



UNIVERSITY OF  
EASTERN FINLAND

Gaps in Wonderland: Lexical Gaps in the Karelian  
Translation of Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in  
Wonderland*

Milla Tynnyrinen

Master's Thesis

University of Eastern Finland

Philosophical Faculty

School of Humanities

English Language and Translation

April 2022

University of Eastern Finland, Philosophical Faculty

School of Humanities

English Language and Translation

Tynnyrinen, Milla: Gaps in Wonderland: Lexical Gaps in the Karelian Translation of Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*

Master's Thesis, 125 pages

April 2022

**Keywords:** translation strategies, translation solutions, lexical gaps, minority languages, Alice's Adventures in Wonderland

The aim of the study is to examine translating into minority languages, especially from the viewpoint of problems arising from the endangered nature of said languages. The phenomenon is studied by analyzing Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and its Karelian translation, *Alisan šeikkailut kummanmuas*, which was translated by Aleksi Ruuskanen.

The Karelian language and translating into Karelian have not been widely studied, which is why this study vastly analyzes the history and legal status of the Karelian language as well as the current situation of its speakers. Additionally, the study examines the positives and the negatives of translating into minority languages and the question whether translating could be better utilized as a part of language revitalization. To make this possible, translators must become aware of problems specific to translating into endangered languages. These themes are examined through academic texts of, for example, Riionheimo, Kuusi and Sarhima.

One of the greatest issues when translating into Karelian is the fact that a translator will constantly have to create new vocabulary, as Karelian lacks notable amounts of even basic vocabulary due to restricted usage domains and a halted transmission of language from one generation to another. Accordingly, this thesis uses a case example and aims to uncover the ways in which potential lexical gaps have been translated. First, the study establishes the kinds of words and phrases that can be especially challenging to translate into Karelian (invented words, nonsense, names of animals and mythological creatures, food vocabulary and historical words). Second, the study seeks to reveal what kinds of linguistic variants have been utilized when no unambiguously fitting option has previously existed. This phenomenon is analyzed

through a categorization of translation solutions, which was formed by modifying such categorizations by Chesterman (1997) and Pym (2016). The solutions included in the modified categorization were 1) copying sound, 2) copying morphology, 3) hyponymy, 4) synonymy, 5) paraphrase, 6) explicitness change, and 7) cultural filtering, the last of which merely accompanied the other six categories.

The results of the study showcase that solutions falling into all six categories have been utilized in the translation, although copying structure and paraphrase were undoubtedly encountered the most often. Cultural filtering was encountered as well, but, even as a secondary solution, the times it could be assigned were scarce. The analysis clearly showed that not nearly all neologisms or other inventive translation solutions encountered in the Karelian translation were inspired by the English source text but instead seem to have been affected by Finnish, which happens to be the translator's first language, functioning as an implicit relay language of sorts. This topic needs to be studied further in the future.

Itä-Suomen yliopisto, Filosofinen tiedekunta

Humanistinen osasto

Englannin kieli ja kääntäminen

Tynnyrinen, Milla: Gaps in Wonderland: Lexical Gaps in the Karelian Translation of Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*

Pro gradu -tutkielma, 125 sivua

Huhtikuu 2022

**Avainsanat:** käänösstrategiat, käänösratkaisut, leksikaaliset aukot, vähemmistökielet, Liisa Ihmemaassa

Tutkimuksen tavoitteena on tarkastella vähemmistökielille kääntämistä erityisesti kielen uhanalaistumisesta johtuvien ongelmien näkökulmasta. Ilmiötä analysoidaan tutkimalla Lewis Carrollin *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* -romaanin Alisan šeikkailut kummanmuas - karjalannosta (kar. Aleksii Ruuskanen).

Karjalan kieltä ja sille kääntämistä on tutkittu vain vähän, mistä johtuen tässä tutkielmassa kartoitetaan karjalan kielen historiaa ja laillista asemaa ja puhujayhteisön tilannetta kattavasti. Lisäksi tutkielma analysoi ja pohtii vähemmistökielille kääntämisen uhkia ja mahdollisuuksia ja sitä, voisiko kääntämistä nykyistä laajemmin hyödyntää osana kielenelvytystä. Jotta tämä tulisi mahdolliseksi, tulee kääntäjien olla tietoisia erityisesti uhanalaisille kielille käännettäessä ilmenevistä ongelmista. Näitä teemoja pohditaan etenkin Riionheimon, Kuusen ja Sarhimaan akateemisten julkaisujen kautta.

Karjalan tapauksessa keskeisimpiä ongelmia on, että kääntäjä joutuu kääntäessään jatkuvasti luomaan uutta kieltä, koska rajallisten käyttöalojen ja katkenneen ylisukupolvisen kielisiirtymän vuoksi karjalan kielestä puuttuu runsaasti sanastoa. Tämä tutkielma pyrkiikin tapausesimerkin kautta selvittämään, kuinka mahdollisia leksikaalisia aukkoja on karjalannoksessa käsitelty. Ensin tutkielma kartoittaa, minkälaiset sanat ja fraasit ovat mahdollisesti erityisen haasteellisia karjalantaa (keksityt sanat, hölynpöly, eläinten ja myyttisten olentojen nimet, ruokasanasto ja historiallinen sanasto). Sen jälkeen tutkielma pyrkii selvittämään, millaisia vastineita käänöksessä on käytetty silloin, kun yksiselitteisesti pätevää karjalankielistä varianttia ei entuudestaan ole ollut olemassa. Tätä ilmiötä tutkitaan Chestermanin (1997) ja Pymin (2016)

käännösratkaisu- ja käännösstrategialuokitusten pohjalta tätä tutkimusta varten muokatun luokituksen pohjalta. Tutkielmaan sisällytettiin seuraavat ratkaisumallit: 1) äänen kopiointi, 2) rakenteen kopiointi, 3) hyponymia, 4) synonymia, 5) parafraasi, 6) eksplisiittisyyden muutos, ja 7) kulttuurinen mukauttaminen. Näistä kategorioista viimeinen esiintyy vain yhdessä jonkun muista kuudesta kategoriasta kanssa.

Tutkielma osoittaa, että karjalannos hyödyntää kaikkia kuutta kategoriaa, vaikkakin rakenteen kopioiminen ja parafraasi ovat ehdottomasti yleisimmät. Myös kulttuurista mukauttamista esiintyi aineistossa, mutta selkeät tapaukset olivat harvassa. Analyysi selkeästi osoittaa, että läheskään kaikki karjalannokseen luodut uudissanat tai muut luovat käännösratkaisut eivät ole inspiroituneet englanninkielisestä alkutekstistä vaan vaikuttaa siltä, että myös suomi, joka sattuu olemaan kääntäjän äidinkieli, on vaikuttanut käännösratkaisuihin jonkinlaisena implisiittisenä välikielenä. Tämä ilmiö tarvitsee tulevaisuudessa lisää tutkimusta.

Päivännouzu-Suomen yliopisto, Filosofieline tiedokundu

Gumanitarnoi ozasto

Anglien kieli da kiändämine

Tynnyrinen, Milla: Gaps in Wonderland: Lexical Gaps in the Karelian Translation of Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*

Pro gradu -tutkimus, 125 sivuu

Sulakuu 2022

**Avainsanat:** kiännösstrateegiet, kiännösrešeeniet, leksikolougizet loukot, vähembistökielet, Alisan šeikkailut kummanmuas

Tutkimuksen tavoiteh on sellittä vähembistökielile kiändämisty enne kaikkie nämmien kielen varavonalazes stuatussas johtujien problemoin nägökulmas. Ilmivyö kačotah ezimerkin vuoh da anualizan keskes on Lewis Carrollan kniigu *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* da sen karjalankieline kiännös, *Alisan šeikkailut kummanmuas*, kuduan on kiändänyh Aleksi Ruuskanen.

Karjalan kiely da karjalakse kiändämisty ei ole tutkittu äijjiä, vähimyölleh ei angliekse. Sendäh tämä tutkimus tarkah analiziiruiččou karjalan kielen historiedu, zakonallistu stuatussua da sen pagizijoin tilandehtu juuri nygöi. Ližakse tutkimus kaččelou vähembistökielile kiännändän pozitiivistu da negatiivistu puoldu da kyzyy, voisgo kiändämisty parem käyttöä vuittinnu kielenelvytändiä. Moizen tilandehen azumizekse kiändäjien pidäy opastuo ellendämäh vähembistökielile kiändämizeh liittyjiä problemua. Nämmii tiemoi kačotah gradus ezimerkikse Riionheimon, Kuuzen da Sarhimaan akadeemizen kirjalližuon kauti.

Yksi suurimbis karjalakse kiändämizen problemois on se, gu kiändäjän pidäy kaiken aigua luadie uuttu sanastuo, sendäh gu karjalas ei rajoitettuloin käyttöyhtevyksien da kielen katkennuon sugupolvapäi toizele siirdymizen täh ole tarbehekse erähien, tavanomahiziengi, alovehien sanastuo. Tämän täh tämä tutkimus oppiu kiännösezimerkin kauti sellittä, mittumil tavoil leksikolougistu loukkuo voi kiändiä. Enzimäizenny tutkimus sellittäy, mittumat sanat da virkehet voijah olla jygiel kiändiä karjalakse (luadivosanat, hölynpöly, elättilöin da mifolougiellizien olendoloin nimet, syömissanasto, historiallizet sanat). Toizennu tutkimus oppiu ellendiä, mittustu kielellisty keinuo kiännökses on käytetty, konzu selgieh pättäviä karjalastu variantua ei ole olluh. Tämän dielon kačondas avuttau kiännösrešeenielöin da -strategieloin javottelu,

kudai on luajittu Chestermanan (1997) da Pyman (2016) javotteluloin pohjal. Uudeh javotteluh otetut rešeeniet ollah 1) iänen kopiiruičus, 2) morfolougien kopiiruičus, 3) hiponiumat, 4) sinoniumat, 5) parafruzu, 6) tarkuon muutos, da 7) kul'tuurilline muutos. Nämmis jälgimästy on materjualas vaigu yhtes toizien rešeenielöin ke, ei yksin.

Tutkimuksen tulos ozuttau, gu kaikkii rešeenielöi on käytetty kiännökses, hos morfoulogien kopiiruičus da parafruzu oldihgi selgieh tavallizimbat. Anualizu selväh kerdou, gu uuzis sanois da toizis eričyksellizis kiännösrešeenielöis kai ei oldu muvostuttu anglienkielizen algutekstan pohjal ga ne juohatettih suomen kiieldy, kudai on i kniigan kiändäjän muamankieli da toinah toimii peittohajun kauti buitegu välikielenny. Tädä dieluo pädöy tuliel aijal kačella ližiä.

## Content

<b>1 Introduction</b> .....	4
<b>2 The endangered Karelian language</b> .....	8
<b>2.1 The history of the Karelian language in Finland</b> .....	9
<b>2.2 Attempts at language revitalization</b> .....	15
<b>3 Translating into endangered languages</b> .....	19
<b>3.1 Translation in the fields of contact linguistics and language revitalization</b> .....	19
<b>3.2 Translating into Karelian as language revitalization</b> .....	21
<b>3.3 Objectives and motivators of endangered language translation</b> .....	23
<b>3.4 Issues specific to endangered language translation</b> .....	25
<b>3.4.1 Ideological and abstract issues</b> .....	25
<b>3.4.2 Practical issues</b> .....	27
<b>3.5 Relay translation and relay languages</b> .....	29
<b>4 Lexical gaps</b> .....	31
<b>4.1 Strategies and solutions of bridging lexical gaps</b> .....	32
<b>4.2 The modified categorization</b> .....	37
<b>4.2.1 Solutions (1) Copying sound and (2) Copying morphology</b> .....	37
<b>4.2.2 Solution (3) Hyponymy</b> .....	40
<b>4.2.3 Solution (4) Synonymy</b> .....	41
<b>4.2.4 Solution (5) Paraphrase</b> .....	41
<b>4.2.5 Solution (6) Explicitness change</b> .....	42
<b>5 Translating for children</b> .....	46
<b>5.1 Endangered languages and translating for children</b> .....	48
<b>6 Material and Methods</b> .....	49
<b>6.1 Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland</b> .....	49
<b>6.2 Ališan šeikkailut kummanmuas</b> .....	50
<b>6.2.1 <i>Alisan šeikkailut kummanmuas</i> as a communicative situation</b> .....	52
<b>6.3 Research material</b> .....	52
<b>6.3.1 Background and general principles</b> .....	53
<b>6.3.2 The final research material</b> .....	54
<b>6.4 Methods</b> .....	56
<b>6.4.1 Categories (1) Copying sound and (2) Copying morphology</b> .....	57



6.4.2 Solution (3) Hyponymy .....	58
6.4.3 Solution (4) Synonymy .....	58
6.4.4 Solution (5) Paraphrase .....	59
6.4.5 Solution (6) Explicitness change .....	60
<b>7 Analysis and results .....</b>	<b>62</b>
7.1 Invented words .....	63
7.1.1 Example 1: Caucus race .....	63
7.1.2 Example 2: Cheshire-cat .....	64
7.1.3 Example 3: Mock Turtle .....	65
7.1.4 Example 4: Seaography .....	66
7.1.5 Examples 5 and 6: Hatter and March Hare .....	67
7.1.6 Invented words: summary .....	68
7.2 Misspelled words and nonsense .....	69
7.2.1 Example 7: The Antipathies .....	70
7.2.2 Example 8: Uglification .....	71
7.2.3 Example 9: Drawling, stretching, and fainting in coils .....	72
7.2.4 Example 10: Curiouser .....	73
7.2.5 Misspelled words: summary .....	74
7.3 Animals and mythological creatures .....	75
7.3.1 Example 11: Lory .....	75
7.3.2 Example 12: Dormouse .....	76
7.3.3 Example 13: Gryphon .....	77
7.3.4 Example 14: Serpent .....	78
7.3.5 Example 15: Starfish .....	79
7.3.6 Example 16: Flamingo .....	80
7.3.7 Example 17: Porpoise .....	81
7.3.8 Animals and mythological creatures: summary .....	82
7.4 Edibles .....	83
7.4.1 Example 18: Cherry-tart .....	85
7.4.2 Example 19: Roast turkey .....	86
7.4.3 Example 20: Toffy .....	87
7.4.4 Example 21: Barley sugar .....	88
7.4.5 Example 22: Comfit .....	88

7.4.6 Edibles: summary .....	89
<b>7.5 Words related to Victorian English culture .....</b>	<b>90</b>
7.5.1 Example 23: Jack-in-the-box .....	90
7.5.2 Example 24: Croquet .....	91
7.5.3 Example 25: Fender .....	92
7.5.4 Example 26: Bathing machine .....	93
7.5.5 Example 27: Housemaid .....	94
7.5.6 Example 28: Footman .....	94
7.5.7 Example 29: Livery .....	95
7.5.8 Example 30: Jury-box .....	95
7.5.9 Example 31: Day-school .....	96
7.5.10 Example 32: Memorandum .....	97
7.5.11 Example 33: Inkstand .....	98
7.5.12 Words related to Victorian English culture: summary .....	98
<b>7.6 Miscellaneous words .....</b>	<b>100</b>
7.6.1 Example 34: Hearthrug .....	100
7.6.2 Example 35: Hookah .....	101
7.6.3 Examples 36 and 37: Latitude and Longitude .....	101
7.6.4 Example 38: Sky-rocket .....	103
7.6.5 Miscellaneous words: summary .....	104
<b>7.7 Discussion .....</b>	<b>104</b>
7.7.1 General summary of found solutions .....	105
7.7.2 Summary of the relationship between solutions and thematical categories .....	106
<b>8 Conclusion .....</b>	<b>112</b>
8.1 Evaluation of the research and its results .....	112
8.2 Implications for future research .....	113
<b>References .....</b>	<b>116</b>

## 1 Introduction

This master's thesis will examine specific issues of translating from English to Karelian and, more specifically, the ways a translator can attempt to bridge **lexical gaps** and navigate around other issues related to the endangered and variably standardized nature of the Karelian language. A theoretical summary of **endangered** or **minority language studies** and **translating into minority languages** will be presented and the theoretical framework will be utilized in the analysis of Lewis Carroll's children's novel *Alice in Wonderland* (2015/1865) and its Karelian translation *Alisan šeikkailut kummanmuas* (2018/1865), which was translated by Aleksi Ruuskanen.

The purpose of the study is to consider the ways in which translators, especially those of endangered languages, can attempt to bridge lexical gaps or navigate other situations where target language equivalents for certain source language concepts might not yet exist. Translating into minority languages has been studied in the past by several scholars, such as González (2019) and Grenoble-Whaley (2006), but the Karelian language has not yet received much attention within translation studies, which makes the topic of this thesis especially relevant: it will both exemplify the general situation of endangered language translation through the example of the Karelian language and offer new insights into the ways translated Karelian is structured. Due to lack of pre-existing theories and analysis on translation in the context of Karelian, the thesis will, at times, heavily rely on its writer's personal experiences and research that do not specifically consider Karelian. However, some scholars and activists have published research articles about revitalizing the Karelian language. For example, the thesis will refer to academic research and other writings of Helka Riionheimo (2019; 2021a; 2021b), Päivi Kuusi (2017; Kuusi P. & Riionheimo, H. 2020; Kuusi, P., Koskinen, L. & Riionheimo, H. 2017) and Natalia Giloeva (2017; Giloeva, N. & Kok, M. 2020; Giloeva, N. & Kok, M. 2021). The trio have published, both together and individually, a great deal of academic texts on the Karelian language as well as its history, speakers and revitalization. Riionheimo and Kuusi occasionally refer to translation, as well, but these texts have taken a rather practical standpoint and could be regarded as case studies rather than broader, theoretical analysis of translation studies. Thus, the field of research on translating into Karelian is expanding but somewhat unbalanced, which can be seen in the certain of uniformity of sources utilized in this thesis. Riionheimo, however, is currently

conducting empirical research on translation as a tool of revitalizing Karelian (Riionheimo 2021a). As this research is not yet completed or public, this thesis aims to be an analysis on the already existing scattered sources, as well as a case study of translating into Karelian.

The topic of the thesis is especially relevant, as the **revitalization** of the Karelian language in Finland is currently at a crossroads: the previous, to some extent established way of revitalizing the Karelian language by granting small sums of money annually to Karjalan Kielen Seura was discontinued after the bankruptcy of the aforementioned organization (Tolvanen 2020). Since then, the revitalization programme has, at least for now, been transferred to the University of Eastern Finland (UEF). One could assume that this shift towards more academic means of revitalization could indicate that different methods, including translation become all the more relevant. Moreover, UEF offers some professional translator training for students of Karelian, as well, which is why examining translation specifically from the viewpoint of Karelian can be very insightful. Furthermore, it is a generally accepted fact supported by, for instance, Riionheimo and Kuusi (2019) and Gonzáles (2019), that translation can be an excellent way of improving the status of an endangered minority language. This potential will be explored in this thesis.

The thesis will begin with an introduction on relevant translation studies as well as historical background. Section 2 will begin with an explanation of the past and envisioned future of the Karelian language in Finland as well as a general introduction to language vitality terminology. For the most part, the focus of the history section will be on events that took place right before and immediately after the second World War, as they are what, largely, led to the current, endangered status of the Karelian language in Finland. The situation of the language is somewhat similar and equally endangered in Russia (Pyöli 1996), but the status of Karelians residing in Russia will be only occasionally referred to. Next, the thesis will progress to introduce the different ways activists, speakers and teachers have attempted to revitalize the language through raising awareness, organizing events and workshops, and translating. Here, academic publications of Sarhimaa (2013 & 2017) will be utilized, as she has broadly studied these topics.

After introducing the reader to the Karelian language, both in the past and in the present, section 3 will, in general, describe the ways in which translating into a minority language differs from translating between two vital languages that are not at risk of extinction and can be comfortably used in all realms of life. Some of the most crucial questions and topics are the ways

in which endangered language translation both stems from different goals and needs than vital language translation and is impacted by different problems than translation in general. Special attention will be granted to the problems and issues, some of which are ideological, others practical. For instance, the thesis will examine how an endangered language translator will, most likely, have to create new words or think of other, imaginative ways to produce translations to segments containing words previously unknown in the minority language, i.e. lexical gaps. As endangered languages do not exist in a vacuum or separately from more vital languages, the effect other languages have on endangered languages will be considered, as well. Out of this kind of phenomena, especially codeswitching and implicit relay or intermediate languages (Jääskeläinen 2022, personal communication) will be examined both in this section and throughout other theory sections and the analysis of the research material.

Section 4 will discuss lexical gaps and the ways a translator can go about resolving them in translation. Lexical gaps are, of course, only one example of dilemmas encountered by minority language translators, but it has been selected as the main topic of this thesis as it can function as a clear example of theory presented in section 3. First, the concept of lexical gaps will be introduced and discussed on a general level, after which a modified categorization of solutions of dismantling lexical gaps, based on Chesterman's (1997) and Pym's (2016) categorization of translation strategies, will be introduced on a general level. This new categorization was created specifically for the needs of this thesis. After this, section 5 will briefly discuss translating for children, as *Alice's Adventure's in Wonderland* (Carroll 2015/1865) is widely known as a classic of children's literature. Although translating for children is not the main topic of this thesis, it is important to at the very least acknowledge, as the target audience consisting of children affects the ways in which a translator can navigate different solutions and strategies typical for translating into a minority language.

Section 6 will introduce the materials and methods. First, the primary material of the thesis will be introduced. This material consists of Carroll's original *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* (2015/1865) and its Karelian translation, *Alisan šeikkailut kummanmuas* (2015/2018). The source text will be examined from the viewpoint of its cultural significance both as a classic of children's literature and as the one of the first notable example of nonsense literature. While inspecting the translation, the thesis will focus on what is known of the translation process (see Riionheimo

2019a) and on how the currently inspected translation differs from other and earlier Karelian language translations as well as how its context is unique when contrasted with other communicative situations wherein Karelian is used. The translation is interesting from several viewpoints as, for example, direct translations into Karelian from languages other than Finnish or Russian are extremely rare. Furthermore, the translator is not a native speaker of either Karelian or English, which is not typical for literary translations and allows interesting tentative analysis on implicit intermediate or relay languages, as suggested above. Last, as examining the whole novel and its translation would not be feasible in a master's thesis, the research material has been narrowed to specific passages, and the focus will be on lexical gaps. After initial introduction to the research material, the reasoning and the progress of selecting certain passages will be explained. For the sake of clarity, the research material will be presented in several thematic categories, after which the modified categorization of translation solutions first introduced in section 4 will be revisited. This time, focus will be on the ways the categorization was specifically utilized in this study, what kinds of results were expected, and how the solutions were observed within the source and the target texts.

The analysis of the research material takes place in section 7. The analysis of the material will be presented according to the thematic categorization of the research material presented in section 6. Every category is granted an individual sub-section, in which the passages will be investigated one at the time. The specifics of the analysis are thoroughly explained in section 6, but, in a general sense, the analysis will first identify lexical gaps, or other passages that strike as challenging to translate, after which the focus will be on how the assumed lexical gap or other problem has been dismantled. Each example is assigned one or more of the translation solution categories presented in sections 4 and 6. After all thematic categories are analyzed, section 7.7 discusses general patterns and interesting details encountered while studying the research material.

Lastly, section 8 will briefly revisit the research questions of the study and evaluate whether the eventual analysis was able to offer satisfactory results. Moreover, the results of the analysis will be analyzed from the viewpoint of future research: are there topics that perhaps surprisingly became central in this study and could studying them in the future be beneficial?

## 2 The endangered Karelian language

In this section, the past and the present of the Karelian language will be discussed, after which the attempts at revitalizing the Karelian language and its potentially brighter future will be introduced. First, essential information regarding the Karelian language and its history, especially within the past and current borders of Finland, will be exemplified, as historical events are what have led into the poor status of the language today. After establishing the greater picture behind the endangerment of the Karelian language, the thesis will move on to explaining the ways in which scholars and activists have aimed to revitalize the language through, for example, teaching and language activism.

In this thesis, the terms **minority language** and **endangered language** will be used interchangeably because 1) the lines between the two concepts are not always entirely transparent and 2) Karelian fits into both categories, which renders it difficult to distinguish whether some of its issues are caused by its minority or endangered status. In most cases, the reason can be assumed to be an overlap of both categories. However, to summarize and simplify, a minority language is, according to the Institute of Languages in Finland (KOTUS 3), a language, which, in a certain area, such as a country, clearly has fewer speakers than a likely **prestigious language** spoken by a larger amount of people. According to the above explanation, the Institute of Language in Finland states that the term **minority language** is indistinct since the Finnish law does not recognize the concept of a minority language. Two **national languages**, Finnish and Swedish, are recognized, and a few others are granted various levels of standardizing and care (KOTUS 2). Largely due to a lack of a better term, Karelian is often referred to as an **autochthonous** minority language. This means that the language is native to the area its spoken in and that it has been used for at least as long as the prestigious languages of the area (Sarhimaa 2017, 38–39).

Moreover, some minority languages are endangered, which is the case of Karelian, as well. For instance, both the Helsinki Term Bank for Arts and Sciences (HTBAS 1) and UNESCO (2003) define an **endangered language** as a language that is not **safe** or **vital**, that has a declining number of speakers, that is spoken in fewer and fewer domains, and that is no longer naturally transmitted from one generation to another, meaning fewer individuals learn the language as their first language. Thomason (2015, 4) states that these languages are often referred to as **moribund**

and are at a risk of vanishing within a generation or two. Similarly, UNESCO (2003) classifies a language as severely endangered (grade 2, see table 1) when it is “mostly used by the grandparental generation and up” and critically endangered (grade 1) when it is “used by very few speakers, mostly of great-grandparental generation.” The full classification of UNESCO is presented in table 1 below.

**Table 1** Intergenerational Language Transmission (UNESCO 2003)

<b>Degree of Endangerment</b>	<b>Grade</b>	<b>Speaker Population</b>
safe	5	The language is used by all ages, from children up.
unsafe	4	The language is used by some children in all domains; it is used by all children in limited domains.
definitively endangered	3	The language is used mostly by the parental generation and up.
severely endangered	2	The language is used mostly by the grandparental generation and up.
critically endangered	1	The language is used by very few speakers, mostly of great-grandparental generation.
extinct	0	There are no speakers.

Placing a language somewhere in such a classification is by no means a simple task, but one could define Karelian as severely endangered (stage 2), which means it is mostly used by the grandparental generation and up. This is accurate because, according to Sarhimaa (2017, 141), more than 60% of fluent Karelian speakers in Finland are more than 60 years of age. The case is similar in Russia, as well, as demonstrated by Pyöli (1996, 58–61).

## **2.1 The history of the Karelian language in Finland**

In this sub-section, the relationship between the Finnish and the Karelian languages and their speakers as well as their shared history will be discussed. The aim of the sub-section is to



exemplify and explain how and why Karelian language became endangered and how other, dominant languages have affected both Karelian and its speakers.

As briefly stated above the Karelian language is often regarded as an **autochthonous language**, meaning it has been spoken in a certain area for such a long period of time that it can be seen as native for the area (Sarhimaa 2017, 38–39; KOTUS 2). For Karelian, this is the case in Eastern Finland and Western Russia. The language is closely related to Finnish, with which it exists on a dialect continuum, as western dialects of Finnish descent from Proto-Finnish, whereas eastern Finnish dialects and all dialects of Karelian share a common ancestral language, Proto-Karelian (Leskinen 1964, 109; Sarhimaa 2017, 38–39; Leskinen 2004, 448). Although discussions about the lines between Karelian, Finnish, and dialects of both languages have long been muddled, with organizations such as Karjalan Kielet (“The Karelian Languages”) (Siippanen 2020) stating that some or all of the different dialects of Karelian would better be classified as independent languages, this thesis follows perhaps the most commonly recognized and accepted definition of linguistic borders. To simplify, this thesis regards Karelian its own language, thus independent from Finnish, and divides it into two main dialects: (1) Karelian Proper, which is further divided into North/Viena Karelian and South Karelian, and (2) Olonets Karelian or Liygi. This is in line with many notable writers on Karelian issues, both recently, such as Moshnikov (2021, 45), The Institute of Languages in Finland (KOTUS 1), Sarhimaa (2017, 30), and Palander & Riionheimo (2018), and earlier, such as Turunen (1982, 66–68) and Torikka (2003).

As referenced above, due to the close linguistic relations between the Finnish and Karelian languages, to draw a line between the two languages has always been, to some extent, political, and, as Turunen (1982, 65) implies, Karelian has, at some points in history, been seen as a dialect of Finnish. This ambiguity of definition is caused by the fact that the traditional areas of Karelians have long been warred over by several national states, namely Sweden, Russia/Novgorod/The Soviet Union and, most recently, Finland. Languages and politics of all these countries have affected both the Karelian people and their language. Due to this, Finnish and the Karelian spoken within Finnish territories are partially mutually intelligible, which has traditionally been seen as a factor signaling that two speech variants are dialects of the same language. However, sociopolitical matters and the language community’s identities affect the blurred lines between independent languages and dialects. For instance, the largely mutually intelligible Swedish,

Norwegian, and Danish are undoubtedly considered separate languages (Crystal 2000, 8–10). The case with Karelian is similar.

In Finland, Karelian has been spoken for at least as long as Finnish (Sarhima 2017, 18), but today the state and vitality of the language are quite grim, and its speakers are not granted the financial or legal support needed to maintain and develop their language. Much of this is due to a continuum starting with an air of suspicion following World War II and its battles between Finland and the Soviet Union: these battles heavily affected the speakers of Karelian, as they have traditionally resided in the very eastern parts of Finland and the very western parts of Russia or Soviet Union. During WW2, Finland and Soviet Union engaged in two wars, Winter War (1939–1940) and Continuation War (1941–1944), during which most Karelian speakers residing in Finland had to either be evacuated further west from their residences in Eastern Finland, which were surrendered after the Continuation War. Additionally, a notable number of Karelian speakers had already come to Finland as refugees from Vienna and Eastern Karelia, which belonged to The Soviet Empire, during the First World War (Sarhima 2017, 109–110).

During WW2, more than 407,000 Karelians were transported into the remaining Finnish territories (Kulha 2019, 19). They were divided by their home province back in Karelia and given new homesteads in various parts of Finland. However, as explained by Waris, Jyrkilä, Raitasuo and Siipi (1952, 130–131), the homes needed to be built or renovated and the newly-appointed plots of land needed to be ridded of trees, rock and other obstacles. Moreover, Waris et. al. (1952, 131) state that by 1951, less than 72% of all evacuees had established permanent residences, whereas the rest resided in saunas or other temporary constructions. Furthermore, before evacuees were granted land to build homes on, they were temporarily housed in communal buildings and, more commonly, in local Finnish households. Raninen-Siiskonen (1999, 153–158), who has studied Karelian accounts of the years following WW2, explains that while some Karelians were met with sympathy and care, forced housing in individual houses often caused conflict and led into locals treating Karelians with suspicion and sometimes behaving discriminately towards them. This claim is supported by Hietanen (1986, 101) and Kananen (2010, 63–66), who describes the ways in which locals tended to treat evacuees with suspicion stemming both from political and economic difficulties following the war and from fear of change. The latter, in some cases, led into the locals seeing the evacuees as ethnical others (64–

66), which, of course, accelerated the diminishing of the Karelian language. This will be examined later in this sub-section through publications of Sarhimaa (2013 & 2017), Thomason (2015) and others (Crystal 2000; Fisherman 1991).

Sarhimaa (2017, 113) has estimated that before WW2, approximately 40,000 out of the 407,000 evacuees spoke Karelian, whereas the rest spoke eastern dialects of the Finnish language. As briefly covered above, a significant number of these Karelian speakers faced discrimination and suspicion in their new home areas. According to Kananen (2010, 64–66), much of this was due to the Karelian language and its speakers' Orthodox Christian religion and unknown social habits appearing notably Russian in contrast to the locals' Finnish language and Lutheran Christianity. Furthermore, Kananen explains that, due to nationalist ideologies, Russians had long been seen as suspicious and somehow less valuable or intellectual (114), which meant that some of the attributes, such as blasphemy, vanity, filthiness, simplemindedness (64), attached to the hypothetical Russian were now connected to Karelians, as well. Moreover, Puuronen (2006, 42) describes that the general atmosphere shortly after Finland gained independence in 1917 and later after WW2 emphasized the assumed homogeneity of the Finnish population. This was exemplified, for instance, with the Finnish language, which was claimed to be spoken by nearly all citizens, and by generally directing academic history studies towards a nationalist agenda rallying for a falsely constructed image of cultural uniqueness of the several peoples that have resided within the Finnish territory (Martikainen, Sintonen & Pitkänen 2006, 10). This, naturally, did not benefit citizens belonging to cultural or linguistic minorities and slowly led into the Karelian language diminishing, as Karelian children were often punished by teachers or, at the very least, bullied by other students for attempting to speak Karelian in schools (Kananen 2021, 86–88). In a situation like this, many a Karelian felt the need to refrain from criticizing their new neighbors or lives, perhaps out of fear of things worsening (Uusitupa 2021, 94). This, in turn, might have initially hidden turbulent relations between the locals and the evacuees, thus making it difficult to react to linguistic or social challenges.

Simultaneously, in the decades following WW2, many Orthodox Karelians married Lutheran Finns, which led into multi-cultural and multi-lingual households. These marriages have widely, both in common speech and in academic contexts, been regarded as mixed marriages. Although these marriages are exceedingly common in situations where one of the ethnic, social, or

religious groups in question is small or marginal, the very word referring to such family situations is negatively tinted: the Finnish word *seka* has negative implicit meanings and connotations, such as 'confusing,' 'chaotic' and 'mixed-race,' and contains the implication that something previously good and pure is now being mixed with something else (Reuter & Kyntäjä 2006, 106–109). In the case of Finns and Karelians, the undesirable ingredient has always been everything that is Karelian, which has led into multi-cultural households eventually favoring the Finnish language over Karelian, thus resulting in a complete or a near-complete language shift (Sarhimaa 2017, 118–121).

The story of the Karelian language in Finland is very much in line with academic descriptions of language shift or language death, albeit Karelian has, so far, managed to narrowly avoid the latter. For instance, David Crystal (2000, 78–80) recognizes three broad stages of language shift, which can be used to summarize the history of Karelian in Finland. The first stage of language shift begins when the language community faces immense pressure to speak the dominant language. This pressure can be introduced by official recommendations or laws or, as in the case of Karelian, through peer group pressure and "unwritten rules." In the second stage, the language community enters a period of emerging bilingualism, where speakers, out of necessity, gain competence in the dominant language. In the beginning, the now endangered language might remain in use in individual households, but an eventual shift is bound to occur, as the third stage of language shift begins when the younger generation becomes more proficient in the dominant language than in the endangered one. This is often caused by both lack of opportunities to use the endangered language and over-generational shame (Crystal 2000, 78–80). As explained above, this is what happened to speakers of Karelian when language use was discouraged in both schools and within newly formed mixed families.

Estimations of the number of Karelian-speakers living in Finland today vary, but it is safe to assume that the language community consists of around 20,000–30,000 people, out of whom 5,000–9,000 are fluent speakers and actively use the language (Sarhimaa 2017, 112–113). Anneli Sarhimaa (2017, 113) has thoroughly analyzed this group of people and notes that, since WW2, the Karelian language has been steadily losing speakers. As the language has never been used in the realms of business, education, or higher culture due to it largely being seen as a lesser, Russified dialect of Finnish one should strive to avoid, it has mostly been used and developed in

within individual households. This had led to a situation where all speakers of Karelian are bilingual at best, and most struggle to communicate in Karelian, because the entire society surrounding them functions in either Finnish or Russian (Sarhimaa 2017, 163–167; Pyöli 1996, 24).

The problems are not only societal, as one of the greatest reasons keeping speakers of Karelian from using and developing their language is the lack of legal support, recognition, and sufficient governmental funding for revitalization programs. Despite how long and by how many people the language has been spoken in Finland, it does not have any kind of legal status. However, in 2009 the Finnish government included Karelian in its official listing of non-regional minority languages spoken in Finland, which, technically, has made it legally possible for Karelian children to access education in their own language (Sarhimaa 2013, 10). Unfortunately, as Sarhimaa (2013, 10) describes, the gesture has been purely symbolic as it has not had any long-lasting, beneficial effect on the language community. The case of Karelian, however unfortunate, is not unique: Thomason (2015, 18–32) states that discriminatory laws and overall lack of legal support are some of the most easily detectable and most devious reasons behind languages becoming endangered and potentially extinct, alongside conquest, economic pressures, melting pots (environments where several languages, some more prestigious than others, are spoken), and negative attitudes. These issues and factors often intersect, and, according to Thomason (2015, 27), societal and political discrimination might be the very reason behind situations where a language is further endangered due to its speakers' negative linguistic self-esteem; the speakers internalize the direct or indirect cultural pressure and prestige of the majority and begin to devalue their own language. Sarhimaa (2017, 133) expresses similar attitudes as she explains that while Karelians generally seem to value their language, the speakers do not explicitly assume anyone to actually use the language in their day-to-day lives.

On a purely legal level, minimal positive development has taken place since 2009, when Karelian became a non-regional minority language spoken in Finland. However, all revitalization programs of the Karelian language were temporarily seized in 2019 due to the financial problems and eventual bankruptcy of Karjalan Kielen Seura, the organization mainly responsible for existing revitalization programs. In 2021, the revitalization program was transferred onto the University of Eastern Finland, but the granted funds, which were already insignificantly small,

were cut (Kämpfi 2020b). Moreover, the Ministry of Justice Finland is currently attempting to establish a new language policy, which is said to acknowledge the speakers of Karelian. The content and effects of said policy are still unclear. Luckily, the language community itself, despite lack of assistance from the government, has become increasingly active in advocating for their language rights. These attempts at revitalizing the language, both historically and today, will be examined in the following sub-section.

## **2.2 Attempts at language revitalization**

There have been attempts to revitalize the Karelian language in both Finland and Russia. This sub-section will focus on the situation and said attempts in Finland, as it is more relevant to this thesis and its source material, but occasional references to events and projects organized in the Republic of Karelia in Russia will occur, as well. In addition to presenting what has already been achieved, the section introduces expert theories (Pasanen 2022; Sarhimaa 2013; Fisherman 1991) on what other changes must be implemented for the state of any endangered language to improve.

The attempts at language revitalization will be presented in a chronological order, ranging from the early 1900's to the past few decades. Several different levels of language revitalization, such as attempted governmental and educational reforms and modern activism of individual speakers, will be covered. Only translation will be omitted, as the history and the predicted future of translating into Karelian will be examined in section three, which focuses on translating into endangered languages.

As stated above, within the past and present Finnish territories, attempts of revitalizing the Karelian language were prominent as early as in the 1920's, albeit they were marginal. Although legislation would have permitted it, Karelian-speaking schools were not established at the time, but individual activists and scholars, such as the Swedish-speaking Finn Edvard Vilhelm Ahtia, tried to improve the status of the Karelian language. Ahtia published several writings in Karelian, including biblical texts and educational pamphlets on the state of the language and compiled a grammar of the Olonets/Liygi Karelian dialect, which was spoken in the very eastern parts of what was, at the time, Finnish territory (Sarhimaa 2017, 104–105). A group of Finnish activists published some Karelian texts in the newspaper *Vapaa Karjala* ("Free Karelia"), as well, but the deeper aim of the texts was war propaganda, not true support of the Karelian language.

Several organizations, such as *Akateeminen Karjala-Seura* ("Academic Karelian Society"), *Inkeri-Seura* ("Inkeri Trust") and *Suomalaisuuden liitto* ("The Union of Finnish Culture") supported Ahtia in his goal to establish a standardized written language for Karelian, but his ideas were dismissed by authorities, as the higher organizations deemed the Karelian language improper and thought it impossible to form one standard variety of a language spoken with so many different dialects, although a common written language had earlier been achieved by, for example, speakers of Finnish, which, traditionally, consisted of many regional dialects. Shortly afterwards, all such plans died out for decades after they were interrupted by WW2 and the mass-evacuation of the Karelian speaking citizens of Finland (Sarhimaa 2017, 109).

The situation remained grim until the 1980's and the 1990's when Karelian evacuees and their descendants began to organize revitalization campaigns for the language that had, for decades, only been spoken at homes and, occasionally, in events hosted by the Orthodox church. For instance, *Karjalan Kielen Seura* (later abbreviated as KKS), which has later been discontinued due to financial problems, was founded in 1995. During its 25-year-old existence, KKS greatly contributed to the revitalization of Karelian in Finland and, for example, published a great amount of both children's and adults' literature. Among the publications were original Karelian poetry collections and short stories, but a fair share of the organization's publications consisted of translations of children's literature, such as most of the *Moomin* books, originally published in Swedish by Tove Jansson. KKS was, for some years, granted a small yearly fund to use on language revitalization, and after the organization's bankruptcy (Kämppe 2020a), the money has been redirected to the University of Eastern Finland, which also holds a Karelian professorship and offers teaching in both Karelian language and the culture (UEF 2020). A few other organizations, such as *Karjalan Sivistysseura* ("Karelian Sophistication Society") and *Karjalaiset Nuoret Suomes – Karjalaiset Nuoret Šuomešša* ("Karelian Youth in Finland"), have contributed to the revitalization of the language in Finland, as well.

Although the work of individual organizations and in-group members is highly valuable and a motivated language community is crucial for an endangered language to thrive (Pasanen 2022, 55–57), speakers alone cannot improve the state of a rapidly diminishing language. Instead, as Sarhimaa explains in her report of the ELDIA (European Language Diversity for All) project (2013), which examined the state of the current Karelian-speaking community in Finland, introducing

the Karelian language to other domains of the society is essential. She states that, for the Karelian language to survive and thrive, the speakers need to gain recognition and representation in mainstream media, the language and the identity of its speakers need to be strengthened to better fit the current and the future, and the society, at large, needs to legally and institutionally sustain the language both by establishing a regularly funded language revitalization program and by ensuring language learning through law and education (Sarhimaa 2013, 24–26). Although very little political or legal development has taken place, these statements are largely supported by young Karelian activists and scholars, such as Tuomo Kondie (2021), Maura Häkki (Kurko 2021), and the Karjalazet Nuoret Suomes (“Karelian Youth in Finland”) organization (KNS 2020).

The attempts of revitalizing the Karelian language seem to closely follow expert opinions on successful language revitalization, although all attempts are jarred by legal issues both in Finland and in Russia (Sarhimaa 2017, 205–221; Knuuttila 2021, 115–117). According to Thomason (2013, 157), perhaps the most cited and well-known list of factors critical to successful language revitalization is that of Joshua A. Fisherman (1991). The stages of successful revitalization, or reversing language shift, introduced by Fisherman in *Reversing language shift: theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages* (1991, 396–404) are, in a simplified form, the following: 1) reconstructing language skills of adult speakers, 2) re-establishing connections within the community, which allows speakers, especially the old and the native, to use their language freely, 3) transmitting the language from one generation to other, 4) acquisition of literacy in the endangered language, 5) introducing the endangered language to majority language schools, 6) introducing the endangered language to the work sphere, 7) establishing local and/or regional mass media and governmental services in the endangered language and, finally, 8) establishing educational, professional and governmental usages of the language on a higher, nationwide level. Fisherman (1991, 396–404) himself introduces the steps in a reverse order, which means that, in his writing, the final goal of reversing language shift is referred to with the number one (1), whereas the grassroots level goals are numbered five to eight (5–8). In this thesis, the order of steps is the opposite as it makes them more logical to follow by emphasizing what needs to be done first, second and so on. Currently, the Karelian language community is striving to complete goals 1–4 by educating both adult and child speakers and establishing intracommunal contacts, but goals 5–8, which are equally or even



more important in reversing language shift and revitalizing the language, require government funding and care to succeed. How this will or will not be achieved remains to be seen.

### 3 Translating into endangered languages

This section will examine the specifics of translating into an endangered minority language. First, the section will introduce the ways in which translation has or has not been acknowledged in discussions regarding **contact linguistics**, which is an area of linguistics focused on the relationships languages have with each other, and **language revitalization**. Second, the thesis will briefly discuss the history of translating into Karelian as well as the ways translation has been knowingly utilized as a tool of language revitalization. During this discussion, certain problems that are unique to translating into an endangered language will surface, and they will be explained in more detail in sub-section 3.3, which exemplifies how both the needs for and the goals of translating into minority languages differ from those of translating in general.

#### 3.1 Translation in the fields of contact linguistics and language revitalization

One could assume for translation to be a recurring topic in discussions regarding contact linguistics especially when it is utilized for language revitalization, because translation projects that seek to actively alter or develop the target language create an environment where languages affect each other in earnest. Of course, languages affect and loan from each other in all forms of translation, but this aspect is especially prevalent in endangered language translation, where one language of the pair is often highly prestigious or at least sufficiently standardized and vital, whereas the other is endangered. As endangered languages tend to be underdeveloped and not as steadily standardized as vital or prestigious languages, they are more likely to be affected by the much stronger source language than some vital target language might be.

Although there is no question about whether minority language translation poses as linguistic contact, Kolehmainen (2013, 423) states that translation has not for long been extensively studied in contact linguistics (or minority language studies). Furthermore, Kolehmainen (2013, 421) describes, as has previously been explained by Tiittula (2010, 253), that, in contact linguistics, the effects translating and translations have on any language have traditionally been seen as something negative, an interference, that potentially disrupts and derails the target language. From this point of view, it seems peculiar to think someone would willingly invite a foreign influence upon a small, already endangered language, but translating has long been used as one of the tools of revitalizing or otherwise improving the status of non-prestigious

languages and has successfully been implemented into language revitalization attempts of severely endangered languages (see Pasanen 2015 for information on the revitalization of the Sami languages). Furthermore, as Tiittula (2010, 258), Kolehmainen (2014, 432–433), and Paloposki (2016, 19) note, old written Finnish was initially created for and by translated biblical texts, and, in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, translations of European literary classics were highly encouraged, as they were thought not only to connect Finns to other Europeans and make them more civilized but also to improve the Finnish language by making it more refined and fit for writing high literature. In the modern age, many small languages are, both intentionally and unintentionally, especially influenced by English, and before English emerged as the most recent lingua franca, languages of religious prestige, such as Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, had similar effects (McLaughlin 2011, 10).

It is interesting to consider why not many of these translational feats and instances have been widely documented, especially in mainstream media, but one could argue it is closely related to the somewhat outdated idea of an undetectable translator being the ideal translator. Typically, translations are discussed in mainstream media only when their quality is questionable (Tiittula 2010, 253), while some translations that are deemed good enough might be used for comparative analysis of gradual change in the target language, all the while no one acknowledges that the text in question is a translation, thus further establishing that a successful translator is an invisible one (McLaughlin 2011, 2). This view of translation should be challenged, as one could claim it is somewhat elitist and rooted in rights, which speakers of prestigious languages take for granted. These speakers have the right and possibility to stop and consider whether translations are good, bad, or needed, while speakers of certain minority languages cannot exercise this right, as translations are few and far between. Furthermore, there are, after all, languages that cannot be used in the public or the legal sphere at all, which means that the speakers of such languages need to constantly translate everything they say or think to obtain their legal rights. Moreover, speakers of majority languages rarely or never translate their messages into the minority languages, with the exception of vital minority languages that are granted governmental support (i.e., Swedish in Finland). In most situations, a speaker of an endangered minority language cannot make a decision but absolutely needs to translate what they are feeling and thinking to be able to communicate or to obtain customer service or legal help. These minority languages are **mandatory translation languages**, as Albert Branchadell

(2005, 126), calls them, and this is the case of Karelian, as well. Although Branchadell uses the term in a fairly practical manner to describe everyday communication between individuals and groups of people, the idea can be applied to consider translations, as well. To conclude, the average Karelian speaker cannot dwell upon whether a translation is good or bad, since there are next to no potentially better translations to turn to.

### **3.2 Translating into Karelian as language revitalization**

As suggested above, the speakers of Karelian could not avoid translating and translations even if they so desired. Accordingly, the constant need to translate has been accepted and acknowledged, and there have been attempts to consciously use it as a tool of language revitalization. This sub-section will both briefly present the history of translating into Karelian as well as discuss the aforementioned attempts of using translation in language revitalization. Out of all the academics consulted for this thesis, Riionheimo and Kuusi are inarguably the most experienced in the fields of the Karelian language, language revitalization, and translation, which is why this section will heavily rely on their knowledge (Kuusi 2017; Kuusi, Koskinen & Riionheimo 2017; Kuusi & Riionheimo 2020; Riionheimo 2017).

If one examines Fisherman's (1991) steps of successfully reversing language shift, it is clear that translation and high-quality translations could help achieve language skills of adult speakers (step 1), greater percentages of Karelian literacy (step 4), and a fluent continuum where the language is naturally passed on to the younger generation (step 3), at the very least. This has, clearly, been realized by the language community, as a notable share of Karelian language publications so far consists of translations (Kurki). This is, of course, partially due to the fact that it is faster and more efficient to translate established materials than to create entirely new ones, although materials specifically tailored to fit Karelian culture are valuable, as well. Despite the notable amount of translated works, not all translators responsible for these efforts have received extensive training in translation, at least not specifically in the context of Karelian, as it was impossible in Finland until the Karelian translation project *Kiännä!* was launched in 2015 (Kuusi & Riionheimo 2020). Moreover, most established translators of the Karelian language have worked on almost or entirely on a volunteer basis. It is possible to both acknowledge the great significance of these translators' work and their mastery of the Karelian language and to

acknowledge that, when it comes to endangered languages, educating translators to work specifically with the language in question and offering them sufficient payment is vital.

To answer this need, The University of Eastern Finland organized the briefly aforementioned *Kiännä!* project, which was launched in 2015 and proceeded until 2019. The aim of the project was to host open-access translation seminars, where attendees were taught methods used in educating professional translators. In short, the seminars offered university-level translator training for anyone interested and skilled in the Karelian language. Each seminar lasted for one year and 20–30 students attended yearly. Some of them trained specifically in translating non-fiction or fiction, while the majority studied both (Kuusi & Riionheimo 2020). Since the end of the project, similar translation courses have been offered to students of Karelian by the University of Eastern Finland.

In the seminars, both students and teachers soon became aware of how difficult it was to apply commonly recognized translation methods in the case of the Karelian language (Kuusi & Riionheimo 2020). For instance, since Karelian does not have societal prestige, it has commonly been spoken only at the sphere of households, which means that the language still lacks a lot of vocabulary. Karelian news broadcasts are aired both in Finland and Russia, which has led into the lexicon of Karelian greatly broadening, but, in the seminar, it became evident that nearly every assignment required for the translator to create new Karelian words (Riionheimo 2019b). Neologisms, of course, are not entirely unknown to any translator, but the amount of time a translator needs to dedicate to this task while working on the Karelian language is greater than in the cases of most other languages.

Moreover, the Karelian language does not have one single authority on linguistic issues – instead, the revitalization of the language has entirely been a task of the language community as a whole, although universities in both Finland and the Karelian Republic offer teaching in Karelian, and some newspapers are, within the language community, seen as authorities on how to write grammatically correct and vibrant Karelian (Puura & Tánczos 2022, 219–221; Tánczos 2021, 180–184). Additionally, the newly launched revitalization program of the University of Eastern Finland features a vocabulary expert group (Karjalainen 2021), but the situation is still uncoordinated and not ideal. The unfortunate circumstances are not identical for all speakers of Karelian, though, as there is no single, standardized way of writing Karelian, but all dialects are in

active use, some having official written languages while the others are still in progress (Joki 2019). Therefore, a translator looking for answers needs to be acutely aware that there are no definite answers and that all textual examples are always written by individuals in their individual dialects.

### **3.3 Objectives and motivators of endangered language translation**

The uncoordinated and conflicted state of the Karelian language is not unique, but its history of translation can be seen as an example of issues and features that are typical when translating into endangered languages. This sub-chapter compares endangered language translation to translation in general and discusses differences regarding both the goals of translation and issues and challenges encountered while translating. The themes will be discussed on a general level, but Karelian will occasionally be used as an example.

Translating into an endangered language is different from translating from one vital language to another in both theory and practice. Typically, texts and other material are translated to make them accessible for a group of people that does not understand the language the work was originally published in. Sometimes this material is deemed mandatory, such as legal texts or user manuals, and other times the translational benefits are more subtle or cultural, as when translating fictional texts that might educate the reader on a foreign culture or a yet unknown genre of literature. All in all, the goal of translation, traditionally, is to transport texts and messages between languages and cultures in a way that allows more people to understand and enjoy the original work: in other words, translation widens the target audience. To many, this goal is at the very core of all definitions of the act of translation, which makes analyzing endangered language translation challenging.

The case of translation is different when translating into endangered languages as most native speakers of endangered languages are fluent in the prestigious languages spoken in their societies, as well. Depending on the levels of individual linguistic assimilation and support a country grants minority languages, it might even be that, as covered in section 2, a bilingual speaker is more fluent in a prestigious language than the one they ethnically identify with and first learned to speak (Sarhimaa 2017, 142; Savijärvi 1994, 51). In this case, translating anything into, for example, Karelian hardly broadens the text's potential audience, as most members of the language community have already had access to the text in another language, perhaps even

a one they are better equipped to grasp said text in. Gonzáles (2005, 107) notes this uniqueness of motives behind translating certain works and suggests that translating into minority languages could be characterized as activism striving for a world where the speakers of endangered languages can make a conscious choice of whether they want to read a text in their native or their second (or third or so on) language. In other words, the goal is to grant people access to the same types of texts in both prestigious and non-prestigious languages. Riionheimo and Kuusi (2019, 93) share Gonzáles' (2005) idea and add that translating can be a good way of making previously hidden minority languages more visible in the target society. As both of these goals (activism and bringing attention to typically overlooked languages and speech communities) are urgent and complex, it is often quicker and more efficient to rely on translations rather than to create completely new texts in the minority language (Koskinen, Kuusi & Riionheimo 2017; Kuusi & Riionheimo 2020).

However, not all goals of translating into endangered minority languages are abstract and ideological, as the most important long-time goal of language revitalization is, after all, to ensure a smooth language transition between generations (Grenoble & Whaley 2006, 13; Thomason 2015, 156). While it is important that adult speakers of varying skill-levels have access to various materials in the endangered language, the focus of language revitalization, both when translating and when not, has been on children (Grenoble & Whaley 2006, 69–101). This has been the case for Karelian, as well, and it seems that the very first goal of language revitalization is to ensure that new native speakers, children, have books and other materials to grow up with, while materials that are aimed at other age groups seen as less crucial can be attended to at a later time. The duality of new speakers, consisting of both adults and children, is interesting in the context of Fisherman's (1991) steps towards successful language shift, which were first introduced in section 2.3. Fisherman's (1991) steps are, of course, a simplification, but nevertheless imply the different developments taking place in a certain order: first, adult language proficiency is obtained, after which the language can be passed on to children. With critically endangered languages, such as Karelian, the steps are not linear but overlapping: oftentimes it is so that both the children and the adults are learning the language at the same time, thus monolingual and bilingual new speakers are emerging simultaneously. In such a situation, translations, which are reliable and fast to generate for several generations or age groups at once, provide useful.

Although language activists often name translation among the first and most crucial tools of language revitalization, there is a gap in research regarding language revitalization and translating or translator training. Kuusi, Koskinen and Riionheimo (2017) have analyzed this gap, stating that it is a direct result of the very limited opportunities of institutionalized language training in the context of minority languages. While some translation training programs, such as the *Kiännä!* project, have been launched in the recent years, they have been restrained and challenged by the fact that translating into a minority language is financially unreliable and largely non-profitable (Kuusi, Koskinen, Riionheimo 2020). The somewhat grim situation could be improving, however, since the currently funded revitalization program of the Karelian language has explicitly stated that it has utilized and will continue to utilize translation in all its efforts (Riionheimo 2021b).

### **3.4 Issues specific to endangered language translation**

This section will explain and exemplify the ways in which problems encountered while translating into an endangered language differ from those encountered by translators in general. Many challenges transcend categories such as “vital” or “endangered,” but certain problems are notably more common in the context of endangered language translation. In this thesis, the problems have been divided into two categories for the sake of clarity. First, section 3.4.1 will discuss ideological and generally more abstract dilemmas that mainly consider meta-work, such as planning the translation and deciding what to translate in the first place. Second, section 3.4.2 covers the more practical issues encountered during the concrete act of translating.

#### **3.4.1 Ideological and abstract issues**

Even when minority language speakers have access to translator training, they will quickly notice that the problems, both ideological and practical, differ from when translating between vital and widely used languages. Even the simple question of whether to translate or not cannot be easily answered in the case of endangered minority languages. These issues, as well as some other notable features that are not inherently problematic, will be illustrated below.

First, endangered languages benefit from translations more immediately than vital languages, as translation is a quick and efficient way of establishing new vocabulary, terminology, and even entire literary genres previously unknown to the target culture (Kolehmainen 2013, 432–433).



While translations can introduce new genres to any literary target culture, this is especially important when it comes to small, endangered languages that are very limitedly represented in literature. In cases like this, source texts of translations and the eventual translations can work as examples of how similar texts could be constructed directly in the target language (Kuusi 2017, 50). Moreover, newly translated texts are highly likely to reach a large audience, which might, in the case of a gravely endangered language, even consist of most of a speech community. Situations like this are highly auspicious for setting an example, as mentioned by Kuusi (2017, 50), but within the possibilities granted by a certain intimacy lies a dilemma, as well: translation and book publishing, much like anything else, are fundamentally guided by the markets, and projects with small and uncertain target audiences do not readily obtain sufficient funding. This can be seen in the case of Karelian and its voluntary translators, as explained in section 4.2.

Once a translation is successfully funded and in progress, new concerns are bound to arise. Although both contact linguistics and translation studies have come far from the days when all outside linguistic interference was considered negative, translators working with endangered languages need to be acutely aware of the kind of influence they are inviting or permitting access into the target language. In minority language translation some of the influence is, of course, intended, and translating is an effective way of establishing newly invented words and structures. However, the need to invite foreign influence or coin new vocabulary quickly and efficiently can indicate that the target language functions as a **weak target system** (Toury 1985, 5–8) meaning that the language is weaker than other, more prestigious languages and perhaps poorly standardized. This means that the language is more prone to influences from other languages and, to a certain extent, relies on it, which allows translations into said language to be more creative: whereas translators of vital languages rely on the set norms, minority language translators need to invent the norms themselves (Kuusi 2017, 50–51). A skilled translator with an expertise in a minority language should be able to dramatically improve the state of their language while translating, but they absolutely need to carefully weigh every decision. Especially since minority language translation is often done on a tight schedule, as, for example, in the case of translating national news from Finnish into Karelian (Giloeva & Kok 2021, 229–232), and either with a low salary or completely voluntarily, translators might not always have time to make nuanced and researched decisions but instead might resort into using loan words increasingly

more often. This can be tempting because speakers of an endangered language are more likely to understand the meaning of a loan word than a neologism created within the target language system, as they can be expected to be fluent in some vital language. Thus, when translating a text into Karelian and publishing it in Finland, coining a neologism based on the target audience's vast and shared knowledge of the Finnish language is a rather safe and effective option (Giloeva & Riionheimo 2022, 208–210).

### 3.4.2 Practical issues

Once we establish that change and outside influence are necessary in moderation, we can discuss the types of concrete translational problems, which translations of minority languages encounter while working. In this section, the focus will remain on the Karelian language yet stay applicable on a general level.

No two translation processes are entirely similar, and the encountered difficulties vary between different translators and projects. We can, however, pinpoint some issues that are more prone to rise specifically when working with endangered languages in general or Karelian in particular by examining accounts written by and about Karelian language translators. For example, Riionheimo, Kuusi and Koskinen (Kuusi 2017; Kuusi, Koskinen & Riionheimo 2017; Kuusi & Riionheimo 2020; Riionheimo 2017) have analyzed the topic broadly, based on their own research as well as personal experience in the *Kiännä!* project. From a vast array of minority language specific issues, perhaps two especially notable ones arise. First, the importance of thorough research and expertise is heightened when working with an endangered language such as Karelian, as only a limited selection of dictionaries, parallel texts and other materials is available (Riionheimo & Kuusi 2019, 93; Riionheimo & Kuusi 2020), meaning that the translator might need to spend more time on research while acknowledging that definite answers to certain problems may not yet exist. The difficulty of the situation is heightened by the fact that Karelian language dictionaries and other materials have been published in both Finland and Russia, which has led into regional differences. For instance, many a Finnish-published Karelian dictionary contains the assumed neologism *kobračču*, which stands for mobile phone. The word has been coined by combining the word *kobru* ("hollow of the hand") and the suffix *-čču*, which often transforms a noun into an adjective. However, the word *kobračču* has long been used in the Karelian spoken within certain parts of the Republic of Karelia in Russia, where it is a

derogatory term referring to male masturbation. This example is anecdotal, but a translator nevertheless need not only know the language they speak but different varieties of the language, some of which might, at times, be inaccessible to them.

Second, minority language translators need to, especially when translating political, technical, or scientific texts, constantly fill lexical gaps in the target language. For instance, the Karelian language lacks even some of the very basic vocabulary in the realms of education, science, and politics, and Natalia Giloeva (2017, 81), who translates news texts from Finnish to Karelian, states that creating neologisms, or using adaptive translation strategies, is one of most notable aspects of her work. This, of course, makes a translator's work slower and requires immense knowledge of not only the languages in question and translation but also of language revitalization and development.

Regional difficulties and the dilemmas regarding neologisms and other inventive translation solutions are heightened by the fact that there is no unified written standard. For example, there is no standard Karelian, but instead several dialects have been standardized separately – namely, Viena and Liygi have their own, rather established written standards, while one for Suvi is currently underway (see sections 2.1 and 2.3). Although mutually intelligible, the dialects differ from each other both in terms of grammar and vocabulary, and creating separate written standards was, at the time, a conscious decision aiming to satisfy needs of all speakers (Kunnas 2006, 229) and, thus, ensure a future where as many speakers as possible could maintain or relearn their language skills. One written standard has since been discussed but is not actively being developed (Kunnas 2006, 230). No matter how esteemed, the decision to develop several written standards makes a translator's work all the more difficult, as they now need to always ascertain which dialect they want to translate the work in. This, of course, is the case with bigger languages, such as English, as well, but the weight of these decisions is different when working with minority languages – surely an Australian English speaker will have other materials to consume even if a certain translator decides to work on British English, instead, but the same cannot be assumed in the case of endangered languages where each individual translation has a comparably heavy impact on the canon of Karelian literature. Moreover, even when a translator has decided on a dialect, they will most likely run into certain issues. For instance, creating new vocabulary can be difficult, as it would often be favorable if the new Karelian word would fit the

norms of all dialects. Several fixes to this problem have been initiated, ranging from intracommunity questionnaires posted on social media (Tuomasjukka 2019) to books that are simultaneously published in all three dialects (Oma mua 2021).

### 3.5 Relay translation and relay languages

Although this thesis focuses on the English and the Karelian languages and extensive research on the topic cannot yet be found, the potential effect the Finnish and sometimes the Russian languages have on works translated into Karelian cannot be overlooked. As referenced above, situations where additional languages, those being all languages except the source language and the target language, affect a translation process have not extensively studied, perhaps because most translators work so that they are a native speaker in at least one of the languages involved in the current translation. However, the case for Karelian is different, as skill profiles of even native speakers vary (see section 3.1), and it is not at all uncommon for a translator to translate from one foreign language to another, one of these being Karelian. Accordingly, Kuusi, Riionheimo and Kolehmainen (2022) have noted that, when encountered with lexical gaps or other difficulties, users of Karelian tend to utilize other linguistic resources, mainly Finnish and Russian, to coin neologisms.

The presence of more than two languages in translation is not a phenomenon exclusive to translating into endangered languages but arguably is more common when at least one of the languages involved in the translation is rare or endangered or when the two languages are not closely related, making locating a translator that is fluent in both challenging. In situations like these, the only opportunity might be to create a translation not based on the original source text but one or more of its pre-existing translations, as has been done when translating i.e., Greek (Ivaska 2020) and Japanese (Porrasmaa 2016) literature. This is called translating via **relay languages** or **relay translation**. To simplify, in addition to a source text and a target text, a relay translation features at least one **intermediate text** (IT) that replaces the source text that cannot be understood or reached (Ringmar 2010).

As stated above, translations that feature challenging, endangered, or marginalized languages are more likely to have been obtained through relay translation, and users of endangered languages have learned to utilize their knowledge of other, viral languages. However, it is interesting to consider, whether the presence of a third language can, perhaps unknowingly to

the translator, be so notable even when translating without an intermediate text, that one could speak of an **implicit relay language**. This is not a previously used term but a means for this thesis to describe a situation where a translator does not knowingly use an intermediate text or continuously rely on other languages but might subconsciously first translate the source text message into their first and therefore dominant language and only then convey the original message into the target language. Of course, one cannot see into the head of a translator and determine whether they have knowingly or accidentally implemented the interference of another, third language, but it can be assumed that especially in those cases, where the target language and the translator's first language are closely related, the target text could very easily come to contain both vocabulary and grammar more typical to the first language than to the target language. This could be very likely between Finnish and Karelian. Moreover, the languages are, in some respects, so alike and share such a notable share of their vocabularies that it would not be inherently unjustifiable for a translator to simply use a variant from their own first language, or implicit relay language, in the target text. Whether this practice results in authentic or vibrant language is, of course, an altogether different discussion.

Again, it is important to emphasize, that while relay languages, implicit or not, are not a focal point in this thesis, the topic will be occasionally referred to and its potential impact will be analyzed, although most such claims are reliant on observation of source and the target texts, speculation, and personal deduction and experience on translating into Karelian. The importance and specifics of this phenomenon in the context of this thesis as well as why the potentially implicit nature of relay languages has been included will be explained in more detail in section 6.2.1, while discussing the research material.

## 4 Lexical gaps

In this section, **lexical gaps** and the ways in which a translator might approach translating them will be discussed. According to *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (Crystal 2003) a gap, or an accidental gap, is a term used to describe “an absence of a linguistic unit at a place in a pattern of relationships where one might have been expected” (205) based on other, closely related languages or the environment the language in question is spoken in. For instance, certain African languages not having words for snow or slush are not accidental gaps, as the speakers of these languages are not often in direct contact with snow. However, if such an absence occurred in, say, a minority language spoken in Northern Russia, the gap would definitely be accidental (and rather confusing). Moreover, the term accidental gap cannot be used to describe linguistic absences created by the rules of a certain language – for example, there are certain sounds that cannot exist in certain language systems. A gap is accidental only when there is no obvious linguistic or sociocultural reason for such a feature to be absent from the language.

The focus of this thesis will be on lexical gaps, as they are the most relevant in the case of Karelian. As Karelian functions relatively similarly to other surrounding and closely related languages, having taken phonological influences from the Russian language and **lexical loans** from both Russian and Finnish, there is no purely linguistic reason to suspect notable amounts of grammatical or syntactic gaps. Lexical gaps, however, are notably common in the case of Karelian, as the language has, for a long time, lacked some of the very basic vocabulary in certain areas of language. These lexical gaps are direct consequences of the oppression and the lack of support given to the Karelian language, as these factors have led to societies surrounding Karelians functioning solely in either Finnish or Russian, which, in turn, has led into Karelians filling in the lexical gaps by borrowing words from other languages, i.e., **codeswitching** (Pyöli 1996, 186–189). Due to this, this thesis abstains from using the term accidental gap altogether, as the word “accidental” suggests a sense of randomness, although the gaps in vocabulary are very much caused by the sociocultural context and the legal situation of the Karelian language. Thus, the gaps are not accidental or unexplainable.

Furthermore, in the context of Karelian, studying lexical gaps specifically regarding translation is especially interesting, lexical gaps are treated quite differently in translation than they are some other domains of modern Karelian, such as online writings or personal conversations. As

covered earlier in this thesis in section 3.2.1, most Karelians are fluent in other languages, as well, and use those on a daily basis. Due to some domains of the lives of Karelian speakers functioning entirely in, for instance, Finnish or Russian, the most natural communicative solution when encountering a lexical gap is to simply **codeswitch** or **temporarily loan** the needed word from another language. The written Karelian used in official instances, such as news articles or published works of literature, however, greatly differs from the language used in everyday speech situations, as it is standardized, and codeswitching and temporary loans are generally avoided: instead, the rare publications give space to clear, grammatically correct and coherent Karelian (Koivisto 2017). These differences are especially interesting and prevalent in the case of translation, as it further enhances the unavoidable effect of foreign languages. Furthermore, most modern Karelian-language translations aim to revitalize and normalize the Karelian language (Puura & Tánčzos 2022, 219–221), which means they strive for language that is both grammatically correct and vibrant enough to function as a linguistic example. Due to this, codeswitches or direct loans tend to be avoided, as stated above, which requires the translator to approach lexical gaps in a way that is quite different from the quick and easy everyday codeswitch. Therefore, the solutions of crossing lexical gaps introduced in this section specifically consider the context of written and translated Karelian. Although they are not the most common types of solutions of avoiding all lexical gaps, they are inarguably interesting from an academic perspective, as they represent and exemplify the concrete and intentional aims of maintaining and revitalizing the Karelian language.

#### **4.1 Strategies and solutions of bridging lexical gaps**

When translating any text from one language to another, a translator has a certain set of **translation strategies** to utilize in order to arrive at a certain target text. Several scholars have studied these different strategies of translating, starting with Vinay and Darbelnet's (1995) categorization, first introduced in 1958, of 'translation procedures' while translating between French to English. To simplify, their procedures consisted of (1) borrowing, (2) calque, (3) literal translation, (4) transposition, (5) modulation, (6) correspondence of reformulation (equivalence), and (6) adaptation (Vinay & Darbelnet 1995, 32). Vinay and Darbelnet's quite simplistic categorization is often talked of as a starting point, since which other scholars have adapted and broadened their theories. For instance, Andrew Chesterman has categorized potential

translation strategies in his book *Memes of translation: The spread of ideas in translation theory* (1997), where a total of thirty strategies, some of which Vinay and Darbelnet share, are divided into three sub-categories: syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic strategies. To simplify, syntactic strategies mostly impact form, while semantic strategies consider individual words and pragmatic strategies have to do with “the selection of information in the [target text]” (104), but all three categories overlap. The pragmatic categories are especially vague in practice, and might involve both bigger, more systematic changes as well as changes to individual words or phrases (103). The full categorization is presented in table 2.

**Table 2** Translation strategies (Chesterman 1997)

<b>Syntactic strategies</b>				
G1: Literal translation	G2: Loan, calque	G3: Transposition	G4: Unit shift	G5: Phrase structure change
G6: Clause structure change	G7: Sentence structure change	G8: Cohesion change	G9: Level shift	G10: Scheme change
<b>Semantic strategies</b>				
S1: Synonymy	S2: Antonymy	S3: Hyponymy	S4: Converses	S5: Abstraction change
S6: Distribution change	S7: Emphasis change	S8: Paraphrase	S9: Trope change	S10: Other semantic changes
<b>Pragmatic strategies</b>				
Pr1: Cultural filtering	Pr2: Explicitness change	Pr3: Information change	Pr4: Interpersonal change	Pr5: Illocutionary change
Pr6: Coherence change	Pr7: Partial translation	Pr8: Visibility change	Pr9: Transcending	Pr10: Other pragmatic strategies

Moreover, Chesterman states that for ways of translation to become a translation strategy, they need to be widely used and recognized by translators. When this is achieved, translators in training begin to learn them from their seniors and they are continually passed on to new translators (Chesterman 1997, 87). The pool of current strategies is, of course, always prone to change, which is very often the case when a translator works with minority languages. For instance, while discussing syntactic translation strategies, Chesterman (1997, 92) states that



literal translation (G1), or remaining as close as possible to the source text both in form and in meaning, is seen as the default way of translating. However, when it comes to translating into an endangered language and especially when the passage in question contains a lexical gap, opting for a direct translation is difficult and results in the translator creating neologisms. Similarly, there are certain strategies in Chesterman's classification that are, also, irrelevant in the case of translating into a small, endangered language, while others might be all the more common than when translating between two or more vital languages. For instance, coherence change and emphasis change are most likely not especially common when translating into a minority language, as they consider broader textual changes that can be expected to occasionally occur when translating into any language. Other strategies, such as copying sound or copying structure, which might sometimes be seen as easy or overly simple can be more common or at least more accepted and respected in the case of minority language translation, as will be explained in sections 4.2.1 and 6.3.1.

Although Chesterman's categories, according to Gambier (2010, 414), refer to the level of texts and their translations, the word "strategies" potentially places emphasis on the act of translating, as the word refers to a cognitive process. The translator's mind is undoubtedly interesting but often remains inaccessible for scholars working on a textual level: a reader can observe the result, the translation, but it is not necessarily possible to conclude what kinds of **strategies** the translator has utilized to create a certain text. Zabalbescoa (2000, 120) points out that, while some strategies might appear more likely than others, what readers see as words on the paper can only say so much about what the actual process of translating has entailed. Moreover, categorizations of translation strategies become even more complex once we realize that arriving at a certain result is most likely due to a sum of different modified strategies that intersect and affect each other (Zabalbescoa 2000, 120).

To differentiate material texts from strategies used by translators, scholars have discussed **translation solutions**, which, according to Zabalbescoa (2000, 120), are "what is reached as a result of a [translation] strategy." The term has since become somewhat established, and it has been adopted by several scholars, such as Anthony Pym (2016). Furthermore, Pym (2016) has, based on previously existing categorizations and classroom testing, produced a translation solution categorization of his own. Moreover, Pym (2016, 219) states that his categorization,

consisting of seven main categories and their sub-categories, can be applied to many languages. Pym's full categorization can be seen in table 2.

**Table 3** Translation Solutions (Pym 2016)

<b>Copying</b>	Copying Words	Copying Sounds Copying Morphology Copying Script
	Copying Structure	Copying Prosodic Features Copying Fixed Phrases Copying Text Structure
<b>Expression Change</b>	Perspective Change	Changing Sentence Focus Changing Semantic Focus Changing Voice
	Density Change	Generalization/Specification Explicitation/Implication Multiple Translation Resegmentation
	Compensation	New Level of Expression New Place in Text (notes, paratexts)
	Cultural Correspondence	Corresponding Idioms Corresponding Culture-specific Items
<b>Content Change</b>	Text Tailoring	Correction/Censorship/Updating Omission of Content Addition of Content

The categorization used in this thesis is a modification based on both Chesterman's (1997) and Pym's (2016) categorizations presented in this section. The reason for modifying the categorization lies both in the viewpoint of this study and the state of the Karelian language. First, Pym's and Chesterman's categories are numerous and were likely created to cover all kinds of translations and translation solutions ranging from individual words to longer, culturally challenging passages. Moreover, translation strategies and solutions that specifically consider individual words are relatively sparse in the existing categorizations, and most categories seem to refer to changes made to, for example, the density or sentence structure of the text, or consider the text as a whole (i.e., Pym's Compensation and Text tailoring categories). This is most likely caused by the fact that the categorizations were compiled, for the most part, to suit vital

languages and their comprehensive vocabularies. However, as already established, when translating into a minority language, a translator will have to continuously adapt different translation strategies to arrive at creative solutions even on the level of lexicon, as the target language of any translation might be lacking even in the most basic vocabulary. Although studying the structure and tone of minority language translations is interesting, as well, it is sensible to narrow down the scope of one's study from thirty to less than ten potential strategies, as curious and challenging translation solutions are likely to be numerous. This, of course, does not mean that all possibilities should not be considered and examined, but, when studying a language that has previously not been greatly studied, it might be sensible to initially refrain from extensive sub-categorization. Due to this, the translation solutions studied in this thesis specifically affect matters on a lexical level, whereas potential sub-categories and other interesting factors can be attended to in further studies.

The modified categorization consists of the following categories:

1. Copying sound
2. Copying morphology
3. Hyponymy
4. Synonymy
5. Paraphrase
6. Explicitness change
7. Cultural filtering

Out of the above list, solutions 1–6 occur independently, whereas the role of cultural filtering (category 7) is different: it alone does not explain any specific way of dismantling a lexical gap but occasionally offers additional information on why a certain solution might have been applied. Accordingly, cultural filtering will not occur on its own but instead will accompany other solutions. merely accompanies other solutions. The unicity of cultural filtering as well as expected results and the ways of concretely utilizing each solution in this thesis will be presented in section 6, while the following sub-section 4.2 introduces and exemplifies the categorization on a general level.

Before proceeding onto defining the above listed categories, it is necessary to again address the number of categories included. In a sense, seven categories are arguably little, and such a small array of potential explanations for translation may result in simplistic results. However, as stated in the introduction of this thesis and as will be further explained in section 6, the aim of this thesis is to survey the topics of translating into Karelian and coining neologisms, while finer details are left to be attended to at a later time and with the support of more, perhaps yet unreleased studies on related topics. Therefore, including a very limited number of categories was an intentional decision that supports both the general aim of the study and the research question(s). Had the questions been phrased differently, an alternative set of categories could have been utilized to conduct a similar study, with a different focus.

## **4.2 The modified categorization**

As stated above, this sub-section will present the solutions of the modified categorization. The aim of this section is to introduce the reader with the basics behind the solutions, whereas section 6 will explain how and why certain solutions were exploited in this study.

Both this section and the analysis of the research material will occasionally refer to certain solutions being either **domesticating** or **foreignizing**. Although these two themes are not at the center of this thesis or its research questions, their importance in all translation studies is too crucial to be ignored. Furthermore, they can be especially useful when attempting to establish or categorize solutions of minority language translation, as potential solutions and the motivations behind them can be analyzed by loosely dividing them into ones that seek to domesticate and ones that seek to foreignize. To summarize, domesticating translation solutions tend to be adaptive when it comes to cultural concepts and terminology, whereas foreignizing solutions honor and preserve even those aspects that can appear disorienting and foreign to the target text readers (Paloposki 2011, 40–42; see Venuti 1995).

### **4.2.1 Solutions (1) Copying sound and (2) Copying morphology**

When a translator is encountered with a lexical gap, simply copying, or borrowing, the word from the source language can be an inviting strategy. Words can be loaned either directly or by slightly modifying them to better fit the target language's linguistic or phonological rules, or by extracting the original word's meaning and directly translating it, morphological element by morphological

element, into the target language, thus creating a seemingly target language word based on another language (Chesterman 1997, 92).

Chesterman (1997) and many other scholars call direct copying **loaning** while more meaning-oriented borrowings are called **calques**, but this study refrains from using Chesterman's terminology simply for the sake of clarity. Instead of talking about loans and calques, this thesis uses the terms **copying sound** and **copying morphology**. In addition to being transparent and terminologically symmetrical, these terms refer to the concrete act of transferring a word to another language and are, therefore, more local and temporary than loan and calque, which have often been used to describe borrowed words that have been used more widely and are, perhaps, even generally accepted or at the very least recognized by the language community (i.e., loanwords). In a way, copying sound and copying morphology do not make any assumptions on what becomes of the translations and neologisms outside the translation but, rather, regards them as individual translation solutions made by an individual translator. In other words, the decision allows for one to comfortably remain on a textual level. One should note, however, that some eventually fixed borrowings, such as established loanwords, do originate from individual translations, but, in academic contexts, it is sensible to differentiate between well-established but fairly recent loans and temporary and tentative borrowings created by the translator of the book in question.

First, one way to borrow words from another language is to copy their phonetics, although this solution, of course, borrows meaning, as well. To simplify, Pym (2016, 221) states that, while copying sounds, a translator "introduces terms [into another language] by imitating the foreign sounds." As what is being copied is the sound and not exactly their written manifestation, it is only natural that the spelling of the original word is sometimes altered to better fit the target language system, as in the following example, where RUS stands for Russian and KRL for Karelian:

Example 1:

RUS: яблоко – yabloko ('apple')

KRL: juablokku

It is noteworthy that, in certain cases, these kinds of translation solutions could just as well be classified as instances of **direct transfer**. Direct transfers are loanwords or phrases that are transported from one language to another without any alterations. Generally, these words are pronounced and written in the same way in both the source and the target languages (HTBAS 2). While example 1 is clearly a case of copying sound, as the spelling of the word notably changes, the line between the two definitions – copying sound and direct transfer – is not always transparent. However, in this thesis, the concept of direct transfer is merely acknowledged, whereas copying sound is actively included in the analysis, for two reasons. First, although some words examined in this thesis are seemingly identical in both English and Karelian, their pronunciation differs from one another. For instance, the word ‘flamingo’ is pronounced *flemɪŋəw* in English, but its Karelian pronunciation closely resembles the Finnish one (*flamiŋo*). Second, by using the term **direct** transfer, one assumes the word has simply been loaned from the source language to the target language, which, most likely, is not the case with Karelian. As covered in sections 2 and 3, speakers and developers of the Karelian language often work in intimate contact with Finnish and/or Russian. If one acknowledges this context, it becomes evident that, based on mere texts, it is not possible to conclude whether a new word has been transferred directly from English or loaned via an implicit relay language. What remains sure, however, is that the phonetics of the English and the Karelian word remain similar, although not identical.

In addition to copying sound, a translator can borrow words by copying morphology or morphemes, which are meaning-expressing units of a language (Pym 2016, 221), as in the following example:

Example 2:

FIN: vähemmistökieli (‘minority language’)

KRL: vähembistökieli (‘minority’ + ‘language’)

Although Pym (2016, 223) states that copying words, be it sounds or morphology is “likely to be a solution limited to the occasional textual item, either because the alternatives are worse . . . or because the purpose is only to give a minor textual effect.” Furthermore, Pym (2016, 223) continues to explain that the desired effect of using a French or Spanish word in an English text

might be to, for example, “invite a touch of local color” or “sound cool” (223). Despite Pym’s somewhat dismissive stance, copying both sounds and morphology are common solutions when translating into an endangered language. This topic will be analyzed in more detail in section 6.

#### 4.2.2 Solution (3) Hyponymy

Sometimes a direct or exact target language variant for a word does not readily exist, but the concept behind the words is not entirely unknown in the cultural context of the target audience. In such a situation, a translator might opt for a word that is, in layman terms, close enough. For this, there are several possibilities, one of which is hyponymy.

*A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (2003, 233) defines hyponymy as a relationship between lexical items, of which the “former is included in the latter.” To exemplify, **hypernyms** are broader words, such as ‘furniture’ or ‘flower,’ whereas their **hyponyms** are specific types of their hypernym, such as ‘chair’ or ‘daisy.’ When a translator is faced with a culturally or geographically specific realization of a global phenomenon, one potential strategy is to rely on hyponymy – for example, an exotic flower only found in a certain area of the planet might be reduced to a better-known higher type of the same general category of such flowers. In this example, the specific type of owl from the hypothetical Finnish source text becomes a generic owl in English:

Example 3:

FI: tunturipöllö (*Bubo scandiacus*)

EN: owl

This strategy seems to be notably common when translating into a minority language, especially when it comes to names of flora and fauna. Natalia Giloeva and Maria Kok explain (2020, 28) that translating the names of animals and plants can be challenging, as it is not always evident whether the names are general nouns, names, or scientific terms. Moreover, the names can be so old that their etymology, let alone whether they are rooted in science or even empirical knowledge rather than beliefs and tradition, is hard to determine.

The names of flora and fauna that do exist in endangered minority languages are often both old and local, which critically contrasts the way in which names of flora and fauna are generally treated, as this vocabulary is often reassessed and renewed to maintain scientific accuracy (Giloeva & Kok 2020, 29). This leads into the existing words of minority languages being, more

often than not, outdated, which, means that the translator might struggle with how to translate the name of, say, an exotic African bird. In this case, a hyponymy might prove useful: instead of speaking of an African blue tit (*Cyanistes teneriffae*), a Northern European translator might accommodate to the needs and knowledge of the target audience by simply calling the bird in question a blue tit, which allows the reader to recognize and think of it as a Eurasian blue tit. This solution is oftentimes very effective, as it could be argued that, more often than not, the desired message conveyed through including a certain bird is not the very existence of the bird itself but, for example, the presence of a small, common bird. In such cases, the same effect can be achieved naturally by slightly altering the language used (unless faced with other constraints, such as illustrations).

#### **4.2.3 Solution (4) Synonymy**

Despite hyponymy being a common translation solution, as explained in the above section, not all non-obvious (Chesterman 1997, 102) word choices consisting of elements already existing in the target language can be classified as hyponymy.

Most languages, especially rich and vibrant, vital ones, contain sets of **synonyms**, different words that refer to the same or nearly the same concept. Some synonyms contain the exact same meaning, at least on a semantic level, but others might better suit certain contexts or carry different tones (HTBAS 3). Due to this or to, for example, avoid repetition, a translator might select a synonym or a near-synonym instead a more obvious option (Chesterman 1997, 102).

Example 4:

KRL: čoma ('beautiful,' 'pretty')

EN: alluring

#### **4.2.4 Solution (5) Paraphrase**

At times, when translating, it might feel as though certain concepts simply are not describable in the target language. Perhaps the concept one needs to translate is completely strange to the new target audience or something about the structure of the source text is too different from what new intended readers are accustomed to. In these situations, a translator needs to, more than ever, think outside of the box, and to paraphrase might be the best possible option.



According to *A Dictionary of Linguistics and phonetics* (2003, 350), to **paraphrase** means to “produc[e] alternative versions of a sentence or text without changing the meaning.” Essentially, paraphrasing means locating the core message of a sentence and conveying it in other words. In translation theory, such strategies are often called loose or free translation, and they tend to focus on the pragmatic sense of the message while disregarding semantic components (Chesterman 1997, 104).

Although Chesterman seems to only discuss the term paraphrase in the context of sentences or lengthier textual passages, this thesis broadens the concept to consider individual words and phrases, as well. In other words, all instances where a translator cannot or does not translate an individual word or a string of words representing one concept into one similarly structured target language word can be referred to as paraphrases. Moreover, some instances where the target language word is, in fact, a singular word are considered paraphrases if they consist of several morphological units and cannot be traced back to pre-existing forms in other relevant languages. Therefore, the source text’s meaning or message is conveyed through either a full explanatory sentence or by using a neologism that cannot be classified as a case of copying either sound or morphology.

Overall, this strategy is especially common when translating concepts so unknown to the target language that even referring to near-synonyms or similar categories might not help, such as example 4 below:

Example 4:

EN: bathing machine

KRL: heboloin vietty uinduputki (‘swimming tube pulled by horses’)

#### **4.2.5 Solution (6) Explicitness change**

Sometimes entirely changing a source text word or phrase into some other (see sub-sections 4.2.3 and 4.2.4) might not seem like the most plausible option, but the target audience could nevertheless benefit from some amount of additional information. Perhaps a certain word exists in both the source and the target languages, but it carries a slightly different meaning in different languages: for instance, the source text variant might carry additional information that is

**implicitly** known to source language speakers, while this concealed meaning would, when directly translated, remain completely unknown to target language speakers. In such a situation, a translator must somehow make what was originally known implicitly **explicitly visible**. Doing this can be called **explicitness change**.

**Explicitness change** is a term used to describe when a translator either omits details that were explicitly given in the source text (**implication**) or adds new details to the target text (**explicitation**). The details added to the translation are not up to the translator's imagination, but often consider things that are implicitly but undeniably conveyed through the source text (Chesterman 1997, 108). Due to cultural differences and the unique set of knowledge shared by the source text's but not the target text's intended audience, details obvious to the readers of the source text might no longer be understandable to the new audience, which leads into a situation where a translator will have to be more explicit than the author of the original text.

Explicitness change oftentimes exists alongside other solutions. For instance, a paraphrasing solution could simultaneously be an explicitness change if the aim of the new structure is to include information that was implicit for the audience of the source text but would, without the newly added explicitation, remain unknown to the new target audience. Moreover, an explicitness change may be especially difficult to differentiate from a hyponymy solution, as these solutions are artificial, theoretical, and tentative. However, in this thesis, hyponymies and explicitness changes are considered separate, although one could see hyponymy as a type of explicitness change. All occurrences of explicitness change, however, cannot be called hyponymy. This can be exemplified with the following hypothetical translation dilemma.

Kyykkä is a Karelian team sport played with clubs and balls. While the game is relatively well known in Finland, most English speakers are not familiar with it, which would make translating a kyykkä-related text into English somewhat difficult. A translator could apply several different translation strategies and arrive at different solutions. For instance, if a translator was simply going to state that the characters were playing "a team sport," the solution could be classified as a hyponym – kyykkä is one example of a team sport. This translation would be less specific than the original but, also, classifiable as a hyponym. However, if a translator was used a phrase such as "a game of kyykkä" or a "kyykkä match," the solution would no longer be hyponymy, since "a game of kyykkä" and "a kyykkä match" are not sub-types of kyykkä or the other way around.

These instances, where a translator has to make something that used to be implicit – such as *kyykä* being commonly known as a team sport – explicit in the translation, are pure examples of explicitness change.

#### 4.2.6 Category (7) Cultural filtering

As partially illustrated by the sports-related example above, translating never considers only languages, and translators have long been seen as transmitters of culturally loaded information. Cultural aspects might sometimes cause certain problems during translation processes, and several, mostly foreignizing and explanatory ways of navigating these difficult decisions, such as paraphrase, have been expressed above. There are times, however, when lengthily and sometimes awkwardly explaining foreign cultural concepts might make the text challenging to read, and translators must apply alternative, and rather opposite, solutions.

**Cultural filtering** is perhaps better known as naturalization, domestication, or adaption, and it “describes the way in which [source language] items, particularly culture-specific items, are translated as [target language] cultural or functional equivalents, so that they conform to [target language] norms” (Chesterman 1997, 108). As the name cultural filtering suggests, the norms in question are not only linguistic, and it appears that the term “target language norms” is extended to refer to cultural norms shared by the speakers of the target language, as well.

The need to culturally filter while translating arises in situations where the source text aims to evoke a specific reaction from its readers but some or even none of the thought-evoking scene could not be readily understood in the target culture. Here, a translator can locate the culturally specific source text content and, in the translation, replace it with language or phenomena that carry similar implicit meanings in the target culture. Pym (2016, 230–231) calls this **cultural correspondence** and exemplifies the concept with cultural idioms and sayings, which can, when used correctly, convey large units of meaning and values but easily become flat and alienating if translated directly. In general, Pym’s approach is similar to that of Chesterman’s (1997), but his categorization contains two common sub-categories that are left implicit in Chesterman’s writing: (1) corresponding idioms and (2) corresponding culturally specific items (i.e., units of measurement or currency) (231). These sub-categories are useful, but they will not be referred to in this thesis, as they best fit contexts where all languages in question are vital enough to, for example, certainly contain words for measuring units and currencies. Moreover, the case of

translating into endangered languages differs from the standard situation analyzed by Pym (2016) and Chesterman (1997), as the need to culturally and linguistically filter can occur surprisingly often and in unexpected contexts, due to the asymmetric structure of endangered target language lexicon. Occasionally, cultural filtering can be easier and more convenient than creating neologisms or looking for sufficient (near)synonyms.

## 5 Translating for children

This section will briefly consider translating children's literature and for a child audience.

Although the thesis does not specifically consider children's literature and its translation, it is important to consider the study of translating for children, as well, as *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* is a widely known and loved classic of children's literature, as well as a prominent example of the playful and surrealist nonsense genre (Gicala 2020, 125 & Schwab 1996 49–51). Moreover, the fact that the target audience of the translation consists, at least partially, of children, may affect the ways in which lexical gaps are treated while translating.

The study of translating for children is interested in texts translated for children. As in any academic field, approaches vary, but Cecilia Alvstad (2010, 22) describes that most scholars focus on one of several of the following: **cultural context adaptation**, **ideological manipulation**, **dual readership** (both children and adults), **features of orality**, and **the relationship between text and image**. All of these categories affect both the translation process as a whole and each other. However, this short sub-section will only cover cultural context adaptation, dual readership, and the relationship between text and image, as the three are most crucial in the context of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and the Karelian language.

First, cultural concept adaptation, as Alvstad (2010, 22) explains, borrowing Klingberg's (1986) terminology, concerns "modifications that aim to adjust a text to the prospective readers' frames of reference." Furthermore, she explains that this category includes "the use of literary references, foreign languages, historical background, flora and fauna, proper names, weights and measures and other culture-specific phenomena" (22). All scholars do not necessarily agree on whether it is better to apply foreignizing or domesticating strategies onto such problems, but it is evident that a translator needs to acknowledge these details and the fact that children's set of knowledge differs from those of adults. In the case of Karelian, culture context adaptation becomes all the more difficult due to linguistic constraints, which will be discussed in detail in section 5.1.

By dual readership, Alvstad (2010, 24) means that children's literature is never written merely for children, as it is consumed by adult editors, teachers, librarians, and parents. The adult influence does not stop or begin at consumption, and Oittinen (2000, 51–54) demonstrates that adults

pose as authorities of children's literature. In other words, adults decide what literature is seen as entertaining, educational or, simply, good enough to be passed on to the children. Once certain stories are deemed sufficient and are published, parents are perhaps the most significant non-children group that partake in reading children's literature because many children's books, especially those aimed at a young child-audience, are read out loud by parents and other adults. Due to this, in addition to explicitly addressing the child reader, the narrative oftentimes seeks to amuse and engage the adult reader in subtly amusing ways. Alvstad (2010: 24) mentions that the dual complexity of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, among that of other children's classics, has been studied before and that successfully translating both the explicit children-oriented message and the implicit adult-oriented humor is often difficult or impossible. Due to this, the translator often must make a conscious effort of translating for either children or for their parents.

Last, the relationship between text and image is especially critical when translating illustrated works. To simplify, the illustration the translation is published alongside with, according to Alvstad (2010, 25), greatly affects the translation strategies and solutions used. The claim is supported by Ippolito (2008, 86–90) who explains that while a translator can “intervene only on the verbal text, but, at the same time, they must not overlook any interactive influence between the verbal and visual codes” (88). For instance, a character name including a pun or a cultural reference could very well be successfully translated with both the explicit (the name) and the implicit (the pun) meanings intact in a non-illustrated text, but when the illustration clearly showcases a character's appearance, dramatically altering their name may not be possible. If the original pun or reference does not directly translate to the target language, a translator might have to settle on translating the name in a way that best accompanies the illustration and thus seems logical, although, in doing so, they are not able to transfer the intended pun to the target audience. In a way, this dilemma is in line with the one of a double audience: a translator decides to accommodate children by remaining faithful and logical on a surface-level, whereas the puns, mostly implicit and intended for the adult audience, are understandably neglected. The decision is only logical because, as Oittinen (2000, 108) reminds, the primary audience of a children's book consist of children, which is something the translator cannot forget. In fact, the translator's every decision should support the child reader and their needs, and close and collaborative connection between the visual and the verbal can be seen as one of these things. After all, a

child reader that does not approve of the translated text's style or find it logical enough will not take it seriously (Oittinen 2000, 108).

### **5.1 Endangered languages and translating for children**

As much as translating for children is different from translating for adults, translating for minority language children differs from translating for children that speak a vital language, as well. As already established in this thesis, the aim of creating minority-language materials for children is not only to grant children access to materials in their own language but to also, in general, revitalize the state of the language in question and to ensure a smooth transition from child into adult speakers.

Much like adult speakers of a minority language, many children, especially those who already have begun school alongside speakers of majority languages, may struggle with their first language. This becomes especially prominent when discussing academic or societal ideas and topics. What makes translating for minority language children trickier, though, is the fact that, in a way, children, as readers, are more demanding than adults. For instance, a 23-year-old reader who fluently speaks Karelian, Finnish, English and Russian will most likely understand any neologism, loan or calque introduced in a translated Karelian text, as most words introduced to Karelian are based on either Finnish or Russian. However, the situation is different with a child reader, as they might not yet be familiar with the more prestigious languages that they are likely to learn once they begin school. Moreover, as stated earlier in section 4 while discussing Fisherman's goals of reversing language shift, the very aim of re-establishing a language community is creating environments where young speakers can learn the language in question as their mother tongue. In this light, it is beneficial for the translations to support this tender and newly found language skill, while simultaneously remaining understandable for the older generations, whose language skills might be affected by other prestigious languages. This is a good example of the kind of struggle created by dual readership, as introduced by Alvstad (2010) and discussed in the beginning of section 5.

## 6 Material and Methods

In this section, both the primary material of this thesis and the ways it has been studied will be introduced. First, Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and its cultural significance will be explained briefly, after which the thesis will examine the Karelian translation of the novel, *Alisan šeikkailut kummanmuas*, both as a translated work of literature and as a communicative situation.

Sub-section 6.3 will present and exemplify the passages that the research material consists of, and, lastly, section 6.4 revisits the solution categories first introduced in section 4 of this thesis. This time, the focus will be on the specific ways the solution categories have been utilized in the analysis of potential lexical gaps and their translations.

### 6.1 Alice's Adventures in Wonderland

*Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* by Lewis Carroll is undoubtedly one of the most well-known children's books in the world. The book was first published in 1865, and it has since become one of the most popular English language works in the world, enjoyed by both children and adults.

*Alice* is perhaps best known for its creative use of riddles, wordplay, and absurd or nonsensical words, idioms and symbols, and the book is often thought of as a prominent of **nonsense literature** (Gicala 2020, 125 & Schwab 1996 49–51). Accordingly, *Alice*, originally a story Carroll conjured for his daughters, is wildly fantastical in terms of plot, as well: in the story, Alice finds herself in a world of puzzles, riddles and curious creatures, and the laws of physics no longer seem to apply. The certain psychedelic nature of Alice's adventures may be the reason behind the book's success among an older audience. Additionally, Alice's whimsical narrative often cleverly and intertextually parodies works of literature and other cultural phenomena of the time it was written in, which may further engage adult audiences.

According to Riitta Oittinen, who is an expert on translating for children, *Alice* is especially interesting from a translator's point of view, as it is a prime example of a story that can be read differently in different cultures and times. Moreover, while Carroll originally intended *Alice* to be read by children, its numerous translations have made it possible for the book to resurface in the hands of new audiences, which has led into *Alice* becoming adult literature, as well (Oittinen 2000, 133–135).



*Alice* has been translated into Finnish several times (Swan 1906; Kunnas & Manner 1974; Martin 1995; Nevanlinna 2000), each with different illustrations. Oittinen states that the illustrations have both impacted the translations and been altered for translational purposes. For instance, Tove Jansson, the creator of Moomins, was specifically requested to re-illustrate one version of the translated *Alice* to “depict [her] adventures in a modern, original way” (Oittinen 2000, 143). The Karelian translation, however, was published alongside Sir John Tenniel’s original illustrations, which must have affected at least some of the translation solutions.

## 6.2 Ališan šeikkailut kummanmuas

In 2018, *Alice* was translated into Karelian by Aleksi Ruuskanen and published by Karjalan Kielen Seura as *Alisan šeikkailut kummanmuas*. Ruuskanen is a native speaker of Finnish and a self-taught speaker of Karelian and originally translated *Alice* into Karelian in his free time. He later attended a few Karelian translation seminars and workshops organized by the University of Eastern Finland and has since translated several children’s literature classics, such as *Le Petit Prince* (krl. *Pieni prinsut*) and *Pippi Långstrump* (krl. *Peppi Pitkysukku*) into Karelian. His translation of *Alice*, though, stands out even among his own work because it is one of the only, if not even the only, Karelian text that has been translated directly from English rather than Finnish, Russian or Swedish (Riionheimo 2019a).

Despite being a native speaker of Finnish but not of English, Ruuskanen has stated that translating *Alice* from the English source text instead of the Finnish translation was an conscious decision made to best avoid the effect the Finnish language would understandably and unavoidably have on the translation, as it is closely related to Karelian and would, feature numerous choices of words that could be directly transmitted into the Karelian translation (Riionheimo 2019a). This decision is in line with the thoughts and literature introduced in section 4 of this thesis: translation is a powerful tool of language revitalization, but a good translator should be aware of the dangers of translating not only from a vital language to an endangered language but between two closely related languages, as well. Theoretically ideological decisions are rarely purely so in execution, and although Ruuskanen has very well justified his decision to refrain from using the Finnish translation of *Alice* as an relay language, it might not have been enough to entirely avoid the impact of Finnish. It is true that by avoiding the Finnish translation Ruuskanen has most likely avoided some Finnish influence, but the decision has created quite

the curious situation, as well: Ruuskanen is translating from a learnt language to a learnt language, whereas most translators translate from learnt languages to their first language. The aim of the thesis is not to evaluate whether translators should work on their first or learnt languages, but the curiosity of the situation, which is very typical for endangered language translation, cannot be overlooked. As suggested in section 3.5, the lack of a first or fluent language in the translation process has resulted in the Finnish language potentially functioning as an implicit or accidental relay language. This will be referred to multiple times during the analysis of the research material.

According to Ruuskanen, *Alice* was not an easy book to translate because it heavily relies on and wittfully parodies aspects of Victorian English culture and often refers to people with English names, as well as English language songs and riddles (Riionheimo 2019a). Despite the challenges, translators in such situations have several strategies they can employ to arrive in solutions that both honour the original text and benefit the target language and its users. These strategies and solutions will be thoroughly examined in section 6.4, but it is worth stating here, on a general level, that the choices of solutions correspond with the target audience the translator has decided to work with. As already discussed through the academic writings of Alvstad (2010) in section 5, a translator of children's literature often needs to decide primarily focus on one target audience instead of translating for both adults and children. The situation is similar when translating historical works of fiction, as the translator can choose to either treat the source text as a historical document that does not need to be fully understandable to the modern reader or aim to domesticate the text so that it serves the original communicative function of, for instance, children's entertainment in a modern setting, as well. This is, of course, a generalization, and one should not underestimate a child reader's ability to be understand and be entertained by more than just what their everyday surroundings consist of. Nevertheless, a translator needs to be aware of these aspects of the text or texts in question and accordingly adjust their approach in the translation.

This thesis refrains from detailed speculations of the translator's thoughts and motives and instead strives to remain on a textual level, and all Ruuskanen has stated about his broader values while translating is that there is no reason why works aimed at children could not rely on foreignizing translation strategies and thus contain things strange and unknown (Riionheimo

2019a): here, the implication that children's literature would stereotypically be domesticating by nature, is Ruuskanen's and not explicitly sourced. He has not, however, addressed how he had approached the historical aspects of the text, which would not, in any case, affect this thesis, as its focus aims to remain on a textual level instead of dwelling too much on the translator's choices and motivations. The translator will be merely referred to when his presense is especially prevalent.

### **6.2.1 *Alisan šeikkailut kummanmuas* as a communicative situation**

In addition to introducing and examining the concrete conditions *Alice* was translated into Karelian in, it is important to realize that *Alisan šeikkailut kummanmuas* is an extraordinary Karelian language work even when it is examined not as a translation but as an independent text.

First, although books and other cultural products in Karelian have been published for decades, lengthy novels are still rare. Second, most of the rare novels published in Karelian tend to consider a traditional, Karelian way of life or the history of the Karelian people. So far, contemporary, standardized Karelian language that does not, necessarily, in any way consider the Karelian people, tradition, village life, or individual idiolects, has mostly been used in official and theoretical contexts, such as news reports or newspapers covering current events. In a sense, translated children's literature is one of the few exceptions: in these works, modern and standardized Karelian is somewhat regularly used to describe concepts and worlds that have nothing to do with being Karelian.

Due to the extraordinarity explained above and the presense of several different languages in the translation process, the ways in which the translation is expected to deal with lexical gaps greatly differs of those typical to everyday speakers of Karelian, as explained in section 4. This is important to keep in mind while later examining the research material.

## **6.3 Research material**

In this sub-section, focus on both *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and *Alisan šeikkailut kummanmuas* will be narrowed to examination of excerpts relevant for the study at the core of the thesis. The section will begin by revisiting the themes first introduced in the introduction of this thesis: an explanation on the significance of the work and its translation as well as the

reasoning behind utilizing it as primary research material. Simultaneously, the aim of the research will be presented in a condensed, simplified form. Then, the way the novel and its translation were examined and dismembered to compile a potentially interesting collection of linguistic material – source and target language pairs of certain segments – will be explained.

### **6.3.1 Background and general principles**

As covered section 1, *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* was chosen as the research material for this thesis because it is one of the only, if not the only, literary works translated from English into Karelian (instead of from a relay language, such as Finnish or Russian). The decision was not only made out of necessity, though, but the story provides excellent material for a study on translation solutions of Karelian translators, as mentioned above in section 6.2.

*Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, being an iconic work of children's literature, offers a whole array of potentially interesting topics for one to examine. However, due to lack of previous academic studies on translating into Karelian, especially from English, this thesis intentionally remains on a fairly general level, while focusing on a certain theme (lexical gaps). Because the thesis format is somewhat limited in terms of both length and depth, the number of instances the final research material consists of is quite small but nevertheless diverse and eyeopening. This is in line with the objectives of the thesis, as the study was never intended to be a comprehensive analysis of all translation solutions found in the research material but a rather tentative exploration of possibilities and topics that could be studied further in the future.

As the research material is a full-length novel, it is likely that several different sets of interesting excerpts could be compiled. The selection for this thesis was compiled based on the theory presented in above sections as well as personal experiences of translating from Finnish and English into Karelian. When compiling the selection, the focus was on locating words or phrases that would likely not yet exist in the Karelian language or that would otherwise be challenging to translate (e.g. for cultural reasons). This supports the research questions introduced in section 1 of this thesis, as one of the aims of the study is to examine what the successfully located and potential lexical gaps say about the source and the target cultures and the differences between them.

### 6.3.2 The final research material

According to the principles expressed above, the final set of potentially interesting excerpts was compiled through several thorough readings of both *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and *Alisan šeikkailut kummanmuas*. The readings were executed from a purportedly Karelian perspective and by assigning focus on the prototypical Karelian speaker and their array of everyday languages: what themes, topics, and details in the source text appeared as ones that could not be easily discussed in Karelian? Whether these themes are generally recognized by the speakers of Karelian as concepts or in other languages was not relevant, as the focus of the thesis is on language and what can be conveyed with either original or specially created Karelian and not through codeswitching.

To generalize, most of the eventually chosen words were notably historical and often geographically or culturally specific to English or Victorian English. In addition to historical or Victorian words, such as “bathing machine” and “fender,” names for items and organisms not native to the areas Karelian speakers generally reside in were included in the thesis.

For the sake of clarity, the selected research material has been categorized as follows:

1. **Invented words:** Common or proper nouns invented for or mostly known in the universe of *Alice*, such as “Cheshire cat” or “Mock Turtle”
2. **Nonsensical words:** Purposedly misspelt or otherwise misused words, such as “The Antipathies”
3. **Animals and mythological creatures:** Names of animals and mythological creatures assumedly not recognized in the Karelian language, such as “Gryphon” or “lory”
4. **Edibles:** Names of foods and drinks assumedly not previously recognized in the Karelian language, such as “comfit”
5. **Victorian English words:** Words referring to historical items and concepts that undeniably relate to Victorian English culture, such as “day-school” and “bathing machine”
6. **Miscellaneous words:** Words that do not clearly fit into one or only one category

In table 3, all relevant research material, which will later be presented divided into categories 1–6, and their translations are presented:

**Table 4** Relevant words and passages in an alphabetical order

Source text	Target text	Source text	Target text
barley sugar	n'amu	inkstand	černilpulloine
bathing machine	heboloin vietty uinduputki	jack-in-the- box	vieteriukko
Caucus-race	kruugois juoksendelu	jury box	suvvonsellittäjien audio
cherry tart	višn'umuarjois luajittu piiroi	latitude	leveysgruadussi
Cheshire- cat	Irvo-kaži	livery	livree
comfit	n'amu	longitude	piduvusgruadussi
croquet	krokuettukiža	lory	popugailindu
Curiouser!	Kubo mimmii!	March Hare	Kevätjänöi
day-school	škola	memorandum	kirjuttakkuat mustoh
dormouse	Unihiiri	Mock Turtle	Valehsuojusšlöpoi
drawling, sketching, and fainting in coils	siirdämisty, keskiizoin luadimistu da voiruakkumualavustu	porpoise	meripoččizii
fender	kyvensuoju	roast turkey	räkitetty indiekku
flamingo	flamingo	Seaography	merentiedo
footman	lakei	serpent	mado
Gryphon	Grifonu	sky-rocket	raketti
Hatter	Hatunluadii	starfish	meritiähti
hearthrug	kaminan mattoine	The Antipathies	Antipatiet
hookah	vezipiippu	toffy	sliuhkukaramellu
housemaid	palvelii	Uglification	pahendus

After the first version of the list was compiled, several dictionaries of the Karelian language were consulted. The selection of dictionaries contained both monolingual and multilingual dictionaries (Pyöli 2021; Pyöli & Markianova 2021; Penttonen 2006, Tast 2000). If an established translation for the word or words in question could not be found from any of the dictionaries, or if the

potential translation or translations offered were different than the variant used in the primary material of this thesis, the translator's choice of words was considered either a neologism or an otherwise relevant and unconventional translation solution.

In addition to dictionaries, parallel texts, such as news articles published by *Yle uudizet karjalakse*, *Oma mua* and *Viestit Karjala*, have been consulted, and the words in question have been searched on the internet to see if they have been used in everyday colloquial speech. However, these sources are not listed in the bibliography as they have not been systematically or even continuously consulted, as news articles and newspapers are sometimes difficult to access and internet writings are not reliable or always traceable to a certain writer. Moreover, this thesis refrains from using any individual texts or text types as definitive authorities of what is or is not proper Karelian, although, for instance, the *Oma mua* magazine does have an important and conscious role in language revitalization (Tánczos 2021, 180–184). The decision was made because written Karelian is still undergoing continuous development and its revitalization is arguably in a very early stage.

## 6.4 Methods

In this sub-section, the ways in which the research material has been analyzed will be discussed and exemplified. As stated earlier in section 4, the basis for this analysis lies in a modified categorization of translation strategies and solutions compiled from pre-existing categorizations by Chesterman (1997) and Pym (2016). Although Chesterman uses the term strategy in his categorization, this thesis calls his "strategies" **solutions** in the same way as Pym's categories, as the nature of this study only allows one to analyze finished translations instead of the translation process behind it.

The core method of analysis has been comparative: inspecting both the original word or phrase and its translation, as well as different ways of expressing the same idea in both closely related languages, such as Finnish, and otherwise relevant languages, namely Russian. Based on general linguistic context and analysis, all findings have been categorized according to the modified categorization. In the following sub-sections, all solution categories relevant to this study will be further discussed. For general descriptions of the categories, see section 4.

In some cases, tools and sources, such as *The Annotated Alice* (Carroll 1972/1865), several dictionaries, and a corpus tool, have been utilized. The specific ways of consulting each tool will be explained either in section 7 or during the analysis itself.

#### **6.4.1 Categories (1) Copying sound and (2) Copying morphology**

As discussed in section 4.2.1, Pym states that copying either sounds or morphology most likely only considers occasional textual items and, even then, might not be the most desirable option but, instead, the most tolerable among several potential and insufficient translation solutions. Pym (2016, 223) additionally recognizes a foreignizing or exoticizing function, which emphasizes a certain strangeness encountered in the source text.

Despite Pym's somewhat dismissive stance, copying both sounds and morphology are commonplace solutions when translating into an endangered language. Furthermore, in this context, these solutions cannot be expected to solely strive to achieve stylistic effects and might be over-represented due to loan-based solutions potentially being the fastest and the most convenient solutions to employ. Easiness and convenience become important criteria when a source text features numerous instances that are difficult or impossible to translate directly. Moreover, solutions that rely on another language instead of creating new material solely within the Karelian language system are especially helpful because even native speakers might struggle with grasping new words: because of the prestigious languages used in the fields of education, working life, and public spheres in general, many speakers are more fluent in other languages than they are in Karelian. Due to this, a word that closely resembles a common word in another language is not only faster to create than a more creative, original neologism, but also more likely to be understood by the target audience and thus fulfills its communicative purpose. This, of course, depends on the communicative function in question. Here, it is assumed that most works translated into Karelian are aimed at diverse audiences consisting of both adults and children. The situation might be different when translating solely for children (see section 5 for a more detailed explanation).

For the reasons above, copying sounds and copying morphology were immediately included in the analysis and later encountered numerous times. Instances of copying sound were relatively easy to locate, although there was variation in whether the spelling of the source text word was copied, as well, or altered. Copying morphology was a somewhat straightforward category, as



well, but locating some instances of it required heightened attention because in addition to copying the English, source text structure, the translator has occasionally copied the structure of the Finnish language variant of the original, source text item. Some of these instances were clear to see, but others were vaguer and sometimes allowed for alternative interpretations, such as paraphrase or explicitness change, to arise, as well. These findings will be discussed in detail in section 7.

#### **6.4.2 Solution (3) Hyponymy**

As discussed in section 4.2.2, translation solutions that rely on hyponymies can be expected to be common when translating into endangered languages. This is the case for Karelian, as well, as the language, owing to successful language revitalization in the recent years, features a somewhat large and lively lexicon of general and basic concepts but is lacking in other areas of life. For instance, as stated earlier in this thesis (see section 2.1), Karelian has, for a long time, mostly been spoken among individual households. Due to this, as well as codeswitching in certain social situations, the language has long lacked vocabulary regarding several fields of life. These gaps in the vocabulary have since been determinedly filled through language revitalization methods, but the focus of revitalization work has understandably been on modern, every-day vocabulary and phenomena that directly consider the Karelian language users.

Hyponymy was chosen as one of the applicable categories for this thesis because *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* is a distinctively historical work of literature that, geographically and culturally, takes place relatively far from Karelia. This allows one to assume that there will be instances where the Karelian language does have a word for a general related concept but might lack a more specific term.

#### **6.4.3 Solution (4) Synonymy**

In section 4.2.3, it was stated that especially rich and vibrant languages feature considerable amounts of synonyms a translator can choose from to, for example, avoid repetition or stylistically enhance the text. Interestingly, this portrays synonymy as a positive category that is always voluntarily chosen to improve the target text, whereas copying sounds and copying morphology were portrayed as negative, involuntary solutions brought on by difficult circumstances. However, it was stated earlier that copying solutions are often entirely voluntary

and even desired when translating into minority languages. Similarly, the usage of synonymy is expectedly different, which is why it was included in this thesis, as well.

Unsurprisingly, the unique usage of synonymy as a translation strategy is, in the case of Karelian, caused by the way its vocabulary has been formed (see section 6.4.2). When a perfect translation of the source text word does not exist, a translator might, in addition to examining hyponymies, transport the source text word to the target text by using a synonym or a near-synonym. Of course, when translating into minority languages, this can be done to enhance the target text, as well, but it can be assumed that most instances of synonymy rather stem from the fact that the target language system does not include as many unique and specific words as those of vital languages do.

For the most part, locating instances of synonymy was easy. As most cases of synonymy are fairly straightforward, the analysis, on their part, also considered whether the eventually employed variants conceal implicit meanings or tones that notably differ from the ST variant.

#### **6.4.4 Solution (5) Paraphrase**

Alongside copying sound and structure, paraphrase seems to be one of the most common strategies or translating into endangered languages or, at the very least, to Karelian. Much like the copying strategies, academic texts regard paraphrasing as an acceptable but undesirable solution and, additionally, only refer to it when discussing sentences or other large linguistic units. However, in the case of endangered language translation, paraphrasing can and does take place on a semantic level, as well, and especially when considering units that are larger than individual words but smaller than full sentences (i.e., phrases).

In the study, all instances where the target text word or phrase does not expectedly correspond to the source text variant are considered paraphrases. For instance, target text passages that contain words previously unknown to the Karelian language and that have not been coined by using one of the other examined solutions are considered examples of paraphrase. Accordingly, many of these instances of paraphrase could be referred to as neologisms, which mean new words or expressions coined for specific communicative contexts (Cambridge Dictionary). Additionally, larger passages where the target text expresses the message of the source text in clearly differing words or by using alternative structures have been included in the analysis.

Due to the ambiguity expressed above, the ways in which the paraphrasing instances have been analyzed differ greatly. On a general level, the focus of the analysis of such instances has been on 1) the potential reasons behind the paraphrase and 2) whether the paraphrase successfully retains the meaning of the source text, although words and structures similar to the source text could not be used.

#### **6.4.5 Solution (6) Explicitness change**

As stated in section 4.2.6, instances of hyponymy and explicitness change are sometimes difficult to distinguish from one another. Despite the certain ambiguity, explicitness change was included in the analysis as its own, independent category, as it can oftentimes appear as a solitary solution category (see *kyykkä* example in section 4.2.6).

In this thesis, all instances where the target text contains more or less information than the source text have been considered examples of explicitness change. Sometimes these instances have been assigned an alternative solution category if the translation, the function of which is to omit or add information, has been concretely coined by, for example, paraphrasing. This has only been done in cases where the alternative translation solution has been especially interesting or prevalent, but, in most cases, explicitness change has been treated as a dominant category that is allowed to overlap or overwrite other potential categories. This has been done, for instance, when examining the Karelian translation or the word 'lory' (see section 7.3.1).

#### **6.4.6 Solution (7) Cultural filtering**

Section 4.2.7 briefly explained that cultural filtering does not independently occur in this thesis. Although the wording above suggests that solutions either appear or do not appear in the research material, appointing cultural filtering a slightly different role was a conscious and carefully weighted decision.

As stated in section 6.2, the translator of *Alisan šikkailut kummanmuas* has stated that he has intentionally avoided the influence of the Finnish language and firmly believes that children's literature can, and perhaps should, be foreignizing (Riionheimo 2019a). According to this, the translation is, for the most part, foreignizing and explanatory in nature, but the notable differences between the source and target languages and cultures, it was assumed, while compiling the modified categorization, that certain instances where cultural filtering could not

have been avoided would arise. For example, the Karelian language has been standardized relatively recently, which might make it challenging to decide how foreign names should be pronounced or spelled in a Karelian language context.

All in all, instances of cultural filtering, even as a secondary translation solution, are scarce in the research material, but the solution has not been entirely overlooked or removed from the analysis for a few reasons. First, the scarcity of culturally filtering instances offers interesting information on the expectations and realities of translating into endangered languages as well as the translation at hand. Second, some translation solutions, although clearly categorizable as something else, appear to be serving a culturally filtering purpose.

Of course, almost all translation solutions have at least something to do with cultural factors because languages can never be fully separated from the cultures they represent. However, while no cases of pure cultural filtering, such as exchanging a source language proper noun to a target language equivalent, were encountered, there are passages where some culturally specific detail of the source text has clearly been filtered to be easier for the target language reader to understand. In these cases, cultural filtering has been applied as a **secondary translation solution**, and the potential reasonings for a culturally filtering translation have been analyzed.

## 7 Analysis and results

In this section, the material presented in section 6.3.1 will be analysed and the results discussed. The aim is to analyze the translation solutions on the basis of the modified categorization of translation solutions presented in sections 4 and 6. Most findings have been assigned one solution category, but not all cases are as evident. Thus, some findings have been placed into two or more solution categories, one of which is always defined as the superior, more likely, or otherwise stronger solution while the other is regarded as a secondary solution or another aspect likely to have affected the translation. The findings will be presented one thematic category (see sub-section 6.3.2) at a time, after which some general tendencies will be discussed. The structure of analysis of individual instances might differ, but the general form will be as follows: 1) establishing a potential lexical gap, 2) identification of the new item in the Karelian target text, 3) establishing the relationship between the source and the target texts, and 4) assigning the word or phrase a likely translation solution or solutions. Stage one, of course, consider the source text, whereas two and three at least partially take place within the target text. In stage one, however, English-language dictionaries and, occasionally, *The Annotated Alice* (Carroll 1972/1865) have been consulted in addition to the source and the target texts, and stage four is heavily reliant on the endangered language translation theory presented in the above sections.

Before advancing to the analysis, it is beneficial to address the position this thesis assumes in regards to the translator. Despite the occasional reference to the translator or his potential or assumed thoughts, decisions and known languages, the aim of the thesis is not to implicitly judge or to evaluate the translator's work or his competence. All analysis will remain on a general textual level and consider translation solutions that can be derived from the source and the target texts. However, entirely separating translations from their translators or the cultural context they translate in is difficult or near impossible, which is why the translator is occasionally referred to. Moreover, in this case, referring to the translator is sometimes justified, as his position while translating from a foreign language to another foreign language is exceptional and allows one to expect indirect influence from his native language Finnish.

## 7.1 Invented words

In this section, the so-called invented words will be analyzed. The category of invented words consists of words or phrases that did not exist before they were created for the context of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. Some individual words, such as Cheshire Cat, might have existed prior to Carroll's work, but they have been included in this thesis because they were undoubtedly popularized by Carroll and have since become known through his work, to the point where their original etymology is no longer remembered.

Based on the theory presented in sections 3, 4, and 5, it was assumable prior to analyzing the material that some of the several meanings of Carroll's invented words might have become less explicit in translation. This might relate to the restrictions created by the illustration or the way the Karelian language is constructed (see section 5 on dual readership and translating for children and sections 2 and 3.2 on Karelian vocabulary restrictions). However, assuming a more detailed hypothesis was and is not possible because many a topic presented in the theoretical sections of this thesis have not yet been studied in the context of Karelian.

### 7.1.1 Example 1: Caucus race

In chapter three of *Alice's Adventure in Wonderland*, Alice and a group of animals become wet after falling to falling into a river. As Alice expresses discomfort at her wet state, the Dodo, seemingly nonsensically, suggests a **caucus race** to help the group become dry again. The animals and Alice then begin to aimlessly run around in circles. When the race abruptly ends, the Dodo starts wondering who to declare as the winner of the race. Eventually, seemingly for no reason at all, the Dodo declares that everyone has won and is therefore deserving of a prize, which, in the end, is not of any real value (Carroll 2015/1865, 29–30).

On the surface level, the whole race seems like a meaningless, whimsical way to dry oneself. However, as established in section 5, a dual readership shared between children and adult's is one of the most documented features of children's literature (Alvstad 2010), which is why it is not outrageous to expect that seemingly nonsensical passages of the novel have concealed meanings; as much has been stated by the translator of the novel himself (Riionheimo 2018). For instance, according to the Merriam-Webster English dictionary, the word *caucus* means "a closed meeting of a group of persons belonging to the same political party or faction usually to select

candidates or to decide on policy.” This knowledge could inspire an alternative interpretation, according to which the aimless running around was written as political satire and criticism on the way political candidates were picked in 19th century Britain (Carroll 1960, 48).

In *Alisan šeikkailut kummanmuas*, the caucus race becomes **kruugois juoksendelu**, which translates to “running in circles.” The solution could be categorized as a **paraphrase**, as the Karelian translation considers the broader context of the scene and conveys the same action of chaos and rushing about – and the emotional effect it has on the reader – in different words. However, while this is done, the translation inevitably loses its concealed, political meaning, which, arguably, might have been lost in English, as well, over time and different editions and ways of reading *Alice* have emerged. In the context of translations, such omissions are often direct consequence of the fact that dual readerships and its double meanings are extremely hard to reproduce in translations, which is why it is a common translation strategy to simply aim one’s translation at either adults or children (see section 5).

### 7.1.2 Example 2: Cheshire-cat

**Cheshire-cat** is a character first introduced in chapter six of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*. The Cheshire-cat is a mystical cat who lives in a tree and is characterized by its wide grin. The concept of a cheshire cat is not unique to the world of *Alice*, as “to grin like a Cheshire-cat” was already an established idiom in Carroll’s time (Carroll 1960, 83). However, in modern times, the Cheshire-cat has become best known in the context of *Alice*, which is why including it in the analysis is beneficial.

In fact, the Cheshire-cat is, nowadays, so associated with *Alice*, that seldom is its etymology pondered. Due to this, the origins of the word have become muddled, but several theories have arisen and, interestingly, more than one of them consider cheese. For instance, it has been said that Cheshire could refer to an English county of Cheshire so abundant with dairy farms and thus milk and cream that all the cats were grinning happily. Similarly, another theory states that, in Cheshire, cheese used to be sold moulded in a way that resembled a grinning cat (Carroll 1960, 83).

In the Karelian translation, Cheshire-cat becomes **Irvo-kaži**. As in the English original, the latter part of the Karelian name translates to “cat,” but the earlier part “Irvo” is more ambiguous. What

is clear, however, is that it does not contain any references to cheese or to geographical locations, as the original does. Instead, it could be derived from the Karelian words “irvistely” (en. irony) and “irvoilu” (en. banter, joking), which are both characteristics often associated with the character. Likewise, the name closely resembles the verb “irvistiä,” which means to make a face or to grimace. This is very much in line with the illustration, as the character is often portrayed with a wide grin. However, one cannot overlook the potential effect of implicit relay languages (see section 3.3), as Cheshire-cat, in Finnish, is **Irvi-kissa**.

While it is interesting to ponder why the Karelian translation refers to the cat’s expression as a grimace rather than a smile, the translation solution is categorizable as **a paraphrase**, as the translation appears to aim for a similar expression as the source text does – that is the implication of smiling or grinning. As suggested above, there are several potential reasonings behind the translation solution, but it could be thought to be affected by previously shared cultural information, which is why the solution has been sub-categorized as **cultural filtering**. First, the connections between the county of Cheshire, cats, and happiness or grinning are not known to the Karelian target audience and, second, a fair share of Karelian readers can be expected to be familiar with Finnish translations of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*, which makes the Finnish name Irvi-kissa shared cultural knowledge. Cheshire, here, has not been replaced with a place or other proper noun that would carry the same implicit meaning as the source text variant, as one does not exist, but the translation is, nevertheless, familiar and understandable to the target audience.

### 7.1.3 Example 3: Mock Turtle

**Mock Turtle** is a character first introduced in chapter nine of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*. Mock Turtle, as its name suggests, is not an actual turtle, although he talks about how he “once was a real [t]urtle” (126). In the illustration of the Macmillan children’s edition of the book, Mock Turtle is shown to feature characteristics of several different animals, such as hooves, a tortoise shell and mouse-like ears, but his actual species is left unknown.

In addition to the obvious, physical layer of Mock Turtle’s name, it is a reference to the English mock-turtle soup. This comes clear when Alice asks the Queen who Mock Turtle is and the Queen tells her that it’s “the thing mock-turtle soup is made of” (123). According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, mock turtle soup was a soup made with cheap meat, such as a calf’s head,



wine and spices in imitation of green turtle soup. The reference to mock turtle soup could be nonsensical or, perhaps, read as a comedic remark targeting the way the common folk strived to imitate the cuisine and other habits of the rich.

In the Karelian translation, Mock Turtle is called **valehsuojusšlöpöi**. The translation is an obvious instance of **copying morphology**: “valeh” means “a lie” or “mock” and “suojusšlöpöi” means “turtle.” The Karelian translation features mock turtle soup, as well, and it has been directly translated into “valehsuojusšlöpöišuuppu.” However, much like in the case of “caucus-race,” the cultural meaning of the name Mock Turtle will, most likely, not be understood by the target audience. This is not necessarily a problem for two reasons. First, it could be argued that not all modern English readers are familiar with mock turtle soup and its cultural implications of class either and, second, the omission of implicit meanings is not an uncommon occurrence when translating children’s literature (see section 5).

#### 7.1.4 Example 4: Seaography

The word **Seaography** is introduced in chapter nine of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* where Alice and Mock Turtle discuss their experiences with school. The entire scene is a word-play, and Alice and Mock Turtle struggle to understand each other’s experiences: Alice is talking about school, as in education, while Mock Turtle’s “school” is a reference to a school of fish, although he does describe having related subjects and classes, one of which is Seaography.

In the Karelian translation, Seaography, which is most likely something akin to oceanography, is translated into **merentiedo**. This is a case of **copying morphology** because all the elements of both the English and the Karelian variants are similar. First, the English word consists of the word “sea,” the interlinking vowel ‘o,’ likely borrowed from similar words such as “geography” and “oceanography,” and the suffix -graphy, which refers to a field of study. Similarly, the Karelian translation consists of the word “mer[i],” the genitive suffix “n,” and the word “tiedo,” referring to a field of study. Here, the genitive suffix has a similar function with the added letter “o” of the source text variant. A similar genitive form is encountered in other similar Karelian words, such as “muantiedo” (eng. geography).

Interestingly, if Carroll’s choice of using the word “sea” instead of the “ocean” has any semantic significance, it is not transferred through the Karelian translation. This asymmetry between the

source and target texts is most likely not due to the translation itself but the Karelian language, which does not distinguish between the seas and the oceans.

### 7.1.5 Examples 5 and 6: Hatter and March Hare

The **Hatter** is one of the most known and loved characters of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. In the book, Alice first encounters him in chapter seven, when she stumbles upon a tea party, although the character is referred to earlier in the book, as well. Alongside the Hatter are the Dormouse and the **March Hare** (Carroll 2015/1865, 85), the latter of which shares one significant quality with the Hatter: they both are known as parts of idioms emphasizing craziness, silliness or stupidity: mad as a hatter and mad as a march hare (Cambridge Dictionary). Their very names do not contain madness, but, given their connotations with the aforementioned idioms, their craziness is informed implicitly in the fact that they are taking part in a **mad** tea party, as the chapter title suggests (Carroll 2015/1865, 85).

In the Karelian translation, the characters are called **Hatunluadii** and **Kevätjänöi**. First, the word Hatter, in English, consists of the common noun "hat" and the modifying suffix "-er," which, according to the Macmillan Dictionary, is "used with some nouns to make other nouns mean someone who is involved with something, especially as a job." In the Karelian translation, the name carries a similar meaning, although it is constructed a bit differently: the translated version of the name consists of a genitive form of the word "hattu" (krl. hatun) and the noun "maker" (krl. luadii). This structure is very common in the Karelian language and can be found, for instance, in the words "päččinluadii" (bricklayer) and "puččinluadii" (barrel-maker).

Based on the analysis above, this solution is a **paraphrase**. In a sense, one could, as well, talk of a case of copying morphology, but the meanings are slightly different, as a hatter is a profession, whereas a hatunluadii is an individual that merely makes hats. Under strict semantic analysis, the word does not consider whether the hat-making is done professionally or recreationally. This is a valid distinction to make in the context of Karelia, where many individuals have historically, in addition to their primary occupation, received supplementary income by selling items, materials and handicrafts in the nearby areas (Hämynen 1997, 69). This, of course, might no longer be the case, but as the context of *Alice* is strikingly historical, taking historical circumstances of Karelia into account seems only sensible.

Second, the case of March Hare is similar, albeit it is a clearer instance of **copying morphology**. Both the English and the Karelian version of the name consist of a word or a word segment referring to the third month of the year (eng. March, krl. **kevät**kuu) and the noun “hare” or “jänöi.”

Although the solutions behind translations of Hatter and March Hare are different, both have lost their implicit meaning of insanity. This is due to one of the aspects typical for translating for children, as illustrations likely have a strong effect on translation solutions such as these (see section 5). Even if similar insanity-related idioms existed in the Karelian language, they would be impossible to utilize in the illustrated context of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, where the illustrations readily depict the characters in a certain, unalterable way.

### **7.1.6 Invented words: summary**

The translations of Carroll's whimsical, invented words seem to have been achieved through copying morphology, paraphrases, and mixtures of the two (i.e. Hatter → Hatunluadii, which could be categorized as either). In addition to linguistic constraints of the Karelian language, several solutions of this category were clearly influenced by cultural differences between the source and the target cultures, once significantly enough for the example to be sub-categorized as cultural filtering (Cheshire cat). In general, the Karelian translation appears to remain true to the form and semantics of the source text, perhaps in order to support the illustration, but does not always accommodate Carroll's original word-play or contain all of his alternative or implicit meanings.

As stated while discussing above examples, the loss of alternative meanings or word-play does not indicate shortcomings in the translation but, instead, showcases common translation solutions of children's literature translations (see Alvstad's ideas in section 5). Moreover, in the case of this translation, the wider context of the scenes in question suggests that the translation acknowledges both the explicit and implicit meanings of Carroll's choice of words, but explicitly remains on a local, somewhat literal level. This assumption can be derived from the fact that other references to the humor behind the puns and the broader context are translated understandably, although a certain word within the context of the joke might have seemingly lost some of its alternative meanings. It is highly likely that when the target text seems to be lacking something, such as details or puns, it is not due to anything within the translation

process itself but instead relates to the qualities specific to the Karelian language as well as its endangered status.

It is once more worth mentioning that Alvstad (2010) states that such omissions of alternative meaning are incredibly common when translating children's literature, as dual-meanings are often reliant on shared knowledge and norms of the source culture and notably difficult to fully translate into another language. If one was translating *Alice* to a more unified target audience and perhaps with a more domesticating overall approach, one potential solution could be to entirely swap the original, cultural reference to something else. This something else could be a translator's own invention, or it could be something similarly logical already existing within the target language system. For example, mock turtle soup could become some similar mock soup traditionally prepared by Karelians – perhaps something prepared during the Orthodox Christian lent, when most 19th and 18th century Karelian speakers abstained from eating meat? This would consequently change Mock Turtle into some other, not yet defined mock meat. In a historical context, this translation would be fitting, although one could argue that, these days, mock turtle soup is not supposed to resemble any actual dish but instead it has become a part of Carroll's whimsical world where little girls can become bigger and smaller by drinking potions and people eat turtles. Moreover, be such a cultural swap effective or not, it would not be possible when translating illustrated children's literature, as Mock Turtle is clearly pictured with at least some tortoise-like features. Thus, these potential domesticating translations only function as thought-exercises and examples of what could have been done in a similar situation had it arisen during a different translation process.

## **7.2 Misspelled words and nonsense**

In this section, intentionally misspelled words and nonsense will be analysed. The words and phrases in this category differ from the ones presented above as invented words in several ways, the most crucial one being that these words, albeit nonsensical, clearly relate to words commonly known in the English language. The nonsensicality of these words is obtained differently: they are modified and altered, even uncanny, words of something generally known, whereas the invented words stem from Carroll's own imagination and cannot be easily connected to a similar word that would have already existed. As the ways of coining these odd words differ, the translation solutions differ, as well.

Most of the intentionally misspelled or otherwise odd words of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* are introduced within Alice's speech turns or internal monologue, and they serve different communicative functions to different readers. For example, a child reader might not recognize a grammatically false form and when encountered with a strange word might simply assume that it refers to something they do not know of, but an adult reader is assumed to understand what the misspelled instance is actually referring to and to find Alice's lack of knowledge childish and amusing.

Similarly to invented words, this category features both instances where the puns and wordplay of the original have been translated in a way that contains the source text's meaning and ones where the humour or nonsensicality of the translation rely on other similarly crafted linguistic elements. This time, the issue lies not so much in the ambiguity of translating for both children and adults but in the different sets of cultural knowledge shared by the different target audiences of the source and the target texts. For instance, if the underlying punchline, reliant on adult knowledge of the world, considers something known to the modern Karelian, an all-encompassing translation solution should, theoretically, not be difficult to find. However, if the very content of the joke is Victorian or otherwise geographically specific or outdated, the solutions in question might appear less straightforward.

### 7.2.1 Example 7: The Antipathies

In the first chapter of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, Alice falls down a rabbit hole. While falling for a long period of time, Alice starts to wonder where the hole will eventually lead. As the fall continues and continues, she questions whether she will "fall straight through the earth." Then she wonders about how amusing it will be to arrive among people that "walk with their heads downwards" and proceeds to call this place, consisting of New Zealand and Australia, **The Antipathies** (Carroll 2015/1865, 4–5).

The name, in this form, is nonsensical. The correct spelling of the word would be "antipodes," which, according to the Merriam Webster dictionary, means "the parts of earth diametrically opposite – usually in plural – often used of Australia and New Zealand." Here, the word is misspelled likely for comedic effect and to showcase Alice's childlike understanding of the world around her; while in shock, she is trying to make sense of the new situation by inaccurately repeating what has been taught at school. Throughout the novel, she makes such knowing but

often misdirected remarks. The humour is derived from the fact that, as a child, she has misunderstood or only partially grasped these concepts, which is why the Antipodes in her speech do not refer to the opposite poles but to antipathy, a word close in terms of phonetics but very separate in meaning.

Although none of the Karelian dictionaries examined include a word with roughly the same meaning as the Antipodes, which could indicate a linguistically unknown or unnamed concept, the translation seems fairly loyal to the source text. As in the source text, the Karelian word **Antipuatiet** is in plural and closely resembles the source text equivalent. Moreover, both misspelled forms indicate an antipathy, which, in turn, is a pre-existing and generally known word, “antipuatii,” in the Karelian language.

In this case, the solution is considered as **copying sound** – the translated word resembles the English original, but it has been slightly modified to better fit the spelling and the pronunciation of the Karelian language. This solution may have been facilitated by the fact that only one part of the pun (the Antipodes) needed to be specifically created for this context, whereas the other part, the antipathy (antipuatii), was readily available. However, this translation solution slightly lessens the effectivity of the pun, as target text readers cannot be expected to readily recognize the assumedly new word, Antipuatiet, especially when it first appears within a pun. Although this inevitable change might momentarily shatter the flow of reading and appear familiar, it does not indicate a shortcoming in the translation but instead exemplifies difficulties that arise from the restricted usage domains of the Karelian language and of from their consequences.

### 7.2.2 Example 8: Uglification

Like Seaography, **Uglification** is one of Mock Turtle’s fabricated school subjects introduced in chapter nine of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*. Although Uglification is not necessarily complete nonsense but has, instead, been used in the English language both before and after Carroll’s work, it has been included in this thesis as its structure is unconventional and as it, most likely, does not have a ready-existing equivalent in the Karelian language.

In *Alice*, Uglification is defined by Mock Turtle as the opposite of beautification, which Alice already knows of (Carroll 2015/1865, 130–131). The scene implies that beautification is the better-known, standard practice, while uglification is its whimsical counterpart. The Karelian

translation seems to rely on a similar solution, as the translated equivalent of the term is **pahendus**. The word itself cannot be found from Karelian dictionaries, but the word “čomendus” does exist and roughly translates to “decoration” or “decorating.” The word is derived from the adjective “čoma”, which means pretty. Therefore, the word “pahendus” is created similarly from the word “paha” that means “ugly,” “bad” or “broken,” which indicates that its translation solution is **copying morphology**.

### 7.2.3 Example 9: Drawling, stretching, and fainting in coils

In chapter nine of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, Mock Turtle tells Alice about a teacher of his, a Drawling Master. According to Mock Turtle, the teacher came over to teach him and his peers once a week, and his subjects included **drawling, stretching, and fainting in coils**. Alice is puzzled by all this, but the contents of the teaching are left unclear apart from the fact that Mock Turtle is allegedly too stiff to show Alice how the exercises were done (Carroll 2015/1865, 130).

Although drawling, sketching, and fainting at coils, at first glance, appear as complete nonsense, they do have a concealed meaning, which could be examined as an example of **allusion** or **intertextuality**. Accordingly, *The Annotated Alice* explains (Carroll 1972/1865, 129) that drawling, stretching, and fainting in coils is a reference to an English art critic John Ruskin, who taught children drawing, sketching, and painting in oils. This makes drawling, sketching, and fainting in coils a word-play, most likely aimed at adults, that imitates the structure of the original phrase but renders the meaning of the words nonsensical.

In the Karelian translation, the passage becomes, perhaps a little surprisingly, **siirdämisty, keskiizoin luadimistu da voiruakkumualavustu**. Here, the list is in partitive case and roughly translates to “moving (objects from one place to another), creating centers (not a previously known word, but most closely resembles the word “keski,” meaning middle), and painting with oilcrabs/buttercrabs.”

Much like the English original, the translation, at first, does not seem to conceal any deeper meaning. Moreover, in terms of structure, it is so different from the source text that even a reader familiar with both the source and the target texts might struggle to understand the relationship between the English and Karelian language variants. Upon closer inspection, however, it becomes clear that the translation recreates the nonsensical quality of the source

text. The translation might lose its deeper cultural significance (the reference to a certain person), but the nonsensical words and their sensical referents become strikingly similar. First, “siirdämisty” clearly resembles the word “piirdämisty” (eng. drawing), while “keskiizoin luadimistu” is a nonsensified version of “eskiizoin luajindu” (eng. skething/creating sketches). “Keskiizu” actually makes the target text more nonsensical than the source text, as “keskiizu” is not an actual Karelian word but has been created for this context and, thus, seems strange. Its intended meaning is unclear, but it is, most likely, a nonsense-compound of the words “keski” (eng. middle) and “eskiizu” (eng. sketch). Lastly, “voiruakkumualavus” directly translates to “oilcrab painting” and refers to “voikruaskumualavus,” which, in turn, means painting with oil colors.

This translation solution could be categorized as a **paraphrase**, as the target text seeks to have the same effect on the reader as the source text does, but it achieves this by using different words.

#### 7.2.4 Example 10: Curiouser

As explained in the beginning of this section and then proved through examples, *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* contains several instances of intentionally misspelled words. However, not all linguistic strangeness derives from amusingly misspelled words: instead, the word *curiouser* is spelled mostly correctly, but its specific form is grammatically incorrect.

Chapter two of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* begins with Alice exclaiming “**Curiouser and curiouser!**” because her neck is expanding “like the largest telescope that ever was” due to her eating a piece of magical cake in the previous chapter (Carroll 2015/1865, 13). While “curiouser” appears a form that could, technically, exist in the English language and remains understandable, it is not grammatical. The correct comparative form would be “more curious,” because “curious” features more than two syllables. One can only speculate on Carroll’s reasoning behind this choice of words, but it clearly enhances the narrative’s sense of absurdity. Perhaps the mistakenly uttered and almost hypercorrect form is representative of the turmoil within Alice’s head? Moreover, it has been noted that false comparatives that lack the word “more” when needed are not uncommon in the speech of children (Smith 1933, 188).



In Karelian, a similar solution could have worked: for instance, Carroll's wordplay could have been taken by applying and altering the word "kummembua" (eng. stranger, partitive case). However, the partitive case exclamation, while grammatical, does not sound quite natural in the Karelian language, and, accordingly, the translation features a different solution. In Karelian, Alice's exclamation has been translated into **[k]ubo mimmii**. Although the exact mechanism or logic behind this misspelled form remains unknown, it can be assumed to refer to the Karelian surprised utterances of "mibo kummu!" or "midä kummua!". Both of these roughly translate to "what on earth!". What is worth noting, however, is that the solution somewhat resembles a spoonerism, which is, as explained by the Merriam-Webster English Dictionary, "a transposition of usually initial sounds of two or more words." Spoonerisms, which are referred to with the word "sanamuunnos" (word-changing), are notably common in Finnish, which could again indicate that features of Finnish may have contributed to the solution, although not necessarily as an implicit relay language.

To summarize, this translation solution can be classified as a **paraphrase** because it encompasses the same meaning as the source text – a nonsensical utterance of confusion – but does so in different words.

### 7.2.5 Misspelled words: summary

In this section, translation solutions of Carroll's intentionally misspelled, non-grammatical, or nonsensical words have been analysed. The solutions found were varied, and the examples contained instances of copying morphology, copying sound, and paraphrase. Although definitive notions cannot be drawn based on an array consisting of only four examples, in this context, the differences between the solution seem to follow a pattern: intentionally misspelled words (the Antipathies, uglification) seem to have been translated by seemingly straightforwardly copying sound or structure, whereas instances concerning grammatical inconsistency (curiouser) or larger units of language and meaning (drawling, sketching, and fainting in coils) feature a paraphrasing solution.

However, the assumed pattern does not necessarily concern the categories of misspelled words and nonsense but instead is, in their context, coincidental. Moreover, the straightforward, copy-loaning solutions have seemingly been applied in situations where the unknown linguistic matter is at least somewhat understandable or applicable in the Karelian context, either through similar

words of the Karelian language or due to Finnish or Russian influence. The likelihood of these straightforward solutions being understandable to the target audience lessens when concerning longer passages that, in addition to being linguistically challenging, at least partially rely on shared cultural knowledge of the readers of the source text or on references to Victorian public figures. In these situations, more drastic solutions, such as paraphrase, have been used. Similarly, grammar can be an obstacle, as in the case of *curiouser*: while copying structure and creating a comparative form, such as “*kummembua*,” using a suffix would have been possible in Karelian, as well, but a more natural structure was featured instead.

### 7.3 Animals and mythological creatures

In this sub-section, names of animals and mythological creatures and their translations will be analysed. *Alice* includes several references to fauna, which makes this sub-section rather long. Furthermore, prior to the analysis, it was expected that the category would contain several instances of interesting and noteworthy translation solutions, as names and words referring to flora and fauna are often especially challenging to translate. In addition to being geographically specific to certain locations, ecosystems, and points in time, these names exist at an interesting juxtaposition of appearing both scientifically accurate and very rooted in empirical knowledge and tradition, as explained through the thoughts of Giloeva and Kok (2020) in section 6.4.2.

#### 7.3.1 Example 11: Lory

In chapter two of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, Alice falls into a pool of tears. While Alice is floating, more and more animals fall into the pool, making it quite crowded. Among these animals is a **Lory** (Carroll 2015/1865, 25).

According to BirdLife Suomi (MLSN), a lory, or loriini, belongs to a tribe of parrots distributed throughout the Australasian region. Previously, the loriini were considered to be separate from parrots and belonging to their own class (*Loriidae*), but presently they are seen as a type of parrots.

In the Karelian translation, the Lory becomes **popugailindu**, which translates to “parrot bird.” In addition to the translation’s reduplication (the word “popugai” already includes the here added meaning of “bird”), “popugailindu” is a clear example of **explicitness change**: whereas the source text discusses a specific type of parrots, the translation refers to parrots in general. This,

alone, would be a case of hyponymy, but the solution is predominantly determined as an explicitness change due to the reduplication. What was implicit (the meaning “bird” included in the word “parrot”) has now become explicit (“parrot [bird]” + “bird”).

The solution reflects the fact that parrots are not native to Karelia, or nearby areas of Finland and Eastern Russia, which is why the intended reader would not necessarily recognize a lory based only on its species name. Therefore, although parrots in general are recognized, their subspecies might not be. The suggestion is further supported by the fact that the solution features reduplication that specifies the birdness of the parrot. It is interesting to speculate whether the reduplication would have been deemed necessary had the lory been pictured in the illustration: now, the illustration only depicts Alice floating alongside a mouse, and a picture of the lory appears later in the book.

In either case, as stated previously in section 6.4.2, Giloeva and Kok explain (2010, 28) that adaptive and creative translation solutions are common solutions when translating names of flora and fauna. This is due to several different reasons ranging from geography (parrots are not native to Karelia) to language (an equivalent for the word lory has not yet been coined). For instance, the words for flora and fauna often represent the very oldest and the most original vocabulary of any language, which makes them distinctively original both in form and in tone: in other words, they are often free from the influence of other languages (Giloeva & Kok 2020, 4). Thus, “popugai,” as a loan from another language, might strikingly differ from other words representing birds, which is why it might not immediately and implicitly be recognized as a bird among other birds.

### 7.3.2 Example 12: Dormouse

In chapter seven of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*, Alice tumbles among a mad tea party attended by the March Hare, The Hatter, and a **dormouse**. Alice notes that the other two are using the dormouse as a cushion and considers this uncomfortable for it, but remarks that it should be fine once the dormouse falls asleep (Carroll 2015/1865, 85).

The dormouse is a small rodent belonging to the family Gliridae. The exact etymology of its name is unknown, but it could possibly be derived from the Anglo-French word *dormouse* (“tending to be dormant”). As the meaning of sleep or dormancy has not been coined recently

and explicitly but is, according to dictionaries and as stated earlier, historical and only assumed, the etymology of the word can be expected to be unknown to readers of both the source and the target texts. Interestingly, the translation makes the implicit and hidden etymology of the word more explicit, as the dormouse becomes **unihiri**. The translation directly translates into “sleep + mouse,” and closely resembles the Finnish language name of said tribe, “unikeot” (eng. *sleepyheads*). Considering this knowledge, the translation solution is categorized as case of **copying morphology**, although the morphology that was copied was not the English of the source text but that of Finnish, again possibly functioning as an unintended and implicit relay language.

In a sense, the solution could, additionally, be categorized as an explicitness change due to the hidden etymology of the word becoming explicit once again. However, the thesis refrains from doing so for two reasons. First, explicitness change implies that something originally implicit, but still entirely understandable to the source text reader, is made explicit for the sake of the target text reader’s understanding. In this case, the implicit linguistic meaning of sleepiness cannot be assumed to be known by the English-speaking source text readers, thus the explicitness change seems coincidental rather than deliberate. Second, the recurring effects of the Finnish language indicate that they could be at play here, as well, which further indicates coincidentalness. Thus, copying morphology is decided as the dominant translation solution.

### 7.3.3 Example 13: Gryphon

In chapter nine of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*, Alice, while wandering the queen’s grounds, stumbles upon a **Gryphon** sleeping on the ground. The reader is clearly not expected to readily recognize the gryphon, as the nameless narrator instructs the reader, in the case they are unaware with gryphons, to look at the illustration (Carroll 2015/1865, 124). Since then, the word might have become relatively commonly used in the English language due to, for example, rise of science fiction and fantasy literature, but its exact etymology is not known, although gryphons or gryphon-like animal hybrids have long been known in several literatures around the world since the Ancient Egyptian times (LaChiusa 2009; Dunn).

In the Karelian translation of the book, the Gryphon has become **Grifonu**. This is an obvious case of **copying sound**, as the new, Karelian world closely resembles the English original but has been slightly modified to better fit the spoken and written conventions of Karelian. For instance,

the first vowel sound of the word is roughly the same in both the English and Karelian variant of the word, although the sound is represented by different letters (y and i). Moreover, the translator has added the letter u at the end of the word, as is typical for common nouns in Olonets/Liygi Karelian.

The translation solution is logical in its context, as griffins have assumably not previously been discussed in the Karelian language since there are next to no fantasy or science fiction publishings. However, as both genres are exceedingly popular and griffins have become widely known across the world, a prototypical, modern reader of the target text has most likely previously encountered the concept or gryphons in texts or other cultural products in another languages, at least if familiar with speculative fiction. Such a translation solution permits these speakers to recognize the seemingly-Karelian word and to understand it without a paraphrasing, explanatory translation. In a sense, the translation solution is foreignizing, as the word so clearly resembles one of another language, which corresponds the meaning of the source text, as well: the gryphon is supposed to appear strange, and this has been obtained in the Karelian translation.

#### **7.3.4 Example 14: Serpent**

In chapter five of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, a worried pigeon mistakes Alice for a threatening **serpent** (Carroll 2015/1865, 64). Although the word serpent stands for a snake, a globally recognized concept, it has been included in this analysis because it, when compared to the synonym or near-synonym "snake," appears to be interestingly mystical or historical in tone in English.

At a first glance, snake appears to be a relatively established and common word for different types of long, limbless, carnivorous reptiles, all of whom belong to the suborder Serpentes. This taxonomical, Latin categorization is probably what has given a snake one of its names (serpent). However, to better understand the differences between these two words, a look at corpora might prove fruitful.

The words snake and serpent were compared using the English Historical Book Collection (EEBO, ECCO, Evans) corpus and, more specifically, its "comparative word sketch" function, which offers the user information on the linguistic and grammatical context a certain word is typically used in.

For instance, the words “snake” and “serpent” both appear alongside several key words, such as “adder,” but differences can be noted, as well. For instance, the word “snake” is often connected to words “Eve,” “viper,” and “lizard,” whereas the most common words appearing alongside “serpent” seem to be “scorpion,” “dragon,” and “toad.” Moreover, a snake often seems to be described as poisonous, curling, stinging, or venomous, while a serpent can be brazen, fiery, venomous, or crooked. The words are somewhat similar, but one could suggest that the snake, excluding its specific connection to Eve, often represents a more material threat of poison or a sting, whereas a serpent has potentially devilish or evil connotations: the serpent is equally dangerous due to its venom, but it has a morally crooked quality, as well.

Karelian language dictionaries (Markianova & Pyöli 2021; Penttonen 2016) offer several potential translations for the word snake (e.g., mado, vedeliškö, n’oloi, smija), but the implied meanings and collocations of them are unclear, as there are not many large corpora of the Karelian language. However, interestingly, the most common word for snake, “mado,” does not seem to be particularly negative, as one dictionary (Kotus) offers the following modified version of the word: pahamado (eng. evil + snake).

In the Karelian translation of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*, the serpent has become **mado**, which has, arguably, caused the translation to lose its original tone. This is most likely due to the fact that mado is the most established Karelian word for snake and, despite being technically neutral, the shared knowledge and life experience of the target audience as well as the context (the pigeons’ fright) assure that the reader will implicitly understand that the mado is, in fact, a threat. Thus, the translation solution could be categorized as a **synonymy**.

### 7.3.5 Example 15: Starfish

In chapter six of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*, Alice is handling a baby, whom the nameless narrator and Alice describe as a “queer-shaped little creature [who] held its arms and legs in all directions ‘just like a **starfish**’” (Carroll 2015/1865, 77). The baby passage itself is not challenging to translate, but the passing metaphor of a starfish is not entirely straightforward, as starfishes, not being native to Karelian waters, might not be the most content for Karelian language metaphors. As the translator has stated that the general approach of the translation is foreignizing, one could expect for the text to feature the same creature. What is interesting, however, is how the creature is referred to. This is why it was eventually included in the analysis.

Based on the English source text and previous examples of how assumedly strange or unknown vocabulary has been translated, one could expect for the starfish to become **tähtikalu** through copying morphology. **Copying morphology** has indeed been employed in the translation, but its source is, again, not English but, potentially, Finnish. Accordingly, the baby of the Karelian translation is compared to a **meritiähti** (eng. ocean + star), which closely resembles the Finnish form of the word, “meritähti.” Either the solution has been intentional to accommodate to the Karelian target audience mostly living on the Finnish side of the border or the Finnish language has functioned as an implicit relay language.

### 7.3.6 Example 16: Flamingo

In chapter eight of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, Alice is playing croquet with a queen. The game, much like everything else in Wonderland, is unconventional: the balls are small animals, and the clubs are **flamingoes**.

Flamingoes are not native to Karelia and, consequently, Karelian language dictionaries do not contain an established Karelian equivalent for the word flamingo, as names of exotic birds have probably not been seen as the most urgent lexical gaps to fill. Due to this, the translation seems to feature a translation solution that copies sound, as the flamingo, in the Karelian translation, is simply **flamingo**. This is a case of **copying sound**, and the translation solution is especially natural because the Finnish and Russian words for flamingo have been formed similarly, which makes the new Karelian equivalent recognizable for most readers.

This solution could be called a direct transfer, as well. However, this thesis has decided to abstain from using the term for reasons described in section 6.4.1. To summarize, the seemingly identical English and Karelian words flamingo and flamingo are pronounced in such different ways that the Karelian loan has been modified too greatly for it to be considered a direct, unaltered transfer – in a sense, the sound has been copied and modified to fit the target language system, not only transferred as it was. Moreover, the transfer cannot be assumed to be direct or to only consider the English source text, as the word “flamingo” is known in both Finnish and Russian and as the translation otherwise seems to feature numerous instances of Finnish functioning as an implicit relay language.

### 7.3.7 Example 17: Porpoise

While Alice and Mock Turtle are having a conversation in chapter ten of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, the word **porpoise** is mentioned. The word itself refers to the aquatic mammal, but it soon becomes evident that Mock Turtle is not referring to the animal but instead intends to say “purpose” (Carroll 2015/1865, 139). This makes the passage a play of words, relying on the fact that the two words sound and appear identical enough for them to get mixed up in speech but different enough to be comical when misused.

Of the translated passages inspected, this one differs from the source text the most dramatically, albeit it does, in a way, retain the sense of comically and almost childlikely misusing words. Whereas in the English original the Mock Turtle states that “no wise fish would go anywhere without a porpoise” (Carroll 2015/1865, 139), the Karelian version of the Mock Turtle, instead, informs Alice that “meripočči välttämättäh tulou . . . Da se ainos ottau **meripoččizii** kerale.” Translated back into English, this passage would appear as follows: “the guinea pig, of course, is coming . . . And it always brings guineapiglets with it.” Now, the word “guineapiglet” is not commonly used in the Karelian language, though it has been obtained by creating a deminutive form out of the Karelian word for guineapig. This is a common strategy used by Karelian speakers when they want to emphasize the smallness or cuteness of something. In this case, however, the form appears somewhat hypercorrect because another word is already in common use, as Alice points out by asking whether Mock Turtle actually meant “meripoččinpoigazii” (eng. guineapig babies, partitive case).

Interestingly, the translation solution does not seem to have anything in common with its source text equivalent. Whereas the original pun relies on the fact that the word “purpose” and “porpoise” are pronounced similarly, the Karelian translation utilizes hypercorrectness. Much like in the source text, this solution creates an impression of something strange or uncanny while remaining understandable enough not to be completely nonsensical. Due to this, the translation solution could be called a **paraphrase**, although it arguably is a very loose one. However loose, though, both the source and the target text deliver the same comical, somewhat uncanny effect, although they employ different means (seemingly similar and easily confused words vs. hypercorrectness) and use different words (purpose – porpoise vs. meripoččine – meripoččinpoigaine). While the original comedy stemming from words that are similar in form but



different in meaning, is lost, the translation, nevertheless, manages to recreate the sense of overcorrectness and childlikeness of the source text. As there are no restrictions regarding the illustration, the purpose-porpoise is not pictured, a loose solution such as this has been possible.

### 7.3.8 Animals and mythological creatures: summary

The analysis of translation solutions of animal names presented in this section has provided varying results. The variants of the target text can be divided into several different categories, but all solutions seem to stem from the need to make the potentially new words and forms easily recognizable to the reader. Oftentimes this is achieved by utilizing words that already exist in either Finnish or Russian, as was the case with dormouse, starfish, and flamingo.

The most common solutions were **copying sound** and **copying morphology**, which were both encountered two times. Additionally, one instance of each synonymy, explicitness change, and paraphrase was encountered. In a way, the usage of these different solutions represents a spectrum ranging from concepts that are somewhat established in the Karelian language to animals and creatures that have not at any point been regarded as important enough to be regularly discussed in the target culture. First, it seems that translations for animals that are somewhat known in the Karelian language, though not as specifically as for the intended readers of the source text, seem to rely on **explicitness change** or **synonymy**. For example, an average Karelian speaker might not recognize a newly crafted word that stands for the bird lory, but as lory is a type of parrot, translating it into a popugailindu ensures the reader's implicit understanding of what is being referred to – a different translation strategy might require for them to consciously compare the newly found word to, for instance, Finnish or Russian in search for its meaning, which could negatively impact the flow of the text. Similarly, a serpent is surely known in the Karelian language, but its connotative meanings seem to slightly differ from English.

Second, **copying morphology** seems to have been applied to animals and creatures that might not at all be known in the Karelian language or in a specifically Karelian context, but are recognized in other languages, namely Finnish and Russian, spoken by Karelians. For instance, the translations for dormouse and starfish are morphologically very similar but not identical to their equivalents in English. This has, most likely, become possible because the words function similarly in Finnish, which makes it possible for the reader to, again, recognize the Karelian

words somewhat implicitly in the case that they know Finnish. Moreover, solutions that notably resemble Finnish words or structures were encountered across the research material, which has repeatedly been connected to the possible effect of the translator's first language, Finnish, working as an implicit relay language.

However, in cases where the animal or creature in question is non-sensical or unknown to either only the target language or equally so in all Finnish, Russian and Karelian, or when it is intended to be strange even in the source text, **copying sound** has been employed. For instance, flamingo was simply translated into flamingo, and gryphon became grifonu. These kinds of strategies, referred to as direct transfer in some contexts, are very common when translating words that do not have a synonym or even a near-synonym or a culturally similar variant in the target language.

In addition to the spectrum of relevant solutions expressed above, the category features one instance of paraphrase. Here, however, the solution does not have much to do with the animal in question (the porpoise) but instead depends on the source text's communicative function and how it could best be conveyed in the target language: the pun relying on the similarity of the words *purpoise* and *porpose* would not have functioned in Karelian, which is why another type of animal word-play was employed.

## 7.4 Edibles

*Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* is abundant with descriptions of feasts and afternoon tea parties, and numerous foods, drinks, and common ingredients are mentioned both during these instances and as a part of Alice's internal monologue.

Historically, names of foods have been closely tied to culture, and languages tend to have more words for dishes and ingredients that are commonplace in the areas they have traditionally been spoken in. Accordingly, names for notably foreign foods and ingredients might be scarce or undeveloped. Of course, globalization has shaped a world where cuisines transfer readily between cultures and, for instance, sushi can be eaten anywhere in the world, but this might not apply in the context of Karelian. As covered several times in this thesis (see sections 2.1 & 2.3), the Karelian language has for decades mainly been used within individual households and personal relationships. In a sense, speakers of Karelian have largely been "among their own"

when it comes to using their language, whereas day-to-day communication with non-Karelian peers has been executed in some other language, which is why Karelian might lack words for everyday items and concepts. This does not mean Karelians would live in some rural and historical bubble. In truth, the situation is quite the opposite, as Karelians have for a long time had strong connections with both Finns and Russians, which has led into adept **codeswitching** (see section 4). If the new words have been readily available in Finnish or Russian, there might not have been a need to coin a Karelian-language variant to be used only within individual households or other intimate groups, all members of which know either Finnish or Russian, anyway.

Although language revitalization programs have attempted to solve these problems and inconsistencies of the language, making it possible to discuss sushi, among other things, in Karelian, certain gaps still exist. For instance, modern food vocabulary might exist and be in common use, but historical gaps in the vocabulary have not been deemed crucial enough to be tended to. This is most likely due to codeswitching, as explained above: modern Karelians are more likely to encounter new foods and other concepts in Finnish or Russian environments than their Karelian-speaking homes, which is why these foreign-language words are likely to re-emerge in Karelian-language conversations, as well. The essentials have been knowingly translated into Karelian as part of goal-oriented terminology work and language revitalization, but niche foods, such as many vegetarian or vegan dishes and historical foods, still do not have set Karelian variants that could be found from the dictionaries consulted for this thesis.

This is important in the case of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. While most of the foods and ingredients mentioned in the book are common enough to be at least somewhat known in most parts of the world, their specific realizations might be historical in either form or tone. For example, sweets and baked goods have been prepared and eaten in most cultures, but they have certainly changed in form since the Victorian times. Moreover, Karelian might have the structures and the vocabulary to refer to certain basic dishes, such as pies made with fruits and vegetables, but established and specific terminology might not yet exist due to minimal usage.

### 7.4.1 Example 18: Cherry-tart

In chapter one of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* Alice stumbles upon a bottle labeled with an instruction to drink it. As Alice obliges, she describes the flavor of the drink by comparing it to several tastes, one of which is **cherry-tart** (Carroll 2015/1865, 10).

Initially, cherry-tart might appear a simple and straightforward dish to translate, but, judging by its eventual translation, it has not been so. This is most likely due to the fact that cherries are not an essential part of Karelian cuisine, which makes the dish, too, culturally specific to other areas, such as England, France, Greece, and the United States. Accordingly, the target text refers to the tart as **visn'umuarjois luajittu piirai**, which translates to "a pie made with cherries."

The translation solution, although appearing as something akin to a paraphrase, is a case of **explicitness change**. First, instead of simply naming the tart a cherry-tart, the translation makes everything more clear by specifically declaring that the tart was made using cherries. The solution might appear random, but it is most likely related to the way in which the word "piirai" functions in the Karelian language. In English, according to the Cambridge, Merriam-Webster, and Collins Dictionaries, the word "tart" refers to baked goods made with sweet fruit, berry, or jam filling, while the Karelian equivalent, although similarly used to refer to sweet goods, **prototypically** represents a savory pie made using rye flour and filled with, for example, rice, oats, barley, or potato (KKS; Sallinen-Gimpl 2021, 16 & 23). Moreover, some of these Karelian pies are named quite creatively according to, for example, their shape, resulting in names that do not always concretely describe the taste or type of the pie. Therefore, what was implicit in the source text (= tart is sweet) is explicit in the target text (= the pie is made using sweet ingredients, thus it is sweet). The difference might seem minimal, but without the specification, there would be a real risk of some readers mistaking the reference to cherries as, for example, an explanation of the shape of the pie.

As the likely reasoning behind this solution is cultural, it is worthwhile to consider whether it could be sub-categorized as cultural filtering. However, this thesis refrains from doing so because the solution, however reliant on cultural differences, does not alter something culturally strange into culturally familiar, but instead remains somewhat foreignizing. Therefore, the translation does not culturally filter the source text but, instead, culturally explains.

### 7.4.2 Example 19: Roast turkey

Another taste that Alice compares the Drink me potion to in chapter one is **roast turkey** (Carroll 2015/1865, 10). Much like cherry tart, a roast turkey is not an entirely alien concept to the average Karelian reader or impossible to convey in Karelian, as roasted or otherwise cooked meats are features in most cuisines around the world. The specific dish, the roast turkey, however, is still somewhat culturally specific to areas other than Karelia, which might be reflected in the language. Even in Anglophone societies, turkey has historically been associated with great feasts in indulgence, which is heightened in the context of Karelian, as meat was considered an occasional luxury item until less than a hundred years ago. This too, indicates potential linguistic curiosities emerging from the translation.

In Karelian culture, “päččilihu” (or “karjalanpaisti” in Finnish) is a prominent celebratory dish that somewhat resembles the roast turkey. It is an oven-poached stew traditionally made with carrot, rutabaga, onions, and several types of meat, namely pork and beef. In a more domesticating translation, the roast could very well have become päččilihu, but the translator’s announced foreignizing style (Riionheimo 2019a) can be seen in the target text equivalent, as well: in the Karelian translation, roast turkey becomes **räkitetty indiekku** (eng. heated/torched + turkey).

In terms of meaning, the translation is rather direct, but upon closer inspection certain differences can be detected. In the source text, roast turkey is a compound of two words that is established to a point where roast turkey is a set name for a certain dish and not a sum combined out of separate parts. However, the Karelian equivalent does not similarly appear as an established equivalent but is, instead, **a paraphrase** consisting of the dish’s main ingredient (indiekku) and an adjective describing how it has been prepared (räkitetty). Furthermore, this solution could, similarly to example 16, be categorized as an explicitness change, but as the meanings of all parts of both the source and target language equivalents are roughly equal, it is only the tone the information is offered in that differs. Therefore, paraphrase emerges as the more likely translation solution.

However, whether this translation solution could be sub-categorized as cultural filtering is debatable and depends on how one approaches the subject: if it assumed that the paraphrase exists due to linguistic constraints of what is deemed natural to say in Karelian, the solution is not an example of cultural filtering. If the paraphrase is at least partially due to different cuisines,

cultural filtering could be a potential solution, as well. Here, the thesis decidedly refrains from assigning the sub-category because, again, the solution does not take something foreign and change it into something familiar, but the importance of cultural factors here is still worth acknowledging.

### 7.4.3 Example 20: Toffy

One more flavor Alice compares the potion to is **toffy** (Carroll 2015/1865, 10). Toffy is a notably British English way of spelling toffee, which, according to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, is “candy of brittle but tender texture made by boiling sugar and butter together.”

None of the Karelian language dictionaries consulted include a word for toffee, and the translation solution, accordingly, appears creative: in *Alisan šeikkailut kummanmuas*, toffee is referred to as **sliuhkukaramellu** (eng. cream + caramel/candy). The translation solution is interesting, as traditional toffee as described in the Merriam-Webster, Collins and Cambridge dictionaries does not have cream in it, although modern, commercial applications often are reliant on cream and called cream toffee or something of the like. According to the previously consulted dictionaries, these buttery toffees are often referred to as fudge.

The likely reasoning behind the translation solution is that while the original, somewhat historical form of toffy might not be recognized by many modern non-English target audiences, cream toffee can be encountered in common convenience stores across the world. Whether the eventual translation has more to do with these cultural circumstances or features of the English and the Karelian languages, however, it is not entirely relevant, as it is nevertheless clear that the solution can be categorized as a **paraphrase**: the meaning of the source text word has been transported into the target text by using another, rather explanatory and likely previously unused word. The explanatory nature and the fact that *sliuhkukaramellu* cannot be found from Karelian language dictionaries are what clearly makes the solution a paraphrase instead of, for example, synonymy. Moreover, the translation is not categorized as cultural filtering for the same reasons as, for example, cherry tart (7.2.1) and roast turkey (7.2.2) were not: the unfamiliar has not been exchanged for familiar, since *sliuhkukaramellu* is still very much a foreignizing, explanatory translation.

#### 7.4.4 Example 21: Barley sugar

In chapter nine of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, the Duchess talks to Alice about the kinds of ingredients one might find in her kitchen. She discusses ingredients she does not need and, in fact, finds displeasing, as they cause the people who eat them to be a certain way. For instance, peppers allegedly make people hot-tempered, and “**barley-sugar** and such things . . . make children sweet-tempered” (Carroll 2015/1865, 117).

According to the Cambridge Dictionary and *The Annotated Alice* (Carroll 1972/1865), barley sugar is a hard sweet made from boiled sugar. Despite its name, the candy does not seem to have anything to do with barley, per se. In the Karelian translation, the candy has been translated into **karamellu**, which simply means caramel or some other type of sweet or candy (Markianova & Pyöli 2021). As the word is not accompanied by a modifier that would express the alleged hardness of the candy, this translation solution is an example of **hyponymy**, as instead of referring to a specific type of sweet (barley sugar; hard sweet), the target text refers to sweets in general.

#### 7.4.5 Example 22: Comfit

In chapter three of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, Alice takes part in a caucus-race with an array of antropomorphic animals. As the Dodo declares every contestant as a winner, he demands that Alice hands out prizes. Alice panics but luckily finds **a box of comfits** from her dress pocket, and the animals are satisfied (Carroll 2015/1865, 30-31).

Interestingly, the comfit is the third specific type of candy featured in the text. Moreover, the comfit is clearly distinct from the other types of fairly simple and general candy discussed, as, according to the Cambridge Dictionary, it is “an old-fashioned sweet made of a nut, seed, or piece of dried fruit with a hard sugar covering.”

In the Karelian translation, the scene is otherwise the same as in the original, but the box of comfits has become **namupakiettaine**, translating, simply, to “a box of sweets.” This, clearly, makes the translation solution in question a **hyponymy**, as comfits are a type of sweet.

#### 7.4.6 Edibles: summary

As in the above categories, the translation solutions identified while examining the food words of *Alice's Adventure in Wonderland* and its Karelian translation varied. However, the array of solutions was smaller than in some instances, as the only found solutions were explicitness change, paraphrase, and hyponymy. Moreover, even cherry tart, which was categorized as explicitness change, could have very well been categorized as a paraphrase, as well.

Generally, the paraphrases and explicitness changes occurred in situations where a reader of the target text would, on an abstract level, recognize the dish in question but would most likely require additional information on the way it is prepared or how it is in appearance or taste. For instance, the seemingly simple cherry-tart was made more defined through an explicitness change/paraphrase explaining how it was made and that it was, indeed, a sweet pie. Similarly, the translation of roast turkey, instead of simply relying on the name of the dish, amplified the way the dish is prepared. In the case of toffy, a yet another paraphrasing solution was employed, this time describing the ingredients of the specific sweet.

Unlike toffy, both of the other sweets in this category, barley sugar and comfit, were categorizable as occurrences of hyponymy, as instead of referring to the specific delicacies, the target text talked of sweets in general. This is likely due to the historical nature of the words, which is why, as discussed in the beginning of this section, more specific names for the treats simply do not yet exist in Karelian. However, the target text does not become more homonymous than the source text, as the applied hyponyms of the word sweet are not the same but synonyms to each other. Therefore, the target text has recreated the varied nature of the source text, although by using its own methods.

Interestingly, cultural filtering became a somewhat challenging solution type in this category. While it needed to be, at least, acknowledged and speculated in many instances, it could not be satisfactorily applied to any of them. This very well exemplifies why, when discussing solution types in the context of this study in section 6.4.5, cultural filtering was not given an independent but an accompanying role.



## 7.5 Words related to Victorian English culture

In this sub-section, words that essentially relate to Victorian English culture are analysed. Of course, very few words or objects exclusively refer to Victorian English times and customs, but *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* does contain words that, in the novel's context, constitute to the narrative's historical setting, which is notably Victorian.

These words may be difficult when translating the novel into an endangered language, such as Karelian. Due to the historical and social aspects surrounding the Karelian language, Victorian English culture has, largely, not been discussed, which has led into notable gaps in the lexicon (for a slightly more detailed explanation, see section 7.4 'Edibles'). Therefore, the translation solutions of this category vary a great deal and contain instances where the source and the target text clearly differ.

### 7.5.1 Example 23: Jack-in-the-box

In chapter four of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, Alice encounters a lizard named Bill, who springs out of a chimney. Bill initially seems flustered, and when he is asked to talk about it, he does not know how he is feeling, but is certain that whenever something “comes at him like a **jack-in-the-box**,” he goes up as a sky-rocket (Carroll 2015/1865, 46-47). According to the Cambridge English Dictionary, a jack in the box is a “children's toy consisting of a box with a model of a person inside it that jumps out . . . when the top of the box is raised.” This indicates that lizard most likely means that he will emerge from the chimney whenever he is disturbed in some way.

In the Karelian translation, the lizard explains similarly: “[T]ijän vain, jotta minih minuh iški kuin **vieteriukko**.” The passage is especially interesting, as the Karelian lizard is written to speak in Viena Karelian/Northern Karelian Proper, whereas the rest of the novel has been translated into Liygi/Olonets Karelian. It might be that the use of different dialects was meant to correspond to the source texts different variants: other characters lack a certain regional indicator in their speech, while the lizard speaks in Cockney dialect. The comparison is interesting, as Cockey is considered a rather working-class dialect as opposed to the more neutral or posh way the other characters speak in. Northern Karelian Proper does not have a similar reputation among speakers of Karelian, although it is worth noting that it might very well be the most remote of the

main dialects of Karelian, which might make it appear rural. Thus the tonal difference between the two speech variants remains despite the fact that the dialects of Karelian are not separated by class.

When examining the word “vieteriukko” itself, one should not overlook its closeness to the Finnish variant of the word: in fact, the Finnish and the Viena Karelian variants are identical. This could be entirely coincidental, since, out of the dialects of Karelian, Viena Karelian is the most closely related to eastern dialects of Finnish, which has led into notable similarities both in terms of grammar and of vocabulary. However, another valid interpretation is that Finnish has, here, again functioned as an implicit relay language.

All in all, the translation solution could be classified as either **copying morphology** or **paraphrase**, depending on how one addresses the issue. From the source text’s perspective, when considering only the source and the target languages, the solution is an example of paraphrase – the translator has taken the most commonly recognized, stereotypical features of the item that is referred to as a jack-in-the-box and conveyed them using other target language words. It is unclear whether the word “vieteriukko” has previously existed in the Karelian language, but as, upon quick inspection, it appears not to be used in any internet writings or dictionaries consulted, this thesis regards it as a neologism. However, if one inspects the situation through a broader lens and considers the sociocultural and sociolinguistic context Karelian is spoken in, it becomes evident that “vieteriukko” could be a loan, achieved by copying Finnish morphology. Due to the book being published in Finland for a mostly Finnish Karelian audience and being translated by a native Finnish speaker, this situation is slightly more likely, which is why the solution will primarily be categorized as **copying morphology**.

### 7.5.2 Example 24: Croquet

There are several references to **croquet** in *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*, but the game is first mentioned in the very first chapter of the book when Alice, in passing, mentions having played a game of croquet against herself as a small child (Carroll 2015/1865, 11). The constant mentions of croquet already indicate that it is a sport culturally very significant, and it is known that modern croquet originated from England and was especially popular among the Victorian Era. Playing croquet, however, is not the most common Karelian past-time.

In the Karelian translation, croquet becomes **krokuettukiža** (eng. croquet + game). This is an example of **explicitness change** achieved through reduplication, as the English word croquet already contains the implicit meaning “game,” which has been made explicit in the Karelian translation. This is most likely due to the fact that croquet, as a word, might not immediately be recognized by the Karelian audience especially since, here, it has been translated through copying sound (croquet > krokuettu) and slightly modifying the word to fit target language norms. Thus, the translation could feature an alternative solution of **copying sound**, but it is primarily categorized as an explicitness change, as it is initially more prominent.

### 7.5.3 Example 25: Fender

At the beginning of chapter two of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*, Alice drinks a potion and her neck grows unnaturally tall. This causes her to worry about her feet and whether she will be able to wear shoes or socks by herself again. This, and the dizzying effects of the potion, make her realize she should be nice to her feet, and she plans a letter to them, where she explains that she wants to send them a present. One line of the postal address of her feet is “near the **fender**” (Carroll 2015/1865, 14-15).

According to the Cambridge English Dictionary, a fender is a “low metal frame around an open fireplace that stops the coal or wood from falling out.” One could assume that most people, especially in the Northern hemisphere, are familiar with fireplaces and fireplace safety, thus they should be recognized linguistically. Open fireplaces might be commonplace today, but, here, it is important to remember that the Karelian language has mainly been stagnant for several decades, if one does not take into account the purposeful efforts of language revitalization orchestrated over the past three or so decades. This means that a notable part of the Karelian still used today is based on a more traditional, village way of life, and many historical lexical gaps have not been filled (see sections 7.4 and 7.5). In the case of this specific translation question, it is necessary to realize that Karelian houses did not typically have small, open fireplaces, but instead employed big baking ovens that were used for cooking and, consequently, warmed up the entire wooden building (Sirviö 2010, 11–14; Sallinen-Gimpl 2021, 22). These ovens had large and heavy, lid-like iron doors that were kept closed, which is why it is only natural that the language lacks a word for a fender.

Accordingly, in the Karelian translation, the fender has become **kyvensuoju** (spark + protector/protection), which appears to be a neologism. At first glance, the solution seems like a paraphrase due to its rather explanatory nature: as opposed to fender, *kyvensuoju* explains both the action (protection) and the target (the spark). In a sense, these features indicate an explicitness change, as well, but, in this case, paraphrase would be treated as an overriding category because it affects the neologism on a structural level, as well. However, the eventual categorization is neither of the two but **copying morphology**, since the Finnish equivalent for a fender is **kipinäsuoja** (eng. spark + protection/protector). Although it is possible that the coining of a similar Karelian term has been accidental, it can be assumed, based on other instances encountered in the research material, that the Finnish language has very likely affected the translation solution as an implicit relay language.

#### 7.5.4 Example 26: Bathing machine

In chapter two of *Alice's Adventure's in Wonderland*, Alice, who has fallen in a pool of tears, wonders whether she has ended up in the sea. To test her theory, she thinks of things she has grown to associate with the seaside, and among them are a number of **bathing machines** (Carroll 2015/1865, 20). While the words “bathing” and “machine” are readily understandable on their own, an average modern reader might be unfamiliar with what the compound refers to. The Collins English Dictionary defines a bathing machine as a “small hut, on wheels so that it could be pulled to the sea, used in the 18th and 19th centuries for bathers to change their clothes.”

Clearly, this is an instance where the Karelian language translation notably differs from the source text, as bathing machines were not and still are not known in many Northern European cultures. As one could expect, in the Karelian translation, bathing machine has become **heboloin vietty uinduputki** (eng. swimming tube pulled by horses), which is a clear example of a **paraphrase**.

It is noteworthy that the meaning or function of the tube has slightly changed, as the Karelian translation emphasizes swimming, while the dictionary definitions talk of changing clothes and preparing for a swim. However, the source text variant refers to bathing instead of changing clothes, as well, which makes this observation merely anecdotal. Furthermore, the changing of clothes would be challenging to contain in a unit as compact as a neologism.

### 7.5.5 Example 27: Housemaid

*Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* features several words for different kinds of servants, which were common in the Victorian period. In the Karelian culture, however, household workers have not traditionally been typical, as historical Karelians used to live in big households that often consisted of several generations or otherwise tighter family units (Karlova, Karakina & Karakin 2019, 3). Moreover, most regular Karelians were not wealthy enough to afford service workers, which means that they have only been talked about in an outsider context (i.e. when talking about the rich folk that live in the cities). As for language revitalization, traditional service workers are not as commonplace in a modern context, at least not if not taking into account the very richest. This could indicate a lack of nuanced words for different kinds of service workers.

One such word is **housemaid**, which is first mentioned in chapter four, when Alice worries that someone has mistaken her for a housemaid (Carroll 2015/1865, 38). According to the Merriam-Webster and Collins Dictionaries of English, a housemaid is a female servant that does cleaning and other such tasks around their employer's house. The latter part of the definition – working for someone else – is included in the Karelian translation of the word, **palvelii** (eng. servant). However, the word does lose its gendered nature, as “palvelii” can be of any gender. Despite this, the translation solution could be categorized as a **synonym** or, at least, a near synonym, especially since the Karelian language does not tend to indicate gender in nouns other than words for family members and personal relations. Therefore, the omission is assumedly not intentional enough to indicate, for example, an explicitness change.

### 7.5.6 Example 28: Footman

Another example of words that refer to service workers is **footman**, which is first introduced in chapter six, where Alice encounters a fish-footman (Carroll 2015/1865, 68). According to the Merriam-Webster and Collins Dictionaries of English, as opposed to a housemaid, a footman is, first, male and, second, often seems to work in several different locations. For example, footmen are said to attend a master's carriage or to serve at tables, tend doors, and run errands, while housemaids, traditionally, tend to remain in a certain house or even certain parts of a house.

In the Karelian translation, the footman has become **lakei**, which has been loaned either directly from the English word “lackey” or from the Finnish loan-word “lakeija.” Either way, both options

point to the word “lackey,” which, by definition, is another name for a footman. Therefore, the translation **solution** could be classified as a **synonym**, although the **variant**, which is a synonym, has been achieved through copying sound from either Finnish or English. As was the case with the housemaid in example 28, the Karelian equivalent seems to have lost the original word’s meaning of a certain gender. This, however, does not affect the analysis even in the same coincidental way as in the housemaid example, as the gendered nature of the word is not explicit on a linguistical level: nothing in the word itself indicates gender.

### 7.5.7 Example 29: Livery

When the footman is first introduced in chapter six, Alice specifically recognizes his profession by his uniform, which is called a **livery** (Carrol 2015/1865, 68). A livery differs from the broader word uniform, referring to any outfit signifying a certain profession or group membership, significantly as it suggests someone else’s ownership. For instance, the Merriam-Webster English Dictionary defines livery both as a servant’s uniform and as an identifying design to be placed onto a vehicle to indicate or designate ownership.

In the Karelian translation, livery has become **livree**. An identical word exists in Finnish, but its context seems to be distinctly historical and it is not in regular use today. Thus, it is unlikely that it would have, rather than the source text, influenced the translation, although the possibility should not be entirely overlooked, as *Alice*, too, is a historical work of literature and as similar instances of Finnish working as an implicit relay language have been encountered elsewhere in the research material. Despite this possibility, it is the most likely that the Karelian translation is an instance of **copying sound**, which might have been supported by the fact that a similar word exists in Finnish.

### 7.5.8 Example 30: Jury-box

In chapter eleven of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*, Alice finds herself in a court of justice. As the experience is new for Alice, she carefully observes her surroundings, and these observations are described in great detail. One of the things that Alice notices and is able to name is a **jury-box** occupied by jurors (Carroll 2015/1865, 146–147). While jury-box might not strictly be Victorian, it is positioned in this category as it is culturally specific. First, court-room logistics differ, to some extent, between cultures and historical periods, making the word not only

unknown but historical, as well. Second, Karelian has never been used as a language of law or justice, but Karelians have, instead, gone to court and attended to legal matters in either Russian or Finnish. Due to this, the language can lack words for seemingly normal parts and functions of the justice system.

In the Karelian translation, the jury-box has become **suvvonsellittäjien aidivo** (eng. accusation explainers' compartment). This is a classic example of **a paraphrase**, and, interestingly, it is not only the word jury-box that has been paraphrased but juror, as well – in a sense, this gives the translation a secondary categorization of **explicitness change**, as it, unlike the source text variant, specifies who it is that resides in the jury-box and what their profession entails.

As stated earlier, this solution is most likely due to the lack of corresponding vocabulary in the Karelian language. When working with limited resources and addressing bilingual or even trilingual audiences, such explanatory translations become increasingly common. It might be that, here, the translation utilizes that fact that the target audience shares certain knowledge with the Finnish and the Russian, which is why terms coined with the help of pre-existing Finnish and Russian language variants will be easily recognized and accepted. However, it is unclear how intentional this decision has been, as this might be another example of the translator's first language, Finnish, working as an implicit relay or intermediate language.

### 7.5.9 Example 31: Day-school

In chapter nine of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, Alice and Mock Turtle discuss education. Mock Turtle boasts about the quality of his education by stating that he went to school every day, to which Alice replies that she, as well, has been to **day-school** (Carroll 2015/1865, 128). The word day-school might seem odd to the modern reader, as most schools of the present age would be considered day-schools, as opposed to, for example, boarding schools where pupils stay for long periods of time. However, *Alice* was written in a time, and in a culture, where boarding schools were more common than they are or have ever been among Karelians, which makes the distinction necessary.

In the Karelian translation, instead of day-school, Alice simply states that she has been to **škola**. Škola is originally a Russian loan and can be used to describe any school, which makes this translation solution an **explicitness change**. Whereas, in the source text, it is necessary to make

the day-to-day nature of the school explicit, it is and has always been a standard in Karelian culture. The meaning of the scene slightly changes, as well, as the source text includes an implicit attitude: day-schools are somehow better than boarding schools, or at least they are worth boasting over. In the Karelian context, the scene does not concern the differences between day and boarding schools, at all, but Alice and the Mock Turtle seem to see receiving any type of education as a privilege, which used to be typical for rural Karelians until the beginning of the 20th century. These days Karelians, of course, receive the same amount of schooling as any other children in their area, but the situation has not always been the same. Historically, it was typical for Karelian children to only partake in some classes, after which they would have to cease going to school to be able to contribute to making a living for their families. Although this is not the case today, it is very much in line with the historical context of *Alice*. In a way, this translation strategy is, therefore, surprisingly domesticating.

#### 7.5.10 Example 32: Memorandum

While Alice is in court in chapter eleven, the jury makes **memoranda** of speech turns of certain participants (Carroll 2015/1865, 150). According to the Merriam-Webster Dictionary of English, a memorandum is “an informal written record of an agreement that has not yet become official.” In other words, a memorandum is a written note made during a trial. Using these notes later when evaluating the trial and posing judgements is standard practice, but, as in the case of the jury-box, one could expect for the Karelian language to lack pre-existing vocabulary to best describe the concept. This is due to both the asymmetry of communicative situations Karelian is used in and the fact that courtroom practices differ between countries and points in time.

In the Karelian translation, the whole interaction is written out. Instead of using a noun, such as “a memorandum,” the scene goes as follows: “- **Kirjuttakkuat mustoh, – sanoi Koroli suvonsellittäjile, da hyö kiirehel kirjutettih mustoh kai kolme päivymääryä . . .**” This roughly translates into “- Write it down, – said the King to the jurors, and they hurried to write down all the three dates. . .” Here, the word memorandum is explained as “writing something down,” which makes it a **paraphrase**. In a sense, this instance is one of the purest paraphrases encountered in the research material, as it does not merely use syntactically similarly applicable but different words but is rather explanatory. What was originally expressed through a few words has, in the translation, been made explicit by offering additional explanation. Due to this,



the translation could be secondarily categorized as an **explicitness change**, as the implicit physical action of writing expressed through the word “memorandum,” is made more explicit than in the source text.

### 7.5.11 Example 33: Inkstand

In chapter twelve of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, Alice gives her testimony in a rather chaotic trial. During the trial, a turmoil takes place, and at least the Knave, the King, the Queen, and the Lizard are involved. At one point, the Queen furiously throws an **inkstand** at the Lizard, who had, previously, been writing down the events of the trial (Carroll 2015/1865, 166).

Though the word inkstand is most likely recognized by as many English speakers today, it is undeniably historical, albeit not necessarily unique to the Victorian English period. However, in this thesis, it is regarded as such, as, in the context of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, it is a factor specific to the novel's historical, Victorian English context. Moreover, the inkstand, which several dictionaries, such as Cambridge, Collins and Merriam-Webster, define as a container for writing implements and ink, is closely tied to a historical context where liquid ink was routinely used for writing. Accordingly, the Merriam-Webster dictionary states that the word was first used in 1768, and the Collins Dictionary showcases that the word was most commonly used during the 19th century. Thus, the word has, at the very least, a Victorian flair.

In the Karelian translation, the passage goes as follows: “Duamu . . . paistes lykkäi **černilpullozen** šiziliuhkah,” which translates back into English as “The Queen . . . tossed a little bottle of ink at the Lizard while talking.” The general meaning is the same, as what is being thrown is still a container for ink, although a slight difference can be found – in the source text, what is being thrown is a stand for potentially several bottles of ink in a stand, whereas, in the target text, a single bottle of ink is hurled at the lizard. Despite certain qualities of a paraphrase, the translation solution could be classified as a case of **copying morphology**, as it consists of roughly the same morphological units as the original word (eng. “ink” + “stand [= container for inks and related items]” vs. krl. “ink” + “bottle [= container for ink]”).

### 7.5.12 Words related to Victorian English culture: summary

As the length and detail of this sub-section have exemplified, *Alice in Wonderland* is littered with historical or otherwise culturally specific words that refer to Victorian England. As initially

speculated prior to conducting the analysis, the encountered translation solutions varied a great deal and occasionally overlapped.

First, it seems that the translation solutions for historical words differ from solutions of many other thematical categories. For instance, copying morphology has been widely utilized in the other categories, whereas, in this category, it was encountered in only three instances out of eleven, and all the instances featuring it had qualities connected to paraphrases and sometimes explicitness change, as well. Instead, copying sound and paraphrase emerged as commonly used solutions, and many a solution had a secondary effect of explicitness change.

Second, on a general level, the solutions found in this category seem to function similarly to the ones encountered while examining names of animals and mythological creatures (see section 7.3). For instance, concepts that can be expected to be somewhat familiar or expressible in the Karelian language were, in the translation, categorizable as either **explicitness change** (when necessary words already exist in the Karelian language, such as in the case of “škola”) or **copying morphology** (when necessary words do not yet exist in Karelian but are established in, for instance, Finnish or Russian, and can be expected to be in regular use among speakers of Karelian).

However, concepts that can be assumed to be unknown to either the target audience or the target language system were, in the translation, categorized as **copying sound**, as was the case with animals and mythological creatures, or, uniquely to this category, as **paraphrases**. In a sense, these instances could be seen as examples of concepts that simply cannot be directly translated into Karelian, as the necessary words do not exist, which leaves two options: 1) applying a foreignizing approach through copying sound (or direct transfer) and 2) attempting to explain the concept in other words and abandoning and/or rewriting the original structure in the progress.

In addition to the instances that could be categorized as either unknown or somewhat known, as above, the category featured a third distinct set of words. This set considers words that represent concepts that are known and understood in the context of Karelian, but their terminology is, for one reason or another, asymmetrical. For instance, the English language features numerous words for different kinds of service workers, and these words all have their own sets of additional, implicit meanings. Karelian has its own words for service workers, as well,

but their implicit meanings might not be as detailed; rather, they are perfect synonyms of the same concept, and can be used interchangeably in the translation to maintain the source text's sense of variety (as suggested by Chesterman [1997], see section 4.3.2). In other words, whereas the English words encountered in the research material conceal implicit meanings that, in addition to the core meaning of "service worker," refer to the worker's gender or specific tasks, the Karelian words simply seem to function as identical synonyms representing the concept of "service worker." This case is very similar to that of the different sweets presented in section 7.4, as their translations mostly relied on synonymy, as well.

## 7.6 Miscellaneous words

In this section, words or phrases that do not fit into any other category will be presented. As the words refer to a varying array of topics, general notions will not be presented at the beginning of the section but before analysing specific examples, when relevant and necessary.

### 7.6.1 Example 34: Hearthrug

As discussed in section 7.3.3, chapter two of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* features a scene where Alice is theorizing a letter to her own legs. In the example, Alice's legs seem to be lounging near the fireplace, as one line of their alleged address is **hearthrug** (Carroll 2015/1865, 14).

According to the Oxford Dictionary of English language, a hearthrug is, as the name suggests, a rug that is laid in front of the fireplace to protect the carpet or the floor. The word seems somewhat obvious, but in the Karelian context, there has not been a need for such a word, as most fireplaces have been closed instead of open (see section 7.5.2 for a more detailed explanation).

In the Karelian translation, hearthrug becomes **kaminan mattoine** (eng. little carpet of the stove). This solution could fit well into several categories, the most obvious of which is copying morphology, as the translated version of the word features all and only the "ingredients" used in the original word. However, the morphology of the new term differs from the one featured in the source text, as the original word is a compound but the Karelian translation is a phrase consisting of two nouns, first of which (kamina + the genitive indicator "n") is genitive. This, within this thesis, renders this solution a **paraphrase**, as the original concept is explained in other words, however similar they are to the original.

### 7.6.2 Example 35: Hookah

At the very end of chapter four of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, Alice encounters a caterpillar who is smoking “a long **hookah**” (Carroll 2015/1865, 52). The hookah is mentioned very matter-of-factly and without further introduction, which implies that the concept of a hookah is included in the knowledge assumedly shared between the reader and the writer. Although the concept seems to be familiar or, at the very least, is introduced as such, the word itself must have appeared somewhat exotic or of foreign origin when *Alice* was first published. Accordingly, the word “hookah,” which refers to a type of pipe used for smoking, for example, marijuana and tobacco is recognized by several dictionaries, but most of them inform that the same pipe is known as a hubble-bubble or a waterpipe, as well (Collins & Merriam-Webster). Furthermore, the Collins Dictionary of English language states that the origin of the word is in the Arabic language. All of this could imply that the very existence of the hookah could be to alienate the reader or somehow indicate that the caterpillar is foreign or eccentric.

In the Karelian translation, the caterpillar is smoking a **vezipiippu** (eng. water + pipe). This could be seen as a paraphrase, but it is likely that the word is actually formed according to the Finnish equivalent of hookah, **vesipiippu**. This would make the translation solution a case of **copying** morphology, potentially through Finnish, which would again be working as an implicit relay language. What is notable about this translation solution, however, is that the word “vesipiippu” simply describes the pipe’s function without containing a message of strangeness or exoticness. Either this has been lost in translation or the word “vesipiippu,” alone, has been seen as exotic and strange enough to the Karelian audience. In fact, the latter interpretation is quite likely, as the hookah was, most likely, introduced to English culture through its colonialist ties to other countries, whereas, in Northern Europe, tobacco has mostly been consumed with pipes or as cigarettes. In modern-day Northern Europe, hookahs have become known through cultural contacts and globalized media, but this has not previously become reflected by the Karelian language, due to its endangered state.

### 7.6.3 Examples 36 and 37: Latitude and Longitude

In chapter one of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, Alice is falling, and she wonders whether she is about to hit the center of the earth. First, she deciphers that such a fall would need to be about

6,000 kilometers long, after which she starts to ponder about “what **Latitude** or **Longitude** [she’s] got to” (Carroll 2015/1865, 4).

Latitude and longitude, again, seem like relatively straightforward words to translate, but this is not the case with minority languages, at least not Karelian. As stated several times, the Karelian language has not been used as a language of education aside from turbulent and occasional, low-grade language teaching offered on the Russian side of the Karelian border (Pyöli 1996, 53–55). This has led to a situation where regular users of the Karelian language might find talking about science, mathematics and other such topics in their own language near impossible. However, words such as latitude and longitude, when talking about geography, are so essential that they have been purposely invented into the Karelian language during efforts for its revitalization. For example, Martti Penttonen’s (2006) Karelian-Finnish-Karelian dictionary offers the words **levevysaste** and **piduvusaste**.

The reason these words are featured in the analysis is that the translation solution used in the translation differs from the ones documented in the dictionary. Of course, synonymy exists in all languages, but it is especially prevalent in developing and poorly documented languages, such as Karelian. Moreover, in the case of minority languages, synonymy might affect even the seemingly fundamental or scientific vocabulary where consistency is seen as ideal. In the case of Karelian, this is especially prevalent as there is no official organization responsible for the development of the language but it is instead developed within the community and among individual speakers. The divide between speakers is further deepened by the fact that people developing the language in Finland and in Russia are not always in regular linguistic contact with each other, which has led into terminological asymmetry on different sides of the border (see section 3.2.2).

In this translation, the words used were **levevysgruadussi** and **piduhusgruadussi**, which consist of the words for “width/length” and “degree.” Although definitive conclusions cannot be drawn, in this thesis it is assumed that these solutions are instances of **copying morphology** of Finnish, as similar words (*pituusaste* and *leveysaste*) exist in the Finnish language. Moreover, this is a good example of regional differences and asymmetry of the Karelian language, which were first introduced in section 3.2.2: although dictionaries might recognize certain words for seemingly basic concepts, they have not yet been used so exclusively and widely that all speakers of the language would recognize them or even know that they exist. This, in turn, leads

into several variants of the same word coming into existence, when individual users of the language create their own versions of the word with a specific communicative situation in mind. It is likely that, eventually, one of these several variants will reign as the dominate one, but, for the time being, numerous different words remain in use.

#### 7.6.4 Example 38: Sky-rocket

Section 7.3.1 began by summarizing a scene where Alice encounters a lizard name Bill, who has a habit of “[going up] like a **sky-rocket**” whenever something “comes at [him] like a jack-in-the-box” (Carroll 2015/1865, 47). The earlier section focused on the potentially Victorian word “jack-in-the-box,” but “sky-rocket” is equally interesting.

In the text, it is not entirely clear what the term sky-rocket specifically refers to, but it is safe to assume that Bill means some sort of an object or vessel that is launched into the sky. According to the Merriam-Webster Dictionary of English Language, the first and basic meaning of the word “rocket” is “a firework consisting of a case partly filled with a combustible composition fastened to a guiding tick and propelled through the air by the rearward discharge of the gases liberated by combustion.” One could assume that, if this is what Carroll intended, he could have simply used the term “rocket.” Perhaps the definitive addition “sky” implies something bigger and more grandiose – could Carroll have meant some sort of a utopic air-craft or a jet engine, which these days are known as space ships or space vehicles?

The Karelian translation of the novel takes into account Carroll’s ambiguity, as “sky-rocket” has simply become **raketti**, which would refer to either fireworks or spacecrafts. In terms of categories, if overlooking the omission of “sky,” the solution is similar enough to the source text variant to be seen as a case of **copying sound**. However, the omission does cause for an alternative interpretation of **explicitness change** to emerge, as the source text’s rocket explicitly heads towards the sky, where as, in the Karelian translation, the direction of the rocket (upwards) is implicit. This could be due to the fact that the Karelian translation was published in modern times, which allows the assumption that the target audience is more familiar with rockets and their purpose. Alternatively, the asymmetry here could simply be result of wanting to avoid repetition in the translation: the verb phrase “going up” of the original already implies that the rocket is, indeed, going up.

Again, it is purposeful to stop and consider the potential impact of the Finnish language: the Finnish word for “rocket” is identical with the Karelian variant, used here. However, as was the case with jack-in-the-box, it is impossible to establish whether the translation has been affected by Finnish or if it has developed so naturally due to the Viena/Northern Karelian Proper spoken here being so closely related to Finnish. Due to this ambiguity, the thesis refrains from analysing potential copying of morphology, which is why the solution is categorized as a case of **copying sound**, with a secondary category of **explicitness change**.

### 7.6.5 Miscellaneous words: summary

As stated in the beginning of this section, the words examined above do not obviously belong into a coherent thematical category but are nevertheless relevant or noteworthy. Despite the general thematic disarray of the words and phrases examined, this miscellaneous category is perhaps the most unified in terms of encountered translation solutions: out of the five instances analyzed, three were categorizable as **copying morphology** and, furthermore, two had likely copied not the morphology of English but that of Finnish as a relay language.

In addition to copying morphology, instances of **paraphrase** and **copying sound** were encountered. Moreover, the paraphrase (hearthrug/kaminan mattoine) also contained features of copying morphology, whereas the instance of copying sound was assigned a secondary categorization of explicitness change.

Although this category cannot be utilized to draw general notions due to the lack of a unified theme, it offers interesting information and provides several examples of Finnish being used as a potential, implicit relay language. Furthermore, the instances presented in this sub-section can be used as comparisons for other examples and, perhaps, reveal patterns and tendencies of endangered language translation or, at least, translating into Karelian.

## 7.7 Discussion

In this section, the analysis and its results will be compiled and discussed. First, a summary of the found translation solutions divided by categories will be presented and the significance and implications of these solutions will be discussed. Moreover, potential patterns and their explanations will be presented and examined.

### 7.7.1 General summary of found solutions

As was expected, the translation of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* featured numerous instances of several different, creative translation solutions, although some were notably more common than others. The initially crafted, modified categorization of solutions was adequate, as no new categories needed to be implemented while conducting the analysis. However, it very soon became evident that not all instances could be simply categorized as only one solution type, sometimes not even as two different types. Cultural filtering, which was initially expected to only appear alongside other solution types, proved to be especially challenging, as, while it was often speculated, it could very rarely be assigned. Despite this, it was not removed from the thesis, because 1) its unique nature was recognized from the beginning and 2) its potentiality and eventual exclusion from solutions of a certain translation offer interesting insight on translating into endangered languages, at least in the case of *Alice* and *Alisa*.

The most common primary solutions were **paraphrase** (12) and **copying morphology** (12). This outcome was expected from the beginning. **Copying sound** (5) and **explicitness change** (4) were the third and fourth common solutions, while **synonymy** (3) and **hyponymy** (2) were notably less common. Furthermore, **copying sound** and **explicitness change** sometimes occurred as secondary solutions alongside **paraphrases**. In these instances, the primary translation solution was categorized as a paraphrase, but certain parts of the overall solution had likely been achieved through copying sound or applying an explicitness change. Out of the solution categories, instances of Finnish functioning as an implicit relay language were encountered in **paraphrases**, **synonymy**, and, most frequently, **copying morphology**. The specifics of these instances will be discussed later when examining the results of the analysis one solution category at a time.

On a general level, it would seem that copying **morphology**, **synonymy**, **hyponymy** and **explicitness change** were used in instances where the concept being referred to was not entirely unknown to the new target audience but where additional information could be beneficial or the language was moderately lacking in adequate vocabulary and structures. One key difference among the four categories seems to be that synonymy, hyponymy and explicitness change mostly relied on the, perhaps inadequate, material already existing in the Karelian language, whereas copying morphology stood out by more concretely borrowing from



other languages – oftentimes it either recreated the morphology of the source text variant or copied Finnish (implicit relay language).

On the other hand, **paraphrase** and **copying sound** seemed to be employed in situations where the referent was either 1) entirely unknown in the target culture to the point where to express it with Karelian words would be near impossible or 2) geographically or culturally so distinct that a notably foreignizing translation solution was applied. For instance, concepts such as the bathing machine or the fender do not have any near or approximate counterpart in the Karelian language or culture, which is why they have been translated very liberally and sort of explanatorily: more often than not these solutions could be assigned a secondary categorization of **explicitness change**. Copying sound, in turn, was used to express exotic concepts, some of which, such as the Gryphon, were intended to seem unfamiliar to the original target audience, as well.

### 7.7.2 Summary of the relationship between solutions and thematical categories

In this section, any patterns between the thematical categories and certain solutions will be discussed. As the concluding sub-sections at the end of analysis of each thematic category already featured a summary of the most common solutions used, this sub-section will address the topic from the perspective of the solution categories and examine what thematic categories certain solutions could be found in and whether patterns can be detected. This will be done in the order the solution categories were first introduced in section 6.4.

First, **copying sound** was encountered in five instances out of 38, and it was featured as a secondary category twice. The solution was found in instances categorized as **misspelled words or nonsense, animals and mythological creatures, Victorian English words** and **miscellaneous words**. Thus, the solution was not encountered while analysing **invented words** or **edibles**. As stated several times in this thesis, copying sound seems to occur mostly in instances where the original, source text concept is unknown and somewhat untranslatable in the context of Karelian, at least if using material previously existing in the language. This could be due to, for instance, the overall strangeness of the word (i.e. the Gryphon). Sometimes, however, the assumed bilinguality of all Karelian speakers seems to have affected the translation. For instance, copying sound in the cases of words such as “flamingo” or “sky-rocket” seems especially logical because the Finnish, and sometimes Russian, variants of the words have

been coined similarly. Due to this, such a solution is easier for a Karelian reader to understand than, say, a paraphrase could be (in addition to being easier and faster to coin while translating).

**Copying morphology**, in turn, was encountered in 12 instances out of 38 and in **all thematical categories**, excluding edibles. The solution was especially common in the categories of **invented** and **miscellaneous words**. As noted in the conclusive analysis of animal words and later further proved by the analysis of miscellaneous words, in addition to reduplicating Carroll's invented words, copying morphology seemed to be an especially common strategy while translating passages concerning matters that are not necessarily discussed in the Karelian language but are not entirely excluded from the daily lives and shared knowledge of the speakers of Karelian. After all, Karelian speakers regularly communicate in Finnish, Russian and English, which can be utilized while creating neologisms. Because of this, names of foreign animals (i.e. lory, starfish) and cultural artifacts (i.e. hookah) were often coined by reduplicating the structure of the source text (or that of another language, such as Finnish): no paraphrase of explicitness change is deemed necessary, as the reader is likely to recognize the new word because of cultural knowledge and everyday language shared with the Finns or the Russians.

As briefly mentioned above, the solution did not always seem to copy English morphology but, instead, oftentimes appeared to heavily rely on a pre-existing Finnish variant. This possibility was recognized in the theoretical sections of this thesis, but its realizations were still surprisingly common in the research material. Despite the initial surprise, the findings are very logical when taking into account the explained and exemplified differences between the Finnish and the Karelian languages as well as the sociopolitical distress faced by Karelian speakers. Accordingly, the instances of copying Finnish morphology were not occasional, as it was as a real possibility in seven out of twelve cases of copying morphology. This is especially interesting because, as discussed in section 6.2, the translator has stated that he intentionally aimed to avoid the influence of Finnish while translating. Perhaps the finding suggests that the two languages are historically, linguistically and socially so ingrained that certain similarities and influences cannot be avoided. In a sense, avoiding the effect of Finnish might even be counter-productive because it could be argued that it is not natural for Karelian to exist in a vacuum without any influence from Finnish, as the two languages share a root and have always existed alongside each other. This can be seen in the way the languages share a great deal of vocabulary, most of which

originates from a time when both Finnish and Karelian still developed organically and without the help of revitalization programmes. However, native speakers of Finnish do tend to produce texts and speech in somewhat Finnishized Karelian, which not everyone sees as desirable, especially in cases where Finnish has not only affected vocabulary but grammar and sentence and information structures, as well. Arguably, there might not be an objectively safe and beneficial way of translating and developing Karelian, but these are themes anyone working for the future of such an endangered language needs to be aware of: the situation is not unique to Karelian speakers residing in Finland but affects those on Russian-speaking territories, as well. Uniting the Karelian dialects that have developed separately in Finland and in Russia is an altogether different problem and has been discussed in sections 2 & 3.2.2.

**Hyponymy** was encountered in only two instances out of 38, making it the most seldomly encountered category. Moreover, both instances of hyponymy rather surprisingly concerned **edibles** and, interestingly specifically, names of sweet treats. This was an interesting finding, as research literature and academic texts consulted for this thesis primarily discussed hyponymy as a tool often used when translating words considering the natural world, such as names of flora and fauna. Perhaps this would have been the case if the animals in question had been sub-species of animals regularly encountered in Karelia, in which case related but not entirely sufficient vocabulary would have previously existed. Instead, the animals discussed were mostly almost entirely unknown or downright mythological, which clearly affected their translation solutions. The case of the two sweet-related hyponymies remains unclear, as conclusions cannot be drawn with such a limited array of examples. Certain speculations can rise, however, and the reasoning for the use of hyponymy could, for example, be a mixture of restrictions created by the nature of the Karelian language and cultural differences regarding shared knowledge on types of sweets.

**Synonymy** was encountered in three instances out of 38, which makes it only marginally more commonplace than hyponymy. Unlike hyponymy, however, synonymy was encountered in separate thematical categories: once in **animals and mythological creatures** and twice in **words regarding Victorian English culture**. In all three instances, as the name synonymy suggests, the translation was not direct, but another pre-existing Karelian word with a similar meaning was used. Similarly, the Karelian translations often included slightly different implicit

meanings, as the serpent loses its ominous and almost moral threat and the housemaid and lackey their implied gender. These differences, however, were minor enough for them not to render the solutions hyponyms and paraphrases. This was especially prevalent in the examples considering gender, as the omission was not intentional but caused by the very genderless nature of the Karelian equivalents.

Additionally, the likely effect of the Finnish language was detected in one instance of synonymy (footman → lakei). In this case, the Karelian word was likely coined according to similar vocabulary in Finnish, but, when examining only the connection between the source and the target texts, it clearly functioned as a synonym of the source text word rather than as an obvious or a direct translation.

**Paraphrase**, which was encountered in 12 out of the 38 instances, was one of the most commonly encountered translation solutions. This might partially be due to the thesis' rather liberal definition of paraphrase, as it was broadened from explaining single-word concepts in larger passages to equally applying to instances where similarly sized but differently structured neologisms were coined (i.e. short compound → one noun modified with an adjective). However, the broad definition does not seem to have given paraphrase an unfair advantage, as it was expected to be featured numerous times for other reasons, as well. In fact, its expected occurrences were so high that it was somewhat surprising that paraphrase was only encountered 12 times in the research material. Either way, the relatively high number of occurrences of paraphrase is due to the different levels of standardization and active usage domains between the English and the Karelian languages. Because of this, certain concepts that can be readily and efficiently referred to using independent English language nouns might not be equally simple to discuss in Karelian. The findings support this assumption, and paraphrase was encountered in **all thematic categories**. Moreover, it was especially prevalent in the categories of **invented words** and **Victorian English words**. This is very logical, as words and phrases belonging to these two categories either did not at all exist before Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland* or were popularized by it and, thus, have not been documentedly discussed in the Karelian language prior to *Alice* being translated.

Alongside copying morphology, paraphrase was the only category that featured more than one clear instance of Finnish functioning as a likely implicit relay language. The two instances

(Cheshire-cat & Curiouser) were quite different from one another and no thematic pattern both of them would be affected by can be traced. However, the lack of pattern is an equally interesting finding that showcases several different potential shortcomings of the Karelian language. First, Cheshire-cat was likely impacted by Finnish for two reasons: 1) organic and coincidental similarities between the Finnish and the Karelian vocabularies and, perhaps more likely, 2) the earlier Finnish translations of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*: the Cheshire-cat is such an iconic character that most intended readers of the target text are familiar with it through the Finnish translations of the novel, which might make even considering other or notably different names for the character impossible. Second, the case with Curiouser was strictly grammatical, as it was translated using a spoonerism, perhaps due to faulty comparative forms not being very common in Karelian. Spoonerisms are notably common in Finnish and less so in Karelian. However, relying on a spoonerism is, nevertheless, a logical solution, as whimsical and childlike uses of Karelian have not been widely documented, which is why a similar, uniquely Karelian linguistic structure could have been unnecessarily different to form.

**Explicitness change** often overlapped or existed alongside other categories, but it was encountered on its own in four instances out of 38, as well. Additionally, it was applied as a secondary category twice. These secondary instances occurred in **words regarding Victorian English culture** and **miscellaneous words**, out of which the former featured three instances of primary explicitness change, as well. The remaining two primary instances occurred in names for **animals and mythological creatures** and **edibles**. As stated several times during the analysis, most explicitness changes occurred in contexts where the source text referred to concepts whose specific realizations were unknown to Karelian but for whom broadly recognized, similar words exist. For instance, the average user of the Karelian language cannot be expected to be intimately familiar with a cherry-tart baked in England during Victorian times, but pies and other basic baked goods are recognized somewhat universally. Thus, these translations can easily be made understandable by explicitly offering the target text reader some additional information that was originally given implicitly.

Last, as briefly explained in the beginning of section 7.7.1, **cultural filtering**, although initially assumed to be scarcely encountered, was definitely assigned only one time. When the solution was first analyzed in the context of this thesis in section 6.4.6, its uncertainty and possible

overlap with other solutions was acknowledged, but the near complete lack of culturally filtering translations was nevertheless surprising. Despite this, the potentiality of cultural filtering was often discussed, which resulted in interesting observations of the differences between the source and target texts, audiences and cultures. For example, cultural filtering or at least some kind of transmission or explanation of cultural information seemed to function as a catalyst for many other solutions, especially when translating culturally specific words, such as names of certain dishes. However, most of these instances were eventually not sub-categorized as cultural filtering because the assumed aim of the cultural changes was not to make the concepts in question more familiar for the Karelian audience but to sufficiently explain them while keeping them clearly foreign. This is in line with what Ruuskanen has stated about his translation process (Riionheimo 2019a), as it indeed seems that, despite the notable differences between the source and target cultures and other challenging aspects of the translation, the Karelian translation of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* has managed to, for the most part, maintain a foreignizing nature.

## 8 Conclusion

In this section, the overall success and comprehensibility of this thesis will be discussed. The initial ambitions and objectives of the study will be revisited to establish whether the eventual study has offered answer to the originally constructed questions. Moreover, the discussion will consider whether new questions or other surprising findings have arose from the analysis of translation solutions. Last, potential new questions and topics that require further research will be analysed in sub-section 8.2.1.

### 8.1 Evaluation of the research and its results

In this sub-section, the thesis and its results will briefly discussed. First, the initial research question will be revisited, after which certain triumphs and shortcomings will be presented.

The aims of this thesis were to examine and analyze translating into endangered minority languages and specifically Karelian. As one of the greatest obstacles in endangered language translation is the asymmetry between the source and the target languages, often caused by lack of usage domains and poor standardization of the target language, the scope of the thesis was narrowed down to translating lexical gaps. Although summarizing a single research question proved to be difficult, an attempt was made in section 1. The question went as follows: **When examining *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and *Alisan šeikkailut kummanmuas*, can traces of likely lexical gaps be located and if so, how have the gaps been translated and what do these translation solutions say about the source and the target languages and cultures and the differences between them?**

It can be stated that the research has, overall, provided a satisfactory answer to this question. First, by consulting both the source and the target texts and several Karelian dictionaries and parallel texts, it quickly became evident that numerous lexical gaps, especially when considering such a historical text, exist. Although challenging, it was eventually possible and insightful to consider what kinds of translation solutions had been applied while filling in these gaps. Moreover, the reasoning behind certain solutions was often reliant on either cultural differences, the linguistics or the sociopolitical situation of the Karelian language, or a mixture of the two. While not all solutions could be definitively explained, general notions could be drawn and assumptions could be made.

Overall, the theory sections of the thesis proved to be useful, which could be considered one of the greatest successes of the thesis. First, the review of literature regarding the past, present and the potential future of the Karelian language provided important context for the analyzed research material. Similarly, the review of literature on endangered languages, endangered language translation, lexical gaps, and translating for children proved to be useful. The briefer overviews of nonsense literature and relay languages were appropriate, as well. Especially the latter made interesting ponderings on the desirability of Finnish language effect, or the lack thereof, on Karelian language translations possible.

Although the thesis achieved desired results, the modified categorization could have been compiled differently. For instance, while all instances categorized as paraphrase could logically and easily be regarded as paraphrases, several sub-categories could have been distinguished. This would have made categorizing the examples more nuanced on a general level and helped more determinedly categorize the ambiguous examples. Similarly, the unique, oftentimes supportive or secondary role of explicit change as well as the way Finnish tends to function as an relay language of solutions that copy morphology could have been granted even more thought. In this thesis, however, this would not have been possible without unnecessarily broadening the topic and, thus, lengthening this already rather voluminous thesis. Perhaps it is for the best that these topics remained interesting sidenotes in a larger, broader study.

## **8.2 Implications for future research**

The fact that not all questions set in the beginning of the thesis project were definitively answered and that new ones arose does not indicate a failed or lacking master's thesis. Moreover, a study or a research project that does not evoke further questions is likely to be rather enclosed by nature, as research tends to be cumulative: new studies loan certain thoughts from previous studies, thus creating new concepts and ideas that can be further examined by other scholars. From this point of view, a study that does not answer all possible questions is quite the successful study that allows further scholars to become inspired and consequently create more developed and polished analysis.

Accordingly, there are several ways one could go from here. First, this study has compiled different academic sources ranging from sociolinguistics and history to studies of language revitalization and (translating) children's literature. All of these fields are crucial for those seeking



to study language revitalization and translation in the context of Karelian, but they had not previously been compiled into one easily comprehensible package in this specific context. In addition to compiling this information, this thesis has, at length, exemplified the topic by analysing a relevant and concrete work of translated literature, *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland/Alisan šeikkailut kummanmuas*. Second, as explained at the end of the previous subsection, the research did not arrive at a definitive conclusion, but, instead, several questions remain open. For instance, this thesis only concerned one translation, which, despite being an iconic work of children's literature, is read by people of all ages. As language revitalization often especially concerns children, this study could be repeated with research material consisting of literature aimed specifically at small children who might not yet be fluent in either Finnish or Russian. For instance, musician Kristiina Olanto and the band Lekkujad have published an album containing translated versions of 15 popular, originally Finnish children's songs, which could be interesting to study in a similar manner, especially as one of the aims of the album was to support children in Karelian language acquisition (Olanto & Ljekkujad 2020).

Another topic that surfaced during this thesis process and that could be studied more in the future was the surprisingly common instances of the assumed use of Finnish as an implicit relay language. As suggested above, similar studies could be conducted on other Karelian language materials produced in Finland, but the focus could be shifted from a general viewpoint to definitely consider the effect of Finnish language. The same phenomenon could be studied using materials published in the Republic of Karelia, as well, thus moving the focus onto the way the Russian language has affected and continues to affect Karelian. This could be an especially interesting topic for a study because, as the results of the study could be difficult to predict because while Karelian is not linguistically close to Russian as Finnish is, scholars such as Pyöli (1994) have noted that spoken Karelian is very much impacted by Russian. In a sense, these two points interestingly contradict each other. After establishing a general understanding of whether patterns such as those examined in this thesis exist between the Russian and the Karelian languages, as well, comparative analysis on works published in Finland and in Russia could be conducted. The current political situation with Russia invading Ukraine has further separated the Karelians living in Finland and Russia from one another, which could make such research difficult but, simultaneously, all the more important and topical.

These two paths (examining other translations and examining texts published in Russia) are similar in the sense that deep down they both consider the questions of how the Karelian language should ideally be revitalized and what actions are best for its speakers. This is due to the fact that, while examining an acutely endangered language, one cannot entirely separate translation or neologisms from the context of language revitalization. Moreover, the current political and linguistical climate in both Finland and Russia is one where merely acknowledging and mentioning the Karelian language is viewed as activism regardless of the original intention of the writer or the speaker. This can bring an immense pressure on the experts, lovers, and speakers of the Karelian language, but offers great opportunities for speaking up and potentially furthering the evercontinuing process of evaluating and documenting the language. The duration and end goal of the process is unclear, but, undoubtedly, it is impossible to conclusively and definitely ensure a better future for the language without studying all aspects of it and all kinds of Karelian language media published both in Finland and in Russia.

## References

- Alvstad, C. 2010. Children's literature and translation, in Y. Gambier & L. van Doorslaer (eds.). *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 22–27.
- Branchadell, A. 2005. Mandatory translation, in A. Brandachell & L. M. West (eds.). *Less Translated Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 125–136.
- Carroll, L. 1906. *Liisan seikkailut ihmemaassa* (A. Swan, Trans.). Helsinki: WSOY. (Original work published in 1865.)
- Carroll, L. 1972. *The Annotated Alice : Alice's Adventures in Wonderland : Through the Looking Glass*. New York: New American Library. (Original work published in 1865.)
- Carroll, L. 1974. *Liisan seikkailut ihmemaassa ja Liisan seikkailut peilimaailmassa* (K. Kunnas & E. Manner, Trans.). Jyväskylä: Gummerus. (Original work published in 1865.)
- Carroll, L. 1995. *Alicen seikkailut ihmemaassa* (A. Martin, Trans.). Helsinki: WSOY. (Original work published in 1865.)
- Carroll, L. 2000. *Liisan ihmemaassa* (T. Nevanlinna, Trans.). Helsinki: Otava. (Original work published in 1865.)
- Carroll, L. 2015. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. The Macmillan Children's Edition. London: Macmillan Children's Books. (Original work published 1865.)
- Carroll, L. 2018. *Alisan šeikkailut kummanmuas* (A. Ruuskanen, Trans.). Helsinki: Karjalan Kielen Seura. (Original work published in 1865.)
- Chesterman, A. 1997. *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Crystal, D. 2000. *Language Death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. 2008. *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (6th ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Dunn, J. Strange (Fantastic) Animals of Ancient Egypt : Beasts of Ancient Egypt.  
<URL=<http://www.toureygypt.net/featurestories/beasts.htm>>. Accessed 28 March 2022.

- Fisherman, J. 1991. *Reversing language shift : theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Gambier, Y. 2010. Translation strategies and tactics, in Y. Gambier & L. van Doorslaer (eds.). *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 412–418.
- Gicala, A. 2020. How Can One Word Change a World? Black Humour and Nonsense in Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and its Polish Translations from the Cognitive-Ethnolinguistic Perspective, in Dybiec-Gajer; Oittinen, Riitta & Kodura, Małgorzata (eds.). *Negotiating translation and transcreation of children's literature : from Alice to the Moomins*. Singapore: Springer. 125–138.
- Giloeva, N. 2017. Luajimmo nygösty karjalan kiieldy yhtes!, in E. Linna & A. Sarhimaa. *Meijän hierus – Esseitä karjalan kielestä*. Helsinki: Karjalan Sivistysseura. 80–86.
- Giloeva, N. & Kok, M. 2020. Ičensienet, koiransienet ja kivilinduzet – Kuinka eliölajien nimiä käännetään suomesta karjalaksi?, in J. Sullöv (ed.). *Sõnavara- ja kirjandusküsimusi võru ja karjala keelemailt*. Tartu: Võro Institute. 26–47.
- Giloeva, N. & Kok, M. 2021. Päivittyvä karjalan kieli – Yle uudizet karjalakse: käännössolmuja ja niiden ratkaisuja, in P. Suutari (ed.). *Karjalankieliset rajalla*. Vantaa: Suomen kansantietouden tutkijain seura. 229–250.
- Giloeva, N. & Riionheimo, H. 2020. Yskyniekanvakku: yhten sanan pitky pajo, in Grünthal, R; Linna, E.; Nuolijärvi, P. & Riionheimo, H. (eds.). *Šulkkuni sanaine : kirjoituksia karjalasta ja vähemmistökielistä*. Helsinki: Karjalan Sivistysseura. 219–224.
- González, M. G. 2005. Translation of minority languages in bilingual and multilingual communities, in A. Brandachell & L. M. West (eds.). *Less Translated Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 105–124.
- Grenoble, L. A. & Whaley, L. J. 2006. *Saving Languages: An Introduction to Language Revitalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hietanen, S. 1986. Siirtoväen asuttaminen, in *Hämeen historia V. Toisen maailmansodan jälkeinen aika*. Hämeenlinna: Karisto. 101–111.

HTBAS 1 = Tieteen termipankki. Kielitiede:uhanalainen kieli. <URL=  
[https://tieteentermipankki.fi/wiki/Kielitiede:uhanalainen\\_kieli](https://tieteentermipankki.fi/wiki/Kielitiede:uhanalainen_kieli)>. Accessed 8 September 2021.

HTBAS 2 = Tieteen termipankki. Kielitiede:sitaattilaina.  
 <URL=<https://tieteentermipankki.fi/wiki/Kielitiede:sitaattilaina>>. Accessed 28 September 2021.

HTBAS 3 = Tieteen termipankki. Kielitiede:sitaattilaina.  
 <URL=<https://tieteentermipankki.fi/wiki/Kielitiede:synonyymi>>. Accessed 30 March 2022.

Hämynen, T. 1997. "Rajako railona aukeaa? : Raja-Karjalan ja Vienan Karjalan väestön yhteydet itärajan yli 1880-luvulta toiseen maailmansotaan. *Karjalan Sivistysseura*, Karjalan Heimo, volume 5-6. 69–71. <URL= [https://www.karjalansivistysseura.fi/sampo/sites/default/files/kh-artikkelit/KH1997\\_05-06\\_093.pdf](https://www.karjalansivistysseura.fi/sampo/sites/default/files/kh-artikkelit/KH1997_05-06_093.pdf)>. Accessed 20 October 2021.

Ippolito, M. 2008. The Relationship Between Text and Illustrations: Translating Beatrix Potter's Little Books into Italian, in. R. Oittinen & D. Gonzáles. *Whose Story? : Translating the Verbal and the Visual in Literature for Young Readers*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 45–56.

Ivaska, L. 2020. *A mixed-method approach to indirect translation: A case study of the Finnish translations of Modern Greek prose 1952–2004*. Turun yliopiston julkaisuja, series B, Vol. 524.

Joki, L. 2019. Kotimainen kielemme karjala. *Kielikello*, vol 2:2019.

Kananen, H. 2010. *Kontrolloitu sopeutuminen : Ortodoksinen siirtoväki sotien jälkeisessä Ylä-Savossa (1946–1959)*. Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities No. 144. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.

Karjalainen = Karjalan kielen elvytyshanke käynnistyy. 2021. *Karjala-lehti*.  
 <URL=<https://www.karjala-lehti.fi/m/index.php?p=21&yl=1&id=215&b=1>>. Accessed 8 September 2021.

Karlova, O., Karakina, V. & Karakin, J. 2019. Karjalaisen perheen rakenne ja sen jäsenet. Helsinki: Karjalan Sivistysseura. <URL=[https://www.karjalansivistysseura.fi/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/oppimateriaali2017\\_s3-9.pdf](https://www.karjalansivistysseura.fi/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/oppimateriaali2017_s3-9.pdf)>. Accessed 14 October 2021.

KKS = Karjalan kielen sanakirja. 2009. Helsinki: Kotimaisten kielten keskuksen verkkojulkaisuja 18. Helsinki: Kotimaisten kielten keskus. <URL=[https://kaino.kotus.fi/cgi-bin/kks/kks\\_etusivu.cgi](https://kaino.kotus.fi/cgi-bin/kks/kks_etusivu.cgi)>. Accessed 20 October 2021.

Knuuttila, S. 2019. Karjalan kielen revitalisaatio : Ruohonjuuritason elvytystä kielipolitiikan raameissa, in P. Suutari & O. Davydova-Minguet. *Joustavat etnisyydet : Identiteetti-prosessit Venäjän Karjalassa*. Joensuu: Suomen Kansantietouden Tutkijain Seura. 103–118.

Koivisto, V. 2017. Karjalan kielestä ja sen tutkimuksesta 2010-luvulla. *Suomalais-ugrilaisen Seuran Aikakauskirja*, vol 2017:96. 423–438.

Kolehmainen, L. 2013. Käännöstiede ja kontaktilingvistiikka kohtaavat, in L. Kolehmainen, M. Miestamo & T. Nordlund (eds.). *Kielten vertailun metodiikka*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. 420–460.

Kondie, T. 2021. Lätinät sikseen, elvytystyo on raakaa logistiikkaa.

<URL=<https://www.kondie.fi/latinat-sikseen-elvytystyo-on-raakaa-logistiikkaa/>>. Accessed 8 September 2021.

Koskinen, K., Kuusi, P. S. & Riionheimo, H. 2017. Kaikki on vinksin vonksin: käännösseminaari vähemmistökielen elvyttämisen tukena. *MikaEL Kääntämisen ja tulkkauksen symposiumin verkkojulkaisu*, volume 10. 167–180.

KOTUS 1 = Kotimaisten kielten keskus. Karjala. <URL=<https://www.kotus.fi/kielitieto/kielet/karjala>>. Accessed 28 February 2021.

KOTUS 2 = Kielen asemaan liittyvät termit hallinnossamme –sanasto: vähemmistökieli.

<URL=[https://www.kotus.fi/julkaisut/kielipolitiikkajulkaisut/kielen\\_asemaan\\_liittyvat\\_termit\\_hallinnossamme\\_-sanasto/vahemmistokieli](https://www.kotus.fi/julkaisut/kielipolitiikkajulkaisut/kielen_asemaan_liittyvat_termit_hallinnossamme_-sanasto/vahemmistokieli)>. Accessed 8 September 2021.

KOTUS 3 = Kielen asemaan liittyvät termit hallinnossamme –sanasto: autoktoninen kieli.

<URL=[https://www.kotus.fi/julkaisut/kielipolitiikkajulkaisut/kielen\\_asemaan\\_liittyvat\\_termit\\_hallinnossamme\\_-sanasto/autoktoninen\\_kieli](https://www.kotus.fi/julkaisut/kielipolitiikkajulkaisut/kielen_asemaan_liittyvat_termit_hallinnossamme_-sanasto/autoktoninen_kieli)>. Accessed 23 March 2022.

Kurki, T. Kirjallisuus. <URL=<https://www.karjalansivistysseura.fi/kulttuuri/kirjallisuus/>>. Accessed 25 March 2022.

Kulha, K. 2019. Karjalainen heimo mieron tiellä, in K. Kulha, L. Hirvisaari, P. Hakanen, S. Savikko & H. Pukkila-Toivonen (eds.). *Evakkotaival : Karjalan siirtoväen tarina*. Porvoo: Bookwell. 16–283.

- Kunnas, N. 2006. Yksi, kaksi vai monta kirjakieltä? Vienankarjalaisten kanta kirjakielidebattiin. *Virittäjä*, volume 110:2. 229–247.
- Kurko, A. 2021. Suomalaisten suhde Karjalaan on täynnä eksotisointia ja sortoa – TikTok-aktivisti Maura Häkki kamppailee kansansa säilymisen puolesta. *Voima*, volume 7:2021.
- Kuusi, P. & Riionheimo, H. 2020. Kiännä karjalakse: kääntäjänkoulutusta kielenelvyttäjille. *Kieli, koulutus ja yhteiskunta*, volume 11:2.
- Kuusi, P., Koskinen, L. & Riionheimo, H. 2017. Multiple Roles of Translation in the Context of Minority Languages and Revitalization. *Trans-kom*, volume 10:2. 138–163.
- Kuusi, P., Riionheimo, H. & Kolehmainen, L. Translating into an endangered language: filling in lexical gaps as Language Making. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, volume 273. 133–160.
- Kuusi, P. 2017. Varovasti, haurasta! Vähemmistökielet ja kääntäjänkoulutus. *MikaEL Kääntämisen ja tulkkauksen symposiumin verkkojulkaisu*, volume 10. 47–59.
- Kämppe, M. 2020a. Karjalan kielen seura haettu konkurssiin. <URL=<https://yle.fi/uutiset/3-11483429>>. Accessed 28 February 2021.
- Kämppe, M. 2020b. Valtio tukee karjalan kieltä jatkossa Itä-Suomen yliopiston kautta – elvytys on ollut vähäistä kieliseuran rahavaikeuksien ja konkurssin jälkeen. <URL <https://yle.fi/uutiset/3-11700446>>. Accessed 20 October 2021.
- LaChiusa, Chuck. 2009. Illustrated Dictionary of Egyptian Mythology. <URL=<https://buffaloah.com/a/archsty/egypt/illus/illus.html>>. Accessed 28 March 2022.
- Leskinen, H. 1964. Suomen itämurteet keskiajan ja uuden ajan taitteessa. *Virittäjä*, volume 68:2. 97–115.
- Leskinen, J. 2014. Karjalaisten kielimuotojen alkuperän arvoitus, in M. Saarnisto. *Viipurin läänin historia I: Karjalan synty*. Keuruu: Otavan Kirjapaino Oy.
- Martikainen, T., Sintonen, T. & Pitkänen, P. 2006. Ylirajainen liikkuvuus ja etniset vähemmistöt, in T. Martikainen. *Ylirajainen kulttuuri : Etnisyys Suomessa 2000-luvulla*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. 9–41.

- McLaughlin, M. 2011. *Tradurre/Tradire: Translation as a Cause of Linguistic Change from Manuscripts to the Digital Age*. California: University of California.
- MLSN = Birdlife Suomi. MaaIlman lintujen suomenkieliset nimet. Online archive of bird names. <URL=<http://nimisto.birdlife.fi:3000/>>. Accessed 14 October 2021.
- Moshnikov, I. 2021. *NUT-partisiipin variaatio rajakarjalaismurteissa*. Publications of the University of Eastern Finland Dissertations in Education, Humanities, and Theology No 168. Joensuu: University of Eastern Finland.
- Oittinen, R. 2000. *Translating for Children*. New York: Garland.
- Olanto, K. & Ljekkujad. 2020. *Metrolla buabon luo*. Helsinki: Karjalan Kielen Seura. CD.
- Oma mua = Uuttu kniigua: Suomes piäzi ilmah "Adaman gruunu". 2021. *Omamedia*. <URL=[https://www.omamedia.ru/fi/news/uuttu\\_kniigua\\_suomes\\_pi\\_zi\\_ilmah\\_adaman\\_gruunu/](https://www.omamedia.ru/fi/news/uuttu_kniigua_suomes_pi_zi_ilmah_adaman_gruunu/)>. Accessed 23 March 2022.
- Palander, M. & Riionheimo, R. 2018. Miten Raja-Karjalan murre eroaa suomesta? Rajakarjalaistaustaiset pohjoiskarjalaiset kuuntelutestissä. *Sananjalka*, vol. 60:60.
- Paloposki, O. 2011. Domestication and foreignization, in Y. Gambier & L. van Doorslaer (eds.). *Handbook of Translation Studies Volume 2*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 40–42.
- Paloposki, O. 2016. Translating and translators before the professional project. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*. Vol. 15. 15–32.
- Pasanen, A. 2015. *Kuávsui já peeivičuovâ 'Sarastus ja päivänvalo': Inarinsaamen kielen revitalisaatio*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Penttonen, M. 2006. *Karjal-suomi-karjal sanakniigu*. Helsinki: Karjalan Kielen Seura.
- Porrasmaa, R. 2016. "Kääntäjä on ikkuna, jota parhaimmillaan ei huomaa, tärkeää on vain mitä sen läpi näkyy." Haastattelussa kääntäjä Kai Nieminen. *Ennen ja nyt: Historian tietosanomat*, vol 16:4.



- Puura, U & Tánczos, O. 2022. Sanomalehti kirjakielen kasvualustana, in Grünthal, R; Linna, E.; Nuolijärvi, P. & Riionheimo, H. (eds.). *Šulkkuni sanaine : kirjoituksia karjalasta ja vähemmistökielistä*. Helsinki: Karjalan Sivistysseura. 219–224.
- Puuronen, V. 2006. Näkökulmia etnisten suhteiden tutkimukseen Suomessa, in T. Martikainen. *Ylirajainen kulttuuri : Etnisyys Suomessa 2000-luvulla*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. 42–54.
- Pym, A. 2016. *Translation Solutions for Many Languages: Histories of a Flawed Dream*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Pyöli, R. 1996. *Venäläistyvä aunuksenkarjala : Kielenulkoiset ja -sisäiset indikaattorit kielenvaihtotilanteessa*. Joensuu: University of Joensuu.
- Pyöli, R. 2021a. *Sanakirja karjala-suomi*. Helsinki: Karjalan Sivistysseura. <URL=<https://www.karjalansivistysseura.fi/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/Pyoli-sanakirja-karjala-suomi-1.pdf>>. Accessed 31 March 2022.
- Pyöli, R. & Markianova, L. 2021. *Sanakirja suomi-karjala*. Helsinki: Karjalan Sivistysseura. <URL=<https://www.karjalansivistysseura.fi/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Markianova-Pyoli-sanakirja-suomi-karjala.pdf>>. Accessed 31 March 2022.
- Raninen-Siikonen, T. 1999. *Vieraana omalla maalla : Tutkimus karjalaisen siirtoväen muistelukerronnasta*. Helsinki: Kotimaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Reuter, A. & Kyntäjä, E. 2006. Kansainvälinen avioliitto ja stigma, in T. Martikainen. *Ylirajainen kulttuuri : Etnisyys Suomessa 2000-luvulla*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. 104–125.
- Riionheimo, H. 2019. Lauantaina kuultiin luentoja kaunokirjallisuuden kääntämisestä ja pohdittiin, olisiko ruutu-aika karjalaksi möllötysaigu. <URL=<http://kianna-hanke.blogspot.com/2019/01/lauantaina-kuultiin-luentoja.html>>. Accessed 28 February 2021.
- Riionheimo, H. 2019. Käännösseminaarin perjantain: vähemmistökielille kääntäminen ja kääntäjänkoulutus. <URL=<http://kianna-hanke.blogspot.com/2019/03/kaannosseminaarin-perjantai.html>>. Accessed 23 March 2022.

Riionheimo, H. [@Hriionheimo] 2021a. “#minätutkin monenmoista mutta tällä hetkellä ainakin 1. karjalankielisille suunnattua kääntäjänkoulutusta, 2. kaksi kääntämisen merkitystä karjalan elvyttämisessä, 3. karjalaisten käsityksiä karjalan kielestä, 4. kääntämistä ja monikielisyyttä tutkijan työssä @UniEastFinland.” Tweet.

<URL=<https://twitter.com/Hriionheimo/status/1435264073411747843>>. Accessed 12 October 2021.

Riionheimo, H. 2021b. Sähköinen projektiehdotus avattu lomakkeita varten. <URL=<https://blogs.uef.fi/karjalanelvytyks/2021/04/23/sahkoinen-lomake-avattu-projektiehdotuksia-varten/>>. Accessed 12 October 2021.

Riionheimo, H. & Kuusi, P. 2019. *Kiännä da elvytä: kääntäjänkoulutusta karjalankielisille*, in E. Linna & A. Sarhimaa (eds.). *Meijän hierus – Esseitä karjalan kielestä*. Helsinki: Karjalan Sivistysseura. 91–98.

Sallinen-Gimpl 2021. *Suuri karjalainen piirakkakirja*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Sarhimaa, A. 2017. *Vaietut ja vaiennetut: karjalankieliset karjalaiset Suomessa*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Sarhimaa, A. 2013. Karjalan kieli Suomessa – ELDIA-projektin tuloksia. *Studies in European Language Diversity*. <URL=<http://rasimaki.net/sanomat/eldia/suomi.pdf>>. Accessed 22 March 2021.

Savijärvi, I. 1994. Itämerensuomalainen kolmijako, in V. Jääskeläinen & I. Savijärvi (eds.). *Tieten tahtoen*. Joensuu: Joensuun yliopiston humanistinen tiedekunta. 45–62.

Schwab, G. 1999. *The mirror and the killer-queen : otherness in literary language*. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press.

Siiippanen, M. 2020. Karjalan kieli sai uuden seuran – Karjalan kielet ry tavoittelee samaa valtionrahoitusta kuin taloussotkuista epäilty Karjalan kielen seura KKS. <URL=<https://www.karjalainen.fi/maakunta/259770>>.

Sirviö, A. 2010. *Karjalan elävä ruokaperinne uunin lämmöstä*. Thesis. Lappeenranta: Saimaan ammattikorkeakoulu.

Sketch Engine. Historical collection of the Text Creation Partnership's (TCP). Available for licensed users on the Sketch Engine website. <URL=<https://app.sketchengine.eu>>.

Smith, Madorah E. 1993. Grammatical Errors in the Speech of Pre-School Children. *Child Development* vol 4:2, 183–190. <URL= <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1125596>>. Accessed 6 January 2022.

Tánczos, O. 2021. Vähemmistökielisten sanomalehtien tehtäviä niiden päätoimittajien kuvaamina, in P. Suutari. *Karjalankieliset rajalla*. Joensuu: Suomen Kansantietouden Tutkijain Seura. 159–192.

Tast, J. 2000. *Omua tšomua : Aunuksenkarjalan murteen sanakirja*. Helsinki: Werner Söderström Osakeyhtiö.

Thomason, S. 2015. *Endangered languages : an introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tiittula, L. 2010. Käännökset suomenkielisten tekstien maailmassa, in H. Lappalainen, M. Sorjonen & M. Vilkuna (eds.). *Kielellä on merkitystä: Näkökulmia kielipolitiikkaan*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. 253–276.

Tolvanen, P. 2020. Karjalan kieltä elvyttänyt seura teki näyttävän mahalaskun – kieliaktivistit näkevät sen mahdollisuutena. <URL= <https://yle.fi/uutiset/3-11670417>>.

Torikka, M. 2003. Karjala. *Kielikello*, volume 1:2003.

Toury, G. 1985. Aspects of translating into minority languages from the point of view of translation studies. *Multilingua – Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, volume 4. 3–10.

Tuomasjukka, T. 2019. Kuibo parem karjalakse? *Journalisti*. <URL= <https://journalisti.fi/artikkelit/2019/03/kuibo-parem-karjalakse/>>. Accessed 23 March 2022.

Turunen, A. 1982. Raja-Karjalan murteet, in M. Yrjö-Pekka & I. Lehmusvaara (eds.). *Karjala 2. Karjalan maisema ja luonto*. Hämeenlinna: Arvi A. Karisto Oy. 65–89.

UNESCO. 2003. *Language Vitality and Endangerment*. Paris: UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages. <URL=<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000183699>>. Accessed 8 September 2021.

UEF = University of Eastern Finland. 2020. Karjalan kielen elvytys Itä-Suomen yliopistolle. <URL=<https://www.uef.fi/fi/artikkeli/karjalan-kielen-elvytys-ita-suomen-yliopistolle>>. Accessed 28 February 2021.

Uusitupa, M. 2021. Suomalazethäm myö olem vaik myö olem kreikkalazii yxskai myö ollaa suomelazii. Karjalan kieltä ja karjalaisuutta koskevat kommentit rajakarjalaisen siirtoväen murrehaastattelupuheessa, in P. Suutari. *Karjalankieliset rajalla*. Joensuu: Suomen Kansantietouden Tutkijain Seura. 37–66.

Venuti, L. 1997. *The translator's invisibility : a history of translation*. London: Routledge.

Vinay, J. & Darbelnet, P. 1995. *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Waris, H., Jyrkilä, V., Raitasuo, K. & Siipi, J. 1952. *Siirtoväen sopeutuminen : Tutkimus Suomen karjalaisen siirtoväen sosiaalisesta sopeutumisesta*. Helsinki: Otava.

Zabalbeascoa, P. 2000. From Techniques to Types of Solutions, in A. Beeby, D. Ensinger & M. Presas (eds.). *Investigating Translation: Selected papers from the 4<sup>th</sup> International Congress on Translation, Barcelona, 1998*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 117–128.