

**UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ**

**CONNOTATIONS IN KENNETH GRAHAME'S THE WIND IN THE  
WILLOWS AND ITS FINNISH TRANSLATION**

**A Pro Gradu Thesis in English**

**by**

**Marianne Ranua**

**Department of Languages**

**2009**

Marianne Ranua

Connotations in Kenneth Grahame's *The Wind in the Willows* and Its Finnish Translation

Pro gradu-tutkielma

Englannin kieli  
Kesäkuu 2009

99 sivua

Tutkielman aiheena ovat konnotaatiot Kenneth Grahamen lastenkirjassa *The Wind in the Willows* ja sen suomenkielisessä käännöksessä *Kaislikossa suhisee*. Tavoitteena on selvittää, 1) minkälaisia konnotaatioita lähtötekstissä ja kohdetekstissä on, 2) miten lähtötekstin ja kohdetekstin konnotaatiot eroavat toisistaan, 3) arvioida, ovatko konnotaatiot molemmissa versioissa johdonmukaisesti tietyntyyppisiä, 4) selvittää, onko kohdeteksti konnotaatioiden osalta ja kokonaiskontekstiin nähden yhtenäinen, ja 5) arvioida, onko konnotaatioilla merkittävä vaikutus tarinoiden merkitykseen: ovatko konnotaatiot selkeitä ja vahvoja siinä kontekstissa, jossa ne esiintyvät, ja vaikuttavatko ne siten tarinoihin. Lähtökohtana tutkimukselle ovat semantiikasta konnotaatiot ja käännösteoriasta etenkin skopos-teoria, kotiuttaminen (domestication), pragmaattiset adaptaatiot, manipulaatioteoria ja lapsille suunnattu kääntäminen. Tutkimuksen tarkoitus on korostaa kohdetekstin lukijoiden huomioinnin tärkeyttä sekä kohdetekstin yhtenäisyyden ja johdonmukaisuuden tärkeyttä. Aineisto koostuu Kenneth Grahamen kirjasta *The Wind in the Willows* ja Eila Piispasen tekemästä suomennoksesta *Kaislikossa suhisee*. Tutkimus on kuvaileva.

Konnotaatiot on jaoteltu neljään ryhmään: uskonnolliset, gender-, poliittiset ja asenteelliset konnotaatiot. Menetelmänä oli selvittää, minkälaisia konnotaatioita englanninkielisessä versiossa on suomenkieliseen versioon verrattuna. Englanninkieliset ja suomenkieliset esimerkit asetettiin vastakkain, ja niiden konnotaatioita verrattiin toisiinsa arvioimalla kuinka vahvoja ja selkeitä konnotaatiot ovat konteksteissaan molemmissa versioissa. Apuna arvioiden tekemiseen käytettiin sanakirjoja.

Konnotaatioista löytyi paljon sekä samanlaisuuksia että eroavuuksia, mutta eroavuudet eivät juuri vaikuttaneet kokonaisuuteen. Osoittautui, että sekä englanninkielisessä versiossa että suomenkielisessä versiossa oli merkittävästi uskonnollisia konnotaatioita, ja niillä oli huomattava vaikutus tarinoiden tyyliin, vaikka tarinat eivät ole varsinaisesti uskonnollisia. Uskonnolliset konnotaatiot eivät esiintyneet johdonmukaisesti molemmissa versioissa. Englanninkielisessä versiossa niitä oli enemmän. Molemmissa versioissa oli paljon gender-konnotaatioita ja poliittisia konnotaatioita, mutta niillä oli varsin vähäinen vaikutus tarinoiden sisältöön, koska ne esiintyivät neutraaleissa konteksteissa ja olivat toisinaan ajasta riippuvaisia. Lähtötekstissä oli hieman enemmän gender-konnotaatioita ja poliittisia konnotaatioita, eikä niitä esiintynyt johdonmukaisesti molemmissa versioissa. Asenteelliset konnotaatiot erosivat toisistaan aika paljon. Kohdetekstin konnotaatiot olivat ajoittain selkeästi negatiivisempia, mutta yleistyksiä tästä on vaikeaa tehdä esimerkkien rajoituksen takia.

Asiasanat: translation, connotation, synonymy, equivalence, skopos theory, domestication, foreignization, pragmatic adaptation, manipulation theory, translating for children.

# Contents

1 Introduction	1
2 Issues of Semantics	4
2.2 Connotations	4
2.3 Synonymy	8
3 Translation Issues	9
3.1 Different Translation Ideals	9
3.2 Equivalence	12
3.3 Problems Concerning Equivalence	18
3.4 Creating a Similar Effect	22
3.5 Context	24
3.6 Target Audience Needs	26
4 Skopos Theory	33
5 Translating for Children	36
6 Data and Methods	42
7 Analysis	46
7.1 Religious Connotations	46
7.2 Gender-Related Connotations	58
7.3 Political Connotations	70
7.4 Attitudinal Connotations	77
8 Conclusion	88
Bibliography	98

## 1 Introduction

In this study, I look at the connotations the various stretches of text in the stories in Kenneth Grahame's *The Wind in the Willows* and at the Finnish translations of those stories in the translated version *Kaislikossa suhisee*, translated by Eila Piispanen. I then attempt to determine what types of connotations the source and target text counterparts have and to explain how they differ and what they have in common. However, my intention is not to suggest that the connotations must be similar to those of the original text. Instead, I try to point out that even if the connotations of certain parts of the translated text are different, the translation is still valid. What matters is that the translation is coherent, understandable, and natural and enjoyable to the target readers.

In this study, one of the questions I address is the types of connotations the words or expressions in the original text and the translation contain either on their own or as part of the context in which they appear. Another issue I look at is how the connotations in the translated version affect the story itself: for example, I will determine what type of implications certain word choices bring to specific parts of the text in the Finnish version as opposed to the English version. I pay attention to the coherence and overall context of the stories in making these assessments.

I chose this topic for several reasons. First, I was already familiar with translation theory prior to this thesis. Secondly, while the issue of translating for children is not a brand new area of research, it has not been studied much due to the low status of literature aimed at children. Thirdly, while issues such as the translation of cultural items like currency, food, personal names, and so on, as well as the translation of word play, puns, and idioms have been studied in translations of literature for children, connotations have not been given much attention, probably due to the fact that they are often considered to be subjective.

My study focuses on issues related to translation theory and specifically issues that deal with translating for children. I also deal with *connotation* and *synonymy*. The concept of

synonymy has significance because a translator will usually have to choose between synonyms according to the context in which a word appears. Of course, it is also worth noting that it is not always favorable to choose synonymous words and formulations for words in the source version, partly because they may be unnatural from the perspective of the target readers, partly because synonymous words may have strange or overly negative (or positive) connotations.

My emphasis is on the target audience rather than on the idea that the translation should be as equivalent to the original as possible. This study has the following aims: First, I will explain what types of connotations words or expressions have in the English version and its translation and compare these connotations. Second, I will try to demonstrate that the translation, with its connotations and otherwise, is written in readable and natural Finnish and is understandable to its target audience, and explain why this is so. To an extent, my study will also deal with *intratextual coherence*, a term used by Reiß and Vermeer (1986). Thus, I will also try to determine whether the translation has inner coherence, for example, with regard to the connotations. The context in which a word or expression appears is of high significance with regard to the coherence of the translation, so I emphasize the importance of taking the context into consideration. I will then try to determine whether the translation and its connotations are valid in a given context.

I stress that translations are always written for a specific purpose and directed towards some type of a readership, and that the *skopos* of the translation thus guides the choices the translator makes. As the text and its translation I deal with is aimed towards children, I look at issues related to writing and translating for children and emphasize that the text should sound compelling when read aloud, as Oittinen (see, for example, 1993, 1995, 2000) has repeatedly stressed.

One of my arguments is that equivalence is not a realistic goal in translation. The translation should always be done with a purpose, *skopos*, in mind, and that requires taking the target readers into consideration. This, in itself, will impose its own constraints to any effort to

make a “faithful” translation. My argument is that not only do the language and culture of the source and target audiences differ, but also that every individual has a unique interpretation of any given text due to their different background. I argue that a text cannot be objectively determined to have one true or a few true interpretations. Thus, instead of aiming at sameness, the translator should stay true to his or her own interpretation of the text in a coherent, consistent way, and try to make a translation that serves the target readers well.

My view is that there is no one absolute way to translate any given text, and that the target audience and the *skopos* of the translation should determine the choices the translator makes. With regard to faithfulness, I want to stress that the needs of the original author and those of the target audience do not actually clash, and that making a translation that is readable and understandable from the target culture point of view, in fact, is a form of faithfulness to the original author. After all, the author, whatever his or her intentions may be, presumably wants the readers of the translation to be able to understand and to enjoy the text. In my opinion, this is especially important with regard to translating for children, as stories written for children will have an impact on their future reading habits, and because children’s learning and emotional development is furthered by stories written for them.

In this study, I argue that all readers read for their own purposes and interpret texts in their own ways. For this reason, it is not a realistic goal to try to find out what the intention and especially the “spirit” of the original piece of writing are. Instead, the translator should let his or her own interpretation be visible in the translation. I attempt to show that translation is always a matter of rewriting. Translators are influenced by their reading and interpretation of the source text. Reading is an active process that involves reinterpretation.

Another aspect of translation theory tackled in this thesis is the issue of *domestication* and *foreignization*. My view is that translation always inevitably involves domesticating the text, and that this is of crucial importance when dealing with the translation of literature aimed at

children: children have a lower tolerance for difference, and they have to be able to be emotionally involved and relate to the characters and the story. If the text is too strange for them, they may not focus on the relevant aspects of the story, and find it tedious or even unpleasant. Uninspiring experiences like this could lead to a loss of interest in reading as a whole.

My data consists of Kenneth Grahame's stories in *Wind in the Willows* and its Finnish translation *Kaislikossa suhisee* by Eila Piispanen. I chose this data because I was already familiar with a couple of stories in the book prior to this thesis, and was thus aware that the stories contain rich and descriptive language that is guaranteed to have a great deal of connotations. My method of research is to try to apply the translation theory I have read to the analysis of the original and translated stories in *Wind in the Willows*. I simply look at the texts and try to find connotations that might be of interest in terms of differences and similarities. I then try to determine whether it was a good or bad approach from the translator's part to either use words or expressions with similar or different connotations in a given context, from the point of view of the target language and culture readers.

## **2 Issues of Semantics**

### **2.1 Connotations**

Connotative meaning refers to the aspect of the meaning of words that deals with people's emotional reactions to them (Nida and Taber 1969: 91). It is the communicative value expressions have by virtue of what they refer to beyond their conceptual content (Leech 1974: 14). Connotation refers to the aspect of meaning that is based on the feelings and moral ideas words or expressions evoke within the receiver (Newmark 1981: 119). Connotations can have a positive or a negative

charge, and they may reflect various associations or the world view of the writer or speaker (Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 74). Rather than being a matter of referential meaning, that is, denotative meaning, connotations are associational, subjective, and affective (Bell 1991: 99). People have learned to expect specific referents to possess certain properties, such as physical characteristics or psychological and social properties. Different attributes are thus imposed on certain referents. Connotations are a matter of the real world experience people associate with expressions. Any characteristic of a word or expression may contribute to its connotative meaning. (Leech 1974: 14-15)

Connotations vary according to age and the society people live in, and to some extent, they even vary from individual to individual within the same speech community (Leech 1974: 14). While people may have their own individual associations, only the connotations that are associated with a specific word in the minds of a larger group or an entire language community are significant from a translational point of view. Some words may reflect associations that are common to a specific language community. In Finland, for example, the word *fox* has the connotation ‘cunning’. Words that have the same denotative meaning in different languages may have different connotations in these languages. For example, the French word *escargot* has the connotation ‘delicious’ for French speakers. Of course, words with a different denotative meaning may have the same connotation in different languages. In Finnish, people talk about ‘carrot and stick’, while Russian speakers talk about ‘whip and gingerbread cookie’. (Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 75)

Connotations depend on the situation and context (Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 75). The fact that some words are “loaded” and thus convey or evoke certain attitudes and emotions can lead to confusion, as the receiver may not be able to distinguish between the conceptual, denotative content and the affective, connotative content of the message (Leech 1974: 50). The listener or reader may focus on the affective meaning the message evokes within them instead of paying attention to the conceptual meaning (ibid).

As suggested above, the contextual usage of words and expressions results in those words and expressions gaining connotations. Connotations are dependent on the situation and the context in which words appear, and for this reason, the same word may be an insult or a term of endearment in two different situations (Orjala 2008: 44). Certain words are typical of certain speech situations and specific members of society. Thus, when the same person uses specific words in different circumstances, these words have rather different connotations (Nida and Taber 1969: 93). For example, some words are considered to be “women’s words”, while some other words are seen as “men’s words” (ibid). The phenomenon where words acquire associations as a result of occurring with certain words is called *collocative meaning* (Leech 1974: 20). One example is the adjective *green*, which is associated with envy (Nida and Taber 1969: 94). Certain words gain connotations because they are used as symbols for concepts (Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 75). The word *heart*, for example, is used as a symbol for love, joy, and sorrow in many cultures.

Some words gain connotations because they sound or look similar to certain words that are unrelated, but still cause a certain reaction because of the similarity (Nida and Taber 1969: 94). Words and expressions may also be associated with the dimension of time. In these cases, the emotional reaction to these words depends on how the receiver feels about the past, the present, and the future (ibid). As connotations vary historically, the same word may have a different connotation now than fifty years ago, for example (Orjala 2008: 43). Some words even have such strong associations that people avoid using them, and they thus become taboo words (Nida and Taber 1959: 91).

Koller (1979) has made a long list of different *connotative dimensions* that are related to translation. There are connotations on the speech level, which have to do with the elevated, poetic, normal, colloquial, slang usage, or vulgar usage of language. Connotations of socially determined usage refer to the language of specific groups of people. Connotations may also be associated with geographical relation or origin. There are connotations associated with the medium

of language, that is, written or spoken language. Connotations of stylistic effect refer to different styles of language, such as archaic, pompous, plain, or descriptive. Connotations of frequency have to do with whether a word or expression is common or uncommon. There are connotations associated with register, such as normal, technical, or medical. Connotations of evaluation refer to positive evaluation, pejorative use, irony, etc. Finally, connotations of emotion are a matter of whether words are emotive or neutral. (Koller 1979: 101-102)

Connotations associated with emotion and evaluation are important for this study, as the data I analyze has examples of attitudinal words and words with positive and negative connotations, sometimes related to sociopolitical issues. Connotations of stylistic effect are also of significance, as some words in either the source or target version are archaic, standard, or descriptive in comparison to the other version. Some expressions in either the source or target version are common or uncommon in comparison to the other version, so frequency is also relevant to an extent. Children's literature is often expressive and emotive in language, so these aspects of connotation are relevant when looking at stories for children. As children tend to learn from and be influenced by stories, it would be preferable if they would not learn to use language that perpetuates negative stereotypes and normalizes prejudiced thinking, for example. For this reason, the attitudinal and evaluative dimensions can be of importance. It is also worth noting that in translation, change is inevitable. Changing a word in a specific context can have the effect of retaining the connotations of the source text, at least to some extent, or relaying different types of connotations (Orjala 2008: 44). This change in the translation may even change the point of view expressed in the source text (*ibid*).

## 2.2 Synonymy

Synonyms are not an object of study in this thesis, but they matter because choosing a synonymous translation for a part of the source text may or may not be recommendable depending on the context and the connotations. Synonyms are words that differ phonologically but share the same or very similar meanings. However, exact synonyms are very rare, as they are distributed differently along different parameters. Synonyms may also belong to different registers and thus differ in terms of style: the style may be, for example, either colloquial or formal. As a result of this, these synonyms are appropriate for different situations. Synonyms may also express different attitudes, making one of the synonyms either more positive or negative. Synonyms may also have different connotations. (Saeed 2003: 65)

The conceptual meaning and the stylistic meaning of words rarely coincide. Stylistic meaning involves connotations, as synonymous words may evoke significantly different associations. This has led people to the conclusion that there are no true synonyms. The concept of synonymy is often restricted to the equivalence of conceptual meaning, and conceptual synonyms are then contrasted according to the different stylistic overtones they have (Leech (1974: 17). Jantunen argues that there are only so-called close synonyms, as language does not have expressions that have the exact same meaning. He also states that absolute synonyms have not been proven to exist. The choice of synonymous expressions is guided by features related to referential relationships and the surrounding text. The concept of synonymy is generally used in reference to expressions that have an identical or a sufficiently similar denotation. Words also have different connotations, and this leads to different choice preferences or constraints. (Jantunen 2005: 163-164)

Jantunen writes that in translating, the translator has to determine how to choose an appropriate equivalent for the source language expression. In this process that involves working between two different systems of meaning, the translator should be familiar with the different

features of meaning between the synonymous expressions in the source and target languages. Even when the words have a similar conceptual or propositional meaning, the meaning equivalents may differ in terms of their expressive meaning, for example. Indeed, synonyms often differ from one another in terms of their expressive features. (Jantunen 2005: 66) The concept of expressive meaning used by Jantunen refers to the same phenomenon as Leech's stylistic meaning. Expressive or stylistic meaning is relevant because it is an issue of connotation rather than denotative meaning.

### **3 Translation Issues**

In this section, I attempt to deal with several salient translation theories, but only theories that are relevant to this study. I will briefly explain the history of various translation ideals. The concept of equivalence is covered in this section, as it has been and continues to be a central, yet controversial issue in translation theory. The difference between the normative and the descriptive approach to translation are central to the thesis, as is the issue of faithfulness to the source text vs. target audience needs, so they are covered. I then deal with the problems that the concept of equivalence poses and the reasons why translation is not and cannot be a matter of creating sameness. The descriptive approach is of particular importance to my thesis, as I have taken a descriptive approach to looking at the connotations in the source and target texts.

#### **3.1 Different Translation Ideals**

Translation scholars have often emphasized the importance of being faithful to the original text and trying to preserve its content as well as possible. Equivalence of form and function has been considered to be vital, and many scholars have stressed the importance of choosing the closest natural equivalents of words and expressions whenever possible. Many scholars have insisted that

the translation should capture not only the content and message as accurately as possible, but that the target text should also convey the emotional effect and “spirit” of the source text. However, focus has shifted from the unclear concept of equivalence to the needs of the target readers. Some scholars do not consider being faithful to the source text to be as important as creating a target text that resonates with the readers in the target culture. While some scholars believe that being faithful to the source text is important, they prioritize faithfulness to the target readers and emphasize that a translation should be understandable and readable to them.

Translation ideals have varied a great deal over the course of times. During the period of Classicism in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century, arbitrary translations were popular (Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 26). The principle was that translations could be extremely free (ibid). In France, for example, translations were accommodated to the requirements of local aesthetics, and the social, historical, and other special features of the source text, as well as the individual style of the author of the source text, were erased from the target text (ibid). In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, however, translators started to be seen as “servants” in the English-speaking parts of the world. In the early part of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, translation was still seen as a useful way for writers to shape their own style of writing and to enrich their native language in the process. However, as the concepts of nationalism and national languages went through a change, the status of the translator changed as well: the translator was no longer seen as a creative artist, but merely as someone in a master-servant relationship with the source text. Despite this new view of translators as replicators of the source text, some translators held the exact opposite view due to feelings of cultural superiority: they felt the need to improve upon source texts that came from “inferior” cultures and that were written in an “inferior” language. (Bassnett 2005: 12-13)

Linguistic translation theories were born in the 1950s and 1960s. Linguistic translation theories involved looking at translations and comparing the functions of specific linguistic units in the source and target languages. They classified and systemized the linguistic and lexical

differences found in a translation as opposed to its source text. The translation ideal of linguistic translation theories was semantic equivalence. The idea behind *semantic equivalence* was to convey the content of the source text precisely, but in natural and fluent target language. (Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 35-36) The *normative* approach to translation involved trying to define a fixed set of features that a translation needs to have before it can be considered to be one (Desmidt 2006: 79). The concept of equivalence was defined in an absolute and descriptive manner (ibid: 80). The normative approach involved specifying how equivalent two texts have to be in order to be seen as a source text and a target text (ibid).

However, many translation scholars eventually came to the conclusion that equivalence in its traditional sense is unattainable due to the lack of symmetry between languages and due to the fact that several factors determine how texts are translated. In the 1980s, translation scholars aimed at a descriptive approach to translation, which means describing a translation rather than evaluating it (Koskinen 2002: 377). *Descriptive translation studies* focus on the relationship between the translation and target literature, on the varying factors that guide the process of translation, and on the solutions the translator comes to in order to make the translation fit in with similar source language texts (Puurtinen 2002: 83). Instead of focusing on hypothetical ideals, descriptive translation scholars look at translations made during different times and in different cultures, and thus illustrate that translation is bound to context and culture (Koskinen 2002: 376-377). Scholars who take the descriptive approach to translation studies do not reject any translation, but rather investigate why a translation was labeled as such at a given time and in a given place (Desmidt 2006: 80). In descriptive translation studies, a pragmatic approach to the concept of equivalence is called for (ibid). The pragmatic approach means that some adaptations will have to be made for the target readers. I will deal with this issue below.

### 3.2 Equivalence

For a long time, equivalence was considered by many to be vital to achieving faithfulness in translation. However, the concept of equivalence is difficult to define, as translation scholars themselves have not succeeded in defining it in a clear way. They have often made dichotomies between texts that are supposed to be translated as literally as possible and texts that allow for, and even demand, more creativity.

Nida and Taber (1969) make a distinction between *formal* and *dynamic equivalence*, the former referring to the reproduction of the syntactic form of the original text and the latter referring to creating a similar effect in the target text that was created by the source text. Nida and Taber (1969: 24) state that the concept of *dynamic equivalence* should be defined in terms of the degree to which the target language readers respond to the target language message in the same manner as the source language readers respond to the source language message.

Nida, who came up with the dichotomy, was the first person to develop a *communicative translation theory*, as opposed to a linguistic one (Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 54). According to Nida and Taber (1969: 12), the primary aim of the translator should be to “reproduce the message” and “strive for equivalence rather than identity”. Nida and Taber (1969: 12) state that in translation, the closest natural equivalent of the source language message is reproduced in the target language, “first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style”. Further, “a conscientious translator will want the closest natural equivalent” (ibid: 13).

Newmark (1981) makes a similar dichotomy between *semantic translation* and *communicative translation*. In a semantic translation, the translator strives to follow the semantic and syntactic structures of the source text as closely as possible. Semantic translations remain within the source culture and are more complex than communicative translations. Communicative translation, on the other hand, attempts to create a similar effect on the readers of the target text that

was produced on the readers of the source text. Communicative translations are addressed to the target reader, and foreign elements are assimilated into the target culture to enable the reader to understand the text without difficulty. Thus, communicative translations are ‘‘smoother, simpler, clearer, more direct, more conventional’’ than semantic ones. (Newmark 1981: 39)

While Newmark prefers the communicative approach due to his appreciation for creating a similar effect and conveying the style and spirit of the original, he claims that both methods are useful for different purposes. He also states that even in semantic translation, the only valid method for creating equivalent effect is a literal, word-for-word translation (Newmark 1977: 118-119). Newmark (1981:12) states that a word in the source text should not normally be translated into a word in the target language that has another primary one-to-one equivalent in the source language. He believes that a translation should be as literal as possible (*ibid*). He argues that the use of ‘‘unnecessary’’ ‘‘synonyms’’ (*synonyms* in quotation marks in the original) and paraphrases in particular is inexcusable in any type of translation (Newmark 1977: 119). However, he states that communicative translations conform to a particular register, tend to undertranslate by using generic terms for difficult expressions, and are thus simple and clear (Newmark 1977: 118). Making such clear and conventional translations must require changing some aspects of the source text, as source and target languages and cultures differ. As he points out (Newmark 1977: 133), the attempt to create a readable and immediately understandable target text always involves a great loss of meaning.

*Functional equivalence theories* are communicative translation theories just like Nida’s theory of dynamic equivalence. They focus on the function or functions of the source text and the target text. While they are communicative translation theories like Nida’s theory of dynamic equivalence, they do not focus on the reactions of the receivers, as measuring such reactions is difficult. The function of the text generally refers to the purpose for which it is used. Functional equivalence means that the functions of the source text and the translation are the same, or at least

close to one another. The translator should make choices that enable maintaining the functions of the source text. Since the function of a text can be defined not only as the purpose for which the text is used, but also as the ability of the text to create a specific communicative effect within the receiver, the concepts of functional and dynamic equivalence only have a different point of view of the same issue. (Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 70-71)

However, since the function of the translation is bound to be at least slightly different due to the different social and cultural situation of the target readers (discussed in more detail below), functional equivalence is a rather flexible concept. For this reason, the concept of functional equivalence has been modified, so that it no longer refers to the same function, but instead means that the function of the translation is largely analog to the function of the source text. (Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 91)

Koller (1979) writes about *pragmatic equivalence*, which he defines as translating for a particular readership. He states that when the translator considers the norms of specific types of texts in the target culture, he or she is taking the expectations that the readers have about certain text types into account. However, sometimes a text, such as a legal text, may have to be translated for readers who are not experts in the field. In a case like this, Koller argues that achieving pragmatic equivalence requires deviating from the requirements of text-normative, connotative, or denotative equivalence. (Koller 1979: 103)

House (1997: 24) writes that a translated text is doubly bound: it is bound to its source text and to the communicative conditions of the recipients. She states that the following aspects of meaning are particularly important for translation: first, there is the semantic aspect of meaning, which consists of the relationship of reference or denotation (ibid: 30). Secondly, there is the aspect of pragmatics, which deals with the correlation between linguistic units and the user or users of these units in a communicative situation (ibid). The illocutionary aspect is related to pragmatic

meaning, and it refers to the particular use of an utterance on a specific occasion (ibid: 31). Thirdly, there is the textual aspect of meaning (ibid).

House (1997: 31-32) states that in translation, a text in the source language is replaced by a semantically and pragmatically equivalent text in the target language, and that an adequate translation thus is one that is pragmatically and semantically equivalent. As pragmatic equivalence involves writing for a specific audience, connotations are a relevant aspect of it. After all, the translation should come across as natural and understandable to the target readers, and this can hardly be achieved with choices that evoke undesirable associations or otherwise seem out of place.

House (1997) differentiates between *overt* and *covert* translations. The former refers to a translation that is clearly a translation, and one that attempts to retain the function of the original text in its original cultural setting (House 1997: 29). Thus, the readers of an overt translation are not directly addressed by it (ibid: 66). However, she states that even overt translations cannot have the same function as the original, as to the source text is either tied to a specific historical event or because it has a unique status in the source culture (House 1997: 67).

Covert translations, on the other hand, imitate the function of the original text in a different discourse world (House 1997: 29). A covert translation has the status of an original text in the target culture and is not specifically addressed to any source culture audience, and thus is not particularly tied to the source culture (ibid: 69). Covert translations are “based on contemporary, equivalent needs of a comparable audience in the source and target language communities” (ibid), and for this reason, the function of the source text should be retained in the translation.

The issue of overt and covert translation is relevant to the study because overt translations are a matter of aiming at maximal equivalence, and, as I will argue below, equivalence is a problematic issue. Covert translations, on the other hand, take the target readers into consideration, and, undoubtedly, depend on the *skopos*, that is, the purpose, of the translation.

House's distinction between overt and covert translation poses a problem for her criticism of Reiß and Vermeer's *skopos* theory, a theory that states that how a text is translated depends on what purpose for which it is translated and on the assumed readers. She claims that with a *skopos*, the translator becomes a "co-author" of the text by selecting a function to the translation, and that the translator is thus free to change the original text (House 1997: 12-13). However, her dichotomy of texts that can be translated overtly or covertly seems to suggest that she herself feels that different texts should be translated differently, and that while the original function is retained in covert translations, the text will have to be changed in many ways to fulfill this function. Of course, she also fails to consider that the *skopos* of the translation may not require, or even allow, major changes.

House (1997: 29-30) also argues that the translator could achieve functional equivalence in covert translation by using a cultural filter to conduct shifts and changes along pragmatic parameters. As Reiß and Vermeer (1986: 30) point out, this basically means that the translator should try to see the source text from the perspective of the target culture. This would certainly seem to require making some adjustments for the target readers, which would require changes to the original. Connotations have significance to translating for a specific audience, as the closest natural equivalents may evoke certain unfortunate associations. House (1977, as cited by Reiß and Vermeer 1986: 30-31) argues that a given text does not "require" either an overt or covert translation strategy, but the purpose and target group influence the choice: there is no one "right" translation strategy for any given text, but the translation strategy is instead chosen according to the circumstances. Thus, House herself seems to agree with the principles of the *skopos* theory.

Reiß and Vermeer (1986: 76) make a distinction between *adequacy* and *equivalence*, defining the former as a relation between the source and target text to which the consistent consideration of the *skopos*, that is, the purpose of translation, is characteristic, and the latter as the

relation between the source and target text when these texts fulfill or can fulfill the same communicative function in their own cultures.

Reiß and Vermeer (1986) state that the translator strives not only for receiver coherence, in other words, for *intratextual* coherence, but also for coherence between the source text and the translation, in other words, for *intertextual* coherence. Reiß and Vermeer call this *fidelity*. They state that every translation should be as ideal a realization of the *skopos* as possible, and that insofar as this condition permits it, the translation should adhere to the source text with regard to its content and form on all levels. In other words, the translator strives for the coherent transfer of the source text if the *skopos* allows it or calls for it. (Reiß and Vermeer 1986: 65)

Koller (1979) presents five referential frames of equivalence. Denotative equivalence refers to the extralinguistic content a text conveys. Connotative equivalence means that the translator relays the connotations through word choice by paying attention to the style (register), social and geographical dimension, etc. in the source text. Text-normative equivalence requires following the usage norms, that is, the text and language norms associated with given text types, in the target culture. Pragmatic equivalence refers to directing a translation to certain receivers by “tuning” it to them in order to create a specific effect, etc. Formal equivalence deals with retaining the special formal-aesthetic features of the source text. Since achieving all these forms of equivalence in the same text is not possible, Koller argues that the translator has to set up a hierarchy of equivalence requirements for the text by determining which values need to be preserved. Koller (1979: 100-101, 104)

From all these various ideals concerning equivalence, one can conclude that striving for one form of equivalence will rule out aiming at another form. Proponents of equivalence theories appear to argue that the text type or genre will generally determine whether the translation should be equivalent in a formal or dynamic way (in Nida and Taber’s terms), in a semantic or communicative way (in Newmark’s terms), functionally equivalent, pragmatically equivalent, and

so on. Thus, according to these scholars, translators need to set hierarchies and priorities based on the text, as attaining equivalence on all levels is considered a hopeless task. However, advocates of equivalence still argue that the target audience will determine how the translation is done. This makes the concept of equivalence rather problematic, as the rules appear to be flexible and dependent on various factors between which the translator is expected to make choices.

### **3.3 Problems Concerning Equivalence**

Even scholars who insist on equivalence, or at least equivalence on a specific level determined by the genre or text type, agree that equivalence is a complex issue, and that perfect equivalence can never be attained. Many translation scholars claim that equivalence is a completely unattainable, unrealistic goal. There are several reasons for this. One is that languages differ, and retaining the exact same meaning while holding on to the style and connotations of the original is thus impossible. Another reason is that different people have different interpretations of texts depending on their life experiences. Yet another reason is that when a text is moved from one culture to another, its values change.

Nord (1997: 5) quotes Nida (1976: 64) when dealing with the impossibility of creating a similar response, as “the responses can . . . never be identical, for interlingual communication always implies some differences in cultural setting, with accompanying diversities in value systems, conceptual presuppositions, and historical antecedents”. Reiß and Vermeer (1986: 36) state that culture and the language that is a part of it are inevitably going to change in translation, which means that the values attached to them also change. In every reception situation, only a part of all the possible ways of understanding and interpreting are realized, while other typical features become neutralized or gain connotations (ibid). Words sometimes gain connotations when they are associated with a specific concept or expression. Since the reception situations differ, it is

questionable whether it is possible to achieve the same effect even within the same language (ibid: 71-72). Puurtinen (2002: 89) also notes that the extent to which a source text is modified and what methods of translation are used to modify it largely depend on the status and age of the source text. Modern entertaining literature is translated more freely, whereas old classics do not completely follow the norms of modern literature, but are often specifically expected to be translated into old-fashioned target language (ibid: 89-90).

Oittinen points out that many authorities constrain the translator or guide his or her choices, such as the author of the source text, the publishers, critics, etc. (1995: 142). The translator always has to consider the conditions set up by the several interpretive communities and work within the constraints set up by the publishers, for example (ibid).

The translator, too, is a reader, and his or her interpretation of the source text affects how he or she is going to translate it. Reading is an active event that involves constructing meanings and interpretations. The translator brings the reader towards the writer of the original text by presenting the writer from his or her own point of view (Oittinen 1995: 40). Oittinen stresses that if the translator focuses on the intentions of the author of the source text, he or she is ignoring himself or herself as an active reader, and he or she is also neglecting the future readers of the text (Oittinen 1995: 38).

In an article that deals with how children's stories have been translated into Finnish, Puurtinen (2005: 220) writes that one of the common features of translations is their simplicity: in terms of their vocabulary and sentence structures, translations are simpler than the original texts with regard to these aspects. She also points out that translations are conventional: translators generally choose expressions and structures that are typical to the target language, conventional in it, and unmarked in the target usage instead of opting for unusual and creative ones (ibid). This phenomenon seems to apply to the translation of literature in general, which poses a problem to the

idea of equivalence and similar effect. After all, this would suggest that translations are not as creative and expressive as the original stories.

Newmark (1981: 7-8) writes that translation always involves a loss of meaning, as the source writer and the translator have different individual uses of language. He also writes that people have their own lexical and maybe even grammatical idiosyncrasies, and everyone attaches "private" meanings to certain words (ibid: 8). The writer of the source text and the translator also have different theories of meaning as well as different values, and the translator's theory of meaning has an effect on his or her interpretation of the text (ibid). As translators are apt to attach certain values and emotional reactions to some words, they may set greater value on connotation than denotation where the author of the original primarily places value on the denotations (ibid).

Zhongying (1990: 98) writes that people have different interpretations about what faithfulness and smoothness in translation are. He also claims that if the translator changes the original wording and expression at all, he or she is not being faithful to the source text (ibid). Zhongying (1990: 102) also points out that the translator can never be equally fluent in his or her foreign language as he or she is in his or her mother tongue, which makes conveying the exact same impression impossible.

Nida and Taber (1969: 5) write that the form of the message must be changed in order to preserve its content. They point out that this requires many grammatical and lexical adjustments (ibid: 12). Preserving the original stylistic subtleties is "usually quite impossible" according to them (ibid: 13), and the semantic areas of corresponding words are different in different languages (ibid: 15).

Nord (1997: 8) criticizes the vagueness and inconsistency of the context of equivalence by pointing out that the theorists of equivalence often argue that pragmatic texts can be translated in less literal ways than literary texts, and that this principle suggests that the standards for the selection of the translation method are different for different genres or text types. She also

states that translation scholars are aware of cases in professional translating where equivalence is not even called for (ibid). She also noted that Reiß herself had explained that not only is equivalence often impossible to achieve, but it is also not always desired in the first place (ibid).

Vehmas-Lehto writes that translation has even been considered to be impossible due to the following factors. First, reality is dissected in different ways in different languages. Sometimes one word can be translated in several ways, or several words are only translated with one. Secondly, languages have culture-specific words that lack equivalents in other languages. As these concepts are not known in other cultures, the concepts do not have words for them in other languages. Thirdly, connotations vary from one language into another. Fourthly, wordplay may be impossible to translate. Fifthly, if the source text contains dialect or slang, it may be difficult to translate. However, she states that while these factors cause problems in translation, they are not a hindrance to communication. After all, languages do not differ from one another in what they are capable of expressing, but rather in the means with which they do it. The view of translation being impossible was based on the erroneous assumption that translation is only possible when the target language has the same means of expression as the source language. (Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 24-25, 32)

As Jakobson (1959: 56) writes, any existing language can convey all cognitive experience and classifications of it. When a target language lacks a grammatical or lexical expression for something in the source text, loanwords, loan translations, neologisms, semantic shifts, or circumlocutions can be applied (ibid). Jakobson even argues that no lack of a grammatical means of expression renders it impossible to make a literal translation of the *conceptual* information in the source text in its entirety (ibid: 57). Bassnett (2005: 36) states that once the lack of sameness between languages is accepted, the issues of loss and gain in translation can be considered. She points out that the translator can enrich or clarify the original text, and that something that is missing from the source text context can be replaced in the target text context (ibid).

However, it is important to note that equivalence can be defined in a different way and thus be a more realistic concept with regard to translation. While the concept of equivalence has been much criticized, it has been redefined as the seeming, illusory similarity with the source text (Koskinen 2002: 375). The focus of translation theory has shifted from striving for sameness and setting up norms to recognizing and even emphasizing differences (ibid: 376). Koskinen states that the demand for faithfulness is based on the assumption that there is one true equivalent translation that the translator should strive for (Koskinen 2002: 376). Snell-Hornby (1995: 16) writes that in linguistic translation theories, translation was seen as a matter of transcoding that involves substituting a unit in the source language with an equivalent unit in the target language, and that doing this involves choosing an ‘‘optimal equivalent’’ from several ‘‘potential equivalents’’. She states that this idea was based on the erroneous view that symmetry exists between languages (ibid).

My view is that equivalence, in its traditional sense, is, indeed, unattainable, and that adaptations must always be made in order to make the translation intelligible and well-written. However, if equivalence is defined as the seeming similarity with the source text, the concept is far more realistic. Of course, the concept still remains problematic due to the fact that scholars cannot reach agreement on how to define it in a conclusive way, and not everyone defines it as illusory similarity to the original text.

### **3.4 Creating a Similar Effect**

It is the opinion of many translation scholars that a translation should convey the ideas of the author of the source text and create the same effect in the target readers that the original text creates in the source readers. As Newmark (1981: 10) writes, it is widely agreed that producing the same effect on the readers of his or her translation as was produced on the readers of the source text to the highest

extent possible should be the main aim of the translator. Newmark (1981: 20) also points out that the translator should bear the intentions of the original in mind throughout the process of translating. He highlights the significance of ensuring that the target language version has the same emotional and persuasive charge as the original (ibid). Thus, Newmark (ibid: 39) feels that communicative translation, which attempts to produce on the target readers an effect as close as possible to that created by the source text on the source readers, is useful for this purpose.

Zhongying (1990: 98-99) considers the preservation of the effect of the original to be of particular importance in literary translation, as the translator has to consider the style of the author and the spirit of the original. He points out that since literary works have strong artistic appeal and moving emotional effects, the translator should aim at giving the target text the same emotional appeal (ibid). Zhongying (1990: 99) writes that the translator has to re-express what has been said in the source language in a way that enables the receivers to more or less get the same impression as the source language receptors. He believes that a translation should convey the ideas as well as the spirit of the source text, and this requires taking the whole text into consideration, paying attention to the main ideas expressed in the text, and trying to get across the message and purpose of the author (Zhongying 1990: 101). His view is that formal correspondence is not sufficient, and that the translator must express the ideas of the source text in order to be faithful, that is, look for dynamic equivalence and be faithful to the degree of denotation (Zhongying 1990: 98). Still, conveying the original ideas is not enough to be faithful, as the translator should make an effort to convey the style and spirit of the original as well, that is, be faithful to the degree of connotation (ibid).

Güttinger (as cited in Reiß and Vermeer 1986: 71) believed that the goal of *all* translation is to achieve the same effect on the receiver that the original message has. Güttinger stated that the target text has to convey the same information as well as the same effect as the source text, and that preserving the original effect called for choosing an expression that is common

in the given situation (ibid). In Güttinger's view, the translator has to, above all, take the pragmatic dimension of linguistic signs into consideration in order to achieve equivalence (ibid). The pragmatic dimension refers to translating according to the needs and expectations of the target readers. This view is comparable to House's concept of pragmatic equivalence.

### 3.5 Context

It is important for the translator to remember that the words and sentences need to be seen as parts of a coherent whole. Kußmaul (1985: 12) points out that a translator should not focus on an individual word, view it as a dictionary entry that can be subdivided into different definitions or meanings that can be analyzed in terms of semantic features, and aim to preserve the features of the meaning of the word at all costs. Instead, the translator should determine what the relevant features of the meaning of the word are in a given context (ibid).

As Kußmaul (1985: 14) explains, only the semantic features of words that are relevant in a given context are activated. Thus, paying attention to the context is very important in order to stay faithful to the original author and text. Kußmaul (1985: 14) presents the concept of the maxim of the *necessary degree of precision*, defining it as the reproduction of the semantic feature or features that are relevant in a given context in terms of the function of the translation. Nida and Taber (1969: 15) also emphasize the relevance of context to a translator's choices, pointing out that the choice of the right word inevitably depends more on the context than a fixed system of verbal consistency. They state that contextual consistency should be prioritized over verbal consistency (Nida and Taber 1969: 14).

Bassnett states that when a word has a wide range of meanings in the source language, the translator must pay attention to the particular use of the word in not only the sentence itself, but also in the sentence in its relation to other sentences, as well as in the overall textual and cultural

contexts of the sentence. She demonstrates this issue with the example of the English word *spirit*, which consists of a rich set of semantic relationships, and can thus be used in punning and word-play. (Bassnett 2005: 27). It is important that a translator focuses on the connotations a word has in a specific context.

Of course, the context is not merely important with regard to certain words in a specific sentence or paragraph. The translator has to understand the text as a whole and make choices according to the entire text. There are also larger contextual factors to consider than the text as a self-sufficient entity. The translator also has to pay attention to issues related to culture, place, and time. Vehmas-Lehto (1999: 17) states that prior to making a decision, the translator has to analyze the text and come to an understanding about what it means and what aspects of it should be conveyed to the readers of the translation. This, of course, requires taking the context of the whole text into account. Vehmas-Lehto (*ibid*: 18-19) stresses that only a part of the problems involving translation are linguistic, and that most problems associated with it have to do with extra-linguistic factors such as cultural differences. She states that the translator has to understand what each part of the text deals with, as he or she may otherwise end up making senseless choices that express something that the writer of the source text never meant to express. Cultural context is important with regard to connotations, as connotations sometimes differ to a great degree in different cultures.

Oittinen (2002: 172) writes that the source text has to be analyzed “top-down”, from the whole to the parts. While the translator analyzes the text in both directions, he or she needs to have a conscious interpretation of the whole text prior to this two-way analysis (*ibid*). The translation always has an interactional purpose that affects how individual parts of the source text are analyzed and interpreted (*ibid*). The translator then has to determine how to put together the parts and the whole, the form and the content (*ibid*). The translated text is a whole, the parts of which are to be understood in relation to one another and the whole (Oittinen 1995: 88). Bassnett (2005: 117) writes that a prose text exists in a dialectal relationship with other texts and is located

within a historical context. Thus, the translator should not treat individual sentences or paragraphs as translation units and translate them in isolation, without relating them to the overall work. This means that the text itself as a whole is the prime unit of translation in prose translation.

### **3.6 Target Audience Needs**

Taking the needs and expectations of the target text receivers into consideration is considered to be central to a successful translation. Even most translation scholars who emphasize the need to be faithful to the content and style of the source text consider it important to take the target readers into account.

As stated above, Nida's theory was the first communicative translation theory, and while he, together with Taber (1969), focused on equivalence and faithfulness to the source text, the basic idea behind his concept of dynamic equivalence is that the translator should focus on extra-linguistic and extra-textual factors such as the reactions of the target language readers (Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 56). Dynamic equivalence thus sometimes requires not only deviating from the linguistic form, but also of the meaning of the source text, in order to bring the translation closer to the culture of the receiver of the translation (ibid). The theory is communicative: translation is interaction that involves the translator relaying a message from the source language sender to the target language receiver (ibid: 58).

When dealing with the *skopos* of translation, Nord (1997: 12) states that one of the most important factors in determining the purpose of the translation is the target text audience with its culture-specific knowledge of the world, its expectations, and its communicative needs. Oittinen (1993: 53) points out that the expectations of the target language readers are also included in the function of translation, and taking them into consideration is a way of being loyal to the future

readers of the translation and to the author of the original alike. Zhongying (1990: 102) writes that a writer usually has to consider what his or her audience is before writing, and that the writer has to write in different ways according to what the audience is, as people's culture, customs, and other situational factors differ.

Venuti (as cited in Oittinen 2000: 74) states that *domestication* involves assimilating a source text to the cultural and linguistic values of the target culture, whereas *foreignization* is a method of translation that involves retaining some significant foreign aspects of the source text. Hatim and Mason (1997: 145) state that in domesticated texts, foreign cultural values are expressed in familiar and unchallenging ways to the target culture through assimilation to a dominant culture. They describe foreignization as a method of minimal translator mediation: the characteristics of the source text are made entirely visible, and few concessions are made to the reader (ibid: 148).

Hatim and Mason (1997: 145-147) believe that the choice between domestication and foreignization always reveals something about the translator's ideology. However, they deny that either method has ideological implications per se; it is the effect of either of these strategies in a given socio-cultural context that may have these implications. Of course, in their view, whether the translator domesticates or foreignizes, he or she filters the source text through his or her own ideology, which reduces the range of interpretations. Thus, the translator feeds his or her knowledge and beliefs into the processing of a text, which means that translation always involves mediation.

Venuti (as cited in Oittinen 2000: 74) considers domestication to be a form of ethnocentric racism and violence, and that he believes that the dominant aesthetics should be challenged in order to combat this ethnocentrism. However, Venuti does not take the future readers of the translation into account: people read texts for different reasons, and Venuti fails to consider the issue of multiple readers and reader responses (ibid). Oittinen emphasizes that translation is an issue of different text users and involves rewriting for new target readers, as every act of translation is affected by the assumptions the translator makes about the future readers (ibid: 75-76, cf. Reiß

and Vermeer 1986). As translators are supposed to be loyal to their audiences, translators for children need to be loyal to the children reading or listening to the stories instead of trying to please the adults who read them (ibid: 76). Translators adapt texts for certain purposes and certain readers, and the use of a familiar language to the target readers in and of itself brings the source text closer to the target readers (ibid: 83-84). Thus, domestication is a part of translation (ibid: 84).

According to Oittinen (1995: 74), texts are always dialogic and contain the points of view and intentions of the writer and the readers alike. She argues that if a translator is not allowed to be in a dialogic relationship with the text, his or her translation will not reach out to its target language readers (ibid). She states that if translators try to neutrally convey the text to the target reader, it will remain distant to the translators (ibid: 143). In this way, the text becomes a taboo that cannot be changed (ibid). This, in turn, will lead to awkward and poorly functioning translations that are not specifically targeted to anyone in particular (ibid). Oittinen stresses that if the translator does not have a point of view, the translation lacks a purpose (ibid). She argues that in order to succeed, translators have to make the words into their own, and that translations necessarily contain the translator's own intentions (Oittinen 2000: 31).

Vehmas-Lehto (1999: 19) points out that a translation may require explication, in other words, making a clear-cut explanation of something that is deductible in the source text but that has not been expressed overtly. She states that the reader of a translation is in an inferior position than the reader of a source text, as the reader of a target text is not equally familiar with the state of things in the source culture, and his or her position should thus not be made more difficult by leaving parts in the text that are unclear (ibid: 19-20).

When parts of the source text would not function in the target language when translated as such, pragmatic changes are called for (Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 99). Vehmas-Lehto paraphrases the definition of *pragmatic adaptation* by Ingo from 1990. Pragmatic adaptation involves modifying the denotative meaning of the source text in order to make the reception of the

message easier for the target readers (ibid: 76). Thus, denotative meaning is modified on the basis of situational factors such as the receivers and the function (*skopos*) of the translation (ibid: 100). Pragmatic adaptations are common to all communicative translation theories: dynamic equivalence, functional equivalence, and the *skopos* theory (ibid). Vehmas-Lehto describes them as a natural part of translation (ibid). Jakobsen (1993: 68) states that whenever a translator defines the purpose of the translation and who it is for, reformulation, paraphrase, explication, etc, become a natural part of the process of translating, as cultures express ideas and shape concepts and texts in different ways. Thus, original text production is required in translation (ibid). Pragmatic adaptations are made due to differences in time, place, and text function, the different background information of the receivers, the differences between the source and target cultures, and because of differing conventions (Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 101).

Some scholars look at translation as manipulation and actually argue that a translation should be manipulative. *Manipulation theory* looks at translation from the target readers' point of view (Aaltonen 2002: 388). Instead of concentrating on the similarities between a source and target text, manipulation scholars focus on the differences between the two (ibid). A translated text is seen as an independent entity, yet it is also seen as a part of its cultural context (ibid: 388-389). The focus is on the receiver. Translations offer insight into the time and place they were made (ibid).

Oittinen (2000: 163) does not agree with the notion that translations should not change the original even when it could lead to improvement. She states that if the translator does not try to make the text function better for the target readers, the translator is being disloyal to both the target readers and the author of the original (ibid). The target language readers are less likely to make the text their own if it has poor elements from their point of view (ibid).

The idea behind manipulation theory is that the culture and society of the target audience determine the special features of the translation and its relation to both the source text and other target language texts (Aaltonen 2002: 394). Thus, all translation involves modifying the source

text, in other words, manipulating it for a specific purpose (ibid: 392). Translations are seen to be custom-made for a purpose rather than texts that describe some sort of immutable reality, and it is seen that translations do not follow any unchanging rules (ibid: 389).

Manipulative scholars take a descriptive approach to translation: they reject normative and evaluative ideas, and focus on the result rather than the process (Snell-Hornby 1995: 24). In manipulation theory, equivalence is given a functional content: a translation is always considered to be equivalent to the original text, but in a different way (Aaltonen 2002: 395). The problem with the manipulative approach is that if it is taken to its extremes, any text that is claimed to be a translation will be accepted as such (Snell-Hornby 1995: 25).

While adapting the text to the needs and expectations of the target readers is currently considered to be necessary, translation scholars emphasize that adaptation should not be arbitrary: the translator has to be able to justify his or her choices (Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 26). The translator should not lead the reader astray; the reader should be aware of how the text has been modified and why (ibid). Vehmas-Lehto points out that not conveying the denotative meaning is an exceptional solution (ibid: 81). Jakobsen (1993: 73) states that there should be symmetry between the source text and target text: the reader should be able to see the target text as a possible translation of the source text. Bassnett (2005: 33-34) explains that according to Popovic, all translations of a given text will have an ‘invariant core’ of stable, constant semantic elements, and that transformations, or variants, only influence the expressive form, but they do not modify the core of meaning. This ‘invariant core’ is not the same as the ‘nature’, the ‘spirit’, or the ‘soul’ of the source text. She feels that the ‘soul’ of the original text is an indefinable quality that translators can rarely capture. In her view, striving for equivalent effect involves speculation and can lead to rather dubious conclusions.

Puurtinen (2002: 83-84) explains the concepts of *acceptability* and *adequacy* as defined by Gideon Toury. Toury’s concept of acceptability means that the translation follows the

norms of the target language and target language literature. Adequacy, on the other hand, refers to faithfulness to the source text. Puurtinen states that translation is generally guided by the norms of the target language and culture. A translation becomes less acceptable when it flouts the norms of the target language. If the translator uses structures that are rare or have a different function in the target language than in the source language, the translator violates the norms of the target language. When the norms of the target language are violated, then, and the reader of the translation feels that it is clearly a translation due to its grammatical and lexical mistakes and oddities, the reader may not find the translation reliable (Jänis 2002: 67). The reader may feel that the translation fails to convey what it should convey (ibid). Thus, acceptability would appear to be a much more sensible goal in translation, since the target audience is realistically viewed as a crucial factor in translation decisions.

Puurtinen (2002: 85) lists and explains the four norms presented by André Lefevere that regulate how a literary text is modified and to what extent it is modified. The first norm is the *poetics* of the target culture, which refers to the target culture perception of literature and its genres. The genre of the source text may be changed in the target version if the genre of the source text does not exist within the literature of the target culture. The second norm is the *universe of discourse*, which may include customs and concepts that the target readers may not understand or accept. References to these concepts will then either be modified or left out. The third norm is the ideology of the target culture. If customs and situations in the source text are in conflict with the ideology of the target culture, they may be manipulated in order to be made acceptable. The fourth norm deals with the linguistic norms of the target culture. These linguistic norms are subordinate to the three aforementioned norms, as decisions made on the level of language depend on those three categories.

According to Puurtinen (2002: 86), a linguistically acceptable translation follows the linguistic norms of texts in the target language that belong to the same genre as closely as possible.

After all, the expectations that the readers have of translated texts are generally specifically based on original source language texts (ibid). The norms that determine the acceptability of a translation shift according to the genre and the target group in question (ibid: 89).

Oittinen (1993: 50) criticizes the notion that the translation method should be chosen according to the genre or text type of the source text, as texts often fall under more than one category. She also feels that it is difficult to say whether even texts within the same text type or genre are similar enough to call for a specific translation strategy based on the text type (Oittinen 1995: 21). While the translator should be familiar with the text conventions of the source language and source culture, they are not the only basis for translation, as the purpose of a text may change in different situations (ibid: 21-22). Oittinen states that even textual analysis is done in a situation and for a given purpose, and that the function of the text is redefined whenever the text is read (2000: 11-12). In other words, the target readers determine the purpose of the translation, and it is more important to cater to them than it is to try to make the target text conform to text type conventions.

Paying attention to the needs of the target audience is crucial to the *skopos* theory presented by Reiß and Vermeer (1986). According to them, a competent translator enables the receiver to interpret the text and understand the intentions of the sender (ibid: 21). They emphasize the importance of the expectations about form and function that the target culture has (Reiß and Vermeer 1986: 49). According to Reiß and Vermeer (1986: 58), the *skopos* is a variable that depends on the receiver. They also stress the importance of the receiver being able to interpret a message to have sufficient inner coherence with his or her own situation as a receiver (ibid: 63). I will delve deeper into the issue of *skopos* below.

These views demonstrate that many translation scholars not only consider pragmatic adaptations to target readers inevitable, but they also find them to be necessary. Foreignizing translations will likely be alienating and fail to enable the reader to understand the text and, in the case of literary texts, to identify with the characters. When translations fail to heed the norms of the

target language and culture, the target readers may have the impression that the translator either has a poor command of the target language or has not fully understood the original text. Domestication is not merely inevitable, but it makes the translator seem reliable to the target readers. A translation will be substantially more understandable and enjoyable if necessary adaptations are made to make it natural for target readers. This is of significance to translating for children, as children rarely take interest in political correctness and prefer stories that do not have too many strange and alienating elements. If children find a story complicated and cannot identify with it, they will dismiss it as boring, and it will fail to establish its position in the target culture. The audience is significant to the study because while this study is descriptive, I still argue that the translation should be coherent, natural, and enjoyable to the readers.

#### **4 Skopos Theory**

The skopos theory is central to this thesis because it emphasizes the importance of taking the target readers' expectations into account, and because it recognizes that translations are made for a purpose, which depends on target reader needs. Thus, it supports the notion that translations should be natural and pleasant to read for the target audience. Also, since this is a descriptive study, the skopos theory is relevant due to its emphasis on the process rather than on judging the product.

The skopos theory challenged dichotomies such as formal and dynamic equivalence presented by Nida and semantic and communicative translation presented by Newmark (Hatim and Mason 1997: 11). The skopos theory differs from these dichotomies in that the choices of the translator are not so strongly bound to the text type or genre of the source text, but are instead constrained, above all, by the translation brief, which includes the purpose of the translation and the likely readers of the target text (ibid). In the dichotomies related to previous equivalence theories,

certain translation strategies were seen to be more or less appropriate for specific translation situations, which had to do with the types of source texts (ibid). In the skopos theory, the target audience is the most important factor to be considered in choosing how to translate a text, rather than the text type or genre of the source text. One of the key elements of the skopos is specifying the translation task as determined by the commissioner of the translation (Ibid: 11-12).

Reiß and Vermeer (1986: 12-13) explain that the text is produced for a certain group of readers with a specific purpose in mind. Producing the text is an action that is performed for the purpose of achieving a given goal, and the receiver or group of receivers is taken into consideration while performing the action. The text is an offer of information given by the text producer to the text receiver. Offers of information can be either primary or secondary. The source text is a primary offer of information, whereas the translation is a secondary offer of information. Translation is not a matter of coding, but instead it involves providing information about the source text. The choice between different forms of information and strategies is not primarily dependent on the genre of the text, but instead on the function chosen for the translation.

Reiß and Vermeer (1986: 27, 33, 58-60) stress that the target text can justifiably have a different function than the source text, and that this is rather the rule than the exception due to the problems brought on by different cultures and readers. Thus, the skopos of the translation may differ from that of the source text. One reason is that translating is a different type of event than the production of the source text. Since the readers of the original text may read the text for a different reason than the readers of the translation, preserving the meaning is a culture-specific issue. As suggested earlier in this study, the values of the original text also inevitably go through a change. How the translator interprets the source text as a receiver substantially effects the translation. Another important factor effecting the translation is the function chosen by the translator. Cultural distance, more specifically the distance between the source text and the time or place in which it was translated always changes the function. There is no absolute way or translating or any absolute

translation; translation varies depending on the skopos given to it. There is a group of goals that are hierarchically arranged, and they have to be justifiable, in other words, make sense.

The act of translation is guided by the given target situation, or more specifically, by the expectations regarding the target situation made by the translator and his or her commissioner (Reiß and Vermeer 1986: 47). Starting off from this premise, the translator and commissioner are able to determine whether it is sensible to make a translation in the first place, what the ideal function for the translation is, and how this function can ideally be realized (*ibid.*: 55). What is sensible in each given situation depends on the prevailing culture-specific norms (*ibid.*: 55). The act has been successfully completed if the interpretation of the producer and the interpretation of the receiver do not significantly diverge from one another (*ibid.*: 57). The message is considered to be understood if the receiver is able to interpret it, or interprets it to be sufficiently coherent with his or her own situation as a receiver (*ibid.*: 63).

Reiß and Vermeer explain the suggestions orally presented by Hella Kirchhoff in 1981 that deal with the decision-making process of the translator regarding the skopos. She suggests that the decision-making process could be divided into the following parts. First, the skopos should be defined by making estimations about the receivers of the translation. Secondly, the translator should arrange the different aspects of the source text into a hierarchy. The relevance of each part of the source text can already be estimated before translating. The third part consists of realizing the skopos. This involves transferring the source text, with attention paid to the expectations of the receivers. Defining the skopos and dividing the parts of the source text into a hierarchy require knowing the target culture, whereas realizing the skopos requires not only familiarity with the target culture, but also knowing the target language. (Reiß and Vermeer 1986: 59)

Reiß and Vermeer note that intratextual coherence is more important than intertextual coherence. The translation should, first and foremost, be understandable as a target text the way the skopos requires it to be. Since the text is an offer of information, changing the skopos does not

violate the fidelity rule, but is higher in the hierarchy. The translator does not offer more or less information than the producer of the source text; he or she offers different kind of information in a different way. (Reiß and Vermeer 1986: 65-66, 70)

While the translation is an offer of information of the source text in the target language, the translation still simulates the form and function of the offer of information in the source language (Reiß and Vermeer 1986: 46). Texts represent certain genres, and these genres have typical, culture-bound models of decoding and structuring in specific types of interactive situations (ibid: 86). Texts also belong to text types, the basic functions of interaction that are linguistically realized in different ways in different cultures (ibid: 87). Reiß and Vermeer (1986) divide text types into three categories, the *informative text type*, the *expressive text type*, and the *operative text type*. If texts have parts representing different genres, the translator needs to set up a hierarchy between these elements (ibid: 116). In expressive text types, equivalence on the level of artistic organization and form is called for (ibid). Since I am dealing with an expressive text in this study, the form and artistic organization are relevant.

## **5 Translating for Children**

Translators who have written introductions or prefaces to justify their choices in the translations they have made for children have often made the didactic purposes of the text clear and explained the content to teachers and parents as well as children themselves (Lathey 2006: 2). However, translators' prefaces have become very rare, and are generally limited to the translations of classics (ibid). Prefaces made to translations for children in the past have offered insight into the intentions of the translators: they have stated why the text was chosen to be translated, what translation strategies were used, and what has motivated and inspired translation for children (ibid). It has

turned out that the translation of children's literature has historically been motivated by didactic purposes, and that translators often had a dismissive attitude towards child readers in the past (ibid: 3).

In the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, many authors and translators perceived children as beings whose natural instincts could not be trusted and who were prone to moral failure, disobedience, and prejudice (Lathey 2006: 7). There was a focus on a reasoned and enlightened approach: children's books were aimed at teaching children tolerance and acceptance of different groups of people (ibid). Philanthropic reformers believed that moralizing stories appealed to children, and they wanted to teach children useful lessons through stories in order to help them lead a good life (Ghesquiere 2006: 21-22). In the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, fairytales were no longer seen as a dangerous incitement to children's imagination (Lathey 2006: 5), but were instead seen to be important. In the era of Romanticism, children were viewed as separate from adults, and it was considered to be important that children are allowed to be children (Ghesquiere 2006: 23). Sentimentality and imagination became the dominant elements of children's literature (ibid). Instead of being encouraged to think for themselves, children were given straightforward answers, and stories written for children were purged of taboo subjects such as sex, violence, and injustice (ibid). Even more realistic stories were highly optimistic and often overly sentimental (ibid: 24).

In Britain, *cultural context adaptation* (discussed more in detail below) was a common method used for translating children's literature throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century (Lathey 2006: 8). Other nationalities and ethnic groups were reduced to stereotypes, and the representation of a nation or culture was often limited to a set of familiar, clearly defined features (ibid: 10). Sometimes unfamiliar elements were contrasted with familiar target culture elements and thus emphasized; this reinforced the national and cultural identity of the child reader (ibid: 11).

Only in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was there a backlash against the lack of realism in children's literature (Ghesquiere 2006: 24). Subjects and genres previously considered

suitable only for adults were directed towards children and teenagers as well (ibid: 24). Secularization and feminism led to traditional values, authorities, and gender roles being questioned, and a more open and authentic approach to writing for children was taken (ibid: 24).

Oittinen (1993: 4) writes that literature for children has its own special features, as books for children often have illustrations and are frequently meant to be read aloud. However, she does not consider children's literature to be a separate genre, as literature for both children and adults encompasses many of the same genres, and children's literature does not necessarily have to have a different role, such as that of a didactic tool (ibid: 41). As when a piece of literature intended for an adult audience become children's literature, individual works of literature, and sometimes entire genres of literatures, may be redefined (Oittinen 2000: 67).

Oittinen explains the ideas of the Israeli scholar Zohar Shavit, who has stated that children's literature is often directed towards two audiences: children and adults (Oittinen 1993: 40). Stories for children often exist on two levels: adults read them on the more logical, refined, and demanding level, whereas the conventional, less demanding level is directed towards children (ibid). She points out that children's literature is always based on adult decisions: adults choose books for children according to their own points of view, likes, and dislikes (Oittinen 2000: 69). While some scholars feel that translators should try to translate with both child and adult readers in mind, Lathey (2006: 15) argues that a translation aimed at both children and an academic audience will not work, as the audiences are too different for such a translation to appeal to both groups.

Desmidt writes that the translator needs to pay attention to several norms when making a translation for children: in addition to source-text-related norms and literary, aesthetic norms, the translator has to take didactic norms, pedagogical norms, and technical norms into account. *Didactic norms* refer to contributing to the intellectual and emotional development of the child. *Pedagogical norms* refer to adjusting the text to the language skills and conceptual knowledge of the child. Technical norms determine to what extent the original layout should be

preserved. She writes that didactic and pedagogical norms may lead to a change of function. (Desmidt 2006: 86-87)

Oittinen (1993: 15) states that anything adults create for children reflects their view of childhood. Thus, translators who translate books for children are affected by their image of childhood and their own child image (ibid: 3). On the one hand, child image is something unique that is based on individual experiences; on the other hand, it is a matter of ideas collectivized in society (Oittinen 2000: 4). In other words, when adults create something for children, they have a certain type of childhood and certain types of children in mind (Oittinen 1993: 29). The translators' cultural heritage and reading experiences are brought into their translations (ibid). Oittinen argues that a translator who is translating for children needs to find the child within himself or herself and their own image of childhood (ibid: 17). According to her, the translator needs to ask himself or herself questions such as *What is childhood?*, *How do children think?*, and *What kinds of abilities do children have?* (ibid).

Oittinen (1993: 28) writes that the scholars Bo Møhl and May Schack have stated that when adults write stories for children, they have the education of the child in mind: they would like to improve the child's understanding. They feel that children's books should strengthen the child's feelings of empathy and identification (ibid: 41). Oittinen points out that emotivity is considered to be a significant feature in a children's story (ibid: 41). According to her, children's identities are strengthened through books, and children compare themselves to characters in them (ibid: 24). The simplicity and even the stereotypes in children's stories provide children the opportunity to imagine how they would feel or respond in a dangerous situation, for example (ibid: 25). Following Hellsing, Oittinen (2000: 65) argues that while children's literature can teach children language, orientation to time and place, and social orientation, it should also have a direct influence on the child by activating the child's creativity and strengthening his or her emotional life.

Oittinen (1993: 78) emphasizes that the translator needs to have a functionalist view of translation and think of the child as a 'superaddressee' of the translation. This way, the translator takes children's experience, abilities, and expectations into consideration (ibid). She presents the arguments expressed by van der Bolt and Tellegen that the pleasure of reading is important for the emotional development of the child, and states that for this reason, the primary task for the translator of children's literature is to think of his or her future readers (Oittinen 2000: 28). According to Oittinen, how the translation does this in practice depends on his or her child image and what he or she knows about the children of his or her time (Oittinen 1993: 78-79). She points out that children also deconstruct the stories they read, are subjective, and read them for their own purposes (Oittinen 2000: 162).

Oittinen (2000: 5) argues that if the translator tries to find some "truth" enshrined in the source text, she or she fails to see the purpose of the translation: the target text needs to be readable and sound good read aloud. Oittinen writes that the translator should attempt to make a translation of the story that has a flow to it when read aloud (ibid: 32). When the readability of the text is stressed, the child is given priority as an active reader who understands and participates in the reading event (ibid: 5). Oittinen points out that the readability of the text is not merely determined by the text per se, but by the reader's entire situation (ibid: 34).

According to Oittinen (2000: 74), adaptation and domestication are inevitable when translating for children, as translators interpret stories for children on the basis of their own child images and thus make themselves visible. She stresses that translators need to adapt their texts to their future readers in order to be successful (ibid: 78). Translation is always guided by assumptions about the readers, so a translator needs to be loyal to the children who will read the story (ibid: 76). Oittinen points out that adaptations keep literary classics alive: adaptations are made out of love for children and their literature by speaking a language that appeals to them (ibid: 80). Since the story is

written in a language familiar to the readers, domestication automatically happens in translation (ibid: 84).

Various forms of adaptation can be applied when translating for children. Klingberg's *Cultural context adaptation* (as cited in Oittinen 2000: 90) involves explaining things to children when they are assumed not to necessarily understand foreign or otherwise strange information. *Purification* is a matter of sanitizing values to adapt the text to the values of the parents or teachers (ibid: 90-91). Events and objects considered unsuitable are then purified or censored, and they may be ideological, religious, or frightening things (ibid: 91). *Modernization* involves altering the text in its entirety to make it fit the current time (ibid: 90).

Desmidt (2006: 90-91) writes that translators for children often do not preserve the particularities of the source culture, such as units of currency, measurement, and proper names, but instead localize them. This is because translators try to create a similar effect on the target text readers that they assume the source text created on the source language readers (ibid: 90). They localize foreign concepts because they take the emotional and cognitive development of the child into consideration (ibid).

Oittinen argues that many people oppose adaptation and domestication because they undermine children's ability to learn things on their own and because they do not consider the value of imagination (Oitinen 2000: 90). She does not consider learning geographical facts, for example, to be essential, but instead argues that children have to be emotionally involved in the story to be able to understand other people's feelings in different situations (ibid). She also states that many scholars consider domesticating texts to be denaturalizing and overly didactic, and that they argue that children learn to tolerate difference by reading foreignizing texts (Oittinen 2006: 43). However, she argues that children may not enjoy a story if they consider it too foreign and strange, and she stresses that this may have a negative influence on their reading habits (ibid).

Manipulation can also be negative. As Oittinen (2006: 40) points out, translators may manipulate texts written for children for political reasons in order to manipulate their views (ibid: 40). Lathey (2006: 9) brings up the reductive representations of other nationalities and ethnic groups and points out that these representations may result from the image of another nationality that adults have and then try to impose upon children.

Oittinen stresses that the rights of the author of the source text and the rights of the target readers are not in conflict: taking the target readers into consideration is, in fact, a matter of being loyal to the original author (Oittinen 2000: 84). The reason for this is that when a target text is accepted and loved by the target culture readers, the author of the original has surely achieved his or her goal of appealing to the target audience (ibid). Making readable and likeable translations from the target readers' point of view helps the text live on in the target culture (ibid). Lathey (2006: 15) states that a translator translating for children needs to understand his or her audience, enter an imaginary dialogue with the children, and create stories anew for a modern child audience.

## **6 Data and Methods**

My approach to this study is, as I have suggested above, descriptive. This means that my intention is not to judge the translation. Attitudes dealing with the validity of choices may be implied in some parts. However, I set out to argue that the translation, as a whole, is enjoyable and readable, and I do not try to demonstrate this through isolated and detailed examples. Rather, my aim is to compare the connotations of words or expressions in given sentences or utterances and to determine what they have in common and how they differ. The idea is to demonstrate how the choices and their connotative dimensions affect the various parts of the story. That is, I try to argue that the choices have different implications.

I chose the descriptive approach because a normative approach would not have been sensible in this case. The reason is that the translation does not follow the word choices and grammar of the original story as closely as possible. Thus, taking the traditional approach of meticulously comparing the nuances of synonymous words and arguing that some of the choices are wrong or lacking because they fail to imply the exact same qualities would have led to judging most of the translation – unjustifiably. The translated stories in *The Wind in the Willows* have been popular in Finland for decades, and this would suggest that the translator has made a fairly enjoyable and coherent translation. My view is that the Finnish version is, indeed, rich and compelling in language, and that it would be pointless to argue that just because the translation is demonstrably different, the translator has been bad or unethical in some way. In fact, as I have attempted to point out, difference is inevitable, and the important thing is that the translation is coherent, and that the translator remains faithful to his or her vision of the story.

My method of collecting data consisted of simply searching for salient examples of connotations from the English and Finnish versions of the book. I mostly chose examples from the English version and then compared the Finnish translation to it, rather than the other way round. This was done to facilitate the process and to narrow down the options. I then took notes of the examples, translated the Finnish examples, and wrote down notes of the connotations, using dictionaries to ensure I had the right idea and to receive more insight and ideas about the words. My data consists of two entire books, both of which contain twelve chapters. Of course, I had to narrow down the examples a great deal. The elimination of examples was not a random process, as it involved choosing examples that have the most obvious religious, gender-related, political, and attitudinal connotations. I was mainly looking for connotations that are clearly attitudinal in nature and that have either negative or positive implications, whether religious, political, or merely stylistic or emotional. The choice had to be made from several dozen potential examples.

The greatest problem for me was to focus on the connotations rather than to delve too much into the denotative aspects of the examples. The ambiguity of some of the words, on the other hand, was not a problem, as it only added to the potential connotative aspects of words. Comparisons were not too difficult to make, but connecting the examples to the theoretical background was immensely problematic.

My approach in this thesis is qualitative rather than quantitative. The categories I used deal with the sociopolitical, stylistic, attitudinal, positive, and negative connotations of words and expressions. These categories were inspired by Koller's (1979) connotative dimensions. I collected salient words and grouped them according to the types of connotations they have, and used Random House Webster's College Dictionary for inspiration in some cases. However, since my topic is about connotations rather than denotations, I had to think of the implications the words have in different contexts. I tried to determine whether these words have political, sexual, positive, negative, or specific stylistic connotations in isolation, and how relevant these connotations are in their given contexts. These were the connotations that turned up in the analysis phase.

It was important to note that some words have connotations associated with the dimension of time. This means that a word that now has heavily sociopolitical connotations may have been neutral at the time the book was written, or that words in either version of the story may have gained specific positive or negative connotations since the stories were written. Another important contextual issue to consider was that while words sometimes have clearly religious or political implications, for instance, in some situations, there are also contexts where they are neutral and thus somewhat or completely irrelevant. Thus, the analysis focuses on the social dimension and the historical dimension in terms of context.

I then took notes of the Finnish translations of these examples and focused on the Finnish counterparts of the words in focus. This involved comparing the connotations of a Finnish word to the English word and trying to determine whether the connotations were similar. If they

were similar, I attempted to specify whether there is any difference in usage or quality. If they were different, my goal was to demonstrate the political, social, stylistic, pleasant, unpleasant, sexual, etc. implications of the Finnish words in comparison to the English ones. I then had to narrow down the examples before typing them into the thesis. That process involved choosing examples with the clearest sociopolitical or significantly positive or negative connotations.

The analysis is not based on any one specific theory or approach, such as a specific model of translation, but it is inspired by the skopos theory and based on the idea of language, and thus also connotations, as a social phenomenon. There is an attempt to demonstrate that the purpose of the translation guides the choices of the translator, and that factors such as the readership and the need for coherence within the translation are of importance. While I do not argue that the connotations should be similar, there is a focus on the difference between the implications of the English and the Finnish version and whether the connotations may be misleading or apt. Thus, my study draws on translation theory, particularly issues such as the skopos and the descriptive approach to translation, but the main issue is connotations. The importance of context is also dealt with, as it has a strong influence on choices making sense and maintaining coherence. The skopos theory emphasizes the need to write for a specific audience and for a specific purpose rather than striving for rigid equivalence of meaning and style between the original and the translation. It also emphasizes the need for intratextual coherence rather than intertextual coherence, or, as Oittinen has often stated, staying faithful to one's own interpretation and writing a coherent translation based on that interpretation. This matters because the translation I deal with is not rigid and "accurate", and I make no attempt at arguing that the choices should have been more literal.

It is not possible to argue either for or against the coherence of the entire translation, as I will only be able to deal with fractions of the whole text. However, I try to explain the context of the situation in my examples and to at least point out how the choices in these isolated parts make sense with regard to the story itself, as well as with regard to the stylistic and sociopolitical

issues, for example, that influence the associations the text may bring to readers. Of course, I will also compare the degrees of connotations and determine whether they are more political or more attitudinal, positive, or negative in either version. The story is rich in various Christian connotations and even contains Biblical allusions, and the analysis will focus on the significance of those connotations and the differences in the degree of religiousness in the English and Finnish versions. The examples have been classified into the following groups: religious, gender-related, political, and attitudinal connotations.

## **7 Analysis**

This section of the thesis deals with the various connotations found in the stories in *The Wind in the Willows* and its Finnish translation *Kaislikossa suhisee*. The analysis is divided into four categories: religious connotations, gender-related connotations, political connotations, and attitudinal connotations. The original version and the translation are compared and contrasted with each other in the examples, with first the English version or a part of it above and then the Finnish translation of it written underneath it.

### **7.1 Religious Connotations**

There is a great deal of religious connotations in the stories in *The Wind in the Willows*, despite the fact that the book is not particularly religious in nature. Some of these examples of religious connotations are overtly religious, and a number of them are even clear Biblical allusions. However, there are also words that have religious overtones in some contexts, but not in others. Some of these

examples deal with words that may have religious connotations, but the connotations are not relevant to the context.

I will now turn to this example from chapter five, in which the Rat and the Mole are on their way back to the river when the Mole senses the smell of his old home in the vicinity, and soon feels compelled to return there.

**Example 1:**

*As for the Rat, he was walking a little way ahead, as his habit was, his shoulders humped, his eyes fixed on the straight grey road in front of him, so he did not notice poor Mole when suddenly the summons reached him, and took him like an electric shock. (Grahame 1908: 69)*

*Rotta kulki tapansa mukaan hiukan Myyrän edellä hartiat kumarassa, silmät luotuina suoraan eteenpäin harmaaseen tienpintaan, eikä hän niin ollen huomannut, kuinka Myyrä rukka äkkiä sai sanoman, joka vaikutti häneen sähköiskun tavoin (Grahame 1949: 90)*

The word *summons* suggests a very urgent and pressing call. It can refer to ‘an authoritative call or notice to appear at a specified place for a particular purpose or duty’ (RHWCD 1992: 1338). The word implies that the call is highly compelling and demanding, an irresistible force that the Mole must comply to. On the one hand, *sanoma* is a milder word than *summons*, as it refers to a mere message. However, similarly as *message*, the word *sanoma* can have significant political and social implications. A social or political *sanoma*, or message, is designed to generate change and to motivate people to think or act in certain ways. The word *sanoma* also has religious connotations. The noun *ilosanoma*, meaning ‘gospel’, literally means ‘message of joy’. In a more spiritual sense, this noun suggests a strong emotional impact.

The following example appears in chapter six. In it, the other animals are plotting on how to stop Toad from recklessly driving and getting into trouble with the authorities, as he frequently has. The Badger decides that they are going to rescue Toad from his bad ways.

**Example 2:**

*'Right you are! cried the Rat, starting up. 'We'll rescue the poor unhappy animal! We'll convert him! He'll be the most converted toad that ever was before we've done with him!'* (Grahame 1908: 84)

*''Olet oikeassa!'' Rotta huudahti hypähtäen pystyyn. ''Pelastamme tuo (sic) onnettoman eläimen! Käännytämme hänet! Ennen kuin lopetamme, hän on oleva käännytetyin konna, joka milloinkaan on nähty!''* (Grahame 1949: 110)

The verb *convert* is, of course, heavily associated with religion, and even when it is not used in a religious sense, a parallel is drawn within a change and a religious conversion. A conversion, religious or not, is considered to involve becoming a "better person" and giving up one's old, bad ways. In this context, the conversion in question is meant to involve Toad becoming rational, sensible, and well-mannered, and no longer driving recklessly and having to deal with crashes and authorities. It is likened to converting to religion and giving up sins and evils due to the huge transformation. This transformation is always very emotional and more psychological than practical, as it is a matter of having a new set of values, ideologies, and principles.

The verb *käännyttää* has similar implications as *convert*, and the associations to a religious conversion are even stronger here due to the presence of the verb *pelastaa*, meaning 'to save'. The Finnish verb is a standard translation for either 'to save' or 'to rescue', and this automatically leads to the Finnish version making a religious allusion lacking in the English version

due to the use of the verb *rescue* rather than *save* there. Both *save* and *pelastaa* are used in religious contexts, and refer to a divine salvation from sins and Hell. Of course, *pelastaa* would not have any clear religious implications without the word *käännyttää*, which is blatantly religious on its own.

I will now deal with the following example from chapter six. The animals have decided to ‘‘convert’’ Toad so that he would become a sensible animal and stop driving recklessly and getting into crashes.

**Example 3:**

*They set off up the road on their mission of mercy, Badger leading the way.* (Grahame 1908: 84-85)

*Mäyrä etunenässä he lähtivät laupeudentyöhönsä* (Grahame 1949: 110)

Both *mission* and *mercy* are words that have religious implications in certain contexts, but they do not necessarily have any religious connotations on their own. When put together like this, however, they do not merely have religious connotations and implications; this is a clear Christian allusion. Helping Toad become a sensible animal and give up reckless driving is likened to a religious mission. A *mission*, in its religious sense, refers to the systematic spreading of the gospel through evangelizing and proselytizing. The animals are going to use verbal persuasion to convince Toad that his activities are immoral and harmful, and that changing his ways will be good for everyone involved, and this involves ‘‘proselytizing’’ of sorts. The word *mercy* softens the association to proselytizing by suggesting that the ‘‘mission’’ in question will be carried out with sympathy and compassion, and that Toad will be treated in a kind way. However, it is up to debate whether *mercy*, in a Christian sense, refers to genuine compassion and sympathy, or if it is a contrived expression of such in the name of a ‘‘higher’’ goal.

The word *laupeus* is a Christian concept meaning ‘compassion’, ‘mercy’, or ‘charity’. There is no ambiguity as to whether the word is religious or not, so the context does not have to point it out. The Finnish version suggests a more genuine and less contrived process that actually involves helping Toad in order to make him happier and allow him to put an end to his troubles. There is no implication that the actions are motivated by a desire to achieve a higher goal in the name of values. Neither is there any implication that systematic preaching is involved, although it certainly is a part of the plan, as is soon revealed in the story when Toad receives a “sermon” from the Badger. The Finnish version likens the process to the loving and caring help that Jesus supposedly offered people, rather than to a mission involving evangelizing.

The following example comes from chapter six. The Badger is trying to motivate Toad to change his ways through an inspiring speech. Initially, the plan works, and Toad is highly moved.

**Example 4:**

*. . . presently they noticed that the sermon began to be punctuated at intervals by long drawn sobs, evidently proceeding from the bosom of Toad, who was a soft-hearted and affectionate fellow, very easily converted – for the time being – to any point of view.* (Grahame 1908: 86)

*. . . äkkiä he huomasivat, että aika ajoin parannussaarnan keskeyttivät pitkät nyhkytykset, jotka ilmeisesti olivat lähtöisin Rupikonnan rinnasta; hän oli näet hyväsydäminen ja hellätunteinen olento, ja ainakin hetkeksi hänet oli helppo käännättää mihin tahansa.* (Grahame 1949: 113)

The word *sermon*, when not used in a religious sense, is often a humorous or disparaging expression for a preachy, sanctimonious speech or rant by a person “getting on a soapbox”, or an annoying disciplinary lecture by a parent, teacher, employer, etc. Even when the word actually

refers to a religious sermon, it often carries the unpleasant associations to an accusatory, judgmental speech that involves imposing a great deal of guilt and regret onto the listeners. ‘‘Fire and brimstone’’ preaching that involves threatening people with Hell or other forms of divine punishment for their sins is often associated with sermons. However, sermons are not necessarily judgmental and guilt-imposing, and they are always meant to inspire the listeners and to motivate them to aspire at a higher level of spirituality and righteousness. A sermon can also be hope-affirming and uplifting.

The implications are slightly different in the Finnish version due to the idea of healing being incorporated into it. It can be interpreted that the sermon in question is uplifting, hope-affirming, and highly motivational. However, due to the ambiguous nature of the verb *parantaa*, this is not self-evident. It can mean ‘to heal’, ‘to cure’, or ‘to improve’. If improvement is suggested, chances are the sermon is very accusatory and guilt-imposing. Even if a cure is suggested, there is a strong implication that the receivers are considered sick in an evil way, which involves quite a great deal of guilt. The noun *parannussaarna* certainly emphasizes the transformation that takes place in the recipient of the sermon. This is not emphasized in *sermon*.

The following example I am going to look at comes from chapter one. In this example, the Mole is cleaning his house, but he feels tempted to go out because it is a lovely summer day outside. Here are the English and Finnish versions:

**Example 5:**

*Something up above was calling him imperiously, and he made for the steep little tunnel which answered in his case to the gravelled carriage-drive owned by animals whose residences are nearer to the sun and air. (Grahame 1908: 11-12)*

*Yläilmoista kantautui kutsu, jota hän ei voinut vastustaa, ja hän ryntäsi kohti ahdasta ja jyrkkää tunnelia, joka merkitsi hänelle samaa kuin hiekoitettu ajotie niille eläimille, joiden asuinsijat ovat lähempänä ilmaa ja aurinkoa.* (Grahame 1908: 8)

The words *something up above* have religious connotations, even if they are not relevant in this context. In many religions, such as Christianity, it is believed or has been believed that God lives up in the clouds, and even as that belief has waned along with the progress of science, Christians still often conceive of God existing above them, and accordingly, consider positive events, for example, to be blessings “from up above”. The use of the verb *calling* reinforces the religious associations of these words, as God is claimed to be calling out to people, and a religious conviction is referred to as a *calling*.

The adjective *imperious* is an emphatic word that refers to something commanding and domineering, even dictatorial. The word certainly suggests a strong force. As the word appears in connection with *something up above* and *calling*, it may also have religious connotations, as God is believed to give people commands that cannot be disobeyed or ignored. In this context, the religious connotations are hardly relevant, but that association may nonetheless be conjured up.

In the Finnish version, the word *yläilmoista* rather literally means ‘from up in the air’, and it does not have religious connotations, or at least that association is not very strong. Also, the word *kutsu* can mean ‘call’ or ‘invitation’, and it does not have equally strong religious connotations as *calling* in the English sentence, especially since *yläilmoista* is not much of a religious expression. The Finnish sentence, thus, lacks the religious connotations of the English sentence, and implies that the spring day simply became inviting and irresistible to the Mole.

The idea of an “imperious” call has been formulated through the words *jota hän ei voinut vastustaa*, ‘that he could not resist’. The Finnish sentence emphasizes the Mole’s feelings and need to accept the “invite” rather than focusing on some external force from above taking

control over him. The expression is also quite mild in comparison to the adjective *imperious* and suggests a stronger sense of agency, even if the Mole cannot fight against the urge. The potential religious associations are missing.

In this example from chapter one, the Rat and the Mole have just eaten and packed the luncheon basket, but it turns out that they have missed a few things.

**Example 6:**

. . . *the Rat pointed out a fork which anybody ought to have seen, and last of all, behold! the mustard-pot, which he had been sitting on without knowing it – still, somehow, the thing got finished at last, without much loss of temper.* (Grahame 1908: 21)

. . . *Rotta osoitti haarukkaa, joka toki jokaisen olisi pitänyt nähdä, ja loppujen lopuksi ilmeni, että hän oli tietämättään istunut sinappipurkilla, mutta Myyrä selvisi siitä kuitenkin menettämättä paljonkaan hyvää tuultaan.* (Grahame 1949: 24)

The expression *Behold!* is often used in humorous ways, and it is, of course, an archaic form strongly associated with the Bible. The Finnish version does not have a humorous expression for noticing something. An obvious Biblical reference could not have been incorporated into the translation in this case, but a humorous expression such as *katsohan*, *kas niin*, or *kas kummaa* which roughly mean ‘would you look at that’ or ‘oh, lookee’, would have worked well in this sentence.

I will now look at the following example from chapter six. In it, Toad has just decided that he is not going to stop driving, despite the fact that a moment earlier he had promised to do so after receiving a long sermon from the Badger on the topic. He says he is not sorry for the trouble he has caused and for having a change of heart.

**Example 7:**

*But I've been searching my mind since , and going over things in it, and I find that I'm not a bit sorry or repentant really, so it's not earthly good saying I am; now is it?' (Grahame 1908: 87-88).*

*Mutta sen jälkeen olen tutkiskellut asiaa ja kertaillut tapahtumia mielessäni ja huomannut, etten oikeastaan kadu hiukkaakaan enkä ole pahoillani, joten on turha teeskennellä, eikö totta?*  
(Grahame 1949: 114)

The adjective *repentant*, of course, has strong associations to Christianity, and the verb *to repent* refers to confessing one's sins, expressing remorse over them, and promising to change one's behavior and avoid sinning: 'to be penitent for one's sins and seek to change one's life for the better' (RHWCD 1992: 1141). The adjective *earthly* also has religious connotations, even if they are not obviously linked to this particular context. According to RHWCD (1992: 420), the word is almost always used to imply a contrast to heavenly things. Thus, it may have the connotation of 'sinful', or it may merely refer to mundane and trivial things as opposed to divine ones. It can also be a reference to one's humble and insignificant position on the large scale of things, and particularly in comparison to God.

The verb *katua* is a neutral and standard word for regretting, and while it may refer to spiritual matters, it does not have religious connotations. It would have been difficult to find a good translation for *earthly* in this context, so the Finnish version does not have any religious associations at all, whereas the English version has two words with such connotations.

I will now turn to the following example from chapter six. Toad has just stolen a car and is so lost in the thrill of driving that he does not consider the consequences or the moral issues of the matter.

**Example 8:**

*He increased his pace, and as the car devoured the street and leapt forth on the high road through the open country, he was only conscious that he was Toad once more, Toad at his best and highest, Toad the terror, the traffic-queller, the Lord of the Lone Trail, before whom all must give way or be smitten into nothingness and everlasting night (Grahame 1908: 94)*

*Hän lisäsi vauhtia, ja auton niellessä kilometrejä ja syöksyessä pitkin valtatieä aukean maaston halki, hän tajusi ainoastaan olevansa jälleen Rupikonna, Rupikonna kunniansa kukkuloilla, Rupikonna, kaikkien kauhu, maantien yksinvalti, jonka edessä jokaisen oli väistettävä, ellei tahtonut singota tietymättömiin tai ikuisuuden yöhön. (Grahame 1949: 124-125)*

The word *lord* has clear religious connotations, as God is often referred to as the Lord. In this context, of course, the word refers to authority and power, and to being a master and ruler, rather than actually being the God of the Lone Trail. However, the connotations stand, and the association is strengthened by the fact that Toad is a self-aggrandizing character. The use of the word *smitten* also reinforces the religious associations. The God of the Bible, after all, has been known to smite people for various reasons. This part seems to imply that Toad has become megalomaniacal and sees himself as a deity of sorts who is entitled to decide on life and death. The expression *everlasting night* refers to death, and it appears to suggest a damnation of sorts, reinforcing the religious connotations and the notion that Toad sees himself as God.

The word *yksinvalti*, meaning ‘autocrat’, would have far more sinister implications in a more political context, and would mean ‘dictator’. In this context, however, the word has similar implications as *lord*, namely, that Toad is the master and ruler of the road. While God may be seen as an autocrat of sorts, worldly leaders and rulers notwithstanding, *yksinvalti* lacks the religious connotations of *lord*. The idea of being smitten has also been omitted from the Finnish

version, and it has not been replaced by any other concept that could have religious connotations. The words *ikuisuuden yö*, similarly as everlasting night, refer to death and have a sense of damnation to them. The English version certainly has stronger religious associations than the Finnish one.

In this following example from chapter seven, the Rat and the Mole are rowing along the river looking for little Portly, and they become aware of the presence of something mysterious and divine. The following passage refers to a small island they discover.

**Example 9:**

*Reserved, shy, but full of significance, it hid whatever it might hold behind a veil, keeping it till the hour should come, and, with the hour, those who were called and chosen.* (Grahame 1908: 103)

*Pidättyvänä, arkana, mutta kuitenkin merkityksestään tietoisena se tuntui säilyttävän jotakin, minkä oli kätkenyt kuin hunnun taakse odottamaan hetkeään ja niitä, jotka olivat kutsutut ja valitut* (Grahame 1949: 137)

The words *called and chosen* constitute a Biblical allusion, and the words have religious associations on their own in specific contexts as well. After all, people are *called* to serve God, and people are *called* to appear before God and explain themselves on Judgment Day, and many Christian denominations, similarly as Jews, see themselves as God's *chosen people*, and only relatively few people are *chosen* to enter Heaven. The words *kutsutut ja valitut* have similar spiritual connotations as *called and chosen*.

I will now turn to the following example from chapter seven. The Rat and the Mole have arrived on a small island and are about to be confronted with the divine presence that they have sensed would be on that island. :

**Example 10:**

*Then suddenly the Mole felt a great Awe fall upon him, an awe that turned his muscles to water, bowed his head, and rooted his feet to the ground. (Grahame 1908: 103)*

*Silloin vapisuttava pelko äkkiä valtasi Myyrän. Se vei voiman hänen jäsenistään, taivutti hänen päänsä ja naulitsi hänet paikoilleen. (Grahame 1949: 138)*

RHWCD (1992: 96) defines *awe* as ‘an overwhelming feeling of reverence, admiration, fear, or wonder produced by that which is grand, sublime, extremely powerful, etc.’, and the word is often associated with such feelings towards God. Thus, the word has its religious connotations. The word commonly refers to fear, and Christians are expected to fear God, as are Jews and Muslims. The capitalization reinforces the notion that this is a spiritual experience for the Mole. The word *pelko* is a standard word for ‘fear’, and it does not have religious connotations. Unlike *awe*, the word *pelko* is unambiguous, and it does not convey the sense of wonder, admiration, and veneration that *awe* does. There is no sense of having a spiritual experience.

In this following example from chapter seven, the Rat and the Mole have confronted the Piper, or the god-like character whose presence they have sensed on the small island. This example describes the Mole’s feelings upon meeting this divine being.

**Example 11:**

*He might not refuse, were Death himself waiting to strike him instantly, once he had looked with mortal eye on things rightly kept hidden (Grahame 1908: 103)*

*Hän ei olisi voinut olla noudattamatta sitä, vaikka olisi tiennyt kuolevansa siihen paikkaan nähtyään, mitä maallisten silmien ei ole lupa katsella* (Grahame 1949: 138)

The adjective *mortal* has religious connotations, as it implies that there are *immortal* beings, and it is contrasted with such immortal beings as God, Jesus, and angels. The mortal body is also contrasted with an immortal soul. The word *mortal* has some negative connotations, as it is often associated with being sinful. Even when sin is not implied, the word suggests insignificance and a rather humble position, as in the expression ‘‘a mere mortal’’. The word suggests imperfection and inferiority in comparison to divine and immortal beings. It also implies frailty and destructibility. The words *maallinen* (‘earthly’) and *mortal* both suggest the insignificance and imperfection that human beings have in comparison to God and Jesus, but *maallinen* has the more negative connotations, as it has a stronger association to sin. What is earthly, after all, is not heavenly or divine, and such things and beings cannot be holy and fully sinless.

## **7.2 Gender-Related Connotations**

While *The Wind in the Willows* has more religious connotations than any other specific sociopolitical or cultural connotations, and the stories do not deal with gender issues, there are some gender-related connotations worth noting in the stories. The connotations associated with homosexuality are related to the dimension of time, as these connotations were not as strong in 1908 as they have been later. The other gender connotations have some sexist connotations that would presumably have been avoided in later decades.

I will now deal with the following example from chapter two. The Rat, the Mole, and Toad have gone on a ride in Toad's horse cart, and a car has just scared the horse and made him run onto the side of the road, making the cart fall down and break.

**Example 12:**

*The Rat knotted the horse's reins over his back and took him by the head, carrying the bird-cage and its hysterical occupant in the other hand* (Grahame 1908: 36)

*Rotta sitoi ohjukset yhteen, heitti ne hevosen selkään ja ryhtyi ohjaamaan hevosta päästä kiinnipitäen. Toisessa kädessä hänellä oli lintuhäkki, jonka asukas oli yhä poissa suunniltaan* (Grahame 1949: 46)

The adjective *hysterical* is applied to women and girls far more often than men, and there is a historical reason for this. The concept of hysteria was often used in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century to describe various symptoms and behaviors particularly exhibited by women (Britannica Concise Encyclopedia 2003: 900). Thus, the word may have had even stronger connotations to women's outbursts at the time the book was released than it does today. The term itself was derived from the Greek word for 'womb', as the Greeks believed that the uterus was the cause of such symptoms (ibid). Hysteria was then attributed to the "wandering womb" in the Victorian era after 1850 (Women's Issues Then & Now, accessed April 21<sup>st</sup>, 2009). In fact, madness was associated with such conditions specific to women as menstruation, pregnancy, and the menopause, and a woman was judged to be insane in the Victorian times if she had an outburst (ibid). Women were considered to be emotional and unstable due to the wandering of the womb, which was believed to suck the energy and intellect out of women (ibid). Even today, the word is often specifically associated with excessively emotional women and girls who suffer from uncontrollable outbursts,

often accompanied by screaming and crying. While men and boys can also suffer from such outbursts, they are often not called hysterical unless they are laughing uncontrollably. All in all, the word has a sexist and even misogynous history.

The expression *poissa suunniltaan* means ‘beside oneself’, and it is a neutral expression that is not marked in gender, but it implies a similar intensity as *hysterical*. This means that the Finnish version does not contain any gender-related connotations. Because of the historical and cultural association of hysteria to women, the English version is more likely to make readers think of a female bird, whereas the Finnish version does not create any such associations.

In this example from chapter eight, Toad has just been sentenced to life in prison for stealing a car and ridiculing the police officers who arrested him. Toad is utterly miserable, but there is some hope for him because of a certain sympathetic girl.

**Example 13:**

*Now the gaoler had a daughter, a pleasant wench and good-hearted, who assisted her father in the lighter duties of his post.* (Grahame 1908: 110)

*Vanginvartijalla oli tytär, miellyttävä ja hyväsydäminen typykkä, joka avusti isäänsä tämän virkaan kuuluvissa kevyissä tehtävissä.* (Grahame 1949: 147)

The noun *wench* refers to ‘[A] girl, maid, young woman; a female child (Oxford English Dictionary 1989: 152). This meaning is dialectal today. The word has also specifically been used in reference to working class girls (ibid). Another dialectal and otherwise archaic usage is the usage of this word as a term of endearment or familiarity (ibid). It is meant in a positive way in this context, but it has also been used for prostitutes: while it is currently a regional word meaning ‘a girl or young woman’, its archaic meaning is ‘a strumpet’, and it can also mean ‘to associate, esp. habitually, with

promiscuous women' (RHWCD 1992: 1513). Thus, the associations are not completely positive. However, since the meaning of 'prostitute' or, according to OED (1989: 152), '[A] wanton woman; a mistress' is archaic, the word presumably does not rouse such associations in readers today, and hardly did in 1908, either.

The word *typykkä* is meant to be a playful, diminutive term of endearment for a girl or young woman. In the late 1940s, it may very well have been a fairly positive and affectionate word. However, the word has fallen out of favor, as it has been used as a sexist insult. Few people would use it in a perfectly well-meaning way today. The word is used in reference to girls and young women, often to attractive ones, and particularly to ones that are not considered very intelligent. It conveys contempt and a belittling attitude. Sometimes it implies that a woman is immature, inexperienced, and naïve. It often suggests that a woman is superficial and vapid. However, the word may even be applied to demonstrably intelligent, educated young women to imply that she is intellectually inferior simply for being female. Other women may use the term to suggest a young woman simply cannot be knowledgeable and wise in the same way as an older one.

Since the translation goes back to the late 1940s, there is a reason to assume that the word was used as a sincere term of endearment, especially since feminist thought had not become commonplace. Presumably, the negative usage of *typykkä* is specifically explainable as one of many counter-reactions to feminism and women receiving higher education and taking up jobs that previously only men had held. Since the translation dates back to a time when such progressive ideas as women becoming educated and working outside the home were not popular yet, there would have been no backlash in the form of sexist usages for words like *typykkä*. It is possible that the word was always sexist to a degree, and that women were disparaged through the use of the word, but it simply was not a matter of a backlash. Even if it was not used as an outright hostile expression, it may still have conveyed a patronizing attitude to young females, even when used with good intentions.

I will now turn to the following example from chapter ten. Toad has managed to escape from prison and the policemen that came after him. He is still dressed in the washerwoman outfit he wore when he escaped from prison, and lies to a barge-woman about being in the washing and laundering business. When she inquires him if he works alone, Toad lies that he has about twenty girls as his employees. Toad has some rather negative things to say about these non-existent girls.

**Example 14:**

*'Oh, I have girls,' said toad lightly: twenty girls or thereabouts, always at work. But you know what girls are, ma'am! Nasty little hussies, that's what I call 'em!' (Grahame 1908: 145)*

*"Voi ei, minulla on tyttöjä", Rupikonna sanoi huolettomasti, "kaksikymmentä tai niillä main yhdellä kertaa työssä. Mutta tiedättehän te tytöt! Inhottavia pikku letukoita ne ovat!" (Grahame 1949: 197)*

It goes without saying that the word *hussy* has negative connotations, as it is an insult, but the connotations are negative in a specific way. The word has been used in the sense of 'a mischievous or impudent girl' (RHWCD 1992: 657), but the association contemporary readers immediately have is that of promiscuity. Of course, the word can also mean 'a brazen or disreputable woman' (ibid), but this was hardly the association the author was going for. This word is quite dated by now, and many people use it in a humorous way. It has more or less become a synonym for words like *slut* and *whore*, which are preferred over this comparatively mild word. Comparatively mild or not, *hussy* is one of many words that express a hostile attitude towards female sexuality.

The word *letukka* is also a fairly dated word, and it has similar implications and connotations as *hussy*. Thus, the word is used to describe unpleasant girls and young women, but it

is also used as a word for promiscuous women. If there is any difference, it might be that *letukka* is more clearly a reference to a fairly young woman.

In this example from chapter ten, the barge-woman says the following thing in response to Toad's complaints about the girls working for him being "nasty little hussies".

**Example 15:**

*'But I dare say you set yours to right, the idle trollops! . . .'* (Grahame 1908: 145)

*'Mutta kyllä minä uskon teidän antavan niille mitä kuuluu ja kuka käski, niille laiskureille! . . .'*

(Grahame 1949: 197)

The word *trollop* has two potential meanings and can be defined as 'an immoral or promiscuous woman, esp. a prostitute' or 'an untidy or slovenly woman; slattern' (RHWCD 1992: 1429). The latter is meant in this context, but due to the alternative meaning, the word may have some rather negative sexual connotations to many adult readers today. The word may not have been heavily associated with promiscuity at the time the book was written, but the word is, of course, marked in gender and arguably sexist. However, the Finnish version lacks any gender-specific epithets, as *laiskuri* has the meaning of 'idler'. Thus, the connotations are very different.

I will now turn to the following example from chapter ten. Two men have picked Toad up from the road because they thought he was a poor old washerwoman. Toad had fainted on the road because he recognized their car as the car he had stolen and the passengers as the people he had seen in the coffee-room where he had gotten the idea of "borrowing" the car after seeing it from the window. He suggests to one of the men that it would be a good idea to let him sit in the front beside the driver in order to get fresh air full in his face. The following is the man's response.

**Example 16:**

*'What a very sensible woman!' said the gentleman* (Grahame 1908: 156)

*'Kuinka järkevä nainen', sanoi herra* (Grahame 1949: 212)

There is always a risk of reading too much into utterances like this, but the utterance seems to imply that women are not generally sensible. Coming to this conclusion is easy, not merely because of the formulation itself, but also because of certain commonly held views about the sexes. Being sensible is generally equated with being rational and practical, and these qualities are often considered to be masculine, or at least more predominant in men. Women, on the other hand, are frequently assumed to be more emotional and intuitive.

In this example from chapter twelve, the animals have managed to sneak into Toad Hall, which has been taken over by the weasels. The weasels are having a wild celebration and fail to hear them below the banqueting hall, where one of the weasels is holding a speech. The following is what the animals overhear.

**Example 17:**

*... 'We all know Toad!' – (great laughter) - Good Toad, modest Toad, honest Toad!' – (shrieks of merriment).* (Grahame 1908: 181)

*... Kaikkihan tunnemme Rupikonnan!' – kovaa naurua - "Hyvä Rupikonna, vaatimaton Rupikonna, rehti Rupikonna!" – riemunkiljahduksia.* (Grahame 1949: 246)

The adjective *modest* can have various meanings. It can give people the association to humility or the association to covering up potentially arousing parts in the female body. Followers of

patriarchal religions more often see the word in terms of the latter than in terms the former. In this context, however, the idea of humility is meant, but in an ironic way, of course. Toad, after all, is quite a self-aggrandizing animal. It is also important to note that since Toad is male, the connotation to females covering up their bodies is hardly conjured up in this context. The word *honest* is generally considered positive, despite the fact that some people only consider those people honest who openly agree with them, and that excessive honesty can bring unnecessary hurt and embarrassment, or even lead to tragic events. This word, too, is naturally used in an ironic sense. The word *vaatimaton*, on the other hand, does not have any religious and sexual connotations that have to do with females covering themselves up. It unambiguously refers to humility and lack of extravagance.

The adjective *rehti*, however, is much more attitudinal than *honest*, and has much clearer sociopolitical connotations than the more neutral *honest*. The word *rehti* is marked in gender, as it is practically always applied to men only. Also, the word is not used in reference to just any type of men. It is often used in reference to men with a blue-collar job, especially if this job involves physical strain. However, any man that is considered hard-working can be *rehti*. Being responsible and law-abiding is also part of being *rehti*. More significantly, *rehti* is applied to men who are masculine in a traditional sense. The word is sometimes used by sexist, xenophobic, homophobic, and anti-intellectual men to describe other such men. Highly educated men, effeminate gay men, and foreigners would hardly qualify for this description. Attractive men who are popular with women are not assumed to be *rehti*. In fact, according to some people, attractive, homosexual, foreign, and intellectual men are dishonest and unreliable.

In this following example from chapter two, the Rat and the Mole have just rowed to Toad Hall, because the Rat wants to introduce the Mole and Toad to each other.

**Example 18:**

*They disembarked, and strolled across the gay flower-decked lawns in search of Toad, whom they presently happened upon resting in a wicker garden-chair, with a preoccupied expression of face, and a large map spread out on his knees. (Grahame 1908: 28)*

*He astuivat maihin ja lähtivät etsimään Rupikonnaa. Kukkien kirjavoiman ruohokentän poikki kuljettuaan he keksivätkin hänet istumasta koripunontaisessa puutarhatuolissa hajamielinen ilme kasvoilla ja suuri kartta polvillaan. (Grahame 1949: 32-33)*

The adjective *gay*, of course, has strong connotations to homosexuality, and the word would hardly be used in any other meaning today than ‘homosexual’, apart from a few historical concepts. Even in 1908, when this word primarily meant ‘happy’, it was associated with wantonness, a characteristic that has often unfairly been applied to homosexuals. One of the meanings of the word is, in fact, ‘licentious; dissipated; wanton’ (RHWCD 1992: 552). According to RHWCD (ibid: 552-553), the word has been associated with sexual conduct from the 17<sup>th</sup> century onwards. A gay woman, for instance, was a prostitute. Some time around the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the word became associated with homosexuals. The word was adopted by homosexuals themselves after World War II, and is no longer disparaging. In 1908, however, the word *gay* hardly would have made children snicker.

Even without the connotation to homosexuality, the word has connotations such as ‘colorful’, ‘flamboyant’, ‘lively’, etc, features which have also been associated with homosexual men. In fact, one meaning of *gay* is ‘bright or showy’ (RHWCD 1992: 552). The word has had a rather negative connotation for a long time, as it has been, and often still is, a derogatory word, and has often been used in a disparaging way to describe effeminate men, homosexual or otherwise. Of course, it also took a long time for homosexuals to be accepted, and for a long time after 1908, homosexuality was classified as a disease and often led to incarceration. It is crucial to note that in

this context, the adjective *gay* refers to lawns, not any of the animals, and not to any person. Thus, the association to homosexuality was unlikely to occur in 1908 for purely contextual reasons, especially since the adjective *gay* was not an unusual word to describe things.

The adjective *kirjava* is a somewhat dated word for ‘colorful’, and *kirjavoida* is an unusual nominalization of this adjective, meaning ‘to make colorful’. The word choice is quite apt, as ‘colorful’ is one possible meaning for *gay* in a context like this, and *gay* still has the connotation of ‘colorful’, among other things. Of course, the Finnish word lacks any connotations to homosexuality or sexual behavior of any kind.

I will now look at the following example in chapter eight. Toad has just admitted to an engine driver that he is not a poor washerwoman, but instead was sentenced to prison after “borrowing” a car and has escaped. The engine driver sympathizes with him despite thinking that what he has done is wrong.

**Example 19:**

*‘. . . I don’t hold with motor cars, for one thing; and I don’t hold with being ordered about by policemen when I’m on my own engine, for another. And the sight of an animal in tears always makes me feel queer and soft-hearted . . .’* (Grahame 1908: 121)

*‘. . . Ensinnäkään en pidä autoista, ja toisekseen minusta on vastenmielistä, että poliisit komentelevat minua, kun kuljetan omaa veturiani. Ja itkevän eläimen näkeminen tekee minut aina oudon hentomieliseksi . . .’* (Grahame 1949: 164)

The adjective *queer*, of course, is associated with homosexuals, bisexuals, and transsexuals today. There is little doubt the word was associated with homosexuality in 1908 already, but it mainly had a different meaning; otherwise it would hardly have been used in a children’s story. One of the

meanings of *queer* is ‘strange or odd from a conventional viewpoint; unusually different; singular; eccentric’, but the word has more sinister implications as well. The word can mean ‘of a questionable nature or character; suspicious; shady’, ‘mentally unbalanced or deranged’, ‘effeminate; unmanly’, and ‘bad, worthless, or counterfeit’, among other things. (RHWCD 1992: 1106) So, even when the word was not used in reference to effeminate gay men, it was used as an implication of insanity and immorality, both of which were, of course, closely associated with homosexuality for a long time. It is no wonder, then, that the word was used as a disparaging term for homosexuals. Some people still use it in a derogatory way, but homosexuals themselves have embraced the word.

The adjective *outo* means ‘strange’, both in the eccentric and the unfamiliar sense. It is a fairly neutral word that certainly lacks any sinister connotations in and of itself, and homosexuality is not associated to it. However, *hentomielen* is not a very positive word. It can mean ‘sentimental’, ‘romantic’, or even ‘mawkish’. The literal meaning of the word is ‘soft-minded’, which implies a lack of reason and wit.

In this example from chapter one, the Rat and the Mole have just disembarked on a river bank, and are getting prepared to have a picnic. The Rat allows the Mole to unpack his luncheon basket, and he is very excited about the contents.

**Example 20:**

*. . . his excited friend shook out the tablecloth and spread it, took out all the mysterious packets one by one and arranged their contents in due order, still gasping, ‘Oh my! Oh my!’ at each fresh revelation. (Grahame 1908: 18)*

. . . hänen ihastunut ystävänsä tarttui pöytäliinaan ja levitti sen, otti esille yksitellen kaikki salaperäiset kääröt ja järjesti niiden sisällön aterialla varten huoaen: ”Voi ihme ja kumma!” yhä uusien ihanuuksien ilmestyessä korin kätköistä. (Grahame 1949: 18)

Even if the connotations are not relevant in this context, the noun *revelation* has religious associations. In Christianity, it refers to God revealing himself to people. The Finnish sentence lacks religious connotations. However, the word *ihanuus*, which roughly means ‘lovely thing’, has its own connotations. The word is marked in gender, or so many Finns would argue, as several Finns claim that only girls and women use the adjective *ihana*, meaning ‘lovely’ or ‘wonderful’. Finns often find it amusing when a man uses the word, and many would even argue that any man using the word on a common basis in all seriousness is homosexual and feminine.

I will now look at this example from chapter ten. The barge-woman has just told Toad that she had realized he was lying about being a washerwoman because he was so conceited. She also states that he has clearly never washed even a dish cloth. Toad becomes very angry.

**Example 21:**

‘You common, low, fat barge-woman!’ he shouted; ‘don’t you dare to talk to your betters like that! . . .’ (Grahame 1908: 148)

*Senkin moukkamainen paksu kanava-akka*’, hän huusi, ’uskallapas vain puhutella ylempiäsi tuossa äänilajissa! . . .’ (Grahame 1949: 200)

The word *barge-woman* is a fairly neutral word, even if it expresses a rather classist attitude. As for *kanava-akka* (‘canal hag’), this word adds a sexist dimension that is lacking in the English version.

The word *akka* is a disparaging word for a woman, and it is often used to describe old, unattractive women, especially nagging and unpleasant ones. So, the Finnish version is more disparaging.

From these examples, it can be concluded that the gender connotations of the English version are not always conveyed in the Finnish version, and, occasionally, the Finnish version contains gender-related connotations that do not appear in the English version. In fact, in most of these cases, if the English version does contain gender-related connotations, they are absent in the Finnish version, and, likewise, when the English version does not relay any gender-related connotations, they are conveyed in the Finnish version. Even when gender connotations appear in both versions, they are different from one another, with the exception of “sensible woman” and possibly “trollops” and its Finnish counterpart.

### **7.3 Political Connotations**

While the stories in this book are not specifically political, there are some political connotations. Adult readers, of course, can quite easily detect political undertones in the plot, as it appears that Toad is capable of getting away with his behavior to a great extent because of his wealth, and because the stoats and weasels take over his mansion when he is in prison. However, not all the political connotations in the stories are related to these issues. Most of them are fairly arbitrary, and some have come to exist afterwards as a result of changes in the political climate.

In the following example from chapter one, the Mole has just spent his first day at the river with the Rat, and he is very satisfied with his experience.

#### **Example 22:**

*This day was only the first of many similar ones for the emancipated Mole, each of them longer and fuller of interest as the ripening summer moved onward.* (Grahame 1908: 24)

*Myyrän ensimmäistä joen varrella viettämää päivää seurasi vielä monta muuta, ja jokainen niistä oli entisiä rikkaampi ja antoisampi, mitä pitemmälle kesä kului.* (Grahame 1949: 28)

The adjective *emancipated*, of course, has very strong political and ideological associations. The word implies a strong sense of liberation, and it is often associated with feminism and the Women's Liberation movement in particular. However, *emancipation* is also a concept that has been applied to the Civil Rights Movement for blacks. One of the meanings of the word is 'to free (a slave) from bondage', and the Emancipation Proclamation from 1863 freed the slaves in the territories that were in rebellion against the Union (RHWCD 1992: 435).

Thus, the word has connotations to progressive political ideologies that deal with equal rights and freedom for previously disenfranchised groups. The strongest association, however, is the association to feminism. Women's position in British society was going through some important changes around the time *The Wind in the Willows* was written. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, women's rights activists had managed to win women certain important rights, such as the right to have a divorce, the right to have custody of their children, and the right to own property, and activists kept pushing for women's equality and emancipation in the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Before women received limited suffrage in 1919 and equal suffrage in 1928, the Suffragettes campaigned for women's right to vote. As they were sometimes militant and even violent, the movement received a great deal of attention. Thus, the concept of emancipation may very well have had strong feminist associations around this time.

The idea of emancipation, or any sense of liberation, has been omitted. It could be argued that the use of the word *vapautunut*, Finnish for 'liberated', would have been slightly bizarre

in this context, even if no stranger than the use of *emancipated* in the English version, as the Mole certainly did not have a guardian, and was presumably free to do as he wished even before meeting the Rat, even if he felt obliged to clean his house at the beginning of the story. However, the word *vapautunut* is fairly ambiguous, and it can refer to being more relaxed or more confident in some contexts. This is one of those contexts where the meaning ‘relaxed’ would apply. The word does not have equally strong political associations, so it would have worked quite well.

I will now look at the following example from chapter two, in which Toad is demanding that the Rat and the Mole join him on a trip in his horse cart.

**Example 23:**

*‘Now, you dear good old Ratty,’ said Toad imploringly, ‘don’t begin in that stiff and sniffy sort of way, because you know you’ve got to come . . .’* (Grahame 1908: 30)

*‘No, kunnan veli Rotta’’, Rupikonna sanoi vetoavasti, ‘sinun on turha ruveta puhumaan noin haluttomasti ja ylenkatseellisesti, kun kerran aivan hyvin tiedät, että sinun on tultava mukaan . . .’*  
(Grahame 1949: 36)

The word *veli* usually means ‘brother’, and like its English counterpart, it can be a form of address between members in a religious community that suggests solidarity. In a more political sense, *veli* means ‘comrade’, and implies solidarity between communists. The usual word for comrade in the Soviet communist sense was *toveri*, but *veli* was also used. These expressions have more or less died out in Finland due to the negative political connotations, and would hardly be used in all seriousness today. The expression *veli* also has connotations to religious cults, and is unpopular for that reason as well. The English version lacks these political connotations.

In this following example from chapter five, the Rat and the Mole are on their way to the river when the Mole suddenly smells his old house and begs the Rat to go there with him. The Rat, however, feels that it is not a good idea. The Mole is depressed about this, but does not want to disobey the Rat and turn his back on him.

**Example 24:**

*With a wrench that tore his very heartstrings he set his face down the road and followed submissively in the track of the Rat, while faint, thin little smells, still dogging his retreating nose, reproached him for his new friendship and his callus forgetfulness. (Grahame 1908: 71)*

*Tuska raastoi hänen sydänjuuriaan, kun hän väkinäisesti voimiaan ponnistaen käänsi katseensa tien pintaan ja seurasi alistuvana Rotan jälkiä. Hienonhienot tuoksut seurasivat yhä hänen loittonevaa nenäänsä ja nuhtelivat häntä uuden ystävyysuhteen ja törkeän laiminlyönnin johdosta. (Grahame 1949: 92-93)*

The adjective *submissive* has strong political and social connotations, and while they are not highly relevant to the context, they give the word choice some heavy implications. Submission is often a matter of subjecting oneself to the power of a person or a group of people. Occasionally, as in the case of many religions, submission involves accepting and consenting to the power of authority, such as that of the church one belongs to and the god one worships. However, consent and acceptance are not always involved in submission. Submission may be an act of resignation when one feels powerless to exercise control over one's life. People often submit to the power of others due to oppression, so as to avoid being mistreated and intimidated, maybe even killed. The Stockholm Syndrome, a term used to refer to hostages sympathizing with their captors and often extended to sociopolitical situations involving issues of dominance and submission, is also often a

part of submitting to the authority of a dominant group, so that oppressed persons or groups can convince themselves the oppression and submission are for their own good.

While these heavily sociopolitical connotations may seem far-fetched in this context, the word choice seems to imply that the Mole feels that the Rat is “the boss” in this situation, and that he must obey him. He also seems to try to convince himself that staying away from his old home, resisting the call to return to it, and moving along with the Rat are the rational things to do, despite the fact that it devastates him tremendously that the Rat will not follow him to his beloved home. Submission, even when completely voluntary and not based on fear of punishment, always involves resignation and sacrifice of some kind. Often, however, it also involves hopelessness. This is also the case here. The adjective *alistuva* has similar sociopolitical connotations as *submissive* and implies similar things.

I will now turn to this example from chapter five. The Rat, the Mole, and some field mice are in the Mole’s old house, celebrating his return home. One of the field mice is asked to recite a play, but he is hopelessly shy.

**Example 25:**

*His comrades cheered him on, Mole coaxed and encouraged him, and the Rat went so far as to take him by the shoulders and shake him; but nothing could overcome his stage-fright. (Grahame 1908: 81)*

*Toverit yllyttivät häntä, Myyrä suostutteli ja rohkaisi, Rotta jopa ravisteli hartioista, mutta mikään ei parantanut hänen esiintymiskauhuaan. (Grahame 1949: 105)*

Due to its connotations to communism and the Soviet Union, the word *comrade* is rarely used seriously today, but it was probably perceived to be neutral in 1908. It may not seem obvious, but

the verb *overcome* is a very powerful word with some significant sociopolitical connotations and strong implications. The word has been linked to ideological battles and struggles for civil rights. One overcomes serious problems and challenges, such as obstacles to fair and equal treatment or happiness, controlling fears, overwhelming obsessions, and harmful addictions. Overcoming a problem is always an admirable and often important accomplishment. It also usually involves a great deal of effort, and is thus not achieved easily. Overcoming a problem is very rewarding for this reason.

In the same way as *comrade*, the word *toveri* has associations to communism and the Soviet Union, even if they are not equally strong. The word *comrade* is very loaded, but *toveri* is still used in compound words such as *luokkatoveri* for ‘classmate’, and it can be used as a word for a ‘friend’ without implying any communist ideas. However, the connotation is there. It is worth noting that the English version dates back to pre-Soviet times, but the Finnish version was written in that era. Thus, the word *toveri* is likely to have had such associations to at least the adult readers of the time, and it may still have those connotations to many readers.

The verb *parantaa* means ‘to cure’ or ‘to heal’, but it is not always used very seriously, and it can be applied quite liberally to various harmless conditions, many of which have nothing to do with pathologies. However, the word still has important implications. After all, when it is said that someone has been ‘cured’, it implies that the person must have suffered from some type of a pathology, be it a physical disease, a psychological issue, or a mental problem.

In any case, the word often implies that someone has had a problem that requires treatment, or else it will take control over one’s body and mind and lead to highly undesirable events. If one insists that homosexuals can and should be ‘cured’ of their homosexuality, it is implied that homosexuality is either a disease or a psychological or mental problem that must be treated. This example illustrates that *parantaa*, like its English counterpart *to cure*, can have significant sociopolitical implications. It may seem like a stretch to claim that the use of the word

*parantaa* in this context suggests that the field mouse in question suffers from a pathological fear that controls his life, but stage fright can, indeed, be pathological, and it *does* restrict and control people's lives. The word *voittaa* for 'overcome' would have framed the stage fright as more of a challenge to be conquered than a pathological problem to be cured. However, due to stage fright being a psychological problem, there is no pressing reason to necessarily opt for a word that has more heroic implications.

I will now deal with this example from chapter nine, in which the Rat has become acquainted with the Sea Rat. The Sea Rat tells him stories about his journeys abroad, and the Rat is utterly fascinated by them. As the Sea Rat tells his stories, the Rat gazes into his eyes and feels entranced by them.

**Example 26:**

*The twin lights, the shifting grey and the steadfast red, mastered the Water Rat and held him bound, fascinated, powerless.* (Grahame 1908: 136)

*Nuo kaksi tuiketta, läikkyvän harmaa ja hehkuvan punainen, lumosivat Vesirotan, ja hän alistui niiden valtaan hurmaantuneena, voipuneena* (Grahame 1949: 187)

The verb *master*, when it is not a reference to skill or expertise, has very negative implications. The master-slave relationship is a negative association that comes to mind. The word may not refer to slavery in its concrete sense, but it often suggests that someone or something has power over a person, and the power is of the detrimental kind. An addiction or fear can be said to *master* a person. There is an implication that the power someone or something has over a person is comparable to a master-slave relationship. In this case, however, the "slavery" is of the emotional and psychological kind rather than concrete. The association to slavery (in its mental sense) is

reinforced by the adjective *bound*, which also implies being subordinate and lacking control, or perhaps merely a “slave” to an addiction, emotion, or a belief. The adjective *powerless* also adds to this impression. Being powerless often suggest lack of control and agency, or at least a sense of lacking them.

The word *hurmaantunut* (‘enchanted’) is quite a mild word in comparison to *master*, but the idea of submitting to the power of someone or something (*alistua...valtaan*) certainly has similar implications as *master* and *bound*. Slavery, concrete or emotional, involves submission. Thus, it involves lack of power, control, and agency. It is not usually voluntary, but rather involves resignation and lack of hope for change, but slavery can be a choice, too. The submission involved in it is always a choice, whether in the sense of resignation or in the sense of willingly embracing one’s servitude. The adjective *voipunut*, however, has very different implication from those of *powerless*. The Finnish adjective refers to lack of energy and vigor, whereas the English adjective suggests a sense of hopelessness and resignation involved in lack of control and agency.

#### **7.4 Attitudinal Connotations**

In this section, various attitudinal connotations are dealt with. These connotations are not specifically political or religious, but differ from one another in terms of strength, evaluation, and contexts of usage.

I will now look at the following example from chapter one. The Mole has stumbled upon a river for the first time and is excited about this new discovery. He trots by the river until he gets tired.

#### **Example 27:**

. . . when tired at last, he sat on the bank, while the river still chattered on to him, a babbling procession of the best stories in the world, sent from the heart of from the earth to be told at last to the insatiable sea. (Grahame 1908: 13)

. . . vihdoin uuvuttuaan hän istahti rantatöyräälle joen yhä rupatellessa solisevana ketjuna maailman parhaita tarinoita, jotka olivat matkalla maan sydäimestä kerrottaviksi koskaan kyltymättömälle merelle. (Grahame 1949: 11)

The verb *chatter* has both positive and negative connotations. In a positive sense, chatter refers to friendly and relaxed talk among equals. In a negative sense, however, it can also refer to ‘rapid and often purposeless talk’ (RHWCD 1992: 230), and often of the excessive kind. In this context, the word is used in a positive sense, but the word could have quite different implications in a different situation.

The verb *babble*, on the other hand, in reference to actual talk, only has negative implications. When it refers to the sounds a baby makes or the sounds of a river, it is not a negative word, but in reference to talk, it often indicates nonsensical, excessive talk, and thus suggests quite a judgmental tone: ‘to talk idly, irrationally, excessively or foolishly; chatter or prattle’ (RHWCD 1992: 99). It is common to speak of ‘incoherent babbling’, which also reinforces this association. However, in this context, the verb is actually used to refer to a river, which gives it a more ambiguous nature. It could be used as a rather unfortunate synonym for *chatter*, a reference to the sounds of a river, or both. The verb *rupatella* is somewhat more positive than *chatter*, as it does not have any negative implications. Like *chatter*, it refers to informal, relaxed, and friendly talk, but it never suggests an annoyance with the speakers, and it does not imply that the talk is useless or excessive. It suggests a fairly high level of familiarity between speakers, more so than *chatter*.

The verb *soliseva* is also more positive and less ambiguous than *babbling* in this context. The Finnish verb is used in reference to the sound of the movement of water, whereas *babbling* is usually used in that sense in the fixed expression *babbling brook*. The word *soliseva* lacks any indication of nonsensical talk and is a neutral expression.

I will now look at the following example from chapter one. The Rat and the Mole are on a boat trip, and they are about to disembark. The following is what the Rat says.

**Example 28:**

‘. . . *Now then! Here’s our backwater at last, where we’re going to lunch*’ (Grahame 1908: 18)

‘. . . *No niin! Tässä on vihdoinkin suvanto, jossa laskemme maihin syömään lounasta* (Grahame 1949: 17)

The noun *backwater* has rather unfortunate connotations, as it is often used to refer to a small, backward place, often with narrow-minded and ignorant people, lacking in progress of any kind: ‘a place or state of stagnant backwardness’ (RHWCD 1992: 102). The word is hardly meant to have any negative associations in this context, and this may not have been a common expression for such a stagnant place in Britain in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, but for many readers, the association is inevitable. The noun *suvanto* means ‘backwater’, but it lacks the negative connotations of its English counterpart. In fact, the associations can be quite positive, as the word appears to incorporate the poetic and archaic word *suvi*, meaning ‘summer’, into itself. Since the Finnish winter is fairly long, cold, and dark, Finns often appreciate summer to a great extent, and the word *suvi* itself certainly has a romantic ring to it.

In this example from chapter two, the Rat talks about rowing to Toad because he assumes that Toad is still enthusiastic about the hobby. However, Toad tells him that he has stopped rowing long ago, and does not have positive things to say about his former hobby.

**Example 29:**

‘*Silly boyish amusement . . .*’ (Grahame 1908: 29)

‘*Typerää lapsellista ajanvietettä . . .*’ (Grahame 1949: 34)

The adjectives *boyish* and *lapsellinen* naturally mean different things, and they have very different implications. It is worth noting that *boyish* is marked in gender, whereas *lapsellinen* is gender-neutral. While *boyish* can be used to describe girls, it refers to a person having the qualities or characteristics of a boy. Depending on the context, this can be a positive or a negative thing. The word *boyish* is meant as a negative expression in this context, implying immaturity. However, the word does not always imply such a negative, judgmental value statement. In fact, in many contexts, *boyish* suggests charms and youthfulness in a positive sense. Also, boys are expected to be wild, rebellious, ill-mannered, disobedient, and even childish and playful by nature, and these qualities are occasionally found endearing.

As for the adjective *lapsellinen*, as its English counterpart *childish*, the word is always negative and judgmental, and it suggests immaturity and behavior that is not age-appropriate. Someone characterized as *lapsellinen* is labeled foolish and infantile. The word lacks any positive sense of youthfulness, and may very well be applied to old people equally often as young people. While an old man or a female person can be considered *boyish*, it merely indicates that he or she has the youthful characteristics of a boy. The adjective *lapsellinen* implies nothing about gender qualities, and is not a matter of youthfulness per se. The word choice is harsh, but it is not an

unreasonably negative one considering Toad's contemptuous attitude towards the hobby that he was just recently very passionate about.

I will now deal with the following example from chapter two. The Rat, the Mole, and Toad are camping. The previous day, Toad had slept very long while the Rat and the Mole had to do all the work. However, the following day, the Rat and the Mole force Toad out of bed and make him do his fair share. Toad had been very excited about the carefree life out in the wild, but is not quite so enthusiastic once he has to work, too.

**Example 30:**

*In consequence, when the time came for starting next morning, Toad was by no means so rapturous about the simplicity of the primitive life, and indeed attempted to resume his place in his bunk, whence he was hauled by force. (Grahame 1908: 33)*

*Niinpä kun seuraavana aamuna tuli aika lähetä matkaan, Konna ei ollut enää yhtä hurmaantunut alkukantaisen elämän yksinkertaisuuteen, vaan suorastaan yritti kömpiä makuukojuunsa, mistä hänet oli väkipakolla vedettävä esiin. (Grahame 1949: 41)*

The adjective *primitive* has some political and social connotations that are not particularly relevant to the context. However, they are the main reason this word is almost always very negative. Characteristics associated with primitive people and cultures have mostly been highly negative, some of them including 'violent', 'barbaric', and 'ignorant'. Cultures are seen as primitive when they involve uneducated, superstitious people living in poor conditions. Even people living in wealthy nations can be seen as primitive. Generally, also in reference to living conditions, the word implies lack of modern luxury, civilization, and progress, denoting a backward, stagnant lifestyle. The word *alkukantainen* is also negative and implies lack of civilization and progress. However, it

can also mean the same as ‘primal’, which is not quite as negative. Not everyone is primitive, but all people have primal instincts, after all.

In the following example from chapter eight, Toad is lying to the engine driver about being a poor washerwoman with several children, and implies that he needs to return to them, or bad things will happen.

**Example 31:**

*‘And they’ll be hungry – and playing with matches – and upsetting lamps, the little innocents! – and quarrelling, and going on generally. Oh dear, oh dear!’* (Grahame 1908: 118)

*‘Ja nälissään ne ovat tietysti – ja leikkivät tulitikuilla – ja kaatavat lamppuja, ne pienet herranenkeli – ja riitelevät ja mellastavat. Voi surkeata!’* (Grahame 1949: 159)

The word *innocent* is, in many ways, a loaded word. It can have very different associations to people depending on their worldviews. It can have a highly positive meaning, as well as several negative ones. Innocence, apart from the meaning ‘not guilty’, often implies lack of experience, lack of knowledge, and naiveté. It is particularly associated with sexual inexperience. In its most positive sense, *innocent* refers to moral ‘purity’, that is, the lack of evil: ‘free from moral wrong; without sin; pure’ (RHWCD 1992: 695). Of course, what is determined ‘evil’ varies according to people’s ideologies. Innocence can refer to lack of evil intentions, naiveté, and ignorance: meanings include ‘not involving evil intent or motive’, ‘having or showing the simplicity or naiveté of an unworldly person; guileless; ingenuous’, or ‘uninformed or unaware; ignorant’ (ibid). It can even suggest stupidity: ‘a simpleton or idiot’ (ibid). The noun *innocent* can be a reference to ‘a young child’ (ibid), which demonstrates people’s attitudes and expectations of childhood. Young children are expected to be good and sincere, but they are also expected to be naïve, ignorant, and

inexperienced, and they certainly are not expected to have knowledge in sexual matters. Those who want to retain children's innocence wish to protect children and have a patronizing attitude to them. They do not want children to think or act independently, and are willing to censor things and keep certain knowledge from children. Thus, the word, although positive in most contexts, has rather negative connotations when not used as an antonym for *guilty*.

The word *herranenkehi* is an explicitly Christian expression. It implies similar things as *innocent*. Angels, of course, are morally pure, and thus free from sin and evil. This makes angels innocent. Comparing children to angels, as often happens, implies that children are assumed and expected to be "pure" in a similar way. The word *enkeli*, however, puts a stronger emphasis on the goodness of these children than *innocent* does. Angels may be sincere, but there is no particular reason to assume they would be naïve and ignorant.

I will now look at this following example from chapter nine. The Sea Rat encourages the Rat to travel round the world, and makes it clear that he has no desire to remain in one place until he is too old to travel:

**Example 32:**

*' . . . Then someday, someday long hence, jog home here of you will, when the cup has been drained and the play has been played, and sit down by your quiet river with a store of goodly memories for company . . . '* (Grahame 1908: 138)

*'' . . . Joskus tulevaisuudessa, kun malja on juotu ja peli pelattu, voit vetäytyä kotitienoillesi jos mielesi tekee ja istahtaa hiljaisen jokesi varrelle seurustelemaan muistojesi kanssa . . . ''* (Grahame 1949: 189)

The words *the cup has been drained* are a Biblical allusion. They imply a sense of closure and resignation. The wording suggests that returning home and ceasing to travel are matters of resignation, and that staying in one place equals not only giving up, but also a certain ‘‘death’’: monotony and repetition; a safe and boring existence characterized by emptiness. Thus, staying put in one place is something he will only do when there is no other choice. The words *the play has been played* have similar implications.

The words *kun malja on juotu* are the Finnish counterpart of the English biblical reference. However, *pele on pelattu* is a fairly ominous expression in Finnish. It suggests that all hope is lost, and there is no point in trying to succeed at something, or to actually survive. It is an utterly pessimistic expression for a hopeless, or what is deemed hopeless, situation. Of course, *the play has been played* suggests a sense of resignation in some contexts, but the expression is not quite as dramatic, and may actually merely indicate closure without a trace of melancholy. The highly negative attitude to remaining in one place is further emphasized by the use of the word *vetäytyä*, meaning ‘retreat’. In this context, this implies withdrawal and isolation, and due to its use in contexts of war, it also implies giving up. The words *jog home* do not imply such a negative attitude to returning home.

I will now turn to the following example from chapter nine. The Rat has fallen into a trance after listening to the stories of the Sea Rat, and the Mole is very concerned. He holds the Rat down by force to prevent him from going away.

**Example 33:**

*Gradually the Rat sank into a troubled doze, broken by starts and confused murmurings of things strange and wild and foreign to the unenlightened Mole; and from that he passed into a deep slumber.* (Grahame 1908: 139)

*Kouristuksenomaisesti nytkähtelevä Rotta oli alkanut hourailla outoja ja hurjia, Myyrälle täysin käsittämättömiä asioita, ja tästä vakavasta horrostilasta hän vähitellen vaipui syvään uneen.*  
(Grahame 1949: 191)

An unenlightened person, in many other contexts, would be ignorant, superstitious, gullible, irrational, and illogical. However, in a context like this, the implications are not quite that harsh. It is simply suggested that the Mole is unaware of many things, but could perfectly well attain knowledge of them. A person can be enlightened in a spiritual or philosophical sense, not merely in an intellectual sense. Of course, in this context, the Mole is ignorant of facts rather than spiritual or philosophical principles. The word often conveys a rather arrogant attitude and comes across as condescending and patronizing. The word *käsittämätön* would appear to imply a highly pessimistic attitude; namely, that the Mole is incapable of understanding the things Rat has become aware of. At least *unenlightened* implies a potential to become enlightened; to understand and to learn. However, the word is quite ambiguous, and it could be interpreted to mean that the Rat is babbling incoherently.

I will now deal with this example from chapter ten. This is the example where Toad has become angry at the barge-woman.

**Example 34:**

*'You common, low, fat barge-woman!' he shouted; don't you dare to talk to your betters like that! . . .'* (Grahame 1908: 148)

*Senkin moukkamainen paksu kanava-akka'', hän huusi, ''uskallapas vain puhutella ylempiäsi tuossa äänilajissa! . . .''* (Grahame 1949: 200)

In British usage, *common* is largely a semi-euphemistic expression for *low-class*. It is a slightly more polite expression than *chavvy* or *trashy*, the latter being more common in America. The word is neutral enough in itself, and it is simply a word for the working classes. In fact, many working-class people have no issue with describing themselves as “the common people”. However, even members of the working classes that take pride in their social class do not want to be “*too common*”. In modern terms, that would make them low-class, boorish *chavs*. While some people might apply the word *common* to themselves and not see it as a negative word, no self-respecting person would be a self-proclaimed *moukka* (‘boor’). People characterized as *moukkamainen* are uneducated, ignorant, low-class people. Worse yet, a *moukka* is generally assumed to be an obnoxious chauvinist male with racist, sexist, homophobic, and xenophobic views. Men like this are also expected to be loud-mouthed, violent bully types who cannot restrain themselves when drunk, which is what they often are. A more popular word for people like this is *juntti*.

In the following example from chapter ten, Toad has been given a ride by two men who thought he was a poor washerwoman. They have let him drive, and he begins to drive recklessly. When they tell him to be careful, he reveals his true identity.

**Example 35:**

‘. . . *I am the Toad, the motorcar-snatcher, the prison-breaker, the Toad who always escapes! . . .*’

(Grahame 1908: 157)

‘. . . *Olen Rupikonna, autovaras, vankilanmurtaja, Rupikonna, joka aina pääsee pakoön! . . .*’

(Grahame 1949: 213)

Using the word *snatcher* instead of *thief* downplays the seriousness of the offense. It is a fairly playful word, after all. The word *autovaras* (‘car thief’) is a standard, no-nonsense word, and it is

not judgmental, but neither is it euphemistic or playful. The use of this word would imply that Toad recognizes that what he has done is, indeed, a crime, and that stealing a car is wrong. However, in earlier parts of the story, it has become clear that Toad firmly believes that he never meant to steal the car, and that he was merely “borrowing” it and was sincerely going to return it. Thus, it seems unlikely that Toad would so frankly admit to being a thief.

The following example comes from chapter six. Toad has taken back his promise not to drive cars anymore, and the Badger is furious.

**Example 36:**

*‘You backsliding animal, didn’t you tell me just now, in there – ‘ (Grahame 1908: 87)*

*‘‘Senkin luopio, etkö hetki sitten sanonut minulle tuolla sisällä – ‘ (Grahame 1949: 114)*

The adjective *backsliding* is quite a judgmental word that implies betrayal. A backslider is not necessarily a turncoat or a traitor. However, since *to backslide* means ‘to relapse into bad habits, sinful behavior, or undesirable activities’ (RHWCD 1992: 101), calling someone a backslider suggests that the person who has relapsed has already shown a great deal of solidarity to a group or to certain values, only to go back into practicing these values again despite previously condemning them. The word *backslider* is often used to describe religious converts who have relapsed into sinful behavior that they have rejected and condemned after their conversion. The word can even be used to describe a de-converted person, perhaps a former cult member, or a person who used to believe in superstitious pseudo-science, who relapses into old, irrational patterns of thought. The same goes for people who relapse into former patterns of thought involving political and ideological issues. The word is certainly very disapproving, but it implies that the actions and thoughts may only be signs of temporary lack of morals or logic, and that the person may “come back to his or her senses”.

The word *luopio* can mean ‘renegade’ in a political sense or an ‘apostate’ in a religious sense. In either case, it suggests betrayal to one’s values and to people to whom one has shown solidarity. It is a far worse thing to call a person than *backslider*, as a backslider is considered to be able to feel remorse over the relapse into former patterns of thought and behavior, and to regain one’s senses and judgment and behave in an acceptable way again. A *luopio*, on the other hand, has allegedly lost his or her sense of right and wrong as well as his or her mind, and is far less likely to do the right thing and have the right views.

## 8 Conclusion

In this thesis, I set out to find various connotations in the stories in *The Wind in the Willows* and its Finnish translation *Kaislikossa suhisee*. The goal was to study the types of connotations present in these stories, and to determine to what extent they affected the stories themselves. This involved determining whether the connotations are relevant within the context, and if they were, demonstrating the implications these connotations have. Since translations cannot be similar on all levels, it was crucial to compare the connotations in the English and Finnish versions of the stories. This was done to highlight any different implications the versions might have, and how they affect the story.

While it was not my intention to pass judgment on the Finnish translation, and my assumption was that the connotations were inevitably going to differ in the original and in the translation, I did have some criteria to determine whether the translation works well or not. I wanted to support the view that this translation, just like any other translation, should be readable and understandable in the sense that it has to be coherent and consistent with regard to the ideas it tries to convey. Also, I have tried to emphasize the importance of using language that the target readers find natural and clear, so that they are not confused by any elements of the Finnish version. The

connotations in the Finnish version have to make sense within the stories for this reason. If the connotations are inappropriate within the context in which they appear, the stories might seem inconsistent and incoherent. In case the connotations appear appropriate, the translation is obviously far more likely to be perceived as enjoyable by its Finnish readers, and thus become established as a popular book. If the target readers themselves reject the translation, after all, the translation has defeated its purpose. Translations are always created for the target readers with their needs in mind, so the least one should expect from a translation is that its various elements, such as connotations, make sense within the entity, and thus make a coherent entity in the first place. Since the book in question is aimed for children, this becomes particularly crucial, as children are most likely to be impatient with texts that are difficult to read and to understand. Children enjoy compelling stories, and they are unlikely to appreciate any politically correct motives behind foreignizing and challenging translations.

In doing the analysis, I discovered that the stories contained a great deal of different connotations. I could divide these connotations into four rough categories: religious, gender-related, political, and attitudinal connotations. Obviously, there was some overlap, as gender-related and political connotations are inevitable going to convey various attitudes.

It turned out that the gender-related and political connotations in particular did not have a major effect on the stories themselves in the sense that the stories did not specifically relay political ideas or ideas about gender or sexuality. This was true of both the English and the Finnish versions. One crucial reason for this was that some of the words did not gain their gender-related or political connotations until some time or even long after the stories were released. Connotations related to homosexuality (*gay*, *queer*) and the Soviet Union (*comrades*) in the English version, for example, came to exist after the stories had already become popular reading. However, it is useful to bear in mind that many adult readers could have detected the homosexual connotations despite the fact that they were less common in the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Also, in the Finnish

example, the word *toveri* (translation for ‘comrade’) could have conjured up these communist connotations, as the translation was made during the Soviet era, whereas the English version predated it.

While some of the political and gender connotations were very similar in nature (*hussy* vs. *letukka*, *sensible woman* vs. *järkevä nainen*, *submissive* vs. *alistuva*, *comrade* vs. *toveri*, *bound* vs. *alistua...valtaan*), there were also some significant differences in the gender-related and political connotations relayed in the English and Finnish version. The noun *wench* is a term of endearment, whereas *typykkä* carries sexist associations to modern Finnish adult readers. The verb *overcome*, in reference to stage fright, implies conquering a serious challenge in a heroic way, whereas *parantaa* suggests a psychological problem that can and should be cured. These differences matter very little on the grand scale of things, that is, with regard to the context of the entire stories.

It is also worth noting that these gender-related and political connotations did not appear consistently in both the English examples and their Finnish translations. That is, the homosexual connotations (*gay*, *queer*) in the English examples, for example, were not conveyed in their respective Finnish translations (*kirjavoima*, *outo*). The gender connotation of *hysterical* was not relayed in the Finnish version. Neither was the gender connotation of *trollop* conveyed in the Finnish translation. The gender-related connotations of the word *modest*, however, are less obvious, as the word is used in reference to Toad, a male character, which makes it possible to argue that *vaatimaton* in the Finnish version expresses the same idea. The word *emancipated*, which has very strong political connotations, is not translated in any way that would convey such political associations. The word *powerless* has connotations to lack of agency that *voipunut* does not have. However, the fact that these connotations fail to come up in the Finnish translation does nothing to affect the flow of the story or the coherence or consistency of the translation. After all, the gender-related and political connotations are fairly isolated in the original stories in the sense that the

stories, in their entirety, are not political in nature and do not address gender issues or political issues of any other kind.

In some instances, the Finnish examples contain gender-related or political connotations that are not present in their English versions. This is true of The Finnish examples containing the words *rehti* (for *honest*), *ihanuus* (as opposed to *revelation* in the English version), and *kanava-akka* (barge-woman in the original). These words have gender-related connotations that are missing in the English examples. This also holds true for *veli*, which has communist connotations lacking in the original version. However, the appearance of these connotations does not make the Finnish version any more or less political in nature, and it certainly does not create any inconsistencies.

Both the English and Finnish versions turned out to have many religious connotations and clear religious allusions. Unsurprisingly, these connotations and allusions were mostly of a Christian nature. After all, Christianity is and was, at the time when the English version was written as well as at the time the Finnish translation was written, the dominant religion in England and Finland alike, and a significant contributor to both English and Finnish culture and society. While the stories are not specifically religious, the religious elements cannot be ignored.

A clear difference between the English and Finnish versions with regard to religious connotations is that the English version contains more religious connotations, as some of them fail to be conveyed in the Finnish translation. The religious connotations of *something up above*, *behold*, *repentant*, *Lord*, *Awe*, *smitten*, and *earthly* are not relayed in the Finnish translation. However, this does not mean that the Finnish translation does not have several religious connotations that are present in the original stories. The religious associations of *convert*, *called and chosen*, and *everlasting night* also appear in the Finnish versions, and with very similar implications (*käännyttää, kutsutut ja valitut, ikuisuuden yö*).

However, when both the English and Finnish versions contain religious connotations within the same part of the story, these connotations also differ from one another to some degree. The connotations of *mission of mercy* and *laupeudentyö* differ from each other, as the reformer emphasizes the systematic nature of proselytizing, while the latter focuses on the altruistic nature of religious people. Both *sermon* and *parannussaarna* can have both positive and negative religious connotations, but *parannussaarna* emphasizes the transformational effect of a sermon on the listener. The adjective *mortal* has the implication of being a mere human and thus humble and destructible, whereas *maallinen* emphasizes the sinful nature of all people and things that are not heavenly and divine. In the case of *summons* vs. *sanoma* and *rescue* vs. *pelastaa*, it is the Finnish translations that have a religious connotation where one is not present in the English version. However, these connotations are specifically linked to the context, as the words only have religious implications depending on the context, and the context allows for these associations to be conjured up.

Despite the differences between the connotations and the fact that they are not consistently relayed in both versions, the English and Finnish stories manage to convey some religious connotations and allusions. It is also important to note that I have not been able to deal with each example of religious connotations in the original version and the translation. However, it appears that the original version contains slightly more religious connotations than the Finnish version, but both have a religious nature despite the book not being particularly religious.

With regard to the attitudinal connotations, they differ from one another in significant ways even when they are consistently negative or positive in both the English example and its Finnish translation. There are cases where either the English or Finnish words clearly have much more negative or positive connotations. In many of the cases, the Finnish words have more negative connotations. The adjective *boyish* is not exclusively negative, and is, in fact, often used to describe the youthful nature of a male or masculine person, whereas *lapsellinen* is always a negative word.

In the case of *the cup has been played and the play has been played*, as opposed to *malja on juotu ja peli pelattu*, The Finnish version conveys a greater sense of resignation and pessimism, and thus a far more negative view of settling down. Similarly, *vetäytyä* in the Finnish version suggests retreating, giving up, and isolating oneself, whereas *jog home* implies no such attitude. While *unenlightened* can imply an arrogant view of someone with a different viewpoint, it is presumably more optimistic than *käsittämätön*, which suggests either incoherent babbling on the part of the speaker or the inability of the listener to grasp the gist of what someone else is explaining. The adjective *common* is fairly negative, but still often used by working-class people to describe themselves, whereas *moukkamainen* is very negative and implies obnoxiousness. The noun *motorcar-snatcher* is not as serious as *autovaras*. A *backsliding* person is frowned upon, but he or she is still perceived to be capable of embracing the “right” values and behavior again. A *luopio*, on the other hand, is considered a lost cause and judged more harshly.

However, there are also instances where the English words have negative connotations and the Finnish examples positive ones. The verb *chatter* and the adjective *babbling* have more negative connotations than *rupatella* and *soliseva*, even if babbling is taken to be a reference to the sounds of the river. In any context, the Finnish words have fairly positive connotations. The noun *backwater* carries very negative associations, whereas *suvanto* has positive connotations, if any at all. The adjective *primitive* is also slightly more negative than *alkukantainen*. The word *innocent* often implies rather unfortunate aspects of a person’s level of knowledge and experience, whereas *herranenkeli* emphasizes the goodness of the person in question. (They do, however, both imply moral purity.)

As I have been able to deal with only a fraction of the many examples of attitudinal connotations, I would not make generalizations about the level of positivity or negativity in either version. It is also worth noting that isolated words in either version do not have a strong enough impact on the whole story to make it much more positive or negative in comparison to the other

version. However, there are some parts of the story where the Finnish version contains even more negative implications, such as Toad's remark in the Finnish translation in which he described his previous hobby as *lapsellinen*, 'childish', rather than *boyish*. Also, the Sea Rat clearly demonstrates an even more negative attitude to ceasing to travel round the world, returning home, and settling down in the Finnish version, as the word choices *pele pelattu* and *vetäytyä* suggest. Toad also appears to have more vitriol towards the barge-woman in the Finnish version, as *moukkamainen* is a much greater insult than common. Besides, he refers to her as *kanava-akka* in the same context, a sexist wording that is much more offensive than just calling her a *barge-woman*, as in the original.

While there have been many studies that deal with the issues of translating for children, and while many scholars have argued that writing for a specific target audience is the crucial goal in translation rather than striving for equivalence on as many levels of the original text as possible, connotations have received very little attention from researchers in the field of translation or otherwise. This is understandable for at least two reasons. One is that connotations are often considered to be too subjective to be studied, and this leads to a hesitance to make generalizations about the associations that some words or expressions might have. Scholars often restrict their analysis to a few words, and have relatively little to say about the connotations words do or may have. Connotations are apparently not viewed to be a topic on which one can base an entire study. This may be because researchers are reluctant to pay too much attention to such minute details, especially since words can have so many different connotations to different readers. Connotations also depend on context. These considerations may lead some researchers to conclude that focusing on connotations could result in reading too much into word choices. There may be a fear of failing to see the forest for the trees.

However, specifically the complexity of connotations is a valid reason to devote studies to them. While connotations are sometimes highly subjective, there are inevitably going to be words and expressions that gain cultural significance due to their frequent occurrence in specific

contexts. Precisely the fact that these connotations are going to be positive for some members of society and negative for others makes for a fascinating topic of study. The Finnish word *rehti*, for example, illustrates this well. Many Finns would certainly regard this word as strictly positive, with absolutely no negative implications about people who do not qualify as *rehti*, and no problematic sociopolitical issues would be attached to its usage. However, those who are never referred to as *rehti* might experience an underlying feeling of annoyance with the word that they cannot quite articulate or explain to themselves. An in-depth study of cultural and sociopolitical connotations of such words might bring awareness to why certain words are only used by certain members of society to refer to specific types of members within that society. Connotations need *not* be the same for all members of a given speech community before they can be analyzed. In fact, if a word can have numerous connotations to various subgroups within a society, it enables a detailed and intriguing analysis of just how dependent connotations are on context, and why it matters who uses a specific wording or who receives this wording. Neither is it a problem that many contexts affect the connotations (cultural contexts and textual contexts), as this allows for a versatile look at factors that determine the associations that will or may be evoked by words or expressions.

Another possible reason why connotations are ignored is that in translation, it is assumed that many elements of the original text will be lost. Whether this is seen as inherently bad or as a positive opportunity for creativity varies depending on the approaches scholars have to translation, but translation scholars agree that it would be impossible to retain the various nuances of the source text, including the original connotations of words. Thus, connotations are going to differ to a great extent between the original text and the translation. This may give some scholars the idea that comparing connotations in the source text to those in the target text is futile, since there are presumably not going to be many matches between the connotations. However, if the connotations are drastically different in the translation, it allows for an analysis of just how much this affects the implications in the two texts, and whether the connotations show any particular

patterns. Patterns may indicate a coherent and consistent approach by the translator to stay true to his or her version of the text. One possible pattern, for example, could be that the connotations in the target text are consistently more negative. Of course, it could turn out that the connotations are not consistently anything at all. This, in turn, allows for an analysis of whether this has any effect on the coherence of the translation.

My study had some limitations and problems. One problem is that the results cannot be generalized. They apply to these particular texts. Another problem is that due to space limitations and the complexity of connotations, I could not deal with the potential connotations in a more versatile way. I was able write general things about the cultural connotations of words, but I could not delve too deep into, for example, how they may be positive for some groups of people in some contexts even if they are largely considered negative by the whole source language or target language community, or vice versa. Neither was I able to pay much attention to the dimension of time with regard to connotations. More could also have been written about the contexts and just how greatly they affect the connotations: precisely how different the connotations would be in different contexts, what these contexts are, and what the connotations would be in these various contexts. It also was not easy to make an obvious connection between the importance of connotations to the coherence and readability of a translation, and the coherence and readability of a translated children's book in particular.

Some potential topics for further studies have already been alluded to above: specific patterns or lack of patterns with regard to connotations and the differences in these between the source and target texts, as well as the myriad of potential connotations for various subgroups within society in both the source and target cultures could be the topics of more detailed studies into connotations in source and target texts. There could also be a study that focuses more on the dimension of time and how it shapes the connotations of words. It could also be studied how likely

children are going to detect connotations, whether they affect the way children will perceive the world, and how different connotations can be for children and adults.

## Bibliography

### *Primary sources*

Grahame, Kenneth 1993 (1908). *The Wind in the Willows*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited.

Grahame, Kenneth 1949 (1908). *Kaislikossa suhisee*. Finnish Translation in 1949 by Eila Piispanen. Porvoo: WSOY.

### *Secondary sources*

Aaltonen, Sirkku 2002: Kun Antto Puuronen Suomeen muutti: kulttuurisidonnainen käännöstutkimus työvälineenä. In Riitta Oittinen and Pirjo Mäkinen (eds.), *Alussa oli käännös*. 2nd edition. Tampere: Tampere University Press, 388-406.

Bassnett, Susan 2005. *Translation Studies*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. London and New York: Routledge.

Bell, Roger T. 1991. *Translation and Translating. Theory and Practice*. London and New York: Longman.

*Britannica Concise Encyclopedia* 2003. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica.

Desmidt, Isabelle 2006. A Prototypical Approach within Descriptive Translation Studies? Colliding Norms in Translated Children's Literature. In Jan Van Coillie and Walter P. Verschueren (eds.), *Children's Literature in Translation. Challenges and Strategies*. Manchester and New York: St. Jerome Publishing, 79-96.

Ghesquiere, Rita 2006. Why Does Children's Literature Need Translations? In Jan Van Coillie and Walter P. Verschueren (eds.), *Children's Literature in Translation. Challenges and Strategies*. Manchester and New York: St. Jerome Publishing, 19-33.

Hatim, Basil and Ian Mason 1997. *The Translator as Communicator*. London and New York: Routledge.

House, Juliane 1997. *Translation Quality Assessment: a Model Revisited*. Tübingen: Günter Narr Verlag.

Jakobsen, Arnt Lykke 1993. Translation as textual (re)production. In Justa Holz-Mänttari and Christiane Nord (eds.), *Traducere Navem. Festschrift für Katharina Reiß zum 70.*

- Geburtstag*. Tampere: Department of Translation Studies, 65-76.
- Jakobson, Roman 1989 (1959). On linguistic aspects of translation. In Chesterman (ed.), *Readings in Translation Theory*. Loimaa: Finn Lectura, 53-60.
- Jantunen, Jarmo H. 2005. Hyvin kummallista vai kovin hyvää? – Esimerkkejä käännösuomen epäkonventionaalisista valintasuhteista. In Anna Mauranen and Jarmo Harri Jantunen (eds.), *Käännösuomeksi: tutkimuksia suomennosten kielestä*. Tampere: Tampere University Press, 163-184.
- Jänis, Marja 2002. Kääntämisen laatu. In Riitta Oittinen and Pirjo Mäkinen (eds.), *Alussa oli käännös*. 2nd edition. Tampere: Tampere University Press, 67-81
- Koller, W. 1989 (1979). Equivalence in Translation Theory. In Andrew Chesterman (ed.), *Readings in Translation Theory*. Loimaa: Finn Lectura, 99-104.
- Koskinen, Kaisa 2002. Ekvivalenssista erojen leikkiin. Käännöstiede ja kääntäjän etiikka. In Riitta Oittinen and Pirjo Mäkinen (eds.), *Alussa oli käännös*. 2nd edition. Tampere: Tampere University Press, 374-387.
- Kußmaul, Paul 1985. The Degree of Semantic Precision in Translation. *Babel* 31 (1), 12-19.
- Lathey, Gillian 2006. The Translator Revealed. Didacticism, Cultural Mediation and Visions of the Child Reader in Translators' Prefaces. In Jan Van Coillie and Walter P. Verschueren (eds.), *Children's Literature in Translation. Challenges and Strategies*. Manchester and New York: St. Jerome Publishing, 1-18.
- Leech, Geoffrey 1974. *Semantics*. Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Newmark, Peter 1981. *Approaches to Translation*. London: Pergamon Press.
- Newmark, Peter 1989 (1977). Communicative and semantic translation. In Andrew Chesterman (ed.), *Readings in Translation Theory*. Loimaa: Finn Lectura, 116-140.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Charles R. Taber 1969. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Nord, Christiane 1997. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity. Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester and Northampton: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Oittinen, Riitta 1993: *I Am Me – I Am Other. On the Dialogics of Translating for Children*. Tampere: University of Tampere, Department of Translation Studies.
- Oittinen, Riitta 1995. *Kääntäjän karnevaali*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Oittinen, Riitta 2006. No Innocent Act. On the Ethics of Translating for Children. In Jan Van Coillie and Walter P. Verschueren (eds.), *Children's Literature in Translation. Challenges and Strategies*. Manchester and New York: St. Jerome Publishing, 35-45.
- Oittinen, Riitta 2002. Tekstilaji ja strategia: ajatuksia kaunokirjallisesta kääntämisestä. In

Riitta Oittinen and Pirjo Mäkinen (eds.), *Alussa oli käänös*. 2nd edition. Tampere: Tampere University Press, 165-185.

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

Orjala, Ulla 2008. Russkies and Ivans. References to the Russians in Väinö Linna's *Tuntematon Sotilas* and in Its English Translation. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylä University Press.

Oxford English Dictionary 1989. 2nd edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Puurttinen, Tiina 2005. Käännössuomen piirteitä lastenkirjallisuudessa. In Anna Mauranen and Jarmo Harri Jantunen (eds.), *Käännössuomeksi: tutkimuksia suomennosten kielestä*. Tampere: Tampere University Press, 211-223.

Puurttinen, Tiina 2002. Käännösten hyväksyttävyyt. In Riitta Oittinen and Pirjo Mäkinen (eds.), *Alussa oli käänös*. 2nd edition. Tampere: Tampere University Press, 82-94.

*Random House Webster's College Dictionary* 1992. New York: Random House.

Reiß, Katharina and Hans J. Vermeer 1986 (1984). *Mitä kääntäminen on. Teoriaa ja käytäntöä*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Saeed, John I. 2003. *Semantics*. Cornwall: Blackwell Publishing.

Snell-Hornby, Mary 1995. *Translation studies. An Integrated Approach*. Revised edition.

Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Vehmas-Lehto, Inkeri 1999. *Kopiointia vai kommunikointia. Johdatus käänösteoriaan*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Helsinki: Finn Lectura.

Women's History Then & Now. <http://www.cwrl.utexas.edu/~ulrich/femhist/madness>, accessed April 21<sup>st</sup>, 2009.

Zhongying, Fan 1990. Some Remarks on the Criteria of Translation. *Babel* 36 (2), 97-110.