These translations vary widely in quality, interest, and accessibility, and thus in their usefulness as teaching tools.<sup>1</sup> But I want to keep the translation<sup>2</sup> as teaching tool in the background today, and focus instead on the problems<sup>3</sup> a translator into an archaic language faces and the choices one makes while working through those problems.<sup>4</sup> These choices have implications for the translation as cultural production.<sup>5</sup> Modern translation theory views<sup>6</sup> the translation as rendering a work<sup>7</sup> not only linguistically, but also culturally.8 A translation of, say, The Iliad into Japanese renders,9 as best it can, a distant and ancient culture accessible to a modern audience.<sup>10</sup> Viewed in this way, a translation of Alice into an archaic language<sup>1</sup> is engaged in a curious two-step:<sup>2</sup> it must represent the nineteenthcentury *Alice* to its audience along with many aspects of nineteenth-century culture<sup>3</sup>—if it didn't it wouldn't be a translation, but something else.4 But it will also, inevitably, touch upon and represent the ancient culture in whose language it is written.<sup>5</sup> Even the 1964 Latin translation by Clive Carruthers,<sup>6</sup> which remains firmly rooted in the nineteenth century,<sup>7</sup> does that, if only by echoing the school-texts its readers are familiar with and employing8 a variety of meters from ancient elegiac couplets to the Goliardic rhymes of the Middle Ages.<sup>9</sup> The Old English *Alice* is, then, a translation for three cultures:10 both nineteenth-century and Anglo-Saxon England, and of course the postmodern world its intended readers inhabit.

These translations vary widely in quality, interest, and accessibility, and thus in their usefulness as teaching tools.<sup>1</sup> But I want to keep the translation<sup>2</sup> as teaching tool in the background today, and focus instead on the problems<sup>3</sup> a translator into an archaic language faces and the choices one makes while working through those problems.<sup>4</sup> These choices have implications for the translation as cultural production.<sup>5</sup> Modern translation theory views<sup>6</sup> the translation as rendering a work<sup>7</sup> not only linguistically, but also culturally.8 A translation of, say, The Iliad into Japanese renders,9 as best it can, a distant and ancient culture accessible to a modern audience.<sup>10</sup> Viewed in this way, a translation of Alice into an archaic language<sup>1</sup> is engaged in a curious two-step:<sup>2</sup> it must represent the nineteenth-century Alice to its audience along with many aspects of nineteenth-century culture3—if it didn't it wouldn't be a translation, but something else.<sup>4</sup> But it will also, inevitably, touch upon and represent the ancient culture in whose language it is written.<sup>5</sup> Even the 1964 Latin translation by Clive Carruthers,<sup>6</sup> which remains firmly rooted in the nineteenth century,7 does that, if only by echoing the school-texts its readers are familiar with and employing8 a variety of meters from ancient elegiac couplets to the Goliardic rhymes of the Middle Ages.<sup>9</sup> The Old English Alice is, then, a translation for three cultures:<sup>10</sup> both nineteenth-century and Anglo-Saxon England, and of course the postmodern world its intended readers inhabit.

These translations vary widely in quality, interest, and accessibility, and thus in their usefulness as teaching tools.1 But I want to keep the translation2 as teaching tool in the background today, and focus instead on the problems<sup>3</sup> a translator into an archaic language faces and the choices one makes while working through those problems.<sup>4</sup> These choices have implications for the translation as cultural production.<sup>5</sup> Modern translation theory views<sup>6</sup> the translation as rendering a work<sup>7</sup> not only linguistically, but also culturally.<sup>8</sup> A translation of, say, The Iliad into Japanese renders,9 as best it can, a distant and ancient culture accessible to a modern audience.10 Viewed in this way, a translation of Alice into an archaic language<sup>1</sup> is engaged in a curious two-step:<sup>2</sup> it must represent the nineteenth-century Alice to its audience along with many aspects of nineteenthcentury culture<sup>3</sup>—if it didn't it wouldn't be a translation, but something else.<sup>4</sup> But it will also, inevitably, touch upon and represent the ancient culture in whose language it is written.<sup>5</sup> Even the 1964 Latin translation by Clive Carruthers,<sup>6</sup> which remains firmly rooted in the nineteenth century,7 does that, if only by echoing the school-texts its readers are familiar with and employing8 a variety of meters from ancient elegiac couplets to the Goliardic rhymes of the Middle Ages.<sup>9</sup> The Old English Alice is, then, a translation for three cultures:10 both nineteenth-century and Anglo-Saxon England, and of course the postmodern world its intended readers inhabit.

These translations vary widely in quality, interest, and accessibility, and thus in their usefulness as teaching tools.<sup>1</sup> But I want to keep the translation<sup>2</sup> as teaching tool in the background today, and focus instead on the problems<sup>3</sup> a translator into an archaic language faces and the choices one makes while working through those problems.<sup>4</sup> These choices have implications for the translation as cultural production.<sup>5</sup> Modern translation theory views<sup>6</sup> the translation as rendering a work<sup>7</sup> not only linguistically, but also culturally.8 A translation of, say, The Iliad into Japanese renders,9 as best it can, a distant and ancient culture accessible to a modern audience.<sup>10</sup> Viewed in this way, a translation of Alice into an archaic language<sup>1</sup> is engaged in a curious two-step:<sup>2</sup> it must represent the nineteenth-century Alice to its audience along with many aspects of nineteenth-century culture<sup>3</sup>—if it didn't it wouldn't be a translation, but something else.4 But it will also, inevitably, touch upon and represent the ancient culture in whose language it is written.<sup>5</sup> Even the 1964 Latin translation by Clive Carruthers,<sup>6</sup> which remains firmly rooted in the nineteenth century,<sup>7</sup> does that, if only by echoing the school-texts its readers are familiar with and employing<sup>8</sup> a variety of meters from ancient elegiac couplets to the Goliardic rhymes of the Middle Ages.<sup>9</sup> The Old English Alice is, then, a translation for three cultures:<sup>10</sup> both nineteenth-century and Anglo-Saxon England, and of course the postmodern world its intended readers inhabit.