

Humaniora
Humana

DISSERTATIONES
ANGLICAE
UNIVERSITATIS
TARTUENSIS

7

KATILIINA GIELEN

Translation History in Systems:
Studies on the Estonian Translational
Space of the 20th Century



DISSERTATIONES PHILOLOGIAE ANGLICAE
UNIVERSITATIS TARTUENSIS

7

DISSERTATIONES PHILOLOGIAE ANGLICAE
UNIVERSITATIS TARTUENSIS

7

KATILIINA GIELEN

Translation History in Systems:
Studies on the Estonian Translational
Space of the 20th Century



UNIVERSITY OF TARTU
PRESS

Institute of Germanic, Romance and Slavonic Languages and Literatures,
Faculty of Philosophy, University of Tartu, Estonia

The Council of the Institute of Germanic, Romance and Slavonic Languages
and Literatures has, on 10 of April 2013, accepted this doctoral thesis to be
defended for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in English Language and
Literature

Supervisors: Raili Marling, Associate Professor of English Language and
Literature, Department of English Language and Literature,
University of Tartu

Reet Sool, Associate Professor of English Philology,
Department of English Language and Literature,
University of Tartu

Opponents: Professor Outi Paloposki, School of Languages and
Translation Studies, University of Turku

Professor Maryvonne Boisseau,
Professor of Linguistics and Translation,
University of Strasbourg

Commencement: Room 140, 18 Ülikooli Street, Tartu, on 24 May 2013, at
14.15 a.m.

ISSN 1736-4469

ISBN 978-9949-32-282-4 (print)

ISBN 978-9949-32-283-1 (pdf)

Copyright Katiliina Gielen, 2013

University of Tartu Press

www.tyk.ee

Order No 152

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people both in private and scholarly contexts that have made the process of this research project a pleasantly rewarding one. First of all, I would like to acknowledge my two supervisors, Raili Marling and Reet Sool. I would like to thank Reet Sool for her precision and support, as well as for the long talks we have had. I am grateful to Raili Marling for her constructiveness in finally pushing me into a work habit that resulted in the present thesis. Without Raili's critical eye and sense of responsibility (as well as humour) the dissertation would have seemed more of a mission impossible.

Secondly, I have also had the privilege of working together with two wonderful colleagues active in the field of Estonian translation studies, Anne Lange and Daniele Monticelli (Tallinn University), who kindly took me in as a partner in organizing two international conferences on translation studies (2010 and 2012) as well as made two of the publications of this dissertation (articles II, III) possible. This partnership has proved to be rewarding both academically, as well as personally. Daniele Monticelli as the grant holder of ETF8152 *Translators (Re)shaping Culture Repertoire*, has played a considerable part in gathering the expertise, finding people engaged in translation research and popularising the study of translation history in Estonia.

I would also like to bring out and recognise the efforts of Eve Annuk for the project to map the itineraries of gender-related knowledge in Estonia. Eve's grant, ETF8875 *Gender question in Estonia: local situation and international influences*, as well as people involved in the grant have been of great support for me.

My special gratitude, however, goes to two professors from very different academic contexts: Professor Jüri Talvet from the Department of World Literature, University of Tartu and Theo Hermans, Professor of Dutch and Comparative Literature, University College London. Jüri Talvet must be especially recognized for being a model of scholarly generosity and an inspirational figure in all his multiple activities, especially regarding the work he has done as an editor of *Interlitteraria*, a journal that has proved to be a wonderful outlet for many Estonian, as well as foreign scholars in the field of comparative literary studies. Two of the articles of the present thesis (articles I, IV) have been published in the aforementioned journal. I consider Theo Hermans to be my Teacher with a capital letter. His dedication to translation studies, his punctuality, but perhaps most of all, his particularly elegant and self-reflective style of writing have been extremely inspirational for me, not to talk of the fact that it was Translation Research Summer School (UCL 2007) that brought me to the field of translation studies.

Not less important are my colleagues at the University of Tartu starting with Ene-Reet Soovik, who has lent her expertise as well as friendly advice on many occasions and hopefully many more to come. I would like to thank all my dear present and former colleagues from the Department of English, University of

Tartu: Ilmar Anvelt, Krista Kallis, Jane Klavan, Leili Kostabi, Piret Kärtner, Pille Põiklik, Pilvi Rajamäe, Eva Rein, Piret Rääbus, Katri Sirkel, Reeli Torn-Leesik, Ülle Türk, Berk Vaher, Kärt Vahtramäe, Enn Veldi, Krista Vogelberg, Natalja Zagura and Age Allas, Mariann Enno, Milvi Kaber, other members of the Institute of Germanic, Romance and Slavonic Languages and Literatures, as well as members of the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Tartu. Thank you for making my work at the university during the challenging time of changes such a pleasant enterprise.

I would also like to give my gratitude to all my dear friends for their support. Especially I would like to thank Redi Koobak for the long inspiring discussions and ventures we have had together, and for always being there when I most needed it. My special thanks, however, goes to my long-time friend and colleague Klaarika Kaldjärv for her never-ending scepticism, lasting friendship and most of all – for all those Thursday nights.

Last but not least, I am grateful for having such a bonus in form of my family, my husband Edwin, children Robin, Iris and Minna who have complained little, criticised even less and provided me with a secure and cheerful background for doing what I do. Thank you also mom, dad, my dear sisters Mariliina and Karoliina with families for a free and inspiring creative context.

My sincere gratitude goes to Professor Outi Paloposki, School of Languages and Translation Studies, University of Turku, and Maryvonne Boisseau, Professor of Linguistics and Translation, University of Strasbourg, for pre-reviewing the present thesis. Your remarks instilled confidence and helped considerably to improve the paper. Thank you!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS INCLUDED IN THE DISSERTATION.....	8
ABSTRACT	9
1. INTRODUCTION.....	11
1.1. Contextualizing Research Environment: Literary History in Estonia and the Position of the Study of Translation within it.....	14
1.2. History of Translation – History of Translation Theory: Towards Scientific Approaches and Descriptive Methodological Models.....	17
1.3. Methodology in Translation History. Key Terms	24
1.3.1. Systems and Polysystems: Translation in Context	24
1.3.2. Translation and Norms.....	28
1.3.3. Texts and Paratexts: Empirical Material of Translation Studies.....	32
1.3.4. Invisibility of the Translator and Early Years of Soviet Estonia.....	35
2. ARTICLES INTRODUCED.....	38
Article I: Translators in Systems. Some Notes on the Factors Shaping Translations: The Case of Marta Sillaots and Young Estonia Publishing.....	38
Article II: Authors as Translators: Emerging Hierarchical Patterns of Literary Activity in Early Soviet Estonia	39
Article III: The Explicit and Implicit Translational Poetics of Marta Sillaots. (Marta Sillaotsa eksplitsiitne ja implitsiitne tõlkepoetika).....	41
Article IV: Forewords and Reviews: On Translators’ Invisibility.	44
3. CONCLUSION	47
4. REFERENCES.....	51
ARTICLES.....	57
KOKKUVÕTE.....	117
CURRICULUM VITAE	121

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS INCLUDED IN THE DISSERTATION¹

Article I:

Gielen, Katiliina. 2012. Translators in Systems. Some Notes on the Factors Shaping Translations: The Case of Marta Sillaots and Young Estonia Publishing. *Interlitteraria*. 17, 259–266.

Article II:

Gielen, Katiliina. 2011b. Authors as Translators: Emerging Hierarchical Patterns of Literary Activity in Early Soviet Estonia. – Antoine Chalvin, Anne Lange, Daniele Monticelli (eds). *Between Cultures and Texts: Itineraries in Translation History. Entre les cultures et les textes: Itinéraires en histoire de la traduction*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften, 201–211.

Article III:

Gielen, Katiliina. 2012. Marta Sillaotsa eksplitsiitne ja implitsiitne tõlkepoetika. (The Explicit and Implicit Translational Poetics of Marta Sillaots.) *Methis. Studia Humaniora Estonica*. 9/10, 104–117.

Article IV:

Gielen, Katiliina. 2011a. Forewords and Reviews: On Translators' Invisibility. *Interlitteraria*. 2/16, 628–642.

¹ The articles are referenced in the dissertation by the numbers I, II, III and IV.

ABSTRACT

The general aim of my research project has been to analyse different sides of translational activity as connected to the context of translation and the position of the translator in Estonia. Apart from the question why translations that can be said to be of different quality (either deemed as ‘good’ or ‘bad’, or just poorly translated or edited) occur in a given culture and how to work with the existing corpora, two very broad and general issues can be brought out that have guided this dissertation: 1. What are the factors triggering shifts in translational behaviour (norms) (ideological changes, influential authors/scholars, etc.)? 2. How does the system in which a translation occurs influence translation; what is the role of socio-political environment, publishing or translational conventions?

In addition to the general history of translation studies, the introduction sets the goal to provide the background to the descriptive translation research methods used and elaborate on the key theoretical concepts of the articles. The four articles investigate the social, political as well as academic context of translations and translators, concentrating on some general aspects of the Estonian poetry translation traditions on a concrete example (article IV but especially on the translational activity of Marta Sillaots, her translation poetics as well as her position as a translator (articles I, II, III).

Four general research questions can be brought out: 1. How does the organization of translational work in systems (such as commissioning, publishing and the socio-political system in general) influence the final product – the translation in a specific translational context? 2. What role did translation play during the political-ideological changes in Estonia during 1940s and 1950s? 3. What are the implications arising from the comparison of the explicit and implicit poetics of a translator, in the case of Marta Sillaots? 4. How do the translation norms operate and change?

The articles included in the project have slightly different foci, ranging from the systems in which translations occur to the status of the translators or changes in such status during different socio-political situations and at different moments in time throughout the 20th century. Still, the focal point throughout most of the study (explicitly present in the first three articles) is the case of Marta Sillaots, an Estonian novelist, essayist and translator whose translational output has so far been under researched². Regarding theoretical and methodological levels, what connects the separate case studies is the concept of interlingual translation as an activity that occurs in a specific translational situation and is governed by social and political conventions. My research suggests that translation is a phenomenon that cannot be submitted to one single definition,

² For the description of Marta Sillaots (1987–1969) and her literary activities see pages 38–44.

but a practice that must be constantly redefined considering its function and given historical context. Throughout the project, I have maintained the viewpoint that descriptive methods of research enable us to look into cultural phenomena such as translation from multiple angles at the same time and thus broaden the horizons in, at least, research into translation history. Separate contextualised case studies into one or another historical period, such as the ones included in the present research project, will eventually give a broader basis for making generalizations and comparisons in future projects.

INTRODUCTION

Through translation writers can escape the prison house of their language, but they are then dependent on translators for the perception of their work in the wider world. Books which are translated may carry that original writer's name on the cover, but the actual words between the covers are written by translators. (Hermans 2009: 1)

According to Octavio Paz, translation is the principal means we have of understanding the world we live in. The world, he says, is presented to us as a growing heap of texts, each slightly different from the one that came before it: translations of translations of translations. Each text is unique, yet at the same time it is the translation of another text. No text can be completely original because language itself, in its very essence, is already a translation – first from the nonverbal world, and then, because each sign and each phrase is a translation of another sign, another phrase. (Paz 1992: 154) More specifically to one cultural environment, all texts circulating in a culture form a cultural repertoire (Even-Zohar 2007) and each new text adds a certain motion to the system, on the one hand building the repertoire layer by layer and on the other hand contributing to unbalancing or changing the hierarchy between the systems. However, texts are produced by people and in context and research into translation history cannot be isolated to encompass texts only.

Although the articles chosen for the present dissertation are concerned with different time periods in Estonian translation history, thematically they all revolve around the same closely interwoven issues: the position of a translator and the factors influencing translational behaviour, or, in broader terms, I am interested in what can be found in translation history, why certain translational phenomena occur and what is the relation between the context of translation, position of the translator in the society and the translational behaviour.

In addition to compositional constraints, the format of an article for a scholarly journal sets limits to the paper space: the issue of the number of characters, words, or pages always gains a certain prominence. The articles included in the present thesis are specific case studies concerned with concrete textual corpora and thus the focus in them is rather on the textual material used, leaving the principles of explanation and prediction, or the theory, in a somewhat secondary position. This introduction gives me the opportunity to elaborate on and open up some of the theoretical concepts and key terms that frame the empirical material in my studies, but have received less attention in the articles due to the constraints the format presents. Along with that, the introduction is a good opportunity for me to contextualise my efforts in the field of descriptive historical translation research and present the state of art of translation as a field of study in Estonia the way I see it.

The stance towards the material that I have adopted conducting my research and writing the articles is, in accord with Descriptive Translation Studies, non-

evaluative. First and foremost this means that I look at translation as a situated part of the social and literary system of the target culture rather than part of the one the original comes from. What is more, although I use comparative analysis of texts (article III) this is not the equivalence-related analysis on the basis of source and target, but a side by side examination of two (or more) target texts (different translations and editions of translations). Consequently the quality of translation falls out of my range of interests and instead, translation and its position in the target culture, the relationship between authorship and translation, as well as inherent ideas about translation as reproduction and translator as an invisible mediator, as well as the possible consequences of such ingrained ideas, come to the fore in my research. Refraining from asking essentialist questions about translation, such as those concerning issues of translatability or concept of good or bad translation, comes from the understanding of translation as a very volatile notion in a given culture that tends to change in history together with translation conventions and norms.

The main theoretical base of my work runs parallel to what can be called systems theories in translation studies. One of the key concepts that has been used as a basis underlying the articles is the polysystem theory first developed by Itamar Even Zohar and expanded by Gideon Toury and others. Proceeding from that, aspects from Gideon Toury's concept of translation norms are present in all the four articles. Thirdly, I have utilized Lawrence Venuti's concept of the invisibility of the translator, modifying it to fit the purpose of describing the translational situation in Estonia (article II). Last but not least, Peeter Torop's notion of explicit and implicit translation poetics has been a tool for describing the translational thought of Marta Sillaots (1887–1969), a prolific Estonian translator whom I have thoroughly researched for a number of years. In the following sections I will provide a frame of reference to the aforementioned theoretical concepts and elaborate on the keywords, giving thus the background to and introducing the articles included in the present dissertation. All in all, I have tried not to do research in the sense that in the process something becomes explicit and clear beyond doubt. Instead, I have tried to engage in a dialogue and open some issues for further discussion.

Although the understanding about what translation is has been widened since from what Peeter Torop (2002) calls the semiotic turn, meaning the Jakobsonian tertiary definition of translation³ (1959), still the most researched field in translation has always been and still is interlingual translation. And this is most likely to continue in the future. As: "Every human being is, on the one hand, in the power of the language he speaks; he and his whole thinking are the product of it. He cannot, with complete certainty, think anything that lies outside the

³ Roman Jakobson's tertiary division of translation into *interlingual* or translation proper, *intralingual* or translation inside one language system (eg. paraphrase, translation between dialects or registers) and *intersemiotic* or translation between different sign systems, first reached wider audiences in *On Linguistic Aspects of Translation* (1959).

limits of language.” (Schleiermacher 1992: 38) Without any intention to go into linguistic determinism, I will just mention that in my case the choice of English rather than Estonian regarding this dissertation and three articles out of four is deliberate. On the one hand, the choice of English is not surprising for papers that are produced within the institutional framework that, on the one hand, promotes and supports the study of the Estonian language, literature and history and, on the other hand, aspires for a wider, international readership. In other words, I have attempted both to interpret and translate my topics to a wider scholarly community. On the one hand, the decision to write in English enables a certain negotiation between the local and the global, but on the other hand it presents a set problematic of its own. Firstly, language, never a neutral element, has often been implicated in efforts to mute the past, and more importantly, cultural identity. This is what Theo Hermans (2000: 2) calls the crisis of representation or “how to offer a cultural practice without doing violence to it” that often results in “ironic models of academic writing”, the irony being the awareness of the problematic nature of representation but inability to exist without such representations. Thus, what has been my concern here is paying attention to the issues concerning representation, and, at the same time, not over-scrutinizing the matter of representation.

Secondly, the choice of language in many senses determines the presentation of the material in the articles. Issues concerning non-native target audience, such as the need to clarify, explicate and thus also interpret for example the general context of the Estonia before and after Soviet occupation acquire a certain amount of prominence in my research together with the risk to blur the focus or lapse into banality, since the space for such presentation is less than limited. On the other hand, considering the present project, I feel the need to justify the descriptive methods (that may not need clarification elsewhere) for the local audiences, mainly since my personal experience in the field of translation in Estonia has taught me that the original is still considered to be the ultimate end in itself against which everything else is compared. A relevant question for me has been how to negotiate and present the topics concerning very specific historical events in Estonia, at the same time keeping in mind the context of the source culture as well as the target audiences, which in the case of three of the articles included is mainly English-speaking, in the case of article III Estonian-speaking and in the case of the introduction aims at both. Thus, the angle of my presentation is dependent on the context of such negotiation, in other words, it is not only dependent on the *when*, the *where* and the *what*, but largely also *by whom* and *for whom*.

I.1. Contextualizing Research Environment: Literary History in Estonia and the Position of the Study of Translation within it

In his *Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies* (1985) Gideon Toury says that it is the applications of translation studies, important as these may be, in the form of either translation didactics, criticism or translation quality assessment, that – “represent the main constraint on the very formulation of the theory which underlies them.” (Toury 1985: 17) Yet it is from such a background of evaluative translation criticism, hundreds of years of fidelity and equivalence debates that descriptive translation research starts to emerge and spread in different cultural environments; at first usually with separate case studies into translational phenomena of a particular language environment, acquiring broader base with each of such study until some generalization is reached. Isolated attempts to study, describe and map actual translations may not constitute a systematic scientific branch as is the aspiration of Toury (1985: 17), but case studies of, for example, a poetics of a translator in a certain translational context do provide a basis for the emergence of such descriptive scientific branch, should there be a wish or need for such a discipline. In Estonia a void regarding the history of translation has been described by Torop already in 1980 (see Torop 1980: 63) and in the light of the developments of recent decades of reviewing the Soviet value systems together with the representation of the past, an even stronger need for research into translation history can be felt.

Estonian national literary history has been relatively well researched and documented. In addition to a number of monographs and treatments, five volumes of *Estonian Literary History (Eesti kirjanduse ajalugu)*, published during the period of 1965 to 1991, and *Estonian Literature (Eesti kirjandus)* by Endel Nirk (1983) were followed by a voluminous *Estonian Literary History (Eesti kirjanduslugu)* in 2000, that also contains the literary history of Estonian writers in exile. Yet this is only one side of Estonian literary history, the one that is concerned with original, indigenous production. The other side, equally important from the point of view of Estonian readers throughout centuries, is literature that has been made available by translation. Among other Estonian scholars, both Anne Lange (2008: 7) as well as Marek Tamm (2010) have stressed the translational nature of such a small culture as Estonian: “Estonian culture has been born from translation and in translation and will last only as long as there will be translation. Our literary language was formed during the Bible translation period, our literature grew out of adaptations and translations and our language renewal was carried out with the help of translations.”⁴ (Tamm 2010) In this way, Estonian intellectuals express their recognition of translation as one of the most important aspects in the development and pro-

⁴ My translation.

duction of the Estonian culture. Yet, as Lange says, translation history does not appear in the Estonian Encyclopaedia as a separate entry among such keywords as Estonian literary-, theatre- or book history, but is rather hidden inside them. (Lange 2008: 8)

Although there have been attempts to gather expertise and systematize knowledge⁵ about translation in Estonia, Estonian translation history still remains in the shadow of Estonian literary and cultural history. Nevertheless, translational phenomena as well as translation theory have attracted the attention of a variety of scholars for a longer period resulting in a number of separate case studies ranging from analyses of the translation of biblical texts (see Paul 1999; Ross 2000; 2002; 2004; 2007; 2009; 2011 and Tafenau 2011), the studies of terms used for the description of translations (Sütiste 2008; 2011; Gielen 2012) and analysis of individual translators (Lange 2004; 2007; 2011; Gielen 2012) or the translations of foreign language authors into Estonian (Kaldjärv 2007; Talviste 2007). There are also studies that attempt to map the dominant developments in translation in the recent decades using statistical data (see Tamm 2010; Soovik 2011; Kaus 2013). What can be considered as conducive to the research potential for translation in Estonia is the existence of high level cultural semiotics, including translation semiotics. Needless to say that Yuri Lotman's work on cultural semiotics has left its mark on the research of translations in Estonia. The studies of Peeter Torop, starting with his doctoral dissertation *Тотальный перевод* (Total Translation) (1995) have, to my mind, widened the notion of translation to cover different forms of communication and contributed to the rise in the awareness of translation studies as a vital part of cultural research.

Nonetheless, there is a clear lack of coordinated study of translation in Estonia, for example, institutional framework for translation studies. Translation can be studied alongside with philology of different languages or as a part of cultural semiotics. MA programmes in translation at the universities of Tartu and Tallinn are mostly concerned with practical translator and interpreter training and there is no PhD programme available in translation studies. PhD dissertations concerning translation research (such as Kaldjärv 2007; Sütiste 2009; Tafenau 2011 or the present one) are a part of (mostly foreign) language and literature or semiotics programmes. What is more, there is a clear need for an outlet of scholarly communication since it is difficult to enter into a dialogue without it. Papers on subjects concerning translation tend to run via the channels

⁵ Two international conferences on the history of translation have been held in Estonia: *Between Cultures and Texts: Itineraries in Translation History* (April 2010) and *Translating Power, Empowering Translation: Itineraries in Translation History* (May 2012) (organized on the initiative of Anne Lange, Daniele Monticelli and myself). Selected papers of the first conference were published in Chalvin, A; Lange, A; Monticelli, D. (eds). *Between Cultures and Texts: Itineraries in Translation History*. (2011); A special issue of *METHIS Studia Humaniora Estica* 9/10 dedicated to the translation history edited by Anne Lange and Daniele Monticelli was published in July 2012.

of already established disciplines adjacent to that of translation studies and are thus dispersed in an array of scholarly periodicals. In such conditions we can speak of a disciplinary as well as institutional void in Estonian translation studies that contributes to the fragmentation of the field of translation. The research is being conducted at different universities, different departments and on different academic levels.

Peeter Torop has already in 1980 stressed the importance of and in 1995 the need for a translation history and raised the issues of a methodology in translation history. (see Torop 1980; 1995: 34) He has also expressed a view that changes in the status of translators and translations that have taken place in the 20th century require a complex treatment. (Torop 2011: 97) Regardless of the steps taken towards mapping Estonian translation history, considering the abovementioned, translation studies in Estonia can still be considered a sub-discipline of literary studies, semiotics and linguistics. Translation history in its turn is embedded into literary history, book history and the history of the Estonian language. For a long period the only work with a historical and theoretical projection on what has been done in the field of translation in Estonia was Uno Liivaku and Henno Meriste's introduction to the translators' manual, dating from 1975 (see Liivaku; Meriste 1975). Recently the field has gained momentum with a collected volume of conference proceedings *Between Cultures and Texts: Itineraries in Translation History* (Chalvin et al 2011) and a special issue of an Estonian-language journal *Methis. Studia Humaniora Estonica* (2012) dedicated to translation studies in Estonia with an introduction by Anne Lange and Daniele Monticelli that in brief sums up and gives an overview of what has been done in the field of translation and translation research in Estonia. The aforementioned introduction also puts Estonian translation research into a wider perspective by comparing it to the developments elsewhere in the world. However, the papers presented in *Methis* are in Estonian and not available for an international readership. Ironically the editor in chief of the Finnish translation history⁶ Hannu Kalevi Riikonen (2012: 203) sees in his review to the first Estonian enterprise to collect knowledge regarding issues of translation and past⁷ that translation history could better be represented within cultural history and not as a separate history. Nonetheless, regarding the pronounced presence of translated texts in the literary production of Estonia, a separate history of translation would help to recognize the role of translation in the circulation of cultural capital, to use Pierre Bourdieu's term⁸. However we might feel about

⁶ Riikonen et al. 2007. *Suomennoskirjallisuuden historia I, II*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

⁷ I am referring to the collection of articles Chalvin et al. 2011. *Between Cultures and Texts: Itineraries in Translation History*.

⁸ Although mentioned already in Bourdieu, Pierre. 1973. *Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction*, the term *cultural capital* has become widely used in comparison with other types of capital in *The Forms of Capital* (1986).

translation in comparison with the original, a mere fact that most people acquire the knowledge of world literature through translations should be enough to study and map the impact of translations and translators and do it in the framework of the target culture.

1.2. History of Translation – History of Translation Theory: Towards Scientific Approaches and Descriptive Methodological Models

In the following section I will elaborate on the general historical background of translation studies as a discipline, attempt to define translation theory the way Paz (1992: 154) sees the world presented to us as a growing heap of historical texts, and point to the problems of representation of translation history.

By translation history we mean the history of translations (when and what has been translated), history of the quality of translations, history of the methods of translation as well as the history of translational ideas. (Torop 1995: 34) Translation theory, on the other hand, is a more difficult term to define. If we consider sustained scholarly thought on translation to be translation theory, then the discipline of translation studies appears to be a relatively young discipline. However, translation theory can be said to originate from or at the very least has been closely connected to actual translations and particular translators. Eugene Nida, among other scholars of translation, finds theory to be manifested in every single translation:

Some professional translators take considerable pride in denying that they have any theory of translation — they just translate. In reality, however, all persons engaged in the complex task of translating possess some type of underlying or covert theory; even though it may be still very embryonic and described only as just being “faithful to what the author was trying to say”. (Nida 1991: 20)

The origin of the word *theory* itself gives us the possibility to interpret translation theory as *looking at* translation, *contemplating on* translation. Adopting such broader historical view and regarding reflections on translation, liminal texts surrounding translations such as notes and remarks by translators or translation critics, as a form of theory, we can go back centuries and see the developments and changes in thinking about translation. Thus it can be said that translation theory, more than any other set of theories in the humanities, has a historical projection. Furthermore, translation theory seen like that appears as not a single theory but a plurality of theories, since reflections on translation in some form or another exist in every written culture. Besides historical projection translation theory is in constant development showing: “an odd lack of continuity” (Ross Amos 1969: X), being thus difficult to generalize: “Translation theory cannot be reduced to a rule of thumb; it must again and again be

modified to include new facts. Thus regarded it becomes a vital part of our literary history,” (Ross Amos 1969: XIII) In keeping with its historical projection it is difficult to separate translation theory from translation history. But in order to establish the field of research a starting point is needed.

Considering literary translation to be a mode of engagement with literature is to understand translation as a specific kind of literary activism where the translators are bound to be active agents and considerable contributors to intercultural communication: “Translators are necessarily involved in a politics of transmission, in perpetuating or contesting the values which sustain our literary culture.” (Simon 1996: 8) Thus, the presentation of translation history or aspects of translation history through translators, the way I have done in the case of article II III and IV or as other agents of translation, as in the case of article I, is not a new idea. (see Delisle, Woodsworth 1996 [1995]; Pym 1998; Delisle 2002; Milton, Bandia 2009; Sela-Sheffy, Shlesinger 2011) Milton and Bandia (2009: 2) broadly categorize such agents of translation into two basic types: the ones who have effected changes in the styles of translation (translators) and secondly the agents ‘who have helped or attempted to innovate by selecting new works to be translated’ (other agents of translation). Many of the most seminal authors and literary scholars throughout centuries have at some point turned their attention to translation, be it then by selecting works to be translated, by translation proper or reflections concerning the transference of meaning in general. Yet the way historical translation theory has come to be represented is in many cases somewhat arbitrary and both dependent on the sources that have come down to us as well as the historians who favour or circulate particular scholars. Andre Lefevere’s *Translation, History, Culture: a sourcebook* (1992) as well as Douglas Robinson’s *Western Translation Theory: from Herodotos to Nietzsche* (2002) have, for example, helped to the circulation of Cicero’s *De optimo genere oratorum* as one of the earliest documented Western theoretical treaties on translation that has been passed down to us in writing. For the starting point of Western translational thought Cicero is as good a choice as any. A convenient beginning to the contemporary Western translation theory, however, is considered to be the lecture by Friedrich Schleiermacher *Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens* given in the Prussian Academy of Sciences in 1813, a paper that Lawrence Venuti, among many others, builds much of his work on. However, the aforementioned historical occasions can be called functional turning points rather than starting points regarding translation history. Cicero, as far as we can tell regarding the sources available, represents the new type of translation from Greek into Latin, a translation that had to have a reformative function: translating like an orator as opposed to the common practice of word-for-word and side by side rendering of Greek texts into Latin of the time. Schleiermacher’s idea of translation as a form of communication between different peoples and social classes of people, his two types of translators, *Dolmetscher* and *Übersetzer*, as well as his methods of translation with the preference of valorising the foreign (Schleiermacher 1992), are uttered

during the Napoleonic era and in the context of German Enlightenment, development of German language and culture, and thus also connected to the need to manifest the change of the function of translation in that particular environment.

However, in pursuit of the convenient starting point for translation studies as a separate discipline from that of literary studies or linguistics, James Holmes and his paper *The Name and Nature of Translation Studies* (1972)⁹, defining the field and attempting to name it, are usually brought out (see Gentzler 2001: 93; Munday 2008: 9). Such a sequence of pivotal texts is commonly recognized in at least the so called Anglo-American tradition of representing the history of translational thought. (See for example Robinson 2002; Qvale 2003; Munday 2004; Venuti 2004; Baker, M.; Saldanha, G. (2008)) This does not exclude that other cultures may see the sequence as well as translation related topics somewhat differently. (see Tymoczko 2005, 2006, 2007) Nevertheless, translation theory can be seen as a more or less arbitrary collection of texts on translation and thus historically closely connected to the agents of translation.

One of the main goals of translation studies as an emerging academic discipline in the late 1970s and 1980s, first emphasized in 1964 by Eugene Nida in *Toward a Science of Translating*, although not with an aim to name the field but to describe one aspect of the process of translating¹⁰, and clearly delineated by James Holmes in his conference paper *The Name and Nature of Translation Studies* (1972 but not widely available until 1988), was an aspiration towards more scientific research methods. The origins of attempting to utilise more scientific methods and formulating the laws in such 'soft' science as literature, can be traced back to Russian Formalism and beyond, a tradition that Itamar Even-Zohar calls *Dynamic Functionalism* (1990: 2). Even-Zohar (1990: 4) sees two basic problems in perceiving the fields of literature or translation 'scientific' fields of study. First, there is a gap between what is believed to be 'scientific' in the humanities and what the concept actually means. Hence, what is conceived to be 'science' is often 'the simplified and popularised versions of science'. Secondly, in adopting a 'scientific' approach the *Dynamic Functionalism*, for example, has made clear its intentions and methodological programme, but has not necessarily succeeded in formulating the adequate 'laws', since the nature of such laws is quite problematic, and thus: "they cannot be taken as eternal truths (as is often the case in literary criticism), but rather as temporary hypotheses, to be discarded or modified whenever it becomes necessary to do so." (Even-Zohar 1990: 4)

⁹ James S. Holmes delivered his paper in the *Third International Congress of Applied Linguistics* in Copenhagen in 1972.

¹⁰ In 1969 Eugene Nida clarifies the use of the term: "the science of translation, or perhaps more accurately stated, the scientific description of the process involved in translating" (Nida 1969: 483)

In translation research the aspiration towards the science of translation has mainly meant a methodological change, manifested in the attempts to map, classify and generalize various translational phenomena and find reasons for them in a non-evaluative way, as opposed to the so called prescriptive methodologies oriented at the negotiation of translation equivalence. However, in accordance with Even-Zohar, it is difficult to find a steady and uninterrupted scientific development when it comes to translation. Different translation methods and theories have been the result of concrete translational circumstances, forming interrupted, erratic or overlapping patterns in history. Nevertheless, according to Thomas Kuhn's episodic model of science¹¹ (1962), in which he challenges the understanding of science as a steady and continuous accumulation of knowledge and argues for a model full of interruptions followed by periods of acceleration or revolutions, translation studies can also be called a scientific discipline – a field that develops according to certain discontinual patterns. In keeping with Kuhn, for instance the turn towards descriptivism in translation studies is often described as the shift of *paradigm* (See Hermans 2009: 9; Pym 2010: 65–66), the idea of the science of translation as “a succession of tradition-bound periods punctuated by non-cumulative breaks” (Kuhn 1996: 208) serves the purpose. Furthermore, similarly to the descriptive translation scholars, Kuhn (1996: 75; 138) puts an emphasis on the context of scientific achievements. Consequently, studies into the history of translation that are based on empirical research and draw from translational thought at a particular time and location can reveal such discontinual patterns of the progress of scientific knowledge. According to Hermans it is the empirical case studies that are the sound basis of translation research since theory ultimately remains a ‘tentative construct’ which is dependent on the success of its application: “...theory consists of an aggregate of hypotheses which tend to be used selectively by individual researchers, and even in its entirety it offers no more than a simplified and abstract model at one remove from the real world.” (Hermans 1985: 12)

However, Gideon Toury's (1995: 3) call for a systematic and organized descriptive branch of translation studies that would: “ensure that the findings of individual studies will be intersubjectively testable and comparable,” can be seen as a continuation of the steps to make methods in Descriptive Translation Studies more scientifically valid. He proposes a three-step methodology for profiling translations according to genre, period or author: (1) looking at the position of the target text in the target environment, (2) comparison of ST and TT to locate shifts and identify the relationships between the pairs, (3) making generalizations on the basis of the reconstruction of the process of translation. (Toury 1995: 36–39, 102) Although criticised for the vagueness and poor applicability (see Gentzler 2001: 130–131; Hermans 2009: 56–57), in practical terms, it is the flexibility and undetermined nature of the method (although meant to undergo “continuous revision” (Toury 1995: 80)) that has spurred

¹¹ Thomas Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* was first published in 1962.

many researches into, for instance, the nature of norms in different cultural environments and at different points in time. The following section will explicate the background of the theoretical viewpoint I have adopted throughout my research.

According to Peeter Torop (2011a: 13), translation is a cultural phenomenon and everything about translation has to do with culture¹² in general: culture is translation and translation is culture. Culture as a collective person translates for itself and within itself and without describing such communication processes it will be impossible to understand culture. (Torop 2011a: 194) Moreover, according to Torop (2011a: 195), moving towards a better understanding of your object of research will help the whole culture to move towards a better self-understanding. Naturally, Torop does not speak of interlingual translation per se, but translation as a universal communicative means, auto-communicative among others.

Critical evaluation of translations, close reading of source and target texts may be a valuable tool for translator training and quality improvement process, but it need not be the primary aim in translation research. Meaning is a plural entity that is dependent on the context of interpretation: “and therefore a translation cannot be judged according to mathematics-based concepts of semantic equivalence or one-to-one correspondence” (Venuti 2008: 13). Furthermore, many factors, both dependent and independent of the translator do influence the final version of a translation. The fact is that different translations with different quality exist and are published and read in every language. We cannot, as Theo Hermans puts it, simply wish them away and a mere fact of their existence should be enough to take a closer look at them, preferably in non-evaluative terms. This is how I see my objects of research as well as the field of historical translation research in general. From a systemic point of view, Hermans devises sets of multiple questions into the conditions of producing translations. Hermans aims at an inquiry into why there is what there is: what is the role of legal arrangements concerning the publishers, authors and translators, or, in other words, who determines who translates what? What are the social, economic and personal reasons concerning the progress of translational work of individual translators? Does the correct/incorrect anticipation of the readers’ expectations affect the reception of translations? How to measure the real impact of translations (as the norms of translation change)? Should we assess the assessors of translations? However, according to Hermans, offering an explanation of things that have happened in the past involves a great deal of interpretation (which cannot be anything but situated) of both – existing translations as well as material surrounding these translations. (Hermans 2009: 4–5) Yet the aforementioned questions are productive for translation historians since such inquiry into

¹² It is not my intention to go into the discussion about different definitions of the term *culture*. For an elaborate treatise as to what can be called culture in the framework of the so called *cultural turn* in translation studies see Koskinen (2004).

translation may explicate certain matters and offer explanations (recognizing that these explanations are heavily dependent on the interpretation of factual material) to why certain translations exist rather than, in more prescriptive terms, simply “wish them away”.

According to Hermans (1985: 9), even the pedagogical considerations do not justify dealing with essentialist issues such as the definition of translation, possibility or impossibility of translation, as well as issues of good and bad translation: “...translation scholars have often been their own worst enemies, not just for failing to question the normative and source-oriented approaches typical of most traditional thinking about translation, but also for continuing to ask similarly unproductive essentialist questions.” (Hermans 1985: 9) Hermans here refers to the self-annihilating practice of presenting translation as a secondary form of writing and translation research as a marginal field of study. Peeter Torop echoes Hermans in saying that viewing translations on the evaluative scale of the binaries ‘good’ and ‘bad’ may not be productive on the consideration that translation readers’ expectations as well as norms (Toury) are different during different time periods in history: “If the works of an author have been translated during a period of two hundred years and dozens of translations have been made of them, it seems possible to arrange them all along a scale of good and bad translations. However the hundred years remaining between two translations do not allow us to compare them in such a manner.” (Torop 2002: 595)

Treating translations as facts in the target culture, translated texts as constructions in their own right, can be traced back to the early works by Itamar Even-Zohar (1970; 1978; 1979), Gideon Toury (1985; 1995) and José Lambert (1980). According to Even-Zohar, translated literature forms a system of its own and is bound to the target culture (rather than the source one) at least in two ways. The first is regarding the principles of selection of literature to be translated and the second the way translations adopt “specific norms, behaviours and policies”. (Even-Zohar 2004: 200) Such target- or receptor-orientation creates a slight clash between most of the historical translation criticism in Estonia, but provides the researcher with an angle to look at the events in translation history from a perspective different from the one that evaluates and prescribes. A translation typology is needed in order to have a comprehensive overview of literary translation history. Torop proposes two general ways to view the history of translation:

/.../ the translation culture of a particular period can be viewed as a certain number of translated texts in one case, or as a hierarchy of translation types in another case. In the former case we can speak of the choice, cultural politics and cultural repertoire, the functioning of translated texts in a new culture. In the latter case we can discuss the translations themselves, translation methods and the translators’ works. In the former case we can use very different languages of description, in the latter case we need comparative terms to denote types of translation, and thus a relatively unified metalanguage is required. (Torop 2002: 595)

Torop (1999, 2011a) brings out four basic components for viewing translation history as a complete whole. Firstly, what he calls the achronic-historical component is the analysis of the translator and translation method. Secondly, we may talk about the synchronic-receptive component, the analysis of translation as an activity, its status as well as the function in the given culture. The third component, according to Torop, is the evolutionary aspect of translations – ontology of translation, translation process, its technical and psychological aspects. Lastly, there is the cultural-historical aspect that looks at translation together with other processes going on in a culture, contextualizing translation (Torop 1999: 46–52, 2011a: 139). This model by Torop is schematic and probably meant to serve as a basic guideline; yet, such complex treatment of translation history is theoretically viable and clear, but difficult to achieve in practical terms.

What is different in Torop and Anthony Pym (1998), who has also formulated the principles of the research of translation history, is that Torop puts an emphasis on the translation process, whereas Pym takes the human translator as the central object of research. Pym (1998: VIII) very strongly positions himself, saying that his method stems from his personal experience, which means that he has been writing “in search of a method, not in defence of one” (ibid.). Torop’s background and experience, although he never explicates this in such lucid manner, is different from that of Pym and sharing some of that background I do not fully agree that it is always the translator that has to take the central stage in historical research and that it is only through the translator that we “can try to understand why translations were produced in a particular time and place” (Pym 1998: IV). There should be a possibility to customize the methodology according to the circumstance (a flexible methodology, as Torop (2011b: 25) puts it), and I have found the methods of DTS flexible enough to work through different translational situations adjusting them according to the particular situation in question. My reluctance to agree fully with Pym in the centrality of a translator comes from my personal experience in describing the translational situation and the function of translation during the early years of Soviet time in Estonia (article II). Although I do treat the personal stories of the translators to show their gradual movement away from the centre of the literary scene, their “responsibility appropriate to social causation” (Pym 1998: IX) can be said to be virtually non-existent in that particular historical circumstance. In case of strong ideological pressure, for instance, during a totalitarian regime, the structure dominates over the subject and the choices of an individual are very limited.

Viewing translation as an integral part of culture that has its specific function in a culture, Torop can rather be compared to Itamar Even-Zohar’s polysystemic approach and systems approaches in general: “Culture operates largely through translation, since only by inclusion of new texts can the culture undergo innovation as well as perceive its own specificity” (Torop 2011b: 25). Yet

instead of the focus on the hierarchies, the auto- and metacommunicative aspects of a translating culture come as central for Torop: “a culture’s capacity for analysis reflects its ability to describe and understand itself” but in the process of description and understanding, “an important role is played by the multiplicity of texts, by their interrelatedness of communication and metacommunication” (Torop 2011b: 23). Yet the systemic approaches tend to dismiss the subject and concentrate on the mechanics, structures and processes. Considering theory to be an adjustable tool to unravel or describe some phenomena, my personal view is somewhere in between of the systems and individual, depending on a concrete translational circumstance.

1.3. Methodology in Translation History. Key Terms

Different disciplines have devised their own methodological models and languages that help to formulate these models, which makes it important to determine the autonomy or fusion of such descriptive languages (Torop 2011a: 39; 2011b: 21–23). Although different starting points may be considered with regard to translation studies, it is still a young discipline and as such, it is neither methodologically nor terminologically uniform, or as Christina Schäffner (1999: 1) puts it: “Despite much research over the past 50 years, translation studies has not yet developed into a homogeneous discipline and there is no agreement on its central concepts.” Thus, the key terms and concepts used in the present, as well as any research, have to be explained and positioned against or within the existing framework. In the following section I will elaborate on the terminology and concepts used in the articles that follow.

The methodological key concepts of the present project, translation norms, translation in (poly) systems, the in/visibility of the translator, explicit and implicit translation poetics, are the concepts that are central to Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS), that for me are interchangeably connected to Theo Hermans’ work, starting from his introduction to the seminal collection to DTS, *Manipulation of Literature* (1985) not to talk about Translation in Systems (1999). Besides that, in order to determine and define the corpora of my research, I have borrowed a term known from narratology – in addition to the common source text and target text, I will make use of (as well as raise some issues relevant to translation) Gerard Genette’s concept of *paratexts*.

1.3.1. Systems and Polysystems: Translation in Context

An increasing understanding within Descriptive Translation Studies (dating back to the 1960s, gaining ground during the 1970s, verbalized as the so called *cultural turn* in the collection by Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere *Translation, History and Culture* (1990)), that translations are inevitably connected to the cultural and political context and time frame of their appearance, presumes

that translation norms (as in Gideon Toury) for literary translation are dependent on the extraliterary translation context, that is issues related to the socio-political and economic conditions of the particular translation. Such a point of view suits well for a research into the history of translation since on the one hand, it facilitates empirical research with actual texts and on the other hand, emphasizes the importance of contextual material. Thus, my articles are inevitably dependent on both the life stories of the translators as well as the socio-political and socio-economic context of their publishing. The whole point about the idea of translation in systems, as Theo Hermans (2009: 33) puts it, is that “it invites us to think in terms of functions, connections and interrelations. Contextualization of individual phenomena is the key”.

To view literature as a system or network of different elements that interact or compete with each other is hardly new. Itamar Even-Zohar (1990: 2), the scholar associated with the polysystem theory, also emphasises a close affiliation to a tradition that he calls the *dynamic functionalism*. In literary and translation studies its origins go back to the Russian Formalists (Roman Jakobson, and especially Yuri Tynyanov)¹³ and Czech Structuralists (Jan Mukařovský, Felix Vodička)¹⁴ (see Hermans 1985: 11), as well as the Estonian semiotician Yuri Lotman (1977). Early works by Itamar Even-Zohar (1978; 1979) and Gideon Toury (1974), José Lambert (1980; 1983; 2006), as well as Theo Hermans (2009 [1999]), to name the most prominent ones, all share the idea of translation as a part of communicative and interactive literary network – a system, inside an even bigger sociocultural framework. However, a clear systemic statement of the importance of studying translation on the backdrop of a larger literary system originates from the introduction by Theo Hermans to *The Manipulation of Literature. Studies in Literary Translation* (1985)¹⁵, edited by Hermans himself and published in 1985. This collection of articles is considered to be a conceptual work for Descriptive Translation Studies¹⁶, a branch of translation studies that after the publication of Gideon Toury’s *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (1995), is referred to as DTS.

The name DTS itself remains somewhat elusive, or, as Antony Pym notes, mere descriptions would not need any grand theory (Pym 2010: 65). Yet, DTS

¹³ ТЫНЯНОВ, Ю. Н. *Литературная эволюция* 2002 [1927]

¹⁴ Mukařovský explored the functions of language in the representation of aesthetic objects (Mukařovský *Aesthetic Function, Norm and Value as Social Facts* (1936; in English 1970) as well as an essay *The Aesthetic Norm* (1937; in English 1978)). Later Vodička elaborated on the concept concentrating on the recipient’s role in the production of an aesthetic object (*Literární historie, její problémy a úkoly* (1942), contributing thus to the notion of ‘norms’ in cultural production.

¹⁵ Authors of the articles in the volume are often attributed a collective name, the Manipulation School.

¹⁶ Despite the statements by Hermans who still seems to consider the impact of the *Manipulation of Literature* somewhat accidental. (see Hermans’s interview in Estonian cultural weekly *Sirp* 18, June 2010)

has accumulated a large number of theoretical concepts throughout the past decades. In his introductory note to *The Manipulation of Literature* Hermans (1985: 10) elicits a common basis of the researchers presented in the collection as having “a view of literature as a complex and dynamic system”. However, by 1985 Itamar Even-Zohar had, in a series of essays¹⁷, already developed the idea of the systems further to a concept of literature as a ‘polysystem’ that can be defined as a heterogeneous and dynamic ‘conglomerate of systems’ characterized by internal oppositions and continual shifts and that brings about an ongoing evolution by the constant interaction between the systems (Hermans 1985: 11; Shuttleworth and Cowie 1997: 176; Munday 2008: 108).

According to Even-Zohar (2008: 199–204), translations are part of the target culture’s cultural, literary and historical system. Translations form a stratified but integral system within that target culture’s literary polysystem¹⁸, being the most active part of it. The parts of a polysystem are in different hierarchical relationships and in constant movement, none of them permanently occupying either the centre or the periphery of the system. The position of translations within the cultural system and the types of prevalent translation strategies used are interdependent on each other. Even-Zohar (2008: 201) proposes a hypothesis that translations (as opposed to the original work) can occupy the central position in a literary polysystem during the periods of change, when there is an intense interference in form of a major source literature, and when, for example, “historical models are no longer tenable for younger generation”.

A literary polysystem is thus seen to be dynamic in its essence, since it is in constantly alternating relations with other systems in that particular culture and is also dependent on the ideological and socio-economic structures of the society under observation. Translation, taken as the starting point for polysystem studies, is seen as a particular kind of communication between cultures and societies.

The idea of systems has been shared by many descriptive scholars. Jose Lambert, for example, sees literatures as auto-organizing systems that produce their own parameters, among which the most prominent are norms and models, and internal hierarchical relations as well as relations with surrounding literatures. (Lambert 2006 [1983]) Moreover, according to Lambert (1995: 116) polysystemic approach (PS) takes into consideration and puts emphases on space and time relations. This also points to the importance of the context of translation, which is probably why PS approach and Descriptive Translation

¹⁷ Even-Zohar, Itamar. 1970. The Function of the Polysystem in the History of Literature. *Masa*, 6/3; Even-Zohar, Itamar. *Papers in Historical Poetics* published in 1978 in Tel Aviv, Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics and ‘Polysystem Theory’ published in 1979 in the journal *Poetics Today* 1/2, 287–310.

¹⁸ In *Translator in Systems. Some Notes on the Factors Shaping Translations*, (article I of the present thesis), I have used the term *polysystem* only when referring to Even-Zohar, otherwise engaging the term *systems*, since the term polysystem applies to all cultural systems, literary among them (see the discussion in Hermans 2009: 106).

Studies have come to be used interchangeably on many occasions¹⁹. Both approaches can be described through the opposition to the previous binary models based on linguistic text comparison of the source and target texts in terms of equivalency, which were largely ‘prescriptive’ in their nature. Although not entirely free from static or traditional ambitions, PS does not in itself aim to be universal but universal concepts may emerge from particular empirical patterns; nor does PS offer theoretical models ready for use, but rather it provides open concepts for the researchers to use and develop.

The systemic nature of polysystem studies has been recognized by scholars like Theo Hermans (2009: 41) to be the factor that has contributed greatly to the recognition of translation studies as an academic field of study. Moreover, the interdisciplinary nature of the polysystem theory has come to be very productive, especially for cultural studies. José Lambert (1995: 112), when discussing the general impact of PS to translation research, concludes that the relevance of PS cannot be limited to literature or translation only but that PS: “also explains something about (a very sophisticated) social behaviour.” Lambert’s example is very vivid: he hypothetically applies PS theory to the scholarly world which, according to him, can be seen as a particular kind of social organization with its struggles for power and prestige, similar to those described in polysystem theory. Lambert says that studying the reactions of scholars to new theories, such as PS, or new models in their field can be very telling since the reception of new models makes the aims and positions of the established field clear. New theories and models trigger certain behaviour and reactions from the part of the traditional scholarship by threatening the established power relations. Lambert concludes, in systemic terms, that the evident power struggle within a given social group, scholars, in his case, is telling of the nature of human behaviour. Thus, looking at a polysystem and the change of power relations within it, may give an idea of the behavioural patterns of a society in a cultural situation when the established power relations are threatened or when new models enter the established scene.

Considering that PS allows to accommodate different kind of systems within one polysystem, it is suitable for the analysis of the position of individual translators in relation to literary practices, since practices such as writing, translation, editing, reprinting, etc., as well as the historical background must all be taken into account. Also, PS allows connections to other systems and polysystems, such as the political or socio-economic system, to be included into the analysis. “The point about the systems idea is that it invites us to think in terms of functions, connections and interrelations. Contextualization of individual phenomena is the key.” (Hermans 2009: 33) In *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Frame* (1992) Andre Lefevere argues that literary practices that he calls ‘rewriting’ (among these translating, editing and drafting, summaries, criticism, etc.) inevitably involve constraints from the part of the

¹⁹ See the discussion in Hermans (2009: 7–9).

rewriter. Thus, "...translation can no longer be analysed in isolation, but that it should be studied as a part of a whole system of texts and the people who produce, support, propagate, oppose, censor them". (Lefevere 1985: 237) In this framework, translation is closely connected to the individual translators and their background socio-political systems. The systems in Even-Zohar are in constant power struggle, whereas the changes in the hierarchy of literary (poly)systems can be connected to the societal changes and changes in the dominant ideology. This theory is a valuable tool for the description of the periods of change in the Estonian history, especially the period of change lasting approximately from 1939 to 1953, when the Soviet ideological system was introduced and implemented.

1.3.2. Translation and Norms

The evaluative interpretation of translation, that in essence is prescriptive in nature, and Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) have different goals equally important to the study of translations and furthering of the discipline. The former takes up issues of translation quality and according to James Holmes²⁰, belongs to the pragmatic and applicable branch of translation studies. On the other hand, DTS has proved to be productive for defining translational behaviour in general and especially in historical terms. Moreover, DTS, according to Toury, is an empirical discipline since on the object-level it consists of actual facts of 'real life'. Moreover, "no empirical science can make a claim for completeness and (relative) autonomy unless it has developed a descriptive branch." (Toury 1980: 16) The initial aim of such discipline is to study, describe, explain and predict in a systematic way. However, an individual translational phenomenon, individual texts or translators, can be perceived both as single and as collective phenomena, provided we overlook the single descriptive categories of the research object and concentrate on the general characteristics, distinguishing thus between the general and individual characteristics of the phenomenon. One way to do it is with the help of the concept of *norms* seen as "a category for descriptive analysis of translation phenomena" (Toury 1980: 57) that is central to the act and event of translating (Schäffner 1999: 5).

The concept of translation norms is inevitably connected to Gideon Toury's name²¹, and even though elaborations on the concept that attempt to be more precise and applicable do exist, Toury's concept in general has proven to be one of the most prolific ones in descriptive translation research during the recent

²⁰ The so called *Holmes's map* as later represented graphically by Toury (1991: 181; 1995: 10).

²¹ Notwithstanding that Toury flamboyantly waives all claims for the originality of the concept of norms in *A Handful of Paragraphs on 'Translation' and 'Norms'* (see Toury 1999: 11).

decades, at least what concerns the English language scholarly community²². If we disassociate the concept of norms from Toury for a second (since in itself ‘norm’ is a widely used and self-explanatory term) and think in broader terms, we can see that the definition of translation practice in terms of translation norms is dependent on whether we perceive translation as a linguistic discipline that strives for the accurate reproduction of a source language text, or we look at translation as a communicative process that takes place in a certain environment at a certain point in time and is connected to the accepted translational behaviour of the conditions it appears in. In the former event, when translation is seen as a linguistic discipline, translation norm can be defined in terms of normality – as replacing a linguistic translational unit of the source language with its (generally) accepted equivalent in the target language. One of the most widely used definitions of translation as such, that Susan Bassnett (1980: 6) calls the ‘narrow definition of translation’ is that of J. C. Catford, according to which translation is defined in interlingual terms as “the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent material in another language (TL)”.

(see Catford 1965: 20)

Gideon Toury, as common to descriptive scholars in general, sees translation as a type of socially contextualized behaviour and, in Bassnett’s terms, provides a ‘wide’ definition of translation (1980: 37, 43–45; 1985: 20), saying that translation is what people think it is: “any target-language utterance which is presented or regarded as such within the target culture, on whatever grounds.” (Toury 1985: 20) Defining translation this way broadens its perspectives to reach over different centuries and includes, as many scholars have pointed out, besides interlingual translation also intralingual and intersemiotic translation, as well as phenomena such as pseudotranslation.

Such an understanding of translation is also appropriate for looking at the practice without getting into the discussions about equivalence²³, a concept which according to Theo Hermans has been: “progressively questioned and hollowed out” during the past decades in favour of the concept of norms. (Hermans 1996: 25) For Toury, equivalence is simply a label that is attached to a translational relation that only presumably exists between two different language texts. (Toury 1980: 39, 65)

Toury (1980: 53) describes three kinds of norms that influence the process of translation. Firstly *preliminary norms*, which are concerned with the choice of a text and whether the use of an intermediary language is permitted²⁴. Toury’s *initial norm* governs the translator's decision to adhere primarily to the source

²² According to Mary Snell-Hornby (2009: 127) for scholars working in other language communities, such as German, the term ‘norm’ sounds too restrictive and thus, for example German origin *scopos theory* prefers the term *Konvention*.

²³ See also Schäffner (1999: 5).

²⁴ Theo Hermans (200: 76) adds here a decision to translate into a native or into a second language.

text or to the target culture. Such source orientation is called 'adequacy' as opposed to the target culture orientation that is called 'acceptability'. I will address the conceptual as well as terminological concerns related to these terms later. Thirdly, there are the *operational norms*, divided into two sets, which are concerned with the concrete decisions made during the process of translation: *matricial norms* or macro-structural norms concern the textual layout as well as the integrity of the text (omissions and relocations made in the target text) above sentence level; *textual-linguistic norms* or micro-structural norms affect the choices on and below sentence level (sentence structure, lexical and stylistic choices, etc.).

There are many issues that researchers have brought out concerning various aspects of Toury's norms. Theo Hermans (2009: 76) speaks mainly of the difficulty in evaluating the 'adequacy' of textual relationships, calling it a utopian enterprise since it is the reader who establishes such relations by investing texts with meaning. Hermans sees a conceptual way out in Andrew Chesterman's or Christiane Nord's further treatment of Toury's translation norms.

In introducing Toury's norms the following quote is often used: “/.../general values or ideas shared by a certain community to what is right and wrong, adequate and inadequate into specific performance-instructions appropriate for and applicable to specific situations”. (Toury 1980: 51) For Toury norms help to answer the questions regarding the existing *translational behaviour*, or, in other words, why do certain types of translational relations exist in a certain context. Thus, norms in general terms, the way many descriptive researchers use the notion, can be described in the context of conventional social behavioural patterns expressive of the values of a people.

However, norms can only superficially be explained as conventions of behaviour for two basic reasons. Firstly, a terminological incongruence appears: conventions are defined as “regularities of behaviour which have emerged as arbitrary but effective solutions to recurrent problems of interpersonal coordination” (Hermans 2009: 81) that have a predisposition to becoming norms in case they prove to be successful enough. Or, as Christina Schäffner (1999: 2–3) says: “When conventions are enforced with normative power they are considered to be norms” Secondly, Toury relies in his definition of norms on the definition borrowed from sociology:

Sociologists and social psychologists have long regarded norms as the translation of general values or ideas shared by a community – as to what is right or wrong, adequate and inadequate – into performance instructions appropriate for and applicable to particular situations, specifying what is prescribed and forbidden as well as what is tolerated and permitted in a certain behavioural dimension. (Toury 1980: 51; 1995: 54–55)

Consequently, the norms in Toury (1995: 55) signify a “regularity of behaviour in recurrent situations of the same type.” However, to define norms as the 'regularity of behaviour' will raise the question about the relation between

norms as conventions and norms as expectations. (Chesterman 2006: 13) Chesterman recognizes two senses of the term 'norm', the descriptive and the explanatory. First of all, norms in descriptive sense mean a tendency indicative of typical behaviour that covers more than a single instance. Secondly, relying on Bartsch' typology²⁵ of (product and production) norms applied in linguistics, Chesterman defines norms in the sense of "the social reality of correctness notion". In this sense the connotation is more causal and prescriptive, since the implication is that such norms affect the collective behaviour in certain ways. (Chesterman 2006: 14)

Chesterman (1993; 1997) speaks of general translation laws which "account for the behaviour of the translators in general" and normative laws which "originate in rational, norm-directed strategies which are observed to be used by professionals" (Chesterman 1993: 1) He develops the idea of norms further in order to cover both the description and evaluation of translations. His micro-ethics of a translator are based on four values: clarity, truth, trust and understanding, whereas clarity and truth are to do with "the texts and the relations between them" and trust and understanding refer back to the relations between people. (Chesterman 1997: 186)

What research into norms should ultimately do according to Chesterman (2006: 16) is "to show plausible links between observed regularities on the one hand and evidence of normative force on the other". He gives some methodological advice for generating hypotheses about norms:

One can either start with observed regularities and look for related signs of normative force, or one can start with some evidence for normative force and check for corresponding regularities; or even work both ways at the same time. (Chesterman 2006: 16)

The move from texts to norms, says Hermans (2009: 86), is "a matter of interpretation and interference" as there is no obvious starting point, the specific methodology remains to be dependent on each separate case.

In my research I have proceeded from the recognition that norms, no matter how we define or call the contextualised regularities of translational behaviour, are not ends to themselves but explanatory means to help to understand why there is what there is. While there is no doubt that such constraints exist, the precise nature of a certain norm at a certain point in time can be described only in very hypothetical terms. Norm theory is not meant for a rigid categorisation of translation periods in history, but rather for broadening the understanding in what translation is, has been and what it can be.

²⁵ In Bartsch, Renate. 1987. *Norms of Language*.

I.3.3. Texts and Paratexts: Empirical Material of Translation Studies

Empirical evidence of norms can be collected in different places. When talking about the construction of translation norms, Gideon Toury brings out two major sources for reconstruction of such norms: textual (1) and extratextual (2) sources. Textual sources are “the translated texts themselves [...] as well as analytical inventories of translations (i.e., ‘virtual’ texts)” and extratextual sources are the “semi-theoretical critical formulations, such as prescriptive ‘theories’ of translation, statements made by translators, editors, publishers and other persons involved in or connected with the activity, critical appraisals of individual translators, or the activity of a translator or ‘school’ of translators” (Toury 1995: 65) Similarly to Toury, Andrew Chesterman also lists two types of sources relevant in the construction of norms, but he proceeds from a more translation process oriented standpoint as opposed to Toury’s text typological one. For him the relevant textual sources are “regularities, norm or belief statements, written criticism” and extratextual sources are “observation of translator work procedures, interviews etc.” (Chesterman 2006: 16)

A text typological parallel can be drawn from Toury’s two types of sources for the construction of translation norms and Gerard Genette’s concept paratexts with an important distinction – Genette (1997: 405), although with some reservation, considers translations to be a form of paratext and thus a subordinate text type, a commentary on the original or a text presenting the original. Such interpretation, however, limits the field of translation studies and brings it back to the narrow definition of translation as interlingual practice (see above), leaving out different phenomena that can be considered translational and restricting translation to serve the original as a subordinate text type²⁶. In the following section I will look closer at the sources of empirical material in translation research.

Besides actual source and target texts, translation studies is a field that often works with texts that are situated on the margins of textual hierarchy, texts that frame or accompany the main texts (forewords), comment on the main texts (translator’s notes, book reviews, criticism) or provide information on translational activity (life-writing, diaries, correspondence of the translators). Thus, assuming on the basis of existing anthologies of translation history²⁷ that views on translation are dependent on the context of translation, and that these views tend to change in time as well as be different in different cultures, an abundant source for translation research (what has been regarded as translation (good and bad), what have the conditions of translating been like, what is the social posi-

²⁶ More on the discussion concerning critical description and study of texts constituting a discourse around the actual translations combined with the analysis of the paratextual elements of a translation see Şehnaz Tahir-Gürçağlar (2002).

²⁷ For example Douglas Robinson (2002).

tion of the translators, how much does the environment influence translations, etc.) is provided not by the translation-original comparative analysis but liminal texts on translations. Such liminal textual material is called paratexts by Gerard Genette.

Although Genette uses the term *paratext* already in his book titled *Palimpsestes* (Seuil, 1981) a wider interest in the texts surrounding the main text inside book covers (peritexts), as well as texts constituting a discourse in the form of advertisements, reviews, interviews, criticism etc. (epitexts) has emerged, spurred by Genette's *Paratexts* ([1987] 1997)²⁸, a work that provides us with a valuable set of terminology and definitions. *Paratexts*, in accordance with Genette, are first of all the texts that are inside book covers but are not the main text (publication information, elements of design, forewords, prefaces and additional notes); secondly, texts that are in one or another way connected to the main text but are circulating independently (book reviews, critical formations essays concerning the main text) (Genette 1997: 2). In translation studies paratexts are, besides the translation itself, very often the main or even the only source of information concerning the translator, translation method as well as the attitude of the translator towards the translated text. Works in translation history such as, for example, Douglas Robinson's *Western Translation Theory: from Herodotus to Nietzsche* (2002) heavily rely on paratextual material, citing, for example, Cicero's few remarks on his translation method in the treatise *Di optimo genere oratorum* or extracts from St. Jerome's defensive letter to Pamachius regarding his *Vulgate* translation. Not less important is the reception of the translations by the audience that can be studied through critical appraisals and reviews on translation. By studying reception it is possible to make assumptions about the prevalent translation norms, for example, Lawrence Venuti's concept of the invisibility of the translator that partially relies on the reception of translations in contemporary Anglo-American context (Venuti 1995); on the other hand, reception (or the lack of reception) is telling of the function of translation, position of the translator as well as the importance of translational activities in a particular culture at a particular time.

In my analysis of the publications and republications of the translations by Marta Sillaots (article III), as well as article IV, I have made use of Gerard Genette's terminology, adding my remarks or fitting the terms for the description of certain forms of paratext, such as the specific form unknown in the English-speaking world – the *afterword*, in Estonian publishing context. As my observations are based only on the published texts (books), the term *main text* in my research means the literary translation, unless stated otherwise.

The purpose of paratexts is communicative, or, as Genette (1997: 2) defines them – the thresholds that link the text with the context, constituting: “a zone between text and off-text, a zone not only of transition but also of transaction: a

²⁸ First published in French (*Seuils*) by Editions du Seuil in 1987; English translation (*Paratexts*) published by Cambridge University Press in 1997.

privileged place of a pragmatics and a strategy, of an influence on the public, an influence that – whether well or poorly understood and achieved – is at the service of a better reception for the text and a more pertinent reading of it.” (ibid.) Genette is equally interested in the means, methods and effects of paratexts, and so am I, but the analysis of paratexts helps me map the changes in the subsystem of translation of the literary polysystem of Soviet Estonia, as well as in the norms of poetry translation (article IV).

First of all, the aim of the secondary texts inside book covers that are placed around the main text – the translation – is to provide the readers with background information and negotiate the meaning of the work at hand. Yet the secondarity of such texts is a debatable issue, since paratexts (Genette 1997) provide the connecting link between the world of the reader and the fictional world. Defined by Genette as thresholds of the interpretation of the text they accompany, the implication in the definition of paratexts is that they are able to influence or manipulate the reader. Thus, paratexts not only provide information on the text they accompany, but also the other way around. As paratexts are important attitude bearers, research into them provides information on the environment they occur in, on multiple aspects of the target culture.

Genette’s concept paratext and its hyponyms *epitext* and *peritext* are based on the typology that takes into consideration text content as well as the spatial (and temporal) positioning of such textual material. Torop, however, often uses the term *metatext* to designate texts written on other texts, and the stress in this case is not on the spatial arrangement of such texts but rather on the descriptive language – *metalanguage* – of such texts. (Torop 2011a: 13) Theo Hermans, on the other hand, makes a clear-cut and practical distinction between the aforementioned terms. Hermans uses the term *paratext* for the texts inside book covers that surround the main text “prefaces, footnotes and the like” and the term *metatext* to refer to the texts that “are presented independently but dealing with other texts” (Hermans 2009: 85) Hermans’s approach presents a practical and functional point of view of the matter, especially considering the unfortunate connotation of the prefix para- as something defective or abnormal. I have made use of Genette’s concept of paratexts firstly, to draw attention to the variety of text types that form the corpora of study in translation research and deliberately position the texts that present or introduce the translation to the same level as the translation and the original. For me these are all texts with the same weight and importance that in researching topics in translation history complement one another and add to the description of the translational situation. Secondly, the term *paratext* is put to work as a stepping stone to explain the special attention of Marta Sillaots to the translator’s foreword, both in what I call her explicit translational poetics, translation reviews, as well as introducing her own translations (article III). What is more, since the texts that I am analysing in article IV have little to do with translations and everything to do with the texts surrounding translations, the concept of paratexts comes to aid when defining the focus of the research. The notion of paratexts is vital also for describing the

changes in the conventions of presenting translations, changes that can be said to have contributed to the invisibility of the translators during the Soviet time in comparison with the 1930s and again with the recent developments in Estonia.

I.3.4. Invisibility of the Translator and Early Years of Soviet Estonia

Visibility and its negative *invisibility* of the translator – terms in Venuti’s *The Translator’s Invisibility* (1995 [2008]) that are used for describing the situation of the translators in contemporary Anglo-American translation tradition – are strongly connected to the experience of contemporary image consumption and consequently with the concept of social visibility and as such are very Western and consumer-culture oriented in their essence. In free-enterprise business one of the definitions of visibility (besides the prediction of future earnings) is a company’s presence in the marketplace – a dominant company would have greater visibility than a smaller one. Consequently, being visible in business is considered the key to successful operation and existence. In politicized sense visibility is not the matter of becoming physically visible but rather the matter of attracting attention and recognition (Chow 2010: 64), in other words – visibility in this sense means power.

When making a case for the greater visibility of the translators and against what Venuti (2008: 12) calls “the global drift towards American political and economic hegemony since World War II”, Venuti (2008: 13) consciously or subconsciously takes the business logic to be the key in changing the situation since his project is: “to make the translator more visible so as to resist and change the conditions under which translation is theorized, studied, and practiced today”. Venuti politicizes translation from a social point of view advocating a self-conscious, resistant type of translation. On the one hand, he traces the origins of fluent translation (and thus also the invisibility of translators) to cultural domination and exclusion (Venuti 2008: 33), on the other hand, he also shows that the exclusion and domination can also be reversed by translation.

Whereas Venuti’s invisibility can be seen as economy bound and textually manifested, the meaning of the term invisibility that I use is dependent on the ideology politics in the Soviet Union and manifested in the social positions of the translators as compared to authors.

When comparing the authorship issues in creative writing practices, translation can be said to have two authors: the author of the original and the translator. Theo Hermans, who can in many respects be considered the voice of the descriptive approach to translation, encapsulates the idea in the following manner: “Books which are translated may carry the original writer’s name on the cover, but the actual words between the covers are written by the translators.” (Hermans 2009: 1) However, spurred by cultural norms that delineate models for a ‘good’ translation and according to the prevalent transparent literary

translation practices (and here I am heavily generalizing), the author of the original dominates over the translator and is thus more visible. For this and various other reasons, such as translation being exploited by various power structures, Venuti considers translation to be a stigmatized form of writing. (Venuti 2008: 1) For Venuti the regime of fluency (fluent translation) is enforced by the readers since (1) they are used to easy readability and (2) transparent translation leaves the illusory effect of being close to the author of the original. (ibid.) One of the consequences of such regime of fluency in English-language writing is the authority of ‘plain styles’²⁹. Achieved over several centuries such movement has, according to Venuti, made realism the most prevalent form of narrative and free verse the most prevalent form of poetry. (Venuti 2008: 5) Secondly, since “the authorial originality continues to stigmatize the translators” work (Venuti 1998: 31–46) it also “shapes the translators’ self-presentation” (Venuti 2008: 6) and affects the recognition of translators’ work (ibid.: 7).

Venuti’s *invisibility* as a concept directly associable with the position of the translator combined with Itamar Even-Zohar’s (2008: 199) theory of literary polysystems that sees literary practices in a constant centre-and-periphery struggle, is applicable to the description of the changes in the literary community of the early Soviet Estonia. I have utilized Venuti’s self-explanatory concepts to my own purpose – to show the connection between how the practice of translation that is inevitably considered secondary as compared to authorship and the self-annihilating attitude of the translators comes to play during the time of ideological change, implementation of Soviet system in Estonia, roughly from 1945 to 1955. On the one hand new ideology needed to be brought in and the quickest and most controlled way to do it was by translation³⁰, on the other hand, what better way to control the previously active literary elite of the country than to engage them in translation instead of writing. Hereby I will have to explicate the socio-political context of writing and translation during the first decade of Soviet rule in Estonia in a more detailed way.

When usually it is the target group that initiates the process of translation (Lambert 1995: 129) by expressing a need for or interest in the source culture’s texts whatever the reason might be (as was generally the case in Estonia before 1939), this cannot be said to be the case in early Soviet Estonia. It is rather the source culture’s political power system that through its local representatives and collaborators expressed the need for and enforced the translation of a selection of approved texts. At the same time an elaborate system for monitoring and controlling translational process (as well as other writing processes) was created. Soviet publishing system differed radically from the publishing system of the former Estonian Republic, first and foremost in the attitude towards the

²⁹ Here Venuti relies on the essays of Charles Bernstein, American poet, who in 1986 published his collected essays *Content’s Dream: Essays 1975-1984*.

³⁰ The raise in the production of translations has been discussed in Möldre (2005).

author, and stemming from that, also to the translator. The author/translator was regarded as the fulfiller of the commission who had to be controlled by the editor for the work to be appropriate and suitable for the Soviet reader. Editors were encouraged to lead and educate writers to write according to the Soviet ideology. Publishing houses functioned as institutions of severe control (Möldre 2005: 116) alongside with other instances, such as public discussion meetings at the Writers' Union. A literary work, be it an Estonian original or a translation, needed to pass several readings by the editor/s before a permission to publish was issued. Authors as well as translators had to keep to the set deadlines. Failure to meet the deadlines brought along fines or, in the worst case, the termination of the commission contract.³¹ As a result translation came to be regarded as a mechanical process during the 1950s; according to Ott Ojamaa, an Estonian translator and literary scholar: "a simple and lucrative business that basically any skilled user of a dictionary could cope with". (Ojamaa 2010: 69) Consequently, the importance of the role of the author within the literary polysystem was decreased and his/her position considerably weakened. A work of literature (both original and translation) can, in this light, be seen as a collective effort of many instances which is probably one of the reasons why Sirje Olesk calls literature written during the period in Estonia 'Soviet literature in Estonian' (Olesk 2008: 84–85). The measures undertaken and systems designed by the Soviet authorities can be connected to the aspiration towards educating the readers ideologically and controlling and directing free thought by channelling it to an appropriate direction through appropriate activities. Books and literature in general were regarded as important and sufficiently efficient means to disseminate Soviet ideology.

Coming back to the concepts of visibility and invisibility, these are inevitably connected to the shifts and changes in the system, literary polysystem among others, during the political turmoil and times of ideological change in early Soviet Estonia. The authors of the previously central author-oriented system were made invisible through a sequence of translations, editions of translations and reprints of translations in a system where translation assumed a central position. The process of such marginalization of established authors, as I see it, can be connected to Venuti's (2008: 1) concept of translation as a stigmatized form of writing but on a different level. Translators in this case are not the agents responsible for the annihilation, but can be seen as manipulated by the system using the traditional position of the translator inside the system.

³¹ For example Oskar Urgart lost a translation contract and Mart Raud a contract to publish a novel by exceeding the deadline in 1948 (see Möldre 2005: 88).

2. ARTICLES INTRODUCED

In the following section I will introduce the articles included in the present project aiming at explicating the context of research in more detail. The articles should speak for themselves but considering different audiences a small insight should nevertheless be helpful. What follows is an abstracted chronological summary of the four articles focusing on the points that I consider worth emphasising. Since one of the articles *The Explicit and Implicit Poetics of Marta Sillaots* is written in Estonian and meant for the Estonian readership I have concentrated on conveying its essence in greater detail.

Article I: Translators in Systems. Some Notes on the Factors Shaping Translations: The Case of Marta Sillaots and Young Estonia Publishing

Considering the receptive level of cultural analysis, the position of an artwork in a particular culture (all forms of creation) is dependant both on its so called readability (receptibility) as well as its availability; that is marketing success. (Torop 2011a: 16–17) The first article included in the present dissertation, *Translator in Systems. Some Notes on the Factors Shaping Translations: the case of Marta Sillaots and Young Estonia Publishing*, aims to describe a part of the translational scene in Estonia in 1920s and 1930s, on the example of the interaction of a translator, Marta Sillaots³² (1887–1969), and one of the most influential publishing houses of the time, Young Estonia Publishing House. The article introduces a concrete context of translation and looks at the translator as an agent of literary transfer but whose activity occurs within the framework of factors determining the translation process, such as state level publishing regulations and policies as well as economic factors. I have looked at the archived correspondents of Marta Sillaots, an established translator by the 1930s, with the publishing house officials during the translation of two novels in a series meant for young readers: Mark Twain's *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* and Jules Verne's *Les Enfants du capitaine Grant (The Children of Captain Grant)*, both published in Estonian in 1932. The correspondence shows the different aims of the translator and the publishing house; for the translator the stylistic integrity comes first and for the agency the goal is to educate the young readers through factual knowledge and also keep the sales figures high. The article raises questions concerning historical research into translational issues: what is the role of translation policy, target audience as well as the translator in the process of cultural transfer and the making of translation canon and how far can we generalise on the basis of particular historical case studies. However,

³² Marta Rannat-Sillaots and her translations are the center of my research in articles I, II and III.

translations are co-operational products and the publishing system through which a translation finds its way to the reader, plays a part in determining the final result. The article touches upon a time period in the life of Marta Sillaots when she had already acquired a certain position among the authors and translators in Estonia; she could negotiate her fees and was free to suggest next or better translation projects to the commissioners. These times, however, were about to change and in the next article included in the present thesis I will examine the most controversial time period of the 20th century Estonia, early Soviet time, during which the ideological changes brought along changes in the centre-periphery relations of the whole socio-political system, pushing the previously active members of the society, established authors and literary figures to the margins.

Article II: Authors as Translators: Emerging Hierarchical Patterns of Literary Activity in Early Soviet Estonia

The system and hierarchies of different literary activities contributing to the mechanics of changes during the first decade of Soviet time in Estonia best emerge when we contextualize the publishing chronology of the individuals who were active on the multiple fields of the literary polysystem, to use Even-Zohar's term, under observation. In the case of a small culture such as Estonian, literary translators are often also practicing authors or figures connected to literary circles (literary critics, scholars, publishers etc.), who are relatively well known to the general public. Or rather, the authors are often translators since translation, in this framework, is mostly regarded as a secondary activity, undertaken for several reasons ranging from the translator's mission to enrich the receiving culture in the multiple ways that translation offers, to financial issues during creative pauses.

Consequently, the second article of my dissertation *Authors as Translators: emerging hierarchical patterns of literary activities in Early Soviet Estonia* presents three individual established Estonian authors/translators Friedebert Tuglas (1886–1971), Marta Rannat-Sillaots (1887–1969) and Betti Alver (1906–1989), members of Estonian Writers' Union, who had been engaged with writing original literature as well as translating already during the 1920s and 1930s, in brief, people who had been active before the so called Soviet time and were continually capable of being active during the time-period from 1945 to 1955 and beyond. I have established a chronology of the literary activity of these individual authors during the period starting with 1945. Such a chronology vividly shows the hierarchies of literary activities and the mechanics of the use of such hierarchies in pushing the established literary figures to the marginal position with the help of such less visible activities like translation as the surge of Soviet ideology was increasingly gaining ground reaching its peak in 1949 and 1950. The publishing narratives presented in the article should give a

personal and political dimension to that particular section of the history of translation in Estonia.

The materials used as a corpus of this study include the publicly available (printed) diaries of Friedebert Tuglas, Elo Tuglas and Betti Alver (manuscript), partially published collection of letters by Marta Sillaots as well as other published research on the subjects concerned. I have also used the bibliographies of Friedebert Tuglas (compiled by Estonian National Library 1993) and Betti Alver (by Vaime Kabur). In addition to that, I have used the bibliography of Marta Sillaots that I have revised and compiled myself and that consists of her published works on the basis of the Estonian National Bibliography Database, her translations as well as articles in the two prominent literary journals *Looming* and *Eesti Kirjandus*. In addition to the published biographical data, I have studied the archival material such as private letters to the editors, translation contracts, notes and remarks by the aforementioned individuals that are stored in the Estonian Literary Museum (ELM), mostly in the Estonian Cultural History Archive (hereinafter ECHA). I also have extensively used the data from Aile Möldre's dissertation on book production in Estonia from 1940 to 2000 (see Möldre 2005).

I have crisscrossed the biographical and bibliographical data available from the period of early Soviet Estonia keeping a critical eye on the findings. The need to assess the material published in the Soviet Union critically is evident. Especially the material published during the time of active propaganda, the first decade of Soviet rule, was submitted to heavy censorship. Such a practice can be called the rewriting of cultural value system. The more personal material, such as letters and diaries, are used in the article not to construct a 'truthful' image of the research subjects, but rather to balance the bibliographical approach and stress the relative nature of any data. The method I have utilized entails a heavy background research, thorough contextualization using a critical eye and, no doubt, as in any research, the present one also contains a fair amount of subjectivity in the interpretation of factual material. I have set the starting point of my observations 1944, and even more so the closing point, 1955, to be preliminary temporal markers, since for better understanding the processes, I will have to retrace the steps back to the years preceding 1944 as well as talk about the years following 1955.

Rather than constructing or reconstructing history or searching for historical truth, the article is an attempt to describe and theorise certain processes in history as I see them. And as has been pointed out (see for example Hiio 2010), Soviet Estonia has become history: it has aroused an academic and more detached, theoretical interest in the generation of scholars in Estonia and elsewhere who, apart from their childhood, do not have an immediate experience with the Soviet time period and are thereby the somewhat distant observers rediscovering, generalizing and attempting to theorize the past.

To continue with the topic of Marta Sillaots, it is now suitable to ask the question of what has happened to her translational output, or in other words,

having had an insight into the contexts and systems surrounding a translator at different moments in time and against different socio-political backgrounds, it would be productive to look into her translations and analyse the factors that have influenced her work together putting them into perspective by taking a retrospective look at them from where we stand now.

Article III: The Explicit and Implicit Translational Poetics of Marta Sillaots. (Marta Sillaotsa eksplitsiitne ja implitsiitne tõlkepoetika)

A common knowledge, expressed by Estonian scholars is that a small culture cannot afford to have too many translations of one and the same work. Yet there is a considerable number of double translations of one and the same work of fiction in Estonia. The life of a translation depends on different factors; among other things changes in fashion and politics as much as language and norms (Toury). Translations that survive the test of time for a longer period are generally idiosyncratic works with a special purpose that are studied or referred to again and again (such as Johannes Aavik's translations into Estonian at the first half of the 20th century, made with an aim to renew, Europeanize and enrich the Estonian language).

In this light it is reasonable to inquire into what happens to other translations, to those whose lifespan is shorter, for example the translations of Marta Sillaots, one of the most prolific Estonian translators of the first half of the 20th century. Article III of the present thesis, *Marta Sillaotsa eksplitsiitne ja implitsiitne tõlkepoetika*. (*The Explicit and Implicit Translation Poetics of Marta Sillaots*), investigates the reasons why a considerable part of the more than 50 novels translated by Sillaots has fallen into oblivion in the special sections of the major Estonian libraries, some of the books that are still relevant or considered to be canonical works of world literature have been translated anew, and but a small selection is still circulating amongst us either in the form of new reprints, but more often as editions of Sillaots's translations.

The most active period of Marta Sillaots' translation can be said to be from the early 1920s to the late 1940s. During this period she translated close to 60 novels of world literature from French, German, Russian and English languages, ranging from Jules Verne, Gustave Flaubert and Anatole France to Friedrich Schiller and Thomas Mann; from Charles Dickens, Mark Twain and Rudyard Kipling to Ivan Turgenev, Leo Tolstoy and Fyodor Dostoevsky. Despite my best bibliographical efforts³³ I dare not vouch for the completeness of the list of Sillaots's translation related publications since some of the early

³³ I have compiled a bibliography of Marta Rannat-Sillaots on the basis of the bibliography available in the Estonian Literary Museum, improving and complementing it by adding information from different published and archival sources.

translations in the periodicals remain nameless and also the translations during the early years of the Soviet occupation (mostly plays from Russian) are extremely difficult to trace. In addition to translating, Sillaots was a prolific reviewer of translations, a literary critic, who reviewed translations for the most prominent of Estonian literary journals of the time such as *Estonian Literature* (Eesti Kirjandus) and *Creation* (Looming). Although she started contributing to journals, but mostly magazines and daily newspapers already from 1910, the beginning of Sillaots's sustained career as a translation critic can be considered from 1928 when, one after another, her translation reviews on recently published books started appearing in the *Estonian Literature*. Her contributions in the field of criticism and reviews continued until 1941.

Sillaots's first longer piece of criticism of a translation was published in 1912 in *Estonian Literature* (1912, nr. 1, 36–39). It was an article on the translation of the Finnish female author L. Onerva's³⁴ *Murdejooned* (*Murattiköynnös* 1911). Onerva's translation (by Eduard Virgo) seems to be not so much a criticism of a translation, but rather a personal statement for Sillaots. She does not talk about translation instead she expresses the importance of the import of such strong opposition to the description of the world through the male gaze: "The women we know from literature are often born from the imagination of men." (Sillaots 1912: 36) This first contribution of Sillaots in *Estonian Literature* is of significant importance since she introduces herself as having a strong female voice: "Male critics usually measure the work by a female author by the same stick they are used to review the work written by male authors considering the best praise for a female author to be that it is difficult to tell whether the work has been written by a man or a woman. /.../ It is a pity that women authors have, up to now, considered it to be most desirable to write like men." (Sillaots 1912: 36) Such statements concerning the male point of view, the male standards in writing, did arise attention and probably determined Sillaots's reception as a writer, critic and translator.

Firstly, analysing what Sillaots says about other translations into Estonian of the time as well as how her own translations were received is important, not only from the point of view of inquiring into the translation norms of the time, but for receiving information about what Peeter Torop (1999b: 45–46, 2011a: 139) calls the explicit aspect of translation history. The translator's explicit poetics or theoretical principles can be drawn from the liminal material surrounding translations; the reviews, critical appraisals, to talk about texts that circulate independently from the translations, as well as in the forewords and translator notes, texts that are published together with the main text, the translation, in other words the paratexts (Genette). That is of course, if such material does exist. I have analysed the concept of a 'good translator/translation' that emerges from Marta Sillaots's reviews of the translations of other Estonian translators in *Estonian Literature* from 1912 to 1940. One of the main clear

³⁴ Full name of the Finnish author is Hilja Onerva Lehtinen.

concepts of 'good' translation is formulated in an article on three translations from French into Estonian. Criticising K. Martinson's translation of Henri René Albert Guy de Maupassant *Une Vie* (1927) (*Üks inimelu*) Sillaots writes: "K. Martinson's translation is but a poor echoing of the original, not the recreation of the original – as a good translation should be." (Sillaots 1928: 392) For Sillaots the value of a translation is closely connected to the ability of the translator to find the stylistic focal points of the original. The writing style of the original author needed to be conveyed in translation using the possibilities of the Estonian language. This, as also comes out from Sillaots's own translations, meant operating playfully with syntax, word order and collocation. On the other hand she stresses the need to use correct Estonian, be precise and discourages loan words (especially from Russian).

Secondly, in order to receive a better picture of a translational poetics, the implicit side of the poetics, actual translations, must be considered. However, in order to explicate Sillaots style as a translator, I have used a slightly different method than that of comparing the original to the translation. I have been interested in what is special about her style of translation considering the fate of her translations – from her output as a translator, the close to 60 books translated from 1919 to 1948 (to consider the translations in book format) only 19 items have been published again since 1990, most of them heavily edited. Time factor, of course, has a significant importance, but stemming from the reviews of her translations already during their first publication, a specific language and translation poetics emerges that does not seem to always confirm with what was considered to be a good translation at the time. Thus, treating translation as a part of the target cultural polysystem, influenced by the target systems conventions and norms, I have undertaken the comparison of Sillaots's two translations and their later edited versions. First of all, the translation of *David Copperfield* by Charles Dickens (published in 1937) and its heavily edited version published in 1991, where Lia Rajandi, the editor, has become a co-translator on the cover of the book, suggesting that little remains of the original translation. Besides that, I have undertaken the comparison of Romain Rolland's *Jean Christophe*, published in 1936 and its later edition published in 1958 (language editor Henno Rajandi). The changes emerging in the comparison can be classified as follows: syntactical changes, changes in the word order and changes concerning collocation. All the changes serve better readability; the edited text displays greater cohesion and is more idiomatic. This is suggestive of two things, firstly, that of the aspiration of the translator to convey the style of the original by using the possibilities of the Estonian language (a trait of a good translator according to Sillaots's explicit poetics). Secondly, this may refer to the change in the norms of translating towards greater fluency. I do realize that changes in language, that development of language during the period of more than 50 years is a significant factor here. Still, I think, the findings are telling of the aspirations of Sillaots as a translator.

What is interesting in the comparison of Marta Sillaots's explicit and implicit translational poetics is that even when most of the principles do overlap, some of the concepts manifested in the explicit poetics as pertaining to 'a good translator' are not followed in her own translations. One such aspect is the use of 'good and correct' Estonian. When in her translation reviews she proceeds from the readability and grammatical correctness of the texts, in other words, the rules of Estonian grammar, then in her own translations she can be said to proceed from the style and rhythm of the original using the possibilities of Estonian language as to the full as she sees fit. This fact along with the evidence of the heavy editing of her translations may have been one of the reasons of the aging of Sillaots's translational contribution. Undoubtedly, translation norms and editing conventions that differ at different times must be taken into consideration. What can be concluded on the basis of the insight into Marta Sillaots's translational poetics, is, that translation for her remains to be a translation, but not as a mere echo of the original but as a separate form of writing or even a separate text type. Sillaots shows a presence in the Estonian translation landscape, her texts reflecting her translator's personality as well as the time she was translating constituting a valuable part of Estonian translation history.

Article IV: Forewords and Reviews: On Translators' Invisibility

Whereas the common theme throughout the first three articles is the case of a prose translator, Marta Sillaots, whose fate has been determined by the changes in the socio-political context as well as translation norms, the fourth article continues to see translation as a norm governed activity with the help of a case concerning poetry translation and more recent past. The translation under scrutiny in article IV of the research, *Forewords and Reviews: some notes on the translators' presence in Estonian translational space*, is Tõnu Õnnepalu's translation of Charles Baudelaire's *Les Fleurs du mal* published in Estonian in 2000. However, the focus will not be on the translation per se, but on the paratexts, both inside book covers – translator's *afterword* at the back of the book, where the translator strongly positions himself – as well as texts concerning the translation but circulating independently – reviews concerning Õnnepalu's translation. My aim here is not to take sides, although I do not make a point of hiding my personal preferences, but to describe the translational situation the way I have come to see it.

When translating a source text that is in verse, according to Maria-Kristiina Lotman (2011: 137), the history of translation into Estonian shows from rather an early stage a tendency to equimetrical³⁵ translation, that is also called mimetic translation (Holmes 1970; 1988), metrical translation (Lefevere 1975),

³⁵ A term preferred by Maria-Kristiina Lotman (2011: 137; 2012: 54)

formal or macrostylistic translation (Torop 1999), that is a strategy to transfer and apply the verse forms of the source culture in translation into Estonian. The strategy has been criticized for its focus on the form of the source text, leaving the sense, communicative value as well as the syntax of the target language on a secondary position. (see Lefevere 1975: 37–42) In the case of Estonia we may talk about an influential tradition of verse translation that is a form-derivative form of mimetic translation and is referred to as homorhythmic or syllabic-accentual translation of verse. (see Kaalep 1997: 65)

It is difficult to determine the origins of the prevailing understanding of Estonian translators of poetry as being comprised of two interconnected and equally important parts: content and form. (see Lotman 2011: 139) The importance of mimetic translation of verse into Estonian might be connected to the fact that Estonian literary culture is relatively young in comparison to other European cultures, since according to Holmes (1970: 98), mimetic form translation for verse tends to come forward when: “the target culture as a whole stands open to outside influences”, in other words, in the periods of cultural renewal or development. This is supported by Ain Kaalep’s (1997: 65) consideration that homorhythmic verse translation has been especially enriching for the Estonian original production, since Estonian authors have started using those new rhythms in their original poems, thus contributing to the development of target culture’s literary practices.

In the final article (IV) included in the present thesis, titled *Forewords and Reviews: some notes on the translators’ presence in Estonian translational space*, I will argue not in favour of equimetrical translation, nor against it, but rather point out how an open encounter with an influential existing norm of verse translation and a clear self-positioning of a translator can, apart from an uproar of criticism, create something that from a sufficient temporal distance seems to be a slot for an enlargement of norms if not a starting point for changes in the norms of poetry translation. There are two sets of norms (as in Toury) that Tõnu Õnnepalu, the Estonian translator, has deviated from in the case Estonian translation of Baudelaire’s *Les Fleurs du mal*. First of all, a disengagement from the prevailing mimetic patterns of verse translation, but most importantly, he makes use of an open manifestation of a translator’s presence in the translated text, a presence usually well-hidden in Estonian translation practice of the second half of the 20th century. It is Õnnepalu’s manifestation in the translator’s *afterword* (the term is explained in the article) that connects Õnnepalu to the line of thought pursued by Lawrence Venuti in his *The Translator’s Invisibility*. Peeter Torop (2011a: 98), among others, considers the translator to have many functions: translator as a mediator, creator, producer, marketing manager, critic and sometimes an ideologue or even a politician. Õnnepalu’s translation has helped to raise many questions concerning translational practices in Estonia, especially the issue of the visibility of the translator in the contemporary Estonian society. For the research, however, it is important to keep in mind that it is only due to the position that Tõnu Õnnepalu

has in Estonia – he is a well-known contemporary Estonian writer – that he could raise these issues, take the lead and position himself against the common way of translating – the existing norms of poetry translation. Whether such postulations will have long-lasting consequences remains to be seen; what is important from the point of view of the self-annihilating invisibility of the translator is that any translator countering such invisibility by firm self-positioning raises the awareness of translation as a vital part of any given culture but more importantly it stresses the fact that the translator is not only an invisible mediator but an active agent of translation who can never be neutral.

3. CONCLUSION

The motto of my research is taken from Theo Hermans' *Translation in Systems* ([1999] 2009). Indeed, the name of the original author does acquire a prominent place on the book cover, but the words inside as well as the interpretation is that of the translator. The paradox of translation studies in Estonia to me still lies in the romantic idea of a writer as a uniquely gifted genius whose works can fully be admired only in the original, an idea ingrained in reading and analysing translations even after Barthes³⁶. Translator (and I do generalize here to a certain extent) is not considered to be a creator but rather an expert in languages who possesses the skill of turning one text into a text in another language with minimal damage. Yet the fact is that translational texts constitute a significant part of the total literary production of a language environment, especially the literary production of such small countries like Estonia. Not to mention that most of us do read most of the world literature in translation and claim to know the work of Shakespeare and Baudelaire, or Derrida and Even-Zohar, for that matter, although we read the words of their translators. This issue was one of the central arguments already more than 25 years ago in the collection *The Manipulation of Literature* (Hermans 1985) and since then many things have changed, starting from translation studies acquiring a relatively solid position in the academia in Europe and elsewhere, to the descriptive research methods being developed and put to use. Yet, mostly due to historical circumstances, translation is not seen as a separate discipline but as a part of such disciplines as literary studies, comparative literature and linguistics in Estonia. This also determines the way translation is treated in the academia: partly as a means for language teaching and partly as a means for translator training – the basic premise of both is the normative-prescriptive approach to translation. With the exception of some translation scholars, there is a resistance to the practice of seeing translation as an integral part of the target culture's literary system (as opposed to the original one) or as a separate form of writing, not to talk about researching translation without comparing it to the original. It is necessary to draw attention to the subjects of translation as it forms a considerable part of our literary as well as cultural history.

In the introduction to the articles included in the present project I have followed the development of translation studies especially that of the descriptive branch of translation studies, as a recognized field of study. DTS started out with a simple understanding that translation is not an original, but neither is it a part of the original literary system since the conventions and focal points in the system the original comes from can be and usually are based on different traditions. Next, I have looked at the aspiration of the developing translation studies

³⁶ Roland Barthes's *The Death of the Author* was published in Estonian in 2002. Michel Foucault's *What is an Author?* in 2000.

to be more scientific. Such an aspiration can be understandable in the context of a new and developing 'soft' discipline seeking to establish itself; however, translation studies, especially if we look at the history and development of the ideas about translation cannot be said to have universal and unchangeable laws to rely on. Thus the methods and theories of translation can be said to be space and time dependent, forming tradition-bound periods in history that are punctuated by breaks and turns usually driven by the shifts in the function of translation.

Coming closer to the main aim of the present project, that is a descriptive analysis of different aspects of translational activity in the 20th century Estonia, I have explicated the terminology and concepts that have come to be used in the case studies. Most of the theoretical concepts mentioned in the articles are not taken as ready-made and fixed, since in some cases the Western theoretical thought needs to be adjusted taking into account the Soviet or post-Soviet experience. Thus, the theories are used on an idea level and serve as a background or a tool for the description of a concrete translational phenomenon. The concept of literary polysystem (Itamar Even-Zohar) is thus seen as being interdependent on other cultural systems and deep-seated in the economic and ideological structures of a society and together with the concept of invisibility, borrowed from Lawrence Venuti, serves as a solid tool for the description of the mechanics of changes during the early days of the Soviet time in which translation played a part (article II). The visibility/invisibility is again taken up in the descriptive analysis of the discussion about Tõnu Õnnepalu's unexpected prose translation of Charles Baudelaire's *Les fleurs du mal*, published in 2000 (article IV). This is a translation where the most significant part is not the main text but the translator's lengthy afterword at the back of the book, where he openly positions his translation against the existing norms of Estonian poetry translation. Not unimportant throughout the project is the attempt to determine and define the corpora of my research, both regarding the present project as well as projects undertaken to research the history of translation in general. It is not only the main text, the translations, we are talking about; most of the early theoretical thought concerning translation has come down to us through translators' comments and the texts accompanying translations. For practical reasons I have applied the set of terms devised by Gerard Genette. The same has been done by other scholars before (see for example Tahir-Gürçağlar (2002)). What is new in such an enterprise comes from the historical tradition of the presentation of translational texts in Estonia. When during the 1920s and 1930s the translator's notes (if commissioned by the publisher) were placed in front of the main texts and in many cases contained also comments on the issues of translating, then in the books published during the Soviet period (up to the most recent times) the translator's foreword, if any at all, has found itself on a more invisible position – at the back of the book, after the main text. Due to the positioning such a paratext has come to be called the *afterword*. What is more, the content of the afterword rarely contained any notes on translation, concentrating mainly

on the original author and the context of the original, contributing thus to the translator becoming more invisible.

Finally, but not less importantly, the case of a productive Estonian translator Marta Sillaots can be considered as a driving force behind three of the articles included in the project. The first article (article I) concentrates on the time period 1920s and 1930s, a period of relatively sustained literary practices and publishing conventions in Estonia. It is a case study following the negotiations between Sillaots and Young Estonia Publishing House for the publishing of Mark Twain's *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* and Jules Verne's *Les Enfants du capitaine Grant* discussing the factors, such as economic factors or scarcity of time, contributing to or determining the final product, the translation. The article attends to the research question concerning the organization of translational work within a social system where the translators might have artistic goals of their own, but the final product is a compromise reached during the process of negotiation between the different agents of translation. The next article included in the thesis, (article II), chronologically follows the time period described in the first article, but the stress is on the ideological and socio-political changes that took place in Estonia during the early Soviet period. As an answer to the second research question, I have found translation to have played a significant role in the dynamics of weakening the position of the previously established literatures, as well as well-known literary figures, such as Marta Sillaots and others. Research into the beginning of Soviet period in Estonian translation history accords with Even-Zohar's theory of translation as a peripheral part of cultural polysystem under normal circumstances; yet, at times of turmoil or ideological change, this balance can be disrupted and, as a result, translation can assume quite a central position of the system of hierarchies.

In addition to the studies mentioned above, a retrospective look at the literary activities of Marta Sillaots is provided in article III. After having established the attempt to erase her from the Soviet literary scene, it is reasonable to inquire what remains of her translational output and make suggestions as to why. I have done that by analysing the implications arising from the correlation between her explicit and implicit translation poetics. The answer to the third research question gives one possible explanation as to why such a large part of Sillaots's close to 60 translations have either been forgotten or heavily edited and how the time factor seems to have a greater influence on the translations and translators that possess an individual idiosyncratic style. The last article included (article IV) continues the time chronology with a more recent period in Estonian translation history. I have analysed the case of the translation of Baudelaire's *Les fleurs du mal* by an Estonian author Tõnu Õnnepalu in the light of established poetry translation norms. My aim was to look at how translation norms operate and how a translator's firm self-positioning can bring along criticism, but also trigger norm changes. The article makes the case for the abandoning of the values established during the Soviet period by foregrounding the translators and the translators' choices or, in other words making the translator visible.

My project proceeds chronologically through the translational landscape of 20th century Estonia and is inevitably connected to a particular time and place. It has no pretensions to be universal, but rather sets the objective to provide points of departure for further studies. I have approached translation related topics in Estonian translation history through a descriptive prism with a firm understanding that different points of view (as well as different historical narratives) enrich the field of translation studies. It is clear, however, that some of the Western theoretical concepts need to be adjusted in order to accommodate the totalitarian experience. The role of the translator in systems, both socio-economic as well as political systems, and the role translation plays in the functioning of that system need some further consideration. By the same token, the concept of the invisibility of the translator that originally makes the case for the translators' situation in the Anglo-American context, acquires a more political dimension in case of the invisibility of the Estonian translator during the period of transition from a young democracy to a totalitarian regime and beyond. My research shows that changes in the norms of translation can be triggered by the system during the periods of strong ideological pressure or by individual agents who are at the position of power inside the literary system. I also want to stress the fact that translation is a collective effort that is inevitably influenced by its context of occurrence.

4. REFERENCES

- Annus, Epp; Luule Epner, Ants Järv, Sirje Olesk, Ele Süvalep, Mart Velsker 2001. *Eesti Kirjanduslugu*. Tallinn: Koolibri.
- Baker, Mona and Gabriela Saldanha (eds). 2008. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bartsch, Renate. 1987. *Norms of Language*. London: Longman.
- Bassnett, Susan. 1980. *Translation Studies*. London: Methuen.
- Bassnett, Susan and André Lefevere. 1998. Introduction: Where are we in Translation Studies. – Susan Bassnett (ed). *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1–11.
- Bassnett, Susan and André Lefevere. 1990. *Translation, History, and Culture*. London: Pinter.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1973. Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction. – Richard Brown (ed). *Knowledge, Education and Cultural Change*. London: Tavistock, 71–112.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. The Forms of Capital. – John G. Richardson (ed). *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. New York: Greenwood, 241–258.
- Catford, John Cunnison. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation. An Essay in Applied Linguistics*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Chalvin, Antoine; Anne Lange, Daniele Monticelli (eds). 2011. *Between Cultures and Texts: Itineraries in Translation History. Entre les cultures et les textes: Itinéraires en histoire de la traduction*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften.
- Chesterman, Andrew. 1993. From “Is” to “Ought”: Laws, Norms and Strategies in Translation Studies. *Target*. 5/1, 1–20.
- Chesterman, Andrew. 1997. *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*. John Benjamins Publishing: Amsterdam and Philadelphia.
- Chesterman, Andrew. 2006. A note on norms and evidence – Jorma Tommola and Yves Gambier (eds). *Translation and interpreting – training and research*. Turku: University of Turku, Department of English Translation Studies, 13–19.
- Chow, Rey. 2010. Postcolonial Visibilities: Questions Inspired by Deleuze’s Method. – Simone Bignell and Paul Batton (eds). *Deleuze and the Postcolonial*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 62–77.
- Delisle, Jean and Judith Woodsworth. 1995. *Les traducteurs dans l’histoire*. Ottawa: Les Presses de l’Université d’Ottawa.
- Delisle, Jean. 2002. *Portraits de traductrices*. Ottawa: Les Presses de l’Université d’Ottawa.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. 1970. The Function of the Polysystem in the History of Literature. *Masa*, 6/3.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. 1978. *Papers in Historical Poetics*. Tel Aviv: Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. 1979. Polysystem Theory – *Poetics Today* 1/2, 287–310.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. 1990. Introduction to Polysystem Studies. *Poetics Today*. 11/1, 1–6.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. 1997. Factors and Dependencies in Culture: A Revised Outline for Polysystem Culture Research. *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature*. 24, 15–34.

- Even-Zohar, Itamar. 2008 [1990]. The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem. – Lawrence Venuti (ed). *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge, 199–204.
- Genette, Gerard. 1997. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Jane E. Lewin (transl). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gentzler, Edwin. 2001. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Gielen, Katiliina. 2012a. Translators in Systems. Some Notes on the Factors Shaping Translations: The Case of Marta Sillaots and Young Estonia Publishing. *Interlitteraria*. 17, 259–266.
- Gielen, Katiliina. 2012b. Marta Sillaotsa eksplitsiitne ja implitsiitne tõlkepoetika. (The Explicit and Implicit Translational Poetics of Marta Sillaots.) *Methis. Studia Humaniora Estonica*. 9/10, 104–117.
- Gielen, Katiliina. 2011a. Forewords and Reviews: On Translators' Invisibility. *Interlitteraria*. 2/16, 628–642.
- Gielen, Katiliina. 2011b. Authors as Translators: Emerging Hierarchical Patterns of Literary Activity in Early Soviet Estonia. – Antoine Chalvin, Anne Lange, Daniele Monticelli (eds). *Between Cultures and Texts: Itineraries in Translation History. Entre les cultures et les textes: Itinéraires en histoire de la traduction*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften, 201–211.
- Hermans, Theo. 1985. *Manipulation of Literature. Studies in Literary Translation*. London and Sidney: Croom Helm.
- Hermans, Theo. 1996. Norms and the Determination of Translation. A Theoretical Framework. – Roman Alvarez and M. Carmen-AfricaVidal (eds). *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 25–51.
- Hermans, Theo. 1999. Translation and Normativity – Christina Schäffner (ed). *Translation and Norms*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 50–71.
- Hermans, Theo. 2009 [1999]. *Translation in Systems. Descriptive and System-oriented Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Hiio, Toomas. 2010. Nõukogude aeg, sovetiaeg või hoopis külma sõja ajajärk? *Sirp*. January, 21, 2010.
- Holmes, James, S. 1970. Forms of Verse Translation and the Translation of Verse Form – James S. Holmes, Frans de Haan, Anton Popovič (eds). *The Nature of Translation. Essays in the Theory and Practice of Literary Translation*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton de Gruyter, 91–105.
- Holmes, James, S. 1988. *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Holmes, James, S. 2004 [1972] The Name and Nature of Translation Studies. – Lawrence Venuti (ed). *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and NewYork: Routledge, 205–218.
- Jakobson, Roman. 2004 [1959]. On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. – Lawrence Venuti (ed). *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and NewYork: Routledge, 138–143.
- Kaalep, Ain. 1997. *Kolm Lydiat*. Tartu: Ilmamaa.
- Kaldjärv, Klaarika. 2007. *Autor, jutustaja, tõlkija. Borgese autofiktsioonid eesti keeles*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Kirss, Tiina Ann. 2006. Ruthi õed: sajandipöörde naiste reaalsus ja fantaasia – Mirjam Hindrikus (ed). *J. Randvere "Ruth" 19/20. sajandi vahetuse kultuuris*. Tallinn: Underi ja Tuglase Kirjanduskeskus, 71–79.

- Kaus, Jan. 2013. Ülelend viimase kümnendi tõlkeilukirjandusest. *Keel ja Kirjandus*. 2, 95–111.
- Koskinen, Kaisa. 2004. Shared Culture?: Reflections on recent trends in Translation Studies. *Target* 16/1, 143–156.
- Krusten, Reet 1976. Marta Sillaots kaheksakümnendal künnisel. – *Keel ja Kirjandus*. 5, 29–297.
- Kruus, Oskar 1971. Marta Sillaots: Pilguheit ühe virga naise teele ja tööle. – *Naine hanesulega. Kirjutisi naiskirjanikest*. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat, 171–183.
- Kuhn, Thomas. 1996 [1962]. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Lambert, José. 1980. Production, tradition et importation: une clef pour la description de la littérature et de la littérature en traduction. *Canadian review of comparative literature / Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée*. 7/2, Numéro Spécial, *La Traduction*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 246–252.
- Lambert, José. 1995. *Translation, Systems and Research: The Contribution of Poly-system Studies to translation Studies*, 105–152. Available at: <http://www.erudit.org/revue/TTR/1995/v8/n1/037199ar.pdf>. Accessed 19.07.2010.
- Lambert, José. 2006 [1983]. L'éternelle question des frontières: littératures nationales et systèmes littéraires. – Christian Angelet and Ludo Melis (eds). *Langue, dialecte, littérature. Études romanes à la mémoire de Hugo Plomteux*. Leuven: Leuven UP, 355–370.
- Lange, Anne. 2004. *Ants Oras*. Tartu: Ilmamaa.
- Lange, Anne. 2007. *The Poetics of Translation of Ants Oras*. Tallinn: Tallinna Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Lange, Anne. 2008. *Tõlkimise aabits*, Tallinn: Valgus.
- Lange, Anne and Katiliina Gielen. 2010. Kirjeldamine üksi, kui see ei teeni mõistmist ja seletamist, on igaväoitu: Theo Hermansiga vestlevad Anne Lange ja Katiliina Gielen. *Sirp*, June 18, 2010.
- Lange, Anne. 2011. Enn Soosaare tõlketegudest. *Keel ja Kirjandus*. 1, 31–47.
- Lefevere, André. 1975. *Translating Poetry: Seven Strategies and a Blueprint*. Assen and Amsterdam: Van Gorcum.
- Lefevere, André. 1985. Why Waste Our Time on Rewrites? The Trouble with Interpretation and the Role of Rewriting in an Alternative Paradigm. – Theo Hermans (ed). *The Manipulation of Literature*. London and Sidney: Croom Helm, 215–243.
- Lefevere, André. 1992. *Translation, History, Culture: a sourcebook*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Liivaku, Uno and Henno Meriste. 1975. *Kuidas seda tõlkida: järeltormatusest eestinduseni*. Tallinn: Valgus.
- Lotman, Maria-Kristiina, 2011. Equimetrical Verse Translation in Estonian Poetic Culture. – Antoine Chalvin, Anne Lange, Daniele Monticelli (eds). *Between Cultures and Texts: Itineraries in Translation History. Entre les cultures et les textes: Itinéraires en histoire de la traduction*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Europäisher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 137–150.
- Lotman, Maria-Kristiina. 2012. Antiikvärsimõõdud eesti tõlgetes 19.sajandi lõpul – 20. Sajandi esimesel poolel. *Methis. Studia Humaniora Estonica*. 9/10, 54–69.
- Lotman, Yuri. 1977 [1974]. The Dynamic Model of a Semiotic System. *Semiotica* 2: 3/4, 193–210.
- Milton, John and Paul Bandia (eds). 2009. *Agents of Translation*. John Benjamins Publishing: Amstardam and Philadelphia.

- Monticelli, Daniele. 2011. 'Totalitarian Translation' as a Means of Forced Cultural Change: The Case of Postwar Soviet Estonia. – Antoine Chalvin, Anne Lange, Daniele Monticelli (eds). *Between Cultures and Texts: Itineraries in Translation History. Entre les cultures et les textes: Itinéraires en histoire de la traduction*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften, 187–200.
- Möldre, Aile. 2005. *Kirjastustegevus ja raamatulevi eestis aastail 1940–2000*. Tallinn: TLÜ Kirjastus.
- Munday, Jeremy. 2008 [2002]. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Nida, Eugene. 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Nida, Eugene. 1969. Science of translation. *Language*. 45/3, 483–498.
- Nida, Eugene. 1991. Theories of Translation. *TTR : traduction, terminologie, Rédaction*. 4/1, 19–32.
- Nirk, Endel. 1983. *Eesti kirjandus: arengulooline ülevaade*. Tallinn: Perioodika.
- Ojamaa, Ott. 2010 [1969]. Armastus seaduslikus abielus. – *Kümnenda muusa muresid I*. Tartu: Ilmamaa, 54–71.
- Olesk, Sirje. 2008. Kirjandus ja kirjanduselu Eestis okupatsioonide ajal. – Ülo Ennuste, Enn Tarvel, Peep Varju (eds). *Kannatuste aastad 1940–1991*. (vol. I) Tallinn: Valge Raamat.
- Paul, Toomas. 1999. *Eesti piiblitõlke ajalugu: esimestest katsetest kuni 1999. aastani*. Tallinn: Emakeele Selts.
- Paz, Octavio. 1992. Translations of literature and letters. – Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet (eds). *Theories of Translation from Dryden to Derrida*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 152–63.
- Pym, Anthony. 1998. *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Pym, Anthony. 2010. *Exploring Translation Theories*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Qvale, Per. 2003. *From St. Jerome to Hypertext*. Manchester and Northampton: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Riikonen, Hannu, K. 2012. Tõlkeloo arvukad dimensioonid. *Methis. Studia Humaniora Estonica*. 9/ 10, 198–203.
- Robinson, Douglas. 2002. *Western Translation Theory: from Herodotus to Nietzsche*. Manchester and Northampton: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Ross Amos, Flora. 1969 [1920]. *Early Theories of Translation*. Columbia University: Studies in English and Comparative Literature.
- Ross, Kristiina. 2000a. Tõlketehnilisi küsimusi eesti kirjakeele algusaegadest: 2. käskkirja. *Keel ja Kirjandus*. 11, 781–795.
- Ross, Kristiina. 2000b. Bible Translation as Mediator of Hebrew Impact on Target Languages: the Estonian Bible. *Nordisk Judaistik: Scandinavian Jewish Studies*. 21/1–2, 123–130.
- Ross, Kristiina. 2002. Esialgseid täiendusi Vana Testamendi tõlkeloole. *Keel ja Kirjandus*. 2, 73–87.
- Ross, Kristiina. 2004. Eesti tõlkeloo ja keelekorralduse alusdokumendid: Piiblikonverentsid ja keelevaidlused: Põhjaeestikeelse Piibli tõlkimise ajaloost (1686–1690). *Bibelkonferenzen und Sprachstreitigkeiten: Quellen zur Geschichte der Übersetzung der Bibel ins Revalenische (1686–1690)* – Leino Pahtma and Kai Tafenu (ed). Eesti ajalooarhiiv. Tartu, 2003. *Tuna. Ajalookultuuri ajakiri*. 3, 136–138.

- Ross, Kristiina. 2007. *Põhjaeestikeelsed Uue Testamendi tõlked 1680–1705*. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.
- Ross, Kristiina. 2009a. Eesti keel Henrikust Anton Thor Helleni. *Keel ja Kirjandus*. 8/9, 553–558.
- Ross, Kristiina. 2009b. History of Estonian Bible translation. *ELM: Estonian Literary Magazine*. 28, 4–11.
- Ross, Kristiina. 2011a. Sisaliku jäljed piiblitõlkes. Lõunaeestikeelse Vana Testamendi saatusest. *Keel ja Kirjandus*. 9/8, 600–613.
- Ross, Kristiina. 2011b. Historical aspects of Estonian Bible translation and the formation of biblical terminology from the Middle Ages up to the 18th century. *Magyar Terminológia*. 1, 19–27.
- Saluäär, Anu. 1987. Marta Sillaots 1887–1969. – *Looming*. 5, 672–681.
- Saluäär, Anu. 2008. Marta Sillaots 1887 –1969. – *Põhjamaadest ja Eestist. Kirjutisi 1987–2008*. Toomas Haug and Inna Lusti (eds). Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus, 505–531.
- Saluäär, Anu. 2009. Kirjutav Eesti naine. – M. Sillaots. Sealtpoolt künniseid: tagasi-vaade. *Loomingu Raamatukogu* 2009, 31–34.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich. 1992. On the different methods of translating. Waltraud Bartcht (transl). – John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte (eds). *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 36–54.
- Sela-Sheffy, Rakefet and Miriam Shlesinger (eds). 2011. *Identity and Status in the Translational Professions*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Schäffner, Christina (ed). 1999. *Translation and Norms*. London: Multilingual Matters.
- Shuttleworth, Mark and Moira Cowie. 1997. *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Sillaots, Marta. 1912. L.Onerva Murdjooned. *Eesti Kirjandus*. 1, 36–39.
- Sillaots, Marta. 1928. Guy de Maupassant: Üks inimelu. *Eesti Kirjandus*. 6, 391–392.
- Simon, Sherry. 1996. *Gender in Translation. Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Snell-Hornby, Mary. 2009. “What’s in a Name?”: On metalinguistic confusion in Translation Studies. – Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer (eds). *The Metalanguage of Translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 123–134.
- Soovik, Ene-Reet. 2011. Estonian Literary Translation in the Early 21st Century: On the Context and the Content. – Antoine Chalvin, Anne Lange, Daniele Monticelli (eds). *Between Cultures and Texts: Itineraries in Translation History. Entre les cultures et les textes: Itinéraires en histoire de la traduction*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften, 227–239.
- Sütiste, Elin. 2008. „Hea tõlke” konstrueerimine tõlkekriitikas (ajakirjas „Eesti Kirjandus” aastail 1906–1922 avaldatud tõlkearvustuste põhjal). – *Kriitika diskursus: minevik ja tänapäev*. Maris Kirme and Rein Veidemann (eds). Acta Universitatis Tallinnensis. Humaniora A 28. Tallinn: Tallinna Ülikooli Kirjastus, 95–136.
- Sütiste, Elin. 2009. *Tõlke mõiste dünaamikast tõlketeaduses ja eesti tõlkeloos*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Sütiste, Elin. 2011. Images of Literary Translation in Estonia in 1901–1917: An Overview. – Antoine Chalvin, Anne Lange, Daniele Monticelli (eds). *Between Cultures and Texts: Itineraries in Translation History. Entre les cultures et les textes:*

- Itinéraires en histoire de la traduction*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften, 165–174.
- Tafenau, Kai. 2011. *Uue Testamendi tõlkimisest Rootsi ajal: käsikirjad, tõlkijad ja eesti kirjakeel*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Tahir-Gürçağlar, Şehnaz. 2002. What Texts Don't Tell: The Uses of Paratexts in Translation Research. – Theo Hermans (ed). *Crosscultural Transgressions: Research Models in Translation Studies II. Historical and Ideological Issues*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 44–60.
- Talviste, Katre. 2007. *Baudelaire et la poésie estonienne*. Available at : <http://doxa.scd.univ-paris12.fr/theses/th0252819.pdf>. Accessed 23.02.2011.
- Tamm, Marek. 2010. Eesti kultuur kui tõlkekultuur: mõned ajaloolised ekskursid. *Diplomaatia*. Märts, 2010, 2/3.
- Torop, Peeter. 1980. Rahvusliku tõkeloo teadvustamisest. – *Keel ja Kirjandus*. 1, 63–64.
- Torop, Peeter. 1995. *Тотальный перевод*. Tartu: Tartu University Press.
- Torop, Peeter. 1999a [1984]. *Tõlkekultuur ja tõlkeaasta*. – Kultuurimärgid. Tartu: Ilmamaa, 66–79.
- Torop, Peeter. 1999b. *Kultuurimärgid*. Tartu: Ilmamaa.
- Torop, Peeter. 2002. Translation as Translating as Culture. *Sign System Studies*. 30/2. Tartu: Tartu University Press, 593–605.
- Torop, Peeter. 2011a. *Tõlge ja kultuur*. Tallinn-Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Torop, Peeter. 2011b. History of Translation and Cultural Autotranslation. – Antoine Chalvin, Anne Lange, Daniele Monticelli (eds). *Between Cultures and Texts: Itineraries in Translation History. Entre les cultures et les textes: Itinéraires en histoire de la traduction*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften, 21–31.
- Toury, Gideon. 1980. *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.
- Toury, Gideon. 1985. A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies. – Theo Hermans (ed). *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. London and Sidney: Croom Helm, 16–41.
- Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Toury, Gideon. 1999. A Handful of Paragraphs on 'Translation' and 'Norms' – Christina Schäffner (ed). *Translation and Norms*. London: Multilingual Matters, 9–31.
- Tymoczko, Maria. 2005. Trajectories of research in translation studies. *Meta* 50/4, 1082–1097.
- Tymoczko, Maria. 2006. Reconceptualizing Western Translation Theory. – Theo Hermans (ed). *Translating Others*. Manchester: St. Jerome, 13–32.
- Tymoczko, Maria. 2007. *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Тынянов, Юрий. Н. 2002 [1927]. *Литературная эволюция: избранные труды*. Москва : Аграф.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 2008 [1995]. *The Translator's Invisibility*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 2004. *The Translation Studies Reader*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1998. *The Scandals of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.

ARTICLES

KOKKUVÕTE

Doktoriväitekirj „Tõlkelugu süsteemides: uurimusi 20. sajandi Eesti tõlkeruumist” (*Translation History in Systems: Studies on the Estonian Translational Space of the 20th Century*) koondab nelja tõlkeloolist uurimusartiklit, mis läbivad kronoloogiliselt 20. sajandi Eesti tõlketemaatikaga seotud episoodide ja ülevaatlikku sissejuhatavat artiklit, kus vaadeldakse tõlketeaduse kui eraldi teadusharu tekkimist ja kirjutatakse lahti artiklites kasutatud teoreetilised kontseptsioonid ning analüüsitakse peamisi mõisteid. Projekti eesmärk on olnud uurida tõlketegevuse erinevaid tahke ja tõlkija positsiooni Eestis 20. sajandil. Mind huvitab (1) tõlkenormide muutumine ajas ja ruumis ning (2) tõlketegevuse sõltuvus taustsüsteemidest, ehk mis rolli mängivad tõlketegevuses tõlkimistavad ning sotsiaalne ja poliitiline kontekst.

Ülevaatliku artikli üks eesmärgi on juhtida tähelepanu tõlkeloole kui kultuuriloo olulisele osale ning selle uurimise vajalikkusele Eesti kultuuri uurimise seisukohalt. Lisaks üldisemale tõlketeaduse kui eraldi teadusharu arengut ja selle problemaatikat kaardistavale osale, vaatleb väitekirja koondartikkel deskriptiivse tõlketeaduse tekkimist, rõhutades deskriptiivsete ehk mittehinnanguliste kirjeldusmeetodite kasutamise olulisust tõlketekstide ja tõlkesituatsioonide uurimisel. Minu jaoks on hea ja halva tõlke mõisted ajas muutuvad ja kultuuriruumi erinevad nähtused ja tõlgetele või tõlkija tööle hinnangu andmisest enam huvitab mind tõlkimise ajalooline kontekst, mille kaudu võib leida seletust küsimusele, mis on erinevate tõlkevalikute taust ja põhjused. Sellisel viisil on piisava arvu väiksemate uurimuste olemasolul võimalik kaardistada tõlketegevuses esinevaid korduvaid mustreid, välja tuua erandeid ja leida nende tekkepõhjusi.

Teiseks oluliseks aspektiks võib käesoleva projekti puhul pidada tõlketeksti mõistmist mitte lähtekultuuri, vaid vastuvõtva kultuuriruumi osana. Selline lähenemine tunnistab esiteks tõlkija aktiivset (teadlikku või mitteteadlikku) rolli tõlkeotsuste tegemisel lähtuvalt vastuvõtva kultuur normidest (Toury) ja teiseks, asetab tõlketekstid hierarhilisse suhtesse omakultuuriliste tekstidega (Even-Zohar). Gideon Toury tõlkenormid, ehk mingis teatud kultuuris teatud ajaperioodil jälgitav regulaarsus tõlkekäitumises, on vaatamata tugevalt preskriptiivset konnotatsiooni kandvale nimele kujunenud deskriptiivse tõlketeaduse üheks keskseks kontseptsiooniks. Toury (1995: 206) viitab tõlkenormidele kui regulaarsusele tõlkekäitumises, mida on võimalik tuvastada tõlketoodangut ja tõlkeprotsesse jälgides. Toury jagab tõlkenormid kolmeks: (1) lähte- või algnorm (*initial norm*), mis puudutab tõlkija tõlkestrateegia valikut skaalal *adekvaatne* (originaalist lähtuv) – *aktsepteeritav* (sihtkultuurist lähtuv) tõlge; (2) eelnormid (*preliminary norms*), mis puudutavad tõlkepoliitikat (teksti valiku printsiipi ja tõlkekeelt) ning (3) operatiivsed normid (*operational norms*), mis puudutavad konkreetsemalt tõlketeksti tõlkimist tervikuna või osadena ja ka tekstilingvistilisi, süntaktilisi-leksikaalseid valikuid. Sellised tõlkenormid on muutliku iseloomuga ja kontekstist sõltuvad nähtused. Tõlkenormide nihkeid ja

vahetumist võimaldab kirjeldada Itamar Even-Zohari polüsüsteemide teooria, mis vaatleb tõlkekultuuri ühe osana tervest sotsiaal-kultuurilisest süsteemist, mille erinevad osad on omavahel pidevalt muutuvates hierarhilistes suhetes ja milles tõlke osatähtsus võib suurenedagi, kui tegemist on uue alles tekkiva või uueneva süsteemiga (Even-Zohar 2004: 199–200). Selline (polü)süsteemipõhine lähenemine kirjandusliku repertuaari kujunemisele sobib näiteks kirjeldamiseks ideoloogiliste muutuste poolt vallandatud kultuurilisi muutusi nõukogude korra kehtestumise esimesel kümnendil ja seda just omatoodangu ja tõlketoodangu vahekorra lähtuvalt. Artikkel II eestikeelse pealkirjaga „Autorid kui tõlkijad: kirjandusliku tegevuse hierarhilised mustrid Nõukogude Eesti esimesel kümnendil” (*Authors as Translators: Emerging Hierarchical Patterns of Literary Activity in Early Soviet Estonia*), kirjeldabki tõlketoodangu ja omatoodangu protsentuaalse suhte muutusi Eestis nõukogude aja esimesel kümnendil, vaadeldes kuidas nõukogude ajale eelnenud perioodil tunnustatud Eesti autoritest saavad alates 1945. aastast olude sunnil uue ideoloogia tõlkijad, ning kuidas vastuvõtva kultuuri ideoloogiliselt ebasobiva autori positsioon vahetatakse järk-järgult välja nähtamatuma, tõlkija positsiooniga. Artikkel analüüsib kolme eesti kirjaniku Friedebert Tuglese, Betti Alveri ja Marta Sillaotsa bibliograafiaid, päevikukatkeid ja isiklikku kirjavahetust keskendudes ajavahemikule 1940–1955. Jälgides kirjanike oma ja tõlketoodangu suhet avaldamiskronoloogiate kaudu, kirjeldab artikkel ebasoosungusse langenud autorite taandamist autorlusega võrreldes nähtamatumale tõlkija positsioonile. Kirjeldades situatsiooni, kus tõlkekirjandus küll tõuseb hierarhias kesksemale positsioonile, kuid kus tõlkija isiku suhtelist nähtamatust võrreldes autoriga kasutatakse ära uue ideoloogilise süsteemi loomisel, tuleb kõne alla Lawrence Venuti (2004) tõlkija nähtamatuse kontseptsioon, mis pärineb küll Anglo-ameerika kogemusel, kuid mis idee tasandil sobib kirjeldama varanõukogudeaegseid muutusi Eesti kirjandusmaastikul.

Tõlkenormide nihkeid või muutusi võib aga vallandada ka mõne isiku, tuntud autori/tõlkija, tegevus. Artikkel IV pealkirjaga „Eessõnad ja ülevaateartiklid: Mõni sõna tõlkija nähtamatusest” (*Forewords and Reviews: On Translators’ Invisibility*) võtab luubi alla tõlgete uurimise seisukohalt tähtsa materjali – tekstid, mis puudutavad otseselt mõnda konkreetset tõlget, näiteks tõlkija poolt teksti sisse juhatav materjal – eessõna, ja eesti kontekstis eriti järelsõna – aga ka tõlkearvustused. Paratekstuaalne materjal (Gerard Genette) annab aimu antud ajahetkel ja antud kultuuriruumis valitsevatest tõlkealastest arusaamadest, ehk siis Toury tõlkenormid väljenduvadki kõige eksplitsiitsemalt just tõlkimisest rääkivates tekstides. Artikkel keskendub 2000 aastal välja antud ja eesti-prantsuse paralleeltekste sisaldavale Charles Baudelaire *Kurja õite* tõlkija järelsõnale ja raamatu väljaandmisele järgnenud poleemikale. Ka selle materjali puhul on lisaks paratekstidele võimalik rääkida tõlkija nähtamatusest ja ka sellest, mis juhtub, kui tõlkija ennast nähtavaks teeb, kas siis implitsiitsete tekstisiseste tõlkevalikute või eksplitsiitsetelt neist tõlkevalikutest rääkides ja end valitsevale tõlkenormatiivsele käitumisele vastandades.

Kuigi projekti neli artiklit keskenduvad tõlketevõtte erinevatele külgedele ja läbivad ajalisel peaaegu tervet 20. sajandit, ühendab uurimusi nii teoreetiline raamistik kui deskriptiivne lähenemine, aga ka kolme esimese artikli keskmeks olev eesti tõlkija Marta Sillaots ja tema tõlketevõtte. Marta Sillaotsast kui kirjanikust ja esseistist on pisteliselt kirjutatud varemgi (Kruus 1971, Krustein 1976; Kaalep 1998, Kirss 2006), kuid siiani on tema tõlkeloomingut lähemalt puudutanud vaid Anu Saluäär (1987, 2008, 2009), kuigi Sillaotsa puhul omab kultuuriloolist tähtsust just tema mahukas tõlkealane looming. Artikkel I eestikeelse pealkirjaga „Tõlkijad süsteemis. Märkmeid tõlkeid mõjutavate asjaolude kohta: Marta Sillaots ja Noor-Eesti Kirjastus”. (*Translators in Systems. Some Notes on the Factors Shaping Translations: the Case of Marta Sillaots and Young Estonia Publishing*) analüüsib 1920/30. aastatel Haridusministeeriumi poolt teadlikult kujundama hakatud eesti kirjastuspoliitikat ja vaatleb Kirjandusmuuseumi kultuuriloolise arhiivi materjalidele tuginedes Marta Sillaotsa läbirääkimisi ühe tolleaegse mõjuvõimsama, Noor-Eesti Kirjastuse esindaja August Pilliga noorsookirjanduse tõlkimise osas. Kirjavahetusest Mark Twaini *Huckleberry Finni seikluste* ja seejärel Jules Verne'i *Kapten Granti laste* tõlkimise asjus ja lepingute tingimustest on näha, et tõlkija töö tulemuse määravad mitmed tõlkevälised tegurid nagu näiteks lühikesed tähtajad, ette antud tõlkeridade arv ja ka toimetusepoolne ettekirjutus teksti redutseerimise osas. Sellised ettekirjutused on omakorda seotud nii tõlke tellija (antud juhul kirjastuse) kui ka lugeja majandusliku olukorraga ja laiemalt võttes ka riikliku kirjastuspoliitika. Artikkel vaatleb tõlkija rolli kultuurisüsteemis vahendaja ja läbirääkijana, kelle tegevuse tagajärjel valminud tõlge on tihti nii arbitraarsete valikute kui mitmete kompromisside tulemus.

Artikkel III, *Marta Sillaotsa eksplitsiitne ja implitsiitne poeetika*, on jätk kahele eelnenud Sillaotsa uurimusele, kuid tegeleb konkreetsemalt Sillaotsa tõlketekstide ja tema poolt kirjutatud tõlkearvustustega, ehk siis analüüsib Peeter Toropi (1999; 2011) järgi Sillaotsa tõlketeeoreetilisi printsiipe, implitsiitset ja eksplitsiitset tõlkepoeetikat. Analüüsi aluseks on võetud ühelt poolt konkreetsete tõlketekstid (Charles Dickensi *David Copperfield* ja Romain Rolland'i *Jean Christophe'i*) ja teisalt Sillaotsa poolt põhiliselt *Eesti Kirjanduses* 1919–1940 avaldatud tõlkeretsensioonid teistele tolleaegsetele tõlgetele. Uurimuse eesmärk on esiteks kaardistada Sillaotsa tõlkealane poeetika, mida Sillaots tõlgete puhul hindab, mida laidab ja kuidas ta ise tõlgib. Teiseks eesmärgiks on Sillaotsa fenomeni kaudu analüüsida tõlgete vananemist, tõlkenormides ja tõlkekaanonis toimuvaid muutusi. Artikli empiirilist materjali on analüüsitud deskriptiivselt, lähtudes tõekspidamisest, et tõlketekst kuulub vastuvõtva kultuuriruumi kirjanduslikku süsteemi, moodustades selles süsteemis tõlkekaanoni. Sillaotsa tõlkeid on analüüsitud ka pisut ebatraditsiooniliselt, kõrvutades omavahel eestikeelsete tõlgete erinevaid toimetatud väljaandeid, jättes originaali vaid taustmaterjaliks. *David Copperfieldi* puhul on vaatluse all 1937. aasta esmatrükk ja Lia Rajandi toimetatud, 1991. aastal välja antud kordustrükk; *Jean Christophe'i* puhul 1936. aasta tõlke esmatrükk ja 1958. aastal välja antud

toimetatud tekst. Toimetamisel tehtud paranduste analüüsi puhul on arvesse võetud võimalikku keele vananemist, kuid tekstivõrdlusest ja silutud tekstosadest paistab siiski läbi ka Sillaotsa idiosünkraatlik tõlkijakeel, implitsiitne tõlkepoeeetika. Võrreldes mõlemat, implitsiitset ja eksplitsiitset aspekti Sillaotsa kui tõlkija tõlkepoeeetikast, ilmneb nii nende kahe vahelisi kattuvusi, kui ka erinevusi. Näiteks paistab Sillaots kriitikuna lähtuvat sihtkultuuri ja keelelise loetavuse seisukohalt. Oma tõlgetes võtab ta aga aluseks originaali autori stilistika ja püüab seda sageli edasi anda eesti keele võimalusi kasutades, kuid seejuures keelelist ladusust ohvriks tuues. Omamoodi põhjendatud on mõlemad seisukohad.

Keele ja sellega seotud kultuurilise kompetentsi problemaatika tuli paratamatult kõne alla antud uurimustöö kõiki kolme inglisekeelset artiklit ette valmistades. Võõrkeeles kirjutatud artiklid, mille sisuks on omakultuur, omavad teatud spetsiifikat. Artikli mahtu tuleb lisaks teoreetilis-analüütilisele uurimusele kasutada ka konteksti ja kultuurispetsiifilise tausta lahtikirjutamiseks. Kuna üks antud projekti artiklitest on kirjutatud eesti keeles ja suunatud eesti lugejale, ülejäänud töö ja artiklid aga inglise keeles, siis on ülevaateartiklis pööratud tähelepanu ka representatsiooni ja enese positsioneerimise problemaatikale sõltuvalt lugejagrupist. Jääb loota, et käesoleva töö raames avaldatud inglisekeelne materjal pakub pidepunkte ja võrdlusmaterjali ka eesti keelt mittevaldavale uurijale. Just võrdlusmaterjali kättesaadavus on siiani määranud tõlketeaduslike ja eriti tõlkelooliste uurimuste suunad, taandudes tihti vaid omakultuuri uurimisele. Samuti vajavad Läänemaailmas kasutusel olevad teoreetilised kontseptsioonid täiendamist ja ümbermõtestamist silmas pidades tõlkija positsiooni ja tõlke tolli totalitarismi tingimustes.

Uurimustöö kokkuvõtteks võib öelda, et tõlge on kultuurifenomen, mille defineerimiseks on vaja arvestada aega ja ruumi tema ümber, sama kehtib tõlkija positsiooni analüüsimisel. Tõlketeaduse seisukohast vaadatuna pakub tõlkeloolasele kvaliteedi küsimusest enam huvi tõlgete funktsioon ja tõlkijate roll kultuuris, aga ka see, millised on erinevate tõlgete tekkepõhjused. Töös kasutatud deskriptiivne lähenemisviis küll viitab suuremale objektiivsusele, kuid kirjeldatud faktide interpretatsiooni on kindlasti mõjutanud nii uurija eelnevad kogemused kui ka keeleline kompetents. Samas peab mainima, et puhas kirjeldus ilma järeltõlgimise tegemata ei sobiks kultuuri ega tõlkeloo mõtestamiseks. Kuigi artiklite fookus on küll kirjastamispoliitikal, küll ideoloogial, on projekti keskmes ikkagi tõlkija koos tema ümber oleva süsteemiga. Käesolev projekt läbib kronoloogiliselt 20. sajandi Eesti tõlkemaastikku, püüdes rajada pidepunkte tulevastele üldistavamatele uurimistöödele, ehk isegi tõlkeloole.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Name: Katiliina Gielen
Date of birth: 22.02.1973, Tartu
Citizenship: Estonian
E-mail: katiliina.gielen@ut.ee

Academic Affiliation:

University of Tartu, Institute of Germanic, Romance and Slavonic Languages and Literatures, Department of English

Career:

2012–... University of Tartu, Department of English, Programme Manager for MA Studies
2005–... University of Tartu, Institute of Germanic, Romance and Slavonic Languages, Department of English, Assistant Lecturer (0.50)
2000–2006 Tartu Art School, English teacher

Education:

1994–2000 University of Tartu, English language and literature (BA)
2006–2010 University of Tartu, Germanic and Romance Philology, PhD studies
2010–2013 University of Tartu, Germanic and Romance Philology, Translation studies, PhD studies

Additional Courses:

2008 International Seminar in Narratology, University of Tartu: Interdisciplinary Postgraduate Workshop Intermediality and Storytelling
2008 Nordic Research School in Interdisciplinary and Gender Studies (Linköping University) PhD course: “Academic Creative Writing in Gender Studies: How to write a scholarly article for a feminist journal?”
2008 Nordic Research School in Interdisciplinary and Gender Studies (Roskilde University) PhD course: “Postcolonial feminist theories and analytical approaches”
2007 Translation Research Summer School (TRSS), University College London (UCL)
2007 Nordic Research School in Interdisciplinary and Gender Studies (Roskilde University) “Feminist Cultural Studies: Theories and Methodologies”

Participation in grants and projects:

- 2010–2014 ETF8875 Gender question in Estonia: local situation and international influences.
- 2007–2013 SF0180040s07 World Literature in Estonian Culture. Estonian Literature in the World literature.
- 2010–2012 Translators (Re)shaping Culture Repertoire.
- 2008–2010 SSHRCC International Initiatives Fund – Literary Translation Project.

Selected publications:

- Gielen, K. 2012. Translators in Systems. Some Notes on the Factors Shaping Translations: The Case of Marta Sillaots and Young Estonia Publishing. *Interlitteraria*. 17, 259–266.
- Gielen, K. 2012. Marta Sillaotsa eksplitsiitne ja implitsiitne tõlkepoetika. *Methis. Studia Humaniora Estonica*. 9/10, 104–117.
- Gielen, K. 2011. *Forewords and Reviews: On Translators' Invisibility*. *Interlitteraria*. 2/16, 628–642.
- Gielen, K. 2011. Authors as Translators: Emerging Hierarchical Patterns of Literary Activity in Early Soviet Estonia. – Antoine Chalvin, Anne Lange, Daniele Monticelli (eds). *Between Cultures and Texts: Itineraries in Translation History. Entre les cultures et les textes: Itinéraires en histoire de la traduction*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften, 201–211.
- Gielen, K. 2009. Writing Alver, Writing Smith: Everyday in a Poet's Biography. *Interlitteraria*. 14, 174–181.

Research interests:

Descriptive translation studies, translation theory, comparative translation history, comparative literature, overlapping

ELULOOKIRJELDUS

Nimi: Katiliina Gielen
Sünniaeg: 22.02.1973, Tartu
Kodakondsus: Eesti
E-mail: katiliina.gielen@ut.ee

Hariduskäik:

1994–2000 Tartu Ülikool, Inglise keel ja kirjandus (BA)
2006–2010 Tartu Ülikool, Germaani-romaani filoloogia, doktoriõpingud
2010–2013 Tartu Ülikool, Germaani-romaani filoloogia, tõlketeadus, doktoriõpingud

Teenistuskäik:

2012–... Anglistika õppekava programmijuht
2005–... Tartu Ülikool, Germaani, romaani ja slaavi filoloogia instituut, Inglise keele ja kirjanduse osakond, inglise filoloogia assistent (0.50)
2000–2006 Tartu Kunstikool, inglise keele õpetaja

Erialane enesetäiendus:

2008 International Seminar in Narratology, University of Tartu: Interdisciplinary Postgraduate Workshop Intermediality and Storytelling
2008 Nordic Research School in Interdisciplinary and Gender Studies (Linköping University) PhD course: “Academic Creative Writing in Gender Studies: How to write a scholarly article for a feminist journal?”
2008 Nordic Research School in Interdisciplinary and Gender Studies (Roskilde University) PhD course: “Postcolonial feminist theories and analytical approaches”
2007 Translation Research Summer School (TRSS), University College London (UCL)
2007 Nordic Research School in Interdisciplinary and Gender Studies (Roskilde University) “Feminist Cultural Studies: Theories and Methodologies”

Grandid ja projektid:

2010–2014 ETF8875 Sooküsimus Eestis: kohalik olukord ja rahvusvahelised mõjud.
2007–2013 SF0180040s07 Maailmakirjandus Eesti kultuuris. Eesti kirjandus maailmakirjanduses.
2010–2012 Tõlkijad kultuurirepertuaari (ümber)kujundajatena.

Olulisemad publikatsioonid:

- Gielen, K. 2012. Translators in Systems. Some Notes on the Factors Shaping Translations: The Case of Marta Sillaots and Young Estonia Publishing. *Interlitteraria*. 17, 259–266.
- Gielen, K. 2012. Marta Sillaotsa eksplitsiitne ja implitsiitne tõlkepoetika. *Methis. Studia Humaniora Estonica*. 9/10, 104–117.
- Gielen, K. 2011. Forewords and Reviews: On Translators' Invisibility. *Interlitteraria*. 2/16, 628–642.
- Gielen, K. 2011. Authors as Translators: Emerging Hierarchical Patterns of Literary Activity in Early Soviet Estonia. – Antoine Chalvin, Anne Lange, Daniele Monticelli (eds). *Between Cultures and Texts: Itineraries in Translation History. Entre les cultures et les textes: Itinéraires en histoire de la traduction*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften, 201–211.
- Gielen, K. 2009. Writing Alver, Writing Smith: Everyday in a Poet's Biography. *Interlitteraria*. 14, 174–181.

Peamised uurimisvaldkonnad:

Tõlkelugu, tõlketeooria, deskriptiivne tõketeadus, võrdlev tõlke- ja kirjandusteadus, souuringud,

DISSERTATIONES PHILOLOGIAE ANGLICAE UNIVERSITATIS TARTUENSIS

1. **Kristina Mullamaa.** Towards a dynamic role conception of liaison interpreters: an ethnographic study of self-descriptions of practising liaison interpreters in Estonia. Tartu, 2006.
2. **Raili Põldsaar.** Critical Discourse Analysis of anti-feminist rhetoric as a catalyst in the emergence of the conservative universe of discourse in the united states in the 1970s–1980s. Tartu, 2006.
3. **Pilvi Rajamäe.** John Buchan's Heroes and the chivalric ideal: gentlemen born. Tartu, 2007.
4. **Lauri Pilter.** The Comic and the Tragicomic in the Works of William Faulkner. Tartu, 2009.
5. **Kärt Rummel.** Creating coherent texts in English as a Foreign Language: Theory and practice. Tartu, 2010.
6. **Pille Põiklik.** Space and positioning in media discourse: A critical discourse analysis of the representation of second amendment court cases in *The New York Times*. Tartu, 2013, 191 p.