi.fi/palvelut/kulttuuri_ja_museo/historiaa_verkossa/nurmijarvelaisia_merkkihenkilo/fi_FI/Diktonius/

OECD PISA (2006). PISA — *Suomen menestystarina*. [PISA — Finland's Success Story] Cited 31.03.2008: http://ktl.jyu.fi/pisa/

O'Connell, Eithne (2006). Translating for Children. In: *The Translation of Children's Literature: a Reader,* 15—24. Edited by Gillian Lathey. Clevendon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Oittinen, Riitta (1993). *I Am Me – I Am Other: On the Dialogics of Translating for Children*. Acta Universitatis Tamperensis ser A vol 386. Tampere: University of Tampere.

Oittinen, Riitta (1997). *Liisa, Liisa ja Alice. Matkakirja*. [Liisa, Liisa and Alice. A Travel book] Tampere: Tampere University Press.

Oittinen, Riitta (2000). *Translating for Children*. New York: Garland.

Ojala, Annina (2006). "Duck, you silly swan": Translation of Wordplay into Finnish in Mutts Comics. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Vaasa. The Tritonia Academic Library Vaasa.

Oxford English Dictionary (2008). *OED Online*. Cited 22.04.2008: http://dictionary.oed.com.proxy.tritonia.fi/entrance.dtl

Potter's Realm (2005). *Characters*. Cited 18.03.2008: http://www.pottersrealm.com/characters-List.html

Puurtinen, Tiina (2001). Käännösten hyväksyttävyys [Acceptability of Translations]. In: *Alussa oli käännös* [In the Beginning There Was Translation], 82—94. Edited by Riitta Oittinen and Pirjo Mäkinen. Tampere: Tampereen Yliopistonpaino Oy – Juvenes Print

Robinson, Tasha (2005). *Interviews: Daniel Handler & Lemony Snicket*. Cited: 21.01.2008: http://www.avclub.com/content/node/42625/1/1

Saukkola, Mirva (1997). *Lapsuuden paratiisit* [Childhood's Paradises]. Helsinki: Cosmoprint.

Saukkola, Mirva (2001). *The Eden of Dreams and Nonsense Land. Characteristics of the British Golden Age Children's Fiction in the Finnish Children's Fantasy Literature of the 1950s*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki. Cited 21.04.2006: http://ethesis.helsinki.fi/julkaisut/hum/taite/vk/saukkola/

Shavit, Zohar (2006). Translation of Children's Literature. In: *The Translation of Children's Literature: a Reader,* 25—40. Edited by Gillian Lathey. Clevendon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Stolt, Birgit (2006). How Emil Becomes Michel: On the Translation of Children's Books. In: *The Translation of Children's Literature: a Reader,* 67—83. Edited by Gillian Lathey. Clevendon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Tigges, Wim (1988). *An Anatomy of Literary Nonsense*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Tiusanen, Jukka. Acting lecturer. Vaasa. Spoken communication, Department of English of the University of Vaasa 14.5.2008.

Tiusanen, Marja-Liisa (1997). Pun for Fun!: a Contrastive Study on Word Play with Special Reference to Alice's Adventures in Wonderland and its Translations into Finnish. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Joensuu.

University of Adelaide Library (2006). *The Gothic Novel*. Cited 21.02.2008: http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/themes/gothic.html

Venuti, Lawrence (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*. London: Routledge.