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Abstract

The translation and publication process of foreign literary works and particularly of children’s literature in Russia has been through various changes and reforms following the socio-political shifts that occurred in different periods of Russian history. This thesis examines three Russian translations of Lewis Carroll’s *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* published before, during and after the Soviet Era. This periodisation is essential, as the main research question of the thesis is how the shifting socio-political circumstances and ideologies governing Russia in each of the three periods examined affected the translation of children’s literature.

The study focuses on power and authority references, which are frequently identified in the book, as the creatures of Wonderland constantly insult and terrify Alice in their attempt to seize power. Through these examples and drawing on Even-Zohar’s polysystem theory, Toury’s concept of norms and House’s model of translation quality assessment, this thesis also answers questions as to how the norms prevailing in the source culture are transferred to the target culture, as well as what translation strategies are used by the Russian translators of *Alice Adventures in Wonderland* in each of the periods examined.

Since the study takes place in a Russian context, references to censorship in translation and publication of children’s literature are inevitable, as previous research has demonstrated that publications were under state control, particularly during the Soviet years. Therefore, the translations used here as observational material, are also examined for any potential censorship effect.

Despite the fact that the same examples are examined in all three translations, the result and the translators’ choices, differ to a great extent. The pre-Soviet translation has many deletions, related particularly to the violent scenes of the book. The Soviet translation is a literal rendering of Carroll’s original story. Finally, the post-Soviet translation is a creative work, which contains many additions that bring the story closer to the mentality and understanding of the Russian readership.
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Introduction

Children’s literature and its translation are considered to be relatively new and unexplored fields of academic research. This is due to the fact that children’s literature was considered to be a simple and easy subject to study on a scholarly level or as Shavit notes, scholars did not regard children’s literature as a “proper subject” to work on, as it was mainly related to its educational purposes and not to its literary value (Shavit, 1986: ix). Epstein also notes that children’s literature seems to be considered “simpler and more conventional” than works for adults (Epstein, 2012: 6). However, the above views have changed as children’s literature as well as its translation received more attention by researchers in different but often interrelated academic disciplines.

According to Tabbert, academic interest in the translation of children’s literature emerged due to the following factors: the assumption that translated children’s books can build bridges between different cultures; text-specific challenges facing the translator; the theory which classifies children’s literature as a subsystem of minor prestige; and the age-specific addressees either as implied or as real readers (Tabbert, 2002: 303). However, more factors make the translation of children’s literature a challenging filed. These may be related to issues of power, ideology and censorship.

In general, all discussions and academic debates on children’s books and their translation always harked back to three variables: the literature, the children and the adults (Hunt, 1999: 15). The adults’ interference as to what children read is inevitable, as they are the ones that write, edit, produce and buy books for children. Due to adults’ involvement in the writing and translating process of books for children, issues related to the manipulation of children’s literature have been raised.

References to manipulation and censorship in children’s literature have been particularly related to totalitarian regimes. In contexts as such, translated literature attempted to enter a country’s literary system, was monitored, as it was considered to be carrier of foreign ideas that might be harmful for the state. More specifically, Thomson-Wohlgemuth (2003; 2006; 2009) has demonstrated that translated children’s literature in the former German Democratic
Republic (GDR) had been revised in order to shape a reader’s identity according to the politically correct ideology.

The reshaping of translated children’s literature in order to instil Socialist ideas has also been observed in the former Soviet Union. Books for children were critically censored and used as a tool of state propaganda. For example, Frank Baum’s *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, was adapted by Alenxander Volkov in Soviet Russia, in 1939. According to Mitrokina, Volkov made “a number of cuts and insertions” that have altered the content of the story, in order to promote “ideological messages” and “appropriate role models” for the Soviet children (Mitrokina, 1997: 183). One example of “the paranoia of the Soviet system”, as Mitrokina stresses, is the tornado that is not a natural phenomenon in the story, but a force coming from the witch Gingema in order to destroy the humans. In the Soviet context, this allegory symbolises the constant search by the Soviet Union for an invisible enemy who is responsible for every negative and unfortunate incident that takes place in the country (Mitrokina, 1997: 184).

Despite the belief that censorship is a Soviet phenomenon, in fact, it has its roots in prerevolutionary Russia, as the idea of protecting the nation’s identity existed already from the early stages of the country’s development (Choldin, 1989: 29). Censorship practices in Russia started to be gradually eliminated during the years of *perestroika*¹ and were completely abolished after 1991 and the official dissolution of the Soviet regime. Therefore, Russia has had many changes in its political, social and cultural structures which were also accompanied with shifting ideologies. If we accept that translation activity is influenced by other developments in society, or as Lefevere (1992) suggested, that social groups and institutions (patronage) ensure that the literary system does not fall out of step with society, then it can be assumed that translations in Russia have been affected by shifting historical circumstances. And historical circumstances in Russia, as was noted above, were dramatic enough to have affected cultural production

Considering the three periods in Russian history (Imperial, Soviet, post-Soviet), the main research question that this study wishes to answer is the following:

---

¹ *Perestroika* in Russian means “restructure”. This was a programme introduced during the Soviet years (mid 1980s) by Mikhail Gorbachev to restructure Soviet economic and political policy.
How do shifting political and cultural ideologies affect the translation of children’s literature in different stages in Russian history?

The answer(s) to this question will be examined through the study and the comparative textual analysis of a classic work of Victorian literature. Three translations of Lewis Carroll’s fantasy story, *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* (one from each designated period) will be examined in parallel with the original text, as well as with each other. The reasons for this choice are related to the fact that *Alice*, a landmark of English literature, is a book, which contains many culture-specific references to the Victorian era. These references make the translation of the book a challenging task. More importantly, previous research has discussed the book’s revolutionary content for the time of its publication.

As Hunt points out, *Alice* was written in a period of “increasing instability” when British power and religion were being challenged and women and the working classes started seeking to change society. These topics are indicated in Carroll’s story through satire and complex allusions. Hunt also notes that *Alice’s* success emerged from the fact that it changed “the idea of what children were allowed to think”, as well as “the tone of voice of children’s book” (Hunt, 2009: 73). Therefore, the transfer of such a rebellious Victorian book into a Russian context is particularly interesting, as both the source and target culture and language are governed by radically different norms.

As will be discussed later in this study, many references (drugs, death, sex, genre, class, power) in *Alice* indicate the book’s ambivalent nature and unsuitability for children. Also interesting from a sensitive content point of view is the issue of power. Indeed, the book features moments where power references or asymmetries can be identified. Arguably, these may be assumed to cause intense emotional responses on the part of the implied reader or the real reader of these books. In other words, translators might have been aware of the impact it had on the implied readers they had in mind and the texts may have had such concrete effects on real readers.

The notion of power in children’s literature and its translation is a topic that has always been interesting for researchers as the children’s books are governed by the adult-over-child power demonstration. However, as Beauvais notes, power has many meanings and it is not always
used to mean the same thing. It may mean “authority, ability, domination, strength, impact, influence, potential, importance, prominence, superiority, energy and much more”. Power is used as an “umbrella term” that needs further explanation (Beauvais, 2012: 79). In Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland, the adult-creatures dwelling in Wonderland exert their power over the child-Alice as well as over each other, through intense, aggressive and violent verbal and non-verbal communication, which includes insults, humiliations and even threats against someone’s life. This thesis explores the transfer of these referential aspects onto a Russian context where issues of power and authority have defined the country in many stages of its history.

To summarise the above-mentioned issues, Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland is a book that may be amenable to layered manipulation: On the one hand the two languages are different and translators are obliged to reformulate, as they do not have the same semantic, syntactic or pragmatic means to express the ideas and form of the source text. To quote the linguistic relativity thesis, language influences thought (Boase-Beier 2011: 31). More importantly, however, linguistic choices are influenced by socio-historical factors. It can be assumed that Russian was steeped in historical circumstances at a given time, so this must have presented translators with opportunities for rewriting of the original. As was noted above, when translating literature under certain periods of Russian history, translators did their work under conditions of publicly acknowledged censorship norms. Thus, it can be assumed that linguistic norms and norms concerning literary motifs on the one hand and societal norms, on the other, may have been aligned. Therefore, the second research question that this study examines is:

How are the norms prevailing in the source culture transferred to the target culture?

Many scholars have discussed the topic of the cultural norms that govern the translation process and the choices a translator needs to make in order to transfer these norms from the source to the target language. Desmidt discusses the fact that there are general translational norms, such as the source-text related norms, the literary aesthetic norms and the business norms. However, the translation of children’s literature is a more challenging task as there are more norms involved than in the translation of adult literature. This is due to the didactic purpose of children’s books and the assumed close relation between the systems of education,
politics and professional literary production. Therefore, when translating books for children, all these norms, didactic, pedagogical as well as technical (illustrations) should also be taken into consideration (Desmidt, 2006: 86). After answering the above question regarding the cultural norms in the translation process, a general conclusion on the translation strategies used in each period will be drawn. The third research question, therefore, in this study is:

**What translation strategies did the translators of Alice use in each period?**

In order to answer this question, it is necessary to collect clues about translators’ behaviour regarding the translation of children’s literature during the three periods examined. Therefore, the conditions under which translations of children’s books were conducted in Imperial, Soviet and post-Soviet Russia are also discussed and whether *Alice’s* Russian translations examined here followed this pattern is analysed.

Finally, since the thesis examines the translation process in the Russian context of cultural production, it is important to focus on references related to censorship are inevitable. Considering all the above, the last question that this study seeks to answer is:

**Is there evidence of censorship in the Alice translations examined?**

Chapters 3 and 4 present details and information regarding the censorship history of the country as well as censorship practices adopted by the government in different periods. Indeed, in children’s literature there are several examples of books where the content has been altered in order to serve the Party’s ideology. An example is Collodi’s *Pinocchio*, who becomes *Buratino*, suggesting a fight for the social “good” (see 4.5.2.1).

In order for the above research questions to be answered the use of a specific theoretical framework, which will illuminate the methodology and the findings of the study, is necessary. As already stated, the main point of this research is to examine the manipulation of translated children’s literature in Russia before, during and after the Soviet Era. The theoretical framework employed for the study is based on Even-Zohar’s polysystem theory and Gideon Toury’s concept of cultural norms and their role in translation. Both these theoretical approaches are culturally oriented and they view translation as a cultural product.
influenced by external factors. Using the above approaches, translations can be examined in relation to the contexts in which they are produced. Moreover, Juliane House’s model of Translation Quality Assessment is also employed in the study as a complementary tool to Even-Zohar and Toury’s approaches to the studying of translation of children’s literature. House's model will be used for textual micro-analysis purposes. The two approaches, systems/norms and text analysis are presented in the following sub-sections.

1.1 Theoretical Framework of the Study

This study explores the translation of children’s literature considering the environment or the context in which they were created. It seeks for answers regarding the manipulation of children’s books in Russia in different periods and the effect of political ideologies and cultural norms on their translation. For the above purposes to be achieved, a combination of translation theories was used as theoretical framework for the conduction of the research. The theories and approaches used in this study are Itamar Even-Zohar’s Polysystem Theory (PST), Gideon Toury’s approach on the role of Norms in translation and Juliane House’s model of Translation Quality Assessment.

Despite the fact that there are many theories and methodologies exploring particularly the translation of children’s literature (see chapter 5), the combination of the theories mentioned above was deemed to be ideal for the comparative text analysis and for the purposes of this study to be achieved. More specifically, polysystem theory examines different literary genres within a wider literary polysystem. These genres may include literary text written for adults, or texts written for children and even translated children’s literature. Polysystem takes into consideration the fact that a country’s literary polysystem interacts with the country’s cultural, political or, broader social systems. Therefore, the relational logic of this model allows a researcher to consider shifts occurring within these systems having possible implications for how literature is produced and presented to readers. Also these shifts change the position of each genre in the polysystem, moving them from a central position to the periphery and vice versa (Even-Zohar, 1979; 1990). Polysystem theory has successfully been applied to children’s literature and its translation. As Even-Zohar notes, with the polysystem theory translations are “no longer treated as the pure transfer between linguistic semiotics but are to be viewed as the transfer between texts” (Even-Zohar, 1979: 289).
Polysystem theory places translated texts in a system, which is dependent on and shaped by various other systems and it examines them as such, instead of looking at texts in isolation. These systems are transformed in time, influenced by various factors (cultural, social, political) which are reflected in the literary system. Therefore, the translational behaviour of the texts is a result of the external factors shaping the polysystem. Even-Zohar’s approach is not only based on textual features. It is an interdisciplinary approach where external and perhaps non-linguistic factors are also considered. More specifically, Even-Zohar’s systemic approach places translations in the context of their creation, which should also be examined.

Influenced by Even-Zohar’s polysystem theory where translations are part of a system within a wider polysystem, Gideon Toury supports the idea of translational norms play a significant role in transferring the source text and culture in the target culture. Since Toury’s norms are the continuation of the polysystem theory, both theories can be considered to be indissolubly linked, so for the purposes of this they will both be introduced for a better understanding of systemic approaches in translation studies. According to Toury, norms may occupy a central position on the social scale between absolute rules and pure idiosyncrasies. The closer to the rule a norm stands, the stronger it is. However, the norms may change positions on the scale, moving either closer to rules or idiosyncrasies (Toury 1995: 54). This expectation gives rise to the idea that patterns (rather than idiosyncrasies) of translation behaviour may emerge when the texts are examined in highly politicised contexts. This is an issue that will be addressed in chapter 3.

For Toury, translations also should not be isolated from their contexts and a translator serves a “social role”, “fulfilling a function allotted by a community” (Toury, 1995: 53). Therefore, translation is a “norm-governed” activity always accompanied by certain constrains (Toury, 1995: 56). Norms define the permitted behaviour for different situations taking place in a community. In the case of translation, the translator is expected to produce a text, compatible with the community’s norms. Deviations from the prevailing norms may have negative results.

Toury classifies the norms to preliminary, initial and operational norms and suggests that the translation activity involves at least two sets of norm-systems on two levels, those found in the source text and culture and those of the target text and culture (Toury, 1995: 56-8). Finally, the translator’s choice to preserve the source culture’s norms, determines the
translation's adequacy. On the other hand, his/her choice to follow the target culture’s norms determines the translation’s acceptability (Toury, 1995: 56–57).

According to Toury, there are two major sources for a reconstruction of translational norms. These sources are textual and extratextual. More specifically, textual are the translated texts themselves and extratextual are general comments, observations and remarks by people involved in the translation activity such as translators, editors, publishers. The difference between these two sources is that texts are “primary products of norm-regulated behaviour” and can be considered as “immediate representations” (Toury, 1995: 65). In general, Toury’s approach on translation norms also examines translations in their context, considering the social norms, the translator’s skills and background and the paratexts that accompany the texts.

Despite the fact that polysystem theory and norms were developed in the 1970s, they are still popular and useful in translations studies. The reasons for that may be summarised to the fact that polysystem theory is “a point of departure” (Shuttleworth, 2011: 179) for any study related to translation history. Polysystem and the way it was developed further in norm theory cast new light on comparative text analysis and translation history. They allowed researchers to think of complex networks of texts, some of which extend to many cultural spaces and/or across time. Thus, language direction, production, dissemination and reception in translation could be seen on a systematic rather than a fragmented/case-study basis. The two models also allowed researchers to turn their attention to context, for example by examining not only the text itself but the paratexts as well such as “prefaces, reviews, reflective essays and so on” (Baker, 2011: 190). All the above, are important for this study as they allow the examination of translation in different historical contexts. Complementary to polysystem and norms a third approach is also used as it allows the examination of specific linguistic choices in detail.

Similar to polysystem and norms, Juliane House’s translation quality assessment relates texts and translated texts to their situational and cultural contexts. House sees translation as both “a cognitive procedure which occurs in a human being’s, the translator’s, head, and a social, cross-linguistic and cross-cultural practice” (House, 2015: 1). She notes that the equivalence in translation is important, which inevitably leads to the assessment of the quality of translation and, therefore, translation quality assessment can be “the heart” of any theory of translation (House, 2015: 1). Preserving the cultural aspect of translation, that both Even-
Zohar and Toury suggest, House’s ideas on “cultural filtering” (1997, 2016) appear to be suitable and perhaps complementary to the notions of polysystem and norms. House identifies “mismatches” between ST and TT where “cultural filter” is applicable and “overt errors” which distort the meaning of the original text (House, 1997).

According to Kaniklidou and House (2017), in the process of cultural filtering, the source text “undergoes systematic rearrangements and major adaptations to target culture norms”. They also explain that these changes occur in order to serve the target text’s “assumed readability and acceptability” by the target audience which includes both children and adults. Therefore, the target text is accepted by the “target cultural norms and expectations” (Kaniklidou and House, 2017: 3). Therefore, the notion of norms is also inscribed in House’s model of translation quality assessment. This makes all three theories used in this theories compatible and complementary to each other as they examine translated texts on both micro and macro level.

Translation Quality Assessment, as well as polysystem and norms examine the translations within their cultural context. Register analysis and particularly the aspect of tenor demonstrate the social distance between characters (addresser/addressee) which is necessary for the analysis of the source and target texts in this study. The combination of all these approaches (Even-Zohar, Toury, House) is invaluable for this study and will be discussed in detail in chapter 2 of the thesis. Drawing on the above theoretical framework, this thesis investigates the socio-political context in which source and target texts were created, as well as the role of the norms governing translation in each of the periods Alice’s Russian texts were produced. The Russian translations of Alice chosen for this study are expected to reflect the norms of the time they were published. Through textual analysis and drawing on theoretical approaches for the translation of children’s literature the study reaches conclusions about the shifts occurred within the Russian literary polysystem.

1.2 Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland

Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland, a Victorian children’s fantasy book written by Lewis Carroll is chosen as observational material for this study. Alice is a book, which has attracted the attention of many disciplines. It has been subject of discussion and criticism in the academic world, from 1865 until today, 152 years after its publication. There is a significant
number of books, book chapters and articles were written regarding some stock aesthetic features of Alice. The list is relatively long and includes the following: Alice’s ambivalent content, the potential hidden meanings and symbols of specific references, the unique linguistic features including the puns, the parodies, the verses as well as Carroll’s wordplay, the depiction of the Victorian era, the position of the child in Victorian society, the illustrations\textsuperscript{2}, which accompany the text, and the translations of the book. Regarding the latter, the translators in all language pairs worldwide seem to have encountered the same challenges regarding the transfer of specific parts of the book in their language (see 5.6).

These challenging parts indicate Alice’s perceptibly culture-specific content. The book contains many personal references (Carroll’s environment), local references (Oxford society) and Victorian references, which cannot be realised by readers of another language and of a different culture. In fact, some of these references could only be understood by Carroll himself and the Liddell girls, while some others only by the people who lived in the Victorian Oxford of that time. When translating Alice, the Victorian norms, and more particularly the norms related to demands of social behaviour, battle of social classes as well as power and authority structures are transferred to a different cultural environment.

In order for all the above to be achieved, and for the research questions to be answered, the selection of specific translations to serve as observational material for the study was essential. The choice was determined after identifying all or at least as many Russian editions of Alice as possible, which have been published since the book’s first appearance on the Russian market until the early post-Soviet years. The research began with the exploration of already existing lists, published in books, journals or online resources on websites and blogs devoted to Lewis Carroll’s works and particularly to Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland and its Russian translations.

1.3 Selecting the Target Texts: Lists of Alice’s Russian Translations

After choosing Lewis Carroll’s fantasy story, Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland as observational material for this study, the next step was to identify the number of the Russian translations published in the period examined. An effective way to find all Alice’s translations

\textsuperscript{2}The illustrations in both Carroll’s books Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland and Alice through the Looking-Glass were created by Sir John Tenniel, an English illustrator and mainly political cartoonist.
published was by looking into lists of publications already existed. Initially three lists containing Russian publications of Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland as well as publications of Alice through the Looking-Glass translated into Russian were identified. These were published by Weaver³ (1964), Rushailo⁴ (1991) and Parker⁵ (1993). The lists had many similarities and none of them seemed to be complete, as the number of publications presented for more than 100 years was small (10 to12 translations). Moreover, all lists contained translations until the 1960s or 1980s and publications from the post-Soviet period were not identified. Therefore, the research for a complete list of Alice’s publications continued from the Imperial until the early post-Soviet years continued.

The most extensive and detailed work regarding the translations of Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland was published in June 2015, two years after the beginning of this study: Alice in a World of Wonderlands, a three-volume bibliography containing translations of Alice into different languages and even dialects, edited by Lindseth and Tannenbaum. This work is a tribute to Warren Weaver and a continuation of his Alice in Many Tongues (1964). The first volume of the publication contains essays on both Alice books, Carroll’s life and work, and Tenniel’s illustrations. There are also essays on the great number of translations that appeared after, as well as an appraisal to Warren Weaver, who was the first one to work on a project containing the publications of Alice worldwide. The second volume includes the back translations of a specific passage from Alice in various languages. The third volume of this significant project is a checklist of all editions of both Wonderland and Looking-Glass into all languages for which a translation has been identified.

The number of scholars who contributed to the publication of this book is considerable, as the essays, back translations and checklists of both Alice books’ publications, in all three volumes were written by “more than 250 unpaid volunteer contributors from around the world” (Lindseth and Tannenbaum, 2015a: 13). There are 7,609 editions, issues and reprints of Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland in 174 languages and 1,530 of Alice through the Looking-Glass in 65 languages. In these numbers are included 650 books, which are

³ See Appendix 1  
⁴ See Appendix 2  
⁵ See Appendix 3
combined editions of both *Wonderland* and *Looking-Glass* (Lindseth and Tannenbaum, 2015a: 22).

Lindseth and Tannenbaum’s list provides a large number of translations of *Alice* published in Russia from 1879 until today. According to the list, there are 219 Russian editions (reprints, republications) of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* only (this number does not include the *Alice through the Looking-Glass* publications), registered from 1897 until 2013 (Lindseth and Tannenbaum, 2015a: 743). This significant amount of editions indicates the popularity of *Alice* in Russia and the interest both children and parents (or in general, adults) have expressed for the book. Moreover, according to Lindseth and Tannenbaum’s recordings the Russian translations (219) hold the 10th position for having the most (re)publications after Dutch (243), Korean (278), Italian (391), Brazilian Portuguese (396), French (451), Chinese (463), German (562), Spanish (1,223) and Japanese (1,271) (Lindseth and Tannenbaum, 2015a: 743). Considering the above facts, *Alice* seems to have been among the popular children’s book in Russia. This number of publications may signify the book’s acceptance in the Russian literary system.

Lindseth and Tannenbaum’s list of the Russian publications of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* seemed to be the most sufficiently complete until that time. It is assumed that it contained all publications and republications of *Alice’s* Russian translations, which were published not only in Russia but in other countries as well (e.g. Germany, Bulgaria). The list contained information needed regarding the date and place of publication, the publishing house, the translator(s) and the illustrator(s), the number of copies published and even the number of pages of each edition. In some entries there were also comments relating to the translation itself as well as the publication process followed. Therefore, this list seemed to be an ideal tool for the final selection and reasonable justification of the translations used as observational material, which serves the purposes of the study, that is, the search for prototypical translations in the three socio-political contexts identified.

### 1.4 The Alice Translations Examined

In her discussion regarding research methods in translation studies, Tymoczko notes that the translations chosen to be examined in a research project assumingly “set in high relief the cultural or ideological issues related to the cultural interface at hand”. However, she stresses
that it is “impossible (and usually irrelevant) to study the full text of one or more translation” and therefore the choice of specific passages that will serve the research’s hypothesis best is crucial (Tymoczko, 2002: 18). As already mentioned, the Russian publications of *Alice* in the period from 1879 when the book was first translated into Russian until 2013 were recorded to be 217, according to Lindseth and Tannenbaum’s list (2015c). This vast body of data is impossible to examine within the time and scope of a PhD project and may probably be unnecessary. Therefore, the translations should be limited and the selection should serve the purposes of the study and give answer(s) to the research question(s) posed.

For example, research questions focusing on examining individual lexical items across a large number of translations would be possible by using electronic corpora. Research questions in this instance would revolve around the distribution of such lexical items and patterns/norms in translation by using small units of translation. In this thesis, however, the approach of close reading takes into account distinct narrative implications (the story) and how translation behaviour varies in relations to these. A small number of translations can then be justified on the grounds that the approach is more qualitative. The study also aims at both confirming findings of existing studies (e.g. Parker) as well as going beyond such studies.

This study, seeks to examine the impact of changing cultural shifts in the translation of children’s literature before, during and after the Soviet era. Therefore, the number of translations to be examined was limited to three: a pre-Soviet, a Soviet and a post-Soviet. The next issue that needed to be tackled was which translation of each period would make the ideal observational material for the comparative analysis, which is presented in chapter 6. Two publications played a crucial role to the methodology of this thesis. The first one is the frequently quoted list of Russian publications by Lindseth and Tannenbaum in their three-volume book *Alice in a World of Wonderlands* (2015c). Their list is used as a guide to all publications that appeared in Russia from 1879 until 2014. The second publication is Herman Ermolaev’s book *Censorship in Soviet Literature, 1917-1991*, published in 1997. Ermolaev (and many other scholars) divides Soviet history into different categories regarding the stages
of censorship in relation to literature and children’s literature. His classification\textsuperscript{6} is used as a guide to the course of literary censorship for the better understanding of the publishing process during the Soviet period. The book contains six chapters, which indicate the six periods of Soviet censorship in the literary history.

Taking into consideration Lindseth and Taunebaum’s list along with Ermolaev’s periodisation it was possible to identify which translations of Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland were published in each period and what this meant in terms of the context of translation. After examining the sources available, the final decision was to choose the first translations that appeared in specific periods during the three eras examined. A problem might arise here. As discussed already, the Soviet era is subdivided into more periods according to specific characteristics and the choice of the relevant translation might need a more detailed explanation. In general, among the large number of Russian translations of Alice, the pre-Soviet translation chosen is the first translation published in Imperial Russia in 1879, and consequently the first Russian Alice. The Soviet translation chosen is the first translation published in Moscow, in 1958, after Stalin’s death and after a long period of stagnation related to Alice’s publication. Finally, the post-Soviet translation chosen is the first translation published in the Russia, in 1991, when the end of the official end of the Soviet regime was approaching. All the above are significant periods in the Russian History and the translations published during that time (especially the first ones) are expected to reflect the cultural, social and political norms prevailing each era in the most effective way.

The reasons for each choice will be presented in detail in the following sections. However, it should be noted here that due to access constraints some of the translations examined are later, identical republications of the first versions chosen for the reasons already mentioned and explained further in the following three sections (one for each translation) of the study. In general, the first translation chosen as observational material is the first translation of Alice published in Tsarist Russia in 1879 and, at the same time, it is the first translation ever published in Russia. The choice of the second translation was more challenging as the Soviet period can be subdivided to different periods during which different publishing policies

\textsuperscript{6} Ermolaev’s classification of the Soviet period regarding to censorship practices in literary publications is used in order to understand the Soviet norms prevailing publications better and to justify the choice of the Soviet translation used as observational material for the study.
applied to children’s literature. The translation chosen here is not the first Soviet translation published (as this is a translation published in 1923 by D’Aktil). Instead, it is the first translation published in Moscow after Stalin’s death and the only one being published in the country for approximately 31 years. In addition to the fact that this translation was the only one circulating in the country for many years, it is particularly interesting, as it is also accompanied with an introduction, which is perhaps used in order to warn the readers about the content of the book. Finally, the third translation chosen was published in 1991, at a time when even if it was not official, the Soviet dictates regarding the publication policies in domestic and foreign literature were no longer effective.

All the translations appeared in periods when social, political and ideological norms were different. In particular, the two latter ones were published in times when changes took place and cultural shifts occurred. The first translation appeared in the Tsarist Russia under the reign of Alexander II. The second translation was published in the time when the Soviet regime was exercising stricter measures regarding publishing policies. Moreover, it was published by Detskaya Literatura, the official state’s publishing house for children’s literature. The third translation was published in 1992 in the post-Soviet, Russian Federation. Therefore, it can be assumed that the translators operated under different constraints, which are possibly reflected in the translation. The selection criteria of all three translations will be presented in detail in the following sections in chronological order (pre-Soviet, Soviet, post Soviet).

1.4.1 The Pre-Soviet Translation

The pre-Soviet translation chosen as observational material for the purposes of this study is the first translation of Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland published in Imperial Russia in 1879 (as recorded in all lists examined and presented above). According to Lindseth and Tannenbaum, this translation was published while Carroll was still alive and it was Carroll himself who attempted to reach an agreement with the translator. This publication was the 7th translation published in a foreign language before Carroll’s death. The rest of the translations published in that time were in Dutch and Danish (1875), Italian (1872), Swedish (1870) as well as French and German (1869) (Lindseth and Tannenbaum, 2015: 103). The pre-Soviet translations listed seem to be 8. However, several factors made this first translation particularly interesting, which will be explained, throughout this section.
The first Russian translation of *Alice* was published in Moscow in 1879 under the title *Sonia v Tsarstve Diva* (*Sonia in the Tsardom of Wonders*) by Typografia A. I. Mamontova. This appears to be the only translation published in Moscow as the rest of the Imperial translations listed were all published in Saint Petersburg. The book’s cover can be seen in *Figure 1*.

![Figure 1: Sonia v Charstve Diva book cover](image)

According to Lindseth and Tannenbaum (2015: 687), there is now evidence that the translator of the first Russian translation was Mrs. Olga Ivanovna Timiriaseva. Despite the above reference and because of its uncertainty, this research will refer to the translator of the first Russian translation of *Alice* as “Anonymous”.

The reasons that make this translation interesting from the academic research point of view are three. First, it is the fact that this is the first translation of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* ever published in Russia. This possibly means that translators who followed might have used this publication as a guide, as a precedent-setting example. Careful spot-checking – in individual items as well as longer excerpts – for similarities, might confirm this
point. For example, in 1908, a few years after Sonia’s debut in Russian, Granstrøm in his translation *Prikliuchenii Ani v Mire Chudes* (*Ania’s Adventures in Wonderland*), also changes Alice’s name, but into Ania this time. In 1923, Vladimir Nabokov also used the name Ania for his Alice in a translation published in Berlin.

In terms of longer excerpts, another example of possible influence from the first translation to the ones that followed is the historical references to Napoleon Bonaparte, the French military and political leader. In the original Carroll’s text when Alice meets the Mouse in the Pool of Tears chapter, she tries to start a conversation with it, but the Mouse seems to ignore her and it refuses to give answers to her queries. Then, Alice assumes that the Mouse does not respond because does not understand her as it is probably a French mouse: “I daresay it’s a French mouse, come over with William the Conqueror” (Carroll, 2009: 21). In the same monologue, Alice assumes the Mouse is a French mouse, which had probably come to Russia with the invasion of Napoleon⁷, and this is why it does not answer her, because it does not understand her language. In 1923, Nabokov uses the exact same reference to Napoleon in his translation.

The above common references might be only coincidences; however, they might also be influences passing from one translator to another. In general, this first translation of Alice was a domesticated version with all its English culture-specific elements rendered into Russian terms. This Russification of Alice’s story was a method used in the majority of the early translations that followed 1879.

A second factor that made this translation seem an interesting choice for further investigation is the evidence of censorship control printed on the first page of the book. Alice’s first Russian translation carries evidence of passing the censor's approval. In the first page of the book, behind the cover, there is printed the following indication:

Дозволено цензурою. Москва, 28 октября 1878 года.

---

⁷ Russian readers of 1879 might not recognise the name of William the Conqueror. However, they must be familiar with Napoleon Bonaparte from the history of their country and more specifically from the French Invasion in Russia in 1812, known as the Patriotic War (Отечественная война).
This sentence means: *Allowed by the censor, Moscow, 28th October 1878 year.* This is a proof that the book had been examined and had passed the censorship control, which might mean that its content might could have been changed or adjusted in order to become appropriate for publication. The censor’s approval can be seen in the following picture.

![Figure 2: Sonia v Charste Diva](image)

The third factor that played an important role in the choice of *Sonia* as observational material for the study is also the negative reviews that the book received in Russia when it was published (see chapter 4). As already discussed, the reviewers’ comments were quite discouraging. The initial reaction to the book in Russia was similar to the reaction to the book in England. The critics in both countries were not in favour of *Alice.* This common reaction to the original book as well as to its first Russian translation triggered further research to ascertain whether such negative impressions from both countries’ critics are justified; thus, close reading of the text was deemed to be necessary.

To sum up, the reasons that led to the choice of the first Russian translation of *Alice’s Adventure in Wonderland* to be examined in a comparative analysis for this study are three: first of all, this translation, as the first to be published, may have served as an example for the translations that followed. Therefore, by its examination, the answers that will occur will
possibly apply to other translations and justify the choices of other translators as well. Second, there is clear evidence in the first page of the book that it was passed by the censorship control. This indication might demonstrate that the content of the book was censored or adjusted in order to be approved and pass to the publication stage. Therefore, it is quite interesting to examine which parts of the book have been altered and explain the possible reasons. Finally, the third reason is the first negative reviews that the book received in Russia, which were similar to the first reactions against the original book in England. This coincidence made the book ideal for further examination as there must be similar reasons for these common reactions that should be investigated.

1.4.2 The Soviet Translation

The choice of the Soviet translation was the most challenging of the three translations that needed to be chosen for this study’s goal(s) to be achieved. This is because the Soviet era can be subdivided in different periods regarding the austerity of the government measures in relation to domestic and foreign publications. Moreover, there was a great number of Alice translations covering the years from 1917 until 1991 according to Lindseth and Tannenbaum’s list (2015c). A number of scholars and researchers have already classified the Soviet Era in relation to the political changes that occurred within the 75 years of the Communist regime. It seemed appropriate to follow their pattern and use their classification for the purpose of this study. More specifically, Ermolaev (1996), as mentioned above, classifies the Soviet literary history in 6 periods in relation to the state’s censorship policies. Ermolaev’s book contains six chapters, each of them devoted to a specific period, which is characterised by title. In his study, Ermolaev identifies two types of censorship, the political and the puritanical and his classification is the following:

- (1917-1931) – “Birth and Maturation”

This is period at the beginning of the Soviet era. It starts with the establishment of the Soviet Union and ends with the introduction of Social Realism into all kinds of art (Ermolaev, 1996: xiv). In Lindseth and Tannenbaum’s list there are two translations in this period and they are both published in 1923 by D’Actil and Nabokov. However, Nabokov’s translation is not taken into consideration for this study as it was published in Berlin. Nabokov’s works were banned in Russia at that time and Nabokov had left the country as a Russian émigré living in
Germany. Therefore, any strict Soviet policies regarding publications probably do not apply to his translation.

- (1932-1945) – “Intensification”

As can be understood from Ermolaev’s title, the second period is when the Soviet regime started to practice the strict measures of censorship control as these are the first years under Stalin’s power (Ermolaev, 1996: xiv). Following Lindseth and Tannenbaum’s list (2015c), there is only one Alice translation published during this time. It is Olenich-Gninenko’s translation, Alisa v Strane Chudes, published in Rostov-on-Don, the translator’s hometown, in 1940 (Hellman, 2013: 475).

- (1946-1953) – “The Peak”

The third period according to Ermolaev’s classification is “the worst period in the history of Soviet literature and censorship” (Ermolaev, 1996: xiv). Once again there is only one Alice translation in Lindseth and Tannenbaum’s list (2015c: 689), published in 1947 which probably is an identical republication of Olenich-Gninenko’s 1940 translation and it is again published locally in Rostov-on-Don.

- (1953-1965) – “The Unstable Thaw”

The fourth period in Ermolaev’s classification includes the years under Khrushchev, or the years of “the first relaxation of Soviet censorship since its emergence” (Ermolaev, 1996: xiv). During this period censorship tactics become looser. Surprisingly, the only translations indicated in Lindseth and Tannenbaum’s list (2015c: 689) are again the ones by Olenich-Gninenko. There are four entries this time. The first one is a translation of 1958 published in Moscow followed by a note saying that “the text underwent insignificant revision in comparison with 1940 and 1946 editions” (Lindseth and Tannenbaum, 2015c: 689). The statement regarding the “insignificant revisions” needs to be further investigated in future research, as it is vague and unjustifiable. However, this is the first time Olenich-Gninenko’s translation reaches Moscow since “Moscow’s publishers would never have accepted Carroll’s absurdism” until then (Hellman, 2013: 475). Considering the above, this translation was chosen as observational material for this study. There were two more translations by Olenich-


The fifth period entails censorship under Brezhnev, Andropov, and Chernenko. During this period, Lindseth and Tannenbaum include two translations in their list. The first one, was published in 1967, by Nina Demurova. However, this translation is also not taken into consideration as it was published in Sofia, Bulgaria (as Nabokov’s 1923 translation was published in Berlin). The second translation indicated, was published in 1971 by Boris Zakhoder.

The three translators mention above by Demurova, Zakhoder and Nabokov are considered to among the most popular Russian translations of *Alice* and they still have a significant number of republications or reprints. However, Nabokov’s translation was not published in Russia until 1976 and similarly Demurova’s translation was first published in Russia in 1978. Despite this delay in entering the country’s system of children’s literature, they still managed to become children’s favourite translations.

To sum up, the first Soviet translation of *Alice* by D’Aktil appeared in 1923. The next translation was published in 1940, 17 years after the first one, by Olenich-Gnenenko and it remained the only translation in the Russian market for 31 years as it was the only one constantly republished until 1971 when Zakhoder’s translation entered the Russian market. This means that for 31 years many generations of Soviet children had only access to the translation of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* created by Olenich-Gnenenko. A possible explanation is that the authorities probably did not wish to experiment with publishing new translations in times of great political, social and military tension that describe the years under Stalin’s power, World War II, Stalin’s death as well as the instability during the Khrushchev years that followed.

All the above can be observed in the table below which is a part of Lindseth and Tannenbaum’s 2015 list which outline the *Alice* translations published from 1923 until 1971. It can be seen that the only translation circulated in the country from 1940 until 1971 was the

---

8 Reproduction from Lindseth and Tannenbaum, 2015c:689-90
one created by Olenich-Gnenenko (highlighted in yellow colour). The 1967 entry by Demurova is not taken into consideration for this study as it is both a combined edition of Wonderland and Looking-Glass and it was also published in Sofia, Bulgaria. Therefore, it is assumed that the Soviet publishing policies have probably had no effect to this translation.

Table 1: (Lindseth and Tannenbaum, 2015c: 689-90)
Going back to the Soviet translation chosen the reasons for its selection will be explained in detail, starting from the book’s translator: Aleksandr Pavlovich Olenich-Gnenenko (1893-1963). Olenich-Gnenenko was a Russian writer and translator of children’s literature. He was born to a noble family in Kegichevka, Ukraine, where he spent most of his childhood. His father was also a writer and a journalist. After childhood, he and his family moved to Siberia, in Omsk. In 1916, he graduated from Kharkon University where he studied, at first, natural sciences and then law. Soon his poems for children were published magazines in St Petersburg and Siberia. In 1918, he joined the Bolshevik Party. In 1922, he started working as a journalist, editing the regional newspaper. In February 1931, he went to Rostov-on-Don and became the editor of the local newspaper “Kolkhoz Pravda”. Later he headed the Rostov writers' organization (1935-1938). There, in Rostov-on-Don, he published his first book for children Veselii Kray (Happy Land) and many more works followed. During the Second World War, he voluntarily joined the army where he worked as a journalist and studied English, German and French.

According to Ermolaev’s classification regarding the periods of literary censorship in Soviet Russia and following Lindseth and Tannenbaum’s list of Russian publications of Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland, the periods that seems to be most interesting in terms of the book’s number of publications are the three periods covering from 1932 until 1965. These are the years of Stalin’s power and the politically unstable years that followed his death in 1953. During this long period, there is only one publication of Alice in the Russian market that is constantly approved and republished. That is, Alisa v Strane Chudes, translated by Alexander Pavlovich Olenich-Gnenenko. The translation was initially published in Rostov-on-Don in 1940 by the publishing house Rostizdat. The book’s cover was designed by V. Biriukov, however, the illustrations inside the book were the original ones made by John Tenniel. The book was printed in 20,000 copies and in 1946 it was reprinted in 5,000 copies with a different cover this time designed by A. Gubin.

Both these publications were published locally in Rostov-on-Don, the translator’s hometown (Hellman, 2013: 475). Olenich-Gnenenko’s publication reached Moscow only in 1958 “since

---

9Aleksandr Pavlovich Olenich-Gneneko’s biographical note is taken from the online Russian journal ВремяZ, which can be found following the link: http://www.ytime.com.ua/ru/50/2746. The translation is made by the author of the thesis.
Moscow publishers would never have accepted Carroll’s absurdism” before (Hellman, 2013: 475). However, with “insignificant revision” (Lindseth and Tannenbaum, 2015c: 689) the book was finally published in Moscow by Detskaya Literatura accompanied with an introductory note written by V. Vazhdaev and with new illustrations created by Valery Alfeyevsky. The picture below is the cover of the 1958 Moscow edition:

![Figure 3: Alisa v Strane Chudes by Olenich-Gnenenko (1958) - cover](image)

More republications of Olenich-Gnenenko’s translation followed in different places: two republications in Rostov-on-Don in 1960 and 1961 and one in Khabarovsky in 1961. According to Lindseth and Tannenbaum’s list there was no other translation of Alice published in Russia from 1940 when Olenich-Gnenenko’s book was first published until 1971 when Boris Zakhoder published his translation in the children’s monthly magazine Pioneer. Therefore, Olenich-Gnenenko’s translation was “Russian children’s sole access to Alice” (Imholtz Jr. and Imholtz, 2014: 153) for 31 years.

Another fact that makes this translation particularly interesting is the introductory note, written by Viktor Vazdaev, which accompanies the book. The introduction is seven pages long and it appears to be a brief but detailed biographical note on Carroll’s life and work with
the main focus on Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland and its content. He begins with a rather literary description of Carroll sitting by the window of Christ Church College, looking at the three Liddell girls – Lorina, Alice and Edith playing in the garden. Vazdaev then talks about Carroll’s love of mathematics and classical literature as well as his journey to Russia and the diary he kept with all the humorous and funny observations he had written down. Vazdaev also describes Carroll’s contributions to magazines, journals and other publications, which became quite popular. Vazdaev talks about Carroll’s choice of this pen name. He comments on the rule of Christ Church that Carroll had to follow and he never got married, as he wanted to devote his life to science. Then he describes Carroll as a shy person who enjoyed photography and telling stories or reading poetry to children.

Vazdaev reveals information and details for Carroll’s life, which probably signifies that apart from the Alice book, there was an interest in Carroll himself in Russia at that time, and perhaps there were translated biographies published. When Vazdaev starts talking about the Alice story, once again he mentions details about the boat trip and the creation of the story. He talks about the publication of Looking-Glass that followed, Queen Victoria’s interest in the book, and the Golden Age of children’s book that started with Wonderland. He explains that the book ridicules the dogmatic life of the Victorian era, the educational system, the everyday habits and the laws, providing examples from Alice’s inability to recall things taught at school, the Mad Hatter’s tea party, the Knave’s court and the Queen’s irrational demand to cut people’s heads off.

Vazdaev admits that through all the above examples, Wonderland might sound a scary place but Alice remains brave. In general, Vazdaev highlights the “absurdities and incongruities” (нелепости и несообразности) of Victorian life. His description might sound like a warning to parents or adults reading the book. He underlines the fact that the incidents described take place in another country, in a place far away from Russia where everyday life is different. In this country, children are scared and suffer, and their life has nothing in common with the “perfect” childhood of Soviet children.
What is particularly interesting here is the last paragraph of the introduction. In a free translation, Vazdaev notes that little Alice loves her big England and because of this love she should now raise her voice calling for a new sense and for a new dream, to see her motherland become better and free from all the things that astonished her in Wonderland. With this last sentence, Vazdaev calls Alice and perhaps the child-reader to ignore all the impressing elements met in Wonderland and fight for a country without any of these absurdities. He stresses that Wonderland and, at the same time, Victorian society is inadequate in comparison to Soviet values. He also encourages the reader not to be distracted by the meaningless content of the book but to stay focused on a motherland free from any irrationality.

The above facts inevitably lead to the conclusion that this translation was allowed to circulate around the country under circumstances of either strict or subtle censorship and, therefore, it must have had a kind of official approval, even in the times when it was published outside Moscow. The book was accessible to the public for such a long time, potentially shaping people’s attitudes and shaping young minds. Despite its promotion by the publishing committees of the time, later critical reviews were not positive. Demurova suggests that this translation was “fatal for Carroll’s works” (Demurova, 1994–1995: 16) and Parker underlines Olenich-Gnenenko’s “attempt to remain exactly constant to the original” which “gives the Russian a monotonous tone, thus failing to convey Carroll’s verbal brilliance” (Parker, 1994: 31). These comments support even more the belief that the content of this translation was processed accordingly to the publishing demands of the time.

In general, taking into consideration the above analysis as well as issues of accessibility in specific translations, the Soviet translation chosen as observational material for this study is Olenich-Gnenenko’s *Alisa v Strane Chudes* published in Moscow, in 1958. As already explained, this seems to be the only translation of *Alice* for many years in Russia. This

---

10 The Russian excerpt from Vazdaev’s introduction is the following: “Мы не сомневаемся, что маленькая Алиса нежно любит свою большую Англию, но в ее любви теперь уже должен зазвучать голос нового чувства, новой мечты — видеть родину лучшей, освобождающейся от всего того, что так поразило Алису в «стране чудес»”.

11 Olenich-Gnenenko’s translations of *Alice* published in 1940 and 1946 in Rostov-on-Don were not found during the research.
probably means that it was transformed into a book “safe” for Soviet children to read. Its transition from a book published on a local level at Rostov-on-Don to a book published in Moscow was also accompanied with “insignificant revision”, a reference that also implies censorship processing. Therefore, this translation will be examined in comparison to Carroll’s original as well as the other two translations in order to answer this study’s research questions.

1.4.3 The Post-Soviet Translation

The final period in Ermolaev’s classification of the Soviet era is the period (1985-1991) or “Melting” era as he chose to name it. This era led to the end of censorship and the Soviet regime during Gorbachev’s perestroika (Ermolaev, 1997: xiv). During that time, the translations published were republications of previous translations by Demurova, Zakhoder, Nabokov, Shcherbakov and Oryol. However, in the year 1991 there is a new addition to the list of Alice’s translators. A new translation by Yakhnin, under the title Приключения Алисы в стране чудес, was published in 1991 the year of the Soviet Union’s dissolution. The regime officially collapsed in December 1991. However, the last few years before 1991 and during Gorbachev’s perestroika the “melting” of the regime started as described by Ermolaev. It is not known what is the exact date of Yakhnin’s publication of Alice, however, it is assumed that this is a new translation, under new perspectives and free from the Soviet ideas and values.

Figure 4: Приключения Алисы в стране чудес
As such, the third translation chosen for this study is the post-Soviet translation by Leonid Lvovich Yakhnin. Yakhnin was born in 1937 in Moscow. In 1964, he started publishing poems for children. He was also known for his translations from different languages such as English, German, Slovenian, Polish and Georgian into Russian. Among his translations were Lewis Carroll’s *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* and *Alice through the Looking-Glass* which were published in 1991 and in 1992 in the journal *Pioneer*.

What makes Yakhnin’s translation of *Alice* interesting in terms of observational material is the fact that this translation was a new entry in the list of *Alice’s* Russian translations provided by Lindseth and Tannenbaum (2015c). Until his translation was published in 1991, *Alice’s* translations in Russia were republications of the Soviet ones which republished, such as the translations made by Demurova, Nabokov and Zakhoder. This can be seen in the table provided below which is in part taken from Lindseth and Tannenbaum’s list. It indicates that among the well-known translations from Demurova and Zakhoder there is also Yakhnin’s translation (highlighted in yellow colour), a new entry and a new translator of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Illustrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Published in Zakhoder: Стихи и казки (Zakhoder: Poems and fairy-tales). Alice on pages 479-590.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 Yakhnin’s short biographical note was found online from [https://www.livelib.ru/author/422117-leonid-yakhnin](https://www.livelib.ru/author/422117-leonid-yakhnin)
To sum up, the three Russian translations of Carroll’s *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* presented above are chosen as observational material for this research as they are believed to serve the purposes of this study’s best. The first translation chosen is the first Russian translation of *Alice*. It was published in 1879, during the pre-Soviet period, in Moscow by an anonymous translator. It appeared under the title *Соня в Царстве Дива* (Соня в Царстве Дива – Sonia in the Tsardom of Wonders). Even when reading the book’s title, someone can imagine the shifts that might have occurred in the translation process. *Alice* becomes *Соня* and *Wonderland* becomes a Russian *Tsardom*13. On the book’s cover, the only information provided in the following order is the title (Соня в Царствѣ Дива), the place of publication (Москва), the year of publication (1879), the name of the publishing house and its address (Типографія А. И. Мамонтова и К°, Леонтьевскій пер, N05). The author’s, the translator’s and the illustrator’s name are not mentioned on the book’s cover, nor in any page of this edition. Despite the fact that it is now known that the author is Lewis Carroll and the illustrator is John Tenniel, the Russian translator remains a mystery.

The second translation chosen was published in Moscow, in 1958 during the Soviet years. The translator was Alexandr Olenich-Gnenenko and the book’s title was *Алиса в Стране Чудес* (Alisa in the Land of Wonders). This translation was originally published in Rostov-on-Don in 1940 and then again in 1946 until it was finally published in Moscow in 1958. Olenich-Gnenenko’s translation was the only version of *Alice* published in Russia from 1940 when it first appeared until 1971 when Zakhoder’s *Alice* was published in the children’s

13 Tsardom is the Russian equivalent for kingdom. It refers to the domain of power and authority of the Tsar (Russian king, emperor).
Finally, the third translation examined in this study was published in Moscow, in 1991 by Leonid Lvovich Yakhnin under the title Приключения Алисы в Стране Чудес (Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland). It was published in 1991 in the journal Pioneer, in a time when the demands of the Soviet regime had already started to fade and publication policies as well as society itself had started to change in order to escape the Soviet past (see 3.4).

1.5 Rationale and Contribution to the Field

Previous research has been conducted on the translations of Alice’s Adventure in Wonderland worldwide covering various editions and language pairs. Regarding previous research on Alice’s Russian translations, a work close to this study was published by Prof. Fan Parker in 1994 under the title Lewis Carroll in Russia: Translations of Alice in Wonderland 1879-1989. In her PhD research, Parker records only 11 translations of Alice in Russia from 1897 to 1989. It seems that Parker used the lists already published by Weaver and Rushailo as they count the same number of translations and they seem to miss many of the editions published in 2015 by Lindseth and Tannenbaum.

In 58 pages, Parker offers a brief description of 11 translations and reaches conclusions of the translation’s quality based on few examples from the text. In some cases, she resorts to a single example or very short sentences without further justification. Her analysis routinely covers one to two pages of the book and in many cases, there are pictures included. It is not known if Parker reached conclusions after examining all 11 translations in detail. However, her conclusions on whether a translation is “attractive though not successfully sustained rendering”¹⁴ (Parker, 1994: 14) or whether a translation “reads smoothly”¹⁵ (Parker, 1994: 31), are not justified through her text analysis.

Despite the fact that two of the translations examined in this study are also included in Parkers’ work, the differences between these studies lie in the methodology used. There are only three Alice translations examined thoroughly in this study in terms of the power relations between Wonderland creatures. The scenes were chosen in terms of their prototypicality as episodes on the basis of strong discourse, plot and criticism-specific features. By discourse-

¹⁴ This comment refers to the first translation of Alice published in Russia in 1879 by an anonymous translator.

¹⁵ This comment refers to Alice’s translation published in 1940 by Alexandr Olenich-Gnenenko.
specific features, it is meant here that the examples contain references to power frames, which are believed to indicate best the authoritative behaviour of the book’s protagonists. By plot-specific features it is meant that the examples contribute significantly to the story’s plot considering their duration (long dialogues/arguments between the characters which could be called episodes) and the outcome of the scene (intense dialogues in which characters are verbally assaulted and might leave the place/scene). Finally, the criticism-specific features indicate scenes, which have previously been under the reviewers’ microscope. This means that other scholars, mainly in the field of literary and cultural studies have also identified these scenes as important for Alice’s plot and have pointed out the power issues they contain. However, they did not discuss power references to the same extent or at the same level of detail, as this study does, especially in terms of translation.

The combination of all or at least of the great majority of the features described above (discourse-specific, plot-specific and criticism-specific) is identified in each of the examples presented. Excerpts will be discussed from a comparative angle. Originals will be presented as free text quotations, accompanied by additional information that helps contextualize the episode presented. Then analysis between the original examples and its three Russian translations (TTa, TTb, TTc) will follow. The same instances from the book are examined in all three translations and any deviations from the original are discussed considering translational norms and contexts. The conclusions reached are based on a detailed comparative textual analysis where the shifts in social relationships between addresser and addressee are identified.

Acknowledging the methodology presented above and adopting an interdisciplinary theoretical framework, which includes systemic approaches of translation studies and translation of children’s literature this thesis aims at making a scholarly contribution to the study of the translation of children’s literature into Russian. More specifically, it aims at reaching conclusions regarding the translation of children’s literature in Russia’s history starting from the Imperial to early post-Soviet years. Three translations of Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland are chosen as observational material. The focus is on the power relationships between Wonderland creatures, as it is believed that they are apt indicators of norms governing the country each particular period examined. Therefore, considering the context in which translations were made, deviations are identified, in an attempt to examine the extent to which translations were influenced by external factors.
1.6 Thesis Outline

The present thesis is composed of seven chapters. The first chapter is the Introduction of the thesis where the topic of research, the research questions and the theoretical framework of the study are introduced. Moreover, the source text, *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* is briefly presented along with the selection process and criteria of the three targets texts. The rationale and the contribution of this study to the field of translation studies are also discussed. The second chapter under the title *Text in Context: Theories of Translation and Quality Assessment* presents the importance of examining translations within the contexts in which they were produced, as well as role of translation history as a method in translation studies. It also provides a discussion of the translation theories that serve as the theoretical framework of the thesis: Itamar Even-Zohar’s Polysystem Theory and Gideon Toury’s Norms in Translation. Juliane House’s model of Translation Quality Assessment is also presented as the model is a useful methodological tool for the evaluation of the three Russian translations of *Alice*. Finally, an example from *Alice* with its three translations is presented where the theoretical framework chosen for this study is tested for its efficiency and suitability for the purposes that this study aims to achieve.

In chapter 3, *Translation in Russian Context: Cultural Shifts and Censorship Practice* a brief presentation of the history of translation in Russia is provided. The translation history in Russia is divided in three sections: *Translation in Imperial Russia*, *Translation in Soviet Russia* and *Translation in the Russian Federation*. This classification is important as the study wishes to present the context in which the three Russian translations examined were created. The discussion on context of translation in Russia inevitably includes censorship practices applied to publications. Therefore, throughout the whole chapter the translation process is discussed in parallel with censorship procedures that were particularly intense during the Soviet years. The chapter also provides an insight into the forms of censorship that appeared and to techniques invented to evade the censors. A second example from source text and the three target texts is presented to test the censorship effect in *Alice’s* Russian translations.

The fourth chapter, *Children’s Literature and Aspects of Translation*, introduces the major factors that make children’s literature and its translation a challenging topic. The notion of
childhood, the educational purposes, the power and ideology effect, the involvement of adults in the production and distribution of children’s books, as well as their double audience are factors that should be taken into account before any analysis of children’s literature takes place. The chapter continues with the classification of genres of children’s literature with a focus on the genre of fantasy as well as the Victorian era, thereby contextualising Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland. The chapter focuses on the notion of power and how it is reflected in the relationships of the narrator and the implied reader through the text’s relationships between protagonists. It also presents the major theories in the field of translation of children’s books from scholars such as Shavit, Klingberg and Oittinen who have extensively engaged with the idea of manipulation in children’s literature. The final section of the chapter describes the context in which children’s literature and translated children’s literature was published and distributed in Russia, particularly during the Soviet time, as state control was more intense. A third example is also introduced here, in order to examine how Alice’s features which children’s literary criticism indicated as unsuitable for children, were treated in the translation into Russian in each period.

Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland: A World Classic is the fifth chapter of the current thesis and it reviews the literature related to Alice, a book that was published in 1865, and even today, 150 years after its publication, is still a topic of discussion in the academic world. The chapter places the original Carroll’s book within the context it was created presenting the initially negative opinion of the reviewers, the critical approaches that followed and the reasons that made Alice an ambivalent text. The notion of power and the violent references will also be discussed, as well as the translations of Alice worldwide and the issues translators’ faced, regarding the transfer of the book onto a different language and culture. The Alice example used in this chapter indicates the book’s special features, which are deeply connected to the Victorian era, and their translations into Russian are examined.

Chapter 6, A Different Alice in Different Wonderlands, contains more Alice excerpts indicate the power and authority relations between Wonderland creatures in their verbal and non-verbal communication. The examples and their Russians translations are presented in separate sections, followed by discussion and commentary. Finally, chapter 7 is the concluding chapter of the thesis where a summary of the main points of the thesis is provided and the findings of the comparative analysis are discussed in relation to the study’s research questions and aims. The chapter ends with suggestions for future research related to Alice’s
Adventures in Wonderland as a book for children as well as to the field of translation of children’s literature.
Chapter 2
Text in Context: Theories of Translation and Quality Assessment

The present chapter explores how theories of translation uncover political ideology in the three Russian translations of Alice. For this purpose to be achieved, a critical overview of the theoretical background of the thesis is provided. The methodologies employed in this study are the following: Itamar Even-Zohar’s Polysystem Theory, Gideon Toury’s approach on translational norms and Juliane House’s model of Translation Quality Assessment. These methodologies provide an apt theoretical backdrop for this study, because they highlight the importance of cultural context and the conventions that accompany both source and target text.

More specifically, the chapter begins with a discussion on the text and context relationship and the role of the latter in the translation act. The notion of context is then related to translation history as both terms indicate social and/or cultural change. The two so-called systemic approaches to translation – polysystem theory and norms are then presented, followed by House’s revisited model of Translation Quality Assessment. Finally, the chapter concludes with testing the theories in one excerpt of the three Alice translations to demonstrate the suitability of the theoretical background in relation to the objectives of the thesis. The Alice scene used here is the one where Alice meets the Duchess and they have an awkward conversation in the kitchen resulting in life threatening orders. This is a scene where Wonderland power structures are demonstrated and creatures attempt to exercise their authority. The following section presents the important role of context in which transitions are made in translation history studies.

2.1 The Context of Translation

As noted in Munday, the etymology of the word “translation” derives from the Latin word translatio, which means “to carry across”, “to bring across”. Today the word translation has acquired several meanings and therefore, is quite challenging to include everything in one definition. According to Munday, translation is “a general subject field or phenomenon” which involves both the “product” (text) and the “process” of translation (Munday, 2012: 8).
Venuti defines translation as “a cultural political practice, constructing or critiquing ideology-stamped identities for foreign cultures, affirming or transgressing discursive values and institutional limits in the receiving culture” (Venuti, 2008: 15). With this definition, Venuti steps away from the linguistic dimension of translation and suggests that the culture-specific elements of the target language and culture play a significant role in the final product of translation as well.

Besides the cultural factor, the “highly complex nature” (Baker, 2006: 321) of translation is always related to, and interact with, many other notions and disciplines. As Baker accurately suggests, considering the fact that translation is “deeply embedded in wider social and cultural practices”, its connection to notions such as context, culture, power and ideology, seems to be inevitable (Baker, 2006: 321). Therefore, the notion of context is one of these terms frequently discussed in translation studies.

Despite the frequent references to context, its definition may be challenging, as it includes or it can be influenced by various factors, such as social, cultural, geographical, political, economic or religious elements (or a combination of the above), which may differ from time to time and from one environment to another. However, “a phenomenon is connected to its surroundings”, as noted by Dilley, and therefore, contexts are “sets of connections construed as relevant to someone, to something or to a particular problem” (Dilley, 2002: 440). Dilley also notes that contexts are related to “local, indigenous social and cultural practice of peoples throughout the world” (Dilley, 2002: 441). This is how translation is associated with context, as the translation process involves two sets of social and cultural norms or two linguistic concepts: the ones prevailing in the source text and the ones prevailing in the target text. Therefore, translation is the transfer of linguistic units from the source text context to the target text context.

Considering the relation between the linguistic units and the context, Malinowski sees translation as “the placing of linguistic symbols against the cultural background of a society, rather than the rendering of words by their equivalents in another language” (Malinowski, 1935: 18). In other words, the cultural context in which translations occur plays a significant role and has great influence on the linguistic result. Therefore, any theories of translation cannot be examined separately from the notion of context. Texts are created in a specific context and then are translated into a different context from the original one. Both these
contexts need to be taken into account in order for translation choices to be understood and justified.

House (2006), discussing a re-contextualization theory of translation, indicates 3 criteria which are necessary for its validity. According to her criteria, the relationship between text and context has to:

- explicitly account for the fact that source and translation texts relate to different contexts;
- be able to capture, describe and explain changes necessitated in the act of re-contextualization with a suitable metalanguage;
- explicitly relate features of the source text and features of the translation to one another and to their different contexts (House, 2006: 344).

In this study, the context or in other words, the background (social, cultural, political, etc.) in which both the original (ST) and its translations (TTs) have been created is taken into account. Following House’s criterion which demands that “source and translation texts relate to different contexts” (House, 2006: 344), not only is the ST different from the TTs, but the TTs are also different to each other. Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland was written and published in England, in 1865. Its Victorian-featured content is then rendered into Imperial, Soviet and Post-Soviet contexts. The word context here includes various conventions and values related to the social, cultural and political instability governing Russia during these periods, as well as to specific publication policies. Therefore, the shifts that may occur from the transfer of a Victorian context to a Russian one may also reflect the shifting norms in the history of Russia during various periods in the country’s history.

2.2 Translation History

The relationship between text and context implies the connection of the text with its environment and its surroundings. It includes answers to questions such as who wrote the ST, who translated the TT, when the translation occurred, where, how and why. It introduces the history of the TT at the time when the text was translated. The translator’s background also provides information on several aspects defining translation, such as historical, social,
political, and geographical elements. Therefore, the examination of a translated work can shed light on various parts of a culture’s history.

Among the many aspects within translation studies that have attracted the interest of academics and scholars in recent years, interest towards Translation History has also emerged. Pym’s contribution to the field of Translation History has been significant. He suggests three reasons for studying translation history. First, the translation history can “fulfil a service function with respect to the humanistic disciplines concerned with describing individual cultures”. Second, it can “provide information and ideas that may prove useful for policymakers in the field of general language and culture as well as translation”. Finally, translation history “can be of indirect service to social groups of intermediaries (translators, negotiators, traders) to affirm their intercultural specificity” (Pym, 1998: 16-17). In other words, Pym summarises the importance of the Translation History to the humanities in general, as well as to language and cultural studies in particular. When studying Translation History, the context in which texts were produced is studied. Therefore, various conclusions might occur regarding the social and political state of both the source and the target cultures during the study process.

According to Pym’s definition, translation history is “a set of discourses predicating the changes that have occurred or have actively been prevented in translation” (Pym, 1998: 5). In other words, the changes that take place within a society, in different periods can be reflected in the translations of its literary systems. He also classifies translation history studies into three categories: translation archaeology, historical criticism and explanation. Translation archaeology answers the questions “who translated what, how, where, when, for whom and with what effect”. Historical criticism “assesses the way translations help or hinder progress” and the explanation as Pym defines it, indicates, “why the archaeological artifacts occurred when and where they did and how they were related to change” (Pym, 1998: 5-6). All these three categories of translation history indicate the complicated nature of translation and the number of actions as well as agents, effects and theories, which are involved in the studying of translation history.

Pym also develops four principles related to the factors that play an important role in studying translation history. First of all, according to him, translation history should explain “why translations were produced in a particular time and place”. This parameter will answer
any possible questions regarding “social causation”, which includes the social reasons that various translation choices were made. Second, Pym suggests that in order to understand why translations were produced, the people involved should be taken into account as well. These are “the human translators” as he calls them and they are responsible for “social causation”. The third principle is that the “social contexts where translators live and work” should also be examined in translation history. Finally, the fourth principle described by Pym is that anyone who is involved with translation history should examine the past, without forgetting the present. In other words, translation history sheds light on the past in order for problems, issues, questions of the present to be solved. For Pym the present should be a priority and the examination of the past can contribute to maintain the present as such (Pym, 1998: ix-x).

Pym’s work focuses mainly on translators, their background and the way they can affect translation, rather than the text itself. In his words, “the central object in historical knowledge should not be the text of the translation, nor its contextual system, nor even its linguistic features” (Pym, 1998: ix). For him the central object should be the translator of the TT. It is generally argued that the translator’s background is not the only factor that defines a translator. Although it is important, however, there are various other reasons and contexts to explain and justify translational choices.

Pym is not the only scholar who has contributed with his research to field of Translation History. In 2010, D’hulst explained the terms history, historiography and metahistoriography and suggested eight questions that translation historians should ask. These questions are the following: Quis?, Quid?, Ubi?, Quibus auxiliis?, Cur?, Quomodo?, Quando?, and Cui bono?. The first question is “Quis?” which means who and focuses on the translator and more specifically on his/her intellectual and social background, production, group of formation and network relations (D’hulst, 2010: 399). This agrees with Pym’s approach and signifies that the translator is never invisible in a translation and that his/her character, personality and background might be responsible for any form of text manipulation.

The second question is “Quid?” and it asks what has been translated. With this question D’hulst wonders which have been the “selection criteria” for each translation and the “concrete selection procedures”. D’hulst suggests that the texts chosen for translation are not random choices. There are more reasons behind the choice or the rejection of texts for translation. The answer to this question may lead the translation historians to useful
conclusions on both history and translation. This is because the selection criteria of which text will be translated and which not, would probably be defined by social, economic, or even political and ideological reasons.

The next question in D’hulst’s list is “Ubi?”, which is, where the translation has been done, published or distributed. The place of creation or publication of a translation and the circumstances that govern this place may also affect the final product of translation. It can also signify social constraints, which may allow the publications in one place, but prohibit them in another. For example, as it will be shown in chapters 4 and 5, when referring to the Russian translations of Alice chosen for this study, the Soviet translation was initially published only in Rostov-on-Don, the translator’s hometown. As stated in Hellman, Moscow would not accept Carroll’s absurdism at that time (Hellman, 2013: 475). Therefore, the place of publication indicates that, at that time, Alice’s content was not considered to be suitable for publication in Moscow, the capital of the country, where publication control may have been stricter, than it was in smaller, rural areas.

Another example regarding the importance of the place of publication in translation history is Nabokov’s Russian translation of Alice, which was published in 1923. Looking at lists that contain Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland publications, it can be observed that this translation was not published in Russia, but in Germany. Examining the history further, it becomes apparent that Nabokov was exiled from the country at that time. His works were banned in Russia and therefore, his Alice translation was published in Berlin, where he lived as a Russian émigré. Nabokov’s translation entered Russia only in 1976 when the strictness of the Soviet regime started to fade. More examples as such, where translation may reflect history, will be discussed later in the thesis.

Going back to D’hulst’s questions, the fourth one is, “Quibus auxiliis?”, that is, by what means the translations have been made. This question implies that translators might have been subjected to various kinds of support in order to complete their work. Since external agents may support the translation process, issues of power, ideology and censorship in translation may occur. This can also be related to the next question which is “Cur?”, why; why do translations appear and why do they appear in specific forms? Both the above questions imply that translations may serve specific purposes or play a role in the society in
which they were published and this is also something that should be taken into consideration in translation history.

The next two questions are “Quomodo?”, *how* and “Quando?”, *when* that indicate how and when are translations done. Both these questions include the evolution of norms, which change over time and, therefore, reflect a given society’s ideas. The last question suggested by D’hulst is “Cui bono?” which literally means *for whose benefit*. This question should give answers to what are the effects, functions and uses of translation in society (D’hulst, 2010: 399-403). This study, as it examines translation through history, will attempt to give answers to how and when the translations of *Alice* were created and if they had a purpose to serve.

The answers to D’hulst’s questions presented above can help translation historians “to understand past thinking, past practices, past contexts” as much as possible (D’hulst, 2010: 403) and they can function as a framework for translation history. Providing answers to all these questions in only one study might not be feasible, considering issues of time, scope and resources. The present study will provide answers to some of these questions examining the translation history of children’s literature in Russia.

As described in both Pym and D’hulst’s approaches, translation history includes many parameters and not all of them may be examined in the data that a translator is given or has access to. Apart from that, translation history demands cooperation between translators and historians, which may also appear to be challenging. O’Sullivan points out that the relationship between history and translation has always been problematic (O’Sullivan, 2012: 131). This tension is also identified by Rundle, whose claim that “the more we immerse ourselves in the historical field of our choice, the more the other scholars of this field become our natural interlocutors and the less we have in common with other scholars in translation studies”, implies the problematic relationship between the two fields (Rundle, 2012: 232). This is how a debate on the purposes of translation history and its interaction with historiography was triggered between Rundle (2012), St-Pierre (2012), Hermans (2012) and Delabastita (2012).

Rundle argues that studying the history of translation differs significantly from studying translation in history and that translation may contribute to a better understanding of history. Rundle’s research is related to translation in fascist regimes and particularly in Italy.
specifically, he tries to show how “the same documentary material can be narrated from two viewpoints, that of the history of translation and that of the history of fascism” (Rundle, 2012: 237). Rundle explains, that if the question that needs to be answered is what Italian fascism can indicate regarding the history of translation then the answer is not enlightening enough. However, if the question is what translation can reveal about the history of fascism then a good “insight into the nature of fascist regime is given, as “the regime’s reactions to the translation phenomenon are a reflection of its own self-image and its essential lack of confidence” (Rundle, 2012: 237-8).

Following Rundle’s conclusions, St-Pierre argues that Rundle’s point deserves some attention, although because he uses a “specific” example applied to fascism and tries to draw out general conclusions and “patterns of behaviour”, further exploration is needed (St-Pierre, 2012: 240). Another opinion on the same topic is introduced by Hermans (2012). Hermans’ argument is related to the fact that Rundle contrasts studies, which contribute to historical knowledge with studies which contribute to the history of translation. This contrast, according to Hermans, is false as the way translation was practiced at a specific time plays an important role with regard to history as well as to the data itself (Hermans, 2012: 244). Delabastita argues that this tension between history and translation depends on scholars’ choices: whether they want to preserve authenticity or not. He also wonders how specific the historian’s specific data can be and why Rundle’s findings should only be examined under these two perspectives (Delabastita, 2012: 246-70).

Despite the constraints presented by the scholars above, this study agrees with Rundle’s view that translation is both “a historical object in its own right and an approach to interpreting other historical subjects” (Rundle, 2014: 7). This definition suggests that translations can reveal historical facts, or vice versa, historical incidents can be explained, identified or confirmed through the examination of translations. The present study aims at acquiring an insight into the translation of children’s literature in Russia using historical facts, regarding the policies followed in the field of publication and, at the same time, draws conclusions pertinent to Russian history based on the translation findings.

This study takes into consideration the majority of factors that constitute translation history studies as it investigates the context in which the translations where made: who, where, when, why and for what purpose were the translations made. In the Russian context, Nikolajeva
suggests, that it is impossible to understand the political and cultural situation of Russia today without examining its Soviet and/or even its Tsarist history. Particularly, in Soviet children’s literature which is “as artificial and misshapen as the Soviet state itself” these political and cultural changes are clearly reflected (Nikolajeva, 1995: 105). Therefore, through the examination and understanding of the Imperial, Soviet and early post-Soviet history, this study reaches conclusions on both translation and history.

2.3 Systems and Norms as Context

The discussion of translation history indicates the importance of placing the translated texts in their contexts. Pym’s principles on the role of translation history point out the necessity of more information around the translations’ date and place of publication and the translators’ social and even personal background (Pym, 1998: ix-x). Apart from that, D’hulst’s points about what questions translation historians should ask (Quis?, Quid?, Ubi?, Quibus auxiliis?, Cur?, Quomodo?, Quando?, and Cui bono?) also indicate that many factors are involved in translation and should be examined. This kind of knowledge leads to a better understanding of the context in which translations are produced and to a more precise explanation of the translators’ choices.

Building upon the discussion on translation history and the importance of the context in which a text is created, this study develops a theoretical framework that will enable the main points to be dealt with. A combination of polysystem theory (PST) by Itamar Even-Zohar and Gideon Toury’s theory of norms seemed to be an appropriate choice, as both theories see translation as a literary system interacting with other systems and they place translation in a social, cultural, and historical context. This combination provides the ground for a further investigation into the factors that might have contributed to the result, such as the translators’ backgrounds, the places and dates of publications, the possible reasons behind the publications or any agents involved. The following two sections provide an insight into both polysystem theory and translational norms.

2.4 Even-Zohar’s Polysystem Theory

Polysystem theory was created in the late 1960s by the Israeli literary and cultural theorist Itamar Even-Zohar. The theory was “an alternative to the then current ahistorical, static, and text-oriented approaches to literature” (Codde, 2003: 91). The theory supports the idea that a
literary work should not be studied isolated from its context, but as part of a wider literary
system, which affects or can be affected by other systems. Polysystem was further elaborated
by many scholars, such as Gideon Toury whose views regarding the role of norms in
translation, will be discussed in 2.5, and Zohar Shavit, whose work on children’s literature
includes systems and norms and it will be discussed in 4.4.1.

Polysystem theory is inspired by the principles of Russian Formalism, a movement that
according to Bennet has its roots in the 1880s. However, as “an identifiable critical
movement”, it appeared in 1915, a few years before the establishment of the Soviet regime
(1917) and lasted for a decade after that (Bennett, 1979: 18). At this point, a few things
should be mentioned about the movement and its basic principles. This presentation will
contribute to a better understanding of the polysystem theory, the use of norms in translation,
which followed, and the choice of these methods as a theoretical background of this study.
Moreover, the translations examined in this study are also Russian literary texts. They might
not have been published during the movement’s most inspirational years; however, they
appeared in the wake of this influential movement.

The Russian Formalist movement, from the beginning was divided into two different groups
that approached literature from different perspectives. The first group was the Moscow
Linguistic Circle represented be such scholars such as Petr Bogatyrév, Roman Jakobson, and
Grigory Vinokur, and the second group was the Petersburg OPOYAZ – Obschestvo po
Izucheniyu Poeticheskogo Yazyka (the Society for the Study of Poetic Language), which
included the scholars, Boris Ejchenbaum, Viktor Shklovsky, and Jury Tynjanov, among
others (Steiner, 1984: 17). The former was founded in 1915 and headed by Jakobson. The
latter in 1916, headed by Shklovsky (Bennett, 1979: 18).

According to Bogatyrev and Jakobson (as quoted in Steiner), the Moscow group believed that
“poetry is language in its aesthetic function” and that “the historical development of artistic
forms has a sociological basis”. On the contrary, the OPOYAZ claimed that “the poetic motif
is not always merely the unfolding of linguistic material” and it insisted upon “the full
autonomy of its artistic forms” (Steiner, 1984: 17-8). However, the two groups did share
common-ground ideas, which overcame their differences. As described in Bennet, there were
two main concerns for the Formalists. First of all, they wished to establish the study of
literature as “an autonomous science using methods and procedures of its own”. More
specifically, they raised the question of *literariness*, in order to “distinguish literature and poetry from other forms of discourse” (Bennett, 1979: 19). Second, the Formalists argued that literature was not “a reflection of reality but only a particular, semiotically organised signification of it”. Literature has the ability to “make it strange”, or to “dislocate our habitual perceptions of the real word”. This ability of *defamiliarisation* (*ostranenie*) is the factor that can distinguish literature from other forms of discourse (Bennett, 1979: 20).

In general, the Formalists argued that “literature should be regarded as a practice which, through a variety of formal devices, enacts a transformation of received categories of thought and expression” (Bennett, 1979: 24), or as Hermans suggests, the Formalists’ “literary evolution” was the replacement of “the familiar with the unfamiliar, the traditional with the innovative” (Hermans, 1999: 104). However, as noted in the *Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* (Baldick, 2008), in the late 1920s and during Stalin’s dictatorship, Formalism was “silenced as a heresy” and its principles migrated to the Prague School, later in the 1930s.

Going back to the Even-Zohar’s polysystem theory, it is noted by Codde, that this theory is “an elaboration of the principles of Russian Formalism and Czech Structuralism, especially the writings of Roman Jakobson, Boris Ejchenbaum, and Jury Tynjanov” (Codde, 2003: 92). In particular, Tynjanov is the first scholar to see literature as a “system” (Hermans, 1999: 104). Rosengrant suggests that the essence of Tynjanov's theory of literature is that “each work of art is a system which has a function within the larger system of literature, which in turn is related to all other historical orders” (Rosengrant. 1980: 357). In other words, he argued that works should be studied as part of the contexts in which they are produced. In order to explain this relationship between text and context, he used the concept of “system” according to which literary works should be seen as a part of various systems, which constantly interact.

Even-Zohar worked further on Russian Formalism and particularly upon Tynjanov’s theory of systems. He called the entire network of interrelated systems as a polysystem. This included literary as well as non-literary systems and was used to explain canonical as well as non-canonical literary works. In the literary polysystem, several literary activities, related to each other, take place. These activities do not include only the *products* – the texts – but also the *consumers*, the *producers*, common *repertoires*, *institutions* and finally the *market*. All
the above factors are closely related and they contribute to the literary functions. Therefore, they should not be examined separately (Even-Zohar, 1990: 34).

Using the word *producers*, Even-Zohar refers to the writers of literary products, the texts. By *consumers* he refers to the readers (Even-Zohar, 1990: 36). For him, the term *institutions*, includes all the factors involved with the “maintenance of literature as a socio-cultural activity”. More specifically, these are: producers, critics, publishing houses, periodicals, clubs, groups of writers, government bodies, educational institutions, the mass media and many others that can influence the function of the literary system (Even-Zohar, 1990: 37). By using the term *market*, Even-Zohar refers to all the factors that influence “the selling and buying of literary products” such as bookshops, book clubs and libraries (Even-Zohar, 1990: 38). Finally, the *repertoire* consists of all the “rules and materials which govern both the making and use of any given product” (Even-Zohar, 1990: 39). As described above many factors have an effect on the final production of a literary text. These factors can also be observed in the translated literature of a literary system.

Even-Zohar’s theory was not originally designed for translated literature, but it was later used to understand the position of translations in the literary polysystem, as well as their functions. More specifically, Even-Zohar studied literary works translated from Russian and Yiddish into Hebrew. As Hebrew lacked original texts, the Russian and Yiddish translations had a central position in Hebrew literature. Therefore, these findings led Even-Zohar to examine further the position that translations can occupy in the system of a literary polysystem. Their position in the polysystem would vary depending upon the nature of the literary system it belongs to. Until then it was believed that translations occupy a secondary position in a given literary system. However, Even-Zohar argued that they could occupy either a primary (central) or secondary (peripheral) position.

The translated literature holds a central/primary position if the translation “participates actively in shaping the centre of the polysystem” (Even-Zohar, 1990: 46). This case may occur under three conditions. The first one is that translated literature occupies the central position in the polysystem when a polysystem “has not yet been crystallized, that is to say, when a literature is ‘young’ in the process of being established”. This means that the literary polysystem of the target culture has not taken its final form and shape and it can be influenced by more established literatures. The second condition is when a literature is either
“peripheral or weak or both”. This means that the literature of the target culture has not developed all literary types and accepts types that do not exist into its system. Finally, the third one is when there are “turning points, crises or literary vacuums” in a literature. In that case, there is a point in literary history when the already existing models are not sufficient and therefore the acceptance of foreign models becomes important (Even-Zohar, 1990: 47).

However, the translated literature may also hold a peripheral/secondary position in the literary polysystem. This means that the translated literature has “no influence on major processes and it is modeled according to norms already conventionally established by an already dominant type in the target literature” (Even-Zohar, 1990: 48). Polysystem theory assumes that there are different norms that affect the translation process and determine the position of the translated literature in the polysystem. The norms of the translated literature may be different from the ones of the original text and its position in the literary polysystem determines the translation strategies employed. If the position of the translated literature in the literary polysystem is peripheral/secondary the translators conform to already existing models of literary texts. However, if the translated literature holds a central/primary position, then the translators are free to create new models of literary conventions.

In Even-Zohar’s words, the translational norms might be “too foreign and revolutionary” for the target literature. However, if the new norms are accepted then “the repertoire of translated literature may be enriched and become more flexible”. This acceptance can only occur during “periods of great change on the home system” because this is when a translator can try new conceptions, which might differ from the already established and accepted repertoire (Even-Zohar, 1990: 50-1). This is the relevance of Even-Zohar’s polysystem theory for this study. All three transitions from the Imperial environment to the Soviet period and then again to a post-Soviet era are considered to be “periods of great change” and the observation of different translation of the same book published during these periods attempts to identify the role of the different translational norms.

Despite the theory’s significant contribution to the field of translation studies, it has also attracted criticism. According to Codde, polysystem theory is “a functionalist approach because it sees all semiotic phenomena as belonging to one or more systems and consequently analyzes these phenomena in terms of their functions and mutual relations” (Codde, 2003: 92). However, it is not a “static system” that it is described here (which is
often associated with functionalism), but a “dynamic system” which takes into consideration “the synchronic relations within the system” which according to Codde allows the system’s evolution in time (Codde, 2003: 92).

As Gentzler points out, the substance of the polysystem theory involves “the exploration of the complex interrelations among the various systems” (Gentzler, 2001: 115). Gentzler also stresses the contribution of the polysystem to the study of literature (or translated literature) from the scope of “social and economic forces of history” (Gentzler, 2001: 120). In other words, Even-Zohar studies the function of literature in its historical context and indicates the interaction of these two systems in time.

Despite its innovative concept for the time it was developed and its use to a number of other works until today, polysystem theory had also been the subject of criticism. Gentzler also stresses the issues that the polysystem theory does not cover. According to Gentzler, Even-Zohar’s theory tends to “overgeneralize and establish universal laws”, despite the little evidence he had examined and the contradictions found in his own research. Even-Zohar also uses concepts such as “literariness” which are not appropriate for a complicated theory on systems related to cultural factors and he does not take into consideration the “real conditions” of a text’s creation, which might also affect its translation (Gentzler, 2001: 120-2).

For Hermans, the central idea of the polysystem theory is “relational”, as elements are “constantly viewed in relation to other elements”, and “they derive their value from their position in a network” (Hermans, 1999: 107). Moreover, he thinks that this theory “integrates translation into broader socio-cultural practices and processes” (Hermans, 1999: 110). However, Hermans, is “unconvinced” by the PTS, as he finds its laws “self-evident, or problematic”. He claims that literature and cultures are not isolated and that the target culture may not necessarily select the ST. He cites the example of the period of European colonization when France and England were seen to be “dumping literary items on a colonized population”. He also claims that the revised version of the polysystem theory seems to include “highly questionable generalisations” (Hermans, 1999: 111).

These reservations about the polysystem theory described above are not an obstacle to accepting the theory’s advantages. Also, some of the concerns are not relevant, such as the
approaches to colonization. Polysystem theory places the translation of literary texts in their historical context and it sees translation as a part of the historical and cultural evolution of societies. PST is used here as it is a theoretical framework, which places literature and language in their cultural contexts. According to Even-Zohar, polysystem theory indicates how “literature correlates with language, society, economy, politics, etc.” (Even-Zohar, 1979: 300). This is also what this study seeks to address: the influence of external factors had in translated children’s literature in Russia.

2.5 Toury’s Translational Norms
The notion and the use of norms in translation has been examined and used by a significant number of scholars. For Hermans, norms are “psychological and social entities”, they are “like rules and conventions” having a “socially regulatory function” and contributing to the “stability of interpersonal relations of groups, communities and societies” (Hermans, 1996: 26). The first scholars discussing translational norms were Jiří Levý and Itamar Even-Zohar. However, Gideon Toury was the one to elaborate more on the nature and role of norms in translation.

Toury, developed further Even-Zohar’s polysystem theory and focused on the actual relationships between the source text and the translation. For Toury, translation activities have “cultural significance” and inevitably meet with socio-cultural constrains. These constraints can be classified in three categories. The first two are the absolute rules (which are more objective) and the idiosyncrasies (which are more subjective). Somewhere between these two categories there are the norms, which can be either stronger and closer to the notion of rules or weaker as idiosyncrasies (Toury, 1995: 53-4). In any case, norms indicate a certain social behaviour and are the “key concept and focal point in any attempt to account for the social relevance of activities” (Toury, 1995: 55). In other words, norms define what is socially acceptable and what is forbidden. They indicate and control the human behaviour in a society in a specific period. Moreover, they differ from country to country and constantly change, transform and evolve.

Translation is a “norm-governed activity” and since it involves two languages, it involves two sets of “norm-systems” (Toury, 1995: 56). The translator who follows the norms and conventions of the source text aims at an “adequate translation”. On the other hand, the
translator who follows the norms of the target text aims at an “acceptable translation” (Toury, 1995: 57). However, the translation is never either adequate or acceptable. It is usually a mixture of these two notions.

According to Toury, there are three types of norms in translation: initial, preliminary, and operational norms. Initial norms are the personal decisions that the translator has to make regarding the translation strategy he/she intends to follow (staying closer to the ST or the TT) (Toury, 1995: 56).

Preliminary norms are related to “the existence and actual nature of a definite translation policy, and to the directness of translation” (Toury, 1995: 58). In other words, preliminary norms define the choice of the texts for translation (translation policy) and determine the directness of translation. This means that many factors need to be taken into account before a work is translated into a particular culture in terms of which translations are suitable for translation in a specific language and what will be the effect on the TT readers. Human agents might be involved as well and will probably define what is “permitted”, “prohibited”, “tolerated”, “preferred”, “ignored” and even “camouflaged” in the target language (Toury, 1995: 59).

Operational norms are the norms that “direct the decisions made during the act of translation itself”. They affect “the matrix” as well as its “textual make up and verbal formulation”. The operational norms can be subdivided to the matricial norms and to the textual-linguistic norms. The former determine the text’s existence, location and segmentation, whereas the latter determine the actual material of the target text and they might be either general or particular (Toury, 1995: 59).

Toury’s addition to the existing theories regarding translatability and equivalence can be summarised to the conclusion that “it is norms that determine the (type and extent of) equivalence manifested by actual translations” (Toury, 1995: 61). These translational norms determine the degree of adequacy and acceptability in translation. Cultural, social, political and ideological norms operating in a country can affect the translation process. The translator has to take into consideration and render properly the norms prevailing in the original text into the target language. For Toury, translations occupy a position in the social and literary...
systems of the target culture, and this position determines the translation strategies that are used (Toury, 1995: 61).

The impact of Toury’s approach on norms to the field of translation studies is significant as it considers translation as a process by which “subjects of a given culture communicate in translated messages primarily determined by local cultural constraints” (Gentzler, 1993/2001: 131). In other words, Toury’s theory allows translators to adjust the text according to the norms of the target culture in order to be acceptable and understandable by the different culture.

Gentzler points out four ways in which Toury influenced translation studies (Gentzler, 1993/2001: 133-4):

- The notion of complete linguistic and literary equivalence is abandoned.
- The literary tendencies of the target culture are acknowledged.
- The notion of an original text with stable meaning is undermined.
- Both original and translated texts are seen as parts of an interrelated semiotic system.

However, Gentzler also suggests that since this concept has its roots to Even-Zohar’s polysystem theory, which is also based on the Russian Formalism, Toury’s theory of norms is an evolved theory of formalism. This formalistic tendency limits Toury’s conceptual framework as “the translated texts are viewed as empirical facts and the cultural norms are seen as static, non-contradictory rules” (Gentzler, 1993/2001: 130).

In general, Toury's approach sees translation as human activity undertaken by translators with a specific social background and ideology, which might affect their choices in translation. According to his concept of norms in translation, there are many sets of competing norms in all societies during a particular period. These norms might interact and even be in conflict with one another. In terms of translation studies, it is indicated that various translations (TT) of the same source text, which occurred in different time in the target culture’s history, would indicate the existing norms of each period.
The above description indicates the reason why Toury’s approach on norms and their role in translation has been chosen for this study. Three Russian translations of the same source text have been chosen. These translations occurred in different times in the target culture and they are expected to reflect the norms of their time. More specifically, the norms during the Imperial, the Soviet and the post-Soviet era may interact or even conflict with each other, as stated above. This interaction is examined through the translations of Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland. In addition, the Russian norms of the target texts are not only compared to each other, but to the Victorian norms governing the source text as well. Therefore, the concept of norms in translation plays a key role in this study.

According to Ben-Ari, translation is “a norm-determined process whose rigidity depends on the state of the literary system of which it forms a part” (Ben-Ari, 1992: 221). This definition of translation includes both norms and systems as two factors dependent on each other and it justifies the choice of these two approaches for this study. The combination of Even-Zohar’s polysystem theory (2.3.1) and Toury’s approach on translational norms (2.3.2) is the most suitable theoretical framework for the purpose(s) of this study for several reasons. First, both theories place translation in a cultural context, taking into consideration that many external factors have contributed to the creation of the final product. Second, they provide a framework for the analysis considering the environment in which the texts were created (i.e. the Imperial Russia, the Soviet Russia and the Russian Federation). Third, they take into consideration not only the norms governing the TT but also the norms of the ST.

As Ben-Ari points out, translation is more a cultural process rather than a linguistic or literary one (Ben-Ari, 1992: 222). Therefore, the context in which translations take place plays a significant role in the final product. The theories of Even-Zohar and Toury both focus on the final product, the TT and its relation to the surroundings as well as to the norms governing literature in the literary polysystem. In general, these approaches apply to adult and children’s literature. The translation of children’s literature, however, might be associated with more challenges and constraints as it addresses a specific audience: children, who have different levels of comprehension and different needs. The challenges of translating children’s literature will be discussed in chapter 4.
2.6 Discourse and Register Analysis for Translation

In 1977, Juliane House developed a new model of translation quality assessment using Crystal and Davy’s (1969) system of “situational constraints” (House, 1997: 38). This model seeks for an answer to the question “how do we know when a translation is good?” The model was designed to provide an analysis of the “linguistic-discoursal as well as the situational-cultural particularities of originals and translated texts, a principled comparison of the two texts and an evaluation of their relative match” (House, 2015: 21). In other words, House’s model of translation quality assessment is based on the comparative analysis between the source text and the target text, indicating the degree of equivalence, including felicitous and less effective matches between translations and originals.

For House, translation should be examined from two complementary perspectives: “a social perspective, which takes into account the macro- and micro-contextual constraints that impinge on translation and the translator, and a cognitive perspective, which focuses on the ‘internal’ way a translator, goes about his or her task of translating” (House, 2015: 5).

Modifying Crystal and Davy’s model (1969), House suggested the following two situational dimensions (House, 1997: 39; 2015: 27-8):

A. Dimensions of Language User
   1. Geographical origin
   2. Social class
   3. Time

B. Dimensions of Language Use
   1. Medium: simple/complex
   2. Participation: simple/complex
   3. Social Role Relationship
   4. Social Attitude
   5. Province

The above categories are then used to explain the linguistic functions on syntactic, lexical and textual levels and the “mismatches” and the “errors” of the translation equivalence are indicated. House applied the model to text translated from English to German and based on
her results she suggested two major translation types: *overt* translation and *covert* translation (House, 1997: 66; 2015: 54).

An *overt* translation is the translation in which “the addressees of the translation text are quite ‘overtly’ not being directly addressed”. According to House, in this type of translation “the source text is tied in a specific manner to the source language community and its culture” (House, 1997: 66). A *covert* translation is the translation, which “enjoys the status of an original source text in the target culture”. It is a translation “whose source text is not specifically addressed to a particular source culture audience, i.e., it is not particularly tied to the source language and culture” (House, 1997: 69). In this type of translation a “cultural filter”, as House calls it, should be applied by the translator in order to modify any cultural elements of the source language, and turn them into cultural elements familiar to the target language (House, 1997: 115).

However, this model received criticism regarding the following four aspects (House, 1997: 101):

- the nature of the analytical categories and the terminology used
- the lack of inter subjective verifiability of the analyses
- the “limits of translatability”
- the distinction between the *overt* and *covert* translation

Therefore, in 1997, House revised her translation quality assessment model using a combination of Halliday’s functional system as well as her previous categories, which drew upon Crystal and Davy’s situational dimensions. This model allows the analysis and comparison of the source text and its translation(s) on three different levels:

- Language/Text
- Register
- Genre

According to House, register “captures the connection between texts and their ‘micro-context’”, while genre “connects texts with the ‘macro-context’ of the linguistic and cultural community, in which the text is embedded” (House, 2015: 64). The new register categories now are **Field, Tenor** and **Mode**. **Field** refers to “the nature of the social action that is taking
place”. **Tenor** refers to “who is taking part, to the nature of the participants, the addressee and the addressees, and the relationship between them in terms of social power and social distance, as well as the ‘degree of emotional charge’ in the relationship between addresser and addressee”. Finally, **Mode** refers to “both the channel – spoken or written, and the degree to which potential or real participation is allowed for between interlocutors” (House, 1997: 108-9). Her model is described in the table below:

![Table 3: House’s scheme for analysing and comparing ST and TT (House, 1997: 108).](image)

House also introduces the concept of a **cultural filter**, which is “a means of capturing socio-cultural differences in expectation norms and stylistic convention” between the source culture and the target culture (House, 2015: 68). She uses this concept to examine cultural differences before any form of manipulation of the original text is conducted by the translator.

Puurtinen (2006: 62) notes that House “does not deal with children’s literature in connection with this model for translation quality assessment”. However, this statement is dubious as House herself applied her revised model of translation quality assessment to different types of texts such as autobiographies, philosophical essays, history texts and most interestingly, children’s literature translated from English into German (House, 1997: 122-131). Through “statements of function” and “statements of quality”, she compared the target text to the source text resulting in a number of mismatches and errors. Her results, particularly for children’s books, identified a number of mismatches in the categories of **Field** and **Tenor**,
which reflect “a culturally conditioned difference in the realisation of Genre between English and German children’s books” (House, 1997: 131).

According to the results of her research on translations of books for children, House notes that of all the children’s books translated into German more than 60% have been translated from English. However, neither the children nor the parents (or anyone who chooses the books for the child) realise that they are translations. Therefore, House suggests that the translations of children’s books from English into German tend to be translated “covertly”, which means that the source text is “adapted to the expectation norms in the receiving culture” (House, 2004: 684).

Apart from House’s own application of translation quality assessment in children’s literature, the model is frequently applied for the evaluation of translation of children’s books as well as different genres of literary texts. In 2012, Tahernejad and Akef applied the model on two Persian translations of Matilda, a book for children written by Roald Dahl in 1988. After examining the texts in terms of register and genre, they identified mismatches, concluding that the two translations were of similar quality but only one followed the overt translation features (Tahernejad and Akef, 2012: 77).

House’s model is adopted in this research, as it efficiently serves the purposes of the study, particularly the part of register that examines the shifts in tenor. This is because the category of tenor includes the author’s provenance and stance, the social role relationship and the social attitude expressed in the text. Tenor appears to be useful in the assessment of the power structures that appear in Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland, which is the key focus of this study. In general, the register category of Tenor refers to the nature of the participants, the relationship of the participants in terms of social power and social distance, the degree of emotional charge, the text producer’s temporal, geographical and social provenance, as well as his/her intellectual, emotional or affective stance and the social attitude (House, 2001: 248).

More particularly, regarding the nature of the participants (who is the addressee and who is the addressee) in Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland the participants are the child-Alice and the adult-creatures in the roles of addressee and addresser. The relationship of the participants in terms of social power and social distance changes many times in the story. Alice initially
seems to have no power in Wonderland. The creatures compete to prove who is the most powerful among them by attacking Alice verbally and even by threatening her life. However, this power demonstration reverses by the end of the story. Alice claims the power and the relationship between addressers and addressees changes.

Regarding the degree of emotional charge, Alice’s emotional state seems to be unstable. She bursts into tears often, which is a result from both the changes in her size and the constant personal assaults by the Wonderland creatures. The White Rabbit is constantly worried about the time. The Queen of Hearts is always angry and show disrespect to everyone she interacts with. In general, all creatures demonstrate a degree of emotional charge, which is most of the time related to their anxiety to gain more influence and power over others.

In Alice’s case the text producer’s temporal, geographical and social provenance, as well as his/her intellectual, emotional or affective stance is different in all versions of Alice examined in this study. The authors’ stance is different as the contexts in which the source and target texts are created is different. The social, political and ideological norms of Victorian era are transferred and perhaps clash with the norms of Imperial, Soviet and post-Soviet Russia. Since the context changes, the author’s stance is also changed.

Finally, regarding the so-called “social attitude”, this is a less transparent term House uses to refer to levels of formality. These levels range from formal to neutral and intimate style (again, her terminology here needs some simplification as she seems to be adopting categories from linguistics that are less transparent; e.g. consultative refers to a neutral style used among people who do not know each other very well). Wonderland characters tend to demonstrate different styles of communication, either formal or informal, depending on the level of their power and authority over to other creatures they interact with and depending on their assumed social class.

To sum up, from House’s model of translation quality assessment (1997), this study employs the concept of tenor. Tenor refers specifically to who is taking part, the nature of the participants, the addresser and the addressees, the relationship between (social role relationship) them in terms of social power and social distance, the degree of emotional change in the relationship between addresser and addressees and the notion of social attitude.
The latter indicates the different styles that may be used – formal, consultative and informal (House, 1997: 108-9).

Using House’s model of translation quality assessment and focusing on the concept of tenor as well as considering her notion of the cultural filter employed in both the source and the target language, this study examines the Russian translations of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* through comparative analysis. Features of House’s category of tenor can be identified in many examples in the book. Language variation along the tenor continuum can be an excellent indicator of social norms and of how a translator applies their own cultural filter. In all excerpts examined in this thesis, the instances of syntactic, lexical and textual mismatches are identified and examined according to their content.

The combination of the theories described above allows an in-depth analysis of the context in which source and target texts were created and demonstrate the impact of Russian political ideology on the Russian translations of *Alice*. In order to answer the question of how translation theories uncover political ideology and why the theories presented above are suitable for further text analysis of Alice’s translations, an example is provided in the following section. Polysystem theory and Toury’s approach on norms are examined together as they are not two different theories, but the latter is part and continuation of the former. These two theories examine the context of translation on a micro and macro level. Similarly, House’s translation quality assessment examines the linguistic aspects of translation in more detail. Therefore, the combination of all three theories is expected to provide a useful background for the text analysis.

The usefulness of the above theories and their suitability to answer the research questions of this study is presented in the following section. The example chosen from *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* to test the frameworks described above is the scene where Alice meets the Duchess in the kitchen of her house. This scene was chosen due to its power demonstration and power subversion from the characters involved and it is believed to prove the suitability of the theories employed for this study.
2.7 Translation Theories in Practice: The Duchess Scene

According to Brandt, houses in Wonderland are “violent places” (Brandt, 1994: 30). Every time Alice enters a house, there are some negative consequences. The first house she entered was the White Rabbit’s house where she grew bigger and trapped in the room. The second “violent place” Alice enters in Wonderland is the Duchess’s house. As noted by Honig, Alice is “more self-confident” when she enters this house than the first time, she walked in the Rabbit’s house. It can be said that she breaks not only the Victorian norms of social behaviour but also the norms of any “polite society” as she opens the door and enters the house without permission (Honig, 1988: 81).

The scene described below takes place in a kitchen where the Duchess who sits “on a three-legged stool”, the cook, the Cheshire Cat and the baby are present. According to Hunt, in his annotated version of Alice, in children’s literature kitchens are “symbols of warmth, food and security”. However, in Alice, the Duchess’s kitchen is an exception. This is a “dysfunctional” kitchen where “everything is violent, unstable and unsettling” (Carroll, 2009: 265). The atmosphere is full of smoke and perhaps Alice is scared as she “timidly” asks Duchess “why your cat grins like that” (Carroll, 2009: 52-3). The Duchess is a mother figure, one that is “highly abusive” (Honig, 1988: 29), and “particularly aggressive” (Brandt, 1994: 30), showing no affection for her baby. She acts with “brutal mania”, as noted by Ren, and “treats her child in an abusive way” (Ren, 2015: 1662). More specifically, she shakes it violently to make it stop crying, calls it “pig” and even throws it to Alice without caring about any potential injury. Tenniel’s illustration for the kitchen scene is the following:

![Tenniel’s illustration](Figure 5: Tenniel’s illustration (Carroll, 2009: 52)
The Duchess is at the centre of the illustration and she is depicted with a disproportionately large head that makes her look scary. Although, the Duchess seems to be the absolute figure of power in this scene, her power is subverted. First, there is a class issue here, as Duchesses in Victorian England would never sit on three-legged stools in kitchens. Second, it is the cook who acts violently and threatening against the Duchess and the baby as she throws any piece of kitchen equipment she could reach such as saucepans, plates and dishes at them. Alice who also feels threatened from all these objects asks the cook to mind what she is doing “jumping up and down in an agony of terror” (Carroll, 2009: 52-3). This scene demonstrates subversion of class structure and shows how scared the child-Alice is in a kitchen where adults display violent behaviour. After the remarks to the cooks and a confusing dialogue between Alice and the Duchess, the latter without any particular reason orders the cook to execute Alice.

**ST1:** “If everybody minded their own business,” said the Duchess in a hoarse growl, “the world would go round a deal faster than it does.”

“Which would not be an advantage,” said Alice, who felt very glad to get an opportunity of showing off a little of her knowledge. “Just think of what work it would make with the day and night! You see the earth takes twenty-four hours to turn round on its axis——”

“Talking of axes,” said the Duchess, “chop off her head!”

Alice glanced rather anxiously at the cook, to see if she meant to take the hint; (Carroll, 2009: 54)

This is the first time an execution order is given in the book and it comes from the Duchess. Carroll uses the axis-axes wordplay to order the execution. Apart from class and social order that are subverted having the Duchess sitting on a stool, in the kitchen, the linguistic order is subverted here as well with the use of a pun. Alice once again seems to be scared as she “glanced rather anxiously” at the cook making sure that she is not going to kill her. Both the content and context of this excerpt in all three translations are presented in the sections below and the theoretical background chosen for this study is tested for its suitability for this study. The source texts (ST) are presented by using the following convention TT1a, TT1b, TT1c. Each translation is followed by a literal back translation for ease of reference.
2.7.1 TT1a

ST1 presented above is an excerpt from the original Alice’s chapter called *Pig and Pepper*. In TTa, the chapter’s title changes to Поросёнок, which means “piggy”. Perhaps, this title is used to emphasise the existence and the role of the unusual baby-pig and the diminutive form used makes it more child-friendly. Also the word pepper is unnecessary in the title, as this kitchen has a smell of onion and garlic (запах лука и чеснока). Perhaps, these are culinary norms of the time, which would make more sense to Russian readers. Sonia still enters a large kitchen full of smoke and sees the Duchess of Spades (пиковая княгиня) to sit on a three-legged stool (на скамьё о трехъ ножкахъ). The translator also preserves Carroll’s subversion of class, having the Duchess sitting on a three-legged stool in the kitchen. However, the Duchess name is not in capitals. In TTa, this feature appears for many characters in the story. Perhaps, the Wonderland creatures are not seen as real characters or people that should have a proper name. Their names are more like descriptions of them and consequently they do not have to be in capitals since the characters are either animals (rabbit, hare) or objects (cards).

Regarding the book’s illustrations, the translator chooses to keep Tenniel’s original illustrations and therefore the picture used here is the same as in the original. The kitchen’s atmosphere is described in a similar way: there is a lot of smoke in the room, the smell from cooking is strong and Sonia “timidly” (довольно робко) asks the Duchess why her cat grins. After their short conversation, the cook starts throwing kitchen equipment in the air and Sonia shouts at her to “stop and be more careful” (перестаньте, осторожнее) while she “jumps and runs around the kitchen in terrible fear” (отскакивая и бегая по кухне в ужасном страхе). After Sonia’s intervention, her conversation with the Duchess continues as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TT1a</th>
<th>„Не совался бы каждый въ чужиа дѣла и земля пошла бы шибче кружиться“, заговорила хриплымъ голосомъ княгиня.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Anonymous, 1879: 82-3)</td>
<td>„Не знаю, что бы изъ этого вышло!” говорит Соня, радуюсь случаю выказать свою ученость. „Вы только представьте себѣ, что бы это было, если бы вдругъ день перепутался съ ночью!…. Вѣдь земля, знаете, въ 24 часа обращается около своей оси.....“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>„Отстань съ твоими часами, счетами да разсчетами! Я чисель и цифрь</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

©Eleni Karvounidou
| Back Translation | “If everyone would not interfere to somebody else’s business, then the earth would have spin much faster,” said the princess in a hoarse voice.  
“I do not know what would come out of it!” says Sonia, happy with the fact that she would show her knowledge. “You just imagine what it would be if suddenly the day got messed up with the night!... As you know the earth, in 24 hours turns around its axis....” 
“Enough with your hours, accounts and calculations! I can’t stand numbers and figures”!
Then the princess took up her child: shakes it and sings a lullaby.  
Table 4  
|   | After Sonia’s attempt to show off her knowledge and her comments that the earth turns around its axis in 24 hours, the Duchess interrupts her and asks her to stop as she cannot “stand numbers and figures” (я чиселъ и цифръ терпѣть не могу) and then she sings a lullaby to baby-pig. Carroll’s axis-axes wordplay and the “chop off her head order” are omitted. The scene progresses quicker to the Duchess’s dissatisfaction with numbers and to the lullaby.  
Concidering the polysystem theory and Toury’s norms the axis-axes pun is deleted perhaps because it is not understandable or because there was no equivalent in Russian that would be understandable from the implied reader of the book. Regarding the deletion of the execution order, norms of the time demanded the protection of the child from descriptions that may cause terror to the child. The translator’s choices possibly reflect the influence of official censorship or perhaps self-censorship (see 3.5.1), which support the idea of protecting children from foreign perceptions. The Russian literary polysystem demanded the filtering of ideas in children’s literature. Therefore, the omission of the Duchess order of Alice’s execution is understandable. |
Examining the excerpt in linguistically based details and in House’s terms of translation quality assessment, the tenor in TT1a has changed due to a number of mismatches and errors. Apart from the axes-axis pun and the execution order that are deleted completely (error), there are lexical mismatches that contribute to the different interpretation of the scene from the implied reader. One of these is the use of small letters for the Duchess (княгиня). As it will be observed in all the examples of TTa, the characters names are written in small letters. Perhaps this signifies the fact that they are not real characters but either animals (rabbit, hare) or imaginary, animate objects (cards). In general, they are not real characters and therefore, they do not have proper name but descriptions. Only Sonia seems to be real and human in the story as only her name is written in capitals.

2.7.2 TT1b

The title for this chapter is translated literally from its original title (Pig and Pepper), as Поросёнок и Перец. Alice enters the kitchen which is full of smoke and sees the Duchess (Герцогиня) sitting on a three-legged stool (на трехногом табурете). Once again, the class subversion that puts a Duchess sitting on a stool in the kitchen is preserved. In the same atmosphere, as in the original, full of smoke and a strong smell of pepper, Alice asks “timidly” (немного робея) why the Cat grins. However, the illustration depicting the scene in the kitchen is different than Tenniel’s original as can be seen below:

Figure 6: The kitchen scene (Olenich-Gnenenko, 1958: 73)
The book’s illustrations were made by Valery Sergeevich Alfeevsky (Валерий Сергеевич Алфеевский, 1906-1989), a children’s books illustrator. The legend of the illustration reads: На трехногом стулке сидела герцогиня нянчила грудного ребенка (Back translation: On a three-legged stool, the Duchess was sitting nursing the baby). This image enhances the description of the text. The kitchen is disorganised – broken plates and kitchen equipment on the floor. The illustrator also emphasises to the smoke surrounded the kitchen and the cook using too much pepper.

After the conversation between Alice and the Duchess, once again the cook starts throwing things in the air and Alice shouts at her to think about what she is doing “jumping up and down in terror” (подпрыгивая в ужасе). And the scene progresses as follows:

| TT1b Olenich-Gnenenko (1958: 75) | Если каждый будет заботится о своих собственных делах, - хрипло проворчала герцогиня, - земля будет вертеться гораздо быстрее, чем сейчас.
- От этого не так было бы лучше, - сказала Алиса, которая была очень рада немного показать свои показания. – Только подумайте, что сделалось бы с днем и ночью! Видите ли, Земля совершает полный оборот вокруг своей оси в двадцать четыре часа. Так как вы уже окончили школу, то пора...
- Что касается топора, — крикнула герцогиня, — отрубить ей голову!
Алиса испуганно взглянула на Кухарку, чтобы узнать, не намерена ли она выполнить намек.

| Back Translation |
- If everyone cares about their own business, grunted hoarsely the Duchess, - the earth would spin much faster than it is now.
This would not be better, said Alice, who was very glad to show her knowledge a bit. - Just think what would happen to day and night! You see, the Earth makes a full turn around its axis in twenty-four hours. Since you have already finished school, it's time...
- As for the axe - cried the Duchess, - cut off her head!
Alice looked scared at the cook, to find out, whether she intends to carry out the hint.

Table 5
Within their conversation about people mind their own business and how fast the earth could spin and Alice’s demonstration of knowledge, the Duchess does indeed order Alice’s execution for the first time. Similarly, just as Carroll uses the axis-axes homophones to eventually introduce the “chop off her head” order, so too Olenich-Gnenenko also uses wordplay. He uses the phrase “то пора” (it’s time) and the word “топора” (axe) which sound the same (to pora - topora). Therefore, when Alice attempts to say “it’s time”, the Duchess interrupts her having the impression that Alice said “axe” and this association makes her order the execution. Alice is not only anxious here that the cook will obey the order, but scared (испуганно) and looks at the cook to find out her intentions. The scene, as in the original, ends with the Duchess’s lullaby.

Another feature that brings the text closer to the original and demonstrates the translator’s choice for literal translation, is the emphasis he gives to the same words and phrases Carroll does. Carroll uses italics quite frequently in his text; they are used for emphasis or, in Mango’s words, Carroll uses italics for “intentional stress, a use which makes for great economy of phrasing” (Mango, 1077: 78). In TT1b, which once again is a literal translation of Carroll’s text, the translator imitates Carroll’s technique of emphasising words. He emphasises the same word as Carroll does. However, the translator does not use italics, but spaced out lettering instead. Despite the different way of stressing the word, the translator produces the same result as in the original. In this example, in Alice’s phrase “which would not be an advantage” Carroll uses italics for the word not. Similarly, Olenich-Gnenenko’s translation for the same sentence is “от этого нет а л о бы лучше”. Thus, spaced out lettering is also employed in order to emphasise. In this case, he emphasises using a wider fond the same negative word. This occurs many times in TTa. Interestingly, this is not observed at all to the other two translations. It seems that other translators ignored Carroll’s italics.

Considering polysystem theory and norms, TTb is taking place within a literary system, which interacts with the political system of the time, which is governed by censorship practices. The norms of the of the target culture demand the application of the principles of Socialist Realism where happy endings are necessary. Within this atmosphere, the deletion of a scene where the child is threatened would be understandable and perhaps expected. However, despite the target culture norms the translator renders the scene as presented in the
source text. The translator also attempts to use a pun the same way Carroll does (то пора - топора).

In House’s terms, there are lexical mismatches, which add more tension at the scene. The translator’s use of the verb “крикнула” (cried), instead of Carroll’s “said”, highlights the Duchess’s anger before ordering Alice’s execution. When Alice hears that order, she looks at the cook to see if she is going to obey. In this case, Alice does not simply “glance rather anxiously at the cook”; instead, she looked at her in a scared manner, “испуганно” as rendered by the translator. Therefore, with these two changes in the paralanguage, the translator depicts an outraged Duchess and a terrified Alice, a scene that does not conform to the source culture literary norms. However, homogeneity does not always occur in Soviet literary system and rules did not always apply (see 4.5.2.1).

2.7.3 TTc
The title for this chapter in Yakhin’s translation is Перченый поросёнок, which literally means, “pepper pig” and it reminds more of cooked food or perhaps recipe. This is a more humoristic approach from the translator to describe the kitchen scene. Alice as in the original and the previous translation enters the kitchen where she finds the Duchess sitting on the three-legged stool (на трёхногой табуретке), the cook, the cat and the baby. The smell of pepper is strong but Alice does not seem to be afraid of the circumstances governing in the kitchen. On the contrary, in this translation, she asks the Duchess “politely” (вежливо спросила она) and not “timidly”, why the cat grins. The illustrator of this version avoids depicting the Duchess sitting on stool, surrounded by the cat and the cook. Alice is not scared even when the cook throws things around her. Her words are: “Hey! Hey! Watch out! Save the nose!” (Эй-эй! Поберегись! Крикнула Алиса – Носик пбереги!), without any evidence of terror but more with audacity. The dialogue between her and the Duchess that follows is presented below:

| TT1c Yakhnin (1993: 50-1) | - Если бы кто-нибудь поберёг свои советы, - буркнула Герцогиня, - Земле легче было бы вертеться.  
- И она бы завертелась быстрее? – догадалась Алиса и тут же решила блеснуть своими знаниями. – Тогда бы началась такая чехарда! День-ночь-день-ночь- день-ночь. Земле надо было бы вертеться как |
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сумасшедшей, чтобы за один оборот...
- Кто обормот? – вскричала Герцогиня. – Да за такие слова тебе здесь голову обормут, то есть оборвут, то есть оборвут!
Алиса с опаской взглянула на Стряпуху, но та как ни в чём не бывало помешивала суп.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Back Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “If someone had taken his advice,” muttered the Duchess, “it would be easier for the Earth to spin.”
“And it would turn faster?” - Alice guessed and immediately decided to show off her knowledge. “Then such confusion would begin!” Day-night-day-night-day-night. The earth would have to spin like crazy, so that in one turn...
- Who is blockhead? - cried the Duchess. - Yes for such words here обормут your head, which is cut off, which is cut off!
Alice with fear looked at the cook, but she was stirring the soup.

In TTc, the target text seems to be influenced by the source text as the translator attempts to imitate Carroll’s use of wordplay. The translator introduces his own word play, resulting from a different conversation between the Duchess and Alice. In the dialogue about morals taking place between the Duchess and Alice, the latter says: Земле надо было бы вертеться как сумасшедшей, чтобы за один оборот... (Earth would have to spin like crazy to one turnover ...). Alice uses the noun оборот (turnover) to say that the earth is turning. The Duchess interrupts her as she thought that Alice used the noun обормот (blockhead). Inspired from that word the Duchess creates her own word обормут, which does not exist in Russian, in order to end up with the verb оборвут (to cut off) and this is how she comes to order the cook to cut Alice’s head off. Using this sequence, оборот-обормот-обормут-оборвут, the translator enriches his translation with his own word play, following Carroll’s way of writing and finally orders Alice’s beheading in a more inventive and humorous way.

The sequence of the Russian words used here by the translators brings to mind and perhaps has emerged from Carroll’s “doublets”. This is a logical game, invented by Carroll and it was published in a series of articles in Vanity Fair, in 1879 under the title Word Links: A Game

---

16 The word “обормут” does not exist in Russian. It is a word form created by the translator to serve the purpose of his wordplay. The word rhymes with the words presented before and after without having any meaning.
for two Players or a Round Game. Carroll invented a “set of scoring rules” as well in order to determine who wins the game (Gardner, 1996: 83). Gardner presents Carroll’s handwritten article and explains the rules of the game. As Gardner describes the rules of the game doublets are created by “changing one word to another by altering single letters at each step to make a different word”. The first and the last word of the chain must be the same length and they “should be related to each other in some obvious way”. The words should also not have identical letters in same positions (Gardner, 1996: 83). According to Straley, doublets shows how one “linguistic form can be converted into another without losing sense” (Straley, 2016: 106). Gardner’s example of doublets is the following: COLD – CORD – CARD – WARD – WARM (Gardner, 1996: 83). In a similar way, the translator uses the words оборот-оборотот-оборотут-оборотут. However, he does not follow Carroll’s rules of the game. He not only alters one letter of each word, but also adds extra letters and even creates words that have no meaning in Russian in order to achieve his own “doublets” resulting in the “cut off her head” order.

Those textual and lexical mismatches resulting from the translator’s attempt to imitate Carroll change the tenor and consequently the function of the source text. The execution order is introduced after Duchess’s irrational monologue with words invented herself and therefore, the scene acquires a comical character. Regarding the norms interacting in the post-Soviet literary polysystem, the above example demonstrates the different message that this translation may deliver to the implied reader. The translator released from censorship practices and having read more information on Alice (source text, different translations, reviews, paratexts) creates a new literary text. Yakhnin’s translation preserves some of the original Alice’s features but also adds his own creative writing and style giving to the text perhaps a more humorous tone.

In conclusion, describing the Duchess and the kitchen episode, Ren accurately points out that in Wonderland the children “must submit to the power and wills of the adults” and if they “dare to defy” their authority the children will be threatened and even punished with death (Ren, 2015: 1662). Also, the Duchess “personifies the most radical pole of madness”, as she exhibits a doubled behaviour towards Alice both times they meet in the story. At first, she is aggressive and rude when they meet in the kitchen and later, when they meet again at the Queen’s croquet game, she is friendly and polite (Roncada, 1994: 59). Those death references
and character features may be extreme for children’s books and may be rejected in different literary polysystems.

The above example demonstrates how the source and target literary systems interact with each other and even offer evidence of potential conflict between the norms prevailing in each era and each context. Through the identification of textual and lexical mismatches and the shifts in tenor, the study attempts to explore the impact of Russia’s political ideology in the three target texts of Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland. In the example presented above, the different norms governing each era are indicated. In TTa, the translator deletes the Duchess death threat to Alice. This choice, as will be also observed in more examples in chapter 6, indicates the system’s tendency to filter these elements that are not suitable for children’s. In TTb, lexical mismatches are identified as the translator uses emotionally charged words, which intensify the scene, and he also attempts to introduce wordplay. Finally, in TTc, the translator also introduces wordplay perhaps in an attempt to reproduce Carroll’s doublets instilling humorous features to the scene, irrespective its intimidating content.

**Conclusion**

Chapter 2 presented the theoretical framework of this study in terms of translation history and its context. More specifically, the theories chosen for the analysis of Alice’s translation are the following three: Even-Zohar’s polysystem theory, Toury’s concept of norms and House’s model of translation quality assessment. The combination of these three translation methods allows the examination of source and target texts in their historical, social, political and ideological context. It also allows examining the power relationships developed between the Wonderland characters in term of their social attitude and social distance. The example chosen to test the theories is the scene where Alice meets the Duchess. This example was chosen due to its power demonstration and at the same time the power subversion, that governs the protagonists’ interaction. Employing the above methodologies the context of translation was examined considering the norms governing each literary polysystem and the shifts in tenor occurred by specific textual and lexical mismatches and errors. The following chapter presents the translation process in Russia in all three periods examined. By examining the cultural, political and ideological shifts took place several times in the country, as well as the censorship practices that played an important role on publications, a deeper understanding of the context in which the chosen translations were created will be achieved.
Chapter 3

Translation in Russian Context: Cultural Shifts and Censorship Practice

The following chapter seeks for answers to whether there is an impact of censorship to the three Alice’s translations and whether it uncovers political ideology. For these questions to be answered, the history of translation in Russia is presented, including the procedures of censorship practice, which appears to be an inevitable part of the wider context in which translation was conducted in Russia. The norms prevailing translation in different periods of the country’s history are discussed, including the principles of Socialist Realism that was introduced in the Soviet era. Censorship affected textual production as well as the authors and translators’ choices in many cases. Therefore, censorship led to the production of texts under specific features and produced certain behaviour from authors in order to avoid any potential consequences of their non-approved writing.

The chapter continues with the presentation of the forms of censorship that existed and with the techniques that writers devised in order to avoid the censor and publish their works. Finally, an excerpt of the three translations is presented and examined in terms of censorship effect.

3.1 A History of Translation in Russia

Despite Russia’s extensive domestic literary heritage, translated works have also played a significant role in the county’s literary history. The Russian tradition in translation practice begins in the 9th century AD with the translation of texts with religious content. In addition, before the 15th century, translations played an important role in “shaping the cultural character of the country”. However, in these early stages of the translation practice the translator’s name was not mentioned, therefore it is not clear whether the book was a translation or a domestic product (Komissarov, 1997: 541).

As noted by Komissarov, the practice of keeping anonymity in translated works was gradually phased out after the 16th century. This was the time when the development of
translation contributed significantly to the country’s language and culture (Komissarov, 1997: 542). There is also evidence of this practice continuing into the 19th century. As will be discussed later, in chapters 4 and 5 of the thesis, the translator of the first Russian translation of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*, which was published in 1879, remains anonymous as well. Another example is the translation of *Alice*, which was allegedly done by Mikhail Pavlovich Chekhov in 1913, without any evidence of his signature. Through these comments, it can be observed that anonymity was a common practice in translation in Russia.

In the 17th century, the number of translations increased and a greater variety of topics such as astronomy, astrology, arithmetic geometry, anatomy and medicine, entered the system of translated literature of the country’s cultural polysystem. At that time, there were four groups of translators: staff translators in various administrative departments who were mostly foreigners; monks, who were well-educated and were translating religious texts; part-time translators who were occasionally translating books; and translators who chose their source texts themselves (Komissarov, 1997: 542).

Despite the fact that translation activity was quite popular already, the most significant changes in the translation tradition in Russia occurred during the 18th century, when the reforms of Peter the Great “expanded Russia’s economic and cultural contacts with European countries” (Komissarov, 1997: 543). These changes increased the need for new translations and more professional translators. This is when translation activity started shaping into a new form. The following sections will briefly present the translation history in Russia during the country’s most significant periods: the pre-Soviet, the Soviet and the post-Soviet. These periods are important in Russian history and they are examined here in terms of the translation practices governing each of them. In this study, translation is examined in the context of censorship as it is an element inevitably related to writing, translating and publishing in Russia. There is a particular focus on the Soviet era, as that was the time when censorship reached its peak.

### 3.2 Translation in Imperial Russia

The transformation of medieval Russia into a modern European country started after the reforms of Peter the Great (1672-1725) at the beginning of the 18th century. The process of transforming and changing through political social and economic reforms induced a feeling
of fear of anything foreign. Translation, among other things was a means of “Westernization” of Russia and was considered to be a “high prestige” form of art (Leighton, 1991: 5). Komissarov notes that, the reforms of Peter the Great “expanded Russia’s economic and cultural contacts with European countries and increased the need for new translations as well as for professional translators (Komissarov, 1997: 543).

During this period, translation activity in Imperial Russia started to reshape. As Komissarov notes, translation was developed in three ways. First, translation was institutionalised and the first organization of professional translators was established. Second, the choice of the material for translation changed to include books of a more pragmatic nature and mainly from modern European languages. Finally, translation was developed into “a kind of creative writing” until the 19th century. That century is described as “the golden age” of Russian translation as it became a “high art” activity (Komissarov, 1997: 544).

However, the authorities always tried to protect the country from foreign and probably dangerous influences. In Paxton’s Companion to Russian History, it is noted that Peter the Great was the first to introduce the concept of censorship in Russia, only for texts with religious content. A more general form of censorship was developed in 1803 and actual legislation on censorship was introduced in the state system in 1826 (Paxton, 1983: 77). In general, all written works, domestic and foreign were examined “for unwelcome foreign concepts and values” (Choldin, 1989: 29).

The first official censorship regulations were established during the reign of Catherine the Great (1729-1796), when two of the most important authors of that period, Radishchev and Novikov were imprisoned and exiled. From 1796 special censorship committees were established by the government in order to control the introduction of every foreign book into the country. This action developed after the Pugachev rebellion of 1773-177517, the French

17 Catherine the Great wished to modernize Russia and in order to succeed she introduced western technological advances, fashions, food, and art, at great financial cost to the entire country. Taxes were increased and the cost of living was unbearable for lower classes. From 1762 to 1772, 160 uprisings were recorded in the Russian empire, but none of them was organized enough in order to succeed; until Pugachev’s Rebellion from 1773 to 1775. This was the most crucial peasant rebellion in Russian history. It started with the rumour that Peter III, the grandson of Peter the Great, had escaped assassination and he was hiding among the Cossacks. Catherine II sought revenge against Peter III. Emilian Ivanovich Pugachov, claiming to be Tsar Peter III, encouraged
Revolution and the spread of Freemasonry\textsuperscript{18} and liberal ideas in Russia. The introduction of censorship committees was a way the authorities tried to protect Russian people from these new ideas and influences. Their goal was “to give to the public books and works which would lead to the flowering of the mind, the development of good taste, and a proper way of life” (Twarog, 1971: 100).

In 1826, after the Decembrist revolt\textsuperscript{19}, a new censorship code was introduced which was stricter and was called “iron code” or “cast iron code”. The code originally promoted the works of art which were considered to be “good for the citizens”, but was revised in order to prohibit any form of art which could damage “the faith (orthodoxy), the throne (monarchy), and the morals and personal integrity of the citizens (Twarog, 1971: 101).

During the reign of Alexander I and later under Nikolas I the censorship laws became harsher and the circulation of new ideas was further circumscribed. This period from 1848 to 1855 was called “the age of terror”, as at that time censorship was practiced in its most severe form (Hingley, 1977: 227). As a result, major Russian authors such as Dostoevsky, Gogol and Turgenev suffered and were exiled using the excuse that their writings were considered to be against the monarchy (Twarog, 1971: 101).

Regarding the foreign publications imported into the Empire in their original languages, Hingley notes that they were censored by a special department that focused on “foreign censorship”. The censors were looking for and deleted parts of these publications which were “offensive to the Russian government” (Hingley, 1977: 233). Choldin indicates four categories of foreign publications that existed in Imperial Russia and, as it will be explained

\footnotesize{peasants to join the revolt by promising to free serfs from their lords and redistribute the land. Hence, he led the last and most important Cossack rebellion in Russia in 1773 (Ness, 2009: 2775-6).}

\footnotesize{18 According to Paxton’s Companion to Russian History, Freemasonry was an “undenominational ‘religion’ for men, based on philanthropy and mysticism. In Russia Freemasonry flourished from 1770 to 1810, but it later degenerated into an incredible and bigoted mysticism” (Paxton, 1983: 142).}

\footnotesize{19 Decembrists were former military officers who were familiar with the Western liberalism and they could not accept the regime that Russian authorities had imposed. In December 1825 they started an anti-tsarist revolt which failed because of poor organization and the members of the revolt were executed, imprisoned or exiled to Siberia (Paxton, 1983: 103)
later, they continued to exist in Soviet Russia more or less with the same characteristics. The publications that appeared during the Tsarist years are classified as follows:

- publications that were permitted to circulate freely
- publications that were absolutely banned
- publications that were banned for the public but they were accessible only to individuals who applied at the Foreign Censorship Committee offices and were approved by the authorities, and finally
- publications that were permitted for circulation only after the excision which means blacking, or pasting over, or cutting out specific words, sentences or passages from the text (Choldin, 1989: 30).

The themes, which were deleted or manipulated by the authorities, were the ones that, according to Choldin, indicated lack of respect toward the Russian Royalty, insulted the existing social order, represented Russian people as non-European barbarians, and included ideas offensive to religion and morality. These themes caused considerable consternation in the Imperial government, which was trying to protect the nation from the intrusion of these ideas (Choldin, 1989: 30).

In general, censorship in Imperial Russia was quite rigorous. However, Tsarist censorship never gave instructions to an author about what he or she has to write; there were only specific topics that should not be mentioned. As Hingley observes, it was not the kind of censorship that tries to instill specific ideas to the citizens of the country. Rather it was used to keep revolutionary ideas out of people’s mind, “it was a censorship of morals, as well as of politics and religion” (Hingley, 1977: 225). However, while authors and translators suffered because of this situation, it is believed that during this period, “some of the world’s greatest literature” was produced. There are also scholars who believe that the existence of censorship forced writers to write in particularly innovative ways in order to evade censorship (Twarog, 1971: 111). The censorship practices established in Imperial Russia continued to exist and even developed to harsher forms under the Soviet Union’s official regulations. The following section gives a detailed description of the rules that governed translation and censorship practices during the Soviet years.
3.3 Translation in the Soviet Union

Translation in Russia has received considerable attention because of the shifting political and cultural environments, such as the multilingual nature of the country and censorship practice (Baer and Olshanskaya, 2013: iii). Critics argue that translations of foreign literary works played an important role in Russia’s development and were instrumental in forming the country’s identity. Moreover, xenophobia was always a restraining factor, which along with censorship regulations prevented Russian people from reading foreign literature. For many years, it was difficult for people to travel out of the Soviet Union. In the same way, it was illegal for foreign publications to cross the country’s borders. Therefore, translated literature under the state’s control was the only communication with the rest of the world.

During the first Soviet years, a great number of books from the West were published in Russia. According to Friedberg, this increase occurred for two reasons. First, the state wanted the public to have access to books that the old regime did not allow them to read. Second, the idea of a “universal brotherhood of workers and peasants” brought into the country books describing the hard working conditions of the working community in the West. Therefore, during this period it was possible for Soviet people to read most of the world’s classics and some of the modern works coming from the West (Friedberg, 1977: 4).

As Friedberg notes, translated literature “refined their tastes” and “enriched the literary language” (Friedberg, 1997: 3). The introduction of translated literature mostly from Western European countries began in the 18th century. Through translations, new forms of secular literature were introduced and the Russian language was enriched with new words and simpler syntactic forms (Baer and Olshanskaya, 2013: iv). The demand for foreign publications was high. However, the selection of books for translation was a “government-controlled” process (Friedberg, 1977: 2). This is evidence that, despite the challenging process that had to be followed, translations were generally accepted in the Russian literary polysystem and occupied a primary/central position in it.

In general, Soviet literature can be classified into three categories of books: prerevolutionary books, Soviet books and foreign books. The third category, that is, translations of foreign literary works was viewed by Soviet critics and publishers “as carriers, to varying degrees, of non-Soviet values and are thus to be treated with particular caution” (Friedberg, 1977: 1). The
situation described above affected children’s literature and its translation as well (see 3.4). However, all literary works, including those written for children, and any form of art in general, had to follow the principles of Socialist Realism.

3.3.1 The Principles of Socialist Realism

Translation during the Soviet years cannot exist without reference to the principles of Socialist Realism, as its ideas influenced every kind of artistic activity in the Soviet Union from the moment of its establishment. This new ideology was introduced by the Soviet government in 1932. More specifically, it was officially established in 17 May 1932, in a public speech by Ivan Gronsky, who was the president of the new Writers’ Union’s Organizational Committee. The legend about the creation of the term says that it was invented by Stalin himself, during a meeting he had with Maksim Gorky. By August 1934, during the First Congress of the Writers’ Union the term “Socialist Realism” acquired a canonical reputation (Clark, 2001: 174). Since then Socialist Realism was the official literary “method” or “theory” of Soviet literature “virtually” until the Soviet regime dissolution. However, Clark notes that after Stalin’s death (1953), the obligatory path of Socialist Realism was avoided by many authors as the publishing policies became looser than before (Clark, 2001: 174).

The features of Socialist Realism can be described as the tendency to promote and support the ideology of the Party. According to Clark, the language used should be completely understandable by the masses: there were no dialectisms, neologisms and abstruse or long-winded expressions; there were also no religious references and no references to any rival political party to the Bolsheviks. In general, literature “served the ideological position and policies of the Bolshevik Party” (Clark, 2001: 175). In fact, the writer was “working for the government”. He/she was guided by the government and his/her texts were controlled and even rewritten before publication. The rewriting process was made by the author himself/herself under supervision, by another writer or by the publisher, and sometimes the author did not even know about the changes made. The Socialist Realism writers were somehow forced to be “politically correct” and promote the image of the “positive hero” to the citizens of the Union. There was even a “master-plot” which was applied in most novels published at that time (Clark, 2001: 177).
According to Nikolajeva, the motto of Socialist Realism was “typical people in typical circumstances,” and the rendition of the events taking place was superficial without allowing any further investigation of the human character (Nikolajeva, 1995: 106). As it is described by O’Dell, Socialist Realism influenced children’s books as well. These works had to follow three requirements: first, they had to be “optimistic”, a happy ending was almost compulsory so that the “forces of good will be seen to be conquering the forces of evil”, even though the hero’s position might not be positive in the end. Second, “man must be portrayed as being basically a social animal”, so that at the beginning of the story the hero might be isolated from other people in the society he lives in, but by the end becomes equal with the others. Finally, “every work of art should have ideological content”, which means, that it has to serve “the goals and methods of the Communist Party” (O’Dell, 1978: 6-7).

Chudakova justifies the special status of children’s literature as a result of Socialist Realism. For writers it was easier to adjust the principles of Socialist Realism in regard to children’s literature rather than in literature for adults (Chudakova, 1990). Therefore, it was easier for a happy ending with a positive hero to be achieved in books for children and at the same time the writers were able to avoid any references to ideological subjects. Translated books were also considered works of literature. In consequence, the principles and guidelines of Socialist Realism were applied to translations as well. As long as the message of the book was optimistic and praised, or at least did not criticize the Party’s beliefs, the book was proper.

In conclusion, translations in Soviet Union attracted the attention of authorities. There were three reasons for that policy according to Leighton. First, was the fear of foreign ideas, as has already been discussed. Second, was the thirst for information that overwhelmed the Soviet people. Third, the “nationalities policy of Lenin” by which he tried to unify the different republics of the Union under a mutual culture (Leighton, 1991: 18). From all the above it becomes obvious that censorship practices were pervasive in Russian history.

In general, the new Soviet ideology promoted the values and benefits of Communism through art and literature. According to Socialist realist depictions, Soviet workers and their everyday life were presented as ideal and creditable in contrast with the negative image of workers in capitalist countries who were presented as miserable. Its major goal was to teach and impart the meaning and values of Communism. Any kind of art produced according to ideas of Socialist Realism had realistic, optimistic and heroic features. However, as Clark points out,
not all works were based on the principles of Socialist Realism and she classifies Soviet literature of the period 1930-1991 into three categories: works that followed Socialist Realism, non- or anti-Soviet works which were published in the Soviet Union, and works which were part of Soviet literature, but do not follow the principles of Socialist Realism (Clark, 2001: 174).

The existence of Socialist Realism in literature has been seen by scholars as “utopian literature, a kind of fantasy of its own” as its main goal was to present life as it should be and not as it was (Salminen, 2009: 18-19). Socialist Realism that certainly affected translation, literature as well as all forms of art, started to gradually fade after Stalin’s death (1953). It almost disappeared during the years of perestroika (1985-1991) and completely vanished with the dissolution of the Soviet regime in 1991. In 1991, a new era for the Russian publications emerged and translations played a significant role in the country’s reshaping.

### 3.4 Translation in the Russian Federation

The dissolution of the Soviet Union took place in December 1991. However, that date is considered to be only its official end. The years of perestroika (1987-1991) are also considered as years when “a change in generations” can be observed, as suggested by Avtonomova (2008: 191). The years of perestroika seem to be the most productive ones in terms of literary circulation. During the late Soviet years censorship practices started to become weaker. During this time, many literary works, both Russian and foreign translations, which were previously banned in Russia were now allowed to be published in the country (Dobrenko and Lipovetsky, 2005: 1), perhaps for the first time. Nabokov's *Ania v Strane Chudes*, which was originally published in Berlin, in 1923, entered the country in 1976. However, during perestroika, multiple editions of the book appeared in the market.

It was also during this period when works that previously were circulated only in *samizdat* and *tamizdat* (see 2.5.3), were now recognized by journals and were officially published (Dobrenko and Lipovetsky, 2005: 2). According to Dobrenko and Lipovetsky, this kind of freedom from censorship in the publication and circulation of literature, “analogous” to the post-Soviet one, only occurred during a period that lasted for a few months after the establishment of the Soviet regime. During that period, books were seen as the “forgotten
weapon” which needed to be reused by the Soviet government (Dobrenko and Lipovetsky, 2005: 2).

Two opposite tendencies can describe the period that followed the dissolution of the Soviet regime. On one hand, as noted by Dobrenko and Lipovetsky there was political anarchy, growth of crime, social and economic marginalization of the intelligentsia and intensification of social and ethnic conflicts. On the other hand, during this period there were also signs of growth of various cultural institutions, development of political life and cultural exchanges with other countries. These factors contributed to the production of a new literature perhaps more “open” to subjects and references that were previously forbidden (Dobrenko and Lipovetsky, 2005: 2-3).

During the years that followed 1991, the situation regarding the development of literature and literary institutions was different than expected. During the 1990s, “a sharp decline in the print runs of literary journals” may be observed and “a complete reshaping of the entire literary field” began. Many local journals and publishing houses closed down because of lack of funds (Dobrenko and Lipovetsky, 2005: 3). Even the “mechanisms for distribution of books have functioned poorly, if at all, across Russia’s huge territory” and corruption governed Russia’s institutions regarding intellectual property laws (Platt, 2011: 41). As Dobrenko notes, “the new Russian literature arose from unofficial literature” (Dobrenko, 2005: 20) and therefore the post-Soviet literature was technically the Soviet literature disguised.

Avtonomova points out that during the post-Soviet period many translations were published, especially in the field of philosophy, as Russians were now more open to the Western thoughts and ideas (Avtonomova, 2008: 198). This is how translation became a huge enterprise, funded by Western foundations. However, the people working for these enterprises were not always as skillful as their post demanded and their knowledge of foreign languages was not sufficient, resulting in a number of weak translations. The western foundations’ activity can be summarised as the following two tasks: an attempt to overcome “the information shortage that had piled up” during the Soviet years, as well as to supply the readership with “the basic literature in philosophy and humanities” (Avtonomova, 2008: 199). Despite this significant effort, there was still a tendency to reject new things and, as
Avtonomova notes, there were still people wondering, “why do we need to translate” (Avtonomova, 2008: 199).

There were many issues, related to the changes that occurred in the country after the dissolution of the Soviet regime. However, Dobrenko and Lipovetsky note that the time from the 1990s onward is considered to be a unique period in the history of Russian culture as it is “the only lengthy interval in which Russian literature developed in the complete absence of censorship of both the political and moral varieties” (Dobrenko and Lipovetsky, 2005: 1).

In conclusion, the previous sections present the situation regarding translation in all three periods examined in this study: Imperial Russia, the Soviet Union and the Russian Federation. In this discussion, reference to censorship is inevitable, as it seems that censorship practices accompanied literary activities, even before or after censorship’s official existence. Censorship seems to govern translation and publication processes in all stages of the Russian history as a part of its literary system. This is why the following section provides a detailed presentation of the censorship mechanism. A closer look at the procedures followed before, during and after publication will provide a better understanding of how the censorship system worked and perhaps why it affected the Russian literary system for so many decades.

3.5 Censorship Practice in Russia

The word censorship includes several meanings. Billiani defines censorship as “a form of manipulative rewriting of discourses by one agent or structure over another agent or structure, aiming at filtering the stream of information from one source to another” (Billiani, 2007: 3). Censorship is also seen as “a guardian of traditions”, a view which “implies the explicit or implicit rejection of innovative ideas” (Wolf, 2002: 46). This is why previous research has linked censorship mainly with totalitarian regimes, as within these contexts censorship practices are used in order to shape national identities. The Russian literary tradition, including the translation of foreign works emerged out of a long tradition of censorship, which is more evident in the Soviet period.

Despite the strong link between Soviet Russia and censorship, monitoring publications is a phenomenon that appeared in all European countries at some point throughout their
respective histories. Wolf notes that censorship is a term “overloaded with historical memory”, and that it is often connected with “repressive regimes that continue to ignore freedom of the press and freedom of expression” (Wolf, 2002: 45). This is true, since in these kinds of regimes information control was one way of securing political and social stability. Germany, Spain, and Italy faced situations of hard censorship.

For example, in fascist Italy, book censorship can be linked to the country’s tendency to become “an official racist state”. Mussolini controlled translation and publishing processes as he thought that foreign literature would be useful and educative for the Italians and that it would have an impact on “shaping the Italian racial consciousness” (Fabre, 2006: 33-34). Another example of censorship in relation to translation comes from Spain, under the Franco regime. According to Gonzalez de Canales, the National Secretary of propaganda, books had to “complement the formation of our national consciousness”. Hence, books were used as “an instrument of ideology”, even if the regime did not have a specific book publication policy (Hurtley, 2006: 87).

Children’s literature is not an exception to the studies of censorship in translation. According to Thomson-Wohlgemuth, in East Germany censoring books was a very well-organised process. Book selection, manipulation of writers, printing, publishing and expenses were carefully planned (Thomson-Wohlgemuth, 2006: 93). The censorship mechanism in this context was based upon Marxist-Leninist theories and it had two goals. The first one was to infuse the communist spirit in citizens’ minds. Books were viewed as “devices with a purpose” to create a new society. The second goal was to protect the Party from criticism (Thomson-Wohlgemuth, 2006: 94).

The same goals seem to apply to the Russian context. Government censorship policy was developed during the 19th century. Until the late 1920s privately owned publishing houses existed, but after that period censorship rules became more severe and all private publishing houses were taken over by the state (Friedberg, 1977: 3). Zemtsov defines censorship as “government control over printed material, public statements, and contents broadcast over radio and television”. He clarifies that, in the Soviet perspective, the word censorship also refers to “the Chief Directorate for the Preservation of State Secrets in Publishing”, or Glavlit, as it is widely known. He also classifies Soviet censorship as: general, military,
international, atomic energy, KGB. Censorship can also be “preventive” or “punitive” (Zemtsov, 1991: 38).

Censorship and publication process was long and complicated in the Soviet Union and it was performed by special state agencies in accordance with the official ideology of the country. Glavlit (Главлит), which was established in 1922, was in charge of supervising and censoring all publications, as well as protecting state secrets. The word “censorship” was never admitted in public. Censorship did not exist officially. However, it was a common secret among writers and editors that all kinds of texts, articles and books were censored for political and ideological reasons.

Another state organisation responsible for censorship was department “D”, which was located in the central Administration of the KGB. The letter “D” probably arose from the word dezinformatsiya (misinformation). The employees working for this department were responsible for spreading rumours, real or not, about matters that would be beneficial for the Party. There was also another group of people who exercised “super control”. This group used to monitor the controllers. They oversaw everything produced in every department of the censorship system. Finally, there was a third group of controllers, the people who had to inspect suspicious individual publications (Dewhirst and Farrell, 1973: 50).

Twarog classifies the Soviet censorship system as follows: 1) the party head, 2) the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Party (formerly the Politburo of the Central Committee); 3) the Kremlin’s press department; 4) the press department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union; 5) the editorial board of newspapers and magazines; 6) the editorial staff; 7) Glavlit. Twarog also notes that Glavlit, which is described as the most important censorship organ. In real terms it was the last one that had control over censorship issues; “they simply carry out instructions” (Twarog, 1971: 113).

Twarog also describes how Soviet press censorship used to work. He unravels the process and explains which institutions and which individuals were involved in the process:

For newspaper publication, an article is shown to the chief of section or to a member of the editorial board. He makes suggestions, and the article is rewritten. Then it goes to a “responsible secretary” of the editorial board, a kind of
managing editor. Upon his approval, it goes to the print shop. The galley proofs are read by the deputy chief editor and included in the dummy of the paper. Page proof is then read by no fewer than six “responsible workers”: the department head, the responsible secretary, the deputy editor, the night editor, the editor in chief, almost all of whom are party members, and then the political editor, the real and final censor. Only after the latter has affixed his code number signifying his approval at the bottom of the last page can any Soviet paper or book be printed. (Twarog, 1971: 113)

To elucidate, an article was checked for topics that were not supposed to be mentioned. Among them were news about train wrecks, plane crashes, unless they happened in someone else’s territory; no mention of leper colonies or hospitals for lepers in the USSR, or of unemployment, venereal disease, crop failures, hailstorms, or disasters. They felt that if no one mentioned socio-economic failures like these, it would mean that they never happened. The press always had to be optimistic. The censors also checked drawings and photographs for any symbol or sign that could have some political meaning (Twarog, 1971: 113).

The above description indicates the complicated nature of the publication process in the Soviet Union. All works were rigorously checked by many state organs at different stages. Even if a book was finally approved for publication, it could be recalled after its publication if it was found to be inappropriate. However, state censorship was not the only form of censorship observed in the Soviet Union. The authors’ self-censorship was also a factor that affected the writing, translating and publishing process. The two forms of censorship, official and self-censorship will be presented below.

### 3.5.1 Forms of Censorship: Official Censorship and Self-Censorship

As already mentioned, there are two kinds of censorship: formal censorship and self-censorship. Finkelstein describes how the system of formal censorship works. He talks about how journalists published their articles in the newspapers. The censor checked every article twice; once before the printing procedure and once after it. This happened in order to avoid any possible changes made by editors or publishers. Therefore, the writer submitted two copies to the censor. The censor, after reading the work, had to send one copy to the press. Once a printed sample was returned to the censor he/she had to compare it with the original
copy he/she had kept. If there were no alterations, a stamp as a proof that the work was ready for printing and publication was applied (Dewhirst and Farrell, 1973: 50).

As described by Sinitsyna, the censor had to put a stamp on the book he had examined. There were two kinds of stamps the “triangle” stamp and the “hexagon” stamp. The triangle meant the publication was safe and the public could read it. However, the hexagon meant that the publication was not to be read by the general public and should be stored in special places in the library where only people with special license could enter. There were even book that got two or three hexagons on their covers. That meant that they were extremely dangerous books and only the KGB, the Central Committee of the CPSU and a small number of selected libraries could have that kind of publication (Sinitsyna, 1999: 36).

Apart from official censorship there is also self-censorship which is something that every writer has but is often expressed in different ways. According to Kuznetsov, as quoted in Dewhirst and Farrell, the notion of self-censorship in the West is a kind of self-discipline, but in the Soviet Union, it is “a form of self-torment”. Kuznetsov also points out, that a writer in the Soviet Union was never free to write; he was always “somehow choking himself”. In fact, there were two kinds of censors. The first was the internal self-censor of the writers and the external official censor was the second (Dewhirst and Farrell, 1973: 26).

Belinkov, also quoted in Dewhirst and Farrell, indicates that self-censorship begins within the family. He gives an apt example describing a family having a discussion with some friends. When their daughter enters the room the conversation suddenly changes to something irrelevant like food. This happens in order to avoid answering the daughter’s questions about the topic or to avoid that kind of questions being repeated at school, having as a result the intervention of the authorities (Dewhirst and Farrell, 1973: 45).

Sinitsyna, referring to the two kinds of censorship developed in the Soviet Union, the personal self-controlling of the author and the official censorship of the state, notes:

We used to feel “an eye” everywhere, therefore everyone had to develop an inner-censor for self-controlling of whatever was to be written, said or expressed in any media (Sinitsyna, 1999: 36).
Apart from self-censorship and censorship itself, there is another aspect that is indicative for the nature of the Soviet Union editing, translating and publishing policies – the censorship by language. It was essential for writers to use the official jargon, that is, the vocabulary of Marxism-Leninism. According to Schopflin, everything has to be expressed in a “stilled formalized and alien political vocabulary”, which left no room for criticism (Schopflin, 1983: 5). All these aspects made the writing and publishing of literary works challenging and it created two different groups of people: the authors and the censors.

3.5.2 The Authors and the Censors

Demin, as quoted in Dewhirst and Farrell, classifies the Soviet writers into three groups. The first one, “the right-wing” is represented by the writers who agree and follow the demands of the regime unconditionally. The second one, included writers like the Russian liberals, who did not agree with the demands of the regime, but were trying to conform to the rules and adjust their ideas in order to pass the censor’s control. The third group consisted of writers like Pasternak and Akhmatova, who completely rejected and opposed to the regime (Dewhirst and Farrell, 1973: 37).

Writers were not free to write about any subject or any plot they wanted. Their writing had to be shaped by a specific ideology and obey the demands of Socialist Realism. The promotion of “positive heroes” who would enhance the stability of communism was the primary goal of Socialist Realism. Writers knew that it was highly likely that their book to would be banned because of its “unsuitable” content even at the manuscript stage, and sometimes not by the censors but by the editors (Dewhirst and Farrell, 1973: 2). In general, the concept of censorship in the Soviet Union became synonymous with Glavlit. Glavlit was the Chief Directorate for the Preservation of State Secrets in Publishing, and it was attached to the Council of Ministers of the USSR (Zemtsov, 1984: 38).

Many scholars have written about Soviet censorship and described the role of the censors; their obligations, their duties and the process that followed in order to give their approval for a book or an article to be published. Vladimirov points out that a censor’s task was “to ensure that no state secret is published”. There was a list of topics that should not be discussed in public; the “List of Information Not to Be Published in the Open Press” (Перечни сведений, не подлежащих опубликованию в открытой печати). He describes that list as a 400-page
book with a green cover where the words “Secret. Copy No. ___” were printed in gold ink. This list was also called “the Talmud”. The censors read the text and marked anything that seemed to be suspicious. Then they checked if the suspicious words or sentences included in the list. The subjects that did not exist in the list, but there were doubts regarding their publication, needed to be discussed with the editor (Vladimirov, 1989: 18). As mentioned above, in theory the censorship system, the special censorship organizations’ existence and a censor’s task was the protection of state secrets. In practice, this whole procedure took another, form; the censors sought “to protect the minds of the Soviet people from the harmful influence and infection of the West” (Sinitsyna, 1999: 36). This statement implies that censors were allowed to follow any procedure in order, not only to protect the state secrets, but also to “save” the citizens from foreign threats.

Dermin underlines the fact that it was hard to be a censor. Mistakes, even spelling mistakes, were neither allowed, nor forgiven. Censors could simply “disappear” and no one would ever know what had happened to them. There was no room for mistakes and the consequences were severe (Dewhirst and Farrell, 1973: 63). Finkelstein, in Dewhirst and Farrell, talks about the recruitment of censors. He points out that some of them were recruited from Komsomol20, and others were recruited from other state security organs, but most of them were taken from the Moscow Polygrafic Institute, which was an educational faculty for training editors and publishers. Censors were supposed to have previous experience of literary work, editing, printing and publishing. After a formal interview, the successful graduates were hired from Glavlit and started to work as state censors (Dewhirst and Farrell, 1973: 64).

There were also censors who were responsible only for translations. The first thing they did was to examine the author’s background. They had to check if he/she had ever expressed a negative opinion about the Soviet Union even though his/her book had no political content. If the author’s name was not connected with negative comments, the book’s publication was accepted for consideration for translation into Russian and publishing (Dewhirst and Farrell, 1973: 74).

---

20Komsomol is an abbreviation of ‘Communist Youth League’ (Kommunistichesky Soyuz Molodezhi). It was the Soviet youth organization founded in 1918 and its structure was similar to the structure of the Communist Party (Zemtsov, 1991: 176).
Morrison argues that in authoritarian regimes there are times that authorities “allow writers to publish their judgments or follow their creative instincts at their own peril” in order for them to be exposed to overtly feared consequences. The consequences for these writers can be quite severe: surveillance, arrest, and even death are the penalties for those writers who tried “to inform and disturb the public”. In these regimes “truth is trouble” and so are the writers whose work can “disturb the social oppression” (Morrison, 2009: 1). Despite the circumstances described above, there were always ways invented by the authors to evade the censor and publish their works.

3.5.3 Evading the Censor

In oppressive regimes, where censorship dominated the press and publications, reactions from the authors against that kind of techniques always happened. Methods of evading the censor were developed due to writers’ desire to have their works published. The first evasive tactic described by Hingley, is “Aesopic” language. It was a method of making allusions and giving hints to the readers, who had to read between the lines to find the implied message. Another way of evading the censor was the secret circulation of manuscripts from hand to hand. Writers tried to give their works to the public without passing the official publication process. Later, during the Soviet years this method continued to exist and was called samizdat. Finally, a third way to be published without the censor’s interference was to print an article in the foreign press. Russian articles and books were published abroad and then were illegally imported back into the country (Hingley, 1977: 231).

Since the pressure coming from the government, which used censors and controlled all publications, was intense, the writers, journalist and poets of the time had to invent their own ways to bring their work and their innovative ideas to the Soviet people. New ideas of how to evade the censor, how to trick him/her were born and evolved at the same rate that censorship methods were evolved. Most of them existed in the Tsarist years, but in the Soviet time they developed dramatically. One of these methods, as mentioned above, was the Aesopian language.

Loseff defines the term Aesopian language as “a special literary system, one whose structure allows interaction between author and reader at the same time that it conceals inadmissible content from the censor” (Loseff, 1984: x). It was thought that the term Aesopian language
was an idea created by Lenin himself. During Tsarist times and before the Bolsheviks seized power, Lenin was one of the inventors of “this double-talk and double-writing in order to deceive the Tsarist censors and police” (Parry, 1950: 190). But, according to Savinitch as cited in Terian, it was first introduced by the Russian satirist M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin, in order to indicate a “figurative language of slavery” and “an ability to speak between the lines […] at a time when literature was in a state of bondage” (Terian, 2012: 75).

The use of *Aesopian language* in writings was a method of evading the censor and it evolved as censorship evolved. It included the substitution of words and phrases with other words and phrases, which would transmit a “detailed subversive message”. Writers used rhetorical strategies and a more sophisticated language in order to avoid the common language clichés, which could be easily identified by the censor (Terian, 2012: 77).

It is believed that the pressure and strictness imposed by the Communist regime was beneficial from the perspective of creativity, since writers had to be inventive and use a different, more sophisticated language in their works in order to evade the censor. This is one of the reasons that during a period of harsh censorship, Russian literature acquired significant impact on a worldwide scale.

Another way of getting published without a censor’s interference in a writer’s work was *samizdat*. Writers, who were not allowed to publish their works in the official press, turned to *samizdat* in order to make their works accessible to the public. The word *samizdat* comes from the Russian words *sam* (self) and *izdatelstvo* (publishing). According to Zemtsov’s definition *samizdat* was “literature produced by private dissident sources”. *Samizdat* as a word became known during the 1960s, but the concept and the practices of *samizdat* existed from the eighteenth century (Zemtsov, 1991: 277). *Samizdat* was an underground circulation of uncensored books, articles, magazines, essays and writings that were secretly distributed. A great number of typewriters in the Soviet Union were used to type both the original and many copies of a particular work of literature (Twarog, 1971: 121).

Paxton also describes the term as a word used “by Soviet dissenters for the system of preparing and circulating writings, usually in typescript form, so as to avoid official censorship”. He also notes that the word is a parody of the official acronym Gosizdat which was the State Publishing House and that it “provides a forum of opinions, as well as a source
of information on political, national, religious, and literary themes that cannot find expression in the official press and publishing” (Paxton, 1983: 354). The consequences though for people who were involved in this underground, secret publication process were severe: arrest, imprisonment and exile were some of the penalties that someone could face.

Two further important terms are magnitizdat and tamizdat. Magnitizdat comes from the Russian words magnitofon (tape recorder) and izdatelstvo (publishing). It appeared during the 1970s and it referred to novels, stories and particularly poems, which were recorded and distributed in many copies. Tamizdat which comes from the words tam (there) and izdatelstvo (publishing), was a word used for works of Russian authors who lived in Russia but whose works were published abroad and often “smuggled into the country” (Paxton, 1983:354). One way or another there was always a solution against government censorship and the techniques of evading the censor became a part of the writing and publication process. As censorship evolved, so did the methods of avoiding it.

All the above provide the context of censorship in which translations and book circulation in general were taking place in Russia. The following section demonstrates an example of how censorship practice affected the three Alice translations chosen. The norms governing each literary polysystem are different and this is something that can be observed in all three translations as they display relatively different features.

3.6 Censorship in Alice: “Off with her head”

The Queen of Hearts, although mentioned several times in the story, she actually enters the plot from chapter 8 (The Queen’s Croquet-Ground) onwards. Despite the fact that she appears later, she is the strongest power-figure Wonderland. The chapter begins with Alice entering the garden where three card-gardeners were painting some roses. They were arguing and making comments about the Queen’s order that one of them “deserved to be beheaded” and that if the Queen finds out what they are doing they should all have their “heads cut off” (Carroll, 2009: 69-70). Alice talks to them again “a little timidly”; however, she has heard about decapitation before, when she was threatened by the Duchess. This is the moment when the Queen approaches them and the card-gardeners “instantly threw themselves flat upon their faces” (Carroll, 2009: 70).
Despite the fact that obeisance was never popular in England, Carroll uses the term to emphasise the absolute monarchical power of the Queen of Hearts. This is the moment when Alice meets the Queen. Alice is the only one that stands still so that she can see what is happening. She demonstrates independence and challenges the Queen’s authority by not prostrating herself. After the Queen asks her name, Alice answers, “very politely” and at the same time she reassures herself that almost everyone around her are “only a pack of cards” and that she “needn’t be afraid of them” (Carroll, 2009:72). The Queen is quickly distracted and asks who the gardeners are. This first interaction between Alice and the Queen of Hearts proceeds as follows:

ST2: ‘How should I know?’ said Alice, surprised at her own courage. ‘It’s no business of mine.

The Queen turned crimson with fury, and, after glaring at her for a moment like a wild beast, screamed, ‘Off with her head! Off with –’

‘Nonsense!’ said Alice, very loudly and decidedly, and the Queen was silent.

The King laid his hand upon her arm, and timidly said ‘Consider, my dear: she is only a child!’ (Carroll, 2009: 72)

The Queen of Hearts (as well as the Red Queen in the Looking Glass), is an “absurdly and unreasonably evil” figure in the book (Nikolajeva, 1996: 77). Following the Cheshire Cat’s comment “we’re all mad here” (Carroll, 2009: 58), Manlove refers to a “psychopathic” Queen of Hearts (Manlove, 2003: 25). However, Brandt calls her “despotic” as she seems to be the absolute figure of power in Wonderland (Brandt, 1994: 31). The struggle for power escalates as the story progresses. At the beginning of the book all creatures Alice meets in Wonderland treat her with hostility. However, the more she immerses herself in the Wonderland environment, the braver she becomes. Wonderland creatures have threatened her life many times. This is the first time that her life is threatened by the Queen herself, the official source of power and authority in Wonderland. However, Alice is not scared at all. The Queen orders Alice’s execution, however Alice “takes masterful control of the situation” as she now knows “how to handle a bully” (Honig, 1988: 82). She seems to defy the Queen’s threat as she has heard that order many times before and answers back “very loudly and decidedly”. The most surprising part of the scene is that the Queen remains silent.
Alice’s answer surprises the Queen who is probably not used to this kind of attitude from the creatures of Wonderland. She is enraged and screams “off with her head”. In this example, Alice challenges the Queen’s authority once, when she chooses not to prostrate herself, and then again, when she answers “nonsense” to the Queen’s order. She challenges the despotic authority and wins as the Queen remains silent. The Russian translations render this interaction differently.

3.6.1 TT2a

In TT2a, the chapter begins in a similar way, where Sonia enters the garden and sees the three gardeners. They are also painting the roses and arguing with each other talking about the Queen’s order to execute one of them the other day (приказывала ея милость снести тебе голову). Sonia’s presence made them stop their conversation and then she timidly (робко) asked them why they are painting the roses red. One of them answered that the roses should have been red instead of white and that if the Queen finds out about their mistake she will have their head cut off (всем нам велит головы снести). Then, when the Queen of Hearts (Червонная Краля) enters the scene, all of them also “hit their face in the ground” (ударились лицомь въ землю). Perhaps, curtsey did not occur in Victorian England, but it was common in Imperial Russia. However, Sonia as in the original chose to stand. To the Queen’s question “what’s your name child”, the translator has the Queen ask “как тебя, милая звать”. The word милая in Russian has the meaning of “darling”, “dear” or “sweetheart”. Despite the negative comments about the Queen and her execution orders, it seems here that she talks to Sonia in a friendlier tone. Sonia answers not only “politely” as in the original, but also with respect (почтительно). The Queen’s next question is who are the gardeners and the polite and respectful conversation changes. Sonia’s answer to that question and the Queen’s reaction is presented in table 7.
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“I don’t know and it’s not my business”, answers Sonia, wondering about her courage. The Queen of Hearts turned crimson from fury, listening to this answer.

[The “off with her head” order is omitted]

Sonia was not frightened and boldly looked at her into the eyes. The Queen of Hearts wanted to shout something, but she kept silent.

“Judge yourself, my dear, she is a child,” the King stood timidly by Sonia, gently putting his hand on the Queen of Hearts’ shoulder.

Sonia similarly answers to the Queen that she does not know and that it is not her business to know and she was again surprised with her boldness (и сама подивилась своей смелости). The Queen also “turned crimson with fury”; however, the “off with her head” order did not follow. Therefore, Sonia did not have to object verbally to the Queen. Here she just looked boldly (смело) into her eyes. This look was enough for the Queen to remain silent. The “off with her head” order is omitted once again. However, Sonia still challenges the Queen’s authority even with a strict look. Similarly as in the original, the King stands by Sonia, interferes, takes her side and tries to protect her, as she is only a child (сама разсуди, душенька, она ведь ребенок).

Regarding the lexical mismatches, there is only one reporting verb “отвечает” (answers) as there is not any form of dialogue between Sonia and the Queen of Hearts. The tenor is different, as Sonia answers that she does not know (who the soldiers are) and that it is not her business. The Queen turns crimson with anger (побагровела от гнева) as in the original; however, she does not order Sonia’s decapitation. The “off with her head” order is omitted once again and, therefore, Sonia never replies to the Queen’s punishment order. She just looks boldly into the Queen’s eyes (смело глядяла ей в глаза) and the Queen, despite the fact that she looks like she wants to shout, remains silent.

The textual mismatches and the different paralinguistic behaviour (kinetics) depict both the character of Sonia and the Queen of Hearts in a completely different way from the original. In terms of the characters’ social role relationships, it seems that the protagonists of this scene are swapping roles. On one hand, Sonia is braver and more determined to seize the power from the Queen and on the other hand the Queen displays hesitation and constraint. Perhaps
this is a way for the translator to show that the Queen, who is not used to be overruled, is shocked by Sonia’s unprecedented reaction.

3.6.2 TT2b

In TT2b, the translation is literal. The translator chooses words of the same or similar intensity to describe the scene. Alice enters the garden and meets the three gardeners to paint the white roses red. They were arguing and accusing each other for the roses, reminding the Queen’s orders about previous (Королева сказала б ты заслуживаешь чтобы, тебе сняли голову) and future executions (если Королева заметит это, нам всем б знаете ли снесут головы прочь). Alice talks to them with “muffled voice” (глухим голосом) which signifies her fear. Soon the Queen arrives and the three gardeners “instantly fell to the ground with the face down” (мгновенно повалились на землю лицом вниз). As in the original obeisance is preserved in the Russian text. However, Alice only turned from the side the noise was coming, as she “eagerly” wanted to see the Queen (Алиса обернулась, нетерпеливо желая увидеть Королеву). The scene progresses in the same way as in the original: the Queen asks Alice’s name (как тебя зовут, дитя?), she answers politely (очень вежливо ответила) and convinces herself that she does not have to be afraid of the cards; she is surrounded (Ну, они только колода карт, в конце концов. Мне нечего их бояться). Finally, the Queen asks Alice who the gardeners are, and she answers as follows:

| TT2b Olenich-Gnenenko (1958:95) | - Откуда мне знать? - сказала Алиса, удивленная своей смелостью. - Это не мое дело. Королева побагровела от ярости и, с минуту пристально поглядев на нее, подобно дикому зверю завизжала: — Долой ей голову! ДОЛОЙ! — Нелепость! — сказала Алиса очень громко и решительно, и Королева замолчала. Король положил свою руку на руку Королевы и робко заметил: - Подумай, моя дорогая: ведь она – только ребенок! |
| Back Translation | - How do I know? – said Alice, surprised by her own courage. - It’s none of my business. The Queen turned crimson with fury, and, for a moment looked at her intently, like a wild beast screamed: - Off with her head! OFF! - Ridiculous! - Said Alice, very loudly and decidedly, and the Queen was silent. |
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The king put his hand on the Queen's hand and timidly remarked:
“Think, my dear: she is only a child!”

Alice is also surprised here with her boldness to say to the Queen that she does not know and it is not her business. The Queen does become furious and like a “wild beast” (дикому зверю) screams “Off with her head” (Долой ей голову). The order is repeated twice and the translator here chooses to put the second time the Queen screams “off” in capital letters (ДОЛОЙ) which is not something used in the original. In this way, the translator emphasises the Queen’s rage. It seems that in TT2b the Queen of Hearts has a more tempered character than in the original. Once again Alice’s unexpected answer is: “Ridiculous!” (Нелепость). She expresses this opinion “loudly and decisively” (громко и решительно). Alice challenges the Queen’s authority as in the original, which is something unusual for her. The fact that her power is questioned is shocking and leaves her speechless (Королева замолчала). When this translation was published under Soviet rule, this kind of behaviour would also be unusual and unacceptable. The fact that a child challenges the Queen’s authority does not conform with the norms of the time.

3.6.3 TT2c

Alice enters the garden and sees the three gardeners painting the white roses, trying to make them red. In this version, Alice expresses her opinion about this action. “That’s nonsense” (ерунда какая-то), she thinks before she goes closer. This is perhaps the same thought the implied reader would have while reading this scene and the translator decides to express it outwardly via Alice. The gardeners keep arguing and talking about the Queen’s orders to execute one of them (Даром что Королева голову тебя оторвать обещала). Alice approaches the gardeners and asks them, not “timidly”, but “carefully” (осторожно). Perhaps, after watching them doing something senseless as painting the roses, she does not what their reaction to her question might be. Hence, she is asking cautiously. Their answer is similar that if the Queen finds out about their mistake, she will execute them (не то не сносит нам головы). Then the Queen arrives and the gardeners “instantly fell on their knees having their foreheads buried in the ground” (мгновенно все трое бухнулись на колени, уткнувшись лбами в землю). The scene appears to be similar to the original until this point. However, as the first interaction between Alice and the Queen proceeds, many mismatches change the tenor.
During the first meeting between Alice and the Queen, the latter did not ask her “what’s your name dear?” or “what’s your name child” like in the other two translations. The Queen in an abrupt, authoritative and commanding way requested Alice’s name with one word: Name! (Имя!). Alice answered with all her courtesy (с всей учтивостью) and realised that everyone around her are playing cards (игральные карты) and that it would be “funny to be afraid of a paper deck of cards” (смешно бояться бумажной колод карт). To the next question, where the Queen asks Alice who the gardeners are the answer is the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TT2c</th>
<th>Yakhnin (1993: 65)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Сами разбирайтесь! - хмыкнула Алиса, немного всё же побаиваясь своей смелости. Королева побагровела и минуту сверлила Алису побелевшими от ярости глазами. Потом из её горла вырвался дикий вопль:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Голову с неё долой! Долой!...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Чепуха какая-то, - усмехнулась Алиса, и Королева осеклась. Король осторожно тронул Королеву за плечо и шепнул:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Остыньте, моя дорогая, она же ещё неразумное дитя.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Back Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Sort it yourself! – snorted Alice, a bit scared for her boldness. The Queen turned crimson and for a moment gave Alice a piercing glance with eyes white from fury. Then, from her throat came out a wild scream:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Off with her head! Off with!...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- That’s nonsense, - grinned Alice and the Queen stopped short. The king carefully touched the Queen's shoulder and whispered:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Calm down, my dear, she's still an unreasonable child.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

Alice’s answer to the Queen’s question is “sort it yourself” (сами разбирайтесь). Alice challenges Queen’s authority even more. She uses imperative form and in a way orders the Queen to find the answer herself. She is disrespectful towards the Queen, the absolute power-figure of Wonderland. Her attitude is opposite to the behaviour that the rest of the creatures display when the Queen is present (obeisance). Alice is even scared herself from her boldness (побаиваясь своей смелости). The Queen became furious, looked at Alice with rage, and then with a wild scream ordered her execution: “off with her head” (Голову с неё долой). However, Alice was not scared at all, even now that she was surrounded by card-soldiers and the whole royal procession and she answered back. “That’s nonsense” (чепуха какая-то) said...
Alice to the Queen, who did not react at all. Perhaps, the expected reaction would be an even more outraged Queen. Nevertheless, she was probably shocked herself that someone dared to challenge her authority and was not able to say anything else. Once again, perhaps through intense and unexpected dialogues the translator attempts to make the text funnier and show that there is no fear in Wonderland despite the death threats that are continuously repeated.

To sum up, in this excerpt, the tenor changes only in TTa, as the “off with her head” order is deleted and Alice is presented as brave only because she said to the Queen that she does not know who the soldiers painting the bush are. On the other hand, in both TTb and TTc the translation is closer to Carroll’s text. There are only minor lexical mismatches, which do not affect the meaning of the scene, and they transmit the Queen’s anger as well as Alice’s boldness in the same way as in the original.

**Conclusion**

In chapter 3, the context of translation in Russia was discussed separately for all three periods examined: Imperial, Soviet, post-Soviet. Censorship of publications and any form of art played a significant role in the country history and development, particularly during the Soviet years. There were two forms of censorship, the official state censorship and self-censorship that was used consciously or not by the authors. However, there were always exceptions of books that were circulated without being censored as many techniques to evade the censor were also developed. In the Alice example examined, there are parts that have been censored (or self-censored), due to their harmful content for the children. During the Imperial years, the norms governing children’s books prohibit anything that would scare the child or that it would transmit foreign ideas. An execution order is indeed a scary content for a child’s story and therefore, it is deleted from TTa. Similar rules applied to the Soviet years with the principles of Socialist Realism to promote happy endings and positive heroes. However, the execution order is not deleted in this translation, as it would probably be expected. This constitutes proof that there was no one-to-one correspondence between the general pressure to censor certain topics and the concrete way in which texts in translation were handled. Homogeneity is not a feature of Soviet children’s literature. The next chapter presents aspect of children’s literature and its translation. It explores the translational norms prevailing in children’s literature in Russia in the three periods examined as well as particular features that classified *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* to the list of the ambivalent books for children.
Finally, an example of how these age-hierarchy and power-related references from *Alice* are translated is also presented.
Chapter 4

Children’s Literature and Aspects of Translation

The present chapter examines evidence of political ideology in translated children’s literature in Russia and particularly in Alice as a translation for children. The chapter begins with the presentation of the main power-orientated theories as power references and power struggle is the key theme examined in the study. The chapter also provides a more detailed description of the translation theories and methods in the field, shedding light on the notions of manipulation and adaptation in the translation of children’s literature. Next, in the chapter, the function and role of children’s books as well as their translation in Russia are presented. This section is divided into three categories, as it describes the status of children’s books and the context in which they were circulating in all three periods of Russian history: pre-Soviet, Soviet and Post-Soviet. This periodization is significant in the study since the thesis attempts to examine the norms prevailing in the writing and translating of children’s books during all three periods. Finally, an Alice example that demonstrates adult power and age hierarchy is examined in all three Russian translations.

4.1 The Challenge of Children’s Literature

Children’s books have a long history beginning with folk, fairy tale, and the oral tradition (Hunt, 1998: 5). Modern children’s literature has its roots in the mid-19th century when authors turned to writing children’s books for entertainment and at the same time publishers realised that, there was a potential profit from their sale (Knowles and Malmkjær, 1995: 2). This need of writing for children was also supported by two other factors: the existence of wealthy families whose children did not have to work in order to contribute to the family income and the fact that childhood, which until then was seen as a “temporary misfortune”, became an important and vulnerable part of life (Pedersen, 2004: 74). However, the stages of development that children’s literature has followed are, in general, the same in all countries. Nikolajeva identifies four stages of development as follows:

- Adaptations of the already existing adult literature and folklore according to the child’s needs and interests.
- Didactic and educational stories written particularly for children.
• An established literary system with various genres and modes.
• A polyphonic or multi-voiced children’s literature. (Nikolajeva, 1996: 95-7)

For many years, there was the assumption that children’s books were inferior or as Shavit notes, children’s literature was considered to be the “Cinderella of literary studies” (Shavit, 1992: 4). This is probably because of their primary audience: children - a minority holding a peripheral position in many cultures (O’Connell, 2006: 18). In addition, the position of children in society and the notion of childhood have changed many times within the centuries of the creation of children’s literature. This is why the ideas of what children’s literature is, as well as its definition has changed many times in the last three centuries and this is due to the changes in the understanding of childhood (Epstein, 2012: 2) and the position of children in society.

Children’s literature in every country is bound to the country’s culture, traditions and customs. Children’s books represent the social and cultural norms prevailing in a country. Children shape their cultural identity through reading, as books have mainly an educative role. They carry moral messages, they teach children the difference between right and wrong and they separate the “good” from the “evil”. According to Hunt, children’s books are always educational or influential in some way as they reflect an ideology and are didactic (Hunt, 1994: 3).

Defining children’s literature has always been a challenging task. This is mainly due to the many factors that someone should take into account and the many agents involved to the creation of children’s books. The notion of childhood that appeared later in society, the position of children in different societies, the educational and didactic purposes that children’s books are expected to have, the involvement of adults in all stages of book production and circulation as well as the adult ideology and power that is hidden within the children’s stories are the main reasons that make any discussion on children’s literature and its translation challenging and its definition inaccurate.

In Alice's Adventures in Wonderland, all the above factors can be identified and perhaps these are the reasons that may have triggered negative critique. Alice was created in a time when the notion of childhood had started to change and children received more attention in Victorian society. Due to this change, the need for books with educational and didactic
content for children emerged. *Alice* may not display a high educational value; however, it does indicate the need for a better education system. The book portrays the Victorian child (Alice) as confused about many things that she had been taught at school. Moreover, the power of adults over children is noted throughout the story. Finally, due to its ambivalent content, the book’s suitability for children has been discussed many times.

*Alice* is an exception among the books of the Victorian era, since it does not teach morals rather, it satirizes them. Carroll mocks the Victorian system of children’s education; what children know and what they should know. This can be seen from many examples in the book. According to Nodelman, almost every scene in the book “involves Alice confronting a situation that transcends the expectation she has built on her previous knowledge” that is constantly proved to be “untrustworthy” (Nodelman, 2008: 38-9). Alice recalls things she had learnt in school but she is not completely sure about them. She never remembers the poems she used to know and she uses long and interesting words, which she had heard, but she is not sure for their meaning. This lack of knowledge that the Wonderland creatures take for granted always causes problems to Alice. The animals she encounters find a chance to embarrass and humiliate her. “You don’t know much and that’s a fact” (Carroll, 2009: 53) were the Duchess’s words to her and many other observations as such followed. The Mock Turtle, the Gryphon, the March Hare, the Mad Hatter and even the passive Dormouse insulted her and also tried to silent her due to her skills as it is be discussed in sections 6.7, 6.8 and 6.11 of the thesis.

By projecting Alice’s lack of knowledge, Carroll stresses the need for change in the Victorian educational system and perhaps the need for new books that could help children to enrich their world knowledge. However, there is a moment when Alice gains her knowledge back and she is sure about her statement “you are nothing but a pack of cards” (Nodelman, 2008: 40).

The involvement of adults is a variable that always influences children’s literature and according to Hermans, it “implies a degree of manipulation of the source text for a certain purpose” (Hermans, 1985: 11). Perhaps this involvement or manipulation is inevitable as adults may feel that they have a duty to raise their children and make them function in accordance with what their society demands, considering the prevailing norms, morals and ethics of their time.
Whether as an “invisible storyteller” (Lathey, 2010), a “hidden adult” (Nodelman, 2008) or an “adult agent” (Beauvais, 2015), the presence of adults stemming from social demands and adulthood normativity, is always visible in children’s literature and its translation. Perhaps, this presence is hardly ever avoided, because as Nodelman observed, there would be no children’s literature “if adults did not believe that children are different enough from adults to need a special group of books and imagine a category to contain them” (Nodelman, 2008: 139).

4.2 Power in Children’s Literature

The role of adults and their relation to children’s literature is a topic frequently discussed by scholars. There is always an adult “mediator” between children and their books. Children’s books are entirely controlled by adults. They can determine what children read since they are the ones who either produce or buy books for children (Knowles and Malmkjær, 1996: 2). Adults are responsible for every choice related to children and as O’Sullivan points out, adults “write, edit, translate, publish, promote, review, sell, buy, recommend, lend and teach children’s books” (O’Sullivan, 2010: 4). Moreover, as noted by Grenby, children’s books are written by adults in order to suit adult purposes (Grenby, 2008: 199). They are bought by adults and read to children to impart general knowledge and values. These purposes are related to the educational or ideological reasons. An adult may also buy a particular book for a child due to his/her pleasant memories of reading it as a child himself/herself. This contributes to “the preservation both of some of the best books ever written for children as well as certain lesser books, which are slow to lose their original popularity” (Kloet, 1977: 9).

Nodelman (2008) argues that the adult authors of children’s literature write according to the adult purchasers’ taste on children’s books (Nodelman, 2008: 5). Therefore, there is always a “hidden adult” in all stages of the production and distribution of children’s literature. Nodelman examines six children’s books, which belong to different genres and periods in an attempt to identify similarities and connections related to their structures and themes in order to reach some general conclusions regarding children’s literature. Indeed, several things were common in these divergent texts. Among them is simplicity, happy endings, repetitions, utopia. However, Nodelman always identifies “a shadow, […] a more complex and more complete understanding of the world, […] something less simple” and “beyond the childlike
consciousness” (Nodelman, 2008: 206). This something for Nodelman is the “hidden adult”, who is always involved in all aspects of children’s literature and is responsible for the creation of “a second, hidden text” or a “shadow text” within the actual text written for children (Nodelman, 2008: 8). This adult, hidden or not, controls children’s books and exercise his/her age-related power on children which is inevitably reflected through the text and the power relationships between the story’s protagonists, the addresser and the addressee, the narrator and the implied reader.

According to Gubar, the adults and “their texts” do indeed exercise their power on children (Gubar, 2009: 98). Nikolajeva also argues that power is present to all children’s “from ABC books to young adult novels” (Nikolajeva, 2010: 7). Nikolajeva (2009, 2010) proposes the term aetonormativity to describe the norm of adulthood in children’s literature. A norm that makes children become the “other”, the deviation of the norm. More specifically, the concept of aetonormativity, refers to “adult normativity that governs the way children’s literature has been patterned from its emergence until the present day” (Nikolajeva, 2009:16; 2010: 8). As Nikolajeva notes, power structures are reflected in all literary genres, however, for children’s literature the “focus on child/adult power hierarchy” appears to be a “particular characteristic” (Nikolajeva, 2010: 8).

Adults’ expectations from children to obey their decisions, rules and laws without questioning them is the norm, in both real life and literature (Nikolajeva, 2010: 9). These reflections of age-related power hierarchy are identified in many books for children as well as in Alice. For example, in the scene when the Lory insists that it is older than Alice and it know better than her. This age reference was the only argument the Lory had against her and it is further discussed in section 4.6.

Regarding power-oriented theories and particularly Nikolajeva’s aetonormativity, Beauvais (2012; 2015) suggests a reconceptualisation of the notion of “power”, which includes two more terms: authority and might. She notes that the adult-child relationship in children’s literature discourse does not necessarily mean that the adult is the “powerful” party and the child is “deprived of potency” (Beauvais, 2012: 78). In this “fuzzy concept of power”, Beauvais splits the frequently used term “power” in two, perhaps interconnected concepts: “authority” and “might”. Authority stands on the side of adults and may display three characteristics: it is legitimate, allows freedom on both adults and children and it increases in
time (Beauvais, 2012: 81). On the other hand, “might” refers to children as they appear to be “mighty” having the ability to oppose to adult’s authority and also evolve towards it (Beauvais, 2012: 82). For her, the difference between adult and child power lays to “the difference of temporality” which may lead to “different kinds of power” (Beauvais, 2012).

For Beauvais, to be mighty is “to have more time left” and to be authoritative is “to have more time past” (Beauvais, 2012: 82). In other words, children’s power is their future and adults’ power is their past. This division of power highlights the fact that children have a future, which allows them to act (and perhaps react) to any kind of adult authority. This power race between adult and child is in strong dependence to time, which provides the necessary “experience”, and “expertise” to the adult. In general, Beauvais argues that it is not only the adult’s power that should be discussed in children’s literature, as it has always been. The child has also a power and this power makes a difference in everything related to children’s literature has been discussed so far seeing the child as passive entity in the hands of adults.

Focusing on contemporary children’s literature (post-1950s) and particularly on picture books, Beauvais highlights the adult-child relationship in terms of time and power. She promotes the idea that the child is “mighty” and his/her power overcomes the adult’s and suggests a new concept of the implied reader. The adult-child relationship depends more on the child’s potential to interpret the adult’s choices. More specifically, “the adults are both giving children something they know and asking children to process it so as to tell them something they don’t know” (Beauvais, 2015: 87). Therefore, the knowledge provided by adults in children’s literature can be interpreted according to the child’s potential and understanding.

As Nodelman points out, children’s literature is “primarily a didactic literature” as it is a tool used by adults to teach children things “they do not know yet” (Nodelman, 2008: 157). However, children may also learn something from children’s literature that the “adults do not know yet”, that the child is also powerful (Beauvais, 2015: 3).

In Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland the demonstration of adults’ power is constant and according to Ren, the whole book is a “power struggle between the adult and the child” (Ren, 2015: 1659). Almost all characters Alice meets in Wonderland, starting with the White
Rabbit and ending with the King and the Queen of Hearts, are adults. All these adult characters try to show Alice that they have power, and according to Ren, this power is “the primary source of their anxiety” (Ren, 2015: 1660). They are either aggressive or tend to ignore Alice and they tend to order Alice about, as they have more authority in the world onto which Alice has intruded.

However, Alice “rudely rejects” everyone’s behaviour through to what Gubar calls “reciprocal aggression” (Gubar, 2009: 98). Being alone and scared at the beginning, Alice burst into tears many times. Once she realised Wonderland rules and also became bigger she behaves in a similar way the other Wonderland creatures do, which “too often lose their tempers and act in autocratic, insensitive, or insulting ways” (Gubar, 2009: 111). As Gubar notes, she does not hesitate to threaten smaller animals that her cat Dinah can go after them (Gubar, 2009: 111). Apart from applying the Wonderland rules of misbehaviour, Alice even becomes the savior and protector of the card-soldiers who were threatened with decapitation from the Queen of Hearts (see 6.5).

In general, Carroll presents Alice as “the wise child in a crazy world, opposing absurd logic with common sense” (Watson, 2001:253). Nikolajeva notes that “the author of the Alice books exercises just as much power toward his readers as the characters do towards the protagonists” (Nikolajeva, 2010: 30). Therefore, power appears to be a dominant feature of the book, exerted from Carroll to the readers, from Wonderland creatures to Alice and to each other and finally from Alice to anyone that threatened her during her journey. Considering the above, it can be said that the issue of power and adult influence in children’s literature is a growing body on literature and translation studies. It is surprising that very few studies on Alice’s translations examine this issue although it has been frequently discussed in studies refereeing to the original book. This study examines the instances of power relations in the Russian translations of Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland closely and more systematically, contributing to the existing gap in literature.

4.3 Children’s Literature in Translation

From all the above a conclusion that might arise is that the translation of children’s literature can be an even more challenging task. Bamberger notes that translated children’s literature may be an “integral part of a national literature” (Bamberger, 1978: 19). Children and, quite
often, parents do not know (and do not care) whether a book they are reading is foreign. They do not know where the book came from originally and they do not know if it is a translation. Books for children are simply nice stories to entertain and their identity does not play an important role with regard to their popularity.

In other words, the translations of children’s books can influence national children’s literature as they interact with national literature and finally become a part of it. For example, Hans Christian Andersen’s fairy tales are known worldwide. They have been translated into many languages and read by children all over the world. However, not all people know that these stories were originally written in Danish. Andersen’s stories not only have been translated into a significant number of languages but they have also influenced domestic children’s literature as well. Moreover, according to Bamberger, features of Andersen’s works can be traced in many fairy tales in other languages (Bamberger, 1978: 23).

The translation of children’s books has always been compared with the translation of books for adults. However, it is a completely different procedure including many factors that should be taken into account. A number of studies in translation of children’s literature have reached the conclusion that translating children’s literature is more complicated and challenging than translating adult literature for many reasons, such as children’s different way of thinking and level of comprehension. According to Puurtinen, translating for children is not as simple as often regarded. The translator of children’s literature has to take into account several constraints as well as attempting to please both children and adults, who act as the “background authority”. More specifically the translator has to consider “the needs of the target audience, the status of the source text and its special characteristics as well as the culture-specific norms regulating translation” (Puurtinen, 2006: 54). This special audience is the reason why the translation of children’s literature is a different act from the translation of literature for adults. This difference has become the subject of considerable discussion within academic circles.

Nikolajeva discusses the differences between translating for children and translating for adults. According to her, words in any language are “polysemantic”, which means that they have several different meanings and therefore the substitution of one word from the source language with another word from the target language is not enough. The translator needs to find, among all the different meanings of a word, the adequate one for the target text.
Nikolajeva also notes that the translator needs to convey the denotation (the literal meaning) as well as the connotation (the contextual meaning) of the text. The latter makes translating for children different than translating for adults (Nikolajeva, 2006: 278). Adults are able to comprehend better the foreign elements of a translated text. They are able to understand name, place and food references, unlike children who will probably need further explanations of these references, as their level of understanding of foreign culture-specific elements is not that advanced.

From all the above, it can be concluded that, there are three reasons which justify and explain the difference between these two translation practices. First of all, children’s books address children – a special audience whose level of comprehension, knowledge about the world and social background are some of the factors that differentiate them as an audience. Second, children’s books are illustrated and the use of illustrations is another challenging process that demands special treatment. The third reason that distinguishes translation of children’s books from translation of adults’ books is the interference of adults themselves in the writing, editing, translating, publishing, selling, buying and selecting process.

The major approaches developed by scholars regarding the translation of children’s literature and the possible manipulation of the texts are presented below. These include Shavit’s discussion of freedom translators have regarding translation of children’s books, as well as Klingberg’s work on cultural context adaptation. Both of these approaches are influential in the field of translation of children’s books.

4.4 The Manipulation of Children’s Literature

In this study any reference to a country’s children’s literature will include the translated literature, unless otherwise stated. Children’s books (domestic and translated) have always been connected and discussed in parallel with the notion of manipulation. Major works in the field of children’s literature translation are the theories of Shavit Klingberg, Lathey, O’Sullivan, and Oittinen. These scholars have discussed the differences between adaptation and fidelity. Klingberg and Shavit reject adaptation and they seem to support fidelity on the translated works for children.
According to Shavit, children’s literature has always provided material for “textual revisions”, mainly because of the editors’ assumptions regarding the “the child’s capacity to understand and the themes to which he should be exposed”. This idea justifies the great number of various adaptations of children’s stories circulating in the market offering different solutions to the sequences considered unsuitable for children (Shavit, 1986: 27). As Lathey points out, there are many abridgements, adaptations, retellings and even multimedia versions, particularly of fairy tales and children’s classics, which vary from “minor alterations to radical rewriting” (Lathey, 2015: 113). It is through these rewritings that children’s books are diffused over time and space, often bearing the mark of original works, or of faithful translations.

Censorship is also a term frequently involved with the translation of children’s literature and it may have several meanings. In the case of children’s literature, it implies the extent to which adults can interfere in the production of children’s books as well as in their circulation after publication (Hunt, 1998: 6). The adults in question may be writers, translators, editors, publishers, sellers, parents, teachers, librarians who may try to impart specific ideas to children. Children’s books are created by adults and they contain what adults think is suitable for children and what adults think that children understand or what children are allowed to understand (Hunt, 1994: 5). The reasons for this intervention are usually related to politics, education, power and ideology and they will be discussed in detail later in the thesis (see chapter 3).

However, the censorship of children’s literature starts from the idea or the “assumption”, as Hunt notes that books are an important influence. Hunt suggests that there is a view that the effect of books is overestimated as what children understand from what they are reading is not clear (Hunt, 1994: 164). Tucker also notes that the effects of books upon children may vary from one to another (Tucker, 1981: 190). Not all children understand the same thing when receiving a specific message. There might be multiple explanations regarding their level of comprehension and their imagination, which may vary regarding their age and living conditions. Moreover, children usually understand more than adults’ expectations, especially today. Therefore, book censorship might not have been effective today as according to Hunt, children receive information from a number of different sources every day and books cover only a small percentage of the information and knowledge acquired (Hunt, 1994: 165).
Besides the ideas of manipulation and censorship in children’s literature and its translation, there might also be various reasons for a book’s retranslation. The reasons for this are not always related to manipulation, censorship and ideology. According to Lathey, publishers and editors may resort to a retranslation for the following reasons (Lathey, 2015: 120-1):

- The need/demand of new illustrations (perhaps by a popular illustrator)
- An update of the “archaic language” used may also be required in order for the contemporary children to fully comprehend the text
- A “fresh” translation will enhance the book’s popularity
- A new audience is now targeted (versions for younger/older children)

In the Russian context, the urge for retranslations occurred many times in the country’s history. This was not necessarily due to social and political changes. It may had been a need of refreshing the already existing, monotonous children’s literature. This tendency in retranslations can be also observed and perhaps verified in Alice’s Russian publications. As presented in Lindseth and Tannenbaum’s list (2015) there were many translations frequently reappearing.

This view of books as tools able to shape young people’s minds and construct national identities, might not be that strong now. In recent years, the advent of television and the internet gave readership and especially children access to any kind of information that they might want to know. By contrast, for the greater part of the previous century, when books were the only source of learning something new, the value of books could not be described as overestimated. All the above, indicated how complicated the topic of children’s literature can be. Therefore, it can be said that any discussion related to children’s literature and its translation might be quite challenging, particularly in contexts governed by instability and multiple political and social shifts. The Russian environment provides such a context where children’s books as well as all literary genres have been through many different stages following the changes that occurred to the country’s status several times in its history.

The following section presents the translation theories and approaches related particularly to children’s literature. Shavit (1986), Klingberg (1986) and Oittinen (1993) have extensively discussed changes, adaptations and deviations that may occur in the translation of children’s
literature. The concept described below are important for the disciple of translation studies regarding children’s literature; however, they are not specifically used as frameworks for this study, because House’s translation quality assessment has been used as the main framework that helps derive categories for analysis.

4.4.1 Shavit’s Approach to the Translation of Children’s Literature

Even-Zohar’s polysystem theory was applied in children’s literature in 1986 by Zohar Shavit. According to polysystem theory, literature is seen as a set of differentiated and interrelated systems (literary, cultural, social) having a hierarchical relation to each other. There is a constant change to the position of the systems and the influence they exercise to each other. Because of the belief that children’s texts occupy an insignificant position within the literary polysystem, translators as systemic approaches indicate, can be permitted greater liberties than with other texts (e.g. literature for adults), and therefore they could adapt them to literary models already accepted in the target literary system. More specifically, following Even-Zohar’s polysystem theory, Shavit underlines the peripheral position and inferior status of children’s literature in the literary polysystem (Shavit, 1986). Shavit suggests that, in childrens’s literature the translator is allowed to manipulate the text in many ways by adding, deleting and changing its content as long as he/she takes into account the following two principles:

- an adjustment of the text to make it appropriate and useful to the child, in accordance with what society regards (at a certain point in time) as educationally “good for the child”
- an adjustment of plot, characterization, and language to prevailing society’s perceptions of the child’s ability to read and comprehend (Shavit, 1986: 112-113).

These two principles have been discussed extensively in academic research on the translation of children’s literature. Shavit has examined the translations of children’s books into Hebrew. However, the results of this research may not only be applied to the translations of Hebrew children’s literature, but to other language pairs and literary systems as well. Shavit (1981; 1986) identifies five main constraints that translators of children’s literature may face in their attempt to transfer a text from the source to the target language. These are the following: affiliation to existing models, the integrality of the text's primary and secondary models, the
degree of complexity and sophistication of the text, its adjustment to ideological and didactic purposes and the style of the text (Shavit, 1981: 172). The “systemic affiliation” of the text, as Shavit calls it, seems to be inevitable particularly obvious texts, which were moved from adult to children’s literature and with texts that belong to both adult and children’s literature at the same time. *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* belongs to this category, and therefore, constrains described by Shavit are necessary to be presented.

The first of these constraints, according to Shavit, is the affiliation to existing models. This means that if the model of the original text does not exist in the target system, then it needs to be adjusted (by deleting or adding specific elements) to a model that already exists in the target system (1981: 172; 1986: 115). For example, if there is no room for satire in the new system, then all satirical elements from the text are deleted and perhaps the story is transformed into a fantasy, to suit the target systems hierarchies. Regardless, Alice’s classification as an ambivalent text, the Russian translations of the book were strictly done for children and the book was considered as a children’s story only.

Shavit’s second constraint is the text’s integrality (1981: 174; 1986: 120). Deletions that will allow, for example, an adult’s text to be transferred in the children’s literary polysystem are acceptable in order to make the text suitable for children and their level of comprehension. For example, as noted by Shavit, in the case of *Gulliver’s Travels*, translators either deleted completely the scene where Gulliver was implied to have a love affair with the queen, or they adjusted it to render it more appropriate for children (Shavit, 1981:174).

The third constraint presented by Shavit is related to the level of complexity of the text (1981: 175; 1986: 123). The norm of complexity, as Shavit refers to it, determines the thematic, the characterization as well as the main structures of the text (Shavit, 1981: 175). What is particularly interesting here is that Shavit presents *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* as an example of the complexity norm. According to her, Alice which was “written originally for children, it was taken over by adult literature, and afterwards, the text, written initially for children, was readapted for children” (Shavit, 1981: 175). Perhaps due to this systemic exchange Carroll wrote later *The Nursery ‘Alice’* that was only for children. As Shavit notes, both Carroll in this version of Alice as well as his translations in many Alice’s adaptations made particularly clear that this was a book for children, already from the first chapter of the book (Shavit, 1981: 175). They underline the fact that this story is only a dream, implying
that Alice faces no danger from falling into holes and meeting scary creatures in dark rooms. This similarity between Carroll’s *Nursery ‘Alice’* and the translators adaptations is probably as Shavit notes, due to the constraints of the children’s literary system, which in order to accept *Alice* as a children’s books, a simplification of its context was necessary (Shavit, 1981: 176). Perhaps, something similar occurred to the Russian translations. In their majority, they were simplified in order to be accepted in the country’s literary polysystem and follow the norms of each era.

Ideological or evaluative adaptation is Shavit’s fourth constraint of texts’ systemic affiliation (1981: 176; 1986: 126). Due to the didactic orientation of children’s literature, the text may be subjected to ideological manipulation related to the translator’s own ideology. Shavit identifies examples when the translator changed completely a text, making it an “ideological instrument”, as for example a German translation of Robinson Crusoe by Campe, which was adapted to serve Rousseau’s ideology on pedagogical systems as this was what the translator had been taught (Shavit, 1981: 177). The translator’s ideology in the Russian context has certainly played an important role to *Alice’s* translations, as censorship promoting specific ideologies was the norm in most of the periods examined.

Finally, the fifth constraint met in the translation of children’s literature, according to Shavit, is the changes in stylistic norms (1981: 177; 1986: 128). These are norms of “high literary style” and they are related to the didactic purpose of children’s literature as they attempt to enrich the child's vocabulary (Shavit, 1981: 177).

Considering the fact that Shavit’s research on children’s literature took place in the early 1980s, this list of constraints may still be applicable in some cases. However, it is not complete. Contemporary studies in the field of the translation of children’s literature have demonstrated more issues that should be taken into account when translating for children. Apart from that Shavit does not include cultural norms prevailing in both source and target texts, which play a significant role to the final translation product.

### 4.4.1.1 Ambivalent Texts: Children or Adult’s Literature

Shavit has discussed the ambivalent nature of children’s books. According to Shavit, most writers of children’s books follow specific rules when writing for children. They usually
write texts appeal to both children and adults and which follow the already known forms because a country’s literary system tends to refuse anything new. If, however someone wants to overcome these standard lines of writing there are two possible ways: to reject the adults completely and/or to appeal to adults via the child. The creation of texts defined as ambivalent result from these two factors (Shavit, 1986: 63). Shavit notes that ambivalent texts are those, which have been rejected by the adult system and are not yet accepted by the children’s. Once these texts are accepted by the new system, similar texts will follow (Shavit, 1986: 67). *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* was certainly a work written outside the typical framework imposed on children’s books for the specific time and era in which it was published, making it an ambivalent text.

Ambivalent texts exist on “two levels”, one for children and one for adults (Shavit 1986: 74-75). In these texts there is the structure of children’s language but there is also an array of allusions, metaphors, hidden messages, ironies and parodies which are not compatible with a child’s level of comprehension. The extraordinary word play, on the linguistic plane, and the parody of mid-nineteenth century society, on the content plane, make *Alice* an adult book. At the same time, the fantastic elements and the assertion of the child protagonist’s reason against the foolishness of the adults makes this appealing to children (Kibbee, 2003). Shavit notes, that when adults and children read an ambivalent text each of them will understand the text differently (Shavit, 1986: 70). In this way, children who read *Alice* will enjoy Carroll’s jokes and laugh with the puns and the verses. However, adults might realise the deeper meaning of Carroll’s words and text structure, as well as the symbolizations and satire of Victorian class, society, education and law.

Shavit’s analysis proves the ambivalent nature of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*. Carroll wrote three versions of the same book: *Alice’s Adventures Underground, Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* and *The Nursery ‘Alice’*. The existence of these three books and the differences they have indicate the ambivalent nature of *Alice*. Carroll’s decisions to correct his first story *Alice’s Adventures Underground* in order to finally publish *Wonderland* and then correct this version again in order to publish *The Nursery*. Perhaps the first version was “too sophisticated to be accepted by the children’s system, yet not sophisticated enough to be accepted by adults” (Shavit, 1986: 72). According to Shavit, some features, which are only hinted at in Underground, become dominant in *Wonderland* and these are the ones that give an ambivalent nature to the text. Then, all these features are completely deleted in *The
Nursery as Carroll wanted to make a univalent text accepted only in the children’s system (Shavit, 1986: 72).

Regarding the weakness of Shavit’s theory on ambivalent texts, Edström, as quoted in Nikolajeva (1996: 57-58), suggests that in theories related to ambivalent texts, child codes are underestimated and there is the attempt to raise the status of children’s books to the level of adult fiction. This means that children’s level of comprehension is considered to be lower than it is and adults insert these children’s books in the adult literary polysystem. The next approach that has contributed significantly to the translation of children’s literature is Klingberg’s cultural context adaptation.

4.4.2 Klingberg’s Cultural Context Adaptation

The works of the Swedish educator, Göte Klingberg’s on the translation of children’s literature are important in the field of translation studies. In his books Children’s Books in Translation (1978) and Children’s Fiction in the Hands of the Translators (1986), Klingberg argues that the choices had been made by the author of the original should be respected and that his/her integrity and intentions should be maintained in the target text as much as possible. However, he accepts that some typical deviations would occur. Klingberg believes that the original author has produced a text with the implied reader in his mind and therefore he/she has considered the audience’s abilities and understanding and has created the text accordingly. Therefore, the translator should preserve the author’s choices and only apply the necessary changes in terms of what Klingberg calls “cultural context adaptation” - “the adaptation of the cultural context of the source language to the cultural context of the target language” (Klingberg, 1978: 86).

Klingberg’s theory of cultural context adaptation includes two main concepts: purification and modernization. Purification as defined by Klingberg is related to “modifications and abbreviations aimed at getting the target text in correspondence with the values of the presumptive readers, or – as regards children’s books – rather with the values, or the supposed values, of adults, for example, of parents”. Also for Klingberg, modernization “attempts to make the target text of more immediate interest to the presumptive readers by moving the time nearer to the present time or by exchanging details in the setting for more recent ones” (Klingberg, 1978: 86).
Therefore, there are a number of things that should be explained to the child to “facilitate understanding and make the text more interesting” (Klingberg, 1978: 86). These include the following: personal names, titles, geographical names, names of plant and animal species, measurements, concepts concerning buildings and home furnishing, meals and food, customs and practices, the play and games of children, singularities in the source language such as word-play, homonymous or similarly spelled words, newly-created words, and foreign language in the source text, mythology and folklore, personal and geographical names, terms used for supernatural beings and events, historical and literary references (Klingberg, 1978: 86).

Regardless the notions of purification and modernisation, Klingberg highlights the idea that adaptation should only occur under specific circumstances and the source text should be manipulated as little as possible and only in order to serve the values of the target audience. Klingberg’s demand for fidelity is related to the children’s books educational and pedagogical purposes. For Klingberg, there are two “pedagogic goals” when translating for children. The first one is the creation of a text that foreign readers, that is, children whose knowledge of the source culture is insufficient will be able to understand. Second, is the “the development of the readers’ set of values”. In the latter case, the translator can omit or change the content of the original that he/she thinks will not be approved, since there is a different set of values in every culture (Klingberg, 1986: 10). Two other goals when translating children’s literature, according to Klingberg, are the production of more books for children and the chance to make children familiar with other cultures and broaden their knowledge by letting them discover the world through reading (Klingberg, 1986: 10).

Klingberg’s list of references that can be culturally adapted includes specific culture-bound elements and it is by no means exhaustive. There are more abstract notions of cultural contact, that may require a degree of manipulation outside Klingberg’s concept of cultural context adaptation and fidelity. These elements may be standard phrases, collocations, gestures and the expression of feelings (e.g. anger, happiness). For example, the present study tackles the instances of power between child and adult relationships, as presented within the context of.
Klingberg, considering his list of cultural items, recommends some methods that can be used by translators in order to achieve cultural context adaptation. These are the following (Klingberg, 1986: 17):

- Added explanation, which means that the translator explains the unfamiliar element within his/her text.
- Rewording, which means that the translator renders the content of the text without mentioning the specific cultural element.
- Explanatory translation by which the translator describes the cultural element without mentioning its actual name.
- Explanation outside the text, probably in the form of a footnote.
- Substitution of an equivalent in the culture of the target language.
- Substitution of a rough equivalent in the culture of the target language.
- Simplification by which the translator uses a more general word to describe the cultural element.
- Deletion, which means that not understandable words, phrases, meanings will not be rendered at all.
- Localization, by which the translator brings the whole text closer to the reader.

In general, Klingberg sees children’s literature from the adult’s perspective that carries the responsibility for the child’s education. Therefore, he appraises translations that may teach the children without confusing them with unknown information related to cultural issues. An alternative Klingberg and Shavit’s approaches is Oittinen’s dialogical approach to translation. Oittinen sees translation more as reader-oriented and not as text-oriented as the reading experience is equally important as the text.

4.4.3. Oittinen’s Dialogical Approach

Regarding the adaption and translation of children’s books, Riita Oittinen’s work on the field has been extremely influential. Oittinen, a Finnish scholar and translator, separates the terms “translation of children’s literature” and “translating for children”. She prefers to use the second one as, according to her, translators are always translating for somebody and in this case, translators are translating for children. Therefore, they take into account their specific desires, abilities and needs (Oittinen, 2000: 69). They also translate situations and contexts.
regarding the time and place of their publication as well as the culture of both the source and the target text. In general, Oittinen understands translation as the transformation of a target text, which is different from the original (Oittinen, 1993: 91).

On the conflict between translation and adaptation, Oittinen suggests that, adaptations have always been seen as a negative phenomenon – “of little value”, or “secondary”, or “non-original” (Oittinen, 1993: 87). However, she stresses the fact that there is no difference between translation and adaptation as both are “transformations” involving the idea of “deviation and challenge” (Oittinen, 1993: 91). She argues that adaptation and translation should not be seen as two different things as when translating, there is always some kind of adaptation. This is because the translator takes into consideration the needs of his/her implied readers. These may be both children and adults. Since there is no methodological difference between Translation and adaptation, what is important for Oittinen is the function of translation in the target culture, where the needs of the readership meet the creation of the translator, the author and the illustrator (Oittinen, 2000: 83-4).

This dialogic view on translation is based on Mikhail Bakhtin’s dialogism and the reading experience. For Oittinen, the translator’s responsibility and loyalty is a part of the dialogic nature of translation as their own personal experiences as children, but also as adults as well intrudes in their work. More specifically, Ottinen supports the idea that “when a translator translates for the child, she/he also reads, writes, and discusses with her/his present and former self. She/he also discusses with her/his audience, the listening and the reading child” (Oittinen, 2000: 30).

Oittinen’s dialogic approach of translating for children is a child-centred theory, which takes into consideration the needs of the child readers rather than the text and a translation, regardless the degree of adaptation is successful when the translator focuses on his/her implied reader: the child. However, this dialog between the translator and the child may leave room for ideology to intrude. Perhaps, the only difference between translation and adaptation lies in the purpose they may serve. Sometimes, the purpose behind the adaptation of children’s literature may be related to ideology. This use of children’s books as ideological tools is often connected with censorship practices.
As Nikolajeva notes, adaptation may also be regarded as a form of censorship. However, in children’s literature it may be a “conscious” interference in order to make the text “accessible for young readers. She also suggests that adaption in children’s stories may occur through the use of shorter sentences, easier words, uncomplicated syntax, abundant dialogue, straight plots, a limited number of characters and only a few abstract notions (Nikolajeva, 1996: 48).

To sum up, both Klingberg and Shavit argue that fidelity is important in the translation of children’s literature and that adaptations should be carefully reconsidered. Klingberg examines only isolated words or phrases related mainly to names, measurements and customs and he attempts to make generalizations for all translations of children’s books. Perhaps this categorisation makes his point of view narrow, excluding many other features that may not allow preserving foreign elements in the target text or do not serve the educational purpose of children’s books. Shavit also attempts to make generalizations taking into account cultural factors and the position of the translation in the literary polysystem, but without considering individual cases of translators and children as readers.

Regarding Oittinen’s child-centered approach, perhaps this dialogue between the adult translator and the child reader may not always be effective as the translator’s own child images and ideology may transform the text beyond the borders of innocent text adaptation for reasons of understanding. This may be particularly applicable to the translation of children’s literature in Russia as the translator’s background and the social circumstances could have affected translation. Despite the fact that the theories presented in this section are applicable to children’s literature, they do not fully serve the purposes of this study. They are relatively prescriptive and there are more issues that should be taken into account as this study examines more than one translations, from different periods where different norms affected translation and children’s literature occupied different positions within the literary polysystem. The following section presents those different norms and circumstances under which children’s literature and its translation evolved in Russia from the Imperial until the early post-Soviet years.

4.5 Children’s Literature and its Translation in Russia

Children’s literature in Russia has been through many shifts in history. The “changing paradigms”, as Balina and Rudova chose to call them (2005), occurred in the transition from
the Tsarist era to the Soviet one and then again from the times of Perestroika to after the Soviet era. However, many changes also took place within the 74 years of the Soviet regime. As will be discussed later, children’s books were used as propaganda tools. The changes occurred in absolute relation and dependence to changing cultural, political, economic and social norms as well as in relation to the image of children as the new Soviets. As already discussed in chapter 2, the government’s censorship control affected publications during all stages of Russian history, but especially during the Soviet time. Children’s literature was not an exception to the censorship rule. However, there are examples of children’s books (domestic and foreign) that were published despite their content being contradictory to the state’s ideas and values. Examples will be presented later in this chapter, as writing and translating for children has always had paradoxical features in Russia.

The primary aim of children’s books was educational in all stages of Russia’s history. The Russian language distinguishes between two types of education, *obrazovanie* and *vospitanie*. The former concerns knowledge, information and instructing, while the latter entails attitudes morals and upbringing (O’Dell, 1978: 5). There is no English equivalent for the word *vospitanie*, yet it may be rendered as “upbringing” or “moral training”. However, O’Dell uses the term “character education”, as it seems to cover most adequately the range of training in political, moral and social attitudes and behavior, which according to her, is implied in the Russian word (O’Dell, 1978: 9). Aleksei Ostrogorsky, the editor of the journal, *Pedagogicheskii Sbornik (Pedagogical Collection)*, discussed the differences between the notions of *vospitanie* and *obrazovanie*, in his essay *Vospitanie i Obrazovanie*, published in 1897, in Imperial Russia.

The use of two different words indicate that topics related to children, such as education, children’s books and children’s upbringing, attracted special attention in Russia since the early Imperial years. During the following three significant periods in Russian history – pre-Soviet, Soviet and post-Soviet – different policies governed society and consequently affected children’s literature and its translation. However, during all three periods the norms prevailing in children’s books were built on the same basic idea of “character education”. From all three periods examined, the Soviet era is considered to be the harshest and, at the same time, the most paradoxical period of all three. The presentation of the status of children’s literature in all three periods of Russian history will be discussed in the following sections.
4.5.1 Children’s Literature in Imperial Russia

Bibliography relating to children’s literature and the translation of children’s books in Imperial Russia is not as rich as the material, which has been produced for this subject regarding the Soviet period. However, as has already been discussed, many of the harsh policies regarding book production and publication during the Soviet period were originally introduced during pre-revolutionary Russia. Hellman (2013), in his book *Fairy Tales and True Stories: The History of Russian Literature for Children and Young People (1574-2010)*, discusses the evolution of children’s literature from its appearance in the 16th century until the beginnings of the 21st century. Hellman divides the Imperial history of children’s literature into 5 periods, according to the literary movements by which they were probably influenced:

1574 – 1770: The Beginnings
1770 – 1825: From Enlightenment to Sentimentalism
1825 – 1860: Romanticism
1860 – 1890: Realism
1890 – 1917: Modernism

According to Hellman, the history of children’s books begins in the late 16th century with the creation of the first primer for children by Ivan Fyodorov and later in the early 17th century another primer, which was compiled by Vasily Burtsov-Protopopov, under the Tsar’s command, for the education of children. This is how the Russian child learned to read, in order to study prayers and become “a good Christian” (Hellman, 2013: 1). Many primers followed, as well as didactic books, teaching good manners as well as the “appropriate behavior” of children at home, at court and at church (Hellman, 2013: 2). During the reforms of Peter the Great, many religious and courtesy books appeared, teaching children “table manners”, “social intercourse”, “hygiene and morals”, which contributed to “the process of Europeanization” of Russia (Hellman, 2013: 2-4).

During the 18th century and along with Peter the Great’s reforms, a great number of foreign translations entered the country’s literary system. Hellman notes that children’s literature was particularly dominated by translated books from other countries during that time. The books
initially selected for translation were “almost solely” information books and the source texts were mainly works in French or German. However, a move towards “imaginative literature” occurred when *Aesop’s Fables* was published in 1747. Subsequently with the publications of *Robinson Crusoe* in 1762 and *Gulliver’s Travels* in 1772 a start for the acceptance of adventure stories was made (Hellman, 2013: 5).

Children’s literature in Russia during the last three decades of the 18th century flourished, as a significant number of publications appeared on the market. According to Hellman, this was due to the influence of the French Enlightenment that had reached Russia, as well as due to the dissatisfaction with the existing books. Along with Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s idea that “childhood had a worth in itself”, as quoted in Hellman, children’s upbringing and education became important. As such, the need for new and more didactic books emerged (Hellman, 2013: 7). Folk and fairy tales also became quite popular during this time, such as the traditional Russian fairy tales, which contain stories with kings, princes, helpful animals, the evil old Baba Yaga and dragons, as well as Ivan Tsarevich and Ivan the Fool, the peasant boy who always manages to survive through the many challenges he encounters (Hellman, 2013: 14). Regarding foreign children’s books, Charles Perrault’s classic fairy tales were introduced into the country in 1795. They were successful and inspiring for Russian writers such as Nikolai Karamzin, who created similar Russian stories (Hellman, 2013: 14).

The first years of the 19th century were, as Hellman points out, “a period of stagnation” for children’s literature, as writers did not pay attention to writing for children, so that the fairy tale was not as interesting as it used to be and many children’s magazines did not survive at that time (Hellman, 2013: 15). However, later in the 1820s, Russian children’s literature started to change as the notion of childhood and the image of the child in society had started to alter. As discussed in 3.1.1., the notion of childhood had always been closely related to the development of children’s literature. Russian children were now seen as “higher beings with an enchanted poetic world of their own”; therefore, their books were now more informative with topics of Russian history and geography, and the moral tale that also became popular at this time (Hellman, 2013: 24). The folktales which had disappeared for a few decades, were now back in the form of “adapted folklore material and original artistic fairy tales” (Hellman, 2013: 25).
However, “a cautious attitude” started to be taken towards fairy tales. As quoted in Hellman (2013: 25), new instructions that followed were appended to the fairy tales published in the Russian children’s magazine *The Children’s Interlocutor*, were the following:

> It is the mentor’s duty to explain to the children the moral lesson of these tales and to separate in them the embellishments of fantasy of useful truths.

This is probably the first sign of a general attitude towards fantasy and fairy tales, which were to go through different stages of acceptance and rejection throughout Russian literary history. From being extremely popular, they become dangerous, until they were banned at the beginning of the Soviet period, and then reappeared as the “forgotten weapon” of the new Soviet government in order to educate its citizens. Regarding the translation of children’s books and particularly of fairy tales there are more warnings for the translators of this time. As quoted in Hellman (2013: 26), the translator Anna Zontag, advised:

> Do not translate slavishly, but as if you were telling your daughter a foreign story: this will give your style a delicate clarity and simplicity.

The above comment can probably be interpreted as an encouragement to the translators of foreign literature to filter what they are translating and be cautious regarding the information they passed to Russian children, indeed as cautious as they would be with their own children. They should avoid anything that might oppose the morals that children have been taught so far. They should also be clear and simple in order to avoid any confusion in children’s minds. However, despite the warnings, fairy tales and fantasy became again quite popular in the 1830s with the contribution of key figures in Russian literary history, such as Alexander Pushkin and Vasily Zhukovsky, who wrote many fairy tales in verses (Hellman, 2013: 31).

During the 1860s, children’s books with a wider choice of themes, genres and styles appeared since “the upbringing and education” of children was now a significant issue in Russian society. Because of this new norm, politics and ideology started to slowly intrude into children’s literature (Hellman, 2013: 79). During this period the interest around folk, fairy tales and fantasy triggered new discussions. In fact, there was a campaign against these genres. According to Hellman, fairy tales such as the ones of Brothers Grimm and
Hans Christian Andersen were considered to be a “harmful influence on children” as they display “an immature imagination”, “lack of educational value and profound thoughts”, as well as “missing common sense” (Hellman, 2013: 131). This example demonstrates the tendency towards a hostile attitude towards foreign literature, and perhaps, the signs of xenophobia forming in the 19th century.

However, the campaign of critics against fairy tales and fantasy stories had no result. On the contrary, because of the publishers, and readers’ demands, these genres developed even more in Russia. The publications were mainly the translated works of Perrault, Andersen and of various foreign writers whose works are today considered to be the classics of children’s literature (Hellman, 2013: 132). This is the period when Carroll’s Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland was published in Moscow. As will be discussed in chapter 4, the reviewers’ opinions about the book were negative, and sharp comments followed its publication. However, it can be considered that these comments might only reflect the critics’ campaign against the fantasy genre in general and not particularly the story of Alice.

Despite the tension in the field of children’s literature criticism, translations played an important role in the creation of Russian’s literary system. Hellman notes that during the years 1860 – 1890 a great number of translations from Anglo-American, German, French, Italian and Scandinavian languages, were published in Russia, either as books or within the large number of children’s magazines that existed (Hellman, 2013: 161). It will be observed later that many translations of Alice were also published in series in different Russian magazines.

The last decade before the establishment of the Soviet regime (1917), found Russia with a significant amount of children’s magazines as well as with an increasing number of publishing houses, which led to the production of even more children’s books, both domestic and foreign (Hellman, 2013: 169). However, Nikolajeva notes that during the Imperial years, children’s literature was dominated by “sentimental and moralistic stories and verses”, with “sugary, well-behaved children in starched clothes” (Nikolajeva, 1996: 82). As Hellman points out, after 1917, the new Soviet commands achieved “an almost total breakdown of the existing literature through suppression, forced emigration, the closing down of magazines and
purges of libraries” (Hellman, 2013: 293). The status of Soviet children’s literature as observed by many scholars will be presented in detail in the following section.

### 4.5.2 Children’s Literature in Soviet Russia.

As Balina and Rudova note, any discussion related to Russian children’s literature brings to mind folk tales about Baba Yaga, a witch who lives in the forest, in a hut without windows and without doors, that stands on chicken legs, or about Ivan the Fool who after many troubles beats his enemies and saves the princess. Apart from these well-known stories, many other books for children were created during the Soviet times and played “a significant role in identity formation” (Balina and Rudova, 2008: xv).

The transition from the Imperial environment to the new Soviet era brought many changes at all levels of Russian society. Children’s literature and its translation was not an exception to that rule. However, as mentioned at the beginning of section 3.4, Soviet children’s literature is characterized by a paradoxical sequence. More specifically, according to Balina, on one hand children’s literature was used as a means of propaganda, trying to create the new Soviet citizens. On the other hand, children’s literature was one of the “most liberal domains of creative literary expression” (Balina, 2007: 44). Russian writers turned to children’s literature during the Soviet period in order to avoid ideological and political subjects and hence to avoid the harsh consequences from the censorship agencies control. However, Ronen suggests that this freedom was only an illusion, as at some point writers had to conform to the Soviet obligations in any form of writing (Ronen, 2000: 971).

The Soviet era can be divided into different periods when different policies were applied to children’s books, with the Stalin years being the strictest period regarding publications. During that time, there were no private publishing houses as all publishing houses were controlled by the state (Inggs, 2011: 78). The translation of children’s literature in the Soviet Union was a demanding task and a lot of factors had to be taken into consideration before the final product was ready for publication. Children’s literature was used as “means of propaganda and a strong pedagogical instrument of education of new Soviet citizens” (Kaloh-Vid, 2013: 90). As Inggs notes, this is why, the selection of books to be translated was based on their “ideological content, rather than literary value”. Many of the world’s classics were
not translated into Russian for a long time after their publication, as they were deemed not to serve that purpose (Inggs, 2003: 287).

The value of children’s books was recognized from the early years of the emergence of the Soviet regime. With an article that appeared in the newspaper Pravda, written by Kormchyi and signed by Lenin, in February 1918, children’s literature was presented as “a forgotten weapon” which could serve the Party’s interest. More specifically, Kormchyi in the article “The Forgotten Weapon”21 declared:

In the great arsenal with which the bourgeoisie fought against Socialism, children’s books occupied a prominent role. In selecting cannons and weapons, we overlook those that spread poisonous weapons. So focused on guns and other weapons, we forget about the written word. We must seize these weapons from enemy hands. (Kormchy, 1918: 3)

Kormchyi encourages the Party to focus on children’s literature and in order to create a new literature that will instill the Soviet ideas in children. In this atmosphere, the World Literature Publishing House (Всемирная Литература) was founded in 1918 with the support of Lenin and under the supervision of Maksim Gorky and his assistant Kornei Chukovsky. According to Leighton, its aim was “to assemble, to analyze, and to evaluate all existing translations of world literature and to determine which were worth preserving and which should be done anew”. As Leighton also points out, the World Literature project was one of “the most ambitious Soviet Great Projects”. However, Gorky’s vision to translate all the classics of world literature was not fulfilled as the publishing house closed down in 1927. By that time, only 120 editions of great writers from all over the world were published (Leighton, 1991: 7).

Lenin’s New Economic Policy (NEP) was established in 1921. According to Balina and Rudova, NEP helped to revive both the country’s economy and publishing industry (Balina and Rudova, 2005: 190). Hellman also notes that during this period, there was a relaxation of

21 Translation from L. Kormchy, “Zabyte oruzhie,” (O detskoi knige), Pravda (Moscow), 17 February 1918, p. 3.
the initial strict control and many private enterprises arose. Among the new enterprises, there were publishing houses, such as *Raduga*, *Svetiachok* and *Siniaia Ptitsa*, which released on the market many children’s books, a fact that allowed children’s literature to stand “on the threshold of renewal” (Hellman, 2013: 297). Nikolajeva notes that this was the only period in Soviet history when “different trends, movements and styles in art and literature were allowed to coexist” before the demands of Socialist Realism were implemented in all artistic forms of expression including children’s literature (Nikolajeva, 1996: 83).

However, as quoted in Balina and Rudova, the Soviet state was not happy with these publications as they were either foreign translations or pre-revolutionary books, which did not reflect the new ideology. This dissatisfaction led to the creation of the *Institute for the Study of Children’s Reading* in order to study and evaluate children’s books. This is how children’s literature was gradually turned into the Party’s “own ideological property” (Balina and Rudova, 2005: 190).

In the late 1920s and under Stalin’s regime fairy tales and fantasy were once again under examination as it was believed that these books could promote “an alien, bourgeois ideology” and this is why critics and teachers were against any form of “departure of realism” (Hellman, 2013: 354). Therefore, it was time for a new Soviet and revolutionary children’s literature to be compiled. As quoted in Hellman (2013: 355), during the Forth Congress that took place in 1928 it was announced that:

*Anthropomorphism and fantasy were acceptable only in small doses and only in work for children of higher pre-school age (6 to 7 years old); for children of a younger age fairy tales were directly harmful and should under no circumstances be allowed.*

Lenin’s wife, Nadezda Krupskaya, played a key role in children’s books distribution, as she believed strongly in the educative role of children’s literature. As quoted in O'Dell, Krupskaya believed that:

*The children’s book is one of the most powerful weapons of the Socialist character-education of the growing generation. Through children’s books must be laid the foundation of the materialistic world-view of the growing generation.*
This is a great and important task and a task that can be fulfilled. (O’Dell, (1978: 53)

Consequently, the already existing Imperial dispute regarding fairy tales (see 3.4.1), became again a major issue. With Krupskaya’s orders, fairy tales came under the threat of a ban, with the argument that they were the “unhealthy heritage of the past” (Nikolajeva, 2002: 172). According to Dobrenko, as quoted in Balina, (2007: 46), this attitude affected folktales and literary fairy tales as well, since they “badly influenced the yet-to-be developed conscience of children and destroyed their ability to comprehend materialistic images of the world” (Balina, 2007: 46). In other words, this kind of children’s book presented an imaginary world and characters, which did not comply with Soviet real life and its demands. Therefore, in Russia, fairy tales and fantasy stories were neither appreciated, nor accepted; they were even banned for a long time.

According to Balina, the year 1932 was a year of “harsh ideological battles” relating to a “new Soviet literature” in general and to children’s literature in particular (Balina, 2008: 11). It can also be noted here that there were no publications of Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland during this time. More specifically, after 1923 when D’Aktil’s translation of Alice was published, the next one that followed was in 1940, a translation published by Olenich-Gnenenko (see 5.2.2). During that time, the party “pursued its goals aggressively” and they worked towards the production of children’s books under a specific ideological model that would serve the goals of the Party (Balina, 2008: 12). In 1933, the publishing house Detskaya Literatura was established and its goal, as quoted in Hellman (2013: 364), was:

   to produce books that are attractive and accessible, but also strong-principled and on a high ideological level, books which awaken children’s interest in the struggle of the working class and the work of construction […], to publish new editions of the greatest works of world literature for children […].

As Hellman suggests, the last part of the publishing house’s goals indicates the situation of the field of translated children’s literature (Hellman, 2013: 364). During the pre-revolutionary years, translations were an important part of the country’s literary system. However, during the first years of the domination of the Soviet regime they were significantly reduced. The goal of the new project of Detskaya Literatura was to increase
the number of imported works, as well as of works with compulsory topics such as “patriotism, Russian history and revolution, Socialist moral principles, Lenin's life and work, internationalism, and physical labor” (Balina and Rudova, 2005: 192).

Despite the creation of the new publishing house, Hellman notes that “the contact with the outside world” through translated literature was minimal, as these works were believed to be “unsuitable or even incomprehensible” for Soviet children (Hellman, 2013: 421). According to Inggs, the main topics of Soviet children’s books were military, patriotic and revolutionary, which is the opposite of Western children’s books topics and this is why the selection process of the books to be translated was strict. At the same time, many translations that had already been published were removed from circulation, as they did not match the selection criteria of the time (Inggs, 2011: 83).

The process of selection of children’s books for translation was challenging. Motyashov identifies four specific selection criteria of the books that were going to be translated: aesthetic, educational, moral, and political. The term aesthetic criteria meant that the book should comply with the child’s aesthetic needs. The term educational criteria meant that the book should have an educational and informative character, in accordance with the demands of society. The moral criterion indicates that the book should reflect the values which society considered to be right during the specific period. Finally, the political criterion implied that the book should conform to the current political situation and protect and promote the interests of the Party (Motyashov, 1978: 99). All the above restrictions turned the translation of children’s literature into a challenging field for Soviet authors and translators.

This lack of translated works can be seen in Alice’s translations, as there is a large pause in the publications from 1923 until 1940. However, in the late 1930s, fairy tale and fantasy books were still popular. According to Balina and Rudova, fantasy dominated children’s literature as it was a way “to escape from the political tendentiousness” of adults’ literature and this is why many writers started writing fantasy for children (Balina and Rudova, 2005: 193).

During the years of World War II, Soviet childhood was presented as “a cloudless sky” with happy and privileged children (Hellman, 2013: 427). The children’s books of that time depicted military and war themes that promoted patriotism and heroes ready to risk their lives.
fighting for their country (Hellman, 2013: 429). The years that followed the war, were Stalin’s “heyday” even in children’s literature, as children’s books were filled with portraits, poems and stories of honour of Stalin (Hellman, 2013: 438).

Despite the large number of educational novels depicting the right behaviour in class and books portraying the educational function of labour during the post-war years, Hellman notes (2013: 454) that there was also a surprising turn to fantasy and fairy tales. It is believed that this started with the *Kingdom of Crooked Mirrors* (Korolevstvo Krivykh Zerkal), a book by Vitaly Gubarev who began writing it in 1947. The book was finally published in 1951, in 30,000 copies. The story is about a girl named Olya who passes into a secondary world through a mirror. From the other side of the mirror she meets people suffering from a cruel governor. However, the people do not realise that their real situation as it is distorted by a system of crooked mirrors, which show a state of wealth and happiness. This is when Olya leads a revolt against the governor, crushing the mirrors and brings real happiness back to the secondary world (Hellman, 2013: 455).

The reasons for quoting Gubanev’s story here is to indicate the potential influence of Carroll’s *Alice through the Looking-Glass*, where Alice also enters a secondary, distorted world through the mirror. However, Hellman notes (2013: 455) that Olya is a revolutionary figure following the Soviet ideals, and this story may also imply the Soviet propaganda, that describes happy people and a Soviet lifestyle, which is better than any other – as distorted a presentation of reality as the Gubarev’s crooked mirrors.

In general, during the post war years and until Stalin’s death in 1953, Soviet critics were demanded that children’s literature fulfil the Party’s commands. The principles of Socialist Realism, which according to Hellman were related to “triumph of mediocrity, obligatory idealisation and optimism” had been “successfully implemented” in children’s literature. (Hellman, 2013: 468-9). In general, the principles of Socialist Realism demanded books with positive heroes and happy endings. However, Rudova notes that after Stalin’s death, the positive-hero model began to disappear from children’s books and was replaced by “more believable characters growing up in non-heroic social environment”. As such, heroism and sacrifice were replaced with school problems and relationship issues (Rudova, 2008: 24).
More specifically, after Stalin’s death the country saw a period of “revaluation and fresh thinking” (Hellman, 2013: 472) starting; it affected all aspects of Soviet life, including children’s literature and is known as The Thaw (1954-1968). A new generation of Soviet writers developed and children’s literature “opened out in terms of subject matter and style”. There were new translations entering the Soviet market as well as older ones, which were retranslated (Hellman, 2013: 473). For example, Hellman notes (2013: 475) that many of the world’s classics entered the country for the first time such as: Le Petite Prince, published in 1958, Winnie-the-Pooh in 1960, Mary Poppins in 1968. This is the time that Carroll’s Alice was published in Moscow, in 1958, after many years of absence or presence only on local markets of the country’s periphery. What is considered to be a surprise for this period is the acceptance of the Swedish works of Astrid Lindgren, Pippi Longstockings and Karlsson-on-the-Roof which will be discussed in the following section.

The years between 1969 and 1985 were the years of stagnation for the Soviet Union and for children’s literature as well, which has nothing extraordinary to display. Rudova points out that the Soviet children of that time were growing up in an atmosphere of “apathy and passivity of social institutions, dogmatic education, steady growth of materialism, streamlining of official popular culture, instability of the family and lack of dialogue” and they had no appreciation for Soviet heroes. These trends were also depicted in children’s publications, which continued to be challenging as censorship restrictions were still applicable (Rudova, 2008: 25).

However, during the years between 1986 and 1991, the years of perestroika and glasnost, the situation on all levels of Soviet state mechanisms had started to change. It was finally, “openly acknowledged” that the reason for the decay that had occurred in children’s literature, as well as in literature in general, was censorship practices. Hellman points out that, because of censorship, many great works were never published or were only published on the periphery (Hellman, 2013: 559). As will be explained later in chapter 5, the only version of Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland that was published during the years under Stalin’s regime was published in Rostov-on-Don. This version reached Moscow later, after Stalin’s death, in 1958.

During the time of perestroika, a “process of renewal” was necessary to children’s literature as there were many foreign books on the market, but they had all been translated long a time
ago. New books with a “bigger dose of reality” were now in demand. Through this process, the presentation of an ideal Soviet childhood and the idea that Soviet children were the happiest children in the world, collapsed, since the comparison with other countries proved the opposite (Hellman, 2013: 560-1). However, this period did not offer brand new editions in children’s literature. It was more a restoration of the already existing, censored material. This can also be observed in the Alice example, as until 1991 the lists indicate the same translations being republished multiple times. However, a start for new children’s literature was made and the post-soviet years offered a great number of new books for children and young readers.

4.5.2.1 The Paradoxical Nature of Soviet Children’s Literature

Previous literature demonstrates that children’s literature in totalitarian regimes was used in order to educate and prepare the new Soviet citizens, the “new Socialist beings” (Thomson-Wohlgemuth, 2003: 241). Through children’s books, Soviet ideals were promoted and, at the same time, children were protected from foreign ideas. There were books that were banned from libraries and books that had to be adjusted to the Russian reality before publishing. For example, Carlo Collodi’s Pinocchio was transformed to a great extend before its initial publication on the Russian market (Kaloh-Vid, 2013; Balina, 2007; Branson, 2014).

The Russian version of Pinocchio was created by Alexei Tolstoy and it was published in 1935. This translation is one of the most typical examples of Soviet censorship. The story is an adaptation of the original book, which served the political and social purposes of the Communist Party and their line. Tolstoy’s title for the book was Zolotoi Kliuchek ili Prikliucheniiia Buratino (The Golden Key or the Adventures of Buratino). His version was completely different from the original one: plot, ending and characters were changed, and there were shorter dialogues, the disappearance of magic references and the introduction of a class struggle (Kaloh-Vid, 2013: 93).

The story carries a “direct ideological message”. The characters are in search of a dreamland. Tolstoy names that dreamland, USSR\textsuperscript{22} (Balina, 2007: 50). In the middle of the plot, the

\textsuperscript{22} As quoted in Balina (2007:50), one of the characters says to Buratino: “Look, Buratino, I recognize it — it is the country of happy children — the USSR!” In this line becomes obvious the ideological influence that prevailed the book.
magical golden key appears and the only thing Buratino wants is to have that key. The key seems to be a symbol of the Soviet values. Kaloh-Vid concludes that in Tolstoy’s adaptation new ideological meanings are introduced. For example, “friendship became the realisation of the collective ideals”. The story’s happy ending results in the “abolition of private property”. The “struggle between good and evil”, which is a typical feature for children’s books, is based on “social class”. Finally, the search of “a magical place” is realised as “the search for a real place of collective labour and equal rights” (Kaloh-Vid, 2013: 101). These textual manipulations can only verify what has already been discussed by scholars, that in the Soviet Union, literature was used as a means of social control and its goal was to educate its future citizens (O’Dell, 1978: 5).

The transformation of Pinocchio to Buratino and the appearance of the golden key is proof that translation cannot be examined as a process, which is independent of history. Historical references and shifts are reflected through translation; they are a part of it and sometimes they could be the initial motivation for a retranslation. Therefore, translations and retranslations could be evidence of specific values and ideas existing during a specific moment in society. They can even reveal the structure and function of society and they carry the social norms dominating the place and the time of their publication.

Apart from cases, such as Pinocchio where the censorship effect is obvious, there are also references that reveal a climate of freedom around children’s literature. A significant number of Soviet authors turned to children’s literature and its translation, in order to avoid any references to political and ideological issues as well as the consequences that might occur from a wrong approach with regard to the Party’s official line. There were some publications in Soviet Russia, that surprisingly became the children’s favourite books despite contents that did not fit Soviet demands. For example, the Swedish author Astrid Lindgren became popular in Russia. She is the author of Pippi Longstockings, a book that has been translated into more than 60 languages. The first of her books to be translated into Russian was Karlsson-on-the-Roof, which was published in 1957, only two years after its original publication. This is also surprising as translations more commonly reached Soviet Russia a long time after their first publication.

Both Karlsson and Pippi became the new heroes of Soviet children, as they were “rebels”, “trouble-makers” and “norm-breakers”. This image appealed significantly to an oppressed
society where children “should be seen, but not heard” and Socialist Realism, as well as all forms of control, from parents, school and authorities were dominant features. Pippi and Karlsson were symbols of protest against the existing conventions and the order of a regime of fear. In a Soviet context, Lindgren’s books seemed to carry “anti-power”, “anti-conventional” and “anti-totalitarian” messages (Nikolajeva, 1996: 40). They promote subconsciously to the reader “a spirit of freedom and struggle, a call for creative imagination, for conquering the world by play”. It is hard to explain how these books evaded the censor and were published during a period with harsh censorship and the belief in Socialist Realism, which were promoted positive heroes. Pippi and Karlsson did not fit this image, as they could not be seen as positive heroes. They provided the opposite example from what the authorities were trying to promote. A possible explanation for their popularity is that with these subversive messages the books “filled a gap” in the strict Soviet children’s literature, taught in schools (Nikolajeva, 1996: 42). They were different from what the Soviet children used to read until then.

The three examples of Pinocchio, Pippi Longstockings and Karlsson-on-the-Roof described above prove the controversial situation prevailing the children’s literature and the translation of children’s literature in the Soviet Union. On one hand, children’s literature was censored in order to “save” the new generation from foreign ideas and protect Soviet values. On the other hand, children’s literature was considered to be a field where writers and translators were free to express themselves. The controversial status relating to children’s literature and especially to foreign publications, which were trying to find their place within the country’s literary system, is still not widely investigated and there are gaps relating to the manipulation of translated literature for children under the Soviet regime. The children’s book chosen for a comparative analysis between its English and Russian versions is Lewis Carroll’s Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland. The reasons for this choice as well as the process of finalizing the selection of the Russian translations will be described below.

4.5.2.2 Soviet Fantasy

A genre of children’s literature that became popular for a few years during the Soviet era was fantasy. According to Salminen, there are two Russian terms, both referring to the English term “fantasy”: fantastika and fentezi. Fantastica is a general term, which is usually used to describe science fiction. Fentezi is a term, which appeared in the 1990s, and it refers to
fantasy fiction originated from the West. Both terms, *fantastica* and *fentezi*, were recently associated with children’s literature. The terms *povest-skazka* and *skazochnaja-povest* which mean “fairy-tale story”, were used to describe fantasy and fairy tales (Salminen, 2009: 12). Fantasy, as well as fairy tales had suffered a lot throughout Russian literary history and particularly during the Soviet years, as they were considered to be harmful for the young minds. However, as Nikolajeva points out, the 1930s was the “heyday of Soviet fantasy”, probably because fantasy was a field where writers were able to avoid any reference to realistic and ideological statements (Nikolajeva, 1995: 106).

Soviet fantasy has its roots in Western Romanticism, but the interaction between Western and Soviet literature was limited. Therefore, Soviet fantasy followed a different path, as it was developed under “unique social and political circumstances” (Salminen, 2009: 42). According to Nikolajeva, a difference identified between Soviet and Western fantasy is that in the former there is a helper, a “wish-fulfilling agent”, who always appears in order to give a solution to the hero’s dilemma (Nikolajeva, 2010: 140). The master-plot, the pattern existing in most Soviet fantasy stories is that the hero is an ordinary child, in most cases “uneducated” and “unsocialized”. As Nikolajeva writes “the hero comes to a country oppressed by a tyrant or devastated by a dragon and delivers it from evil”. The adults in Soviet fantasy are considered to be always right and the child-heroes ought to follow their advice (Nikolajeva, 2010: 139-40).

The use of secondary worlds was very common in Soviet fantasy as well, having their roots in the folk and literary fairy tale and Russian adult literature containing supernatural elements (Salminen, 2009:15). However, there was a “master plot” applied in all literary works and the typical subject discussed was the effort for achieving a better future through hard and collective work. Therefore, the Soviet fantasy had also to comply with the principles of Socialist Realism. (Salminen, 2009: 17).

Carroll’s *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* is a Victorian fantasy book. The protagonist does not enter a secondary world, which suffers from a tyrant, and no helper appears to contribute to the happy ending. In Wonderland, Alice finds herself in a world where the adults assume they are always right, or at least they try to prove they are right. According to Hunt, the adults in Wonderland are not “reliable” and they live in a “nonsensical and aggressive” world (Hunt, 2009: 75). All of the adult characters contribute to the secondary world’s cruelty.
However, Alice is neither uneducated, nor unsocial. She attempts to be friendly and demonstrate her knowledge at every opportunity. However, the animals recognise her flawed knowledge regarding the rules of their world and insult her continuously. These differences between Victorian and Soviet fantasies, may contribute to the Russian translators’ interference in order to restore the norms governing the fantasy genre.

4.5.3 Children’s Literature in the Russian Federation

The Soviet regime was officially dissolved in December 1991. This is when a new era, and a new literature for children begins. As Hellman notes, “the ideological monopoly of the Communist Party was broken and censorship formally abolished”. Many small and independent publishing houses were created, a fact that contributed to an increase of children’s publications. Moreover, an “intense translation activity” occurs in order to fill the gaps that 7 decades of “restrictive culture policy” had created (Hellman, 2013: 563). The new publishers chose masterpieces of classic children’s literature, such as Pinocchio, Winnie-the-Pooh, Little Women, The Wind in the Willow, Mary Poppins, Peter Pan, The Wizard of Oz and many others which are now retranslated, as investing into new authors is thought to be “risky” (Rudova, 2008: 22). There are also new translations of Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland made by various translators who had not attempted to translate the book before, during the Soviet times. New names and fresh translations appear in the Russian market. Among them, there were also editions of pre-revolutionary children’s books, which were previously “condemned” by the Soviet critics (Hellman, 2013: 564).

However, as Rudova notes, this new literature, which was mainly fantasy, horror stories, comics, fairy tales and playful literature, was considered to be “disgraceful and unforgivable” by many writers, teachers and parents because of the lack of the previous “high ideological and aesthetic standards” (Rudova, 2008: 20). Arzamastseva, a scholar and critic of children’s literature, as quoted in Rudova, notes that in the early post-Soviet years writers of children’s books were in a way “forced to produce entertaining literature” as the market was not interested in “thought-provoking” material anymore. This tendency resulted in the “loss of national history” as there are no books describing the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the wars in Chechnya, or World War II (Rudova, 2008: 20).
The genre of children’s literature that was particularly popular in the post-Soviet years was the detective novel or *detskii detektiv*. According to Rudova, this genre was successful as, despite its low status; it was entertaining and contained “new middle class values, which in a peculiar way, reconnect with values taught by Soviet Literature” (Rudova, 2008: 23). Rudova indicates eight features of *detektiv* stories that played an important role in its popularity. First of all, *detektiv* belongs to the non-canonised literature which according to Shavit (1986: 94) means that it “ignores the adult”. Second, it represents the values and mentality of the middle class, which had disappeared from the social structure from the early Soviet years. Third, it demonstrates the forgotten positive heroes of Socialist Realism. Fourth, it promotes school and educational values. Fifth, it introduces the new trend of materialism. Sixth, there are girl figures playing an important role in solving mysteries. Seventh, it reduces the role of family in children’s life, which was highly promoted in earlier literature. Finally, it is generally an indication of nostalgia for the Soviet past as these books “convey a sense of respect for the Soviet past” or in other words, a desire for “a stable world” (Rudova, 2005: 287-297).

*Detskii Detektiv* was the genre of children’s books that dominated the post-Soviet children’s literature. In general, the two decades following the Soviet Union dissolution have been a “troublesome period” for children’s literature (Hellman, 2013: 571). This was a period of transition from the Soviet past to a new chapter. All Soviet restrictions were officially gone, however, there were probably self-restrictions from the authors’ side and a readership looking for new role models among the already established Western heroes.

In all three periods described above children’s literature is observed to be affected by political and cultural ideologies orientated by adults. The adult power and adult interference has emerged many times in discussions on children’s literature. The age hierarchy determines the degree of power exerted. The following example demonstrates the argument between the child-Alice and the Lory who claims that his ideas are right because he is older. The age becomes power and this image of an adult being wiser than the child is frequently promoted in children’s books.

### 4.6 Age hierarchy in Wonderland: the Argument with the Lory

As discussed in 4.2, the adult power promoted in children’s literature is always an issue. However, contemporary approaches on power issues argue that the child also has a form of
power related to the time he/she has left (Beauvais, 2015). Adult power and age hierarchy plays an important role in children’s literature. In many instances in children’s book, the adult presence may be particularly obvious and manipulation, censorship or even political ideology may also be observed. The following example indicates the age-related power that the adult creatures of Wonderland assert overtly.

First of all, the title of the chapter that this conversation between Alice and the Lory takes place is *A caucus-race and a long tale*. As noted by Gardner, “caucus” is a term used in the US to describe “a meeting of the leaders of a faction to decide on a candidate or policy”. However, in England was used in a more abusive way from one party for “the organisation of an opposing party”. Gardner also suggests that this might have been a symbolization for political parties that generally run in circles without reaching any conclusions (Gardner, 2000: 121). Therefore, there is a political reference already in the chapter’s title and perhaps its translation into Russian might be challenging.

Despite the title which will be discussed later, chapter 2 ends with Alice, a Duck, a Dodo, a Lory, an Eaglet and “several other curious creatures” swim out of the pool of tears. According to Hunt (Carroll, 2009: 261), the Duck is supposed to be Rend Robinson Duckworth, Carroll’s friend and fellow at Trinity College. The Dodo is Carroll himself. Due to his stammer, the pronunciation of his name might have been “Do-do-Dodgson”. The Lory is Alice’s older sister Lorina and the Eaglet is probably Alice’s sister, Edith (Carroll, 2009: 23). Chapter 3, begins with all these creatures that came out of the pool of tears and looking for a way to dry themselves up. This gathering is the moment when the interaction between Alice and the Wonderland creatures begins. Initially Alice talks “familiarly” with the creatures “as if she had known them all her life” and she even has a “long argument” with the Lory about an unidentified reason but probably related with the drying procedure (Carroll, 2009: 24). At some point while arguing, the Lory “turned sulky” and declared that it is older than Alice is and knows better. Alice insisted on finding out the Lory’s age but it refused to reveal it and this is how the conversation ended. However, the Mouse finally attracts everyone’s attention and attempts to provide a solution to their problem. The scene proceeds as follows:
**ST3:** ‘I am older than you, and must know better;’ and this Alice would not allow, without knowing how old it was, and, as the Lory positively refused to tell its age, there was no more to be said.

‘At last the Mouse, who seemed to be a person of some authority among them’ called out, ‘Sit down, all of you, and listen to me! I’ll soon make you dry enough!’ (Carroll, 2009: 24)

The above example indicates the issue of age-related hierarchy, which emerges many times in the story. Within the frame of adult normativity, or aetonormativity (Nikolajeva, 2009; 2010), it is implied here that age is an indicator of knowledge and wisdom. The norm of adulthood suggests that the older someone is the more he/she knows and understands. This is how the Lory asserts power, by using the fact that it is older than Alice and therefore it “must know better”. In fact, there are two levels of power play here built on physical terms, i.e. the biological age as well as the privilege to knowledge, which, in this instance, is not even explained. More specifically, these two levels of power are conflated in this excerpt because the Lory refuses to divulge information on its age. This demonstration of power reflects the relations between adults and children. The Lory is the adult who is (always) right and Alice is the child whose lack of knowledge and life experience makes her “immature” and “unable to make any sensible suggestions” (Ren, 2015: 1660).

There are also many personal references in the story, which can be linked to Carroll himself or the Liddell family. In this example, there is a possibility that the Lory represents Lorina Charlotte Liddell, Alice’s older sister. Taking into consideration this reference, the specific example with the Lory shouting that it is older and, therefore, smarter, may be a personal joke between Carroll and the Liddell girls, or an instance when Lorina used her age and any kind of power, she might have had as a big sister, to impose her will on her younger sisters.

Regarding the Mouse’s intervention, Carroll uses the word “authority” to describe it. This is reference is an indication of the implying power structures governing Wonderland and which are identified throughout the text. Mouse is both a person in power and someone who knows a lot about the actions that need to be taken to dry all the creatures. The demonstration of power and knowledge are displayed by two Wonderland creatures and finally the Mouse wins.
In Tenniel’s picture below, it can be observed that the Mouse is in the middle of the circle created by the animals narrating its “dry story”. It seems that everyone is paying attention to what it says regardless the fact that it is the smallest creature in size.

![Tenniel's picture of the Mouse in the center of the circle](image)

*Figure 7: The Mouse*

### 4.6.1 TT3a

As discussed in the previous section Carroll’s original title for this chapter is: *A caucus-race and a long tale*. It is a political terms used by Carroll to satirise the Victorian political system. The title in TTa is *Игра в горелки*, which refers to an ancient Slavic game, in which the first person tries to catch the other participants running in pairs. Carroll’s political hint is lost here as the translator uses a game as a chapter title. After the animals come out of the pool of tears the scene taking place is the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TT3a</th>
<th>Anonymous (1879: 26-9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>„я старше тебя, стало-быть и умнѣе тебя.“ А насколько старше, не хочешь сказать. Такъ Соня видить, что ничего отъ него не добьешься и замолчала. Тогда мышь вступилась. Она, какъ видно, была между ними вѣжное лицо. „Садитесь и слушайте“, сказала она, „вы у меня скоро обсохнете.“</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Back Translation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “I’m older than you, that is, smarter than you.” How older he didn’t want to say. Sonia sees that nothing can be achieved from him and she remained silent. Then the mouse stood up. She, obviously was among them an important person. “Sit down and listen”, she said “you’ll be soon dry”.
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More specifically, in TT3a the statement that the Lory is smarter than Alice results as a natural conclusion from the fact that it is older: “I'm older than you, that is, smarter than you”. It is implied here that the level of intelligence is relevant to someone’s age and it increases as the person grows older. Also, in TT3a, the Mouse is “an important” person (важное лицо). This lexical mismatch is important here as it demonstrates the translator’s denial of using the word authority to describe the mouse.

4.6.2 TT3b
The title given for this chapter by the translator is Избирательные скачки и длинное продолжение. A literal translation of the title would be: Electoral races and a long continuation. The translator chooses to preserve Carroll’s political feature and chooses to add a political reference as well.

| TT3b | Я старше тебя и должен знать лучше! Этим Алиса не могла удовлетвориться, не представляя, сколько же ему лет, и, так как Лори решительно отказался назвать свой возраст, на том разговор и закончился. Наконец Мышь, которая, видимо, была среди них самой почтенной особой, возгласила: - Сидите и слушайте меня! Я очень скоро сделаю вас достаточно сухими. |
| Olenich-Gnenenko (1958: 41) | I'm older than you and must know better! Alice could not be satisfied without knowing how old he was, and, since Lory decidedly refused to say his age, that was the end of the conversation. Finally, the Mouse, who was apparently among them, the most venerable person, proclaimed: Sit down and listen to me! I will very soon make you dry enough. |

In TT3b, the translation is more faithful to the source text. In the same way Carroll uses the word “must”, the translator also uses the Russian modal verb, “должен” (must, have to) in order to emphasise the fact that since it is older, it knows better. Therefore, the translator renders Carroll’s text in a literal way and this is something that will be also observed in the majority of the TTb examples that follow. Also, the Mouse is “the most venerable” person.
(самой почтенной). In this translation, the characterisation “person of authority” is also omitted. Regarding the illustration that accompanies this scene, the mouse here is at the bottom of the image and the rest of the creatures are gathered from one side of the image paying attention to what the mouse says. The way the mouse stands perhaps indicates that it talk to the other creature in a passionate way using gestures to explain and become understandable.

![Figure 8: Olenich-Gnenenko (1958)](image)

4.6.3 TT3c
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Back Translation</th>
<th>I'm older, which means smarter! I'm smarter, which means older! Alice tried to figure out how old he was, but Lory repeated his: I'm older! I'm older! I'm older! And nothing more could be drawn out of him. The mouse obviously, the most respected among them, squeaked: Everybody listen to me! I will instantly dry you!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In TT3c, there are many additions, which make the dialogue between Alice and the Lory more intense. The Lory says that it is older, which means smarter, as if the two words “older” and “smarter” are synonyms. It insists even more by repeating 3 times the sentence “I’m older” as if by repetition his statement will become accepted by Alice. This repetition added by the Russian translator makes the Lory sound like a stubborn child who tries to prove he/she is right by insisting and repeating the same words without reasonable arguments, or even as a parrot, which imitates sounds from its environment (after all Lory is a parrot). The Mouse here it is “the most respectable” person (самая уважаемая) among the Wonderland creatures. In the illustration below, the Mouse is depicted as a giant in comparison with the rest of the creatures. Perhaps, its power and influence among the Wonderland creatures is highlight here with its unusual large size.

*Figure 9: Yakhnin (1993)*
All three translators avoid transferring literally Carroll’s expression “person of authority”. In a Russian context, the word “authority” is a more sensitive notion and may include different meanings and apply to specific people. In a story where the King and the Queen are the main characters of the plot, a mouse could never be a person of authority or overshadow them. Regarding the word authority, the Russian norms (despite the period in which the world could appear in a text like this) relate its meaning with the state and its social institutions. Therefore, translators are careful with the rendering of the word, avoiding giving any form of power to a creature that is lower in the social hierarchy of Wonderland.

Here it can be speculated that the only people of authority in Alice for the Russian translators/readers can be the King and the Queen of Hearts. They have the authority or the power to make decisions and control Wonderland and its creatures. The Mouse is an adult figure, who is permitted to be important, venerable or respected in its community, but it is not a “person of authority” which implies that it cannot make any decisions or give any orders to the rest of the creature. This technique, in other words, allows translators to polarize characters from a power perspective. This tendency is confirmed in other examples (see chapter 6).

Moreover, there are lexical mismatches regarding the reporting verb used in order for the Mouse to attract the creatures’ attention. Instead of Carroll’s “call out”, which may be more appropriate for a person of authority to use, in TT3a, the Mouse simply “said” (сказала) that it will dry the crowd that had just come out of the pool of Alice’s tears. In TT3b, the Mouse “proclaimed” (возгласила) and in TT3c, it “squeaked” (пискнула) in order to catch everyone’s attention. The above lexical mismatches also alter the social relationship as they remove in a way the Mouse’s authority. The Mouse makes an extra effort to catch everyone’s attention and by implication, it becomes equal to the creatures.

The Lory, as all creatures of Wonderland, represents the adult and in this case, the adult becomes dogmatic about defending itself against a powerless child, Alice. The age here, as well as in many other scenes in the story, is indicated as a factor of intelligence and wisdom. TT3a, presents this older/smarter convention as a natural consequence; if a person is older, it is smarter as well. TT3b is a literal translation of the ST as the translator uses the exact same modal verb as Carroll (должен - must). In both, TT3a and TT3b, the Lory is talking to Alice.
using the informal, singular form of “you” (тебя). This is mentioned here, as it will be observed later that in general, the animals have the tendency to refer to Alice in an informal way. However, Alice tends to talk to them using the formal, plural form of “you” (вы/вам), particularly in TTa. In TT3c, the translator produces a free translation of the ST as he is adding his own elements, stressing even more the Lory’s strong belief that it is smarter than Alice just because it is older, by repeating 3 times “I’m older”.

**Conclusion**

Previous research has indicated the complicated nature of children’s literature. This is due to the many factors that have contributed to its development since its emergence. The need for children’s books occurred when childhood was realised as a special period in a human’s life. Their existence was also connected to educational values and ideological references, a fact that makes adults’ degree of interference in the production and selection of books inevitable. All these factors make the translation of children’s literature a different process than the translation of adult’s books. As already discussed in the previous chapters, minor changes and adjustments can occur in any translation in order for the best equivalent result to be achieved. This how the text becomes understandable by the target audience.

In children’s literature, these adjustments might be more as children do not have the world knowledge that adults have and they might need further explanations and adaptations to understand the context of the source text. The translator of children’s books might need to make more adjustments in order to bring the text closer to the children of the target culture. However, if the changes made contain ideological references, which cannot be explained by the linguistic or cultural differences of the two texts, then the texts instantiate acts of manipulation.

All the above constitute the context in which a source text and a target text are produced, which should be taken into account in every translation act. The Russian context, despite the period in which a translation occurred, has always been connected with the notion of manipulation in translation. Particularly, in the Soviet era, children’s literature played an important role in “constructing Soviet identity” (Balina and Rudova, 2005: 186). However, the manipulation of literature appears in many instances in the Russian literary history and
this study wishes to explore further and reach conclusions regarding the status of translated children’s books in Russia.
Chapter 5

Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland: A World Classic

The present chapter examines the reasons that made Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland an ideal choice for this study. The original text is radically bound to the Victorian era and it also uncovers power references related to adult ideology and age hierarchy. The impact that these references had in the three Russian translations of Alice is also presented, through an example that includes many Victorian elements of class and social etiquette.

Hunt notes, that both Alice books have been the subject of a “huge amount of critical exegesis”, as well as of biographical and fictional interest (Hunt, 1994: 79). Moreover, Honig suggests that Alice “has been subjected to every torture form of analysis modern literary criticism can device” (Honig, 1988: 75). These statements represent accurately the situation governing the field of research on Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland. The number of critiques reviewed during the completion of this study was considerable since scholars from many disciplines – philosophers, logicians, mathematicians, physicists, psychologists, folklorists, literary critics and translators – have all examined Lewis Carroll’s Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland from different perspectives.

Yet, despite the numerous publications and analyses on every aspect of Alice, “from science fiction to musical theatre, surrealism to politics […], there is always something else, something other to say about Alice”, as noted by Beer (2016: 1). The material presented here is only a part of the published works related Carroll’s book and have been chosen to serve this study’s purposes in the most effective way. The aspects of Alice highlighted here will contribute to a better understanding of the book’s content, its implied meanings and the cultural norms of the Victorian era which might not have the same or even similar functions in a Russian context.

After providing a biographical note on Lewis Carroll, the author of the book, the description of the story’s creation along with the reviews and the critical approaches (historicist, psychoanalytic and children’s literary theory) to the book are also described. These features are important as they place the book in the canon works of world literature. There are also possible explanations of symbolizations with regard to what Carroll meant when he was
writing *Alice*. These are examined as they are references with a strong cultural content, which made the translation of the book a challenge for translators around the world. Finally, previous research on the translations of *Alice* will be presented as well as the translations and the reception of the book in Russia.

### 5.1 Alice in Context

*Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* was published in 1865, during the mid-Victorian period. Charles Lutwidge Dodgson, widely known by his pen-name Lewis Carroll, was the author of this book as well as of the sequel that followed in 1871, *Alice through the Looking-Glass*. Alice’s fall into the rabbit-hole triggered the creation of a significant number of publications discussing the book’s content, the plot, the inventive language used by its author, the symbolic signification of specific references in the story, the deeper meaning and implications of Carroll’s writing, as well as the great number of translations that flooded the market. *Alice* has been analysed from many different perspectives. The story’s historical features, its psychological interpretation, its value as a book for children as well as its innovative, for the time of its publication, characteristics are still being discussed even today 152 years after its publication.

Several people were involved and various incidents occurred before *Alice’s* publication, which contributed, to the book’s major success. The protagonist of the story, Alice, was a real girl whose name was Alice Liddell. Apart from that, the story indicates many facts that took place in Victorian Oxford. However, *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* was not the story that Carroll recounts in a “golden afternoon” (Carroll, 2009: 3) to Alice Liddell and her sisters during their boat trip.

Carroll’s story was published in November 1865, under the title *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*. The book’s illustrations were drawn by Sir John Tenniel, who was working as a political cartoonist for the *Punch* magazine. Tenniel did the illustrations for both *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* and its sequel *Alice through the Looking-Glass*. These illustrations were the only ones he produced for children’s books (Elwyn-Jones and Gladstone, 1995: 9). Tenniel started working on the illustrations following Carroll’s original handwritten manuscript of *Alice’s Adventures Underground*. However, according to Nières, his interpretation “differs substantially” from what Carroll had originally drawn himself. Tenniel
“ignores or shifts parts of Carroll’s symbolism”, he reduces the number of illustrations and he introduces “a touch of reality” by drawing clothes on the characters as well as a background in every scene (Nières, 1994: 197).

It is said that Alice’s success and popularity is partly due to Tenniel’s contribution to the book’s creation. As Hunt notes, the Alice books are “a satire-allegory on politics, a commentary on Victorian mores, and a sublimation of Carroll’s own desires”. Carroll’s choice of Tenniel, a political cartoonist, to illustrate his books for children was not accidental, as he intended to satirise the political structure of the Victorian environment and therefore, “despite all appearances, the one thing that the Alice books are emphatically not, is nonsense” (Hunt, 2003: 24).

The first Alice review in the newspaper The Athenaeum in December 1865 by an anonymous reviewer was not optimistic. As quoted in Weaver, the reviewer wrote, among other things, that this is a story full of “loops and ties, and loose threads, and entanglements, and inconsistencies, and passages which lead to nothing” (Weaver, 1964: 28). The Illustrated London News and the Pall Mall Gazette liked the story in general. However, The Spectator published negative comments on the Mad-Tea Party chapter, and the Illustrated Times commented that the author’s imagination was not understandable (Auden, 1962: 7). Other critics wrote that they saw nothing original in Carroll’s story. Indeed, there were suggestions that the original idea was stolen from Thomas Hood’s book From Nowhere to the North Pole. The concept in both books is quite similar; they describe odd events, which take place in a child’s dream (Salmon, 1887: 86). From all the above it can be concluded that Alice’s success was not immediate. Wood, quoted in Shavit (1986: 74), notes that Carroll sent out copies of Alice to writers and artists whose opinion could influence the public in order to increase the book’s popularity.

Whether this tactic was effective or not, the comments that followed were more positive regarding the book’s special features. Carroll himself kept a record of newspapers’ and critics, references to his book. He wrote down 19 notices in his diaries. Some of them are described in Cohen: the Reader wrote that Alice is “a glorious artistic treasure […] a book to put on one’s shelf as an antidote to a fit of the blues”. The comments in The Press were that the book is “simple and attractive style […] amusingly written […] a child, when once the tale has been commenced, will long to hear the whole of this wondrous narrative”. The
Publisher’s Circular referred to “the most original and most charming” book. The Bookseller talked about a “delighted… a more original fairy tale… it has not lately been our good fortune to read”. Finally, The Guardian’s comment was that the story contained “nonsense so graceful and so full of humour that one can hardly help reading it through” (Cohen, 1995: 131). Therefore, attitudes towards the book started to change and reviewers as well as the readership began to applaud the book. This is possibly why a few months after Wonderland’s success, Carroll thought about writing a sequel.

A great number of critical works on Carroll and Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland have been published since the book’s appearance on the market. Subsequently, scholars have always been interested in Carroll’s life and works and particularly in the Alice books. It would be impossible to read and analyse all of them, however, in this chapter the most important Alice works related to the objectives of this thesis will be introduced. It has been extensively discussed that Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland is a book related to implied meanings, hidden secrets and real Victorian people of the time. It reflects Victorian societal structures or, according to Cohen, depicts the “manners, conventions, proprieties, taboos, class hierarchy and most of all the foibles and follies of Victorian society”. The landscape, the architecture as well as the landmarks refer to Victorian Oxford (Cohen, 2015a: 77).

Gardner also notes the characters of the book satirise real human beings living in Oxford at that time. There are comments on typical habits, dressing codes, food and drink of the Victorian Era and comments on the meaning of Carroll’s puns, verses, anagrams, linguistic jokes and even illustrations. These jokes could be understood only by residents of Oxford. In addition, there are other, more private jokes, which could be understood only by the Liddell family (Gardner, 2001: xii). All the above references and symbols can be rendered and explained in numerous ways.

5.2 Children’s Literature Criticism

According to Lathey, the books that entered the canon of “children’s classics” are a “hybrid set of texts” including stories written for all ages in various languages or they are the so-called ambivalent texts (Shavit, 1986), which were originally written for adults, however, they managed to enter the children’s literary system (Lathey, 2015: 120). Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland belongs to this category of books and it has attracted the critics’ interest.
regarding its suitability as a book for children. This criticism was mainly due to the book’s ambivalent status, as shown by the violent references as well as by Carroll’s special use of language.

5.2.1 The Ambivalent Alice

Knowles and Malmkjær note that with the publication of Alice, a new period for children’s literature begins with books having a dual audience, both adults and children (Knowles and Malmkjær, 1996: 17). Shavit, as already discussed in 3.1.5., places Alice together with Winnie-the-Pooh, Watership Down, The Little Prince and The Hobbit in the category of ambivalent texts, as they exist on “two levels”, one for children and one for adults (Shavit 1986: 74-75). As already mentioned in 4.4.1.1, for Shavit, ambivalent texts are the ones rejected by the adult system but are not yet accepted by the children’s. However, once these texts are accepted by the new system, similar texts will follow (Shavit, 1986: 67).

Shavit discusses the ambivalent nature of Alice as this can be verified by the existence of the three Alice versions: Alice’s Adventures Underground, Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland and The Nursery “Alice”. Oittinen also discusses the ambivalent content of Alice providing comparative examples between Wonderland and Nursery. According to Oittinen23, Carroll’s new book was simple and more logical. He wanted to be sure that the child reader would be able to understand the story. Since he created this book for younger children, he also wanted to make sure that there would be nothing scary in the book. Therefore, he underlined the fact that Alice is only dreaming; none of the events that take place are true and no one would be hurt, since this is only a dream. For example, the book begins as a fairy tale with the typical phrase “Once upon a time…” and Carroll states that what follows is a dream (Oittinen, 2000: 131).

Once upon a time, there was a little girl called Alice: and she had a very curious dream. (Carroll, 1890: 1)

Another example where this dream-state is quite clear is when Carroll describes Alice’s fall into the rabbit hole. He stresses the fact that she would not hurt herself during the fall because this is only a dream (Oittinen, 2000: 127):

---

23The examples discussed in the section are quoted by Oittinen (2000).
If anybody really had such a fall as that, it would kill them, most likely: but you know it doesn’t hurt a bit to fall in a dream, because, all the time you think you’re falling, you really are lying somewhere, safe and sound and fast asleep! (Carroll, 1890: 3-4)

In *The Nursery “Alice”* the syntax is also simpler and the sentences are shorter, as can be seen from the above examples, Carroll even use italics in order to show to the adult reader which words needs to be stressed while reading the book to a child. In addition, he explains everything in great detail. For example, he tries to make sure that the child would understand exactly how big Alice is in the following example (Oittinen, 2000: 131-33):

She grew, and she grew. Taller than she was before! Taller than any child! Taller than any grown-up person! Taller and taller, and taller! Just look at the picture and you’ll see how tall she got! (Carroll, 1890: 7-8)

The exclamation marks in the above example show Carroll’s intention to stress Alice’s size. He also encourages the readers to look at the illustrations of the book in order to acquire a better understanding of what he means. According to Oittinen, the illustrations in Wonderland add something new to the story. However, in *Nursery* they depict and explain exactly what Carroll says with words (Oittinen, 2000: 132). Moreover, *Nursery “Alice”* is wearing an apron with a big bow around her waist and on her head. Her skirt is a “good little girl’s skirt”, unlike the Wonderland skirt which is “broad and extravagant” (Oittinen, 2000: 126). Oittinen concludes that since *The Nursery “Alice”* was written 25 years after *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*, Carroll’s child image as well as society’s child image had changed. And this is why there are so many differences between the two texts (Oittinen, 2000: 126).

*The Nursery “Alice”* was probably created because of the reviewers’ reactions to the original book. They suggested that it was not appropriate for children. The existence of three *Alice* versions explains Carroll’s corrective actions and the ambivalent nature of the book. However, this was not the only reason that led reviewers to consider the book as a story unsuitable for children. The fact that many violent and death references appear constantly in the book has also contributed to this view. The above references are expressed due to the
Wonderland creatures’ tendency to exert power not only over Alice, but also over each other. The scenes depicting power violence, usually through violent verbal and non-verbal communications will be examined in detail in chapter 6, reaching conclusions relating to the translation of the ambivalent Alice story into Russian.

5.2.2 Violence in Wonderland

Another view related to children’s literature criticism on Alice, as well as to the book’s ambivalent nature, is the opinion that the book contains many violent scenes, which can cause feelings of fear and terror in children. For example, the scene where Alice falls into the rabbit hole or the fact that she is alone in an unusual world where she changes sizes, and where various creatures order, humiliate and threaten her life, might be terrifying situations for children. Douglas-Fairhurst notes that his feelings when reading Alice as a child were mixed. For him it was “an emotional scramble of amusement, fear, bewilderment and sheer unexamined joy” (Douglas-Fairhurst, 2015: 3). Tait also describes her personal opinion about the book as frightening, because of “all the growing and shrinking, and the characters gripped by senseless violence” (Tait, 2010: 38).

Tucker accredits these feelings of fear to the book’s “moral anarchy, where events are always so arbitrary and unpredictable” (Tucker, 1981: 10). He also suggests that the aggression found in Wonderland “may echo children’s own infantile emotions”. Alice’s frightening experiences, such as falling in a deep, dark hole, the growing and the shrinking process that creates the feeling that there is not enough space, may reflect the “personal nightmares or worrying fantasies” of the young readers (Tucker, 1981: 98-99). Douglas-Fairhurst also compares Alice’s dream-Wonderland to the life and the problems of a child in the real life. Alice is facing the abrupt behavior of the creatures and the Queen who shouts “Off with her head”. In real life the Wonderland creatures are replaced by the adults and potentially a mother who shouts “Go to your bed” (Douglas-Fairhurst, 2015: 128).

In general, the story contains many scenes of violence and mistreatment towards a child who is lost in Wonderland. As Douglas-Fairhurst notes, Alice encounters danger in every step she takes in that world. She is falling into the middle of the earth, she is being “snuffed out like a candle”, she almost breaks her neck against the ceiling when she grows bigger in the White Rabbit’s house, she is terrified by a giant puppy, and she is attacked by a pigeon “violently
beating her with its wings”. Alice is bullied by almost everyone she meets. She is also threatened to be executed and almost all the creatures she meets are “cranky rather than cuddly” (Douglas-Fairhurst, 2015: 126).

In other words, Wonderland is a world full of aggression. There is always someone who is disgraced, or is threatened with death (Demurova, 1991). This is how the creatures try to assert power. Love, consolation and sympathy do not exist in that world. Most of the characters have bad manners and treat Alice in a hostile way. This might represent Carroll’s relationship with his family. He was probably seeking the love of his parents, since in such big families’ children usually feel neglected. Maybe the King and the Queen or some of the animals who verbally attack and order Alice represent Carroll’s parents (Schilder, 1938: 290). As Auden notes, Wonderland is a place of “complete anarchy” and Alice is the only person with self-control, who tries to “adjust herself to a life without laws” (Auden, 1971: 9).

Scenes containing features of power and authoritative behavior will be examined in detail in chapter 6. Carroll’s original examples will be compared to their Russian translations. More specifically, the examples represent adults’ power and authority towards the child-Alice. This behaviour initially terrifies Alice; however, by the end of her adventurous she adopts a similar attitude over the Wonderland creatures. The references that suggest a child being mistreated by various creatures or adults is probably opposite to the Russian norms, especially during the Soviet period when books described the ideal childhood of the perfect Soviet children (see 3.4.2).

**5.2.3 Carroll’s Special Use of Language**

Special features regarding Carroll’s use of language or perhaps inconsistencies, which later lead to translation issues are frequently found in *Alice*. So far, in this study many aspects of *Alice* as well as Carroll have been described. This section discusses the special features of the text as examined by many scholars in relation to linguistic and coherence levels. Carroll’s use of language – puns, verses, word play – has always been an issue for translators.

Starting with the text’s problems of coherence, Beckman identifies 300 cases of incoherence in the story and classifies them into five categories: thematical, propositional, referential, predicative and illocutive incoherence (Beckman, 1994: 112-3). According to Beckman,
thematical incoherence occurs often, as the sudden change of topic in Wonderland dialogues is a common phenomenon. For example, the Hatter in the Mad Tea-Party chapter during his conversation with Alice suddenly tells her that she needs to get a haircut and in another part of the dialogue he asks her to solve the “why is the raven like a writing desk” riddle (Beckman, 1994: 112).

The propositional incoherence occurs according to Beckman when, for example, the 9 foot tall Alice can use the White Rabbit’s fan or when, by telling a story, can make the Wonderland creatures dry again after swimming in the pool of tears. The referential incoherence can be observed in all references to Dinah, Alice’s cat. Alice threatens the animals that Dinah would be able to catch them, but the reference has no point as Dinah is not a part of the Wonderland world (Beckman, 1994: 112).

An example of predicative incoherence is the birds, which have fallen into the pool of tears instead of flying away from it, as well as the fact that Alice can cry that much in order to create a pool (gallons of tears). Finally, the illocutive incoherence can be seen in the example when the Hatter asks Alice a riddle - “why is the raven like a writing desk” without knowing the answer himself (Beckman, 1994: 113).

All these incoherencies are additional factors that contribute to the challenging act of translating Alice. However, they are not the only part of the book that challenges translators. Another common use of Carroll’s special language in Alice is world play, which also appears frequently in the book. The ‘language play’, as Crystal refers to it, is “the way in which people enjoy themselves by bending and breaking the rules of a language”. He notes that all languages illustrate forms of language play, which, however, may vary when comparing the languages (Crystal, 2015a: 15).

As Crystal also notes, playing with language is always a key feature when interacting with children. Since Alice is a book for children, the presence of language play is there. Therefore he classifies the levels of play in Alice in eight categories: the sound-based play, the typographical play, the letter-based play, the word-structure play, the syntax-dependent play, the lexical play, the pragmatic play and the cultural play (Crystal, 2015a: 17-19).
The sound-based play can be seen in Carroll’s tendency to introduce words with phonetic relevance (e.g. Elsie, Lacie, Tillie). The mouse’s tale/tail, which is depicted as a tail, is an example of the typographical play. An example of the letter-based play is the part of the Mad Tea-Party chapter where the Dormouse is trying to think of words that start with ‘M’. The word-structure play is the construction of new words, from the combination of the words that exist and the words that do not exist (e.g. treacle-well). The syntax-dependent play occurs when someone understands an idiom literally, as for example the relationship between “in the well” and “well in”. An example of lexical play is Carroll’s alteration of standard phrases by using more emotionally charged words. One example is the expression “killing time” which turns into “murdering time”. The pragmatic play is “the manipulation of the rules governing a normal discourse”, as for example the different interpretation of Alice’s words ‘I don’t think…’ from the Mad Hatter who interrupted her in a rude and insulting way. Finally, the cultural play is the cultural element that is hidden behind the words. For example, the names of the Mad Hatter and the March Hare are related to madness, which is something that non-British readers might not know. However, the expressions “mad as a Hatter” and “mad as a March Hare” are known to British readers (Crystal, 2015a: 17-19).

All the references described above – personal, local, Victorian, psychoanalytical, those related to children’s literature, the ambivalent meanings and the book’s suitability for children – in some ways reflect Victorian norms. These norms were depicted in literature and certainly in children’s books. As has already been discussed, the appearance of children’s literature is closely related to the notion of childhood. Helson notes that the Mid-Victorian period was a time when many things changed in society and that the “suppression of impulse” was a dominating characteristic of the time. Modern conveniences were more acceptable and the role of genders had started to take a new form. Men “offered power, achievement, initiative and rational effort” (Helson, 1974: 67). The role of women was to offer “moral and emotional support at home”. On top of all these was the “religious dedication”, that was quite intense at that time. All these changes, the suppression of impulse, the new gender roles, the materialistic tendencies, the devotion to God and the new way of life caused tension and resulted in the creation of a new social structure (Helson, 1974: 67). However, these norms are rejected, as Alice also promotes some innovative feature in relation to the time of its publications and to the norms it represented (or was meant to represent).
5.3 The Rebel Alice in the Victorian World Order

According to Honig, the so-called Golden Age of children’s literature covers the years from 1840 to 1910 (Honig, 1988:1). This is when the genre of fantasy started to flourish. As Honig notes, although women were still “repressed”, female characters started to multiply in fantasy books, playing the most important role in the stories’ development. The major topics in both children and adult literature with female protagonists, as described in Honig, were “nursery life, childhood conflicts, the struggles of learning, growing to maturity and finding a proper and comfortable sphere as a woman” (Honig, 1988: 2).

An interesting observation by Honig is that with the development of the fantasy and fairy tale genre during the Victorian time, a new idea emerged from the authors’ side: freedom to project their own conceptions of what females were really like, or what they could become in a less restrained world (Honig, 1988: 3). Perhaps these ideas may be applied to Alice books since the presentation of Carroll’s images for girls, as they are freed from strict societal rules and consequently independent and, perhaps, rude to anyone who is rude to them. Many scholars have talked about Carroll’s self-projection in Alice books, as will be discussed in 4.3.2.

Honig, after researching a wide range of Victorian children’s books on female depiction, concluded that mothers are problematic figures and that they are usually absent from the stories, as in this way the child-hero can be more independent and move faster towards maturation (Honig, 1988: 8). In Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland, there is no reference to Alice’s mother. However, there are mother figures, such as the Duchess who is not the typical example of a Victorian mother. The ideal mother was supposed to be devoted to her husband and children, however, the Duchess is “a grotesque figure both in appearance and behaviour” (Honig, 1988: 28).

Victorian girls were expected to be “religious, serious, moral, intellectual in a refined, socially acceptable way and above all, obedient to parents and older brothers” (Honig, 1988: 65). However, the fantasy stories’ new female protagonists are not that at all. They are polite and well-mannered as Victorians, however they are also “assertive, adventurous, independent, and even aggressive” indicating the features of a male hero (Honig, 1988: 69). Honig also notes that the independent Alice displays a “subversive feminist message” that
could be easily dismissed within the frame of the Victorian reality (Honig, 1988: 71). However, Alice became the model that many other authors followed, depicting brave, independent girls as the heroines of their books.

In the unprecedented climate of Victorian changes, the position of children was also redefined. The upbringing of children became more important as their development was the vehicle for the ability to rise or fall in the social scale. This was the main goal of the period, especially for middle class families. As Helson concludes, “there was especially the feeling of transition, of moving from an essentially feudal past, through a confusing present, to something new” (Helson, 1974: 68). These conditions altered Victorian society and focused on the child and a new notion of childhood.

*Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* occurred within this change and was seen as a “revolutionary event” (Helson, 1974: 72), as its purpose was not only didactic as children’s books had been, but was also entertaining. Leach notes that Victorian children’s books were written in order to introduce children to reality and to the morals of the time. But *Alice* contains many elements found in fairy tales. Her character does not fit the Victorian stereotype. She is curious and that curiosity leads her to a big adventure, rejecting in a way the adult authority (Leach, 1971: 88). These radical characteristics reflected through Alice’s personality, are the ones that made the book innovative.

Indeed, Wilson also notes that *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* was “a world away from other Victorian children’s books because it was entertaining and whimsical rather than serious and educational” (Wilson, 2015: 12). Carroll’s fantastic, adventurous dream world was the opposite of the serious and didactic world, which was presented in other Victorian books for children. Alice was a “rebel” in contrast to other Victorian book heroines of the nineteenth-century. She was a radical departure from the traditions of the juvenile literature of the time (Mulderig, 1977: 320). Her confidence and curiosity are not the expected characteristics of women in the Victorian era.

Until the *Alice* books came to existence, the goal of children’s literature was to teach and preach. Authors had been writing about religious principles, prayers and sins. These books instilled discipline and compliance. Carroll opposed that tradition and offered to Victorian children something “lighter and brighter”. Carroll’s prose was unconventional and
imaginative. He used long, polysyllabic words and sophisticated concepts in contrast to the monosyllabic and dull language used by other authors whose works did not have any sensitivity or imagination (Cohen, 1995: 141-2).

Alice’s character did not fit the Victorian stereotype. She was an awkward character for Victorian children who were “used to girl angels fated for an early death, or to impossibly virtuous little ladies, or to naughty girls who eventually reform in response to heavy adult pressure” (Leach, 1964: 90). Alice never “reformed”. By the end of the story, she becomes even braver and bolder and dares to contradict the adults exerting pressure on her. Alice is not the typical Victorian girl and this can be observed from the first instance of the book, as a “typical Victorian angel” would never be that incautious and daring to fall into a rabbit hole in the first place (Honig, 1988: 77).

5.4 In Search of Alice’s Identity

In Victorian world described above, Alice seeks her identity. She passes through the rabbit hole into Wonderland – a secondary world in which she suffers a number of changes mainly related to the size of her body. She shrinks and expands many times in the story. Regarding the body changes, Roncada has identified four categories when changes occur. First of all, the change might be an unexpected growth or decrease. Second, it can be a growth or decrease driven by others (for example the pebbles that turn into cakes). Third, this growth or decrease is initiated by Alice herself (when biting the two pieces of mushrooms). Finally the size alteration may be “the spontaneous conquest of normality without any magic object”, as during the trial scene Alice returns to her normal size without any interference (Roncada, 1994: 54).

Despite the reasons that cause Alice’s size fluctuation, the result is that Alice is still confused and unable to realise her identity. She even asks herself: “Who in the world am I?”. She thinks that she is Mabel, one of her friends, an idea that makes her unhappy. The issue of Alice’s identity appears many times in the story and the Wonderland creatures constantly ask her who she is, which makes her more confused as she does not know the answer. As Turci notes, phrases such as “You are!”, “Who are you?”, “You are not!”, “You can’t be!” are continuously repeated throughout the story (Turci, 1994: 71). The caterpillar also demands to know who she is, asking in a rather aggressive way. With this question the Caterpillar
“throws her into profound confusion” (Honig, 1988: 80). Alice still does not know the answer, as she is not “herself lately”; she knew who she was this morning but not anymore. However, at this point she is not the person she was in the morning and, as Honig observes, she is on her way to becoming the person she will be at the end of the book. The new Alice who, through challenging the adults’ power, becomes “confident” and she even walks away when the Caterpillar is no longer pleasant company for her (Honig, 1988: 80).

The Rabbit also ignores her identity and is not interested in investigating who this intruder into Wonderland is. For the Rabbit, Alice is Mary Ann, probably his maid who has to obey the orders and bring his gloves and his fan. Alice also faces the Pigeon which “was beating her violently with its wings” (Carroll, 2009: 47) and screaming, calling her “serpent”. This returns the identity question, which frequently appears in the story, as Alice always wonders who she is. The only creature that gives an answer to the identity issue is the Pigeon: Alice is a serpent (Del Ninno, 1994: 39). However, in this case although Alice may not know who she is, she is certain that she is not a serpent and tries to justify herself. The Queen also asks Alice who she is. Alice seems to have stopped wondering who she is at this point. She may not be sure about her identity but she knows that she should not be afraid of the creatures she has met and of the Queen’s soldiers, as they are “nothing but a pack of cards” (Carroll, 2009: 109).

Through this identity confusion, the Wonderland creatures exert their power. Alice does not know who she is and therefore she is going to be whatever they want her to be: a maid, a serpent or even just a senseless child in an adults’ world. However, Alice is not the only Wonderland character who faces identity issues. As noted by Beckman, the Duchess’s baby is transformed into a pig (Beckman, 1994: 111). Regarding this transformation, Greenacre, as quoted in Honig, claims that it indicates that Carroll “passionately disliked babies” (Honig, 1988: 30). These irregularities related to identity lead to problems of coherence in the story, as discussed in 4.3.3.3. As such, the Wonderland characters can be classified as children and adults.

According to Elwyn-Jones and Gladstone, the child characters are in general “bright and pert”. The Dormouse is a child’s pet, the Dog is a happy puppy, the Lory and the Eaglet are Alice’s sisters, Lorina and Edith. The rest of the figures Alice meets are adults and they are not friendly. The White Rabbit is “flustered, determined and brusque”. The Duchess and the
Queen of Hearts have something masculine about them. The Mad Hatter is “imperious” until the trial when he becomes “apologetic” (Elwyn-Jones and Gladstone, 1995: 62). However, the Wonderland creatures’ identities are also depicted in Tenniel’s illustrations. Their behaviour towards Alice, is reflected in the pictures and shows which of the characters are children (as Alice) and which are adults.

According to Nières, all the human characters of the story (the White Rabbit, the Duchess, the Mad Hatter, the Queen of Hearts) are dressed in Tenniel’s illustrations and this is what distinguishes them from the rest of the animals (Bill, the puppy, the Dormouse) (Nières, 1994: 200). Nières also suggests that the animal characters are “her inferiors or of lower social rank” as children would be (Nières, 1994: 202). The fact that it is adults or perhaps human beings (disguised) that Carroll is referring to can also be seen in Tenniel’s illustrations. All the creatures who are dressed in clothes are depicted with “anthropomorphous characteristics” (Nières, 1994: 202). For instance, the Dodo and the Caterpillar are depicted with a pair of human hands, as can be observed in the figures below:
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Some early Russian translations maintain Tenniel’s original illustrations but it is not certain that all these indications were realised by the Russian translators. New illustrations were added later by various Russian artists and their examination would be ideal ground for future
research. In the Russian versions of Alice examined here the human characteristic is missed in all illustrations of the translations.

### 5.5 Power and Authority in Wonderland

In the previous section the issue of Alice’s identity has been discussed, as well as, the Wonderland characters who have been classified as children and adults according to their behaviour to Alice and to their depiction in Tenniel’s illustrations. According to previous research, it has been observed that the adult characters are the ones that exert power and demonstrate their authority over Alice. Ren’s (2015) work on the adult power in Wonderland is particularly interesting. According to Ren, “power and adulthood are closely related” in Wonderland. All the figures that the child Alice encounters in Wonderland are adults (the White Rabbit, the Caterpillar, the Duchess, the Mad Hatter, the King and the Queen of Hearts) and she has to struggle with them for power (Ren, 2015: 1659). Adulthood signifies power, even in their intelligence. This can be also observed in the example with the conflict between Alice and the Lory where it insists that it is “older and must know better” (Carroll, 2009: 24).

Another example is the White Rabbit who initially ignores Alice, then orders her to bring his gloves and fan and later threatens to burn her alive in the house. The Duchess also insults Alice, when she asks about the grinning Cheshire Cat. Her answer is “You don’t know much, and that’s a fact” (Carroll, 2009: 53). Later the Duchess threatens Alice’s life by ordering the cook to “chop off her head” (Carroll, 2009: 54). The Mad Tea-Party is the ultimate moment of Alice’s humiliation. The Mad Hatter and the March Hare ask her to leave the moment they see her “NO room, NO room”. Alice decides to sit with them and then they try to silence her – “Sh! Sh!” or insult her by making personal remarks – “your hair need cutting” or even by suggesting that she should not talk. Finally, the Queen of Hearts uses her favourite threat “Off with her head!” more than once with Alice.

In general, Alice is considered to be “inferior” and “weaker” as all children are considered to be in Victorian society and this is why the adults “infantilize” the child-Alice in order to remain in power (Ren, 2015: 1660). Wonderland is an adults’ world and Alice is sometimes too big or too small to confront the challenges she meets during her journey. According to Honig, one way to view Alice’s journey is as “a child’s eye view of an adult world” (Honig,
1988: 76). However, Alice learns the Wonderland rules and she uses them against the adults. By the end of the story, she is the one that insults and attacks, and her power reaches its highest point when she “fights back physically by trying to beat the cards/leaves off” during the last moments of her dream (Honig, 1988: 86).

This tension and adult power can be also seen in Alice’s illustrations. Nières notes that Tenniel “endows all the animals exercising even the slightest authority over Alice or imitate adult behaviour” even if they are not adults (Nières, 1994: 202). The only character that is not classified as good or bad is the Cheshire Cat. Regarding the role of Cheshire cat, there are two views. According to Nikolajeva, the Cheshire Cat is “the most prominent representative of power” (Nikolajeva, 2012: 28). On the other hand, according to Nières, it is the only character in the story “not subject to any authority or hierarchy”. It has a unique position among the other animals, since it controls its own body and speaks the truth. It was probably, these unique features of the Cheshire Cat that led Tenniel to devote four illustrations to it (Nières, 1994: 202).

The scenes of adult power against the child-Alice are identified numerous times in the story. Due to their frequency and intensity, these scenes and their translations into Russian have been chosen as observational material for the comparative analysis held in chapter 6 of the study. In the following section, previous research on Alice’s translations in different language pairs is presented.

5.6 Translating Alice

The field of translation studies is another discipline, which has extensively examined Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland. As Jaques and Giddens note, “through her many adventures overseas”, Alice has been “shifted, altered and enlivened” many times (Jaques and Giddens, 2013: 106). The translation of Alice into another language appears to be a challenging task. Translators from all over the world have agreed that there are parts of the books, which are untranslatable. Apart from the different time, customs, attitudes and literary conventions prevailing in the period when the book was written, as well as the allusions, the hidden meanings and the symbols of the story, the most challenging part for its translation is the English language which according to Auden is “the mightiest character” in the book (Auden, 1971: 3).
Alice contains references related to the Liddell family, as well as to Oxford society and the Victorian era in general. There are references that could only be understood by Carroll and the Liddell girls, their close environment and Carroll himself. These features contribute to making some parts of the book difficult to translate and they challenge translators to become more inventive in order to transfer them into the target language. Some of these features will be examined in this section.

A great number of papers and previous research have discussed Alice’s level of difficulty regarding its translation. However, Carroll himself was aware of the book’s special nature and the possible difficulties of the translation process. Carroll wrote to his publisher that: “Friends here seem to think that the book is untranslatable into either French or German, the puns and songs being the chief obstacles” (quoted in Weaver, 1964: 33). The book was considered to be “untranslatable” during the early attempts at its translation.

Apart from the names and the references to real people, what makes the book problematic for translation is Carroll’s writing and use of language. The puns and the songs, as the early translators mentioned in their correspondence as well as the word-play, the anagrams, the nonsense and Carroll’s twists of meaning and unique humour, contribute to the book’s level of difficulty in terms of translation. Many scholars have examined the translations of Alice in different language pairs and it seems that they have faced similar challenges.

In her research on the German translations of Alice, O’Sullivan indicates the areas where German translators met difficulties in translation. The “explicit and implicit cultural references” indicated by O’Sullivan are related to topographical elements (“wherever you go on the English coast you find a number of bathing machines in the sea”), eating habits (“hot buttered toast”), historical or cultural references (William the Conqueror), regional and social accents (Pat’s Irish accent), currency (pounds, shillings, pence), weights and measures (inches, feet, pounds), names (O’Sullivan, 2001).

These features were foreign especially to the German reader of the first translation of 1869 (O’Sullivan, 2001: 13). O’Sullivan traces over thirty German translations published in 130 years and she identifies four main approaches to the translation of Alice into German: the fairy tale approach, the explanatory approach, the literary approach and an approach that is
both literary and accessible to children (O’Sullivan, 2001: 14-19). O’Sullivan concludes that Alice was not a success in Germany and that the majority of Germans accessed Alice mainly from Walt Disney movies. This result might have occurred because of the “poor quality” of the translations published in the course of 130 years (O’Sullivan, 2001: 21). Bamberger also notes that Alice’s German translations failed to become popular due to the fact that German-speaking children were not “receptive to fantasies” at that time (Bamberger, 1978: 25). On the contrary, in the Russian context, which is examined here, Carroll’s fantasy was accepted in the literary polysystem. As Nikolajeva notes, the socio-political norms, “unconsciously encouraged” fantasy writers, possibly, because they allowed them avoid expressing any political or ideological opinion (Nikolajeva, 1995: 106).

Oittinen (2002), in her book Translating for Children examines three Finnish translations of Alice: the first Finnish translation published in 1906 and two more translations published in 1972 and 1995. According to her, “translation is always an issue of time, place, culture and even gender” and they also have “different purposes in different times” (Oittinen, 2002: 134). Through the analysis of the three Finnish translations, Oittinen highlights the fact that “all three translations were created in different situations and served different purposes and different child images” (Oittinen, 2002: 134). This result is predictable since the period examined is almost a century and changes within the country occurred during three years might have influenced translations. Oittinen concludes that the differences in the translations examined are the outcome of “different strategies, different audiences and different views of the story” which proves that the translations are created in “unique situations” and that they also serve social a purpose (Oittinen, 2002: 142).

This is also the case with the Russian translations examined in this study. Published in different times and under different circumstances, they serve different purposes and they treat the implied reader in a different way. The child protagonist and consequently the child reader are either more sensitive and vulnerable or more rebellious and mighty (see analysis in chapter 6).

In 2003, Nord through a quantitative analysis indicates the frequency of the reproduction of source-language names without any changes in form, or the frequency of the use of adaptation to the target language norms. The examples examined were translations into Brazilian, German, Spanish, Finnish, French and Italian (Nord, 2003).
Subsequently, Pedersen and Andersen (2007) examined six Danish translations of Alice and concluded that none of the Danish translations examined “lives up to the original” probably for two reasons. First, there are significant differences between the nonsense conventions in English and Danish. Therefore, Carroll’s use of nonsense elements was hard to transfer. Second, there was an unwillingness to adjust to the target text norms as, in order for the text to make sense in Danish, the changes would have been significant. However, if the translators had obeyed the demands of cultural adaptation, the final result would not have been Alice. It would have been a different story with Danish jokes and puns and nothing to remind the reader of Carroll’s masterpiece (Pedersen and Andersen, 2007: 132).

Arguably, the most interesting study in terms of characterization and one that may complement the argument put forward in this thesis was Nord (1997). Nord examined the paralanguage in Alice’s translations into French and German, showing that the translators’ choices made the characters either more or less dramatic (Nord, 1997). Using Poyatos’ classification of non-verbal elements, Nord explains their meaning and gives examples of paralinguistic behavior found in the interaction of the characters in Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland. Nord’s examples of the paralinguistic behavior of the Wonderland creatures are described below:

- paralanguage – the way people speak and the independent, word-like utterances they produce (e.g. When the Rabbit came near her, she become in a low, timid voice. ‘If you please, sir…’)

- kinesics – the way people move, their body-language, gestures, manners, postures, etc. (e.g. The Mouse gave a sudden leap out of the water…)

- proxemics – the distance they keep with regard to each other (e.g. And she squeezed herself up closer to Alice’s side as she spoke.)

- chronemics – the behavior in, and the concept of, time including such aspects as the length of pauses in conversations or norms of ‘punctuality’ (e.g. For some minutes it puffed away without speaking…)
• chemical and dermal reactions like sweat, tears, blushing, goose-pimples (e.g. When the Mouse heard this it turned and swam slowly back to her; *its face was quite pale*…)

• object-mediated or bodily generated sounds, such as the slamming of a door or the sound of footsteps (e.g. It was the white rabbit returning: he came *trotting along* in a great hurry…) (Nord, 1997: 109).

Nord identifies examples of the paralinguistic behavior in the communication of the characters of Wonderland and compares them to their German, Spanish and French translations. Through this comparison, Nord concludes that “the description and transcription of paralinguistic phenomena is determined not only by the author’s intention to represent a particular type of situation, but also by culture-specific conventions” (Nord, 1997: 124). In other words, there are some forms of behaviour which are considered to be universal, as in specific cases all people react in the same way, however, there are reactions which carry a “particular cultural code” (Nord, 1997: 110). This behavior can also be seen in literary texts and their translations as the author and, later, the translator present these culture-specific reactions (gestures, movements, etc.) through the characters of a story.

This study was particularly helpful for this thesis as it contributed to the identification of paralanguage that accompanies verbal communication. Nord had not originally conceived her analytical framework (as borrowed from Poyatos, 1993) to highlight power gaps and their translation into other languages. However, paralanguage may indicate tension and power struggle and Nord’s ideas are also used to identify the power references. The paralanguage in the Russian translations of *Alice* examined seem to alter in many examples, changing the degree of intimacy and displaying different levels of power demonstration by the Wonderland creatures.

All the above references indicate the degree of difficulty in translating *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* regardless of the language of the target text. The following section presents the research conducted on the Russian translations of *Alice*. The challenges the translators met were similar to the ones described above. The Russian translations of the book were not an exception to the rule that suggests translators see the translation of *Alice* as challenge.
5.6.1 The Russian Translations

“It is easier to transfer England, than to translate Alice” (Легче перевезти Англию, чем перевести ‘Алису’) is a statement by Boris Zakhoder, translator of Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland in the early 1970s, as quoted in Nikolajeva (1996: 89). Perhaps this view describes best the opinion of Russian translators regarding Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland. Alice reached the Russian market in 1879. The book was published under the title Sonia v Charstve Diva (Sonia in the Land of Wonders). The translator remained anonymous and the critics were not positive towards this “absurd” book. This first edition of the adventures of Sonia received many negative reviews. One of the first reviews of the book was published in the journal Female Education (Женское образование) and focuses on the following:

There are the books, about which you do not wish to say, not even ten words. Their level is so low that they do not deserve any criticism. This publication lying before us belongs precisely to this kind of books. It is an empty and absurd fairy tale or more accurate, it is simple story (since in the creation of fairy tale is assumed the participation of fantasy) difficult to itself anything to present. We advise all mothers to pass past this fabrication, and stop not even for the minute.

In another review in Folk and Children's Library (Народной и детской библиотеки), the review wrote:

In this small book, which is full of orthographical errors and it is excessively expensive, a boring, sick, painful delirium of an ill-fated girl, named Sonia is described. The description of this delirium is deprived of any artistry and there are no signs of intelligent humour or fun.

A third magazine that wrote a negative review was Education and Training (Воспитание и Обучение):

The audience that looks for any content in children's books will not find it in “Sonia v charstve diva”. It describes an awkward dream girl that wanders into a

---

24 All the reviews on the first Russian translation of Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland were quoted in Demurova, 1968.
world of mice, cats, squirrels, insects. Maybe the buyer of the book thinks that he would find something like “Tales of a grandmother” by George Sand, but, of course, he will find neither any major talent, nor poetry, and if he expects to find any sense, he will make a mistake.

The above reviews denounce the first Alice translations into Russian. They talk about a “low” book, which does not deserve to be commented on, describing the stories of an “ill-fated” girl wandering around with mice, squirrels and other animals. According to Lobanov, as quoted in Skuratovska and Isakova, the book received “unanimously negative reviews”. This was because of the bad spelling, the lack of plot, the lack of artistic measure and the lack of fun and imagination. However, the main reason for the negative comments was that “nonsense literature was not yet in fashion” (Skuratovska and Isakova, 2015a: 461).

Although its success was a universal phenomenon in Russia, Alice never became a children’s favourite book and, as noted by Inggs, the work never “fully entered the Russian canon” (Inggs, 2015b: 10). A possible explanation of this is given by Andreeva (as quoted in Inggs), who points out that the book was in “high demand” in libraries and that children sometimes had to wait for months until they could borrow it, which slowed down the book’s circulation. However, after children had received the book they would “struggle to read it”. Andreeva also explains that this result might have occurred due to the fact that Alice’s “fantastical experiences” were quite different and alien to Soviet children’s reality and to Soviet realistic literature for children (Inggs, 2015b: 10).

The above statements may not be accurate, or at least they may have been for a specific period of time and due to the fact that there were no quality translations of Alice in the market. Despite the initial negative reactions, Alice did found a place within the Russian system of children’s literature and it was accepted in the Russian polysystem. Although she was a different image of behaviour and opposite to the Russian image of children, Alice became a hero. The book’s revolutionary character and norm-breaking attitude made Alice a role model for young readers.
5.6.2 Nabokov’s Ania v Strane Chudes

A Russian translation that should be mentioned at this point is Vladimir Nabokov’s *Ania v strane chudes*, which is considered to be among the best Russian translations of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*. Nabokov signed his Russian translation of *Alice* with his European pen-name, V. Sirin. The translation was published in Berlin in 1923 by an émigré publishing house named after the bird of Russian mythology, Gamaiflower (Karlinsky, 1970: 310). This translation is considered to be superior to all the early Russian translations of *Alice* and previous research has examined its aspects in detail.

As already discussed, Nabokov’s translation of *Alice* was not the first one in Russian literary history. The first anonymous translation published in 1879 changes Alice’s name into a Russian one, Sonia. A translation published in 1908 by Matilda Davidovna Granstrem occurred under the title *Ania v mire chudes* where Alice becomes Ania just as in Nabokov’s translation. One year later, a translation published by Polyxena Soloviova, replaces Carroll’s verses with Russian ones that children would have been familiar with. As noted by Karlinsky, Soloviova replaces the “How doth the little crocodile” poem with an adaptation of Pushkin’s poem *The Gypsies* (Karlinsky, 1970: 311). It is not known if Nabokov was familiar with these early translations. However, these similarities to earlier publications may be strong evidence that he probably had read the translations and perhaps influenced by them.

In general, Nabokov substitutes all English references with Russian ones, resulting in a domesticated and Russified text. Alice becomes Ania, which as Vid points out, maintains a similar sound with Alice since they both start with the same letter (Vid, 2008: 223). The rest of the characters’ names change to Russian ones as well. William the Conqueror becomes Vladimir Monomakh, a Russian Grand Prince. As noted by Karlinsky, Pat and Bill speak “a Russian peasant dialect” and their names are Petka and Yaska (Karlinsky, 1970: 313).

The Queen of Hearts and King of Hearts remain the same in the translation. According to Vid, Nabokov used the Russian royal titles of “tsar” and “tsaritsa” as his domestication strategy would demand (Vid, 2008: 223). However, they have the same names, a choice that transmits “an air of foreign, non-Russian royalty” (Karlinsky, 1970: 313). In general, England becomes Russia and all units of measurement as well as food and forms of address are
substituted with their Russian equivalents. For example, miles turn to versts, pounds to rubles, pence to kopecks and tarts to pirozhiki.

Vid notes that the domestication strategy used by Nabokov makes it possible to read Alice “without the slightest suspicion that her image and her adventures were in fact spawned by an English model” (Vid, 2008: 223). Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland was the only children’s book translated by Nabokov. Having children in mind as the readers of his work, Nabokov’s translation of Alice “tended to achieve the same range functions as the original text” (Vid, 2008: 226). According to Karlinsky, Nabokov’s Ania is “remarkable for its beautifully caught and conveyed tone and diction of the original” (Karlinsky, 1970: 314).

The translators and scholars of Alice agree that there are parts of the book that it is challenging to be transferred in another language. The reason for that is that there are many Victorian references that may have no equivalent in the target language. The following example examines the translation choices on an Alice excerpt that is attached to the Victorian social etiquette and implies the proper behavior during tea-time. This is one of the several scenes/episodes identified as a prototypical scene where power display is prominent. In what follows this scene will be subjected to comparative analysis with the help of analytical categories from register analysis. This comparative analysis will highlight tendencies in the TTs selected as data for this thesis.

5.7 Victorian Table Manners and Social Etiquette: the Mad Tea-Party

Considering the above, Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland displays many characteristics, which anchor the book to the Victorian Era. Due to this feature, there are things in the book that are untranslatable. Perhaps some of these are more appropriate for adult literature. The following example is one of the most typical examples of Victorian era depicting tea parties, table manners, expectation about children’s behaviour and the relationship between adult and child. The excerpt indicates what is “civil” and what is not “civil” to do during tea-time or during a social interaction.

25 The examples are quoted from Vid (2008: 224).
In general, the Mad Tea-Party chapter is the most quoted section of Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland by critics and academics and perhaps the one that indicates and at the same time satirises the Victorian social etiquette and behaviour during tea-time. Weaver (1964), and Lindseth and Tannenbaum (2015) have chosen specific excerpts from this chapter to present in their works on Alice’s translations. All Victorian table manners are broken: The Dormouse is sleeping while the Hatter and the Hare rest their elbows on the table. Alice joins their table without prior invitation and similarly she leaves without having been given permission to leave. The chapter contains intense dialogues, aggressive behaviour and arguments between Alice and all three creatures sitting at the table, making her visit a “decidedly unpleasant experience” (Gubar, 2009: 118). This unpleasant experience begins from the first instance she approaches the table as the Mad-Hatter, the March Hare and the Dormouse shout at her that there is no room at their table the moment they see her:

**ST4:** The table was a large one, but the three were all crowded together at one corner of it. ‘No room! No room!’ they cried out when they saw Alice coming. ‘There's plenty of room!’ said Alice indignantly, and she sat down in a large armchair at one end of the table. ‘Have some wine,’ the March Hare said in an encouraging tone. Alice looked all round the table, but there was nothing on it but tea. ‘I don’t see any wine,’ she remarked. ‘There isn’t any,’ said the March Hare. ‘Then it wasn’t very civil of you to offer it,’ said Alice angrily. ‘It wasn’t very civil of you to sit down without being invited,’ said the March Hare. (Carroll, 2009: 60)

Despite the creatures’ ludicrous claim that there is no room at their table, Alice challenges their power to keep her away and sits with them. Then more instances of norm-defying behaviour towards her begin which also is not typical for the Victorian manners. The March Hare offers her some wine. However, there is no wine on the table and Alice with an offending tone says that it was not “very civil” for the Hare to offer it. The Hare does not miss the chance to return her insult by saying that it was not “very civil” form her side to sit down without an invitation. The insults continue from all three creatures towards Alice and vice versa until the end of the chapter when Alice finally decides to leave. According to Suchan, the Mad Tea-Chapter contains “the most subversive affront to Alice’s system of
aboveground values” (Suchan, 1978: 88). The whole chapter is a constant assault on Alice using personal remarks regarding her appearance, knowledge, and breaks hospitality social rules. Brandt notes that in this scene the conversation between Alice, the March Hare and the Mad Hatter can be described by words such as “rudeness”, “anger” and “disgust” (Brandt, 1994: 30). They see Alice as an intruder to their tea-party and their power demonstration begins from the first instant.

The Mad Tea-Party chapter is Carroll’s later addition to the book and it gives a more humorous tone to the story as the two characters introduced here for the first time, the March Hare and the Mad Hatter, are probably the funniest and most comical characters in the book. However, Elwyn-Jones and Gladstone suggest that since this part was added later “a discrete group of individuals may be hidden in the scene or a group outside Alice’s experience”, implying that since it was never narrated to Alice during the boat trip, it was probably conceived later, inspired by different people and situations (Elwyn-Jones and Gladstone, 1995: 121). Whether these references were realised from the Russian translators it is not known. The Russian translations of this part, which is bound to Victorian culture, are presented in the following sections.

5.7.1 TT4a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TT4a Anonymous (1879: 94)</th>
<th>Всѣ трое сидѣли кучкой на самой серединѣ длиннаго стола; но лишь только Соня подошла, и собралась сѣсть за стол, всѣ на нее накинулись, кричат: „прочь, прочь, мѣста нѣтъ!” „Извините, мѣста довольно, даже много лишняго!” отвѣчаеетъ Соня въ большомъ негодованіи, и усѣлась въ широкое кресло, на концѣ стола. „Не прикажите ли винца?” весьма учитво предложилъ ей заяцъ. Соня оглянула весь столъ: поданъ одинъ чай, а вина не видать. „Гдѣ же у васъ вино?” спрашиваетъ она. „Вина нѣтъ,” говоритъ заяцъ. „Очень нечитво съ вашей стороны предлагать чего нѣтъ“, съ сердцемъ говорить Соня. „А съ вашей стороны очень нечитво садиться за столъ безъ приглашенія“, отвѣчаеетъ заяцъ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Back</td>
<td>All three of them were sitting together in the middle of a long table; but as soon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
as Sonia approached and was about to sit at the table, all of them attacked, shouting: “Away, away, no room!”

“Excuse me, [there is] enough place, even a lot of spare!” answers Sonia in great indignation, and sat down in a wide armchair, at the end of the table.

“Would you like some wine?” The hare offered her quite courteously. Sonia glanced around the table: tea was served, but no wine.

“Where is your wine?” She asks.

“There is no wine,” says the hare.

“It's very impolite from your side to offer something that doesn’t exist,” Sonia says from her heart.

“And from your side, it's very impolite to sit at the table without invitation,” answers the hare.

---

It has been generally observed that in TTa there is a significant inclination from the translator to soften the characters’ behaviour towards Alice (and vice verca) or even to delete the scene when this is not feasible. In TT4a however, the general content and meaning of the example is preserved. The Mad Hatter, the March Hare and the Dormouse passionately declare that there is no room at their table for Alice and they encourage her to stay away (прочь, прочь, места нетъ). Alice, on the other hand, is more polite in this translation as she says “excuse me” (Извините) before she decides to sit. It can be said that, this is the appropriate behaviour for a well-brought up child. The pre-Soviet idea that children's literature should educate children and teach them good manners is reinforced in this example. Apart from Alice’s manners and apart from the insulting content of this dialogue both Alice and the Hare are talking to each other using the polite form of “you” which is second person plural social deixis (Sifianou, 1999). This is the norm-complying method of addressing people in Russian in a polite way. This norm is preserved throughout the translation signifying politeness, respect, social distance, courtesy or age gap depending each time on the participants of the dialogue.

In House’s terms, although the general content is the same, the lexical mismatches play an important role and change the tenor of the translation. The main lexical mismatches are on reporting verbs. All three creatures sitting around the table “attacked her shouting” (на нее накинулись, кричат) to go away as there is no room. The paralanguage expressed through
the reporting verbs signifies more tension and hostility from the creatures towards Alice. Despite their verbal attack, which is expressed more explicit than in the original, Alice still ignores them and joins their company.

### 5.7.2 TT4b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TT4b Olenich-Gnenenko (1958: 81-2)</th>
<th>Стол был очень велик, но все трое стеснились в одном углу его.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Нет места! Нет места! — закричали они, увидев подходившую Алису.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Здесь достаточно места! — с негодованием сказала Алиса и села в</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>большое кресло в конце стола.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Алиса взглянула на стол, но там не было ничего, кроме чая.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Я совсем не вижу вина, - заметила она.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Здесь и нет никакого вина, - сказал Мартовский Заяц.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- В таком случае, не очень вежливо с вашей стороны предлагать его! –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>возразила Алиса сердито.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Точно так же с твоей стороны не очень-то вежливо садиться без</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>приглашения, - заявил Мартовский Заяц.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Back Translation</th>
<th>The table was very large, but all three of them gathered in one corner of it.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No place! No place! - They cried out, seeing Alice approaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Here [there is] enough space! - said Alice with indignation, and sat in the big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>armchair at the end of the table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Would you like wine? – offered the March Hare in an encouraging tone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Alice looked at the table, but there was nothing there, apart from tea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- I don’t see any wine at all, - she noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There is no wine here, - Said the March Hare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In that case, it is not very polite from your side to offer! - objected Alice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>angrily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Indeed from your side it is not very polite to sit without invitation, - said the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March Hare.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 14**

In TT4b, the translator renders the text literally. The story proceeds as in the original. Alice approaches the tea-party and the Hatter, the Hare and the Dormouse shout at her that there is
no room (Нет места!). Alice ignores them and decides to sit down. The Hare offers her some wine that does not exist and the exchange of insults from both sides regarding whether it is polite to offer something that does not exist, or sit at a table where you are not invited, begin. However, the use of different reporting verbs intensifies the scene.

Such lexical mismatches conform to the social norms of the Soviet era that demand the adults to have the absolute power and the children to show respect and obedience. Moreover, Alice talks to the Hare using the second person plural saying that “it is not very polite from your side to offer something that does not exist” (не очень вежливо с вашей стороны предлагать его). However, the adult Hare answers to the child Alice that “from your side it is not very polite to sit without invitation” (с твоей стороны не очень-то вежливо садиться без приглашения) using the second person singular which sometimes may be used to show familiarity or intimacy, but in this case it demonstrates age hierarchy and adult power over the child-Alice. Therefore, the tenor changes as these lexical mismatches imply that the Hare greatly undervalues Alice and at the same time, the different reporting verbs intensify the dialogue. Alice still disobeys and challenges adult authority, but in a proper way, preserving the norms of addressing an adult by using the 2nd person of the personal pronoun “you”.

The illustration that accompanies this scene (featured below) is interesting in terms of power dynamics. More specifically, it depicts Alice and the three characters she interacts with but in terms of proxemics, there is ample space between her and the characters. This could be indicative of their social distance, and the power gap that underpins the scene. Also, ample space and the many cups of tea available, clash with what the three characters are claiming (lack of available space), rendering their statements incongruous (if not unfair towards Alice) on a visual level too. Moreover, except for the mouse, these characters are larger than Alice and they seem to discuss among themselves rather than with Alice, perhaps another sign of exclusion. Even if some of these features do not tally with the verbal elements of the story (number of cups, Wonderland characters exclusively speaking among themselves), they do capture the tenor of the text. More specifically, the angles and gazes represented do not include Alice, nor do they include the reader, who is more of an omniscient participant. However, the illustration may be inaccurate as it depicts Alice holding a hot cup of tea. Alice never had a tea at the Mad Tea-Party. In fact, this was one of the reasons along with insults and personal remarks that made her leave the Mad Tea-Party.
5.7.3 TT4c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TT4c</th>
<th>Yakhnin (1993: 56)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Стол был длинный-предлинный, а все сгрудились на самом кончике. Но, увидев Алису, тут же загалдели:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Чур, всё занято! Чур, мест нет!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Места сколько угодно, - сказала Алиса и плюхнулась в громадное кресло напротив них.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Какого вина желаете? – галантно осведомился Заяц.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Алиса оглядела стол, но ничего кроме чая да чайных чашек не увидела.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Какого вина? – удивилась Алиса.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- А никакого! – равнодушно ответил Заяц.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Невежливо предлагать то, чего нет, - надулась Алиса.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Невежливо садиться за стол, когда места нет! – хмыкнул Заяц.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The table was very, very big, but all of them were gathered at the tip (of the table). But when they saw Alice, all of them shouted: |
- Away, it’s occupied! Away, there is no room! |
- There is enough room - said Alice and flopped into the big armchair opposite them. |
- What wine would you like? - gallantly inquired the Hare. |
- What wine? - wondered Alice. |
- None! – indifferently answered the March Hare. |
- It’s not polite to offer what there isn’t, - sulked Alice.
- It’s not polite to sit at a table when there is no room! – hemmed the Hare.

Table 15

In TT4c, the translator is more descriptive and he uses a more informal vocabulary, which makes the creatures’ negative attitude towards Alice sound more comical. He uses the colloquial phrase длинный-предлинный (very, very long) in order to describe the table and emphasises to that there was plenty of space regardless the creatures claims that there is no room. The image of an extremely long table (as described by the translator) and three creatures sitting at the end of it (кончике) shouting that there is no space is a contrast that it is perhaps amusing for children. Moreover, the translator uses the diminutive form of the word “end” (конеч → кончик) perhaps to highlight the fact that there was indeed plenty of place at the table as it was very long (стол был длинный-предлинный) and the three creatures were taking little space at the end of it (а все сгрудились на самом кончике). This comical feature of the scene is also enhanced by the word “чур”, another colloquial expression that in this case means “away”. This is an old, colloquial children’s expression, which may express either the requirement to comply with the rules, especially in a game, or the desire to avoid anything unpleasant. By making these linguistic choices, the translator renders the scene in a more humorous way, bringing the text closer to Russian children’s understanding. In other words, the scene is more child-friendly, having many colloquial phrases, diminutive forms and entertaining contrasts.

Figure 13: Yakhnin (1993)
In the original, after the conversation between Alice and the Hare regarding the existence of wine and whether it should be offered since there is not any, Alice concludes that it is not “civil” to offer something that does not exist. The Hare’s answer is similarly that it is not “civil” of her to sit without being invited. In TT4c, the word civil becomes rude (невежливо) but the Hare’s justification is not that Alice was not invited. It insists that it is rude to sit somewhere when there is no room (невежливо садиться за стол, когда места нет!). Hare’s insistence that there is no room in a very long table makes him look naïve and makes the scene more comically incongruous.

In all three translations of the first scene of the Mad Tea-Party, the Mad Hatter, the March Hare and the Dormouse shout that there is no room for Alice to sit, showing that she is not welcome to their company. All three creatures demonstrate their power to her and similarly does Alice as she decides to ignore their prohibitions and take a seat. Honig notes that Alice is now more assertive. She may have entered the Duchess’ house with no invitation, but there was no one there to stop her. Now she becomes bolder and sits at the table regardless of the fact that she was asked not to (Honig, 1988: 81).

From this example onwards, Alice’s character progressively starts to change in the original and in some cases in the translations as well. She does not accept the insults and the threats and demonstrates the same attitude that the creatures have towards her.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, the most significant aspects contextualising *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* were presented. Due to Carroll’s personality and to Alice Liddell’s contribution to the creation of the story, many critical approaches emerged relating to the book’s historical and psychoanalytical references as well as its position within the list of children’s books. As already discussed, *Alice* belongs to the category of the ambivalent texts of children’s literature. It displays special linguistic features, violence and death references, identity issues and a constant anxiety and struggle related to power. The book also highlights the Victorian society norms and at the same time rejects them by presenting a girl who is acting in the opposite way to that in which a Victorian girl would; Alice is curious and enters a rabbit hole. On the one hand, Alice cries a lot, she is scared and displays her knowledge and her good
manners. On the other hand, she challenges anyone who insults her and she seems to be fearless.

All the references and unique characteristics of the book have made its translation a challenging activity. Translators from various linguistic backgrounds seem to face similar issues in their attempts to translate *Alice*. The puns, the verses, the wordplay, the paralinguistic features, as well as the references to Carroll’s personal incidents, and Victorian norms and the exchange between reality and imagination are usually lost in translation. This might occur either because there is no equivalence in the target language or because they are probably not realized by the translators, especially in the early translations of *Alice*. However, translations are closely related to the context in which they occur. The following chapter presents more Alice excerpts where power references dominate in the Wonderland creatures relationships.
Chapter 6

A Different Alice in Different Wonderlands

The previous chapters of this thesis have demonstrated the usefulness of the theoretical framework chosen for this study, the censorship application and the Victorian features of Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland by analysing relevant examples in each section. This chapter presents more examples that demonstrate how power relations in Wonderland were transferred across the three target texts. The examples presented in this section serve the purpose of the study best and they demonstrate specific patterns in translational behaviour and perhaps reveal evidence of manipulation and censorship. The scenes were chosen on the grounds of feasibility given the time, scope and resources available in the context of this study. As discussed in 1.5, the scenes demonstrated discourse-specific, plot-specific and criticism-specific features, which mean that they contain power references that contribute significantly to the plot and they have been subjected to previous criticism.

Wonderland is an adults’ world and these adults (disguised as quaint-looking creatures) “exercise their power through language” (Nikolajeva, 2010: 31). In this adult world, Alice struggles to “attain an adult-like identity and social acceptance” and tries to “balance the adult need for order and logic with the child’s need for uncontrolled, spontaneous play” (Suchan, 1978: 79). The adult-creatures frequently try to order Alice and impose their will, however, after many insults, she progressively starts to gain power, answers back and “removes their authority” (Manlove, 2003: 25). The order in which the examples are presented follows the order in which the incidents take place in the book as this is considered the best way to indicate the escalation of tension and power struggle observed in the dialogues among the characters.

6.1 Alice as a Servant

In chapter 4, Alice meets the White Rabbit again and has her first interaction with it. The White Rabbit appears “trotting slowly back again, and looking anxiously about as it went, as if it had lost something” (Carroll, 2009: 31). It had lost its fan and gloves and once again, was
anxious about being late for the meeting with the Duchess. At some point, it notices Alice and this time it talks to her:

Very soon the Rabbit noticed Alice, as she went hunting about, and called out to her in an angry tone, ‘Why, Mary Ann, what are you doing out there? Run home this moment and fetch me a pair of gloves and a fan! Quick, now!’ and Alice was so much frightened that she ran off at once in the direction it pointed to, without trying to explain the mistake it had made. ‘He took me for his housemaid,’ she said to herself as she ran. ‘How surprised he’ll be when he finds out who I am!’ (Carroll, 2009: 31).

The scene described above is the first time that the “neurotic” White Rabbit (Manlove, 2003: 25) talks to Alice. They have met several times before but the Rabbit seems to ignore her or, perhaps, it does not even notice she is there. This time it talks to her “in an angry tone”, calling her Mary Ann and asking her to run home to get its gloves and fan. Both of these items, the fan and the gloves are typical items for the upper/middle class in Victorian England. The name “Mary Ann” that the Rabbit uses is, according to Green (as quoted in Gardner), a British euphemism for a “servant girl” of that time (Gardner, 2001: 39). Therefore, the way the Rabbit calls Alice is reasonable considering the fact that it probably thought she was a maid.

Another comment by Gardner is that in many slang dictionaries there is also another meaning related to the name “Mary Ann” at that time. It was used to describe the “dressmaker’s dress stand” (Gardner, 2001: 40) which also might explain the fact that the Rabbit never noticed Alice before. It might have thought that Alice was not a real person. The Rabbit’s angry tone and order represent the way an upper/middle class individual would talk to a servant girl. Alice, as a Victorian girl, who is “certainly accustomed to orders from Mother, Father and even older siblings”, obeys the Rabbit’s order and acts “submissively” (Honig, 1988: 79). The Russian translations treat the proper names of the story in a different way. Some of them keep the original names and some alter them to names familiar and relevant to the Russian culture and implied reader.
### 6.1.1 TT5a

In TT5a, the White Rabbit (бѣленькій кроликъ) and Sonia meet again and it worries about his delay with the Queen of Hearts (червонная краля). As observed before, the names of the creatures of Wonderland are in small letters. Perhaps, they are not considered to be proper names of real people but rather descriptions of items and imaginary figures. However, the original Mary Ann is used as a proper name although it is replaced by a Russian name and it is in capital letters. The scene progresses as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TT5a</th>
<th>Anonymous (1879: 39)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soon the rabbit noticed Sonia and angrily shouted, “Матрона Ивановна, Матрена Ивановна! Run fast at home, bring gloves, and a fan; but quicker, quicker I’m telling you!” Sonia out of fear ran towards where the rabbit pointed out. “Let the rabbit think that I am Matriona Ivanovna; this must be its cook,” she says to herself. “It will be surprised, when it will find out that I’m not Matriona Ivanovna!”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 16

In TT5a, the White Rabbit calls Sonia, *Matriona Ivanovna* (Матрена Ивановна) instead of *Mary Ann*. This lexical mismatch is a typical, formal way to call someone in Russia, by using his/her first name followed by the patronymic26 (not the family/last name). In that case, Matriona is the first name and Ivanovna is the patronymic. The name Matriona is Latin in origin, Russian female name, which means “noble, respectable woman”27. However, it was connected with the lower class and as can be observed in the translation Sonia assumes that the Rabbit mistook her for its cook (это у него должно-быть кухарка).

---

26Patronymic is the father’s given name. The formal way to talk to someone in Russia is to call him/her by his/her first name followed by the patronymic, which is his/her, father’s name and it is different from the last/family name.

27The definition is taken from the Russian online dictionary Академик, which can be accessed here: http://dic.academic.ru/.
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However, the Rabbit maintains a formal way of talking to Sonia even if it thinks that she is its cook (lower class). It uses the second-person plural personal pronoun вы and talks to her using the formal plural form of verbs and pronouns: сбегайте, принесите, проворнее, говорить вамь. These forms are generally indicators of politeness and respect or they may indicate social distance; the latter explanation is more likely in this case, as paralinguistic shifts indicate: the Rabbit shouts at Sonia in an angry tone (сердито закричалъ). Sonia runs without a second thought in the direction the Rabbit points out. Despite the way of addressing, the Rabbit still asks for its gloves and fan. These too elements are symbols for the upper class not only in Victorian England, but for the 19th century Russian upper class as well.

6.1.2 TT5b

In TT5b, the scene progresses as in the original. Alice meets the White Rabbit and it is the first time, it talks to her despite the fact that it has taken her for someone else.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TT5b</th>
<th>Soon the Rabbit noticed Alice, who diligently sought his lost belongings and called out to her in an angry voice:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olenich-Gnenenko (1958: 50)</td>
<td>Вскоре Кролик заметил Алису, которая старательно искала потерянные им вещи, и окликнул ее сердитым голосом:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Эй, Мэри Анна, что ты здесь делаешь? Немедленно беги домой и захвати мне пару перчаток и веер! Ну, быстрее!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Алиса так испугалась, что тотчас побежала, куда указал Кролик, и не пробуя объяснить ему, что он ошибся.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Он принял меня за свою горничную, - сказала она себе, убегая. – Как удивился бы он, если бы увидел, кто я на самом деле!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28In Russian, as in many other languages, there is a distinction between the two forms of “you” – the singular and the plural. When refer to one person, the singular “you” - ты is used and any verbs that follow are also in singular form. When refer to more than one people or in cases that demand formality and perhaps respect, the use of the plural “you” – вы is indicated. Similarly, the verbs that follow are in the plural form.
where rabbit pointed out, without attempting to explain to him that he was wrong.

- He took me for his maid, she said to herself while running. – How surprised he will be if he sees who I am in fact!

Table 17

In TT5b, tenor has not changed. This translation is closer to the original text, as the whole passage, including the name Mary Ann, is rendered literally. This technique of literal translation has been noticed in the previous examples of Olenich-Gnenenko’s translations (1b, 2b) and it will be observed in the majority of the examples that follow. “Very soon the Rabbit noticed Alice” (Вскоре Кролик заметил Алису) who was looking for his gloves and fan and “called out to her in an angry tone” (окликнул ее сердитым голосом) to run home to get them. The translator uses the informal singular second-person form of you — ты, which is more direct and, on occasions, impolite. In this case, since the Rabbit is talking abruptly to Alice, it is probably not his intention to be polite. The Russian Alice “was so frightened” (Алиса так испугалась), as in the original, that she followed the Rabbit’s orders without even trying to explain to it that her name was not Mary Ann (Мэри Анна). The two excerpts (Carroll’s original and Olenich-Gnenenko’s translation) are identical. The translator renders the scene word for word. This technique is effective here. However, there are parts where the literal translation technique he uses does not make any sense for Russian readers.

6.1.3 TT5c

Similarly as in the original and the two translations discussed above, the story progresses as in the original. The White Rabbit meets Alice and it orders her to get its gloves and fan.

| TT5c Yakhnin (1993: 30) | Эй, мильчка! А ты почему здесь околачиваешься? Быстро, мильчка, домой за веером и перчатками. Одна нога здесь, другая — там!
Алиса хотела объяснить, что зовут ей вовсе не Милочка, но неожиданно для себя бросилась исполнять приказание Кролика.
«Верно, он меня принял за служанку, - думала она на бегу. – Представляю его смущение, когда он узнает, кто я на самом деле [...]» |
| Back Translation | Eh, dear! Why are you wandering around here? Quick dear go home to get me my fan and my gloves. One foot here, one there!
Alice wanted to explain that her name is not at all Milochka, but unexpectedly |
In TT5c, there are textual and lexical mismatches, which alter the tenor as well. The Rabbit calls Alice “милочка” (dear). The word is written with small letters and it is the diminutive form of the word “милая” which means “nice”, “sweet”. This word is also used as a term of endearment for a woman one is familiar with. It is used in informal oral discourse with one of the following meanings: “dear”, “sweetheart”, “darling”. Using this word and a different tone, instead of the “angry tone” used in the original, it can be said that the Rabbit asks Alice for a favour. This is not an order, but perhaps a pleading. The Rabbit talks in a sweeter and maybe funny tone as it is asking her to hurry using the expression “one leg here, the other there” (одна нога здесь, другая – там!), as if she needs instructions on how to walk.

On the other hand, Alice thinks that the Rabbit mistook her for his maid whose name is Milochka. This is why the word Milochka is written in capital letters the second time, because it is used as a proper name. Milochka is the diminutive form of Mila, which in turns is the diminutive form of Ludmila (Мила – Милочка - Людмила). The translator here adds an extra pun with the word милочка as a term of address and Милочка as a proper name. This is one more instance in TT5c where the translator enriches the text with his own puns and wordplay.

In Rabbit’s encouragement to Alice to bring its fan and gloves, the translator uses the informal singular second-person form of you – ты. In this case, this informal way of talking is not rude. The Rabbit is more direct and perhaps more intimate to Alice rather than impolite. This is probably why, in this excerpt, Alice does not seem to be “so frightened”, as she is in the original, in TT5a (Соня съ испуга…) and in TT5b (Алиса так испугалась…). She is not scared at all and she even wishes to explain to the Rabbit that her name is not Milochka. However, she quickly runs to execute the order and she thinks that the Rabbit will be embarrassed when it realises who she is (представляю его смущение, когда он узнает, кто я на самом деле). This statement demonstrates Alice’s confidence about herself since she believes that the Rabbit will be embarrassed when it realises the mistake.
In general, in this excerpt, different characteristics are observed for both Alice and the White Rabbit from the ones displayed in the original. The White Rabbit does not seem to be as stressed it appears to be in the original text, as well as in TT3a and TT3b and it does not talk to Alice in an angry tone. Despite the fact that its tone is not recorded here, it can be said that it talks with a calm voice as it calls Alice “dear” twice and simply asks her to go home and bring its gloves and fan. In general, as will be observed in the examples following, the White Rabbit displays a more timid personality in this translation than in the original.

Alice is presented slightly differently as well. She is not frightened, which is proof that the Rabbit is not aggressive with her and she even wants to explain to the White Rabbit its mistake, that her name is not “Dear” (милочка). However, Alice, “unexpectedly for her she rushed to execute the Rabbit’s order” (но неожиданно для себя бросилась исполнять приказание). Using the word “unexpectedly” (непредвидительно) here the translator possibly implies that Alice is a person who (always) defends herself and in this case she does not because she had no time. This is a feature of Alice not identified in the original text as she is constantly running away because of fear or humiliation.

To sum up, on tenor, the social role relationship is different in TT3a and TT3c. More specifically, in TT3a the use of the second person of “you” indicates a high level of formality and social distance between Alice and the Rabbit. TT3b is a literal translation and the tenor remains the same. Finally, in TT3c the lexical and textual mismatches present the characters with different features than in the original. The Rabbit is more friendly towards Alice and its initial order is presented here as a polite request in a friendly atmosphere, which does not frighten Alice. Perhaps this example describes best the differences between the three translations and the original, namely, a transition from high formality, to an accepted level of formality, then to a dilution of formality features. A similar tendency in the character’s behaviour will be identified to the examples to follow.

6.2 Much Pleasanter at Home

When Alice meets the Rabbit, it ordered her to go home and get its gloves and fan. In this scene, Alice is now in the house, where, after drinking the content of a little bottle, she finds herself transformed into an extremely large Alice. She has her “arm out of the window, and one foot up the chimney” and worries what will happen if she grows more (Carroll, 2009:...
At some point, Alice stopped growing but due to her size and the position of her body, she was “uncomfortable” and certainly “unhappy”, as it can be observed in Figure 14. While trapped in the house and being unable to move, Alice expresses her indignation regarding all the changes she had been through during her journey in Wonderland:

‘It was much pleasanter at home’ thought poor Alice, ‘when one wasn’t always growing larger and smaller, and being ordered about by mice and rabbits. I almost wish I hadn’t gone down that rabbit-hole—and yet—and yet—it’s rather curious, you know, this sort of life! I do wonder what can have happened to me! When I used to read fairy tales, I fancied that kind of thing never happened, and now here I am in the middle of one!’ (Carroll, 2009: 33)

In her Wonderland experience, Alice changes sizes often and she is obliged to follow orders of any creature she meets. After many instances of violent behaviour and power demonstration Alice is now trapped in White Rabbit’s house unable to move due to her size. Being in this situation, Alice appreciates and misses her home where her body did not change and she was not receiving order from animals. Even her life is threatened, as the Rabbit suggests, “we must burn the house down” (Carroll, 2009: 36). The issue of power is stated here by Alice herself. The mice and rabbits (as well as the rest of the creatures) are constantly telling her what to do and where to go. Perhaps these creatures are the adults in Alice’s real life who order the child-Alice to behave in a certain way. They may represent parents or teachers who interact with the child on a daily basis and impose their rules.
6.2.1 TT6a

Similarly, in TT6a Sonia drinks the content of the bottle and she starts growing. After she reaches her final size, she also finds herself at an “extremely unpleasant and awkward” position (положение ея было крайне неприятное и неловкое). In the original text, at this point Alice recalls her home and how “much pleasanter” it was there where animals did not tell her what to do. Here Alice’s monologue is omitted. Sonia is not complaining, she does not miss her home and she does not regret having fallen into the rabbit hole. After drinking the content of the bottle and after growing big, the translation subsequently focuses on the next event that brings the plot forward, namely, the Rabbit’s voice looking for Matriona Ivanovna and its gloves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TT6a Anonymous (1879)</th>
<th>[This segment is omitted in the Russian translation.]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sonia пріуныла. Долго ли, нъть ли лежала Соня, только вдругъ слышить она издали чей-то голосъ, прислушивается: „Матрена Иванова, а Матрена Ивановна, куда вы пропали? что не несете перчатки?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Back Translation | Sonia was depressed. Sonia was lying for a long time, when she suddenly heard someone’s voice: “Matriona Ivanova, and Matriona Ivanovna, where did you go? Why you are not bringing the gloves?” |

Table 19

Perhaps, the part in which Alice expresses her indignation and complaints about Wonderland is only summarised in two words: Соня пріуныла (Sonia was depressed). This textual mismatch changes the tenor. Perhaps, the whole scene is deleted in order for the fairy tale reference to be avoided. Alice in the original says that she feels that she is in a middle of a fairy tale considering everything that has happened to her since she followed the White Rabbit. However, fairy tales in the pre-Soviet era were banned due to their unreal content that might confuse the child.

Another possible reason for this deletions may be the fact that maybe Sonia does not misses her home and does not feel bad for the way the Wonderland creatures treat her. In this translation, many violent and inappropriate scenes for children are deleted. In this Wonderland Alice is not always scared or threatened. The adults here are not demanding and occasionally they are polite, simply asking for things instead of ordering abruptly. Therefore,
she has no reason to complain. Also, elements of despondency and hopelessness are undermined and the plot moves towards a happy ending.

6.2.2 TT6b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TT6b Olenich-Gnenenko (1958: 52)</th>
<th>Гораздо спокойнее было дома, - размышляла бедная Алиса. – Там никто постоянно не рос и не уменьшался и не получал приказаний от мышей и кроликов! Я почти жалею, что отправилась вниз по кроличьей норе, - и все же какой это изумительный образ жизни! Я хотела бы знать, что могло приключиться со мной? Читая волшебные сказки, я воображала, что все там выдумано, а теперь я сама – главное лицо одной из них!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Back Translation</td>
<td>“It was much calmer at home – thought poor Alice. – There no one ever grew or shrunk and received orders from mice and rabbits! I almost regret that I went down the rabbit hole - and yet what an amazing way of life! I would like to know what could happen to me? Reading fairy tales, I imagined that everything there was invented, and now me – I am the main character in one of them!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20

In TT6b there is a similar tendency to the trends identified above, namely, the translation is closer to the original text. There is one lexical mismatch, as the translator here uses the word “calmer” (спокойнее) instead of Carroll’s “pleasanter” to describe Alice’s home. Perhaps he wants to stress the tension with the Wonderland creatures, as Alice is not used to so many figures talking, ordering and arguing with her. Similarly, fairy tales were banned in different periods of the Soviet era as well. Surprisingly, the reference to fairy tales (волшебные сказки) is not omitted here. The illustration accompanies the text is the following:

Figure 15
The visuals accompanying this scene do, however, constitute a marked shift in tenor. The long-shot scene showing the house offers readers the opportunity to survey the physical setting as omniscient observers. Alice's face or body is not visible, so readers are not as involved in this instance. Only Alice's hand can be seen, protruding from a window. In some sense, this image is the reverse of the ST visuals (where the only body part we cannot see is her hand). Rather than looking inside Alice's psyche here, readers observe (and only partially participate in) the absurdity of what has happened to her. At the same time, and crucially from a tenor perspective, despite such a distancing technique, Alice's feeling of claustrophobia is conveyed through her extended hand, perhaps a kinetic indication of asking for help; confined space may also stand for imprisonment and helplessness.

Animal characters are also present. They are much smaller in size and are presented in a composition that is representative of the fairy tale description. They are roughly sketched which is in contrast with the details outlined on Alice's face in the source text visuals. Perhaps this is an indication of their nature as abstractions here. Moreover, there are different types of them presented here. Some are very anthropomorphic because of the way they dress or because of the object they carry. Therefore, the illustrations of this translation contribute more to the change of tenor than the text itself.

6.2.3 TTбс

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TTбс</th>
<th>Yakhnin (1993: 32)</th>
<th>Как хорошо было дома, - горевала бедная Алиса, - там не приходилось расти туда-сюда и места было достаточно, а кролики и мыши зная своё место. Нужно же было мне сунуться в кроличью нору! И всё же, и всё же... В этом что-то есть. Я думала, что такое случается только в сказках. И вот пожалуйста, такое случилось со мной!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Back Translation</td>
<td>How nice was at home, mourned poor Alice, - there you didn’t grow back and forth and the space was sufficient and rabbits and mice knew their place. I had to go to the rabbit hole! And yet, and yet ... There is something in this. I thought that these [things] happen only in fairy tales. And here we are it happened to me!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21
In TT6c, the power reference remains in the Russian text as observed in TT6b as well. However, lexical mismatches intensify Alice’s reaction to the Wonderland creatures’ mistreatment. The translator here uses the reporting verb “mourn” (горевать) to describe in a more explicit way the way Alice’s feelings about everything she has suffered so far. She is indignant and tired about this behaviour and mourns the situation she experiences. Moreover, she says that back home the mice and the rabbits “knew their place” (знали своё место). With this statement it seems that Alice depreciates the mice, the rabbits and generally all the Wonderland creatures. She suggests that the animals belong to a different, lower class than she does. By changing the reporting verb, the translator uses a narrative technique that encourages his readers to feel more empathy for Alice and therefore guides the readers to his own interpretations of the events taking place in the story.

The visuals of this version are highly interesting from this perspective. As in the second translation, the scene allows readers to observe as omniscient observers. Readers can reconstruct cause and effect as there is a sequence of two panels instead of one. First, Alice enters the house, with Rabbit as an onlooker; then, she seems to be trapped/imprisoned. Only her eyes, as windows to her psyche, can be seen through the first-floor windows. Again, there is a feeling of claustrophobia, but this is somehow softened by the fairy tale, if not comical, mise-en-scène and type of drawing, where light, soft colours prevail. In conjunction with the verbal elements, Alice's eyes convey her perspective as a discerning observer, including her view on human-animal hierarchies. Inclusive of these hierarchies and perhaps further dilution of the claustrophobic feelings is the assortment of other characters and objects. Trees, a clock half-buried in the ground, a character popping from behind the house and looking at the reader, another character being at the foreground directing its gaze towards Alice, all divide reader attention. Interpersonal relations in this set of visuals indicate a tenor shift. Alice is at the centre of attention, as a discerning observer and animals become part of the backdrop.
To sum up, the tenor has changed completely in TT4a as the scene examined is deleted by the translator. In TT4b and TT4c, the lexical mismatches identified change the tenor in terms of intensity. In TT4b, Alice expresses her complaint about the circumstances she experiences so far and compares Wonderland with her home where things were calmer and more peaceful. In a similar way, the translator of TT4c also stresses Alice’s discontent with her Wonderland life, more explicitly than in Carroll’s text, using the word “mourn” as a reporting verb for Alice’s words. The shifts in tenor are also identified in TTs illustrations. In TTa, Tenniel’s illustrations are used throughout the book. However, this illustration is deleted along with Sonia’s homesickness. Regarding TTb and TTc, Alice’s face expression and body position are not visible in none of the visuals. Only her hand (TTb) and foot (TTc) can be seen and the implied reader is observing all these from a distance. In Figure 17 Alice also becomes an observer looking at Wonderland creatures and perhaps seeking for help.

### 6.3 The Dormouse’s Story

The Dormouse recounts its story about the three little sisters living at the bottom of well. That story brings many questions to Alice’s mind, as her way of thinking is different from the Wonderland creatures’. One of the questions she asks is the following, which leads to another verbal assault from all the Tea-Party animals:
ST7: ‘Why did they live at the bottom of a well?’

The Dormouse again took a minute or two to think about it, and then said, ‘It was a treacle-well.’

‘There’s no such thing!’ Alice was beginning very angrily, but the Hatter and the March Hare went ‘Sh! sh!’ and the Dormouse sulkily remarked, ‘If you can’t be civil, you’d better finish the story yourself’

‘No, please go on!’ Alice said. ‘I won’t interrupt again. I dare say there may be one.’ (Carroll, 2009: 66)

Alice uses her common sense and tries to express her opinion saying angrily to the Dormouse that there is no such thing. However, the Mad Hatter and the March Hare try to “silence her to obedience” (Ren, 2015: 1661). And, after being told off one more time for not being “civil”, Alice takes her words back, she begs the Dormouse to go on and promises not to interrupt again. She changes her mind and admits that there might be one treacle-well. Perhaps she wants to please the adults who indicate to her the proper behaviour in a child – not to talk.

6.3.1 TT7a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TT7a</th>
<th>Anonymous (1879: 103)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I really do not understand what you are saying? This fairy tale is not similar to anything else!”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Since you would not listen,” Ilyushka said. “Do you want more tea!”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22

In TT7a, once again the textual and lexical mismatches change the social role relationship as well as the social attitude of the characters interacting and of the addressee. However, from this episode it can be observed that Sonia’s Tsardom is linked to a more peaceful Wonderland. The Mad Hatter and the March Hare do not attempt to silence her and therefore, the “Sh!” and “if you can’t be civil” comments are omitted. The Hatter uses the
formal way of address (second-person plural personal pronoun) and he only concludes with a gentle remark that she does not listen.

6.3.2 TT7b

| TT7b Olenich-Gnenenko (1958: 89) | - Но почему они жили на дне колодца?
|                              | Соня опять принялась думать минуту или две и потом сказала:
|                              | - Это был паточный колодец.
|                              | - Такого не бывает... - начала Алиса очень сердито.
|                              | - Но Шляпочник и Мартовский Заяц зашикали на нее:
|                              | - Ш-ш!
|                              | А Соня обиженно заметила:
|                              | - Если ты не можешь быть вежливой, то лучше тогда доскажи сказку сама.
|                              | - Нет, пожалуйста, продолжайте, сказала Алиса просительно. - Я больше не буду вас прерывать. Я допускаю, что о д и н такой колодец мог быть.

| Back Translation | - But why did they live at the bottom of the well?
|                  | The Dormouse again started to think for a minute or two and then said:
|                  | - It was a treacle well.
|                  | "This does not exist ..." began Alice very angrily.
|                  | "But the Hatter and the March Hare hissed at her
|                  | - Sh!
|                  | And the Dormouse offended noted:
|                  | - If you cannot be polite, then you better tell the tale yourself.
|                  | "No, please, go on, said Alice said Alice pleading. "I will not interrupt you again." I admit that there could be such a well.

Table 23

TTb in general, tends to imitate Carroll’s style and the translation is in the majority of cases, literal. Carroll uses italics quite frequently in his text; they are used for emphasis or, in Mango’s words, Carroll uses italics for “intonational stress, a use which makes for great economy of phrasing” (Mango, 1077: 78). In 7b, which once again is a literal translation of Carroll’s text, the translator imitates Carroll’s technique of emphasising words. He emphasises the same word as Carroll does – one (о д и н), however, he does not use italics,
but spaced out lettering. Despite the different way of stressing the word, the translator produces the same result as in the original.

### 6.3.3 TT7c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TT7c</th>
<th>Yakhnin (1993:61)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Простите, вы мне не ответили, почему они жили на дне?</td>
<td>- Excuse me, you did not answer me, why they lived on the bottom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ненравится на дне, пускай будет - на утре, - хмыкнула Соня.</td>
<td>- &quot;You don’t like the day [bottom], let it be in the morning,&quot; snorted the Dormouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- На утре колодца? - перепросила Алиса. - Это чепуха.</td>
<td>- In the morning of the well? – asked again Alice. - This is nonsense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Защ и Котелок зашикали на неё, а Соня тут же надулась и сказала:</td>
<td>The Hare and the Bowler hissed at her, and the Dormouse immediately swelled and said:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Не умеешь слушать, так сама рассказывай!</td>
<td>- You do not know how to listen, so tell [the story] yourself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Нет, нет, пожалуйста, продолжайте. Я, честное слово, больше не перебью. Пусть хоть на утре, хоть на вечере колодца живут.</td>
<td>&quot;No, no, please continue.&quot; I, honestly, will not interrupt anymore. Let it be in the morning, even in the evening of the well where they live.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 24 |

In TT7c, the expression of power demonstration remains almost the same through the Hatter and the Hare’s attempts to make Alice be quiet and the Dormouse’s remark that she does not listen. This remark is still strict but not as insulting as in the original. However, in this scene there is one more inventive addition from the translator which causes confusion and miscommunication between Alice and the Dormouse. In the original, Carroll plays with the meanings of the word “well” as follows:

‘But they were in the well,’ Alice said to the Dourmouse, not choosing to notice this last remark.

‘Of course they were,’ said the Dormouse; ‘- well in.’ (Carroll, 2009: 66)

The translator attempts to imitate Carroll’s word play. He creates his own word play with the words “дно” (bottom) and “день” (day). These two words have a similar conjugation, with one of their forms becoming “дня”. This is where the confusion and miscommunication begins, as Alice is talking about where the story takes place, where the girls from
Dormouse’s story lived – in the bottom of the well (они жили на дне). At the same time, the Dormouse is talking about the time when the story takes place, which might be either during the day or even in the evening. It says to her that if she does not like the day, the story can take place in the early morning or even at night (ненравится на дне, пусть будет - на утре). Perhaps, with this word play, the translators wishes to replace Carroll’s word play with the two meaning of the word “well”, in order to enhance the miscommunication between Alice and the creatures.

In general, in this example it can be observed once again that in TTa, the characters treat Alice in a more respectful way without using direct insults and personal remarks. TTb is translated literally in most of cases in this example; even the word “one” that Carroll has put in italics in his original text is emphasised by the translator. Finally, in TTc, the translator makes his own addition to the text by creating a word play with the words “дно” (bottom) and “день” (day) that they both become “дня” when declined.

6.4 Alice and the Hatter

At the end of chapter VI, Alice was warned by the Cheshire Cat that the Hatter and the Hare “they’re both mad” (Carroll, 2009: 57). According to Hunt, the expression “mad as a Hatter” is probably used due to the fact that “mercurous nitrate, used in hat-making, produced chorea and other neurological effects” to the hat makers making them behave in an awkward way (Carroll, 2009: 267). This is why Carroll named this character Mad Hatter, because indeed he demonstrates an awkward and unstable behaviour.

Another scenario regarding Carroll’s Hatter is the one by Gardner (Carroll, 2000: 133) that this character was based on a real person living at Oxford at that time. His name was Theophilus Carter and he was known in the area as the Mad Hatter because of the top hat he was always wearing or because of his eccentric ideas. He invented the Alarm Clock Bed, which “tipped its occupant out” (Carroll, 2009: 267). Perhaps due to the alarm clock bed the Hatter in Carroll’s story is always “so concerned with time” and he always wakes up the sleepy dormouse. Apart from that, there are also many furniture references in the chapter (tables, armchairs, writing desk), which may signify the connection of this Hatter with the real person.
Alice and the Mad Hatter have been on an argument since the beginning of the Mad Tea-Party chapter. They are exchanging insulting comments and personal remarks from the beginning when the Hatter along with the other three shouted at her “No room!”, while their table was almost empty. The next insult to follow was when the Hatter said to Alice: “your hair needs cutting” and Alice said that this is rude (Carroll, 2009: 60). Then the unsolved riddle “why is a raven like a writing desk” followed that confused Alice even more. An even more confusing conversation regarding time followed and then the Dormouse started his story telling. After trying to find words starting with M (mouse-traps, and the moon, and memory, and muchness), on the Dormouse’s question “did you ever see such a thing as a drawing of muchness!” (Carroll, 2009: 67), Alice seems to be more confused than ever:

**ST8:** ‘Really, now you ask me,’ said Alice, very much confused, ‘I don't think -‘

‘Then you shouldn't talk,’ said the Hatter.

This piece of rudeness was more than Alice could bear: she got up in great disgust, and walked off; (Carroll, 2009: 67)

In her attempt to explain what confused her regarding Dormouse’s question about “muchness”, Alice is interrupted by the Hatter with an aggressive and humiliating comment:
“then you shouldn't talk”. Despite the fact that the Mad Tea-Party chapter is full of personal, insulting remarks from all the creatures towards Alice, the one by Hatter appears to be the most annoying for Alice that makes her leave the table. However, the adult-creatures of Wonderland remain at the table do not even notice that Alice is leaving. They were probably happy “to get rid of a child with many questions” (Ren, 2015: 1661).

6.4.1 TT8a

The chapter title in this translation is Crazy Conversation (Шальная Бесѣда) which in a way summarises the content of the chapter. The conversations taking place do not make sense and perhaps is hard for the translator to place it in the Russian context. Indeed the whole chapter is a conversation without any coherence. Perhaps, this is why the awkward and incoherent turn-taking is deleted. The chapter demonstrates the Victoria social etiquette and table manners during tea-time (see 5.7). However, in the translation many differences are identified. First of all, the table where the tea party takes place is not “under a tree in front of the house” (Carroll, 2009: 60). It is in the house, and therefore, Sonia enters the room where a long table is in the middle (Соня вошла въ комнату; вилить – по срединѣ стоитъ накрытый, длинный столъ). Alice is not welcome as everyone shouts that there is no room (прочь, прочь, мѣста нетъ). Personal remarks about Alice’s hair also take place in this translation. More specifically, the Hatter says to Sonia:

„А вамъ, Гнѣденькая, не мѣшало бы подстричь гривку“

Back Translation: And you, Gnedenkaya, you won’t bother to cut your mane?

In this excerpt the Hatter is more insulting to Sonia than in the original. He calls her “Gnedenkaya”, a word that probably comes from the word “гнедко”, which is used to describe dark horses with black tail and black mane. It is a nickname for horses used in literature. As noted by Victor Fet29, this translation contains many “unidentified literary markers” that may be “internal jokes” within the translator’s social and professional

29 His article can be accessed here: http://litbook.ru/article/10031/
The word “Gnedenkaya” is introduced in Leo Tolstoi’s short story Метель (The Snowstorm) published in 1956. On one hand, this influence by literary norms of the time makes the text familiar to the implied reader. On the other hand, the Hatter refers to Alice with using a horse reference and asks her to cut her mane, a characterisation, which is certainly more insulting than the one in the original. However, Sonia does defend herself using equally dismissive statement:

„Во-первыхъ, я не Гнѣденькая, и такихъ именъ не бываетъ, во вторыхъ, вамъ нѣть дѣла до моихъ волосъ; а въ третьихъ, очень неучтиво дѣлать замѣчанія прямо въ лицо!“ строго обратилась къ нему Соня.

(Back Translation: “First, I am not Gnedenkaya and such name doesn’t exist, second my hair is not your business; and third it’s very impolite to make remarks straight on somebody’s face!” strictly said to him Sonia)

Alice here deflects all comments. The above dialogue is perhaps the only instance that the translator makes creative interventions in the story. After this part, the conversation continues with the raven riddle, which becomes: “а скажите-ка, какая разница между чаемъ и чайкой?” (what is the difference between tea and seagull). This riddle replaces the original one as the words tea (чай) and seagull (чайка) sound similar in Russian. The conversation about Time follows, but the “twinkle-twinkle little bat” verse is omitted. The Dormouse’s story is much shorter than in the original as the words starting with M part is also omitted. When the Dormouse finishes its story, the following conversation between Sonia and the Hatter takes place, which brings the chapter to a conclusion earlier than in the original.

| TT8a Anonymous (1879: 105) | „Я право не понимаю, что вы такое говорите? Это выходит сказка совсѣмъ ни на что не похожая!“
| | „Такъ вы бы не слушали“, напустился на нее Илюшка. „Хотите еще чайо!“
| | „Еще!“ обиженно огрызлась Соня. „Довольно странно предлагать еще, когда я еще не пила“! |

30 This is the excerpt from Tolstoi’s short story The Snowstorm (1856): “- Жив, братцы! - сказал Игнашка и снова побежал вперед, и мы снова ехали, и даже так скоро, что маленькая гнеденькая пристяжная в моей тройке, беспрестанно постегиваемая в хвост, не раз попрыгивала невольным галопцем.”
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“Я и спрашиваю васъ – все ли еще хотите чаю?”
Соня разобидилась, вышла изо стола и пошла къ двери. Мишенька тотчась заснул, а тѣ двое не обратили на нее никакого вниманія.

**Table 25**

The excerpt presented in Table 25 is not equivalent to the source text. This dialogue takes place earlier in the original story, but here due to the many deletions it appears before the end of the chapter. The Dormouse story is shorter here and after it is over Sonia admits that she did not understand. The Hatter comment here is not as harsh as the original. He just notes that she was not listening and immediately asks her if she wants more tea. Sonia is not offended by his comment regarding her paying attention but because she is offered more tea when she did not have any at all. Despite the fact that she had more reasons to feel offended and leave the table earlier in the story, see decided to leave now because she was offered more tea. The Hatter’s insulting remark “then you shouldn't talk” and his attempt to silent her are omitted but the part when he uses horse names for her is enough to make her leave the table.

Sonia is “greatly offended” (разобидилась) when she is offered more tea despite the fact that she did not have any before. Sonia’s departure is introduced earlier and for different reasons. Perhaps, through this shift the translator avoids exposing the creatures’ cruelty towards Alice who is a child in an unknown, adult world. There is a dialogue between Alice and the Hatter, which upsets her and makes her leave, but the Hatter does not use offensive remarks about her appearance or her manners (as according to him Alice is sitting with them uninvited). Moreover, during their conversation the Hatter still uses the second-person plural form of “you” - васъ, maintaining conversation on a formal level.
6.4.2 TT8b

In TTb, this chapter has the title *Crazy tea party* (Безумное чаепитие). The story progresses as in the original without any additions or deletions from the translators. After the Dormouse’s story and the words starting with M, Alice is confused and tries to explain what she did not understand. The translation is literal and the Hatter’s comment that outrages Alice is preserved.

| TT8b  | - Раз вы спрашиваете меня, — сказала Алиса, очень сконфуженная, — действительно, я не думаю… |
| Olenich-Gnenenko (1958: 90) | - Тогда ты не должна и говорить, — сказал Шляпочник. Такой неслыханной грубости Алиса не могла вынести. Она с величайшим отвращением встала и пошла прочь. |
| Back Translation | - Since you ask me, - said Alice, very much confused, - really, I do not think … |
|  | - Then you shouldn’t talk, - said the Hatter. |
|  | This unheard rudeness Alice could not stand. She with the greatest aversion stood up and walked away. |

*Table 26*

Despite the fact that, in TT8b, the translation is quite similar to the original text, the translator is more explicit in his use of adjectives describing Alice’s feelings. The Hatter forbids Alice to speak (тогда ты не должна и говорить) and Alice not being able to stand this “unheard rudeness” (неслыханной грубости), stands up and leaves the table with “the greatest aversion” (свеличайшим от вращением). Using an exaggeration and the superlative form of adjectives, the translator places more emphasis on the level of offence taken. As a result, it raises the levels of suspense in a more intense way. In this excerpt, the adult Hatter exerts his power over Alice, a child, by asking her to stop talking. This segment serves the norms of the Soviet context that demanded thought-control and repression of speech and perhaps the implied reader is familiar with such attitudes. However, Alice’s reaction to leave the table may be rebellious for the Soviet rules of how a child should behave.

6.4.3 TT8c

| TT8c | - Не встревай! – оборвал Алису Котелок. |
6.5 Off with their Heads

As described in Graner, Wonderland is “a matriarchal society, ruled by a vicious insane Queen”, who threatens executions of “nearly everyone she encounters”. After threatening Alice during their first interaction, she now threatens the card-gardeners and more threats will follow. However, her orders are never executed as “she is easily duped” (Graner, 2014: 254).

In the following scene, the Queen interrogates the three card-soldiers painting the roses from white to red. However, their answers are not convincing and she orders their execution. The soldiers run to Alice for protection. Alice previously displayed courage when the Queen ordered her execution and her answer to the Queen was that this is “nonsense” (see 2.7). Alice questioned the Queen’s power once and now she does it again by hiding the three soldiers into the flower-pot.

ST9: ‘I see!’ said the Queen, who had meanwhile been examining the roses. ‘Off with their heads!’ and the procession moved on, three of the soldiers remaining behind to execute the unfortunate gardeners, who ran to Alice for protection.

‘You sha’n’t be beheaded’ said Alice, and she put them into a large flower-pot that stood near. The three soldiers wandered about for a minute or two, looking for them, and then quietly marched off after the others.
“Are their heads off?” shouted the Queen.

“Their heads are gone, if it please your Majesty!” the soldiers shouted in reply.

“That’s right!” shouted the Queen. “Can you play croquet?” (Carroll, 2009: 72)

The gardeners run to Alice for protection. Since she rejected the Queen’s authority, she became a hero, a protector. The rest of the soldiers that stay behind to look for the gardeners also attempt to trick the Queen by lying to her that her order has been executed and the gardeners’ heads are off. Perhaps, they feel braver as well having Alice around that she may protect them as well against the Queen. The Russian translations are presented in the following sections.

6.5.1 TT9a

Similarly as in the original, the procession with the King and the Queen of Hearts arrived at the scene where the gardeners were painting the roses. The Queen interrogated the gardeners and she was not happy with their answers. However, the scene develops in a different way than in the original as can be observed in Table 28.

| TT9a Anonymous (1879: 118-21) | “Вижу, вижу, вы изволили постараться“, передразнила ее червонная краля, осматривая кустъ и погрозила кулакомъ. Шествіе двинулось впередъ. Отстало отъ него лишь трое солдатъ, чтобы исполнить приговоръ надъ бѣдными садовниками, которые бросились к Сонѣ, умоляя защитить ихъ. „Не бойтесь, останетесь цѣлы“, сказала имъ Соня; взяла и сунула всѣх троихъ въ цвѣточный горшокъ. Солдаты поискали, поискали и, недоискавшись ихъ, преспокойно отправились себѣ назадъ. „Умѣешь ты играть въ крокетъ?” вдругъ крикнула краля.
|
| Back Translation | “I see, I see, you wanted to try,” mocked, the queen of hearts, examining the bush and shaking her fist. The procession moved forward. Only three soldiers stayed to execute the verdict for the poor gardeners who rushed to Sonia, begging [her] to protect them. “Do not be afraid, you will remain intact,” Sonia said to them, took and shoved
all three of them into a flower pot.
The soldiers searched, searched and having missed them, calmly went back.
“Can you play croquet?” suddenly cried the queen.

In TT9a, the Queen of Hearts displays a completely different linguistic and paralinguistic behaviour and, therefore, the tenor is different. First, the Queen after examining the roses, she “mocked” (передразила) the gardeners for their attempt to correct their mistake regarding the colour of the roses. However, she does not order their beheading. She only threatens them by shaking her fist (погрозила кулакомъ), an explicit paralinguistic expression of her anger. Alice in this excerpt appears to be their protector again as she hides them in the flower pot. Some soldiers stayed behind to look for the gardeners and execute the Queen’s order. However, it is not clear what the Queen’s order they had to execute was. The Queen perhaps implied that they would be beaten by making this gesture with her fist but she never ordered decapitation as in the original. Therefore, in terms of textual mismatches this death reference is deleted, changing the Queen’s attitude and status as the dominant power figure in the book. By not using the “off with their heads” phrase, the Queen inevitably becomes less harsh and aggressive than in the original. This deletion is once again related to the norms governing children’s literature in imperial Russia, demanding the filtering of negative images and the protection of the child reader.

6.5.2 TT9b

| TT9b Olenich-Gnenenko (1958: 96) | - Я вижу! — сказала Королева, тем временем осматривавшая розы. — Долой им головы! Процессия двинулась дальше, и только три солдата остались позади, чтобы казнить несчастных садовников, которые бросились к Алисе за защитой.  
- Вы не будете обезглавлены! — сказала Алиса и спрятала их в большой цветочный горшок, стоявший вблизи.  
Три солдата минуты или две бродили вокруг, ища их, и потом спокойно замаршировали вслед за остальными.  
- Отрубили им головы? — закричала Королева.  
- Их головы исчезли, если это будет угодно вашему величеству! — гаркнули солдаты. |
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- Правильно! – закричала Королева. – Не сыграть ли нам в крокет?

| Back Translation | - I see! - said the Queen, examining the roses. - Down with their heads! The procession moved forward and only three soldiers were left behind to execute ery unfortunate gardeners who rushed to Alice for protection.
- You will not be beheaded! - said Alice and hid them in a large flower pot, standing near.
Three soldiers for a minute or two wandered around, looking for them, and then quietly marched after the others.
- Did you cut off their heads? - cried the Queen.
- Their heads have disappeared, if it please your Majesty! – shouted the soldiers.
- Right! - cried the Queen. - Shall we play croquet? |

Table 30

On the contrary, in TTb, the translation does not follow the demands of the Soviet norms. The literary polysystem conformed to the principles of Socialist Realism demanded positive content in children’s books, without any references to death or any kind of misfortune. The translation in TTb is literal with the Queen of Hearts being direct and decisive in her order for the soldiers’ executions. There are no mismatches in this segment and therefore, the tenor is not changed. The translation preserves the same linguistic and textual features with the original and perhaps creates the same feelings to the implied readers, depicting the Queen as a harsh and powerful character in Wonderland. Perhaps, this representation of the Queen highlights the features that a monarch has – absolute and cruel to his/her subjects.

6.5.3 TT9c

| TT9c Yakhnin (1993: 66) | - Все ясно! – прошипела она. – Оторвать им головы!
И она двинулась дальше. Все поспешили за ней. Только три солдата отделились от процессии, чтобы выполнить приказ Королевы. Несчастные садовники заметались, бросились к Алисе и буквально прильнули к ней.
- Не бойтесь, - шепнула Алиса, - я вас спасу.
И она спрятала их в цветочном горшок среди цветок и листьев.
Солдаты покрутились, поискали осуждённых, никого не нашли и снова встали в строй. |
- Приказ выполнен? – строго спросила Королева.
- Так точно! – рявкнули солдаты. – Их нет как нет!
- Благодарю. - кивнула Королева. – Сыграем в крокет?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Back Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- All clear! - she hissed. - Cut off their heads!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And she moved on. Everybody hurried after her. Only three soldiers separated from the procession in order to fulfill the Queen’s order. The poor gardeners rushed to Alice and literally clung to her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Do not be afraid,” Alice whispered. “I'll save you.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And she hid them in a flower pot among the flower and leaves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The soldiers went around, looked for the convicted [gardeners], they found no one, and again stood at the line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is the order executed? – strictly asked the Queen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Indeed! - bellowed the soldiers. - They are not at all present!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Thank you, the Queen nodded. - Are we going to play croquet?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31

In TTc, the Queen of Hearts seems to have a different attitude and treatment towards the gardeners. She appears to be calmer than in the source text, indicating some sort of understanding regarding the problem with the roses and the gardeners’ attempt to resolve it. She seems to be indifferent and she only hisses (прошипела), “all clear” (Все ясно!) to their efforts to provide a valid explanation. With this statement, it would be expected that the scene will end soon without the Queen’s rage. However, the Queen in a short, certain and direct way she still orders the soldiers’ executions. This order in unexpected here as there is no sign of irritation from her side.

In this translation, Alice appears to be the gardeners’ protector once again. She hides them in the flower pot and the soldiers were not able to find them However, they did lie to the Queen that her order is executed. The Queen’s reaction at this point is unexpected as she thanks the soldiers for executing her order (Благодарю, - кивнула Королева). This is a contrast, which is not identified in any other translation, with the Queen being polite and preserving the rules of social behaviour.

In Carroll’s text, the Queen of Hearts is the absolute power figure in Wonderland and she is responsible for the creatures’ life and death. However, in the translations her authority is
often expressed via different linguistic and paralinguistic means in comparison with the source text. In this example, the most significant changes are observed in TTa. The excerpt does not contain the death order towards the soldiers painting the roses. The tenor is different as the Queen is a character perhaps less cruel than the original who avoids ordering decapitations (in more than one scenes). She is still a power figure, however, not as irrational as presented by Carroll. By contrast, TTb and TTc are closer to the original. The Queen orders the soldiers’ executions and she is a figure as dominance as it appears to be in the source text as well. The censorship effect may be seen in TTa where the “off with their heads” is replaced by the Queen’s threatening shaking of the fist as if she wishes to hit the soldiers. The translation choices in TTb and TTc for the same segment do not display features of censorship. They are literal translations where the Queen’s demand for execution is preserved. For TTb, this choice opposes to the Socialist Realism norms governing literature. However, homogeneity is not always achieved in the Soviet children’s literature.

6.6 The Executioner

In this scene, Alice introduces the Cheshire Cat to the King. The King expresses his wish for the Cat to kiss his hand. He says to Alice “it may kiss my hand, if it likes”, but Cheshire Cat answers in a disrespectful way “I’d rather not”. The King’s power is subverted here by the disobedience of a Cat. The King is not happy with this reaction. He is offended and he asks for the Queen’s help to “remove” the Cat. The only solution that the Queen gives to any problem emerge is execution. And, this is what she orders this time as well. Almost automatically, she orders “off with his head” without even realising what the problem was. The King runs to find the executioner. The reference to an executioner in a children’s book is not ideal. References as such, enhanced Alice’s ambivalence and its suitability as a book for children. After the executioner is present an awkward conversation on whether a head can be removed from a body when there is no body to be removed from, begins. Carroll’s original scene is the following:

**ST10:** ‘Well, it must be removed,’ said the King very decidedly; and he called to the Queen, who was passing at the moment, ‘My dear! I wish you would have this cat removed!’

The Queen had only one way of settling all difficulties, great or small. ‘Off with his head!’ she said without even looking round.
'I’ll fetch the executioner myself,’ said the King eagerly and he hurried off. 

[...] 

The executioner’s argument was, that you couldn’t cut off a head unless there was a body to cut it off from: that he had never had to do such a thing before, and he wasn’t going to begin at his time of life. 

The King’s argument was, that anything that had a head could be beheaded, and that you weren’t to talk nonsense. 

The Queen’s argument was, that if something wasn’t done about it in less than no time, she’d have everybody executed, all round. (It was this last remark that had made the whole party look so grave and anxious.) 

(Carroll, 2009: 76-7) 

In this excerpt, the exchange of power between the characters occurs several times. The King who is a person of authority and demands his hand to be kissed, calls the Queen to help him with the disobedient Cat. The Queen orders the execution and then the executioner enters the scene. The image of the executioner is also a symbol of power. The executioner has the power to take people’s lives. The existence of an executioner in a child’s story is questionable. On a visual level, Tenniel’s illustration of the executioner is not that intimidating. As seen below, the characters are the figures from the typical images featured on deck card, images that even children were probably familiar with. The executioner’s axe does not look threatening in that picture. The high angle from which the Cat is shown and its large size seem to signal a vantage point. As was mentioned earlier, Cheshire Cat is a character in possession of true power as it has freedom of movement and it is able to appear and disappear whenever it wants.
However, the situation in the Russian translations is not the same. Both the text and the illustrations transmit a different situation regarding the executioner and his role in Cheshire Cat’s decapitation.

6.6.1 TT10a

As observed in previous examples, deletions of death references or scenes that may scare the implied reader frequently occur in TTa. This is one more excerpt where the tenor changes due to these deletions. The meeting between the King and the Cheshire Cat takes place as in the original. The King asks Cheshire Cat to kiss his hand and the Cat refuses. The King is annoyed from this behaviour and he asked for the Queens help. More specifically, he asks her to order the cat to go (прикажи ей, душенька, отсюда убрать). Everything that followed, regarding the Queen’s order for execution, the executioner’s arrival and the conversation on when a head can be removed, are omitted by the translator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TT10a</th>
<th>Anonymous 1879: 127</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>„И чего она здсь торчит! вовсе не у мѣста“, рѣшилъ онъ. „Прикажи ей, душенька, отсюда убрать“; обратился онъ къ червонной кралѣ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[This segment is omitted]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Back Translation | “And what is she doing here?” not at all at the [right] place,” he decided.  
“Order her, darling, to get out of here,” he turned to the queen of hearts. |
The King asks from the Queen of Hearts to order the cat to go. However, there is no reaction from the Queen’s side. The “off with his head” order is never given and the King never looks for the executioner. In fact, the word executioner is never mentioned. The scene that follows the acquaintance between the King and the Cat is the one where Sonia is looking for the hedgehog (пошла отыскивать своего ежа). The part where the King, the Queen and the executioner argue about the cases when a head can be cut off, is also deleted. After Sonia finds the hedgehog, the chapter finishes when she suddenly sees the Duchess standing in front of her (но вдруг перед ней пиковая княгиня, да такая добрая). Tenniel’s illustration depicting the executioner holding the axe is also deleted. These deletions are due to norms governing children’s literature in Imperial Russia demanding the protection of children from negative images. However, the situation is not the same in the next two translations.

6.6.2 TT10b

| TT10b Olenich-Gnenenko 1958: 100 | Во всяком случае, он должен быть удален! — сказал Король очень решительно и позвал Королеву, которая в этот момент проходила мимо. — Моя дорогая! Я желаю, чтобы ты удалила этого Кота!
Королева знала лишь один способ устранять все затруднения – большие или маленькие.
- Долой ему голову! – крикнула она, даже не оглянувшись.
- Я сам пойду за палачом! – нетерпеливо сказал Король и поспешно ушел. […]
Палач доказывал, что он не может отрубить голову, если нет тела, от которого она должна быть отрублена: он никогда прежде не делал ничего подобного и не хочет начинать учиться этому в е г о возрастею
Довод короля был краток: всякий, у кого есть голова, может быть обезглавлен, и поэтому нечего болтать чепуху.
Довод Королевы был тот, что, если что-нибудь не будет выполнено в мгновение ока, она казнит присутствующих всех до одного. (Именно последнее замечание было причиной того, что вся компания смотрела очень мрачно и испуганно.) |
In any case, it must be removed! - said the King very decisively and called the Queen, who at that moment was passing by. - My dear! I wish you to remove this Cat!
The Queen knew only one way to eliminate all the difficulties - big or small.
- Off with his head! - she cried, without even looking back.
- I'll go to get the executioner myself! - impatiently said the King, and left hastily. [...] The executioner argued that he could not cut off his head if there was no body from which it can be chopped off: he had never done anything like this before and he did not want to start learning about it at his age.

The king's argument was brief: anyone who has a head, can be beheaded, and therefore there is no nonsense talking.

The Queen's argument was that, if something is not done in an instant, she executes everyone who is present at once. (It was this last remark that was the reason that the whole company looked very gloomy and frightened.)

The language used here is similar to the original text. However, the norms are disturbed by the illustration of the King and Queen’s procession. The executioner, a symbol of power is depicted as human instead of card holding his axe and wearing a hood. This feature appeals to reader’s background knowledge about how executioners behave or why they retain anonymity. Dark colours seen at the centre of the image can also deemed to be ominous (executioner’s hood, queen’s dress). The only fantastic element in the image is the Cat, who is still hovering above all other characters and not featuring the ST’s characteristic grin. It looks more like leonine and less like a domestic cat. This image is more realistic than Tenniel’s representation. It certainly opposes the norms of Socialist Realism that demand avoidance of death references and descriptions of incidents that may terrify children. The fact that all characters are humans makes the picture more realistic and consequently more intimidating.
6.6.3 TT10c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TT10c</th>
<th>Yakhnin 1993: 70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- А я знаю, что знать его не хочу! – закапризничал Король. – Эй-эй, дорогая! – крикнул он Королеве. – Тут кое-кого надо бы...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Королева, не задумываясь, откликнулась:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Отнить Кое-Кому голову!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Так я сбегаю за палачом, ладно? – обрадовался Король и убежал.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Эта голова без туловища, - возмущался палач. – Мне здесь нечего уже делать.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Зачем тебе туловище? – кричал Король. – Есть голова. Вот её и отрывай!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Не оторвёте эту голову – велю оторвать вашу! – вопила Королева.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Back Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- And I know that I do not want to know him! – said the King in a capricious way. - Hey hey, dear! - he shouted to the Queen. - There's someone you should ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Queen, without hesitation, responded:
- Tear off this Someone's head!
- So I'll run after the executioner, okay? said the king excited and run away.
[...]
- This head is without a body, - the executioner protested. - I have nothing to do here."
- Why do you need a body? - cried the King. - There is a head. Here it is and tear it off!
- If you do not tear this head off - I'll order to tear off yours! yelled the Queen.

Table 33

TT10c is once different from the source text in a way that the translator’s creative writing is revealed. This time the translator turns narrator descriptions into reporting verbs and inserts in direct speech. The scene progresses faster however the general conclusion and the outcome of the conversation takes place is the same: how can a head without a body be cut off. The scene, regardless of its intimidating content is render in a humoristic way. The Queen, who is here as well in charge of everything and the strongest power figure in Wonderland, orders the execution of “this Someone” (Оторвать Кое-Кому голову). By calling the Cat “this Someone”, it can be said that she indifferent to what takes places around her and that she just mechanically executes her objects. Moreover, the executioner answers that he has nothing to do here since there is not body to cut the head from (Мне здесь нечего уже делать). These reactions give a comical character to the scene, indicating the translator’s mood for creating an entertaining story for children.

Similarly, the illustration does not depict cards but actual humans. The axe looks realistic, something that may increase the level of threat implied yet this effect is mitigated by the composition of the illustration.
Vivid colours, thin contour lines and watercolouring effect indicate that this is a fantastic, fairy-tale-like scene. Then, the orientation of characters remains the same, but the Cat is depicted in an outsize image, with its characteristic grin. This contrasts sharply with the figures shown underneath, who look less pivotal to the plot. Body language shows that their actions are not consequential too: the queen is gesticulating (pointing), the executioner stands idle, possibly looking confused and both of them have little contact with the entity hovering just above their heads. This helps mitigate the element of threat as a comical tone is created.

This excerpt is rendered in a different way in all three translations and the tenor changes. In TT10a any reference to execution or to the executioner is omitted. Tenniel’s illustration depicting the executioner-card holding the axe is also deleted. This choice aligns with the rest deletions of power demonstration and death references that take place in the story. TT10b and TT10c include the execution scene; however, it is mainly the illustrations that shift the tenor. In TT10b, the characters are depicted as humans. The executioner is depicted wearing a hood and holding his axe, an intimidating scene for a children’s book. Finally, in TT10c, the character’s body language makes the scene more comical and the translator’s choice to render Carroll’s narration to dialogue, make the scene progresses faster. In all three cases the tenor changes as the characters seem to have a different reaction to the incidents take place.
6.7 The Trial Scene

The final scene of the story is very important for the book’s plot and finale. This scene, and the whole last chapter of the book in general, indicate Carroll’s views of the Victorian legal system. Carroll probably wishes to satirise the absurdity and the unfairness of the laws prevailing in the Victorian society. As will be observed in this excerpt the legal procedures depend on the Queen’s decisions. The King is overruled and even ignored as his order for a verdict before the sentence is reversed by the Queen, the absolute monarch of Wonderland.

More specifically, this scene is longer than the ones presented so far in the study as it is quite dense in terms of features that indicate power and authority. There are three characters interacting with each other and asserting power through intense verbal and non-verbal communication. The King asked “for the twentieth time that day” the verdict on the Knave. As soon as he finishes his sentence, the Queen orders the jury to announce the sentence first and then the verdict. This is the point when Alice’s own sense of justice does not allow her to remain silent. She reacts to this irrational order, opposes to the Queen’s order and questions her power. After Alice’s brave reaction, the Queen of Hearts orders her execution and the card soldiers attack Alice. At this point, the story reaches its peak and Alice more powerful than ever, tries physically to beat the card-soldiers off until she wakes up from her Wonderland dream.

ST11: 'Let the Jury consider their verdict,' the King said, for about the twentieth time that day.

'No, no!' said the Queen. 'Sentence first - verdict afterwards.'

'Stuff and nonsense!' said Alice loudly. 'The idea of having the sentence first!'

'Hold your tongue!' said the Queen, turning purple.

'I won't!' said Alice.

'Off with her head!' the Queen shouted at the top of her voice. Nobody moved.

'Who cares for you?' said Alice, (she had grown to her full size by this time.)

'You're nothing but a pack of cards!' At this the whole pack rose up into the air, and came flying down upon her: she gave a little scream, half of fright and half of anger, and tried to beat them off… (Carroll, 2009: 108-9)
This final scene of the story takes place during the Knave’s trial who is accused for having stolen the Queen’s tarts, in the court of law. For Honig, the court of law is a “peculiarly adult institution” which is formed within “a complex system of societal rules” which perhaps can be understood fully only by a lawyer (adult). As Honig also notes, if Alice wishes to “assert herself” and be “victorious” in this adult’s institution, she needs to prove her “maturity and her ability to comprehend the adult world” (Honig, 1988: 83). And, this is exactly what Alice does. She reacts to the Queen’s illogical demand. Her self-assertiveness is at its peak, and without trying to be “an ideal, feminine girl”, she “speaks her mind and acts decisively” (Honig, 1988: 84). She shouts to the Queen that all these procedures followed in the court so far are “stuff and nonsense”. The Queen asks her to hold her tongue. However, Alice does not stop there. She answers back again that she “won’t”. As she is now bigger in size, she feels that she has “the authority of a giant” (Brandt, 1994: 31).

The Queen then asks her execution with the well-known “off with her head” order. The card-soldiers attack Alice and even then, she is still brave enough to beat them off. Regardless the differences between source and target texts noticed in previous examples, the Russian translations of this last scene are similar to the original and perhaps transmit the same degree of tension to the implied reader.
6.7.1 TT11a

In TT11a, as discussed in previous examples the peak of the plot and the end of the story comes earlier than in the original. Carroll’s two last chapters (XI – Who stole the tarts and XII – Alice’s evidence) are merged and therefore many details that lead to Knave’s trial and to Alice’s reaction to his “sentence first – verdict afterwards” order are omitted. However, it is the first time in TT1a that an execution order is given. All the previous death references coming either from the Duchess or from the Queen of Hearts were deleted. However, Alice reacts with braveness and courage, and perhaps by displaying an even more provocative reaction. The Russian translation of this final scene is as follows:

| TT11a Anonymous (1879: 165) | Король побледнел и съ досадой захлопнул памятную книжку. „Молчать!“ „Вздоръ! Не замолчу!“ закричала Соня въ себя. „Снести ей голову!“ - во все горло заорала Червонная Краля. Никто не двинулся. „Очень я вась боюсь!“ гордо и смело сказала Соня. „Всѣ то-вы колода картъ и больше ничего — годны развѣ только поиграть въ дурачки31!“ |
| Back Translation | The King turned pale, and angrily slammed the important book. "Be silent!" "Nonsense! I won’t be silent!" started shouting Sonia beside herself. "Cut her head!" - shouted at the top of her voice the Queen of Hearts. No one moved. "I’m very afraid of you!" proudly and bravely said Sonia. "All of you are a pack of cards and nothing else – suitable only to play a game with cards!" |

Table 34

Due to the merge of chapters XI and XII the trial scene appears earlier in the story and the incidents that led to the story’s finale are also different. In TT11a, Alice argues with the King after his indication that all people taller than a mile should leave the room (another instant where Carroll expresses his opinion about nonsensical Victorian laws). He slams the law book with anger and asks Sonia to be quiet. Sonia opposes the King’s demand and answers back in an impolite way, saying that this is nonsense and that she will not be silent. The main

31 Дурачки (duratski) is a very popular Russian game with cards.
argument here is between Alice and the King who seems to have more power in this translation and is not always overruled by the Queen. Alice is rude towards the King and questions his power. This is when the Queen interferes and orders her execution. However, Sonia does not lose her courage to the death threat and she even appears to be braver than in the original. She becomes sarcastic by saying “I am very afraid of you” (очень я вас боюсь), a phrase which she does not mean, as she continues saying that the soldiers are “only a pack of cards and nothing else” (Всё то-вы колода карт и больше ничего). Alice here becomes more daring than in the original and the translations that will follow. She even says that the cards are only useful to play дурачки (дурачки), a popular Russian game with cards. However, дурачки is the plural form of the word дурачок, which means “fool”. By using ambiguity, Alice insults the card-soldiers even more and questions their level of intelligence.

The tenor is different in TT11a, as the social role relationship between the protagonists of the scene is changed. The King, as a male figure in power indicates much more authoritative behaviour in TTa, than in the original text. The Queen is involved only when Sonia becomes disrespectful to the King. The textual mismatches are clearly visible as the story is shorter and the scene reaches its peak after different incidents and dialogues between the protagonists take place. There are also lexical mismatches in terms of the use of different reporting verbs from the ones Carroll used in the original. Carroll tends to use the verb “said” in most cases of the protagonists’ verbal communication. However, in TTa, the reporting verbs are either avoided or changed. In TT11a, Sonia “закричала” (started shouting) instead of simply “said” something loudly. Moreover, the mismatch identified in Sonia’s reference to the Russian traditional Russian card game дурачки (поиграть в дурачки) emphasises her lack of fear, intensifies her anger and highlights her courage in confronting the King and the Queen of Hearts. It also places the story in a Russian context, as the implied reader is familiar with the specific card game. Despite the deletions of the execution scenes and Alice’s depiction as a polite and obedient child throughout TTa, in this scene Alice displays the same courage as in the original. Arguably, her braveness here manifests itself more abruptly, given that she was more modest in all her previous reactions.
6.7.2 TT11b

The main strategy used throughout TTb is literary translation. This final scene is not an exception. The translator renders most parts of Carroll’s text literally. The translation is presented in table 35.

| TT11b | Пусть присяжные обдумают свое решение, — сказал Король уже в двадцатый раз в течение дня. |
| Olenich-Gnenenko | — Нет-нет! — возразила Королева. — Сначала казнь, приговор — потом! |
| (1958:140) | — Вздор! — громко сказала Алиса. — Что за бессмыслица — казнить до приговора! |
| | — Придержи язык! — закричала Королева, побагровев. |
| | — Не желаю! — ответила Алиса. |
| | — Долой ей голову! — заорала Королева на самых высоких нотах своего голоса. |
| | — Что вы значите? — воскликнула Алиса (к этому времени она достигла своего полного роста). — Вы — всего лишь колода карт! |

| Back Translation | Let the jury consider their verdict, - said the King for the twentieth time during the day. |
| | - No no! - objected the Queen. - First, the execution, the verdict - after! |
| | - Nonsense! – loudly said Alice. - What an absurdity - to execute before the verdict! |
| | - Hold your tongue! - cried the Queen, turning crimson. |
| | - I will not! - answered Alice. |
| | - Off with her head! – shouted the Queen at the highest tone of her voice. |
| | No one moved. |
| | - What do you mean? - exclaimed Alice (by this time she had reached her full growth). - You are just a pack of cards! |

Table 35

Once more, TT11b displays a literal transfer on all levels of translation. There are no textual mismatches and the tenor remains the same as the author and the translator preserve the same linguistic features expressing the same social role relationship and social attitude between the
characters. However, there are some lexical mismatches regarding the use of reporting verbs. Carroll is stable in his choice of the verb “said”. The translator uses a variety of reporting verbs – сказал (said) возразила (objected) закричала (shouted) ответила (answered) воскликнула (exclaimed) – indicating more tension in the characters’ answers. The King asks for the verdict but the Queen demands to have the sentence first. Alice, who reaches her full size, rebels against the Queen. The fact that Alice is her normal size is indicated in brackets by both Carroll and the translator as the latter imitates all linguistic and textual forms Carroll uses. At this point, and due to her height, Alice demonstrates “mastery of her surroundings”. In an adult word, Alice originally had the wrong size. Now that her real height restores, she is ready to deliver her “famous rebellious proclamation” (Honig, 1988: 85), you are nothing but a pack of cards in both ST and TTb.

The illustration of the final scene in TTb demonstrates large cards falling down and towards Alice in a dark background. Alice displays defiant body language rather than defensive to the cards that attack her. Her legs are apart and the arms are extended as if she is ready for a battle. This is a realistic representation for someone that indeed does not afraid of a deck of cards that flies around him/her. On the contrary, in Tenniel’s visual, Alice puts her hands in front of her face demonstrating a defensive attitude regardless her statements (you’re nothing but a pack of cards).
6.7.3 TT11c

TTc has displayed the most additions from the translator’s side and the most inventive dialogues among the three translations examined in this study. Similarly, in the final scene of the story the translator employs his skills as an author and adds his own perspective to the story. The scene progresses as follows:

- Она невыносима! – зашипела Королева. – Не сносить ей головы!
Все в испуге примокли.
|
| Back Translation | We laughed, and that’s enough! - said pleased the King. - Laugh with laugh, but it’s time to announce the sentence.
- First chop off his head and then give the sentence! – demanded the Queen.
- Nonsense, rubbish, stupidity and nonsense! – cried Alice. This cannot happen.
- She is unbearable! – began to hiss the Queen. – Down with her head!
Everyone out of fright remained silent.
- And not a bit scary! – laughed Alice. She had already grown to her normal height and now could clearly see that in front of her [there was] a regular pack of playing cards. - You are the most common cards! - she said aloud.

Table 36

In TT11c, there are many textual and lexical mismatches. First, the King appears to be “довольный” (pleased) about the whole trial atmosphere as he makes comments on how much they laughed. This demonstrates the sarcastic mood of the translator towards the legal system in a similar way as Carroll does. It is also an attempt to downgrade the King, to depict
him as a naïve and ignorant character and to justify the Queen’s absolute power. On a lexical level the reporting verb “said” is again replaced by many other verbs such as потребовала (demand), воскликнула (exclaimed), зашипела (hissed) and even засмеялась (laughed), rendering the scene in a more explicit way. The scene is rich in verbal and non-verbal features of communication, which do not appear in the original. These additions make the scene more intense, as the characters’ anger and irrationality reach the highest level.

More specifically, the King enjoys and laughs as if he is not aware of the place that he is in and the position that he has. The Queen “demands” (требовать) to have the sentence, which is not an abstract order, She becomes specific by identifying the sentence. It is decapitation. She becomes specific by requesting to chop his head off first (начала от тяпать голову). Executions are the Queen’s “favourite occupation” (Elwyn-Jones and Gladstone, 1995: 9). In TT11c, this is particularly highlighted and the Queen of Hearts is presented to be ruthless. Alice is also presented in a different way than in Carroll’s original. She appears to be angrier than ever. She cannot stand the injustice towards the Knave and she uses four words to describe her opinion about the Queen’s order: “чушь, чепуха, глупости и ерунда”. All these words are synonyms to the word “nonsense”, and by using all four of them the translator stresses that Alice furious. She is now familiar with Wonderland rules. She asserts power and reacts to any irrational incident and behaviour that takes place around her. Alice is not scared at all. On the contrary, she finds it funny and enjoys the whole court scene. She even laughs (засмеялась) with the Queen’s threats as they do not sound scary at all (ничточки нестрашно). Also feels no fear when the soldiers who attack her as they are only “common cards” (самые обыкновенные карты) after all.

The final scene, as presented in TTc, acquires a more comical character and the translator’s additions increase its humourous effect. In terms of role relationships, the characters are different as their image changes. The King seems to enjoy the trial procedures as if he is not aware of his position and role in the court. The Queen is stricter and more powerful as she orders the execution of two characters (the Knave and Alice) in only a few lines. Alice is braver, with no signs of fear and hesitation and she even laughs as it is now her turn to humiliate the adult creatures around her.
TTc visual for this last scene of the book where tension reaches its peak and power transfers to Alice is simple in comparison with the TTb and Tenniel’s original. It is the representation of real cards falling. Neither Alice nor any of the creatures are present, a fact that minimises the tension reflected in the other two pictures presented earlier.

In conclusion, the final scene of the story displays many differences from one version to another and particularly in terms of its visuals. The tension observed in Carroll’s original is also preserved here. Even in TTa where all the death orders and the insulting instances were deleted, the final trial scene when Alice wakes up from her Wonderland dream remains the same. Perhaps this dramatic final scene should not be changed as it is the most important and climatic scene in the book. Many characters are involved, each demonstrating their power regarding their position or size. Despite the scene’s irrationality and the unfairness of the Queen’s orders both for the sentence first and for Alice’s beheading, nobody from the audience attempts to do something. There is no reaction to the Queens actions, as if the creatures are either scared or unable to understand the inappropriateness of the Queen’s laws.

**Conclusion**

The examples presented in this chapter demonstrate the power struggle between Wonderland creatures. The focus of the examples used in the analysis was on power relations between
characters as they frequently occur in the book. These power references demonstrate the adult’s normativity over the child-Alice who is continuously being insulted, humiliated and threatened. Her humiliation is a result of many factors, such as her age (age-hierarchy), her identity (she does wonders who she is), and her lack of knowledge. However, the child-Alice gradually gains the power and her logic and her world order emerge. By the end of the story she opposes to the Queen’s rules and questions her power. She becomes the “mighty child” that Beauvais describes. The child that “owns the only thing that the adult does not: the future and the indeterminacy that goes with it” (Beauvais, 2015: 57).

The Russian translations demonstrate different features. In TTa, many of the power scenes are deleted. The characters are more polite to each other, no death orders are given and personal remarks and humiliations are also avoided. TTb in the majority of the examples, the translation is literal. However, regardless the many similarities between ST and TTb, the Russian version may not always be understandable to the implied readers due to the lack of equivalence. TTc preserves many features of the original; however, the translator displays his creative writing skills by adding his own comments, verses and puns.

In all three cases, the final trial scene demonstrates similar features to Carroll’s original. Alice perhaps due to her size that has gone back to normal reacts to the unfairness. She reacts to the irrational laws of Wonderland that she was forced to obey during her stay there. It is time for Alice now to exert her power. Apart from questioning the Queens and Kings authority, she even uses physical violence. she beats off the card-soldiers until she wakes up from her Wonderland dream and realizes that she “beats off” the leaves that covered her while sleeping at the river bank. As Honig notes, Alice “reaches her full size just in time to reach the end of her dream and she be able to enter the real world at her real height” (Honig, 1988: 84). This is how Alice exits the secondary world she was wandering in and her normativity in the real world is restored.
Chapter 7

Conclusion

According to Pym, translations can be analysed in several ways. They can be compared with their source text, they can be read as “texts in their own right”, or different translations of the same source text and in the same language can be compared to each other (Pym, 1998: 107).

This study combines two of the methods stated above as it compares the Russian translations of Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland to their source text, as well as to each other, in order to draw conclusions about their contexts. The thesis aims at exploring how the shifting socio-political circumstances and ideologies affected the translation of children’s literature across time.

In addition to the main focus there were also complementary questions that require an answer. The first one was how the culture-specific elements and the norms prevailing in the source culture are transferred to the target culture. More specifically, how the Victorian norms are treated in the Russian context. The next interrelated question concerns which translation strategies were used by the translators of Alice in each period examined. And finally, the last question addresses the issue of whether evidence of censorship can be detected in translated texts.

The above questions were designed in order to address various perceived gaps in the field of translation studies, and more specifically, the sub-area of translation of children’s literature in Russia. Also, the study aims at providing a systemic way of examining texts. In this instance, this was done by operationalising a combined theoretical framework based on systemic, norm theory, on one hand, and register analysis on the other. The material that was chosen in order to test these theories and answer the first general question on how texts travel across time, the Russian translations of Lewis Carroll’s Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland were chosen. The book was selected because, a Victorian era cultural product, it is highly culture-specific.

As has been shown, there is a large number of translations of Alice spanning the 140 years since translations into Russian commenced. Yet this uninterrupted time of cultural production cannot but be seen as a period that bears the marks of major socio-historical shifts in Russian
history. Based on this premise, three periods of cultural production were examined, Imperial, Soviet and pre-Soviet era. This distinction is based both convention in historiographic research as well as existing translation lists indicative of translation norms (translation lists indicate patterns in cultural production, peaks and troughs in the import of Alice in Russia across these three periods). The distinction into these periods feeds into the second, more specific set of research questions, concerning norms, strategies and censorship detection.

In order for these research questions to be answered, the presentation of a comprehensive picture of Russia’s social and political status in relation to the norms governing children’s literature in all three periods examined was necessary. The publishing guidelines and censorship practice affecting the country’s literary system were also taken into consideration as both these features changed many times throughout Russian history. In order to observe the potential impact of shifting norms, a collection of texts was made on the basis of certain criteria: the period translations were published and the paratexts accompany the editions. Three translations were thus included in the corpus of observational material: TTa published in 1879, TTb published in 1958 and TTc published in 1991. These translations were produced in different contexts, under different historical, social, cultural, economic circumstances and it is believed that these are reflected in the target texts. At the time of their publication there were various norms governing both society and translation. The position of children’s literature in the literary polysystem altered as well, a fact that has affected translations in various ways.

Starting with TTa, the first Alice translation published in Russia in 1879, Alice becomes Sonia. The book contained many deletions making the book 2 chapters shorter than the original. As was shown, deletions included power relations, personal remarks, insults, swearing, life threats, death references, confusing sequences and word play. This serves as evidence of cultural filtering. To return to the first research question of this study, the political and cultural ideologies of the time demanded the protection of children from negative messages. Perhaps, this was the result of the translator’s filtering in order to protect the children. The prevailing norms at the time demanded positive heroes and happy stories for children. Therefore, Sonia becomes here more innocent than in the original, the White Rabbit’s tone is softer, the Duchess and the Queen of Hearts do not threaten her life and the rest of the creatures (the Mad Hatter, the March Hare, the Mock Turtle and the Gryphon) do not embarrass or make her feel uncomfortable. Finally, everyone uses language that scores
higher on the politeness scale. Whilst it is not clear in all cases whether they are intentionally presented as more polite, such characters are presented as behaving according to norms governing appropriate interaction.

In general, there is a great number of deletions, substitutions and localizations in TTa. The translator chose a reader-oriented approach to serve the child’s needs and level of comprehension, excluding what they might have deemed as unnecessary information and serving at the same time the political norms of the time. This was the only translation that featured visible marks of censorship authorization signature in paratext. This means that the translator and perhaps the editor and the censor followed specific normative instructions before the book reached the market.

In House’s terms, Sonia is a covert translation that had to be manipulated or perhaps censored in order to be accepted in the country’s literary polysystem. And, it was accepted, as after the appearance of Sonia for the first time in Russia, many more translations, adaptations or retellings of Alice were published in different times and under different circumstances, as for example through the hard times of Stalin’s dominance during the Soviet years.

The second translation (TTb) examined in this study was by Olenich-Gnenenko. This Alice was originally published in 1940, during the harsh Stalin years. However, since this translation was published in Rostov-on-Don and most likely away from censorship committees and state control, it was not chosen for this study. The version examined here is the one that finally was published in Moscow in 1958. During the Soviet years and particularly in Moscow, the country’s capital, censorship agencies controlled publications and the consequences to writers and translators’ deviations from the norm might have been severe. The party’s ideology and values were instilled in children’s literature and the children’s books for translation were chosen under aesthetic, educational, moral and political criteria. Apart from that, the principles of Socialist Realism were also applied.

Surprisingly, within this atmosphere fantasy had become the children’s favorite genre and perhaps a convenient way for authors to write without having to express any opinion on reality, everyday situations and political-related issues. Secondary worlds, supernatural elements and secret gates already existed in domestic children’s literature and consequently
accepted in translated works. Olenich-Gnenenko’s *Alice*, after a pause of many years reappeared in Moscow in a literary system that had already accepted portal fantasies.

Despite state control, censorship practices, or Socialist Realism that influenced norms in any form of art, Olenich-Gnenenko’s *Alice* is a literal, word-to-word translation. In House’s terms, it is an overt translation. The translator renders literally the whole text ignoring the source and the target culture’s norms. The translation is of poor quality and sounds unnatural in Russian. There is no effort on the part of the translator to adhere to the target language norms and an example of that is the frequent use of modal verbs, which are not met that often in the Russian language structure as modality is expressed by other means.

This translation of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* is an example where political and cultural ideologies did not affect the translation. The principles of Socialist realism are not applied, as none of the death references and insulting behaviour towards the child-Alice, are deleted. Previous research on translated children’s literature in Soviet Union has also demonstrated that not all cases follow the same norms and that homogeneity is not applicable. *Pinocchio* and *Pippi Longstockings* are two more controversial cases, moving from extreme manipulation to rather rebellious contents and promotion of disobedient child heroes for the time.

The book was also accompanied by Vazdaev’s preface where the author suggests that the Victorian era and the people lived then were absurd and that *Alice’s* little England should be freed from such absurdity. However, introductions, forewords and prefaces were the norm in publications and particularly translations, as they were used to warn the readership about the book’s perhaps harmful content. This practice was common and it was mostly used to works that did not comply with the principles of Socialist Realism and it was a type of censorship. As can be observed in Lindseth and Tannenbaum’s list of *Alice’s* Russian translations (2015), most of the Soviet ones were accompanied by introductory notes perhaps as evidence of a form of control.

Soviet normativity regarding translations is not reflected in this translation of *Alice* as it would probably be expected. The socio-political circumstances had no effect on the translation as it is literally rendered in the majority of its parts. A few words such as reported verbs or adjectives make both Alice and the Wonderland creatures slightly more aggressive.
and impolite affording the scenes greater intensity. Perhaps, this stems from the oppression governing all aspects of Soviet life and the translator unconsciously promotes a rebellious attitude and a model of a child-oppressor.

Moving to the third Alice translation (TTc) examined in this study, Leonid Lvovich Yakhnin’s version published in 1991 evades the applications of fidelity in translation. The translation was published in a period of great socio-political changes and shifts in norms. The Soviet regime and the censorship practice is no longer a factor that affects publications and children’s literature. Independent publishing houses were founded and the translation of children’s literature began to flourish due to the demand for new experiences and world knowledge. All previously censored and manipulated publications of children’s literature were retranslated and even new translators attempt to translate children’s books. Alice was not the exception and Yakhnin was a new name introduced among the great number of translators that worked on Alice.

Among the new retranslations, some low-quality works, which were previously banned by censors, also appeared now within this climate of change. This tendency of Soviet version of Alice being published again can be observed in Lindseth and Tannenbaum’s list. Soviet translations reappeared and kept publishing for long. However, Yakhnin’s translation is a new, creative edition with minor similarities to the Soviet ones. The translation follows the changing norms and preserves its position in the literary system. Yakhnin creates his own wordplay when he has the chance and he often uses emotionally-charged words to highlight the characters reactions. In this atmosphere of dissolution of the Soviet norms, all characters in Yakhnin’s translation seem to adopt a more aggressive and at the same time humorous attitude depending on the situation.

To sum up, regarding the first research question of the study how shifting socio-political circumstances and ideologies affected the translation of children’s literature in different stages in Russian history, the textual analysis reached the following conclusions. Alice’s Russian translations as examined in this thesis, not always reflect the expected socio-political circumstances prevailing in the country each of the periods they were published. Alice as well as the creatures that accompany her in the story change in all three translations in terms of power seeking and expression, representing the power hierarchies between adults and children and the position of the child in the Russian society. The characters become either
stronger and mighty or timid and modest, depending on the situation and their profile in the Russian translation.

The first translation examined indicates high levels of manipulation of children’s literature. It proves that the censorship effect existed before the establishment of the Soviet regime. The second translation indicates no compatibility with the norms governing translations and publications during the Soviet years. It is a word-for-word translation of low quality, which perhaps sounds unnatural in Russian. The third translation follows the new ideas of a non-Soviet country, released from censorship and self-censorship practices.

Regarding the second research question on how the source norms were treated in the target text, the conclusion that occur from the textual analysis is that Victorian norms were either ignored or not realised by the translators in Alice’s Russian translations. Here, what is meant by Victorian norms is all the references described previously which are related to Carroll’s personal experiences or to people and situations of the Oxford society of the time. Carroll’s use of specific names, people and situations has a semiological importance for the English text. However, in the translations these characters and situations may be deleted completely, changed to Russian characters and situations or translated literally, which makes no sense to the Russian implied readers.

Regarding the third research question and the translation strategies used in the Russian translations of Alice examined, there are different strategies identified in each translation. The pre-Soviet translation (TTa) contains many deletions of the original scene with or without substitutions and a tendency of localisation to anything non-Russian. The Soviet translation is a literal translation with no cultural filtering. And, the post-Soviet contains contains many additions and substitutions which bring the text closer to the Russian readership.

To the final question of this research, whether the translations were censored, it can be said that TTa featured some censorship or perhaps self censorship, with respect to social mores. The deletion of the execution scenes, the personal remarks and Alice’s complaints as well as the alteration of the Wonderland creatures’ characters, indicate a tendency to protect the implied reader from unpleasant descriptions. Surprisingly, TTb was not censored in terms of the severe political censorship and ideological propaganda that is expected in totalitarian
regimes and especially during the Soviet times. Finally, TTc displayed features of creativity and free expression of the translator’s writing skills.

In conclusion, translation is a process highly dependent to the translator’s linguistic skills and creativity. However, time, place and cultural norms prevailing both in the source and in the target systems also play a significant role. Regarding Alice’s translations in Russia, the initial reviews were negative (similar with Carroll’s original). Perhaps, this was a result of the quality of the first translations published. However, the book was embraced by the Russian readership as a book written exclusively for children and entered the country’s literary polysystem\textsuperscript{32}. Alice “has survived the Victorian Age, several wars and depressions, the Age of Anxiety, and when last seen was thriving in the Post-Christian Era Philips, 1971: xix). A line that can be added here is that perhaps, Alice has also survived Soviet censorship shifting norms.

**Limitations of the Study and Future Research**

Although this thesis has researched its stated aims, there were some unavoidable limitations due to issues of time, scope and resources. First of all, access to original archives and resources in order to trace Russian translations of Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland was not possible. Therefore, already existing lists from previous research were used. Second, the examination of all the existing translations of Alice into Russian was also not possible. Therefore, the selection criteria had to be specific and serve the purpose of the study in the best way. Finally, poems and verses were also not examined as the translation of poetry requires a different procedure and methodology in literary translation and in this case, it did not serve the purpose of the study.

Regarding future research, there are numerous areas that would need further exploration. First of all, apart from the power references that this study examined, perhaps more aspects of Alice could be also explored. As discussed in chapter 5, the references in Alice that have become topic of criticism include the issues of genre, sex, drugs, death, which might be interesting to examine in the Russian context. Moreover, the same research could be

\textsuperscript{32} This may be seen by the significant number of translations, adaptations and retellings that appeared in Russia from 1879 until today as they are registered in Lindseth and Tannenbaum’s list.
undertaken in different language pairs in countries, which have also been under totalitarian dictatorships (e.g. Italy, Spain).

Another research plan could be related to the detailed examination of the publishing houses involved and their role in the translation and publication process of the translations of Alice, as well as for children’s books in general. There are also many more Russian translations of Alice, which were not included in this research that was not feasible to be examined and could provide interesting research material. Moreover, corpus-based research would also bring interesting results. Perhaps such corpus-based research can take as point of departure some of the shifts identified in this thesis: lexical items expressing linguistic and paralinguistic behaviour (feelings, expressive language, politeness phenomena, kinetics), reporting verbs, modality markers and so on. The current thesis is not but a first step towards shedding more light on the complexity of a culturally highly valued text with direct impact on readerships around the world.
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## Appendix 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Translator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Tropinka (journal)</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>“Alegro” – Poliksena Sergeevna Soloveva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Gamayun</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>V. Sirin (Vladimir Nabokov)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>L.D. Frenkel</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>A. D’Actil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>L.D. Frenkel</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>A. D’Actil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Rostizdat</td>
<td>Rostov</td>
<td>Aleksandr Olenich-Ghenenko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>State Printing House of Children’s Literature</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>Aleksandr Olenich-Ghenenko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Publishing House of Literature in Foreign Languages</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Publishing House of Literature in Foreign Languages</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Rostov Book Publishing House</td>
<td>Rostov</td>
<td>Aleksandr Olenich-Ghenenko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Khabarovsky Printing House</td>
<td>Khabarovsky (Siberia)</td>
<td>Aleksandr Olenich-Ghenenko</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table a (Weaver, 1964:130-33)
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### Appendix 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>TRANSLATOR</th>
<th>PUBLISHER</th>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>ILLUSTRATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td><em>Sonia v tsarstve diva</em></td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>A.I. Mamontov</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>John Tenniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td><em>Prikliucheniiia Ani v mire chudes</em></td>
<td>M.D. Granstrem</td>
<td>E. A. Granstrem</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>Charles Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td><em>Prikliucheniiia Alisi v strane chudes</em></td>
<td>Allegro (pseudonym of P.S. Soloveva)</td>
<td>Journal: Tropinka, nos. 2-5, 7-17, 19,20</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>John Tenniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td><em>Alisa v strane chudes</em></td>
<td>A.D’Aktil (pseudonym of A.A. Frenkel)</td>
<td>L.D. Frenkel</td>
<td>Moscow-Petrograd</td>
<td>John Tenniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td><em>Alisa v strane chudes</em></td>
<td>A. Olenich-Gnenenko</td>
<td>Rostov Book Publishers</td>
<td>Rostov</td>
<td>John Tenniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1972</td>
<td><em>Prikliucheniiia Alisy v strane chudes</em> (Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland)</td>
<td>B. Zakhoder</td>
<td>Pioneer, no 12 (1971) and nos. 2, 3 (1972)</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>V. Chizhikov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td><em>Alisa v strane chudes</em></td>
<td>A. Shcherbakov</td>
<td>Khudozhestvennaia Literatura</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>M. Miturich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author/Translator</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Illustrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td><em>Prikliuchenia Alisi v strane chudes</em></td>
<td>V. Orel</td>
<td>Detskaya Literatura</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>G. Kalinovskii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table b (Parker, 1994: 87-89)