Abstract
This thesis studies the manifestation of stereotypical English elements in P.G. Wodehouse’s texts and the techniques used by translators to convey elements referring to Englishness from English into Estonian.

The paper has been divided into two major parts: the theoretical background of the study and the empirical analysis of translations.

The first part of the paper gives an overview of Wodehouse’s life and work, the constitution of Englishness, the concept of stereotypes and specific stereotypes about the English, as well as the relevant translation theory approaches to translating culture-specific elements and the changes that may occur in translations in comparison to the original texts.

The second part of the paper looks at two texts by Wodehouse and the Estonian translations of these texts with the aim of establishing the manifestation of stereotypical English elements in Estonian translations. A short comparison of the different approaches to handling elements referring to Englishness is made at the end of the analysis.
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INTRODUCTION
This paper studies an aspect of literary translation, more specifically the particularities related to transferring the elements referring to Englishness in P.G. Wodehouse’s works from English into Estonian. The study stems from the assumption that in literary translation some specific elements of the source text or culture are always carried over to the target text by the translator. Wodehouse was chosen as a writer who has used many English stereotypes in his books as a way of creating an ideal English world for his readers.

The introduction of the paper tries to shed light on the claimed Englishness of Wodehouse’s texts.

Wodehouse
There are few 20th-century writers who could be perceived as more quintessentially English than Wodehouse, whose name alone conjures up escapist images of upper-class English society (McCrum 2002: para. 1). Until the day he died, Wodehouse perfected his art of selling to American audiences an affectionate caricature of Britain, extravagant Edwardian aristocracy and young men of leisure, refracted through Wodehouse’s particular humorous approach to the subject (McCrum 2002: para. 4, 5).

As argued by his admirers, Pelham Grenville Wodehouse was ‘the funniest writer in the world’, ‘the foremost exponent of English humour’ (Jasen 2002: xiii, 1). He started his career by writing humour stories for his school magazine and continued producing light novels, even though his main focus seemed to turn to farce (Usborne 1978: 18). He also wrote plays for the stage and films for the screen (Usborne 1978: 19), which, along with his novel-writing and journalism, kept him unimaginably busy.

Wodehouse was born in 1881 as the third son of Henry Ernest and Eleanor Wodehouse. His father worked in Hong Kong and that is where young P.G. (known as
Plum to family and friends) spent his infancy (Jasen 2002: 1, 4). Later, he and his brothers were left in boarding schools and in the care of numerous relatives back in England for the majority of their childhood, as the Wodehouses wanted their sons to have a ‘good education and proper English upbringing’ (Jasen 2002: 4–5). Although Wodehouse was not an orphan, the situation inflicted upon him and his brothers meant that he never got to know his parents very well. However, he did get an ‘English upbringing’ and the full experience of an English public school, which later proved useful in his literary career.

April 16, 1904 was to be a turning point in Wodehouse’s life – that is when he left for his first visit to the United States of America, a place that was to play a major part in his future. He enjoyed New York and upon returning to England found that his trip had made him something of an expert on the USA in the eyes of the English magazines he wrote for (Jasen 2002: 32–22). He kept going back and forth and worked on both sides of the Atlantic, until he settled down in the USA for good. He saw England for the last time in 1939 (Usborne 1978: 18).

In 1934, Wodehouse and his wife bought a house in Le Touquet, located in northern France. Wodehouse thought it a perfect place to become his permanent base, as it suited his needs well: it was secluded, but quite close to England; he had space to write and exercise (Jasen 2002: 139). It was from there that he was taken to a German internment camp in 1940 (Jasen 2002: 173) – a shock to himself, his wife and the public. After years of moving from one camp to another and being held under watch in country houses in France and Germany, he was released from what was called ‘preventive detention’ in 1945 (Jasen 2002: 187). The house in Le Touquet was in a bad shape and the couple decided to sell it in 1946. They returned to America in 1947 (Jasen 2002: 205; 207).

Despite (false) accusations that he had broadcast propaganda for Nazi Germans (Jasen 2002: 181), Wodehouse continued to be in fashion in the USA. He was persistent in
writing about an era that could not be specifically pinned down, but was easily recognisable to his fans, who did not see his style as outdated or his stories as repetitive. They enjoyed the Wodehousian world, regardless of whether it was the England of today, yesterday or never (Jasen 2002: 212; 213). In 1955, Wodehouse officially became an American citizen at the age of seventy-four (Jasen 2002: 232).

Perhaps surprisingly, for an author of near-farcical stories Wodehouse was actually quite shy and took his writing seriously. As a person, he would rather observe life from the sidelines and evade its problems (Jasen 2002: xiv). As a writer, he was extremely prolific, having completed nearly a hundred books before he died of a heart attack in 1975 (Usborne 1978: 11). However, it cannot be said that the overwhelming number of books came with ease – he polished every chapter with meticulous care, pencilled pages and pages of notes, rewrote sentences and cut out many ‘weak’ storylines before he felt that a piece of writing was finished (Usborne 1978: 23).

In his books, Wodehouse created his own world, one that both his American and Britain readers came to know, love and, one might argue, expect from his writing, especially from the Jeeves and Wooster series. Wodehouse’s plots fit his characters, who did not have to be consistent with reality, but with themselves and the Wodehousian world. His humour depends mainly on exaggeration and understatement, the inappropriate use of phrases and the literal interpretation of idiomatic expressions out of context. It appeared to critics, the public and to the writer himself that his only object in writing was simply to amuse (Jasen 2002: xiii).

The Wodehousian world was a reflection of Wodehouse’s own inner world, which the real world seemed to pass by (Jasen 2002: 157). In fact, one of the most remarkable things about his writing is the lack of development (Orwell 1945: para. 16). Wodehouse learned to avoid dates, so that his work would not age (Usborne 1978: 32).
Having moved away from England, he gave his readers novels that were set in an idealised version of England, one that was not real – or if it had ever been, it had been gone for some time. Richard Usborne (1978: 38) claims Wodehouse was well aware that the world he wrote about was extinct, but it did not bother him, just as it did not bother his readers. He had mastered the world of country houses and heavy-set butlers, wise gentlemen’s gentlemen and of settings long gone, and he liked it (Usborne 1978: 38). It was a picture that had formed in his head before 1914 – a naïve, traditional, and admiring picture (Orwell 1945: para. 22), one that was a perfect setting for his kind-hearted stories with inept characters and laughter-inducing plots.

**Jeeves and Wooster**

Bertie Wooster and Reginald Jeeves are arguably the most famous of Wodehouse’s characters. It is certainly true that he wrote about them much more than he did about any of his other characters. Generally, the Jeeves and Wooster stories are narrated in the first person by Bertie Wooster (Usborne 1978: 193, 204).

Wodehouse’s Wooster and Jeeves share childhoods similar to his own (Usborne 1978: 233) – no mention of parents, but a seemingly endless supply of other relatives, mainly formidable aunts, creating a feeling of being ‘passed from hand to hand’ (Jasen 2002: 8, 9). Usborne even claims that pieces of Wodehouse’s life can be found throughout the Wooster world, with many of his own childhood memories from the end of the 19th century used to describe the events in Bertie’s life. In portions of his background and attitudes, Bertie is the young Wodehouse that the old Wodehouse remembers with amusement, candour, modesty and schoolboy romanticism (Usborne 1978: 205–207).

Bertie Wooster is a rich bachelor of about 24, an Englishman who is ‘mentally negligible, but with a heart of gold’, as Jeeves once described his young master (Usborne 1978: 220). He is one of nature’s bachelors, constantly getting in and out of engagements,
and when he is not avoiding aunts, he is trying to help his numerous friends out of amusing predicaments. He rarely ever worries about ‘serious’ matters and never seems to want for much else but a good laugh, a good lunch and some tobacco. Bertie is a happy, although a fumbling and not a very intelligent character, perfectly fitting the stereotype of a carefree unmarried aristocrat.

Jeeves is Bertie’s manservant, or a gentleman’s gentleman – a position that makes him much more important than a manor butler. He is a highly intelligent man, a ‘godlike prime mover, a master brain’ (Usborne 1978: 228), used by Wodehouse in his books to engineer all the plot twists, which would have been good if they had been accidental, but are even better when they are deliberately created. Jeeves as the stereotypically reserved English manservant never gives the impression of being amused or rattled and can move without making a single sound. One can only tell that Jeeves is exasperated when he clutches at a table or twitches his lip/eyebrow (Usborne 1978: 236).

Thus, they seem to be the perfect comical pairing of a dumb master and an intelligent servant – comical first due to the notion that the servant should not be superior to the master, but is; second, due to the exaggerated Englishness of the characters; third for the comedy of the plots; and fourth, for the effect of Wodehouse’s language.

One cannot help but wonder whether Wodehouse drove to perfection in his language and plot twists because his Jeeves and Wooster stories did not provide anything new scheme-wise: Bertie or one of his friends gets into trouble, Bertie tries to solve the problem, but makes matters even worse, Jeeves steps in and helps everyone out. In return, Bertie gets rid of an item of clothing/habit that Jeeves has not approved of earlier in the story. By the end, the status quo has been established and that in itself is a sufficiently happy ending.
Wodehouse’s critics point out that he often repeats himself (Usborne 1978: 42), but perhaps repetition and familiarity actually constituted some of the features that made those books so popular. People in general tend to like familiarity, and Wodehouse provided exactly that – but with enough unexpected twists and turns to keep his readers returning to his novels. Most of his writing was a variation on one theme, illustrating different aspects of human relationships, reaffirming the joy of living and the inherent kindliness of human beings (Jasen 2002: xiv).

The saga of Jeeves and Wooster had humble origins in taking advantage of American stereotypes of English life (Watson 1997: para. 9, 23). As Orwell notes, Bertie Wooster, ‘with his spats and his cane’, is a stage-Englishman (Orwell 1945: para. 21). Jeeves, on the other hand, represented the glorified English manservant (Usborne 1978: 223). Indeed – although it may at first glance seem extraordinary for such quintessentially English characters, the fact is that Wodehouse came up with Jeeves in New York (Watson 1997: para. 1). He had thought of Bertie Wooster earlier (although the characters had a different name at first), but the comic pairing gained momentum in the USA, with the Jeeves-Wooster cycle beginning in earnest in 1919 (Orwell 1945: para. 16). But when one stops to think, the idea suddenly seems less strange – it can be argued that often, expatriates find a renewed love for their native culture and traditions amongst a foreign nation; a much stronger love than anything they had felt while in their original homeland.

In Wodehouse’s case, however, the ‘exile’ was a voluntary one and the factor of pleasing the audience played a major role in creating the English gentleman’s gentleman. Having travelled back and forth between England and America since 1904 and finally settling in the USA for good, he was fairly well informed of what was liked on either side of the Atlantic Ocean. Wodehouse himself claimed that he did not write the Jeeves and Wooster stories to relive his youth, but to give Americans what they wanted – and it would
seem that what Americans enjoyed was to read about exaggerated Englishness. Wodehouse simply gave his audience the kinds of characters they expected the English to be.

**Englishness**
To foreigners, British and English may seem synonymous. To people living in Great Britain, they certainly are not. Locals sometimes find it hard to define themselves nationality-wise, but just as often, they know exactly who they are NOT, e.g., ‘British first, then Scottish, but definitely not English’ (Betts 2007: para. 11). Being English or British is not merely related to one’s geographical location – it has just as much to do with one’s state of mind (Betts 2007: para. 1). This was certainly true of Jeeves and Wooster, who stayed thoroughly English even when their adventures took them to New York.

The current constitutional situation in the UK encourages people to choose their national allegiance (Betts 2007: para. 11), meaning that Englishness is not something that is defined in a book somewhere – it is an elusive concept, much to do with a general feeling rather than something specific. One cannot be certain that people speaking ‘Queen’s English’ would necessarily describe themselves as English, but what seems undisputable is that they will more than likely be perceived as English by people who originally are not from Great Britain and may not know all the nuances of such distinctions. Furthermore, all of us have inevitably come into contact with stereotypes, and stereotypes are indeed strong shapers of what is considered to be characteristic of certain people, especially when viewed from afar.

In the case of Estonians and their perception of Englishness, it could be argued that our general sense of what is typically English can be exemplified by Agatha Christie’s detective stories. Recently, it has been reinforced by English series on our TV screens. Take, for example, Christie’s series about Hercule Poirot – thanks to prevalent stereotypes
of Englishmen, we know that with his posh accent, his hat and his typically English gap-fillers (‘I say!’), Hastings is a stereotypical Englishman. DCI Barnaby, the hero of Midsomer Murders, another English TV-series displaying scenic English villages, always remains calm, whatever the situation – another trait seen as typical of the English. It is argued that the need to preserve one’s dignity is closely linked to keeping one’s emotions to oneself as a way of coping (Taylor 2005: para. 5).

Indeed, the famous English reserve, understated reactions and the wish to keep one’s dignity intact can also be noted in the behaviour of Jeeves and Wooster, with the former usually responding to the most outrageous situations with an ‘Indeed, sir?’ and the latter agreeing to marry girls just to avoid the embarrassment of pointing out that there has been a misunderstanding.

However, it is important to note that not all emotions in English culture are ‘banned’. Expressing oneself through humour is especially important. Of all the characteristics of the English, their sense of humour is one of the best known and most positively regarded, having a powerful influence on their culture (Taylor 2004: para. 1). This may, once again, explain the popularity of Wodehouse.

Upon reading Wodehouse’s books, one is struck by their Englishness – a characteristic that is difficult to define, and even more difficult to translate. This paper attempts to analyse whether and to what degree the English elements related to Englishness present in Wodehouse’s original texts are preserved in their Estonian translations. If the elements present in Wodehouse’s text cannot be found, the omissions and possible reasons for these are studied; if they are preserved, however, questions such as if the English elements are recognisable in translations, as well as the specific techniques used to present the elements in Estonian are observed. In order to do that, a survey of theoretical issues providing the main premises and concepts for the paper is given in Chapter 1.
1. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

For the purposes of this paper, the following quote from Lawrence Venuti shall be used to define translation: ‘Translation is the forcible replacement of the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text with a text that will be intelligible to the target language reader.’ (Venuti 2004: 18).

This thesis shall proceed from the notion that in the process of translation, an English text is replaced by an Estonian text understandable to the target language (Estonian) reader, but particular linguistic and cultural elements specific to the source text are inevitably retained in the target text. Thus, they give the reader the sense of a certain degree of ‘foreignness’. Abolishing such culture-specific elements would mean the complete domestication of the text, which does not seem to be the customary practice in literary translation.

Contrary to that, in the field of technical translation the view does seem to be that a good translation should read like an original – in fact, achieving this effect is one of the routine definitions of the task of a translator (Cronin 2004: 128). After all, if the aim is to be intelligible to the target reader, then the importance of the receiving system seems to be greater in many cases (Aaltonen 1996: 17). However, in literary translation, texts are rarely localised to the extent that even personal names are changed – with the exception of perhaps children’s literature or other types of texts where the location of events is less important and the meaning of the characters’ names may serve a special purpose (e.g. the characters and places in the Harry Potter books).

It can be argued that markers such as names in texts may often give hints to the reader as to their source language or culture. Elements like these remind the reader that the text originates from a culture and language that is essentially foreign to him/her. Therefore, translation is a core element in gathering insights about other cultures and in helping us to
understand the ‘other’ better (Cronin 2004: 6). What is more, readers may in fact expect the foreign elements to be there so that they could educate themselves on the culture and conventions of the other and learn more about what they cannot experience or do not come into contact with in their home country. However, readers inevitably have some expectations as regards the text – for instance, when a person picks up some light reading, s/he arguably does not expect to educate herself or himself on the complexity of source culture sayings, translated by means of calques or borrowings so as to give the reader a taste of the source culture.

Indeed, when a term or a concept is missing from the source culture, borrowing can be used to overcome a gap between the source and target cultures or languages. It is the simplest of all translation methods and used to produce a stylistic effect: the use of foreign terms in the target text gives the text a foreign flavour of the source culture (Vinay and Darbelnet 2004: 85).

A certain kind of borrowing, where a language ‘borrows’ an expression from another language and translates its elements literally, is called a calque. A calque can be either lexical (introducing a new kind of expression, while respecting the structure of the target language) or structural (introducing a new kind of structure in the target language) (Vinay and Darbelnet 2004: 85). Over time, calques introduced into a language may become a part of it in their own right. Translators may want to use calques if there is a gap between the source culture and the target culture that cannot be filled by target culture/language means alone (Vinay and Darbelnet 2004: 85). It can be argued that in terms of bringing foreignness into a text, next to personal names and references to foreign cultures, borrowings and calque translations are some of the more significant techniques in highlighting foreign elements.
Perhaps due to the fact that calques and borrowings can be used only to a limited extent, translators need to adopt other techniques to mediate the content of the text, and one of the techniques may be paraphrasing, which may bring along several changes. This may happen when a source language word lacks an equivalent with all the same connotations in the target language and is thus replaced by two or more in the target language in the attempts to achieve the same effect. Shoshana Blum-Kulka refers to the expansion of a text, to making a text more explicit, e.g. paraphrasing ‘halfway up’ as ‘not up yet’, or adding links between words to make the sentence clearer. She claims it to be a universal practice inherent to language mediation (Blum-Kulka 2004: 301–302). Such changes perhaps come from the fact that in order to translate a phrase, it is often somehow ‘turned inside out’ or paraphrased in order to make it understandable, but not always turned back when putting it into the target language, thus resulting in a greater level of explicitness in the translated text. This refers to changes in cohesion.

However, Blum-Kulka also points to shifts in coherence – that is to say, audience-based shifts that unavoidably occur when texts are changed to meet the needs of the target language readers, who are not familiar with the reference system (allusions to persons, places, other texts) of the source culture. Here, too, the translator must make certain choices in deciding what and how to explain or ‘domesticate’ for the readers (Blum-Kulka 2004: 306). As Ernst-August Gutt (2004: 384) puts it, the translator must use his/her knowledge of the environment and the potential relevance of the text’s aspects.

The translator may be aware of the relevance of certain aspects, but André Lefevere (2004: 237) claims that as different languages reflect different cultures, translators often try to ‘naturalise’ the culture of the other, to make it conform to what the readers expect or are used to. Such changes have nothing to do with the translator’s knowledge of the translated language, but rather with other limitations to the translator’s actions that s/he perceives as
directing him/her in shaping the translation (Lefevere 2004: 237). According to Lefevere, planting a text from one culture to another always involves making compromises, but compromises leave ‘gaps’ between the two systems – the reason why some works simply do not ‘function’ when translated (Lefevere 2004: 237). Thus, the translator has to make choices and compromises in translating and is directed both by limitations of the target culture/language and the context of the text.

This is also claimed by Jiří Levý, who states that the choices that a translator has to make are never random, but context-bound. The task is made easier when there are fewer alternatives to choose from or if the ‘right’ choice is somehow determined by the author’s philosophy (Levý 2004: 149). This could mean that there may not be many synonyms for a term or that the style of the author is such or a character has been written in such a way that does not leave the translator hesitant about which mode and, thus, which one of the possible alternatives to use. Of course, the subsequent choices are all dependent on the very first ones, if coherence is to be pursued. The translator, like the author, creates a context (Levý 2004: 149).

In creating context, translators are faced with three kinds of lexical levels: terms for which there are available parallels; terms that identify objects which are culturally different but have a similar purpose; and terms which are culture-specific (Nida 2004: 136–137). The ‘otherness’ of the translation is most likely to be manifested in the third category. In this case, the readers are introduced to concepts and terms that they have no trouble regarding as inherently foreign, or at least not local. These are the terms, expressions and concepts that are ‘deeply imbedded in the very thought structure of the message’ and which people accept, since they have already come to understand that others behave differently from themselves (Nida 2004: 137) or live in different worlds.
What is also important in Nida’s opinion is that in dynamic equivalence, the ‘emotional tone’ of the author should be preserved. This means that for example, the sarcasm and the irony of the text must be reflected accurately in the translation and the characters must have the same personality in the translation as the author had intended. In addition, wording and style must be chosen in a way that the characters’ social status or dialect would also be evident (Nida 2004: 139). In addition, retaining the humorous elements of humorous texts could be regarded as an aim in translation.

Roger Billerey (Billerey n.d.: para. 4) states that the unconventional use of signifiers by writers of humorous texts may clash with readers’ expectations, thus creating an element of surprise. The reader may be amused by puns and spoonerisms, which substitute the more conventional linguistic choices, or the clash of registers and styles (colloquialisms used in formal situations), or words with certain connotations – all of which the translator may not be able to convey in the target language due to certain restrictions not allowing the target system to be manipulated in a way similar to the source system. In addition, there may not be exact translation equivalents with the same connotations as the terms used in the source text, as already mentioned. Thus, the constraints of the target system deprive the target language reader of the same effects that were there for the source language reader (Billerey n.d.: para. 4).

Venuti claims that

the translator negotiates the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text by reducing them and supplying another set of differences, basically domestic, drawn from the receiving language and culture to enable the foreign to be received there. The foreign text, then, is not so much communicated as inscribed with domestic intelligibilities and interests (Venuti 2004: 468).

Such an approach has led to the questions of the possibility of retaining the foreignness of the text at all. Seeing that a text is translated, i.e. presented in a language different from the language of the source system, the linguistic and the cultural foreignness of a text must be made evident indirectly, by other means signalling a displacement in the translation, through markedly disarranging existing domestic factors (Venuti 2004: 469).
However, it would seem that the translator of literary texts in which the setting, the nationality of the characters and other such details play a significant role, could exercise a somewhat foreignising method. The linguistic and cultural otherness of the source text could be recognisable at least to some extent. As Venuti puts it, the reader could be sent ‘abroad’; the difference of the source culture from the target culture could be manifested (Venuti 2004: 20) by choosing to retain foreign features so as to highlight the source culture or being forced to do so due to the lack of translation options (e.g. no equivalents in the target language to the source language term/object etc).

Venuti observes that proper names are some of the formal and thematic elements that are unchanged in modern translation practices. In addition, neither the overall plot nor the sequence of events is rewritten; the actions of the characters are not altered or left out; dates as well as historical and geographical markers are generally in their original form (Venuti 2004: 470). However, other elements, such as dialects, jargon, registers, clichés, and stylistic innovations are usually rewritten in a way that is characteristic of the target culture and language, and thus inevitably domesticated. The translator is trying to produce the effect of the foreign by domestic analogues (Venuti 2004: 470–471).

Venuti’s views are in part echoed by Sirkku Aaltonen, who has studied the foreign and the domestic elements in translation in her book titled Acculturation of the Other (1996). In it, she looks at how and by which elements the Irish milieu of Irish plays staged in Finland is presented. She claims that if certain traits of the original text are to fulfil a particular function in terms of characterisation, plot or creating atmosphere, the translation always includes acculturation. The extent, however, to which foreign elements are acculturated, depends on how exotic the elements are, to which extent the translation is expected to be exotic, and how such elements can fulfil a particular function in translation (Aaltonen 1996: 5).
As Aaltonen confirms, at least some aspects of the translation must be intelligible in the target system so that the foreign in them could be integrated into the whole (Aaltonen 1996: 18) and the text could function in the target system. As a result, the culture-specific elements of the Irish texts in the Finnish translations studied by her were presented in a combination of Irish, neutral and Finnish elements (Aaltonen 1996: 5). Since some Irish elements were acculturated and presented as Finnicisms, the audience presumably felt less alienated by the remaining Irishisms in the texts.

For wider audiences, the foreign needs to be ‘toned down with familiar techniques’ (i.e. acculturated) – the text is manipulated with so that it would be possible for the receivers to identify with an unfamiliar reality (Aaltonen 1996: 15, 20). After all, texts are not translated purely because of their foreignness, and their integration into the receiving system may be made more difficult by strong cultural specificity or the presence of the other (Aaltonen 1996: 15). The reader needs to be able to relate to the text at least on some level to come to appreciate the elements of the ‘other’, i.e. the reader might feel more at ease when coming across (untranslatable) culture-specific features when the sentence structure of the source text is discarded in favour of the target text structure, or expressions specific to the source culture are substituted by expressions specific to the target culture (e.g. culture-specific proverbs that convey a similar meaning).

Aaltonen also mentions the importance of social hierarchy and distinct varieties of speech, which define the people of the fictional world using these varieties as belonging to certain classes, thus explaining their behaviour and authenticating their actions (Aaltonen 1996: 174). However, if there is no clash of different social classes in a text, this categorisation may also be expanded to include various individuals and the idiosyncratic ways in which they use language, and the translation choices made to distinguish such
people from each other in the text. The way that these characters behave and use language is determined by context.

She notes another extensive category by which the foreign milieu of the translated text is established – political concepts. Under it, she includes everything from ideological views and administrative units to honorific titles and social hierarchies (Aaltonen 1996: 108). She herself admits that if taken widely enough, this category could include almost everything, and its manifestations vary a great deal – for example, it can be seen in how the text is placed in a historical point in time, or conversely, how a specific time is lacking (Aaltonen 1996: 109). Aaltonen (1996: 109) goes on to claim that these concepts never function alone, but are linked to entire systems and further help to create context.

In pointing out ways in which context is created, Aaltonen looks at how the milieu or the features from which we can determine that a text has retained some of its ‘foreign’ traits is presented. She stresses perhaps the most conspicuous signs of the foreign – geographical locations and proper names, which link the locations and people of the text in the readers’ mind to real, existing places (Aaltonen 1996: 88) and create the feeling of the ‘other’. Among their other functions, Aaltonen claims that place names form the background setting for events, facilitate the understanding of meanings, serve to create the atmosphere and construct the plot (Aaltonen 1996: 88).

Aaltonen also mentions references to everyday life inside the text as elements that draw attention to the foreign settings in the translation. Such references may include food and drink, units of measurement, education, currency, distance, areas, temperature, items of clothing, newspapers etc. Aaltonen claims that the elements referred to are usually marginal in terms of the plot. They are mainly included to characterise the people in the text, give hints as to the location of events or ‘create a particular atmosphere and setting for
the events’ (Aaltonen 1996: 156, 159–160, 169). If such elements are left undomesticated, they signal an unfamiliar reality to the audience (Aaltonen 1996: 166).

Another important set of factors highlighted by Aaltonen is what she calls ‘art worlds’ or the mention of cultural goods that get transplanted in a new environment. According to her, the most important function of art worlds is that they characterise the figures and place them in a certain social and economic class (Aaltonen 1996: 141). She concentrates more on works of visual art and song titles, but referring to, for example, poems, proverbs and quotes could also be included in the list.

However, as Aaltonen claims, the extent to which the culture-specific milieu is manipulated with depends on the assumed awareness of the audience of the system in question (Aaltonen 1996: 68). As such, a text’s references to English culture that cannot be domesticated in an acceptable way may alienate the reader and make the text seem more foreign. However, it would seem that over time, Estonians have become able to grasp more and more cultural references. In that, perhaps Estonia is similar to Finland: a large part of cultural influx to the country has lately been coming from the United States and Great Britain (Aaltonen 1996: 16), and thus, the elements specific to those cultures should not be too exotic for the receiving cultures and people (Aaltonen 1996: 24), or at least be less exotic than they were some decades ago. Finns have a certain affinity to the Irish (Aaltonen 1996: 24), as it would seem Estonians have to the English. Thus, these systems present the ‘familiar foreign’ to Finns and Estonians (Aaltonen 1996: 25).

However, despite a certain degree of familiarity with the systems, Finns and Estonians still see Irish and English cultures from the outside. For people who have average knowledge of the original culture, stereotypes are the first and foremost source of what can be expected from it. Thus, the nature and expression of stereotypes shall be viewed more closely in the following section.
1.1. Stereotypes
According to Eleanor L. Simon, ‘a stereotype is a commonly held public belief about specific social groups or types of individuals’ (Simon 2011: vii). More specifically, stereotypes are generalisations of a group and can be based on race, nationality, ethnicity, religion, occupation, gender, and so on (Berger 2011: 329). Psychologists argue that people are inherently prone to stereotyping, as we are motivated to segment the world into pieces more comprehensible to us. Classifying other people and objects into categories based on their characteristics provides us with the means by which to predict the behaviour or nature of new people and things and thus help to reduce the complexity of the world in our minds (Grimm and Hughes 2011: 229, 238).

Silvia Tomelleri and Luigi Castelli (2011: 152) confirm that the mental representations we create for specific groups of people are based on our knowledge and past experiences of what a social group is like (or should be like). We often use stereotypes to ease the burden of overwhelming social information (Castelli and Tomelleri 2011: 152). Thus, it can be claimed that it is likely for people who are confronted with a foreign social setting to start looking for stereotypes – they already know that stereotypes apply to that particular setting and so feel more confident about understanding other foreign elements encountered or connecting them to previous existing knowledge.

According to Arthur Asa Berger (2011: 329), stereotypes are often used in formulaic genres that rely on stereotypes, so that people could make quick generalisations about the text. Stereotypes are enforced over and over: people are already familiar with the stereotypes used, thus recognise them, and the stereotypes are used again since people are expected to recognise them.
As such, stereotypes are considered to be one of the more important levels on which a connection with the audience is created. Stereotypes are universally established knowledge, generalisations that are accepted by the source culture as well as the target culture (Aaltonen 1996: 19), and making them more perceptible to the reader means that the reader may also become more susceptible to other elements making up the specific milieu of the text. The culture-specific elements function primarily in terms of creating the reality of the text, which has to be recognisable within the conventions of the genre, our cultural stereotypes and intertextual references (Aaltonen 1996: 24). However, the end result is largely dependent on the readers – they are the ones that receive the text according to their competence and experience of the general cultural conventions covering the language, manners, moral standards, rituals, tastes, ideologies, sense of humour, superstitions, religious beliefs etc of the source culture (Aaltonen 1996: 18) and interpret their representation in the target text accordingly.

Such an idea of simplification corresponds to the fact that stereotypes are generally based on limited experience. They are often learned from and used in media and humour to create quick associations and save time on explanations (Berger 2011: 329). Among stereotypes, cultural stereotypes are one source of readily available information that people lean on when trying to make sense of groups and individuals (Brandt and Reyna 2011: 48).

The *Xenophobe’s Guide to the English* by Antony Miall and David Milsted is one of the humorous sources of information about what to expect from the English nation. In this slim volume, the authors provide most of the characteristics typically related to the English by themselves and by others. The authors claim the English are used to be seen as stereotypes and even prefer it that way – as costume drama relics of the glory days of the past (Miall and Milsted 2011: 4).
The English pride themselves on their manners and for never breaking their word (Miall and Milsted 2011: 5). Keeping a ‘stiff upper lip’ is important to the English – emotion-betraying trembles are to be avoided, heads are to be held high and the best foot is to be put forward. In short, self-control and moderation in everything is a vital part of being English (Miall and Milsted 2011: 11). Creating a scene in public, making a fuss of any kind or gesturing wildly is unacceptable and suspicious behaviour only suitable for foreigners, if anyone. When confronted with such outbursts, the English generally try to avoid taking part in them in any way. ‘Languid indifference’ seems to be the proper manner of behaviour, even in the matters of the heart (Miall and Milsted 2011: 12, 32–33). Stoicism or cheerful calm in the face of adversity marks a true Englishman (Miall and Milsted 2011: 17).

Just like in the matters of the heart, the English remain steadfast and loyal to the past in matters more carnal as well. To the English, sex and sexuality are not something to be celebrated but to be treated in the vein of the myths and taboos of ‘less enlightened ages’ (Miall and Milsted 2011: 51). Sexual innuendo, however, is loved, as it gives the English a chance to display their sense of humour and wit. More often than not, their comedy seems to be ironic, observational, self-deprecating, understating or altogether surreal. But regardless of the type of joke, English humour and its deadpan deliverance is virtually unmatched in any other English-speaking country (Miall and Milsted 2011: 52, 55). As their humour seems so unique, it is of the essence to the English; something to make life bearable. As the authors remark: ‘In England, brains are optional but a sense of humour is compulsory’ (Miall and Milsted 2011: 53).

The English, despite being individualists, have a need of belonging to groups or teams. The traditional English clubs and societies provide their members with a way of relating to other people with similar interests ‘without actually having to’, with the social
classes being perhaps the biggest clubs of them all (Miall and Milsted 2011: 20–22). Another inherent trait of the English is eccentricity. Most English people are regarded eccentric by other nations, but the English themselves see eccentricity as a way of coping with antisocial behaviour that is even to be admired, especially if the eccentric person happens to be rich or famous. However, the eccentricity of eccentrics remains amusing and acceptable only as long as they are unaware of their own eccentricity (Miall and Milsted 2011: 28–29).

Traditional customs as reminders of the past are clung to. Once again, preserving old traditions harks back to the English past when everything was much more glamorous than anything found in the present. The English yearn for representations of what once was and like to bask in the ‘warm glow of yesterday’ (Miall and Milsted 2011: 36). One of the most inherent customs of the English is drinking tea – a curative, comforting and addictive drink that has been imbued with almost mystical qualities by its admirers. Tea for the English is strong Indian tea with milk, drank whatever the occasion or gathering (Miall and Milsted 2011: 42).

In the health department, there is one national fixation for the English – their bowels. They strive to add fibre in their diet and start their days with a satisfactory trip to the lavatory, and where nature fails, correctives for bowel disorders can remedy the situation. While the English remain as stoic as ever in the face of more serious illnesses, the workings of their bowels are always given the utmost attention, especially when away from home (Miall and Milsted 2011: 56–57).

Naturally, with bowels as tender as the English, all unknown food is distrusted and traditional approaches rule in English cuisine as well. ‘Good plain cooking’ with bacon and eggs for breakfast is traditionally favoured over anything more complicated (or tastier/healthier). Even though the nation’s preferences are moving towards the worldlier,
the English have somehow mastered the integration of the traditional foods of other nations into their own, with the result that restaurants are offering chips with curry sauce in their menus (Miall and Milsted 2011: 58–60).

In terms of culture, Shakespeare is by common consent the most prominent literary hero of the race. All other writers are measured against him and yet sometimes, other nations tend to get much more emotional about the writer than the English themselves. All in all, the English stance toward their literary legacy is to largely ignore it, but find solace in the fact that it is there (Miall and Milsted 2011: 62–63). This reflects their attitude towards the young, who, should the parents’ financial means allow, are sent away to public schools (which of course are meant for anyone but the public) to board for months on end with the excuse that it is ‘good for their character’ (Miall and Milsted 2011: 69).

In general, the English seem to have mastered avoidance of any kind. Examples range from the use of euphemisms in verbal communication to avoid spelling out something unpleasant or taboo-ish, leaving empty seats between neighbours in a crowded cinema to avoid touching someone else, refraining from saying what they mean and downplaying anything from anger to enthusiasm to avoid being embarrassed or seen as ‘Mediterranean’ (Miall and Milsted 2011: 10, 11, 31, 52, 84).

Quite a few of the stereotypes described also appear in Wodehouse’s texts. In the following chapter, the translations of two of his texts are discussed, regarding the stereotypes and other manifestations of Englishness.
2. ANALYSIS

Despite Wodehouse’s impressive output, very few of his texts have been translated into Estonian. In the University of Tartu library, four Jeeves-and-Wooster books are available in Estonian: Väga hea, Jeeves (Very Good, Jeeves) and Olgu, Jeeves, (Right Ho, Jeeves), both translated by Ralf Toming and published in 1997; Lase käia, Jeeves! (Carry On, Jeeves), translated by Kaja Greenbaum and published in 1998; Suur tänü, Jeeves!, (Much Obliged, Jeeves) translated by Kertu Vaino and published in 1998. The time frame during which the texts were translated was relatively short – thus, the translators probably could not base their translations on previous translations. Therefore the question how much unity can be found in Wodehouse’s English world presented to Estonians can also be asked.

The texts discussed in this thesis are Carry On, Jeeves (1925), and Much Obliged, Jeeves (1971) by P.G. Wodehouse. The translations are Lase käia, Jeeves, and Suur tänü, Jeeves, respectively. These translations were chosen due to their common publication year and for the fact that a comparison between the techniques of two translators can be carried out to determine whether different translators handle the elements related to Englishness differently. As Wodehouse’s own texts (especially the Jeeves-and-Wooster ones) changed little over the years (above, p. 6), the huge gap between the publication years of Carry On, Jeeves and Much Obliged, Jeeves is not seen as a hindrance for the analysis.

In the following analysis, the English elements that can be discerned in the source texts and their translations have been arranged according to their type, so as to give a better overview of the more significant or frequent features that the reader may notice based on his/her knowledge of the main cultural elements stereotypical of the English. In establishing these elements, Antony Miall’s and David Milsted’s suggestions (above, pp. 22–25) were used to detect stereotypical English traits, and the model offered by Sirkku
Aaltonen introduced in Chapter 1 was employed in determining which elements may be regarded as manifestations of the foreign system.

Many elements that give the texts a foreign flavour could arguably be fitted under several groups, but in the case of examples that display two or more characteristics, the more dominant one was the decisive factor in determining under which group to classify it. The two works are analysed and the findings compared in order to detect any relevant patterns.

2.1. *Carry On, Jeeves*

*Carry On, Jeeves* is a collection of Jeeves-and-Wooster short stories, which was first published in the UK in the year 1925 (Jasen 2002: 101, 263). The collection is significant for two reasons. First, it contains the story of the first encounter between Jeeves and Wooster, thus establishing the relationship between master and servant carried through many novels to come. Second, it contains the story in which, as he later confessed, Wodehouse realised the potential of Jeeves as a character. The writer awoke to the fact that he had created someone who could get Bertie and his numerous friends out of their predicaments, as none of the young men needing Jeeves’s assistance was blessed with the intelligence to manage their lives themselves. Jeeves, the refined, polished and suave gentleman’s gentleman, was the obvious answer (Jasen 2002: 56–57).

The collection does however differ from the novel studied in that the English characters are transferred to New York in quite a few stories, and to Paris in one, thus creating another dimension – the characters and their actions are a bit foreign in the setting of USA, and both the New York settings and the English features of the characters are somewhat foreign to the Estonian reader.
2.1.1. Proper Names
The first story takes place in London, thus setting the scene for the readers – London is mentioned on the very first page, as are other foreign place names and personal names that occur in the text. Proper names such as Florence, Easeby, Willoughby, and place names such as Shropshire and others are retained in their original form (*Lase käia, Jeeves!* p. 5). Place names are mentioned throughout the text, e.g. on page 165 of *Lase käia, Jeeves!*, where Sir Roderick Glossop mentions London Tower, Westminster Abbey and Hyde Park, all famous tourist attractions in London, which should leave no readers hesitant as to the location of the events. The Hyde Park Corner mentioned could refer to the Speakers’ Corner of the park, but as that has not been clarified in the original, the translator has treated it rather as a place name in its own right (as ‘Hyde Park Corner’) and has not opted to translate it, for example, as ‘Hyde Parki nurk’ or anything else to similar effect. Perhaps the name Hyde Park is familiar enough to Estonians or transparent enough so as to justify the choice of not using any domestication techniques.

On page 170 of *Carry On, Jeeves*, Bertie’s friend gives a false name in court to save himself from getting a mark on his own name. The name that he gives is that of Leon Trotsky, which the judge justifiably suspects belongs to someone else. The name is given in its English form, while in Estonian the name would be Lev Trotski. However, on page 181 of *Lase käia, Jeeves!*, the name is carried over to the translation with its English form. It can be argued that this is a case of unnecessary foreignisation. Bringing in the Estonian version of the name would have served the purpose it served in the original – showing that Bertie’s friend indeed gave a false name, but what is more, a false name that can be easily recognised as that of a famous Marxist politician. In the present case, however, only those who grasp the idea that this is the allusion appreciate the actual situation described.
2.1.2. Honorific Titles
Jeeves always addresses Bertie with the polite ‘sir’, which keeps the same form in the original as well as in the translation (e.g. *Lase käia, Jeeves!* p. 6, *Carry On, Jeeves* p. 12). As Bertie does not have a title (at least not one mentioned in the collection), addressing him as ‘sir’ merely shows that Jeeves recognises Bertie as someone with a higher social status, as Jeeves’s employer. It is important that the translator chose not to replace ‘sir’ with ‘häära’ – borrowing the ‘sir’ also retains the English flavour of the characters and settings. Thus, the reader is reminded of the foreignness of the text. In the translation, both master and servant address each other with the polite form of ‘teie’ in Estonian. ‘Messrs’, first mentioned on page 22 of *Lase käia, Jeeves!,* serves a similar purpose to ‘sir’, as it has been left in its original form and no further explanations are given as to its meaning. However, compared to ‘sir’, which is more widely recognised, ‘Messrs’ remains foreign to Estonian readers and gives relevant information only to those who are aware that it used as a plural form of ‘Mr’.

The mention of lady Florence and of a shooting coat as worn by lord Worplesdon on page 8 (*Lase käia, Jeeves!*) further conjures up images of Englishness, ‘lord’ and ‘lady’ being aristocracy titles in England (EKSS) and shooting being one of the favourite pastimes of the upper classes of English society. In Estonian, ‘lord’ is given as ‘lord’ and ‘lady’ in its Estonian spelling as ‘leedi’.

2.1.3. Units
In the translation (e.g. *Lase käia, Jeeves!* p. 8, 12, 14, 22, 25, 62, 165), distances and units of measurement have been translated, but not converted, Thus, ‘mile’ is ‘miil’, ‘quart’ is ‘kvart’, ‘yard’ is ‘jard’, ‘ounce’ is ‘unts’, and ‘foot’ is ‘jalg’, without added clarifying comments. This brings foreign flavour into the text and mystifies those readers who are unfamiliar with the English measurement system.
In another instance, on page 161 of *Lase kääia, Jeeves!*, ‘a mere elevenpence-ha’penny’ (Carry On, Jeeves, p. 151) has been translated as ‘ainult üksteist ja pool penni’, retaining ‘pennies’ as ‘pennid’ and implying that eleven and a half pence is not much to pay for anything.

Similarly, temperatures in the English text are given on the Fahrenheit scale. On page 22 of *Lase kääia, Jeeves!*, Bertie talks about 80 degrees, which would indeed be unimaginably hot for a summer’s day in Estonia where the Celsius scale is used. The translator, however, has not converted the degrees but rather presented them as they were in the original, and without adding the Fahrenheit marker to the number.

On page 24 of *Lase kääia, Jeeves!*, ‘shilling’ is translated as ‘šilling’, on page 108, a ‘penny’ as ‘penn’, on page 109, ‘quid’ is ‘naelsterling’ and on page 180 of *Lase kääia, Jeeves!*, ‘pound’ is ‘nael’. Estonian readers understand the implication that an item that costs a few shillings is a cheap one, that 500 quid is a substantial amount of money even for a year’s wages and five pounds as a fine is pocket money for a rich gentleman, but learn nothing more of the value of a shilling or a pound in relation to each other or to Estonian currency. As such, the cultural markers of temperature and money used in the text are alien to Estonians, who realise once again that the setting is foreign and the conventions English rather than Estonian, thus linking the English setting in the readers’ minds to the plot.

2.1.4. Institutions
References are made to a few institutions, such as Dartmoor (*Carry On, Jeeves*, p. 206), Colney Hatch (*Carry On, Jeeves*, p. 211), Harrogate and Buxton (*Carry On, Jeeves*, p. 232). As their nature is not explained, readers must go on context alone in deciding the purpose of the institutions. In the case of Dartmoor, it can be argued that its function as a prison is fairly clear from Freddie’s exclamation:
‘Thank goodness you will probably spend the next few years of your life in Dartmoor for kidnapping. That’s my only consolation. I’ll come and jeer at you through the bars on visiting days.’ (Carry On, Jeeves, p. 206)

translated as

“Tänu taevale, arvatavasti veedad sa mõned järgnevad aastad oma elust lapseröövi eest Dartmooris. See on mu ainus lohutus. Ma tulen külastuspäevadel ja irvitan su üle läbi trellide.” (Lase käia, Jeeves!, p. 221).

Here, it can be argued that the translator has made the translation more explicit by using ‘lapserööv’, not simply ‘inimrööv’ to translate ‘kidnapping’. However, in this case, it is pertinent, as Tootles, for the kidnapping of whom Bertie could have been accused, was indeed just a toddler. It can also be argued that ‘Tootles’, the child’s name, could also have been translated, as it is unlikely Tootles was the child’s given name, but rather a nickname.

One of the meanings of ‘tootling’ is walking in a leisurely manner, and combining that with the presumed clumsiness of a toddler, the translator could have exercised some liberty in translation and acted according to the implied meaning of the name. Thus, the child’s nickname could in Estonian have been, for example, Päntajalg, or, if this is seen as too negative, then something more affectionate.

In the case of Harrogate and Buxton, the purpose of the institutions as health spas remains unclear at first mention, but is clarified later on in the sentence, such as in the example.

My Uncle George is a festive old bird who has made a habit for years of doing himself a dashed sight too well, with the result that he’s always got Harrogate or Buxton hanging over him like the sword of what’s-his-name. /…/ Uncle George is bad enough in London, and I wasn’t going to let myself be cooped up with him in one of those cure-places. (Carry On, Jeeves, p. 231–232)

translated as

Onu George on peomaias vana rebane, kelle aastatepiikkused harjumused on pagana kuulsaks teinud, tulemuseks on see, et alailma ripub ähvardavalt tema pea kohal kas Harrogate või Buxton nagu selle mistan’d-nimi-nüüd-oligi mõõk. /…/Onu George Londonis on piisavalt jube, ja ma ei kavatsenudki lasta end koos temaga sulgeda ühte neist tervistavaist paikadest. (Lase käia, Jeeves!, p. 248–249).

A literary allusion is made to the sword of Damocles. However, as Bertie is unable to remember the name, English and Estonian readers are on a par as regards the recognition of the reference.

In the instance of Colney Hatch, however, nothing clarifying is said about it in the original, and the translator has not opted to add anything either.
Looking back at it, I can see that what saved me from Colney Hatch in this crisis was my bright idea in buying up most of the contents of the local sweetshop. By serving out sweets to the kid practically incessantly we managed to get through the rest of the day pretty satisfactorily. (*Carry On, Jeeves*, p. 211–212)

translated as


Here, the context does not provide the reader with an understanding that Colney Hatch is a lunatic asylum – the reader either knows this or not, and it can be argued that rather dissimilarly from major cities (London) or tourist attractions (Westminster Abbey), such specific institutions are rather unknown to people outside Great Britain. Thus, the text retains its foreign elements in the target text and Estonian people reading the translation may think whatever they please – perhaps that like Dartmoor, Colney Hatch is another prison.

**2.1.5. Newspapers**

If a name of a newspaper is mentioned, it can be a sign of everyday life and the times in which the events take place (Aaltonen 1996: 34–35) or perhaps in other cases, signify the character of the person that reads the newspaper in terms of his/her political views and social status, as indicated by Miall and Milsted (2011: 66): *The Independent* is read by those who think they should run the country, *The Guardian* by those who think they do run the country, *The Times* by those who actually do run the country. To Estonian readers, however, the mention of *The Times* on page 153 of *Lase käia, Jeeves!* probably signifies nothing more than the name of an English newspaper, as it is unlikely that Estonian people standing outside the English culture could draw similar parallels between the newspapers of another country.
2.1.6. Food and Drink
On page 7 of the translation, Jeeves brings Bertie a drink to cure his morning hangover. This ‘lifesaver’ of his includes, among others, Worcester sauce, a traditionally English spicy sauce, which is carried over to Estonian as ‘Worcesteri kaste’. The sauce is described as giving the drink colour, but as it is referred to as ‘sauce’ in the original as well, it needs no further explanations in Estonian as to what exactly it is, and readers more familiar with English culture may already know that the sauce is one of the favourite condiments used by the English.

Tea is of course one of the inherently English drinks. Tea is mentioned again and again, e.g. on pages 34 and 101 of Lase käia, Jeeves!, where Jeeves brings Bertie his invigorating cup of morning tea, these being just two instances of many. Tea is almost always mentioned just in passing or as something very natural, as it indeed is in English society. For example, on pages 69, 79, 86, 93, 153, 155 of Lase käia, Jeeves!, references to Bertie’s tea-drinking are used simply as a part of a sentence. Usually, no special attention is drawn to tea, except on page 115, where Bertie claims he is unable to function before his cup of tea. The morning ritual certainly reinforces the young man’s Englishness to readers. On pages 93 and 127 of Lase käia, Jeeves!, the stereotype about tea as something that someone is bound to suggest, no matter the situation (according to the Xenophobe’s Guide), is confirmed when offering a cup of tea is one of the first things the anxious Bertie says to a friend’s uncle/aunt, who has just arrived to his flat in New York.

On page 67 of Carry on, Jeeves, a mention is made of the classic English breakfast ‘bacon and eggs’, which is translated straightforwardly as ‘peekon ja munad’ (Lase käia, Jeeves! p. 66), although in this case, the author may be referring to a full breakfast instead of actual bacon and eggs, just as ‘tea’ is sometimes used to refer to a meal (see, for example, page 115 and 116 of Lase käia, Jeeves!, where Bertie demands that Jeeves bring him his morning tea and is later described having a sandwich).
On page 171 of *Lase käia, Jeeves!*, the name of a drink identified as Green Swizzles (*Carry On, Jeeves* p. 161) is not translated, thus leaving the readers in the dark about the appearance and nature of the cocktail. The necessity of translating proper names is debatable, but as the cocktail does not seem to be an established drink whose name should not be changed, then translating it (e.g. to ‘Rohepööris’ or ‘Roheline Rummikokteil’ etc) may have served to ease the reading experience. The same applies to the name Bailey’s Granulated Breakfast Chips (*Carry On, Jeeves*, p. 209), which could arguably have been translated in some simple way (as in ‘Bailey’s hommikusöögihelbed’ or something else to that effect) to help the readers to understand it was a brand of morning cereal. Instead, the name of the cereal been left in its original form on page 224 of *Lase käia, Jeeves!*, and Estonian readers may only guess that ‘Bailey’s Granulated Breakfast Chips’ are a sort of morning cereal by the mention that they are eaten with a little milk. These can be classified as references to everyday life, which do help the reader understand that the events take place in a foreign setting, but are arguably left in their original form unjustifiably – everyday elements, which are irrelevant in terms of the plot and mentioned only to give a background to the settings, could be translated, as their specificity as markers of the source culture does not need to be retained.

It is important that pudding is mentioned as a part of dinner:

I didn’t think much about it at the time, because boiled pudding is a thing you have to give your undivided attention to if you want to do yourself justice… (*Carry On, Jeeves*, p. 184)

Ma ei jäänud tol hetkel selle üle mõtisklema, sest puding on asi, mis nõuab täit tähelepanu, kui sa tahad endale pandud lootusi täita… (*Lase käia, Jeeves!* , p. 196).

As Miall and Milsted (2011: 59) confirm, the English love pudding and would not think of a meal as finished unless it was followed by pudding. Thus, Bertie’s statement that ‘puding on asi, mis nõuab täit tähelepanu’ should indicate his very English streak of paying undivided attention to food instead of another person. The use of ‘boiled’ in front of ‘pudding’ refers to the fact that in this case, ‘pudding’ is not used to denote just any sweet
dish that follows the main course, as it sometimes may be, but that it is a specific dish of some sort of a boiled variety. Thus, the translation choice of ‘puding’ is probably a sound one, the only question here is: why not translate ‘boiled’? Perhaps, as pudding is something less inherent to Estonian culture, the translator did not care to specify the type of pudding – it may be of interest to an Englishman to know whether the pudding was boiled, baked or steamed, but maybe simply the mention of ‘puding’ is indeed enough in Estonian. Thus, this refers to what Blum-Kulka calls shifts in coherence – changes that the translator makes in the text based on his/her expectations of the target text readers’ needs.

2.1.7. Clubs
Another stereotypical English trait is mentioned on page 10 of Lase käia, Jeeves!, that of belonging to clubs. Bertie is here talking about the gentlemen’s club The Drones, referred to by its name later on, that he belongs to as a traditional member of English aristocracy. It is often mentioned in passing, such as on page 67 of the translation: ‘Ma õhtustasin klubis ja astusin pärastpoolt korraks sisse etendust vaatama’.

However, some confusion arises when the English Bertie states: ‘Well, I slid into the Drones this morning for a bite of lunch…’ (Carry On, Jeeves, p. 199), while the Estonian Bertie says: “Nojah, ma astusin täna Droneside poole sisse, et natuke lõunat süüa…” (Lase käia, Jeeves!, p. 213). This misunderstanding on the part of the translator is strange, as on the top of the same page, Bertie declares he just got back from the club. The suggestion that Bertie has not been visiting his club of leisurely gentlemen, as is his wont, but having lunch with a family called the Drones, is arguably not consistent with the whole context, as having lunch with someone in the Wodehousian world is not something done in passing, but something that usually involves planning and early invitations.

Embarrassment is a driving force in an exchange between Bertie and his friend Bingo Little, who is afraid that if an article revealing his intimate secrets is published, he
may have to become a recluse. However, the underlying English trait of needing to belong is the main element.

‘If it does, I shall have to resign from my clubs, grow a beard, and become a hermit. I shall not be able to face the world.’ (Carry On, Jeeves, p. 234)
translated as

“Kui see juhtub, pean ma loobuma klubidest, kasvatama habeme ja erakuks hakkama. Ma ei suudaks inimestele silma vaadata.” (Lase käia, Jeeves!, p. 251).

It is telling that the first thing Bingo mentions as consequences to the publishing of the article in print is that he will have to resign from clubs (in plural) – implying to the reader that belonging to clubs is important to him, and that it constitutes something which he would rather not give up. This is in coherence with the English need to be a part of the team of people with whom they have something in common, to feel they are not alone (Miall and Milsted 2011: 20). So as to satisfy that need, English life is enriched with clubs and societies, which rarely have a sensible or productive purpose for non-members and the members of which rarely acknowledge each other’s existence outside a said club or society (Miall and Milsted 2011: 20–21).

2.1.8. Literary References
On page 21 of Lase käia, Jeeves!, Bertie recalls a poem unfamiliar to Estonian readers, but having implications for English ones – the poem is ‘about a bird by the name of Eugene Aram’ (Carry On, Jeeves p. 25) and Bertie can only remember a few words of it. He quotes: ‘Tum-tum, tum-tum, tum-tumty-tum / I slew him, tum-tum tum!’ Presumably, the translated lines (‘Põmm-põmm, põmm-põmm, põmm-põmndi põmm, / Surnuks lõin ta, põmm-põmm põmm’) remain unclear to Estonian readers, but to anyone familiar with the poem in English, the misquotation is telling of Bertie’s education, as the actual words he quotes cannot be found in The Dream of Eugene Aram by Thomas Hood, which may be the poem Bertie is trying to remember. He has obviously learned extensively about English literature in school, but his actual memory of it falls short. Thus, the misquotation reveals his inadequacy to the English readers with a similar background, but remains little more
than an empty space-filler for the average Estonian, who has not heard of Eugene Aram or the poem written about him.

On page 57 of _Lase käia, Jeeves!,_ Bertie refers to expressions that by his accounts may originate from Shakespeare ‘and those poet Johnnies’ (_Carry on, Jeeves_ p. 58) about it being darkest before dawn, about a silver lining and about swings and roundabouts. As Bertie is not using exact quotes, but only alluding to texts, the translator does not seem to have found that using exact translations of the expressions is important, and the translation reads ‘alati on kõige pimedam enne koitu ning alati kumab lohutuskiir õnnetuses ja kui sa ühelt poolt midagi kaotad, siis teiselt poolt jällegi võidad’. Thus, the ensuing references are translated quite liberally, with ‘swings and roundabouts’ having been paraphrased to convey the meaning in Estonian. In this case, it is the reference to Shakespeare that is the important element, as Estonians may recognise Shakespeare as the most renowned English writer. A similar allusion to Shakespeare or ‘some equally brainy bird’ (_Carry on, Jeeves_ p. 60) can be seen on page 59 of _Lase käia, Jeeves!,_ where Bertie is once again struggling with remembering the exact quote, but still reminding the reader of his English education and background. In the original text, Bertie muses:

I’m not absolutely certain of my facts, but I rather fancy it’s Shakespeare – or, if not, it’s some equally brainy bird – who says that it’s always just when a fellow is feeling particularly braced with things in general that Fate sneaks up behind him with the bit of lead piping.

translated as

Ma pole oma andmete õigsuses päris kindel, kuid ma olen üsna veendunud, et see oli Shakespeare – või kui mitte tema, siis mõni teine sama nutikas sell –, kes ütles, et see on alati nii, kui mees tunneb end asjade üldise seisuga eriti rahul olevat, hiilib Saatus talle selja tagant ligi mõne väikese vingerpussiga.

Here, the comedy stems from the clash of styles that Billerey mentioned as creating a humorous effect – the reader is not expected to believe that the rather liberal way that Bertie expresses himself was an exact quote written down in quite such a form by Shakespeare or any other poet. However, it can be argued that the text in English is more humorous in terms of almost giving Fate the appearance of a violent villain ready to hit its victim with a bit of piping, while in Estonian, a mere ‘vingerpuss’ seems much more
innocent, nothing more than a childlike prank. Here, what has occurred is a shift in cohesion – the source text has been paraphrased in the target and lost its connotations.

2.1.9. Sports and Hunting

The reference to the annual boat race between the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, which has been a long-standing tradition since 1829, is a strong hint as to the location of the events being specifically England-based. On page 170 of *Carry On, Jeeves*, the boat race is indeed mentioned as an established tradition during which, some liberties are given to citizens in terms of public behaviour.

I am aware that on the night following the annual aquatic contest between the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge a certain licence is traditionally granted by the authorities, but aggravated acts of ruffianly hooliganism like that of the prisoner Trotzky cannot be overlooked or palliated. (*Carry On, Jeeves*, p. 170) translated as

Ma tean, et õöl pärrast iga-aastast veespordi võistlust Oxfordi ja Cambridge’i ülikoolide vahel on tavaliselt teatud vabadused võimude poolt lubatud, kuid jõhkardliku huligaansuse raskendavad asjaolud, nagu vahialus Trotzky puhul, ei saa jätta tähelepanuta või neid pehmendada. (*Lase käia, Jeeves!*, p. 181).

In this case, a reference is made to the impressive duration of the race with the expression ‘I am aware’ and ‘traditionally’, hinting to the reader that the race is an established tradition and celebrated accordingly (Miall and Milsted 2011: 36), which is also carried over to Estonian by ‘ma tean’ and ‘tavaliselt’. Thus, it has been made clear in the translation that the contest between the universities is a tradition in the source culture.

If the reader also knows that the two mentioned universities are regarded as top English universities, depth and perspective is added to the sentence. Even though the contest is mentioned for the first time, and perhaps the reader hears about it for the first time, it is implied that it is an age-old tradition. Old, renowned universities should have time-honoured traditions.

Ferreting or catching rabbits with ferrets in the English countryside (Hattersley 1999: para. 6) is mentioned in passing as a way of illustrating the exploitation of someone to drive someone else away.

‘Great Scott! Yes, I see! It was rather like putting in a ferret to start a rabbit.’ (*Carry On, Jeeves*, p. 252)
translated as

“Püha müristus! Jah, ma taipan! See oli umbes, nagu paneks tuhkru jänese jälgedele.” (Lase käia, Jeeves!, p. 272).

However, as the practice is arguably little known in Estonia, readers may not be aware that ferrets are used to catch rabbits in England and thus, the element may not serve to contribute to the sense of Englishness in the translation. As such, it may be regarded as a calque translation – translating the elements rather literally, but failing to convey the meaning of the exclamation.

2.1.10. Holidays

The English value longstanding traditions, and as such, annual summer holidays by the seaside are almost compulsory to this day. Thus, when Bertie and Jeeves set off for some refreshing ‘sea air and good simple food’ (Carry On, Jeeves, p. 200), they display the typically English craving for holidays, the *raison d’être* of English life (Miall and Milsted 2011: 50). As going on holidays is such an inherent English trait, its importance is stressed neither in the original nor the translation, and ‘kosutav mereõhk ja hea lihtne toit’ is only mentioned in passing (Lase käia, Jeeves!, p. 215).

2.1.11. Digestion

Another English trait, that of being preoccupied with their bowels, is referred to on page 179 of Carry On, Jeeves:

Professor Pringle was a thinnish, baldish, dyspeptic-lookingish cove…

translated as

Professor Pringle oli kõhnapoolne, kiilanev, kõhulahtisuse all kannataja ilmega mees… (Lase käia, Jeeves!, p. 190).

In this case, it is telling that Bertie should choose to describe the professor in such terms. According to Miall and Milsted, the English spend a considerable amount of their time directing the workings of their bowels (2011: 56–57), and as such, failure to achieve a satisfactory condition is something that pains them, probably on more levels that just the physical discomfort. Instead of choosing a more common term, such as ‘seedehäired’, the
translator has opted for a more specific description so as to convey the troubled expression on Professor Pringle’s face as described by Bertie – this refers to a shift in cohesion, as the text is made more specific.

The case of Bertie’s uncle Thomas is one of the main issues in the story titled ‘Clustering Round Young Bingo’ (*Carry On, Jeeves*, pp. 223–254) or ‘Trall ümber noore Bingo’ (*Lase käia, Jeeves!*, pp. 239–273). Several references are made to Uncle Tom’s mood being dependent on the state of his stomach, such as in the following paragraph.

My Uncle Thomas is a cove who made a colossal pile of money out in the East, but in doing so put his digestion on the blink. This has made him a tricky proposition to handle. Many a time I’ve lunched with him and found him perfectly chirpy up to the fish, only to have him turn blue on me well before the cheese. (*Carry On, Jeeves*, p. 229)

translated as


This once again confirms that the English have a tendency to be preoccupied with what is going on inside them in the purely physical sense, even to the extent that good cooks are enough of a reason to lose friends over, as illustrated by the events of the chapter mentioned. However, the Uncle Tom in the original turns blue ‘well before the cheese’, while the Uncle Tom in the translation turns blue ‘vahetult enne juustu’. It may be argued that the English Uncle Tom is more easily irritable, as his mood turns to the worse earlier than in Estonian. The correct translation could perhaps be ‘tublisti enne juustu’ or something else to similar effect, denoting that Bertie had to suffer under his uncle’s bad temper for a longer while than in the Estonian translation.

### 2.1.12. Understatement and Reserve

Wodehouse does not forget to bring in the stereotypical English trait of understating everything. Bertie is depicted as having the time of his life in New York, yet the letters that he sends back home only briefly comment that he is ‘not having a bad time’ (*Carry On, Jeeves*, pp. 116–117). The translation, too, remains suitably understated and reservedly
English – Bertie ‘ei veeda just kehvasti aega’ (*Lase käia, Jeeves!* p. 123). Here, the addition of ‘just’ in Estonian serves to stress the fact that he is actually having a good time, but his Englishness forbids him to boast about it.

Another instance of such English understating (of both positive and negative) comes on page 158, when Bertie reveals one of his uncles was quite possibly insane. However, he swiftly rejects any implications that the condition may have been serious, and rather treats it as that almost desirable eccentric trait of English aristocrats: ‘Nothing serious. /…/ Used to keep rabbits in his bedroom.’ (*Carry On, Jeeves*, p. 149), translated as ‘Mitte midagi tõsist. /…/ Tavatses oma magamistoas jäneseid pidada.’ (*Lase käia, Jeeves!*, p. 158).

Bertie may be the embodiment of a typical Englishman, but one may argue that Jeeves is even more so in terms of reserve and understatements. He has the habit of expressing himself in the calmest manner and virtually in passing, even when what he says comes as a shock to others, and seems to discard any emotion, such as in this example in which he surprises Bertie with a fact about his personal life, upon hearing which Bertie almost crashes the car he is driving. Jeeves, in his calmness even in the face of potential death, stays reserved and polite, and simply makes a suggestion to Bertie as per how crashing would best be avoided.

Jeeves looked dreamily into the traffic.

‘She is my niece, sir. If I might make the suggestion, sir, I should not jerk the steering-wheel with quite such suddenness. We very nearly collided with that omnibus.’ (*Carry On, Jeeves*, p. 168).

It can be argued that in the Estonian translation, Jeeves as a character loses some of his politeness.

Jeeves jälgis liiklust unistava pilguga.


The use of the conditional mood in Estonian is a good choice in that it retains Jeeves’s politeness – he would never *tell* his master to do anything, he merely makes
suggestions as to how things could be handled better. However, the Estonian version implies that Jeeves thinks Bertie has jerked the steering wheel in a sudden manner and he should refrain from it, while in English, Jeeves is much more polite. He acknowledges that his master has jerked the steering wheel, and also acknowledges his right to do so if he wishes, but suggests that perhaps Bertie would nevertheless care to think of not jerking the steering wheel quite so suddenly. His composure is apparent in the fact that he does not simply exclaim something along the lines of ‘Look what you’re doing!’, but takes time to start the sentence with ‘If I might make the suggestion…’

2.1.13. Behaviour and Manners
The inherent trait of Bertie as an Englishman who is not happy about being in the middle of public scenes, is apparent on page 164 of Carry On, Jeeves:

I can’t say I was feeling my chirpiest. Drama is all very well, but I hate getting mixed up in it in a public spot; and I had not realised before how dashed public spot this was. The crowd seemed to have doubled itself in the last five seconds, and, while most of them had their eye on Biffy, quite a goodish few were looking at me as if they thought I was an important principal in the scene and might be expected at any moment to give my best in the way of wholesome entertainment for the masses.

Ma ei saa öelda, et oleksin end just kõige reipamalt tundnud. Draama on tore asi, kuid mulle on vastumeelt sattuda sellesse avalikus paigas, ja ma polnud enne märganud, kui neetult avalik see paik oli. Viimase viie sekundi jooksul näis rahvahulk olevat kahekordistunud, ja kuigi enamus neist vahtis Biffyt, vaatas kenake hulk ka mind, justkui arvates, et ma olen tähtis osaline selles stseenis, ja lootes, et ma kohe-kohe annan oma parima rahvamasside kosutavaks lõbustamiseks. (Lase käia, Jeeves!, p. 175).

Here, Bertie is expressing an English characteristic also pointed out by Miall and Milsted (2011: 9): that the English enjoy the drama of others with fascinated disbelief but generally find the display of emotion disconcerting and share the fundamental dislike of anyone ‘going too far’. Creating a scene in public is altogether unacceptable behaviour for the English, while languid indifference is the preferred attitude in any setting, and too much emotion cannot be displayed even in the matters of the heart (Miall and Milsted 2011: 11–12). Knowing this, Bertie’s reaction as an Englishman is understandable. Even with Biffy’s love life on the line, smashing a glass in with his cane is ‘going too far’,
especially since Bertie himself is unable to be a contemptuous onlooker, but is forced to be an unwilling participant in the unfolding events.

There is a joke about what happens if people of different nationalities (Italian, French, Greek etc) are shipwrecked on an island. If these people are two men and a woman, and happen to be Spanish, the two men duel over the woman, if Greek, the men fight over politics and forget about the woman, and so on. If English, nothing will happen, as there is no one to introduce the people to each other (Dundes, referenced in Berger 2011: 331). This English trait rings true on page 206 of *Carry On, Jeeves*, when Bertie shows his disapproval about a girl playing with a strange child on a beach:

> It seemed to me that, if the modern girl goes about building sand-castles with kids she has only known for five minutes and probably without a proper introduction at that, then all that has been written about her is perfectly true. 

translated as

> Mulle tundus, et kui tänapäeva tüdruk hakkab ehitama liivalosse koos jõmpsikaga, keda ta tunneb kõigest viis minutit, ilmselt ilma igasuguse eelneva tutvustamiseta, siis on kõik tema kohta kirjutatu absoluutselt õige. (*Lase käia, Jeeves!*, p. 220–221).

It seems that in this case, the English Bertie displays a little more need for ceremony by adding the word ‘proper’ to the introduction, implying that not just any introduction will do – it must be done according to etiquette, perhaps by a third person that knows them both. The Estonian translation, however, loses some of the formality by choosing the word ‘igasuguse’ – implying that any introduction would do, as long as there was one. Perhaps this refers to a shift in coherence – the translator has changed the text so as to meet Estonian readers’ expectations, as Estonians are less adamant about the ‘proper’ way of doing things, just as long as they were done.

On page 210 of *Carry On, Jeeves*, Bertie wishes his friend Freddy would show ‘a little more of the old British bull-dog spirit’, which has been translated as ‘inglaslik vaprus’ (*Lase käia, Jeeves!*, p. 225), where ‘British’ has been substituted for ‘inglaslik’, while ignoring the reference to the stubborn and brave bulldog entirely. The same happens when Bertie is talking about himself as ‘summoning up the good old bulldog courage of
the Woosters’ (*Carry On, Jeeves*, p. 241), translated as ‘võttes kokku vana hea Woosterite inglasliku julguse’ (*Lase käia, Jeeves!*, p. 259). Thus, the translator, quite possibly going along with the overall Englishness of the settings, has increased the Englishness of the translation (perhaps to make up for some of the loss of Englishness earlier in the text), but has on the other hand made the expression more general by ignoring the specific references to the dog breed. Such a translation may possibly be the result of the fear that the characteristics and temperament of bulldogs may not be so widely known in Estonia as they are in England. On the other hand, it may be that the translator, like many other non-English people, has simply treated British as synonymous with English, which the people living in Great Britain rarely do themselves. However, references to the braveness of the English are in coherence with Miall and Milsted’s claim that the English are fearless in their confrontation of almost anything (2011: 51).

**2.1.14. Irony**

The ironical side of the English and their habit of seldom saying what they mean (Miall and Milsted 2011: 55, 53) is well expressed in the following, where Bertie is pretending to be Oliver, one of his friends, in the company of latter’s relatives.

‘I remember Oliver,’ said Exhibit A. She heaved a sigh. ‘He was such a pretty child. What a pity! What a pity!’

*Tactful, of course, and calculated to put the guest completely at ease.* (*Carry On, Jeeves*, p. 179) translated as


Here, the irony lies in the fact that Bertie is saying something that is quite the opposite to what he really means, apparent in the clash between ‘Exhibit A’s’ completely untactful utterance and Bertie’s statement that it had been ‘tactful, of course’. In Estonian, the irony is expressed by the phrase ‘muidugi mõista’, but readers are still expected to know what irony *is* and how it may be expressed to ‘get’ the irony of Bertie’s sentence.
The English tendency to use irony and seldom say what they mean is also illustrated by the following example, when Bertie is ironical towards Jeeves who, as it seems to Bertie, is wasting his time talking about a film he went to see, when there are more important things to think about.

‘I hope you enjoyed yourself,’ I said in rather a nasty manner. /…/ ‘And if you have a nice time this morning on the sands with your spade and bucket, you will come and tell me all about it, won’t you? I have so little on my mind just now that it’s a treat to hear all about your happy holiday.’

Satirical, if you see what I mean. Sarcastic. Almost bitter, as a matter of fact, if you come right down to it. (Carry On, Jeeves, p. 213–214)

translated as

“Ma loodan, et veetsite kenast aega,” ütlesin ma küllaltki vastikul toonil. /…/ “Ja kui te täna hommikul kenasti liiva sees oma kühvli ja ämbriga lõbutsete, siis tulete ja jutustate mulle selle kohta kõik, eks ole? Mul pole praegusel momendil mitte kui millestki mõelda ja on suur rõõm kuulda üksikasju teie oivalisest puhkusest.”

Satiiilinene, kui te taipate, mida ma öelda tahan. Sarkastiline. Tegelikult peaegu et vihane, kui otse välja öelda. (Lase käia, Jeeves, p. 229).

Of course, the reader is in this instance helped in realising that Bertie is being sarcastic, as he himself admits it so readily. However, it can be argued that the ironical side of Bertie’s utterances in Estonian is increased by way of the slight exaggeration of the negation – by using ‘mitte kui millestki mõelda’ rather than simply ‘millestki mõelda’. Yet, perhaps ‘vihane’ is not the perfect translation equivalent to ‘bitter’, as it only conveys one emotion, that of anger. Rather, ‘kibestunud’ could have been used, as it includes more characteristics in addition to anger, perhaps also sadness and hurt (as Bertie was counting on Jeeves to help him and instead, the latter was simply enjoying his holiday, or so it seemed). As such, the emotional focus of the target text has changed a little.

2.1.15. Attitudes Towards People

The English attitude to the French is apparent on page 271 (Lase käia, Jeeves!), in Jeeves’s remark about a French chef called Anatole.

‘And Anatole, as is the too frequent practice of these Frenchmen, had made love to her. /…/ A volatile man, sir. Like so many of these Frenchmen’. (Carry On, Jeeves, p. 252),

translated as

This comment is telling of the love-hate relationship the English have with the French (Miall and Milsted 2011: 7). It has been claimed that the English hate the French because the French are a constant reminder of what the English could be if they just let themselves go (Walker 2001: para. 2). Thus, the disparaging ‘‘liiga sageli nende prantslaste puhul komboks’’ refers to Puritan issues the English have with sex (Miall and Milsted 2011: 51) and perhaps to an envious streak that the carefree French seem to lack such problems. And Wodehouse, a quintessentially English writer, almost never even mentions sex as it is an embarrassing subject. It can be claimed that the translation wins from translating the utterance rather literally as ‘‘nende prantslaste puhul’’, rather than opting for the more natural-sounding ‘‘prantslaste puhul’’. Thus, ‘‘nende’’ retains the disparaging attitude by stressing a divide between ‘‘them’’ and ‘‘us’’, the French and the English.

The English attitude towards children is clear from the chapter titled ‘‘Fixing it for Freddie’’ (Carry On, Jeeves, pp. 199–222) or ‘‘Kõik Freddie õnne nimel’’ (Lase käia, Jeeves!, pp. 213–238). In the chapter, Bertie and Freddie are, much to their dismay, paired up with a toddler named Tootles. The way that the two young men act towards Tootles is in perfect concordance with the attitude the English have towards children – they are not something the English can feel passionate about, thus leaving their upbringing to others or letting them rear themselves (Miall and Milsted 2011: 27), as do Bertie and Freddie by swiftly obtaining the services of the neighbours’ nanny. The only role children are assigned is to grow up to be sensible English adults (Miall and Milsted 2011: 27). After all, children are unreliable and unpredictable, they have to be undressed, bathed, and dressed again – something that seems to simply horrify Bertie (‘‘All most unpleasant’’, as he comments), and that not even the usually capable Jeeves is prepared to handle. Jeeves’s reluctance is made apparent on page 211 of Carry On, Jeeves:

‘‘No, sir,’’ said Jeeves, who had just rolled in with lunch. ‘‘I must, I fear, disassociate myself completely from the matter.’’ He spoke respectfully but firmly. ‘‘I have had little or no experience with children.’’ translated as

Here, according to Levý, the choice of words the translator must use is context-bound. Jeeves is a character whose mode of speech can be described as ‘orotund’, then the Estonian Jeeves must indeed use the verb ‘disassotsieeruma’. A simpler expression, such as ‘ma ei saa kahjuks sellega tegemist teha’ or ‘ärge mind sellesse segage’ would not fit the way the character of Jeeves has been ‘built’. Thus, the choice is also in coherence with Nida’s requirement that the characters must be the same in the source text and the target text – as the author had intended. A manner of speech that often leaves others confounded due to its verbosity and complexity is inherent to Jeeves, just like mixing up quotations and bumbling are inherent to Bertie.

It would seem that in the case of this collection of short stories, the translator has opted for a slightly foreignising effect. Quite a few English elements can be discerned in the target text, and overall, the translation follows the source text rather closely, despite being sometimes slightly perplexing in Estonian as a result.

2.2. Much Obliged, Jeeves

Much Obliged, Jeeves is a novel that was first published in the year 1971 in time for Wodehouse’s 90th birthday (Jasen 2002: 251, 265), making it one of the last volumes he managed to complete before his death.

The volume’s significance comes perhaps from the fact that here, Wodehouse mentions Jeeves’s given name for the first time. As Bertie comments, ‘I froze in my chair, stunned by the revelation that Jeeves’s first name was Reginald. It had never occurred to me before that he had a first name’ (Much Obliged, Jeeves, p. 38). Thus, Wodehouse is perhaps using Bertie as a mouthpiece to echo his readers, who had come to accept that Jeeves was simply Jeeves. It can be speculated whether the writer felt that after all these
years, it would do good to give his readers a peek in the personal life of the sometimes almost machine-like gentleman’s gentleman, the inimitable Jeeves.

### 2.2.1. Proper Names

Proper names such as McCorkdale, Charlie Silversmith, Catsmeat Potter-Pirbright and place names such as Market Snodsbury and Worcestershire are retained in their original form (*Suur tänu, Jeeves!*, p. 15, 21, 62, 142, 176) throughout the text. All these references to English places and persons, whose names are more prevalent in English society than in Estonian society, link the action in the text to real places in the reader’s mind, as Aaltonen has commented.

In this novel, Hyde Park is mentioned once again in Bertie’s comments about the strong voices of his aunt and Mrs. McCorkdale that make eavesdropping much easier for him.

As I could hardly step in and ask her to repeat any of her remarks which I didn’t quite catch, it was fortunate that the McCorkdale’s voice was so robust, while Aunt Dahlia’s, of course, would be audible if you were at Hyde Park Corner and she in Piccadilly Circus. (*Much Obliged, Jeeves!*, pp. 99–100) translated as

Kuna ma ei võinud endale lubada, et juhul kui mulle midagi arusaamatuks jääb, lihtsalt sisse astun ja palun neil öeldut korrata, oli hea, et McCorkdale'il oli jõuline hääl ja tädi Dahliagi oma kostuks Hyde Parkist kuulajateni isegi siis, kui nad Picadilly Circusel seisaksid. (*Suur tänu, Jeeves!*, pp. 109–110).

English readers (and, of course, Londoners) are probably aware of the distance between Hyde Park Corner and Piccadilly Circus better than foreigners. Estonian readers, who have never been to London, could however be at a loss as regards the actual distance. Still, from the context it can be arguably understood that the claim about Aunt Dahlia’s voice, which Bertie has described as loud on many occasions, is an exaggerated one and Hyde Park Corner and Piccadilly Circus are probably not located next to each other. However, ‘Hyde Park Corner’ in *Much Obliged, Jeeves* is the same as in the *Carry On, Jeeves* example, yet it has not been translated the same way. Here, ‘Corner’ has been ignored completely, perhaps with the justification that since Bertie is only using a figurative example, the specific ‘Hyde Park Corner’ is not important enough to be
discerned and would perhaps be superfluous. Thus, the translator has opted for the omission of the ‘Corner’ element. However, the translation of ‘could not catch’ could have been more accurate, as to ‘catch’ has two meanings in English, that of understanding and that of simply hearing. It can be argued that in this case, the author had intended to use the verb in the second meaning, as it is the loudness of the voices that Bertie is talking about, and no mention is made about not understanding what the women are saying. Thus, a more correct translation variant could have been ‘juhul kui ma midagi ei kuule’, or, a more idiomatic expression, ‘kui mul midagi kõrvust mõõda läheb’.

The sense of foreign settings is created quite at the beginning of *Suur tänu, Jeeves!* (p. 5), when Bertie mentions Totleigh Towers, sir Watkyn Bassett, Madeline and Spode. On page 9 of *Much Obliged, Jeeves*, Totleigh Towers is mentioned once again, as in ‘What’s Totleigh Towers?’ This has been translated with a clarifying comment, perhaps to make sure that the readers understand it is a place, not, for example, a person: ‘Mis koht see Totleigh Towers on?’ (*Suur tänu, Jeeves!,* p. 7).

2.2.2. Units
Units have, like in *Lase käia, Jeeves!*, generally been translated but not converted, like in ‘the sunny smile widened an inch or two’ (*Much Obliged, Jeeves*, p. 17), translated as ‘naeratus minu näol laienes paari tolli võrra’ (*Suur tänu, Jeeves!,* p. 16). Of course, one notices the fact that the two smiles slightly differ from each other.

Another example of the translation of units comes from page 73 of *Much Obliged, Jeeves*, where Spode is described as being ‘eight foot six in height’, while in the translation, he has lost six inches and is merely ‘kaheksa jala pikkune’ (*Suur tänu, Jeeves!,* p. 80). Arguably, the omission could have happened simply by chance, or due to the belief that such specificity (‘kaheksa jala ja kuue tolli pikkune’) was not significant in Estonian,
as ‘eight feet’ might not say much to Estonian readers anyway and they may need to rely on context to realise that Spode is a tall man.

2.2.3. Titles and Positions
As in *Lase käia, Jeeves!*, Jeeves in this translation also always addresses Bertie with the polite ‘sir’, which keeps the same form in the original as well as the translation (e.g. *Suur tänu, Jeeves!* p. 6, *Much Obliged, Jeeves* p. 8), and serves the same purpose in both texts (to indicate politeness and the gap between the two men’s social standings). However, when in *Lase käia, Jeeves!*, Bertie addresses Jeeves with the polite form of ‘teie’ in Estonian, then in *Suur tänu, Jeeves!*, Bertie uses the ‘sina’-form when talking to Jeeves, such as on page 35 of *Suur tänu, Jeeves!*, when Jeeves has saved Bertie from being run over: “Jah, sina ja ainult sina päästsid mind sellest, et minu nimi homes lehe surmakuulutuste veerus ilmu”. In can be argued that this shifts the balance of the relationship rather towards familiarity and that given the context of the setting, Bertie, although formally higher in the society than Jeeves, would still respect his servant enough to address him politely.

The ‘seventh Earl of Sidcup’, mentioned on page 57 of *Much Obliged, Jeeves*, has been translated as ‘seitsmes Sidcupi krahv’, Sidcup being a district in Greater London.

Giving someone a knighthood (‘rüütliks lööma’, *Suur tänu, Jeeves!*, p. 67) and the subsequent title ‘sir’, then more than just a manifestation of politeness, but as a honorific title, is also something that people associate with English aristocracy.

In another instance, ‘barrister’ is mentioned on page 62 of *Suur tänu, Jeeves!*, with the clarifying footnote ‘Inglise kõrgem advokaat, kel on õigus esineda igas kohtus’. In this case, the translator has opted for borrowing a lexical unit from English, as the English and Estonian court systems differ from each other considerably and adding the text of the footnote by way of clarification would arguably have made the sentence too clumsy and
irrelevant. Thus, people are reminded once again that the settings are English and the situation is described to people less familiar with the English legal system.

2.2.4. Food and Drink
‘Toothsome eggs and bacon’ are mentioned on page 7 of *Much Obliged, Jeeves*, but in the Estonian translation, the specific English breakfast ingredients have become more general as simply ‘eine’, discarding the ‘toothsome’ altogether (Suur tänu, Jeeves!, p. 5). However, when eggs are mentioned again as ‘these eggs’ (*Much Obliged, Jeeves*, p. 7), the translator has seen it fit to add a clarification as to how the eggs have been prepared, as in ‘need praetud munad’ (Suur tänu, Jeeves!, p. 5). Perhaps in this way, the translator is trying to compensate for the loss of specificity earlier, by clarifying that usually, the eggs and bacon of an English breakfast are indeed fried.

2.2.5. Clubs
As it becomes apparent in *Much Obliged, Jeeves*, Jeeves is also a member of a club, like a true Englishman. His club, whose members are butlers and gentlemen’s gentlemen, is called Junior Ganymede. An explanatory footnote has been added to the name in the Estonian translation – a remark about the meaning of the club: ‘ganymede – nalj. kõrtsiteener, kelner’ (Suur tänu, Jeeves!, p. 10). Thus, the foreign flavour is retained, but the readers are given the chance to understand the text on a deeper level as well.

The topic of clubs also surfaces in a rather surreal exchange in which Bertie and his aunt Dahlia muse over the countless fiancés that Florence Craye has cut out of her life.

‘England is strewn with ex-fiancés whom she bounced because they didn’t come up to her specifications. Dozens of them. I believe they form clubs and societies.’
‘Perhaps calling themselves the Old Florentians.’
‘And having an annual dinner!’ (*Much Obliged, Jeeves!*, pp. 96–97)
translated as

“Inglishmaa kubiseb kihlatutest, kelle Florence on sinnapaika jätnud, kuna need tema erinõudmistele ei vastanud. Neid on kümneid. Arvatavasti on nad juba oma organisatsiooni või klubi moodustanud.”
“Nimega Vanad Florentslased nälteks,”
“Kes tulevad kord aastas kokku pidulikus õhtusöögiks.” (Suur tänu, Jeeves!, pp. 106–107).
Although the comment is made in good humour, the statement that Florence’s ex-fiancés are probably forming clubs is in concordance with the English need to belong to clubs formed by people with the same hobby, but nothing else in common, as mentioned earlier. The surrealist nature of the dialogue is in coherence with the love English have for absurd jokes and silly puns. In this case, the name of the ‘club’ has only been half-translated – a ‘complete’ translation would be ‘Vanad Firentslased’, as Florence, in addition to being a girl’s name, denotes the Italian city Firenze in English. However, a ‘complete’ translation would have lost the element that the club members are men rejected by Florence Craye and thus, the translation ‘Vanad Florentslased’ succeeds in making the same point as the original about the abundance of Florence’s ex-fiancés.

2.2.6. Politics
A political streak can be noticed throughout the book, as Bertie’s friend Ginger is trying to win the by-election in Market Snodsbury as a Conservatice candidate and secure a place in the Parliament. Thus, references to the politics in England can be seen in many cases, such as in the following example.

"/…/ ‘Spode’s one of those silver-tongued orators you read about. Extraordinary gift of the gab he has. He could get into Parliament without straining a sinew.’
/…/‘Then why doesn’t he?’
‘He can’t, you poor chump. He’s a lord.’
‘Don’t they allow lords in?’
‘No, they don’t.’
‘I see,’ I said, rather impressed by this proof that the House of Commons drew the line somewhere.
(Much Obliged, Jeeves, pp. 55–56)
translated as

"/…/ Ja Spode on üks neist kuldsuuvest, kes omab selliseid oraatorivõimeid, et võiks ilma erilise pingutuseta parlamentigi pääseda.”
/…/”Kuid miks ta seda siis ei tee?”
“Ta ei saa, vaene sõber. Ta on ju lord.”
“Kas lordid siis ei saa?”
“Ei.”
“Või nii,” nentisin ma, vaimustunud teadmisest, et Alamkoda oli ometigi kord osanud kuhugi piiri tõmmata. (Suur tänul, Jeeves!, p. 60)

Here, the readers learn that lords are not allowed into the House of Commons (‘Alamkoda’), and thus perhaps get a better idea of the political system of England. Second, the ironical way that Bertie comments how the House of Commons has drawn a
line somewhere may imply that usually, the House is less discerning about whom to accept as a member. What is more, it would seem that the House of Commons is harder to get into in the Estonian version than in the English one: in the original, Bertie’s conversation partner Aunt Dahlia states that Spode could ‘parlamentigi pääseda’, which in back-translation would be ‘even in the Parliament’, while in English, she just comments that Spode could get into the Parliament without trying too much. It would also seem that the Estonian Bertie is more emotional than the English Bertie, as in the translation, he states he is ‘vaimustunud’, while in the source text, he is merely ‘impressed’. In addition, Aunt Dahlia is more friendly towards Bertie in Estonian, where she calls him ‘sõber’ – in English, the word used is ‘chump’, meaning a stupid person, and as such, a more correct translation would perhaps be ‘totakas’, or, if a more affectionate address is sought for, ‘tobuke’.

Another example of mentioning two English political parties and drawing some comparisons between the voters for each respective party comes when Bertie sets out to talk to voters and convince them to vote for his Conservative candidate friend.

From long acquaintance with the town I knew that this was one of the posher parts of Market Snodsbury, stiff with households likely to favour the Conservative cause, and it was for that reason that I was making it my first port of call. No sense, I mean, in starting off with the less highly priced localities where everybody was bound to vote Labour and would not only turn a deaf ear to one’s reasoning but might even bung a brick at one. (Much Obliged, Jeeves, p. 76)

Pikaajalise tutvuse tõttu selle linnaga olin teadlik, et too on üks peenemaid Market Snodsbury linnaosii, tundlikud sealne elanikud osalesid tõenäoliselt just konservatiivide poolt häälteaksid, ning selles seisnesi põhjus, mis ma River Row esimeseks valisin. Polnud ju mingi mõtet alustada vähem jõukate asundustega, kus kõik veendunult Tööparteid pooldavad ja sinu seletusi tähele panemagi ei vääru, vaid võivad oma igameelsuses isegi midagi ohtlikku ja ootamatut ette võtta. (Suur tänu, Jeeves!, p. 83).

The two important parties mentioned here are ‘Conservatives’ or ‘konservatiivid’, and ‘Labour’ or ‘Tööpartei’, which create the context of English political life in both texts. In addition, comments are made as to the voters – more affluent people are more likely to vote for Conservatives without even needing to being convinced, while the poorer kind of folk would vote for Labour anyway and may even act violently to anyone trying to make
them change their minds as to their political affinity. However, it can be claimed that the Estonian version is more general in stating that the Labour voters could so something ‘dangerous’, while in the English text, Bertie fears something very specific: that he might be hit with a brick. Thus, the translation succeeds in explaining the political situation, but due to the shift, fails to deliver the same sort of effect that is there in the source text.

2.2.7. Literary References
A reference to the famous detective Sherlock Holmes, like in the following paragraph, is one that Estonian readers might be expected to recognise.

‘You know him?’ said the camera chap.
‘I’m sorry to say I do,’ said Spode, speaking like Sherlock Holmes asked if he knew Professor Moriarty. (Much Obliged, Jeeves, p. 48)
translated as

“Te siis tunnete teda?” küsis fotoaparaadi omanik.
“Kahjuks pean ma seda tunnistama” vastas Spode, sarnanedes sealjuures Sherlock Holmesiga, kellelt küsitakse, kas ta tunneb professor Moriartyt. (Suur tänü, Jeeves!, p. 51).

Here, the readers are expected to be familiar with the relationship between Holmes and Moriarty, although the word ‘kahjuks’ should be enough to signal to the reader that the relationship is unlikely to be a very cordial one. However, the translator has added ‘siis’ to the sentence – something that was not there in the original. Thus, the sentence in English is merely a question, while in Estonian, the ‘fotoaparaadi omanik’ gives the impression that he has already established the situation and is merely asking for confirmation.

In one instance in Suur tänü, Jeeves!, the specifically English element is lost. In Much Obliged, Jeeves, Jeeves casually highlights his education and good memory by the breakfast table.

‘Precisely, sir, Carpe diem, the Roman poet Horace advised. The English poet Herrick expressed the same sentiment when he suggested that we should gather rosebuds while we may. Your elbow is in the butter, sir.’ (Much Obliged, Jeeves, p. 8)
translated as

“Just nii, sir, Carpe diem, nagu soovitas rooma poeet Horatius. Või teisisõnu: nopi roosioösi niikaua, kui selleks on võimalust – luuletaja Herrick. Teie küünarnukk on või sees, sir.” (Suur tänü, Jeeves!, p. 6).

Here, the translator has domesticated the text by giving the name of the Roman poet in its Estonian form. In addition, the foreign or specifically English setting is
downplayed when the ‘English’ is left out at the mention of Robert Herrick. Estonians learn that Herrick is a poet, but it is strange that the English are provided with the information that Herrick is an English poet, while Estonians, who, on the whole, arguably know less about Herrick as an English poet than the English themselves, are deprived of that information in the translation. One would expect the situation to be reversed – that nothing had been added to Herrick’s name by way of explanation but ‘inglise’ might have been added in front of ‘luuletaja Herrick’ in Estonian.

Allusions to Shakespeare are quite frequent in Wodehouse’s texts, as is probably understandable, knowing that he is regarded as the hero of English literature (Miall and Milsted 2011: 62). English readers are therefore expected to understand even half-quotations, like in the following example.

I would be surprised to learn that in the whole W.1 postal section of London there is a man more capable than Bertram Wooster of bearing up with a stiff upper lip under what I have heard Jeeves call the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune… (Much Obliged, Jeeves, p. 91)

translated as

Arvan, et kogu Londoni postiteenistuses ei leidu meest, kes sama hästi kui Bertram Wooster suudaks ingliskult jäiga ülahuulega kannatada karme saatuselööke, nagu Jeeves kunagi üht Taani printsi tsiteerides on öelnud. (Suur tänu, Jeeves!, p. 100–101).

Here, the translator has thought it pertinent to explain the original text in Estonian in several ways. First, the translator has added ‘inglaslik’ to the ‘jäik ülahuul’, thus increasing the sense that Bertie is indeed an Englishman and ‘jäik ülahuul’ is something characteristic of the English. However, ‘jäik ülahuul’ can be regarded as a calque translation, as the expression ‘stiff upper lip’ is often admiringly used in English settings to denote someone not showing their feelings (as this is a sign of weakness), but is not established as such in Estonian. Thus, the usual ways of dealing with this expression presumably involve paraphrasing and the clarity of ‘jäik ülahuul’ can be questioned in case it should be read by Estonians not familiar with the phrase and its meaning. The translator has also added ‘Taani printsi tsiteerides’ to the Shakespeare quotation from Hamlet’s famous monologue so as to ensure that Estonian readers, who may not be so familiar with
exact quotes, but still aware of Shakespeare’s work, would know exactly to what Bertie is referring. However, to claim that Jeeves is citing the Danish prince is erroneous, as the Estonian line is not a quotation from the generally accepted Estonian translation of the monologue (‘kõik nooled, mida vali saatus paiskab’, translated by Georg Meri), but rather a liberal translation of it. It can be argued that in doing so, the translator diverges from the coherence of the text, as a part of Wodehouse’s aim was to show to his readers how Bertie has a ‘magpie mind’, which collects everything from Shakespearian quotations to everyday slang, and mixes them all up together. Thus, the translation could have benefitted from looking up the exact and accepted translation and used it. This case could be regarded as a shift in the coherence of the text that Blum-Kulka refers to – the allusion to another text that exists as an original in the source system. It would seem that the text is changed in accordance to what the translator believes the target reader would be able to understand.

2.2.8. Sports
A reference is made in the novel to Rugger night, which the translator has carried over to Estonian in the form of a borrowing, as in the example.

‘Did you tell me Ginger had done time?’
‘I said he was always in the hands of the police on Boat Race night. And, of course, on Rugger night.’
‘What’s Rugger night?’
‘The night of the annual Rugby football encounter between the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Many blithe spirits get even more effervescent than when celebrating the boat race. Ginger was one of them.’ (Much Obliged, Jeeves, pp. 107–108)
translated as

“Kas sa rääkisid mulle kunagi, et Ginger istus kinni?”
“Ma rääkisin sulle, et ta jäi alatasa ööl pärast paadivõistlusi politeile vahele. Ja muidugi ka ruggeri ööl.”
“Mis see on?”

In this case, we are dealing with a culture-specific sport, something that Nida brings out as terms for which there are no acceptable equivalents in another culture. Thus, the foreign element is retained and the cultural and linguistic otherness of the text is evident – as Venuti would say, the reader has indeed been sent abroad. Here, as the
meaning of ‘Rugger night’ has been explained further in the text, the translator has not
needed to add clarifying comments, and could borrow ‘rugger’ from the source text in its
original form without making understanding more difficult for Estonian readers. The
borrowing is arguably a sound decision, as Estonian culture lacks a sports game
resembling rugby, or an informal name for it, like ‘rugger’ is in English. Thus, there was a
gap between the source and the target culture, which could best be overcome by borrowing
a lexical unit. In addition, a mention is made of the Boat Race also highlighted in Lase
käia, Jeeves!.

2.2.9. Understatement and Reserve
An example of Jeeves’s ever-present composure is expressed in the paragraph following
Bertie’s shocking revelation that his friend is engaged to the imperious Florence Craye,
who had once been Bertie’s fiancée as well.

Well, I hadn’t expected him to roll his eyes and leap about, because he never does no matter how sensational
the news item, but I could see by the way one of his eyebrows twitched and rose perhaps an eight of an inch
that I had interested him. (Much Obliged, Jeeves, p. 35)
translated as

Ma ei lootnudki, et Jeeves silmi pööritades üles-alla hüplema hakkaks, sest seda pole temalt kunagi mõtet
oodata, üüskõik, kui sensatsioonilise uudisega ma päevavalgule tuleks. Kuid tema parema kulmu järgi, mis
kaheksandiku tolli võrra ülespoole kerkis, võisin kindlaks teha, et olin öelduga ta tähelepanu köitnud. (Suur
tänu, Jeeves!, p. 36).

Here, according to Blum-Kulka’s approach, the translator has clearly caused a shift
in the cohesion of the text, as the target the text is more explicit. First, the translator claims
that Jeeves raises his right eyebrow, while it is merely one of Jeeves’s eyebrows that rises
in the original, and second, Jeeves is pictured as jumping up and down, while in the
original, the direction of the jumping is not given. The background for making such
choices remains unclear. It can only be speculated that perhaps the translator wanted to aid
the reader in imagining the scene more vividly, and thus opted for a greater level of
explicitness. ‘Inch’, translated as ‘toll’, is an element of a foreign measurement system.
In another instance, Bertie and his Aunt Dahlia discuss Jeeves and his very English manner of keeping his surprise to himself:

‘You know how Jeeves takes things. One of his eyebrows rose a little and he said he was shocked and astounded.’

‘That’s strong stuff for him. “Most disturbing” is as far as he goes usually.’ (Much Obliged, Jeeves, pp. 120–121)

translated as

“Sa tead ju iseegi, kuidas Jeeves asjadesse suhtub. Üks tema kulmudest tõusid natuke ülespoole ja ta ütles, et on šokeeritud ja hämmingus.”

“See on tema kohta väga tugev tundeavaldu. Tänapäeval näitab “väga ebameeldiv”, et tema emotsioonid on jõudnud haripunktu.” (Suur tänu, Jeeves!, p. 132).

Thus, Jeeves is proven once again to be as English as one can be in not showing emotion. If Jeeves was ‘shocked’, it would indeed shock everyone else – it would mean that the situation was a truly dire one. However, the translator has also opted for a more emotional tone in Estonian when compared to the English version. It can be claimed that ‘strong stuff’ and ‘as far as he goes usually’ are less emotional than ‘väga tugev tundeavaldu’ and ‘emotsioonid on jõudnud haripunktü’. Thus, the translation digresses from Nida’s requirement for retaining the emotional tone of the author. In this case, a more literal translation, such as ‘see on tema kohta tugev tundeavaldu’ and ‘ei lähe tavaliselt “väga ebameeldivast” kaugemale’ could serve the purpose better, as the expression ‘kaugemale minema’ and ‘going far’ are both used in Estonian and English in a figurative manner, as in ‘exceeding reasonable limits’, but are closer to the emotional tone of the original text.

The English reserve is referred to in describing the event in which Bertie meets once again with a dear friend he had not seen for some time.

Arriving at Barribault’s, I found him in the lobby where you have the pre-luncheon gargle before proceeding to the grillroom, and after the initial What-ho-ing and What-a-time-since-we-met-ing, inevitable when two vanished hands who haven’t seen each other for ages re-establish contact, he asked me if I would like one for the tonsils. (Much Obliged, Jeeves, p. 22)

translated as

The English are deeply reserved when it comes to physical contact, as claimed by Miall and Milsted (2011: 31). They also say that in greeting an old friend, Englishmen do allow themselves to put an arm around the other’s shoulder and tap the other a few times on the back, like saying ‘enough of that’ (Miall and Milsted 2011: 32). Thus, it would seem that the Estonian version makes the two Englishmen a bit more tactile and emotional than they are in the original, by using the word ‘ülevoolav’ and ‘jällenägemisrõõm’, while the source text implies that it is possible the men did shake hands, but there were no expressions of being overjoyed. The ‘what ho’ and ‘what a time since we met’ do seem to be cordial ways of greeting – something that could give proof of the two being old friends – but it can be argued that the two Englishmen in the original are still less enthusiastic than in the Estonian version, again referring to changes in emotional tone.

Another example of how important English think reserve and ‘proper behaviour is,’ and how inappropriate unnecessary touching is, comes from the instance when Jeeves and Bertie meet Bertie’s former valet in the club Junior Ganymede.

As to his manner, I couldn’t get a better word for it at the moment than ‘familiar’, but I looked it up later in Jeeves’s Dictionary of Synonyms and found that it had been unduly intimate, too free, forward, lacking in proper reserve, deficient in due respect, impudent, bold and intrusive. Well, when I tell you that the first thing he did was to prod Jeeves in the lower ribs with an uncouth forefinger, you will get the idea. (Much Obliged, Jeeves, p. 38)

Translated as


It is clear from the paragraph that otherwise, the man could have been described in more benign terms, but the fact that he chose to invade an Englishman’s privacy by unwanted physical contact instantly made him an undesirable in the eyes of both Jeeves and Bertie. It is also important to note that the English Bertie used a synonym dictionary to look up ‘familiar’, but the Estonian Bertie used a ‘võõrsõnade leksikon’, implying that the word ‘familiar/familiaarne’ is merely a synonym in English, but a foreign word in
Estonian. Thus, it can be regarded as a form of domestication on the part of the translator and one can understand the reasoning behind this choice, as Estonians perhaps are more used to looking up words in a ‘võõrsõnade leksikon’ than in a thesaurus. However, the Estonian version is more general, as the ‘uncouth forefinger’ becomes merely ‘nimetissõrm’ without the disparaging adjective and ‘lower ribs’ become simply ‘ribid’ without a more specific portion of ribs in Jeeves’s body. Furthermore, a whole phrase has been added in the translation that was not there in the source text: ‘kahtlused osutusid põhjendatuks’. Perhaps it was added to make the reading experience of the text smoother, but no specific justifications for such an addition are apparent from the text itself.

Some more insight into how the English treat human relationships is given in the following exchange.

‘Is he a friend of yours?’

‘I wouldn’t exactly say friend. I came to know him slightly owing to being chased with him on to the roof of a sort of summerhouse by an angry swan. This drew us rather close together for the moment, but we never became really chummy.’ (Much Obliged, Jeeves, p. 26)

translated as

“Kas ta on su sõber?”

“Ma ei ütleks et sõber. Kohtusin temaga viivuks ühe suvemaaja katusel, kuhu meid ajas vihane luik. Kuigi sel momendil olime teineteisele päris lähedased, ei saanud meist kunagi tõelisi sõpru.” (Suur tänu, Jeeves!, p. 27).

As Miall and Milsted (2011: 15–16) say, being trapped with English people might even result in the exchange of confidences, but it is not an invitation to more permanent intimacy, and when, after such an experience, English people say ‘We really must meet again’, one is not meant to believe it. Thus, the abovementioned situation is thoroughly descriptive of the English trait to become ‘chummy’ with someone due to a common misfortune, but forget all about it once normalcy is restored. However, it can be argued that here, a somewhat of a more emotional tone could be employed in translating the word ‘chummy’, as ‘sõber’ seems perhaps too general. The use of a more specific word could be taken advantage of, as the Estonian word ‘semu’ would fit the context well and give the utterance more specificity so as to retain the emotional tone of the author. The two
previous examples could also illustrate a shift in cohesion, but instead of creating more specificity, the text loses in terms of explicitness.

In a humorous key, understatement as a common way for the English to express their feelings about even shocking events in an offhand manner is apparent in the following paragraph where Bertie is musing over first impressions about the personality of a girl he just met.

The sort of girl you could go to and say ‘I say, I’ve just committed murder and it’s worrying me rather,’ and she would just reply ‘There, there, try not to think about it, it’s the sort of thing that might happen to anybody.’ (*Much Obliged, Jeeves*, p. 42)

translated as

Sa võiksid ta juurde minna ja rahumeeli öelda: “Ma tapsin just inimese ja see teeb mulle natuke muret” ja ta vastaks: “Pole viga, katsu sellele mitte mõelda, meil kõigil võib midagi sellist elus ette tulla.” (*Suur tänu, Jeeves!*, p. 44).

Here, Bertie is handling the serious offence of murder in a casual way, saying ‘it’s worrying me rather’. The Estonian translation, it can be argued, manages to compensate for the casual effect lost by the inability to find an equivalent to ‘I say’ by using the word ‘natuke’, and adding the word ‘rahumeeli’, thus illustrating the English tendency or wish to treat everything with stoicism, which forbids showing great worry even in the case of murder. After all, the English will warm to anyone who displays understated good humour in the face of adversity (Miall and Milsted 2011: 17).

The English are not fond of ‘showing off’ their accomplishments or knowledge. As Miall and Milsted (2011: 14–15) comment – even if you have conquered the Atlantic in a small boat, if you are English you are expected to say no more of your achievement than to murmur that you do a little sailing from time to time. This rings true in the following paragraph, where Jeeves does not take advantage of his learning and good memory in trying to secure votes for Bertie’s friend in the upcoming elections. Jeeves, being a typical Englishman, would never dream of stressing his extensive knowledge, although he often uses quotes from famous poets and writers casually and in passing.

‘You didn’t make a speech of any sort before getting down to brass tracks? No mention of Burke or Shakespeare or the poet Burns?’
‘No, sir. It might have caused exasperation.’
I disagreed with him. I felt that he was on the wrong track altogether and couldn’t expect anything in the nature of a triumph at Number Two. There is probably nothing a voter enjoys more than hearing the latest about Burke and his On the Sublime And Beautiful, and here he was, deliberately chucking away the advantages his learning gave him. (Much Obliged, Jeeves, p. 78)
translated as

“Kas sa ei esitanudki pikka sissejuhatavat kõnet enne, kui pärä asja juurde asusid? Sa ei maininud sõnagagi Shakespeare’i, Burke’i ega Burnsi?”

“Ei, sir. See oleks võinud minu kuulajates ärrituse esile kutsuda.”

Ma polnud temaga nõus. Minu arvates oli Jeeves küll valel teel ning vaevalt, et number kahe suhtes võõs suurt midagi loota. Pole midagi enamat, mis hääletajatele rohkem meeldiks, kui kuulata kõige värskemaid uuendusi Burke’i kohta. Siin see Jeeves nüüd jälle oli, püüdes varajata oma mitmekülgseide teadmisi, mis ta elu jooksul oli omandanud. (Suur tänu, Jeeves!, p. 85)

Here, the translator has not added anything clarifying as to the persons Bertie is mentioning, but has instead omitted lexical units from the sentence. First, ‘poet’ is ignored in front of Burns, and the title of Burke’s book is also discarded. It can be argued that the title of the treatise may be too specific to be included in a light reading text, but again – nothing that could justify the omission is apparent in the text.

2.2.10. Behaviour and Manners
Bertie’s attitude that the love of a woman is never to be scorned and the English way of going along with things to avoid embarrassment as well as keeping their word even if the outcome is not exactly what they hoped for is evident in the following example.

/…/ Madeline Bassett /…/ had long been under the impression that I was hopelessly in love with her and had given to understand that if ever she had occasion to return her betrothed, Gussie Fink-Nottle, to the store, she would marry me. Which wouldn’t have fitted in with my plans at all, she thought physically in the pin-up class, being as mushy a character as ever broke biscuit, convinced that the stars are God’s daisy chain and that every time a fairy blows its wee nose a baby is born. The last thing, as you can well imagine, one would want about the home.

So when Gussie unexpectedly eloped with the cook, it looked as though Bertram was in for it. If a girl thinks you’re in love with her and says she will marry you, you can’t very well voice a preference for being dead in a ditch. Not, I mean, if you want to regard yourself as a preux chevalier, as the expression is, which is always my aim. (Much Obliged, Jeeves, pp. 9–10)
translated as


Nii et kui Gussie ootamatult kokaga põgenes, oli mul olukord täbar. Kui naine arvab, et sa armastad teda ja on valmis sinuga altari ette astuma, ei ole just kõige sobivam surnut teeseldes maha viskuda, eriti siis, kui tahad ennast tõsiseks rüütliks pidada, mis on alati olud üks minu eesmärke. (Suur tänu, Jeeves!, pp. 7–8).

The quite substantial omission in the translation is something that may have taken place due to the translator’s belief that the detailed description of Madeline Basset’s
naivety is not significant in the target text to carry on the plot. Thus, this can be referred to as a shift in coherence, an audience-based shift that the translator decides to bring about based on what s/he thinks meets the needs of the target audience (Blum-Kulka). It can be argued, though, that even if the description is not significant in terms of plot development, is it however important in the presentation of the character Madeline Basset, as simply being naïve and believing stars to be God’s daisy chain do not paint the same picture for the readers. In addition, in the source text, it was Madeline who had given to understand that she would marry Bertie, but in the target text, it is Bertie that has given to understand that he would marry Madeline. Thus, it can be argued that the translator’s choices put the Estonian reader in a disadvantageous state compared to the source text reader. In addition, it can be claimed than the Estonian Madeline is less attractive than the Madeline in the English text, as in the source text, she is in the ‘pin-up’ class, while in the Estonian text, she is merely ‘alright’, ‘tal ei ole midagi viga’. One can wonder if the translator acted in coherence with Levý’s belief that a translator’s choices are always context-bound and opted for such a translation so as to be in keeping with the English way of avoiding the show of too much enthusiasm as regards to anything, even female beauty.

Overall, it would seem that the translator has exercised some liberties in translating the source text. Thus, the outcome is rather domesticated and therefore easier to read, but also loses some of the English elements that exist in the original.

2.3. Comparison of Translations
To sum up, it can be said that in some respects, the two translators have approached the task in a similar manner. All personal names and place names are left in their original form, making sure that the readers could link the setting to the plot and thus be aware that the events are taking place in various locations in England (and, in some cases, the USA
and France). In addition, cultural markers such as units of measurement, currency and temperature are translated, but not converted. For example, ‘mile’ has been translated as ‘miil’, but not converted into kilometres. In addition, markers such as ‘sir’ and ‘lord’ have been carried over to the target text, thus serving as references to English culture and society. Such a technique further helps the readers in placing the plot in an English setting – although readers unfamiliar with the English system may feel at a loss when picturing the value of money or the actual distance between two locations.

However, it can be argued that the translators did differ in their treatment of other aspects. It would seem that *Lase käia, Jeeves!*, was translated in a much more straightforward manner, with fewer omissions and additions, even if that meant that the readers were left in the dark about certain elements in the text (i.e. Colney Hatch) or mystified by calque translations that mean very little in Estonian (e.g. ‘tuhkur jänese jälgedele’). As such, it would seem that the text was translated while bearing in mind the source text and its purpose, and the text of the translation diverged from the original as little as possible. The translation generally maintained the purpose of the original, but perplexed target language readers now and then.

Contrary to that, it would seem that *Suur tänu, Jeeves!* was translated more liberally and in the vein of trying to be relatable to the Estonian reader. Clarifying footnotes were added to a few concepts and explanations were given in the case of a few quotations so as to make them more understandable (e.g. ‘Taani prints’, Junior Ganymede). This, however, meant that often, certain changes occurred in the target text when compared to the source text in terms of its explicitness and emotional tone. It can be argued that the changes made the text easier to read in Estonian, but also meant that at times, the characters were more emotional in Estonian than in English, thus conflicting with the stereotype that the English are good at hiding their feelings.
All in all, it would seem that certain changes have taken place in both translations, but the target text was more domesticated in the case of *Suur tänu, Jeeves!*, and more true to the original in the case of *Lase käia, Jeeves!*. 
CONCLUSION
This paper stemmed from the assumption that in literary translation, some culture-specific elements are always carried over to the target text and manifested as foreign elements referring to the source culture in some way.

The first part of the thesis presented an overview of Wodehouse’s life and work, but also the theoretical background for the study. Various papers on the translation of culture-specific elements were referred to. Several options that translators could choose from in translating foreign elements were highlighted, with the emphasis on techniques that were more likely to be used, such as paraphrasing, borrowing and calque translations. In addition, the possible outcomes of exploiting such techniques were handled (e.g. loss of explicitness).

The study was conducted on the example of Acculturation of the Other by Sirkku Aaltonen. In her study, Aaltonen looked at how the specific Irish elements of Irish plays were manifested in their translation into Finnish. It was claimed that the relationship between Estonia and England was similar to the relationship between Finland and Ireland, as both England and Ireland present the ‘familiar foreign’ to Estonians and Finns. Therefore, it was presumed that the analysis conducted by Aaltonen could serve as a model for studying the texts of Wodehouse and their translation into Estonian.

For the empirical analysis of the paper, two texts by Wodehouse and the translations of these texts were analysed. First, examples of various culture-specific elements (titles, customs, character) that could be regarded as stereotypical of the English were highlighted in the source texts and second, the manifestation of these elements in the target texts was analysed. In case of omissions or shifts in the translation as compared to the original, the change between the two texts was pointed out. Some speculations were made as to why a change had occurred.
Finally, a small-scale comparison of the two translations was carried out. Although comparing the translators was not the preliminary aim of the paper, some techniques characteristic of either translator were noted and conclusions were drawn accordingly. It was observed that as a general rule, proper names and place names were always left unchanged, except when part of a pun (e.g. ‘Old Florentians’). However, there were certain discrepancies in the assumptions the translations seemed to have made about their target audiences.

In the case of *Lase kää, Jeeves!*, the translator had translated the target text quite closely to the source text, assuming that Estonian readers have a greater knowledge of England and English elements, or due to the wish to retain a greater level of Englishness. In the case of *Suur tänu, Jeeves!*, the assumption seemed to be that in case of light reading, specificity as regards to the source culture is not the main aim to be pursued, and smoothness of the text is more important. As a result, some major changes, mainly in the emotional tone of the text, were noticeable.

All in all, it was concluded that avoiding major shifts results in a translation text that stays more true to the original, but mystifies target language readers, while changes (as well as additions and omissions) that are presumably made in order to make the target text smoother for the audiences to read result in shifts that may conflict with the original aim of the author.
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Analüüsi käigus võis märgata kummale jõuliselt iseloomulikke jooni, tähn millele olid ka tõlked oma olemuselt üksisteid veidi erinevad. Empiriilise analüüsi lõpuks esitatatakse vastavalt kasutatud tõlketehnikatele ja märgatud muutustele võrdlus kahe tõlkija valikute kohta. Samuti tuuakse välja nende valikute tagajärjed.
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