

Mirena Väänänen

BETWEEN TWO WORLDS
Characterization of a Main Character
in the Finnish Translations of the Chronicles of Narnia

ABSTRACT

Mirena Väänänen: *Between Two Worlds. Characterization of a Main Character in the Chronicles of Narnia*
Bachelor's Thesis
Tampere University
Bachelor's Programme in English Language, Literature and Translation
September 2020

In my thesis I explore the translations of Clive Staples Lewis' the Chronicles of Narnia from English into Finnish. The novels have been translated from English into Finnish by translators Kyllikki Hämäläinen and Kaarina Helakisa. The fantasy book series was first released in the 1950's and has gained international popularity ever since, being viewed today as a literary classic. The novels have been translated into 47 different languages in total and have also been made into films. The hypothesis of my work is that even in a literary translation, domestication is used and that affects the way in which a character is viewed by the reader of a translation.

The aim of my research is to extract from the Chronicles of Narnia passages that feature the character of Edmund and explore his characterization and development as a character in light of translation studies. The method of my research is comparative analysis. I have included various passages from the novels in my thesis alongside with their Finnish translations, and I view from different translational perspectives how the character is portrayed in Finnish as opposed to in English. I have narrowed my investigation to the original English versions of the Chronicles of Narnia and their Finnish translations. As Edmund is not featured in all of them, I only include in my research the novels where he is present, *videlicet The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe, Prince Caspian, The Voyage of the Dawn Treader and The Last Battle.*

The theoretical basis of my thesis is domestication versus foreignization. I examine especially vocabulary but include some syntactic solutions as well. I concluded that the translators of the Narnia novels have appropriated the method of domestication in order for the text to have dynamic equivalence that makes reading the end result be a similar reading experience for a Finnish reader of a translation as it is for a British reader reading the original. Especially effective were the domesticating vocabulary changes. The translation has been quite free, especially translating idiomatic expressions and everyday language. The translators have tried to make the characters relatable by using domestication and this affects the characterization of Edmund. This makes the story more approachable, but also takes away some of the Britishness of the original work.

Key Words: characterization, domestication, Finnish translation, fantasy literature, literary classic

TIIVISTELMÄ

Mirena Väänänen: Between Two Worlds – Characterization of a Main Character in the Chronicles of Narnia
Kandidaatintutkielma
Tampereen yliopisto
Englannin kielen, kirjallisuuden ja kääntämisen kandidaattiohjelma
Syyskuu 2020

Tutkimukseni keskipisteenä on karakterisaatio Edmund Pevensien henkilöahmosta C.S. Lewisin Narnia-kirjasarjan neljässä eri kirjassa: *Velho ja Leijona*, *Prinssi Kaspian*, *Kaspianin matka maailman ääriin* ja *Narnian viimeinen taistelu*. Tarkastelen suomenkielisiä käännöksiä verraten niitä englanninkielisiin alkuperäisversioihin ja keskityn Edmundin hahmoon tehden havaintoja kääntäjän tahtoen tai tahtomattaan tekemistä muutoksista ja kotoutusratkaisuista. Tutkimukseni alana on käännöstiede ja kielinä suomi ja englantti. Olen rajannut tutkimukseni vain niihin kohtiin materiaalissa, missä tulee ilmi jotakin oleellista Edmund-henkilöahmosta. Olen valinnut laajan valikoiman osia kirjoista, joissa käännöstieteellisestä näkökulmasta on jotakin huomionarvoista.

Tutkimuskysymykseni on, onko Narnia-kirjasarjan kääntäjä vaikuttanut käännösvalinnoillaan henkilöahmon persoonaan. Tutkimukseni tutkimushypoteesina on, että Narnia-kirjasarjan kääntäjät ovat kotouttaneet tyyllisesti kirjoja suomalaiselle lukijalle sopiviksi ja että nämä ratkaisut vaikuttavat myös henkilöahmon karakterisaatioon. Tutkimusmenetelmäni on komparatiivinen analyysi. Teoria, jonka kautta tarkastelen tutkimusaineistoa, on teoria kotouttamis- ja vieraannuttamismetodeista.

Tutkimukseni tulokset olivat alkuhypoteesini mukaiset, toisin sanoen kääntäjät olivat tehneet kotouttavia ratkaisuja ja muita muokkauksia pelkästään yhden henkilöahmon kohdalla runsain määrin. Sanastolliset muutokset ovat erityisen mielenkiinnon kohteena tutkimuksessani, koska ne vaikuttavat karakterisaatioon. Idiomaattista ja arkista kieltä kirjoissa on runsaasti, ja näiden osien kääntäminen on ollut hyvin vapaata. Dialogissa pitkiä lauserakenteita on pilkottu pienempiin osiin, mikä lisää kirjan luettavuutta ja käännösversiossa henkilöahmon uskottavuuteen on kiinnitetty huomiota. Kotouttavat ratkaisut toisaalta tekevät lastenkirjasta ymmärrettävämmän lukijalle, toisaalta taas vievät brittiläistä väriä pois kirjoista.

Avainsanat: karakterisaatio, kotouttaminen, suomenkielinen käännös, fantasiakirjallisuus, kirjallisuusklassikko

Table of Contents

1 Introduction	1
2 Domestication and Foreignization	2
3 Characterization.....	5
4 Material and Methods	8
5 Characterization of Edmund.....	9
6 Domesticating a Character.....	12
6.1 Characteristics that Define Edmund.....	13
6.2 Dynamic Character after a Growth Experience	17
7 Conclusion.....	22

1 Introduction

In this thesis I explore the characterization of the character of Edmund, in the context of an interlingual translation of C.S. Lewis' novels. The novels have been originally written in English and the translations I am investigating are in Finnish. The fantasy novels were translated by Kyllikki Hämäläinen and Kaarina Helakisa. The material which I use in my thesis is mainly from the translations of the novels *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*; *Prince Caspian* and *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader*, and Edmund is mentioned a few times in *The Last Battle*, which I also include in my study

Edmund is one of the protagonists of the Narnia books. He is a middle child and has two sisters and an elder brother. He is mischievous and somewhat of a rebel. In this thesis I analyze the characterization of Edmund's character through an analysis of the translations in comparison to the originals. Most of the material I have collected are from the novel *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*, because not only is Edmund mentioned most often in this particular novel, but also the most of his emotional growth and character development occurs in that work.

I chose Edmund as a character I wanted to explore in my Bachelor's Thesis mainly because he is the one character in the novels who changes distinctively. He develops from a very egotistical little boy to a more responsible young person who respects other people. This also does not happen in a magical or supernatural way, even though the novel belongs in the genre of fantasy; instead he makes mistakes and is forced to learn through the consequences of his actions.

My hypothesis for this work is that the translators use domestication as a translation strategy throughout the novels and this is the principal motive behind their translation choices and that these translation choices have impacted the characterization of Edmund. My research question is "do the translators' translation choices impact the characterization of Edmund?" I argue that the domestication of the translations affects the characterization. In my thesis I analyze various excerpts in the book depicting Edmund's actions and character along with their translations and conclude from those examples whether domestication is involved. Furthermore, I explore in the light of translation studies how the evolution of Edmund's character is depicted in the translations as opposed to the original novels in English.

The very act of translation involves domestication, as all translation is adaptation from one version of a text to another (Oittinen 2000, 6). I find, however, that in the translations of the Narnia books the translator has not only adapted the text to another culture but utilized domestication as a stylistic device. One could see this to be derived from a wish to create a text that is coherent in itself rather than being compared to the original (Oittinen 2000, 11). In my thesis I compare the translation to the original. Through this comparative analysis one can learn much about how translating works. As Susan Bassnett (2013, 13) notes a translation provides a “physical manifestation of one person’s reading and rewriting of a text written by another person”. A translated text can thus contribute invaluable insight into the processes of textual manipulation (Bassnett 2013, 13). Learning about the way translation works can help us learn about human communication in the multifaceted and globalized world we live in today (Bassnett 2013, 13).

My research subject has not been studied before. While searching academic material for my thesis I did not encounter many studies on *The Chronicles of Narnia*. There was no research on characterization and translation and there was almost no preceding research on the translation of *The Chronicles of Narnia* either.

The Chronicles of Narnia are intended for children and young people. Children’s books are usually more domesticated than books for adults. Domestication usually involves names of characters. Some names have been translated in the novels, while some have been unchanged. The names of the protagonists, the Pevensie children, have not been translated, being Peter, Susan, Edmund and Lucy in the Finnish translations.

Despite the domestication through word and sentence structure choices, the translators stay quite loyal to the original versions, which is often the case in literary translation. The language in C.S. Lewis’ novels is very idiomatic and colloquial, the narration as well as the dialogue, so naturally the translator is forced to translate many parts with structures and words that correspond not in form, but in meaning in the target language. In many parts of the translations there is no formal equivalence, but there is a valid a dynamic equivalence.

2 Domestication and Foreignization

Translation theorist Lawrence Venuti introduced the terms domestication and foreignization in his work *The Translator’s Invisibility* in the 1990’s and they have been one of the key dichotomies of translation studies since then (Van Poucke 2012, 139). However,

these two concepts have been opposed since the humankind started translating from one language to another (ibid.). The term domestication refers to a translation strategy where foreign elements in a text are replaced with culturally familiar ones (Kemppanen 2012, 51). The preponderance of linguistic, ethnic and ideological features from the target culture are characteristics of a domesticating translation strategy as well as modernity of presentation, unambiguity and linguistic consistency (ibid.) The translator uses procedures such as synonymy, naturalization, explication and idiomatic translation to erase foreignness and to create a familiarized text (Fathalipour & Akef 2013, 14).

Foreignization is the opposite of domestication, a translation strategy where more emphasis is given to elements that are foreign to the target culture (Kemppanen 2012, 52). A foreignizing translation is rife with linguistic, ethnic and ideological features from the source culture, transforming it into a text less fluent in the target language (ibid.). A foreignized translation aims at transferring the original idea of a text with the most precision as possible without any additional adaptations or explanations (Fathalipour & Akef 2013, 14). Foreignizing translation procedures include repetition, borrowing, literal translation and extra-textual gloss (ibid.).

When a translator is translating literary works, they have to make the challenging decision between utilizing a more domesticating or a more foreignizing translation strategy (Van Poucke 2012, 139). It is cumbersome to transfer cultural items from one language to another with different cultural background and translating to a child target group makes it even more of a challenge (Fathalipour & Akef 2013, 8). There has been a multitude of different procedures that have been proposed and applied for working with cultural differences (ibid.). Domestication and foreignization are two major cultural strategies that consider the influence of translation on the target readers from the target culture while taking into account the ideological and cultural factors that play a role in the process of translation (Fathalipour & Akef 2013, 8-9).

A foreignizing method is applied to teach children about other people and other cultures, but one has to take into consideration that children often lack some of the knowledge of the world, different societies and ideologies, because they have not yet completed all the developmental stages (Fathalipour & Akef 2013, 9). Domestication as a strategy of translation is transparent, fluent and “invisible”, which minimizes the foreignness of the target text (ibid.). Thus, domestication is a global translation strategy aiming at creating a

fluent translation in the target language, entailing translating in a transparent way that gives the reader access to the precise meaning of the source text (Palumbo 2009, 38). The transparency of a translation is understood to mean the avoidance of non-idiomatic expressions (Kemppanen 2012, 51). Moreover, archaisms, jargon and repetition are usually avoided in a transparent translation (ibid.). The use of the domesticating translation strategy involves emulation of the text features of the target culture (ibid.). The choice between domestication and foreignization is elemental in its impact to the target audience's comprehension, the text's readability and the way the children get educated by reading translated books (Fathalipour & Akef 2013, 9). When the translator uses domestication there is always an ethnocentric reduction of the source language values involved (Palumbo 2009, 39).

Both foreignization and domestication are used by translators to a greater or lesser extent (Belikova 2012, 102). One can describe a translation as a complex mosaic structure, which without exception, to differing degrees, contains both foreignizing and domesticating elements (ibid.). Customarily, a translation is a compromise between loyalty and infidelity with varying degrees of compliance with the rules of the target language (ibid.). One can say that, when foreignization is the dominant strategy, the translation is easily identified as such from the differences to the original text (ibid.). When domestication dominates, the text by several parameters does not differ from a text originally created in the target language in the target culture (ibid.).

The translator is faced with the dilemma of whether to translate a text directed to the target language, culture, norms and readership or to choose to preserve the key features of the source language and culture (Fathalipour & Akef, 19). At times, the foreign elements may lead to the readership not understanding the text or, at worst, rejecting the target text altogether (ibid.). The aforementioned dilemma is especially relevant when translating children's literature (ibid.). The child audience has limited life experience and world knowledge which affects their capacity to understand texts (Fathalipour & Akef 2013, 10). In the end the choice of either a more domesticating or a more foreignizing translation strategy is for the translator to make (ibid.). The choice depends on a multitude of factors, including the translator's knowledge of both source language and target language, the translator's training, the translator's personal image of childhood, their ideas about what children can process and what is important for a child reader's education (ibid.).

3 Characterization

Characterization involves the representation of a person in narrative and dramatic works (Baldick 2015, s.v. characterization). The building blocks of a character may include direct methods such as description or commentary (ibid.). Additionally, there are indirect methods of characterization such as characters' actions, speech or appearance which invite the reader to imagine the character further (ibid.). Often a distinction is made between "flat" characters that are unchanging and "round" characters that are subject to development and are overall built into more complex personalities (ibid.).

It is a rare occasion that scholars agree about the function and nature of characters in children's literature (Nikolajeva 2002, 7). There is little if any research done on characterization in children's literature (ibid.). Moreover, there does not exist much terminology for discussing characters and characterization (Nikolajeva 2002, 7-8). As it pertains to children's literature, a different set of rules is applied for the author's creation of characters as the readers' understanding of characters is disparate (Nikolajeva 2002, 10). Characters in children's books have to be understandable and relatable for the young readers and therefore might be viewed as less complex (ibid.). Child characters are developing and dynamic as they have not matured psychologically into adults yet (ibid.).

Characters in children's fiction provide models and examples (Nikolajeva 2002, 11). The characters serve didactic purposes (ibid.). The use of collective protagonists enables the author to show a larger variety of human traits without a complex characterization (ibid.). There are characters on the story level and on the discourse level (Nikolajeva 2002, 12). The story level involves the elements such as the characters' place in the narrative, the degree of integrity they represent and the values they express (ibid.). On the discourse level, characterization involves how characters are constructed by the writer and how the readers reconstruct them in their minds while reading (Nikolajeva 2002, 12-13). The story and the discourse are interdependent, but the point of view when investigating the character is slightly different (Nikolajeva 2002, 13).

Literary characters, unlike real people, lack complexity and unity (Nikolajeva 2002, 32). They are also less coherent than persons in real life and the only background they have is written in the literary work (Nikolajeva 2002, 32-34). Characters are more structured than real people and the author can arrange the information about them coherently (ibid.).

There is a difference between genres in providing background information about characters – in adventure stories the background is given less importance (ibid.). Instead there are some basic assumptions that the reader makes about a literary character such as that they have been born, they have parents, they have attended school and that the character is mortal (Nikolajeva 2002, 34). When reading and constructing the complex character in their minds, the readers use these basic assumptions intuitively (Nikolajeva 2002, 34). To characterize a literary personality, unusual experiences that may affect the character's current position, feelings or state of mind should be explicitly or implicitly included in the story (ibid.). Without the information in the narrative, one can only speculate about the character (Nikolajeva 2002, 34).

Traditionally, the two most important conditions put on literary characters are consistency and unity (Nikolajeva 2002, 144). Consistency means that a character cannot have contradictory traits nor behave in a manner that contradicts with what has previously been revealed of them in description, actions or the narrator's comments (ibid.). There is a higher demand for consistency in personalities in children's books because of the didactic nature of literature for children (ibid.). Unity implies that the literary character is viewed by the readers as a complete and structured individual (ibid.). At the same time, the character naturally differs from a real person and is instead an artistic whole (ibid.). Yet these two conditions provide a good starting point for literary analysis even though modern literary studies have somewhat deviated from them. (ibid.).

When assessing the complexity and development of a character two binaries are often utilized (Nikolajeva 2002, 144). The first one of these is the binary of flat versus round character, first introduced by E.M. Forster in his work *Aspects of the Novel* (ibid.). A while later, the pair dynamic versus static character was added to the tools of literary analysis (ibid.). These binaries are both used in character analysis and have been introduced in children's literature criticism, but one has to bear in mind that like all binaries, they should be perceived as two opposing poles of a broad continuum (Nikolajeva 2002, 144-145). After all, flat and round as well as dynamic and static are mere abstractions whereas a literary character tends to be more complex (Nikolajeva 2002, 145). Real people in real life are even more complex and it depends on the writer's skills how well they can construct a literary character to resemble a real person in complexity and unpredictability (ibid.).

The terms static and dynamic are quite straightforward: static characters stay the same throughout the story whereas dynamic characters change and evolve (Nikolajeva 2002, 145). Flat characters are two-dimensional, insipid and lacking in development, possessing only one typical trait (ibid.). Their actions are predictable and they seldom surprise the reader (ibid.). A round character can also be called multidimensional, demonstrating numerous positive and negative traits and a fully developed personality (Nikolajeva 2002, 146). The reader gets to know the round character in-depth as the story progresses but at the same time is unable to predict their behavior. There are a number of other binary categories for analyzing a character: stylization versus naturalism, coherence versus incoherence, wholeness versus fragmentariness, literalness versus symbolism, complexity versus simplicity, transparency versus opacity, dynamicity versus staticism and closure versus openness (Nikolajeva 2002, 168). Especially stylization is a commonly used didactic device in children's literature (ibid.).

External description is the most straightforward way to present a literary character (Nikolajeva 2002, 200). Physical description is commonplace in texts directed to children since young readers can more easily understand and judge characters' external descriptions and actions than subtle psychological changes and motives (ibid.). External orientation is used in combination with other characterization devices and is in no way inferior to them (ibid.). Also, illustrations in a picture book can be part of the characterization and when the work is illustrated, the physical description is often omitted to avoid repetition (Nikolajeva 2002, 201). A story may also forego all physical descriptions of the character, leaving the reader to imagine the appearance of a character (ibid.). Narrative statements are also rife in children's literature, especially in traditional, didactic children's fiction (Nikolajeva 2002, 215). They are the narrator's discourse that makes the reader accept the author's judgments of the characters as opposed to them making their own assumptions (Nikolajeva 2002, 214). Narrative statements can be utilized to comment a character's external appearance, social position, intelligence, actions, attitudes, manners, state of mind and temporary feelings (Nikolajeva 2002, 215).

Events in the book and the characters' actions are a part of characterization, as well as their speech acts (Nikolajeva 2002, 217, 244). Implicit characterization is extensively used in works of fiction (Nikolajeva 2002, 288). These implicit characterization techniques include proper names, age, setting, clothes, food preferences and other habits (Nikolajeva 2002, 298-299). Further, there is a technique called contrastive characterization where the

characters are presented through contrast, such as lazy brother versus diligent brother or well-behaved child versus naughty child (ibid.). Characterization by omission is the final technique of characterization discussed in this theoretical portion of the thesis (Nikolajeva 2002, 301-302). It is rarely used in children's literature as it is a rather demanding device and demands the reader to recognize these subtle elements, but omission involves the author leaving out some important piece of information of the character (ibid.).

4 Material and Methods

The material for my Bachelor's Thesis are portions of the *Chronicles of Narnia* by C.S. Lewis and their translations into Finnish. The original books in English were published from 1950 to 1956. There are seven books in total in the Narnia book series and they are renowned throughout the world and translated into 47 different languages. The novels have sold over 100 million copies.

The events in all of the books take place in the same environment but feature different characters, even the main characters vary from book to book. The fact that the character I concentrated on is not featured in all of the novels helped me define what material I should include in my thesis.

The first book in the *Chronicles of Narnia* is *The Magician's Nephew*, followed by *The Lion, The Witch and the Wardrobe*. *The Horse and His Boy* is the third book in the book series and *Prince Caspian* is the fourth book. Last in the chronicles are *The Voyage of The Dawn Treader*, *The Silver Chair* and *The Last Battle*. All of the books in the chronicle feature events that take place in the surreal world of Narnia where there is eternal winter. The realm of Narnia is reigned by an evil witch who has magical powers and who is the embodiment of frightful.

The Finnish translations of the Narnia books are rather old, the years of publication ranging from 1959 to 1979. There are two different translators for the seven books: Kaarina Helakisa and Kyllikki Hämäläinen. Kyllikki Hämäläinen has translated *The Magician's Nephew* (*Taikurin sisarenpoika*); *The Lion, The Witch and The Wardrobe* (*Velho ja leijona*); *Prince Caspian* (*Prinssi Kaspian*) and *The Voyage of The Dawn Treader* (*Kaspianin matka maailman ääriin*). Kaarina Helakisa's translations are of the books *The Horse and His Boy* (*Hevonen ja poika*), *The Silver Chair* (*Hopeinen tuoli*) and *The Last Battle* (*Narnian viimeinen taistelu*). The commencement and the conclusion of the Narnia

chronicle are therefore translated by different persons, the first book by Hämäläinen and the last by Helakisa.

In my thesis I concentrate on the characterization of one character in the original text compared to the characterization of the same character in the Finnish translations. I chose Edmund as the character to analyze as there is the most personal growth to be found in his character and I found it interesting to examine how the translators have contended with this metamorphosis in their translations into another language. As the main material for my thesis I therefore chose only those four Narnia books that feature Edmund which are *The Lion, The Witch and The Wardrobe*; *Prince Caspian*; *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader* and *The Last Battle* and from those novels I limited my analysis to only portions that define the character of Edmund.

The method of my investigation is comparative analysis. The material is vast, but previously familiar to me. I read through all of the seven original novels and their translations into Finnish to familiarize myself with the whole that the novels form. I then concentrated on solely the novels that feature Edmund in them. I compared the original versions of the novels to their translations with the presupposition that there would be some cultural influence in the translations and also that to maintain the style, the translators have had to at times digress from the meaning of the original wording and structure. I analyzed the nouns, verbs, adverbs and adjectives used to describe Edmund and how his development is mirrored in the use of vocabulary in the original novels compared to the Finnish translations.

5 Characterization of Edmund

The narration in the novels is in the third person throughout the whole chronicle and the narrator is always omniscient. Edmund's character is a dynamic character as he changes as a result of a major conflict. Dynamic characters are usually main characters in a literary work and Edmund, too, is regarded as a central character. There are a number of speech acts by Edmund and conversations he has with his siblings, from which one can build a vivid image of his character in their mind. Physical descriptions of him cannot be found in the text. There are small black and white drawings in the English language versions of the novels, but one hardly gets an idea of what Edmund's appearance is like.

As Edmund's visual characteristics are not once mentioned by C.S. Lewis in his novels, one does not have any opportunity to visualize what the character looked like in the writer's vision. The reader is left to themselves to create a visualization of Edmund in their mind. Contrarily, his personality and actions are featured throughout the Chronicles in a detailed and thorough manner. In addition to the characterization of his mental attributes and ways of acting, also his thoughts are featured in parts of the books as narrative statements. There is a vast amount of dialogue that Edmund engages in, most of it with his brother and sisters, with the White Witch and with a wisdom-speaking lion, Aslan. Different characters have different temperaments and dispositions and their attributes are often reflected in their speech habits (Oittinen, Ketola, Garavini & Galletti 2018, 73). Edmund can be seen as trying to change between registers; he uses a formal, respectful register with older discussion partners in positions of power and a very casual register with persons close to him. He uses a variation of grandiloquent verbiage when talking with people he wants to impress.

Edmund is depicted in the beginning as being a very selfish and self-centered boy. This is brought to the reader's attention in numerous excerpts of the book. He is emotionally dependent on others, but instead of appreciating the people close to him, he uses them to have his fickle wishes done and shifts his attention towards anyone who gives him what he craves at any given moment. He has been raised to have good manners, but he only acts in a polite manner when it helps him get something for himself, for instance treats or attention.

He is merely a child, but he might be somewhat more gullible and naïve than the average child would be, due to his hedonistic personality. However, at the same time he has a scheming and manipulative side to him. Edmund does not have much of a conscience in the beginning. He learns through trial and error and does not seem to have a full capacity for abstract thinking. As he is a child, this is particular for the learning of a child. Edmund's personality type seems to affect his decisions and he is also clearly prone to collisions with other people due to his personality. In appendix 2, Table 3 one can see the use of adjectives, verbs and nouns that are used to describe Edmund. The language used to describe him is predominantly negative.

The following excerpt is from the first Narnia book, *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*. It is a situation where Edmund speaks in a very formal manner to the Witch while being flustered.

Edmund meanwhile had been having a most disappointing time. When the dwarf had gone to get the sledge ready he expected that the Witch would start being nice to him, as she had been at their last meeting. But she said nothing at all. And when at last Edmund plucked up his courage to say, "Please, your Majesty, could I have some Turkish Delight? You – you – said –" she answered, "Silence, fool!" (Lewis 1950, 161)

Edmund oli sillä välin kokenut suuren pettymyksen. Kääpiön mentyä valjastamaan poroja hän oli olettanut, että velho taas olisi herttainen kuten oli ollut heidän viimeksi tavatessaan. Mutta velho ei sanonut mitään. Ja kun Edmund vihdoinkin kokosi rohkeutensa sanoakseen: "Luvallanne, teidän majesteettinne, enkö voisi saada vähän suklaamakeisia? Te – te sanoitte –", niin velho vastasi: "Ole vaiti, pölkkypä!" (Lewis 2007 [1960], 172)

'You' is here translated as the polite form of 'te' which is the plural form of 'you' used also as a sign of politeness as it is in many other languages like French. This is a decision from the translator that underlines Edmund's attitude towards people with authority over him. He clearly knows what it is to have good manners, and therefore is manipulative. Edmund is not depicted as a child who is particularly intrigued by danger or fearless by nature. Here he has to "pluck up his courage" to speak to the witch in order to get what he wants, only to be rejected in a blunt manner. He is therefore not driven by the need for adventure, but instead by his evident greed and hedonism.

Edmund is rather vacillating. He is very dishonest and seems to make an extra effort to deceive others. He is deemed as a bully by his siblings, who bullies "anyone smaller than himself" (Lewis 1950, 130). In the group of children, he is somewhat of an outsider, but this is the case merely because of his rivalry with his siblings and because of his bad behavior. He is especially envious of his older brother, Peter, who seems to be the leader of the group, a position that Edmund would like to take.

Edmund is clever and intelligent, but uses his intellect for evil purposes, which makes him appear as a cruel young boy. He can be seen as a prodigal son in these novels. In many parts of the novel *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* the White Witch explicitly lets Edmund know that she will kill his siblings and still he works actively in aid of the Witch so she could get hold of them.

Where does domestication come into the picture? One can attest that the domesticating choices made by the translators give Edmund the air of an average, somewhat impertinent Finnish schoolboy than the outright mean, entitled boarding school student featured in the

originals. This choice affects the characterization of Edmund. One can notice a certain pattern in the domesticating choices. They seem to diminish the acerbic and poignant nature of the speech acts of the adversative protagonist and present him in a more everyday light. The domesticating strategy discussed in this thesis give him an air of someone more accessible; if there had been foreignizing strategy, he would have seemed privileged and rather foreign to the target culture. For a child reader domestication changes the entire air of the character in the novel. They start to appear as someone relatable, with familiar preferences and pastimes.

The domesticating strategy facilitates the understanding of the text for a young reader, so they can experience the joy of reading without having to ponder about cultural paraphernalia. However, an older reader might enjoy a more foreignized translation when they can reach the atmosphere of the source text. The choice is always for the translator to make and one can contend that the younger the target audience, the more prevalent the domesticating strategy tends to be. The inclination of these particular translations is toward downplaying the dramatic character of Edmund, for instance when he is called 'bad-tempered', the translations speak about Edmund being 'in a bad mood' (huonolla tuulella) (Lewis 1950, 111; Lewis 1950 [1960]). This makes the temper seem less a permanent characteristic of Edmund's personality and more a passing whim. In appendix 1, table 2 one can observe the different types of domestication choices the translators have made in relation to Edmund. It demonstrates in numbers the analyzed data. In the same appendix there is table 1 where one can see the types of characterization devices used in the Chronicles of Narnia regarding Edmund. One can attest from the table that speech acts are the resounding majority of the characterization devices. The manner the protagonist speaks creates an image of his personality.

6 Domesticating a Character

Using comparative analysis, I analyzed the translations into Finnish of the novels. As the premise of my thesis is concentrated on Edmund's character, all the passages from the original novels and the translations are associated with Edmund. Some passages involve Edmund speaking or thinking, others are the narrator's words about Edmund. These passages serve as examples of characterization devices, such as speech acts, actions and events as well as of implicit characterization devices such as food preferences and age.

6.1 Characteristics that Define Edmund

In the following excerpt the White Witch interrogates Edmund about what he is, as she has never seen humans. Edmund does not know what to answer and stutters. He responds by using his name as an identifying factor.

“And what, pray, are you?” said the Lady, looking hard at Edmund. “I’m – I’m – my name’s Edmund,” said Edmund rather awkwardly. He did not like the way she looked at him. (Lewis 1950, 123)

“Mikä sinä olet?” sanoi nainen ja katsoi tiukasti Edmundiin. “Minä olen – olen – minun nimeni on Edmund”, Edmund sanoi kömpelösti. Hän ei pitänyt naisen katseesta. (Lewis 2007 [1960], 130)

That his name is the first aspect of him that comes to his mind, subconsciously incites an image of an individualist in the reader’s mind. The original has the contracted forms of I am, as in spoken language, but the translation has literal Finnish forms *Minä olen* instead. The way in which he speaks is described as ‘awkward’, and in the translation it is translated as ‘kömpelösti’ which means clumsily. It could also be thought that instead of clumsy, he was embarrassed.

In this example the translation is very literal in meaning, but not so much in structure. The last sentence ‘He did not like the way she looked at him’ is translated into Finnish with the structure and the meaning of ‘He did not like the lady’s gaze’. This can be seen as an attempt to make the text flow in the Finnish language, although in Finnish it is specifically an indicator of unrefined language to use a noun when a verb can be used instead. Here the last sentence is a valid example of how the omniscient narrator knows what Edmund is feeling, that he does not like the way the White Witch looks at him.

In the following example Edmund is offered something to eat by the Witch and the youth asks for Turkish Delight without any delay. He does not know the food is enchanted and will make a slave of the person tasting them.

“It is dull, Son of Adam, to drink without eating,” said the Queen presently. “What would you like best to eat?” “Turkish Delight, please, your Majesty,” said Edmund. (Lewis 1950, 125)

“On ikävää juoda ilman syömistä, Aadamin poika”, kuningatar virkkoi. “Mitä hyvää haluaisit?” “Kiitos suklaamakeisia, teidän majesteettinne”, Edmund sanoi. (Lewis 2007 [1960], 133)

There are several points to be made of the excerpt. First of all, it makes known Edmund’s food choice. This can be viewed as a means of implicit characterization. The very specific term *Turkish Delight* is translated in Finnish into *suklaamakeisia* which means *chocolate candies*. This is a choice that the translator has made produces the effect that the treat

seems like something a Finnish child would crave and the temptation is more relatable for a child reading this book in Finnish. Turkish Delight is not something that is known in Finland even as to what category of food it belongs to. This translational strategy is called generalization (Pym 2010, 14). Generalization means that a specific, concrete term has been translated into a more general term, in this case into the larger category of chocolate candies instead of the concrete name of the treat, which makes Edmund's choice less specific and makes him seem somewhat less pampered (Pym 2010, 14). This is a difference in implicit characterization, pertaining to preferences and food choices as part of the person's personality (Nikolajeva 2002, 296).

In the following excerpt Edmund insults his younger sister, Lucy, calling her 'batty' as he taps his head. I chose this specific part of the text, because Edmund had an impressive amount of speech acts in the novels, but the overwhelming majority were insults.

"Batty!" said Edmund, tapping his head. "Quite batty." (Lewis 2007 [1960], 120)

"Älyvapaa!" Edmund sanoi ja naputteli otsaansa merkitsevästi. "Täysin älytön." (Lewis 1950, 127)

This has been translated it as 'älyvapaa' ja 'älytön' which is in the level of insult of an imbecile. The direct translation of this would be 'hullu', as batty means crazy, and it would certainly sound more offensive if he called his sister mentally ill. However, as it is translated as 'älyvapaa', it seems more playful and the sort of utterance an elder brother might make. The meaning of him tapping his head is somewhat changed, in the English version he seems to insinuate that Lucy is unsound, but in the Finnish version it would refer more to lack of intelligence.

The following excerpt shows Edmund being challenging which is also very representative of him, and the characterization devices of narrative statements and actions are present.

The two elder ones did this without meaning to do it, but Edmund could be spiteful and on this occasion he was spiteful. He sneered and jeered at Lucy and kept on asking her if she'd found any other new countries in other cupboards all over the house. (Lewis 1950, 121)

Peter ja Susan tekivät sen huomaamattaan, mutta Edmund osasi olla pisteliäs ja nyt häntä huvitti olla pisteliäs. Hän virnisteli Lucylle ja kyseli piloillaan, oliko sisko keksinyt uusia maita talon muista vaatekaapeista. (Lewis 2007 [1960], 128)

The word spiteful has been translated as 'pisteliäs', which is in the scale of waspish. Spiteful could be seen as being a level of anger, but it can also be far more sinister, synonymous to hateful and vicious. In the next sentence Edmund "virnisteli Lucylle ja kyseli piloillaan, oliko sisko keksinyt uusia maita talon muista vaatekaapeista". In the

original it is written “He sneered and jeered at Lucy”, which in the translation is in the grade of insulting of smile and banter. Sneered and jeered can also be translated as “belittled and mocked”, which would significantly change the tone of the transaction and make it more insulting in tone. The dialogue changes much in tone with word choices.

The following example shows that he is not a small child anymore but knows to whisper his thoughts. However, he still he uses quasi-egocentric speech. Egocentric speech is common when a child is in a problem-solving situation, especially when adult help is needed (Oittinen 2000, 46).

but Edmund was saying to himself, “I’ll pay you all out for this, you pack of stuck-up, self-satisfied prigs.” (Lewis 1950, 135)

Mutta Edmund mutisi itsekseen: “Saatte maksaa tämän kalliisti, senkin itserakkaat tylsät porsaas.” (Lewis 2007 [1960], 144)

The passage shows Edmund as quite the beguiling person; inside he is swearing to make his siblings pay for their actions but does not show it or say anything. In the original he uses the idiomatic phrasal structure of paying someone out for something. It is actually an idiomatic phrasal structure for insulting someone. Therefore, in fact he wants to offend his siblings, not make them pay. The situation here is clearly that Edmund is in inner turmoil and does not know how to contain his emotions, so he resorts to egocentric speech.

The peculiar thing here is that it is not specified in the original whether he speaks aloud to himself or whispers, as the wording is that he says to himself. In the translation he ‘mutters’ instead, which would make it seem in a quieter voice and more unnoticeably. In the original version Edmund calls his sisters and brother as ‘stuck-up’ and ‘self-satisfied’, which has been translated into ‘itserakkaat’ and ‘tylsät’, which would literally mean conceited and boring. ‘Self-satisfied’ can be very close in meaning to ‘itserakas’, but ‘tylsä’ does not definitely mean the same as ‘stuck-up’. ‘Stuck-up’ is an everyday term for egotistical, arrogant or pretentious. Also, the insult ‘prigs’ has been translated into ‘porsaas’, which means ‘pigs’ in Finnish, when instead the literal meaning of ‘prigs’ would be the same as ‘snobs’.

The following example shows an omission made by the translator. Perhaps the omitted portion was viewed as tautologic.

Even though he knew that it was only a stone giant and not a live one, Edmund did not like going past it (Lewis 1950, 154).

Vaikka Edmund tiesi, että se oli vain kivijättiläinen, hänestä tuntui pelottavalta kulkea sen ohi (Lewis 2007 [1960], 164).

The short utterance “and not a live one” has been omitted. The translator has translated the end of this paragraph as Edmund being afraid of going past the stone giant, even though in the original Edmund did not like going past it. The translator has here deduced that the dislike is more fear in the situation. As many times before, the personal pronoun ‘he’ has been replaced with his name, because in Finnish the person being referred to with personal pronouns is more difficult to decipher, as the personal pronoun does not reveal the gender.

The following passage of the work features the narrator addressing the reader directly.

You mustn't think that even now Edmund was quite so bad that he actually wanted his brother and sisters to be turned into stone. He did want Turkish Delight and to be a Prince (and later a King) and to pay Peter back for calling him a beast. (Lewis 1950, 151)

Et saa ajatella, että Edmund olisi nytkään ollut niin paha, että olisi halunnut sisarensa ja veljensä muuttuvan kivipatsaiksi. Hän halusi suklaamakeisia ja halusi tulla prinssiksi (ja aikaa myöten kuninkaaksi), ja hän halusi Peterin saavan rangaistuksen siitä että oli haukkunut häntä lurjukseksi. (Lewis 2007 [1960], 161)

The narrator says that ‘you mustn't think Edmund is bad’, which could be seen as being the passive voice. The translator has translated the expression into the active voice. The expression ‘must not’ does not exist in Finnish, but this passage could be translated as ‘Ei pidä ajatella, että...’ Instead the translator has decided to refer the reader directly and use an expression comparable to being allowed in English. This makes the narrator seem like a personal entity who tells the reader what to think.

Edmund wants to pay Peter back for calling him a beast, which is something active on his part, that he himself wants to pay back. In the Finnish translation this is translated in a different manner, which would be in English something as that that he wanted Peter to receive a punishment, but it is not vocalized who it is that should punish him. In a former excerpt of the book Peter has called Edmund a beast, but this excerpt was translated with a different sentence structure, so the insulting word was not expressed in the Finnish translation. The translation here of beast is ‘lurjus’, which is something of a scoundrel in Finnish.

This following excerpt portrays Edmund as not so much gullible as avaricious. I have included the passage because it shows Edmund's character very specifically. It represents his inner thoughts and feelings.

The silence and the loneliness were dreadful. In fact I really think he might have given up the whole plan and gone back and owned up and made friends with the others, if he hadn't happened to say to himself, "When I'm King of Narnia the first thing I shall do will be to make some decent roads." And of course that set him off thinking about being King and all the other things he would do and this cheered him up a good deal. He had just settled in his mind what sort of palace he would have and how many cars and all about his private cinema and where the principal railways would run and what laws he would make against beavers and dams and was putting the finishing touches to some schemes for keeping Peter in his place, when the weather changed. (Lewis 1950, 152)

Oli kauhistuttavan yksinäistä ja hiljaista. Luulen toden totta, että hän olisi mennyt takaisin ja sopinut toisten kanssa, ellei olisi sattunut sanomaan itselleen: "Kun olen Narnian kuningas, rakennutan ensi töikseni kunnon teitä." Tästä hän luonnollisesti johtui ajattelemaan kuninkaana olemista ja mitä kaikkea muuta hän tekisi, ja se piristi häntä huomattavasti. Hän oli juuri suunnitellut valmiiksi millaisen linnan hän rakennuttaisi ja kuinka monta autoa hänellä olisi ja millainen oma elokuvateatteri ja missä junaratojen tuli kulkea ja millaisia lakeja hän säätäisi majavia vastaan ja miten saisi Peterin pysymään aisoissa, kun ilma muuttui. (Lewis 2007 [1960], 162)

He is void of empathy and plans to make laws against even "beavers and dams", which is certainly a bit humorous as well as it is certainly a personal retribution towards Mr. And Mrs. Beaver who appear earlier in the story and offer help for his siblings. Inner feelings and thoughts are frequent as characterization devices in this work, especially when depicting Edmund. This makes him feel emotionally closer to the reader than the other siblings.

In the following excerpt there has been a domestication choice of the month of year.

They had been just as surprised as Edmund when they saw the winter vanishing and the whole wood passing in a few hours or so from January to May. (Lewis 1950, 167).

He olivat olleet yhtä ihmeissään kuin Edmundkin nähdessään talven häviävän ja koko metsän muutamassa tunnissa siirtyvän tammikuusta toukokuuhun ja kesäkuuhun. (Lewis 2007 [1960], 177)

Clearly the translator has deemed that the weather in Finland can be quite cold and even snowy still in May, when the author has clearly intended the weather to be very warm and summery, so she has added the month of June after May. In June the spring has usually changed into summer even in Finland, so it suits more the intended atmosphere and scenery. This is a clear example of the translator's domestication of the novels for a Finnish reader

6.2 Dynamic Character after a Growth Experience

In the following excerpt the reader can testify the evolution of Edmund's character after being rescued from almost certain death.

"You have a traitor there, Aslan," said the Witch. Of course everyone present knew that she meant Edmund. But Edmund had got past thinking about himself after all he'd been through and after the talk he'd had that morning. He just went on looking at Aslan. It didn't seem to matter what the Witch said. (Lewis 1950, 175)

“Sinulla on täällä petturi, Aslan” sanoi Velho. Tietenkin kaikki läsnäolijat tiesivät, että hän tarkoitti Edmundia. Mutta Edmund ei enää ajatellut itseään kaiken kokemansa jälkeen ja keskusteltuaan aamulla Aslanin kanssa. Hän vain katsoi tarkkaavaisesti Aslania. Tuntui olevan samantekevää, mitä Velho sanoi. (Lewis 2007 [1960], 185)

Clearly the adventure Edmund has experienced has served as something of an awakening for him, as he does not think solely about himself constantly. The change in his personality is also due to his serious talk with the lion Aslan and seems to be more of an enlightenment than anything else.

In the following passage Peter speaks in a caring manner about his brother, who does not share the same sentiments about his older brother.

“All the same,” said Peter in a rather choking sort of voice, “we’ll still have to go and look for him. He is our brother after all, even if he is rather a little beast. And he’s only a kid.” (Lewis 1950, 149)

“Oli miten oli”, Peter sanoi tukahtuneella äänellä, “meidän on mentävä etsimään häntä. Hän on joka tapauksessa veljemme, vaikka onkin katala kaveri. Ja hän on vain lapsi.” (Lewis 2007 [1960], 159)

‘Rather a little beast’ is here being translated as ‘katala kaveri’. The synonyms of a beast are for instance ‘monster’, ‘fiend’ and ‘barbarian’, which would be ‘hirviö’ in Finnish and would sound very harsh in tone. The expression could, however, be literally translated into Finnish as less brutal and translate it into ‘pikku ilkimys’. Here we can see the power of the translator in their choice of vocabulary. The translator has chosen here a freer translation and translated the expression as something equivalent to ‘an underhanded fellow’. Perhaps this expression better explains the reasons behind him being consistently called a beast by his brother and the nature of his character.

The next excerpt is representative of Peter and Edmund’s sibling dynamics, which is important when considering characterization.

“I thought – I thought –” said Edmund; but he couldn’t think anything to say. “You didn’t think anything at all,” said Peter; “it’s just spite. You’ve always liked being beastly to anyone smaller than yourself; we’ve seen that at school before now.” (Lewis 1950, 130)

“Ajattelin – ajattelin”, Edmund sanoi eikä osannut sanoa mitään muuta.

“Et ajatellut yhtään mitään”, Peter sanoi, “Siinäpä se. Olet aina kiusannut pienempiäsi. Johan se nähtiin koulussa.” (Lewis 2007 [1960], 138)

At the same time as Peter is caring towards his younger brother, he often has to correct him in his dealings with the youngest of the children, Lucy. Edmund is dumbstruck and cannot think of anything at the spot to respond to the reprimands he receives. This is often seen in the books. He seems to become overwhelmed in situations and later feels like taking revenge on others. In this dialogue it becomes clear that Edmund chooses to bully people

smaller than himself and seems to truly have a problem with authorities. However, he does not have the courage to direct his anger towards those authorities.

Later in the novel there is a passage that has been very freely translated. This passage further clarifies to the reader that the translator has not translated as literally as possible, but instead has made some larger structural changes.

When at last she was free to come back to Edmund she found him standing on his feet and not only healed of his wounds but looking better than she had seen him look – oh, for ages; in fact ever since his first term at that horrid school which was where he had begun to go wrong. He had become his real old self again and could look you in the face. And there on the field of battle Aslan made him a knight. (Lewis 1950, 192)

Päästyään vihdoinkin takaisin Edmundin luo Lucy tapasi hänet jalkeilla. Edmund ei ollut ainoastaan parantunut haavoistaan vaan näytti entistä ehommalta. Itse asiassa hän ei ollut pitkiin aikoihin näyttänyt niin mainiolta. Hän oli jälleen oma oikea itsensä ja pystyi katsomaan toisia silmiin. Ja tässä taistelukentällä Aslan löi hänet ritariksi. (Lewis 2007 [1960], 205)

In the beginning of the passage the entire sentence structure has been changed around. The sentence is very long in the original and the translator has decided to divide the sentence into three separate sentences in Finnish. The author uses a present participle and a past participle, and the translator has chosen to use an adverb and the past perfect to represent the same structures in Finnish. In Finnish participles are not as widely used as in English. There is also a rare reference to Edmund's appearance.

The translator has decided to omit a whole phrase from the translation in the passage above. Edmund is told to be looking better than before, "ever since his first term at that horrid school which was where he had begun to go wrong" in the original version, which is not expressed at all in the translation. In that short phrase it becomes clearer why Edmund is out of control in his life, so it is quite surprising that it would be omitted. This is one of the few passages in the novels where omission is used.

The following passage is about Edmund as the king of Narnia.

Edmund was a graver and quieter man than Peter, and great in council and judgement. He was called King Edmund the Just. (Lewis 1950, 193)

Edmund oli totisempi ja hiljaisempi mies kuin Peter, etevä valtiomies ja tuomari. Häntä sanottiin kuningas Edmund Oikeamieliseksi. (Lewis 2007 [1960], 206)

He is a graver and quieter man than Peter and this sentence has been literally translated. He is depicted as being great in council and judgement, which is translated into 'etevä valtiomies ja tuomari', sounding even more impressive in the translated version. King Edmund the Just has been translated into a Finnish name that would surely be a name

suitable for a king, Edmund Oikeamielinen. Many parts of the novels feel as flowing as they were originally written in Finnish and not translations from another language.

The next excerpt is from the last Narnia book, *The Last Battle*. It is a typical example of the domestication choices that are found when it regards Edmund.

“This is better than being in a stuffy train on the way back to Latin and French and Algebra!” said Edmund. (Lewis 1951, 318)

“Tämä on hauskeempaa kuin istua pölyisessä junassa matkalla kohti latinaa ja saksaa ja algebraa”, Edmund sanoi. (Lewis 2007 [1961], 340)

Stuffy train has been translated as ‘pölyisessä junassa’, which would mean in a dusty train. One cannot find the reason for the change of adjective here other than dusty would be even more unpleasant than stuffy and the translator has wanted to accentuate the feeling. This is an example of modification. The translator has seen it to be of importance to change the French that the children were studying to German. Apparently, at least decades earlier, German was the foreign language that most Finnish children studied in school, so there would be more of an emotional response in part of the reader to Edmund mentioning not wanting to go to German classes than to French classes.

The following excerpt is from the novel *Prince Caspian* and it is Edmund’s parole where he uses an idiomatic, rather insulting phrase of his elder sister.

“Oh, don’t take any notice of her,” said Edmund. “She always is a wet blanket” (Lewis 1951, 370)

“Äh, älä Susanista piittaa”, sanoi Edmund. “Hän on aina ollut vätys...” (Lewis 2007 [1961], 399)

Edmund calls his sister a ‘wet blanket’ which is close in meaning to someone who spoils people’s joy. The translator has translated the word into ‘vätys’, which alludes to someone who is lazy. If one would read just the English version of the Chronicles of Narnia, they would most likely have much different undercurrent coming from Edmund’s use of words. He would seem less of an average boy and more of a boarding school student belonging to the upper classes. A person reading the novels in Finnish will inevitably have a different subconscious image of the character and find him more wronged than spoilt and the words he uses to affront others seem less exaggerated.

It becomes apparent in the subsequent novels where Edmund is featured that his growth into a more giving person has not changed his affinity with power.

“Who are you talking to?” said Edmund. “I’m no subject of yours. If anything it’s the other way round. I am one of the four ancient sovereigns of Narnia and you are under allegiance to the High King my brother.” (Lewis 1952, 484)

“Kenelle sinä puhut?” sanoi Edmund. “En ole sinun alamaisesi. Itse asiassa se on aivan päinvastoin. Minä olen yksi neljästä muinaisesta Narnian hallitsijasta, ja sinä olet veljeni, ylikuninkaan, alamainen.” (Lewis 2007 [1963], 518)

In *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* he indeed ended up becoming a king. He merely had to accept that his siblings were crowned alongside him. In the passage above Edmund has a power struggle with Prince Caspian, whom he sees as his subject. He wants to be an authority and has found an authoritative position in being a King in Narnia. ‘If anything it’s the other way round’ has been translated into ‘Itse asiassa se on aivan päinvastoin’. The tone is somewhat different, as the Finnish utterance seems more hubristic and confrontational as it would be in English something in the tone of “Indeed, it is completely the other way around.” There is not a great difference, but the accentuating word ‘completely’ changes the tone into more defiant.

The story of Edmund ends tragically as he dies in a train accident. He depicts his own death in Narnia after his passing. He does not know yet that he is no longer alive, but finds he is feeling strange. He had actually predicted the death of his family along with himself by accident, because as a connoisseur of trains he happens to choose the particular train that crashes.

“It wasn’t at all like that other time when we were pulled out of our own world by Magic. There was a frightful roar and something hit me with a bang, but it didn’t hurt. And I felt not so much scared as – well, excited. Oh – and this is one queer thing. I’d had a rather sore knee, from a hack at rugger. I noticed it had suddenly gone. And I felt very light. And then – here we were.” (Lewis 1956, 743)

“Tämä ei muistuttanut ensinkään niitä entisiä aikoja, jolloin meidät temmattiin omasta maailmastamme lumoukseen. Kuului kauhea räminä, ja jokin kalautti minua, mutta kipeää se ei tehnyt. Enkä minä ollut niin pelästynyt kuin – no jaa, kiihdyksissäni. Voi – tämä on kummallista. Minun polveni kivisti koko lailla, olin kolauttanut sen jalkapallossa. Yhtäkkiä huomasin, että kipu oli hävinnyt. Ja minun oli hyvin kevyt olo. Ja sitten – täällä oltiin” (Lewis 2007 [1979], 804)

In the excerpt Edmund explains that he felt ‘excited’, which is translated in Finnish into ‘kiihdyksissäni’, which is physical excitement in Finnish. It could also have been translated into a Finnish word connoting elation or happiness.

Edmund says he had hit his knee in rugby, which the translator of the novel *The Last Battle* has translated into football. Normally children do not play rugby in Finland and it is so uncommon in Finland, that some children might not even know how it is played. If the rugby had not been changed into a more usual sport, it would have seemed foreign to the reader.

When the sport is football, which is more popular in Finland, he seems more the likeness of an average boy.

7 Conclusion

In my study, I used comparative analysis to investigate whether domesticating choices in the translations of the Chronicles of Narnia affect the characterization of Edmund, one of the protagonists. My materials were the Narnia novels which featured Edmund and from those novels I picked the most descriptive and pertinent excerpts. I concluded that the translator has indeed used domestication to make stylistic changes in the novel. I examined various other quotes from the novels featuring Edmund and there were many interesting excerpts where new facets of Edmund's character are brought to the reader's awareness. Characterization devices were numerous, although physical description was left out. There were only a few observations about whether Edmund looks well or not. There is no mention of physical characteristics such as height or hair color.

In the translations many parts regarding Edmund were domesticated. In some parts of the text the verbiage has been changed to make the meaning in the translation different than in the original. When one accounts for connotations and mental images, too, there is an even greater divergence from the original to the translation regarding main characters. I would find it enlightening to know why exactly the translator has made the translation choices she has made. After consideration in light of my study I believe there has been an effort to make the world of Narnia relatable and not so strange for a foreign reader. Edmund has become somewhat of a typical Finnish schoolboy in the translations instead of a British schoolboy. The Finnish version of Edmund plays football instead of rugby and studies German instead of French.

The greatest part of modifications into the language of the translations had been made to the sentence structures. All the modifications had been to divide long sentences into shorter ones. The original novels have rather complex and long-winding sentences that the translator has seen necessary to shorten. This might be seen as simplification of a literary work, but I contend that there has been plenty of room for shortening and the language in the translations still is not too reduced. The Chronicles of Narnia are after all directed towards children and young people.

Edmund revealed to be truly a multifaceted character and relatable even as insensitive as he was from time to time. He did not change the rambunctious side of himself, and in later excerpts after becoming a king he is still brusque at times, but he does not put himself on a pedestal or endanger others with his actions. The subject of my study could be further investigated in the field of translation studies by choosing another literary work and analyzing the characterization of a character at the same time examining the translation strategies in use. There is the possibility to examine the characterization in relation to domestication and foreignization in multiple different languages, which would bring new, enlightening information to the field of literary and translation studies.

8 Works cited

- Baldick, Chris 2015. *Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Oxford University Press. Available: <https://www-oxfordreference-com.libproxy.tuni.fi/view/10.1093/acref/9780198715443.001.0001/acref-9780198715443> [Accessed 16.8.2020]
- Bassnett, Susan 2013. *Translation Studies*. Routledge. Available: <https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.helios.uta.fi/lib/tampere/reader.action?docID=1524157&query=> [Accessed 11.23.2018]
- Belikova, Alexandra 2012. *Money flows into windows and doors or Money flows like a river? Identifying Translation Strategies by the Yardstick of Metaphorical Creativity*. In Hannu Kemppanen, Marja Jänis & Alexandra Belikova (ed.), *Domestication and Foreignization in Translation Studies*, 101-120.
- Fathalipour, Morteza & Kourosh Akaf 2013. *Domestication and Foreignization in Translating Children's Literature Across Different Age Groups*. Saarbrücken: Lap Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Kemppanen Hannu 2012. The Role of the Concepts *Domestication* and *Foreignization* in Russian Translation Studies. In Hannu Kemppanen, Marja Jänis & Alexandra Belikova (ed.), *Domestication and Foreignization in Translation Studies*, 49 – 62.
- Kemppanen, Hannu, Marja Jänis & Alexandra Belikova (Eds.) 2012. *Domestication and Foreignization in Translation Studies*. Berlin: Frank & Timme.
- Lewis, Clive Staples 2007 [1963]. *Kaspianin matka maailman ääriin*. 9th edition. Keuruu: Otava. Translated by Kyllikki Hämäläinen.
- Lewis, Clive Staples 2007 [1979]. *Narnian viimeinen taistelu*. 9th edition. Keuruu: Otava. Translated by Kaarina Helakisa.
- Lewis, Clive Staples 1951. *Prince Caspian*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Lewis, Clive Staples 2007 [1961]. *Prinssi Kaspian*. 9th edition. Keuruu: Otava. Translated by Kyllikki Hämäläinen.
- Lewis, Clive Staples 1956. *The Last Battle*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Lewis, Clive Staples 1950. *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*. New York: Harper Collins.

- Lewis, Clive Staples 1952. *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Lewis, Clive Staples 2007 [1960]. *Velho ja Leijona*. 9th edition. Keuruu: Otava. Translated by Kyllikki Hämäläinen.
- Nikolajeva, Maria 2002. *The Rhetoric of Character in Children's Literature*. Lanham: Scarecrow Press. Available: <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/tampere/detail.action?docID=1434066> [Accessed 16.8.2020]
- Oittinen, Riitta 2000. *Translating for Children*. New York & London: Garland Publishing.
- Oittinen, Riitta, Anne Ketola, Melissa Garavini & Chiara Galletti 2018. *Translating Picturebooks*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Palumbo, Giuseppe 2009. *Key Terms in Translation Studies*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc. Available: <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/tampere/detail.action?docID=601904> [Accessed 16.8.2020]
- Pym, Anthony 2010. *Exploring Translation Theories*. New York: Routledge.
- Van Poucke, Pier 2012. Measuring *Foreignization* in Literary Translation: An Attempt to Operationalize the Concept of *Foreignization*. In Hannu Kemppanen, Marja Jänis & Alexandra Belikova (ed.), *Domestication and Foreignization in Translation Studies*, 139 – 157.

Appendix 1

Table 1. Characterization devices found in the Narnia books regarding Edmund

Characterization device	Physical description	Speech acts	Actions	Events	Narrative statements	Inner feelings and thoughts
Number of incidences	4	71	47	33	26	25

Table 2. Domesticated items in relation to the character of Edmund

Item	Domestication	Foreignization
School subjects	1	0
Sports	1	0
Month	1	0
Food and drink	8	0
Appearance	1	0
Behavior/traits	4	0
Speech	3	0
Names	0	2

Appendix 2

Table 3. Vocabulary used to characterize Edmund with translations

Positive	Neutral	Negative
comfortable – mukava olo	eagerly – innokkaasti	sick – huonovointinen
warm – lämmin	brother – veli	sulky – hiljainen
cleverest – viisain	graver – totisempi	sulkily – äreästi
handsomest – kaunein	quieter – hiljaisempi	annoyed vihainen
nice – mukava		tired – väsynyt
prince – prinssi		bad-tempered – huonolla tuulella
friend – hyvä ystävä		spiteful – pisteliäs
knight – ritariksi		unpleasant – ilkeästi
great – etevä		not clever – ei viisas
excited – kiihdyksissäni		not handsome – ei kaunis
light – kevyt olo		snappish – pisteliäästi
		flushed – punoittavat
		strange – omituiset
		uncomfortable – epämiellyttävältä
		awful – kauhealta
		not well – sairas
		meanest – alhaisimman
		nastier – inhottavammaksi
		gloating – mulkoillen
		beastly – sietämätön
		poisonous – katala
		treacherous – petollinen
		afraid – uskaltamatta
		frightened – pelännyt
		silly – typerän
		childish – lapsellisen
		beast – lurjus; katala kaveri
		traitor – petturi
		terribly wounded – haavoittui pahasti
		growled – murahti
		desperately – epätoivoisesti
		miserable – kurjalta
		sneered and jeered – virnisteli
		teasing – kiusoitella
		awkwardly – kömpelösti
		rude – rumaa
		out of spite – ilkeyksissään
		horrible ideas – hirvittäviä ajatuksia
		bruised – naarmuinen