

UNIVERSITY OF TARTU  
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH STUDIES

**TRANSLATING TAMMSAARE: PEARU MURAKAS' CHARACTER  
SPEECH IN *VARGAMÄE*, VOLUME I OF *TRUTH AND JUSTICE*  
BA thesis**

**KADRI KOITSAAR**  
SUPERVISOR: *Lect.* KATILIINA GIELEN (PhD)

TARTU  
2020

## ABSTRACT

Character speech is essential in representing the characters of a literary work and creating a plausible image of communication between said characters. For that reason, it is often characterized by features not inherent to written language, such as colloquial expressions, the use of slang or dialect or obscure sentence structures, creating a sense of orality. Attempting to replicate such effect in translation could prove to be a challenge due to specific cultural or semantic subtext and might result in the occurrence of a phenomenon called the deforming tendencies of translation. The aim of this bachelor's thesis is to analyse the potential deforming tendencies present in the translation of the character speech of Pearu Murakas in *Vargamäe*, volume I of *Truth and Justice* by A.H. Tammsaare.

The introduction provides an overview of the background of the novel, its author and translation, also including a brief overview of the methodology used and a description of the structure of the thesis. The first part of the thesis introduces the translators of the novel and their background. The second part of the thesis provides an overview of the literature regarding character speech and potential issues related to its translation. It also includes an overview of the primary theoretical source, the theory of deforming tendencies of translation by Antoine Berman. The third part focuses on the analysis of the character speech and its translation, having been divided into three subsections according to different points of focus.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	2
INTRODUCTION .....	4
1. Translators of <i>Vargamäe</i> , volume I of <i>Truth and Justice</i> .....	9
2. Character speech .....	11
2.1 Character speech in literary works .....	11
2.1 Character speech of Pearu in <i>Truth and Justice</i> , volume I.....	11
2.2 Potential issues with translating character speech.....	15
3. Pearu: comparative analysis of Estonian and English character speech.....	19
3.1 The methodology for the comparative analysis .....	19
3.2 Pearu in translation: dialect in the character speech .....	20
3.3 Phraseological units in the character speech of Pearu and their translation	21
3.3 Sentence structure in the character speech of Pearu and its translation .....	24
CONCLUSION .....	30
List of references .....	34
Appendix 1 .....	36
Appendix 2 .....	37
Appendix 3 .....	39

## INTRODUCTION

In this bachelor's thesis I will describe the character speech of Pearu Murakas and analyse its translation from Estonian into English. Pearu Murakas is the antagonist of *Vargamäe*, volume 1 of *Truth and Justice* (1926), the pentalogy by Anton Hansen Tammsaare. The objective of the paper is to employ the theory of deforming tendencies of translation proposed by Antoine Berman and to analyse whether such deforming tendencies have manifested themselves in the translation.

The primary sources for the analysis are the Estonian edition of *Truth and Justice*, volume I, published in 1964 and the English translation, titled *Vargamäe*, published in 2019. The excerpts of character speech have been taken from the first 200 pages of the source text and have been matched to their equivalents in the target translation. The excerpts are also limited to three other characters of the novel in addition to Pearu for the reason of those exchanges being extensive enough to enable comparative analysis.

Anton Hansen Tammsaare was born on January 30<sup>th</sup> 1878 in a Northern Estonian farm of Põhja-Tammsaare. His parents struggled with supporting his education and he was forced to interrupt his educational journey more than once to help out with farm work. (Sõgel et al 1969: 390) However, due to his strong interest in acquiring education, Tammsaare made his way from a simple farm worker into an educated young man who graduated from the Hugo Treffner Gymnasium (Siimisker, Palm 1978: 48) to start his studies in the faculty of law of the University of Tartu in 1907. There he could seize the opportunity to, in addition to law, listen to lectures on psychology, philosophy and history. During this period, he also familiarized himself with the world classics like Goethe, Schiller and Zola, which further pushed his world view towards realism. (Sõgel et al 1969: 390–399) This philosophical base was also shaped by World War I

and its aftermath in which Tammsaare began to sense more profoundly that deeper values like respect for honest work and sacrificing one's personal desires for the sake of a better society had begun to fade, only to be replaced by an endless chase for personal comfort. As he never abandoned the peasant work ethic in its best sense, this conflict of opposing worlds has also found representation in his works of literature. (Sõgel et al 1981: 289-294)

In 1926, he published his first major work of prose – the first volume of his pentalogy *Truth and Justice*, (*Tõde ja õigus, jagu I* in Estonian), which today is amongst the best-known literary works in the Estonian literary history. According to Mandri (2015: 135-136) the narrative of *Truth and Justice*, volume I received mixed reviews, the majority of the reviewers, including Johannes Aavik who was very critically inclined towards the book, agreed on the excellence of its language and composition. Marta Sillaots (1926: 1023) also found there to be a pleasant agreement between the subject matter and the form, and also commended a skilful use of dialect to elevate the characters instead of trivializing them. She expressly lauded the lengthy monologues of Pearu.

Raudsepp (1938: 3) has also found that Tammsaare prioritized descriptions of a person's inner life over lengthy situation accounts and made use of monologue or dialogue to give the characters of his works a distinctive personality. This feature, also known as character speech, differs from the narrative discourse of a work by aiming to representing the way people speak, converse and think in real life. (Fludernik 2009: 64-65) Vaino (2019) agrees that *Truth and Justice*, volume I is not a description of the life of peasants in the 19th century but above all a philosophical work, whereby Vargamäe could be seen as a metaphor for both Estonia and life in general. The dualistic struggle with our own nature and 'something higher', be it nature or God or a mean neighbour, is probably something many people recognize in the novel and also one of the reasons *Truth and Justice*, volume I has been elevated to a literary classic.

Since its publication in 1926, *Truth and Justice*, volume I has been translated into several languages, including Czech, Dutch, Finnish, French, German, Hungarian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Russian, Slovakian (ELC 2020). Tammsaare also made several attempts to get *Truth and Justice*, volume I translated into English. His first attempt was with Andres Prantspill, an Estonian journalist and literary man who had been living in New York since 1910, with whom he held correspondence on the matter but without much success. Following this setback, Tammsaare turned to Estonian translations and contacted Eugenie Mutt, who had also lived in the USA and given lectures and published articles on Estonia, with a request to take on the translation of *Truth and Justice*, volume I into English. (Treier 2000: 194-199) Unfortunately, this request was also met with refusal and the full English translation of *Truth and Justice*, volume I by Inna Feldbach and Alan Peter Trei was published in print not until 2019.

Translation is a challenging task that, according to Berman (2000: 284), aims to “reveal the foreign work’s most original kernel, its most deeply buried, most self-same, but equally the most “distant from itself”. In case of works of prose, the challenges are multifaceted – the translator must consider how to adapt the original text to the source language without completely detaching the result from the subtexts of the source language. In addition, every author has a style of their own, for example the Dostoevsky’s style has been quoted to be heavy and having a “bushy undergrowth” (Meschonnic, cited in Berman 2000: 288), thereat Tammsaare being no exception. As discussed above, Tammsaare aimed to make use of character speech to construct characters and build the discourse in his works. Amongst other things, character speech includes elements of orality that distinguish it from written language and could present challenges for a translator.

Considering the importance of character speech in *Truth and Justice*, volume I, I decided to choose this as a subject for my analysis. I chose the character of Pearu as one of the most

talkative characters in the novel whose speech is also characterized by high level of orality and distinctive use of dialect and phraseological units. The analysis of the character speech of Pearu is based on the theory of deforming tendencies of translation proposed by Antoine Berman, whereby out of the list of 12, items more relevant to character speech have been selected. Firstly, I have described the use of dialect and analysed its translation against the theory of potential deforming tendencies of translation. Secondly, I have repeated the same process with phraseological units. Thirdly, I have approached the character speech on the sentence level and analysed it with the same method.

The bachelor's thesis consists of three parts. The first part provides an overview of the background of the translators of *Vargamäe*, volume I of *Truth and Justice*. The background of the translators of a literary work is relevant to understand the potential motivations behind approaches adopted and the expectations of the translators towards the end result.

The second part has been divided into three subsections. The first subsection gives a brief theoretical overview of the concept of character speech, whereas in the second subsection the specifics of the character speech of Pearu are discussed. The third subsection includes a summary of potential issues regarding the translation of character speech. The primary theoretical source used in the second part is the theory of deforming tendencies of translation presented by Antoine Berman (2000) in his article "Translation and the trials of the foreign". This will also form the basis for the comparative analysis of the character speech in English and Estonian.

The third part includes the analysis of the character speech of Pearu and its translation and has been divided into four subsections. The first subsection discusses the methodology used for the analysis, whereas the remainder of the subsections include the analysis that has been categorized according to specific analysis topics. In the second subsection the analysis of dialect

in the character speech is discussed, firstly introducing the statistical data regarding the use of dialect in the character speech of Pearu followed by a discussion on what has happened in its translation. The third subsection begins with a description of phraseological units in general, followed by the description of those present in the character speech of Pearu. This is followed by an analysis of how these elements have been translated and whether any deforming tendencies have manifested as a result. The fourth subsection focuses on the analysis of the translation of character speech on the sentence level, discussing the potential effects of different deforming tendencies on the representation of character speech in translation.

## 1. Translators of *Vargamäe*, volume I of *Truth and Justice*

Inna Feldbach (1954), the translator, graduated from the University of Tartu with a degree in English philology in 1978. She has worked in the Academy of Science Library and as a translator in the Estonian Legal Language Centre. From 1998-2003, she lived in Massachusetts, USA and following her return to Estonia, continued her work as a translator (VEÜ 2020). Her translation experience includes the translation of several literary works (altogether 15 or more) from English and Spanish to Estonian. According to Feldbach (2020<sup>1</sup>), she has also tried her hand at translation into the English language, but on the condition that the final outcome be edited by a native speaker.

Her late husband and co-translator of *Vargamäe*, Alan Peter Trei (1932-2008), also had roots in Estonia, as his parents were Estonians who had moved to the USA in 1929. Trei acquired his bachelor's degree in geology in the University of Columbia. During his studies he edited the student newspaper and also wrote some stories for the publication. His master's degree in business management was acquired in Harvard University and followed by a career as a writer and editor for different advertising agencies. He has also written two plays that were produced by Swiss amateur theatres. He had a strong interest for theatre and a phenomenal memory in regards to poetry. Estonia was also represented on his book shelf, specifically in the form of an anthology titled *Estonian Anthology: Intimate Stories of Life, Love, Labor, and War of the Estonian People*, compiled, translated and published by Andres Prantspill, the same person Tammsaare approached in an attempt to get *Truth and Justice*, volume I translated into English in 1956. The anthology also included a chapter from the *Truth and Justice*, volume I. According to Feldbach (2020), she had already read the chapter translated by Prantspill before the initial

---

<sup>1</sup> The bulk of the information on the translators is based on my e-mail correspondence with Inna Feldbach. Other sources have been referred to accordingly.

idea to attempt a translation of *Truth and Justice* into English. At one point, Feldbach and Trei experimented with translating the same chapter without a recourse to the work of Prantspill. Feldbach (2020) has stated that while Trei could speak Estonian on a basic level, the works of Tammsaare were only accessible to him through the raw translation by Feldbach. For that reason, she provided the original translation and Trei worked on the editing. Feldbach (2020) mentions that she found the final version edited by Trei “to have a flow very much inherent to Tammsaare”<sup>2</sup> and much better than the translation attempt by Prantspill, being the incentive to move forward with the translation of the book.

The process of translation was multilevel and was done chapter-by-chapter. First, Feldbach produced an initial translation to be edited by Trei. After he had completed the editing process, they sat down to discuss the outcome on the basis of the original text and whether the translation had deviated too far from the original and required correction. According to Feldbach (2020), there was no specific personal vision of Tammsaare and his literary works they attempted to represent, but more of an attempt to follow his method of creation as closely as realistically possible.

---

<sup>2</sup> My translation

## 2. Character speech

### 2.1 Character speech in literary works

For the purpose of conveying oral communication in literary narrative, specific markers are used, which Hennoste (2004: 39) divides into three categories. Firstly, there are elements that are not used in writing. Such are, for example, pragmatic particles like *oh* and *well* (ODLT 2020) or *ahah*, *jah* (Hennoste 2004: 39) in Estonian; or exclamative particles that express emotional response. Secondly, there is a number of word forms that are primarily typical of oral language, for example non-traditional inflectional endings or truncated words such as *telly* (CALDT 2020a). Thirdly, not all units of oral language are full sentences inherent to written language. Sentences used to represent oral speech could end abruptly, have sudden leaps from one thought to another, the disorganization that often characterises oral communication.

For the purpose of bringing literary dialogues or character speech closer to real conversational speech, writers apply some select methods of their own choosing. Such methods are generally chosen on the basis of what the writer aims to achieve. The options are many – they might want to show that their characters are experiencing strong emotions or having difficulties with understanding their conversational partner. Another aspiration might be marking their character as a specific type of person, for example, an uneducated peasant whose speech often includes dialect, erroneous use of words or contorted word forms. (Hennoste 2004: 40-41)

### 2.1 Character speech of Pearu in *Truth and Justice*, volume I

The antagonist of the novel, the spiteful prankster Pearu Murakas, is also based on a real-life person called Jakob Sikenberg who was the neighbour to Peeter Hansen. Although

illiterate, Sikenberg was a witty man, as is demonstrated by the myriad of tricks he pulled on his neighbour, Hansen, causing the latter to seek help from the law more than once. (Mihkla 1938: 37-41) Unlike Andres, Pearu already owns a farm that his late father has worked up to a better state, always assuring that he worked hard so his children would not have to, which is why Pearu “figured his life ought to be easier than his father’s” (Tammsaare 2019: 137). According to Sõgel et al (1981: 310-311), Pearu has been deprived of the need to create something of his own and therefore is seeking for substitutions to fill his daily life, relying on the principle that “this world, and especially Vargamäe, would be so dull if there were no fighting or bragging” (Tammsaare 2019: 136). Pearu occasionally also shows the redeeming sides of his personality, where he can be kind and friendly (Sõgel et al 1981: 311). In many ways, Pearu takes the role of a comedian or a joker, bringing ridiculous situation comedy into otherwise serious situations and therefore giving them an absurd undertone. (Raudsepp 1938: 3)

In order to depict this contrast between the opposing neighbours, Tammsaare has paid great attention to character speech in general but especially to the one of Pearu. In regards to the presentation of the essence of Pearu through character speech, Raudsepp (1938: 12) has commented:

“The odd compatibility of these two aspects (spitefulness and camaraderie), in technical speech so called “interference of lines” within one person creates wonderful humorous effects; this humorous effect culminates over every new ruse that Pearu pulls as we know how it will work out eventually; and mostly it works out as not very dignified defeat, both in the sense of age and status, of the old man.” (Raudsepp 1938: 12)<sup>3</sup>

Indeed, Pearu starts off as a braggart and a trickster who tricks his neighbour into paying half for a ditch dug into Pearu’s land and starts off an unplanned feud as he was just trying to put his neighbour to test. As the feud escalates, his endearing side also shows, especially during his

---

<sup>3</sup> My translation

lengthy dialogues with Krõõt, the wife of Andres, and Andres when Pearu happens to be drunk. These stances alternate throughout the novel, creating a complex and contrasting image of the man. In regards to character speech, this specific ensemble of clashing aspects is conveyed in lengthy monologues and dialogues, by the misuse or deformation of words of written language, also biblical language (*hallelooja, nii et sai tõeks vana Saalomoni sõna: kes vana aeda lõhub, sellele hakkab uss kätte kinni*) (Tammsaare 1964: 168, 100), the use of comical nicknames (*lambasihver*) (Tammsaare 1964: 170) as well as dialect and folksy ways of speech (*vuatan ja vuatan*) (Tammsaare 1964: 100). (Raudsepp 1938: 18)

The most distinctive aspect of Pearu's speech for a contemporary reader are the dialectal markers. The most prominent phonological markers in Pearu's speech are the diphthongization of low and long vowels (respectively *aa>ua* in *vaatama > vuatama*, *ää>ea* in *väärt > veart* and *õõ>õe* in *võõras > võeras*), which, according to Mandri (2015: 138) appear for a total of 176 times in *Truth and Justice*, volume I, being in stark contrast with the language use of the other characters of the novel. For example, the diphthongization of low vowels is present only in the speech of Madis the cottager, where it occurs three times, whereby Madis and Pearu also use the most words (respectively 8 and 4) with a diphthongized long vowel. Mandri (2013: 24) suggests that this refers to intentional use of specific dialectal markers to portray specific characters.

Another dialectal marker of the character speech of Pearu is the lowering of *j* between low vowels, which is evident in the declension of the word *aed* as *aja* (correct declension *aed > aia*), also the vowel shift from *e* to *ä*, for example in *enam > änam*, which are both a common phenomenon in dialects, the latter being the most peculiar to the western part of the central Estonian dialect (Must, Univere 2002: 111). In brief, the statistical data collected by Mandri (2015: 138) has demonstrated that the difference between the frequency of the use of dialect in

character speech in *Truth and Justice*, volume I by Pearu and other characters is considerable. For example, the frequency of the occurrence of principal phonological dialectal markers in the character speech of Andres is 98, while in the character speech of Pearu it is a remarkable 218. This supports the theory that Tammsaare has applied different linguistic techniques, including dialect, to shape the characters of *Truth and Justice*, volume I through masterful use of character speech.

The character speech of Pearu is also abundant in colloquialisms, including a multitude of phraseological units. According to Lala (2018: 12), “phraseological units are word combinations, the meaning of which is defined according to the whole expression but not due to their components or language parts”. Phraseological units can be divided into figurative and nonfigurative, of which the former are known as idioms that convey a meaning not expressed by the sum of meanings of their component words. The nonfigurative phraseological units are multiword utterances with unpredictable features that are not free. (Mel 2012: 32) That means removing or replacing one of the words might produce a result with similar meaning but would be deemed as foreign for native speakers. Phraseological expressions also include proverbs, or in other words short sentences used to describe a situation, phenomenon, object or feature, and adages that are similar to proverbs but often have a philosophical or wise element to them. (EKI 2007) Phraseological units are also characterized by emotional expressiveness and brevity. Unless indicated otherwise, all phraseological units referred to have been researched using the Dictionary of Estonian Phraseology (FES).

Slepovich (2005, in Subbotina 2013: 1488) suggests two methods for translating non-figurative phraseological units, the first of them being on the basis of an existing target language collocation and the second with the help of equivalents. For example, *to take a nap* (Subbotina 2013: 1488) – *tukastama* and *to hit the target* (Subbotina 2013: 1488) – *märki tabama*. For the

translation of figurative phraseological units or idioms, three options are suggested, being respectively the use of absolute or relative equivalents or phraseological analogues. Respective examples here would be *a lion's share* (Kuzmin, 2006, in Subbotina 2013: 1489) – *lõviosa*, *whip-and-carrot policy* (Gurevich, Dozorets 2006, in Subbotina 2013: 1489) – *pütsa ja präänikut* and *beat about the bush* (Slepovich 2005, in Subbotina 2013: 1489) – *nagu kass ümber palava pudru*. The phraseological equivalents in the Estonian language have been provided based on my own knowledge on Estonian phraseological expressions. Although it is apparent that there are several strategies for handling idiomatic expressions or phraseological units in more general sense, Berman (2000: 295) has also referred to an associated risk of destroying the original imagery of the source language culture by replacing it with the one of the target language culture. This allows the analysis of different phraseological expressions present in the character speech of Pearu while keeping in mind the abovementioned aspects.

## **2.2 Potential issues with translating character speech**

Considering that character speech makes use of language features not inherent to written language and often aims towards orality, different problems might present themselves for the translator. One of such problems being the translation of dialect defined as “a form of a language that people speak in a particular part of a country, containing some different words and grammar, etc.” (CALDT 2020). In *Truth and Justice*, volume I, Tammsaare has used dialectal expressions to construct the character speech of Pearu which will be discussed in more detail in a further section of the paper. At that, Horton (1998: 417) discusses the problems with translating non-standard language and finds that when it comes to translating dialect, no two dialects can carry the same set of social, ethnological, cultural-stereotypical associations. This leaves the translator

with a range of options from the neutralization of dialectal forms into standard modes to converting them into a broadly ‘comparable’ target-language dialectal form. (Horton 1998: 417-418) The first option carries the risk of losing the multidimensionality of the text, flattening the nuances the writer has added to characters with their character speech, while the other might end up with a brusque misrepresentation of the context.

However, it is not only the use of dialectal forms that could present difficulties. For example, Berman (2000: 287) finds that a masterwork of prose is often characterized by lack of control that may be achieved by proliferation, the swelling of the text or multiplicity and rhythmic flow and the richness of the writing is owed to its polylingualism. This same polylingualism also poses a threat that any attempts to translate a work of prose might result in failure to respect the “shapeless polylogic and avoid an arbitrary homogenization” (Berman 2000: 287). Such polylingualism could also be seen in the character speech of a literary work of prose, including *Truth and Justice*, volume I. Translating the abovementioned *lack of control* or *polylingualism* could result in the occurrence of deforming tendencies in translation that Berman (2000: 288) presents as a list of twelve items. Considering the specific properties of character speech in *Truth and Justice*, volume I, such as the pursuit of orality, application of dialect and other non-standard language elements and being used as a tool to create a character image, the deforming tendencies concerning similar items should be elaborated on in more detail. Such tendencies, which are defined below, are:

- 1) rationalization
- 2) clarification
- 3) expansion
- 4) ennoblement and popularization
- 5) qualitative impoverishment
- 6) the destruction of rhythms
- 7) the destruction of expressions and idioms
- 8) the effacement of the superimposition of languages (2000: 288)

*Rationalization* is mainly concerned with the “most meaningful and changeable element in a prose text: punctuation” (Berman 2000: 288). Many writers have their distinctive style they apply when constructing sentences, for example, Dostoevsky is characterized to have a “bushy undergrowth” (Meschonnic 1973, in Berman 2000: 288) to his sentences. Within the same category falls *clarification*, “concerns the level of “clarity” perceptible in words and their meanings” (Berman 2000: 289). In addition to traditional meanings attributed to words, words placed in a specific context often convey a hidden message or meaning.

Another deforming tendency, *expansion*, is in part consequence of rationalization and clarification that aim to unveil the hidden or allusive elements of the original. While this might result in a text that is clearer, there is also the threat of expanding the text to an extent that it disrupts the rhythm carefully constructed by the author. A deforming tendency also connected to the abovementioned is *ennoblement*, which Berman also refers to as “rhetorization” (Berman 2000: 290). The aim of rhetorization is to produce “elegant” sentences, while utilizing the source text, so to speak, as *raw material*” (Berman 2000: 290) but it also poses the threat of erasing its originality by recovering the rhetorical elements giving the prose a “certain “orality”” (Berman 2000: 291).

Next title, *qualitative impoverishment*, refers to a method where terms, expressions and figures in the source text are swapped with terms, expressions and figures that “lack their sonorous richness, or correspondingly, their signifying or “iconic” richness” (Berman 2000: 291). Another deforming tendency closely related to the richness of literary texts is *the destruction of expressions and idioms*, which are often found in prose and often convey a meaning or experience that has a parallel in other languages. A good example would be *the apple doesn't fall far from the tree* (CALDT 2020b) with an equivalent of *käbi ei kuku kannust kaugele* (FES 2011) in Estonian. Yet, Berman (2000: 295) argues, while the meaning could be

identical, consistent replacement of idioms with their equivalents in the target language creates a completely new network of images leaving nothing of the original. The loss or domestication of language-specific elements could also lead to the effacement of the *superimposition of languages* that Berman (2000: 295) describes as a phenomenon involving the relation and tension between dialect and a common language. Such tension could be an excellent tool to represent characters of different social or educational status but maintaining it could be challenging, especially if dialectal forms have been used.

All abovementioned deforming tendencies combined could result in *the destruction of rhythms* that is present in all literary works from poetry to prose. According to Berman, the rhythm of a work of prose is more difficult to destroy than the one of poetry for the reason of a novel having a greater momentum more difficult to interrupt. Regardless, the rhythm might be considerably impaired by an arbitrary revision of the punctuation, reorganization of sentences or other abrupt changes to the structure of the original. (Berman 2000: 292)

### **3. Pearu: comparative analysis of Estonian and English character speech**

#### **3.1 The methodology for the comparative analysis**

The comparative analysis is based on text excerpts collected from the first 200 pages of the source text, *Vargamäe*, that is the translation of *Truth and Justice*, volume I by A.H. Tammsaare. The dialogue excerpts have been included in Appendices 1-3 (pg.35-52) to provide the context. The main sources for the theoretical base of the analysis are the theory of deforming tendencies of translation proposed by Antoine Berman that has been explained in more detail beforehand and the bachelor's thesis of Maria Mandri (2013) discussing the dialect in the speech of characters in A.H. Tammsaare's *Truth and Justice*, volume I. An article by Maria Mandri discussing the same topic has also been used for statistical data.

The elements to be analyzed have been chosen on the basis of accumulated background information regarding the methods that A.H. Tammsaare used to elevate the character speech of Pearu to a significant level of orality. Such methods are the use of dialect, archaic expressions, colloquial language, variation of different speech patterns with the purpose of conveying emotionality and also social and educational background. After consideration of the aforementioned factors, I have decided to focus on the elements most distinct in the character speech of Pearu, those being the use of dialect and phraseological units, and also to compare the translation of sentences as a whole. The focus is also on how the translation conveys the orality present in the source text and what possible deforming tendencies of translation affect the rhythm and other aspects of the source text.

### 3.2 Pearu in translation: dialect in the character speech

Dialect is one of the distinguishing markers in the character speech of Pearu that was further explained above. In the example below, that can also be found with further examples in Appendix 1 (pg.36), it can be seen that the words with dialectal markers have been replaced with neutral language:

„Tere **kua**, kallis **nuabrimees!**» hüüdis Pearu Andresele. «Sina ei tule ega tule mind **vuatama**, mina tulin siis sind. Kuda sa elad ja oled **kua**? **Põle** sind millalgi näind. Kõrtsis sa **änam** ei käi, **surnuajale põle** minul asja, seal **suaks** sinuga kokku. Ootasid, et kutsud mu **kua** Jussi maha viima, aga ei ühti, laulsid ja lugesid ilma oma **nuabrimeheta**.“ (Tammsaare 1964: 194)

“Hello Ø, **neighbor!**” Pearu called out to Andres. “You never come **to see me** anymore, so I came to see you. How’ve **you been?** **Haven’t seen** you in ages. You don’t come by the tavern Ø and **I have no** business at the **graveyard**. I thought you might invite me Ø to help bury Juss, but you went ahead, singing and praying without your **neighbor**.” (Tammsaare 2019: 196)

The symbol Ø represent the absence of a word present in the original. Feldbach (2020) has also confirmed that during the translation process a decision was made to not attempt to convey the dialectal forms in the target language text. The resulting neutralization of dialect manifests as a phenomenon Berman (2000: 295) refers to as the effacement of the superimposition of languages where the tension between dialect and a common language, a koine, is destroyed, thus flattening the text. As the abundance of dialectal forms in the character speech of Pearu distinguishes his character from others in *Truth and Justice*, volume I, a tension between his peculiar way of speaking, the character speech of other characters and the narrative text is created and effectively abolished by the neutralization of dialect.

While the deforming tendency is present, it should also be considered that according to Horton (1998: 417-418), no two dialects can carry the same associations on social, ethnological and cultural-stereotypical level, leaving it to the translator to decide whether to neutralize the dialectal forms into standard language or to replace them with non-standard language that is broadly comparable with the source language text. While in the translation comparison, the

neutralization of dialect can be seen, the orality is not completely lost, being conveyed by other means, such as contractions, exclamations, etc. Berman (2000: 294) has also argued that an attempt to translate a dialect could result in domestication where the dialect of the source text is communicated through a local set of signifiers that remotely have the same meaning but create an image that is inherent to the target not the source language. It should also be kept in mind that, according to Mandri (2013: 33), the dialectal forms in the character speech of Pearu have their roots in different regions of Estonia, which presents another challenge if the translator would seek to use the equivalence method.

### **3.3 Phraseological units in the character speech of Pearu and their translation**

As a result of the analysis of dialogue excerpts specified in Appendix 2 (pg.37), I found that behavioristic expressions have been translated into their target language equivalents without distorting the original imagery. To clarify, behavioristic is a speech act by which an attitude is adopted, for example an expression in the form of *go to X*, where the X stands for a location with a religious, supernatural or somehow negative connotation. (Babič, Voolaid 2019: 198) Examples of such speech acts in the original character speech of Pearu are *mine, kus kurat; kasi, kus kurat* (Tammsaare 1964: 99, 150; 2019: 101, 153) that have been respectively translated into *go to hell* and then *you can go to hell*, being expressed even in the same structure of *mine X (kohta)* or *go to X*. In current case, the imagery of the source language has been conveyed effectively and no deforming tendencies are present.

In addition to the abovementioned, other expletives exist in the character speech of Pearu. Such are, for example, *saadana silmamunad* (Tammsaare 1964: 128) and *ligundid* (Tammsaare 1964: 194) that have been respectively translated as *you piece of crap* (Tammsaare

2019: 130) and *assholes* (Tammsaare 2019: 196), relieving the expressions of their comical effect. Regardless, the attitude expressed is present. LDOCE (2020) defines to be a *piece of crap* as “used to show that you do not respect someone or something they say”. Similar could be said about translating *ligundid* into *assholes*, as when put into context, the utterance is used to cuss the spiritual men (the parish clerk and the minister) of the region towards whom Pearu has no respect. LDOCE (2020) defines the term *asshole* to be “used to show that you do not respect someone or something they say”. Although general equivalents have been used, the effect of a deforming tendency described by Berman (2000: 291) as qualitative impoverishment could be perceived. This occurs when the terms or expressions in the source text are replaced with those of lesser richness in sonance or iconicity in the target translation, thus resulting in a flatter text. As these expressions are also phraseological units, the destruction of expressions and idioms is also present. A similar effect could be seen in the translation comparison of other phraseological units that have no easy equivalent in the target language. Below are listed such idiomatic expressions and their respective translations:

<i>ega temagi suu seinapragu ole</i> <i>siis on sinul kruavist rohkem parist kui minul</i> <i>minu kõrvu puutus</i> <b><i>paha peale pääsünd</i></b> <i>kaevasime temaga kahasse kruavi</i> <i>püksid tuliseks teha</i> <b><i>kaelakünnapuid mudin</i></b> <b><i>ära lõppend</i></b> <b><i>põle /../ änam ossi ega tussi</i></b> (Tammsaare 1964: 27, 39, 80, 101, 149, 194)	she gets as dry as anybody you'll get more use out of the ditch than I that's what I heard <b>gotten out to make trouble</b> we dug a ditch together to make his butt burn <b>stretch that neck of yours</b> <b>you're barely with us</b> <b>neither tits nor ass</b> (Tammsaare 2019: 24, 39, 87, 105, 153, 196)
---	--

Expressions marked in bold have been translated by using their relative equivalents, whereas the translation of the remainder of the idiomatic expressions conveys the meaning without attempting to find an equivalent. The relative equivalents convey the idiomatic imagery of the source text and, on occasion, also the comical allusion intended by the author (because it is

suggested that Tammsaare intended Pearu to be a trickster, sometimes mean and sometimes gentle). An example of this would be the original *põle /.. / änam ossi ega tussi* (Tammsaare 1964: 194) that has been translated as *neither tits nor ass* (Tammsaare 2019: 196). Whereas an expression as such could be deemed offensive, the context in which it is uttered (drunk Pearu has come to seek reconciliation with his neighbour and his new wife, Mari) gives it a comic quality and this is also communicated by the translation. As one of the qualities of phraseological units was their expressiveness, it could also be viewed whether the more straightforward translation manages to carry the same emotion as the source text. The translation of *püksid tuliseks teha* (Tammsaare 1964: 101) as *to make his butt burn* (Tammsaare 2019: 105) does convey a hint of comedy whereas *ega temagi suu seinapragu ole* (Tammsaare 1964: 27) is a relatively rich-sounding idiomatic expression in Estonian but *she gets as dry as anybody* (Tammsaare 2019: 25) sounds alien. Further research of the expression used in translation revealed it not to be very common in the target language either.

Although the source text also includes expletive expressions in the popular form of *go to X*, used to express anger and gain relief, that have been conveyed effectively in translation, the analysis of the translation of phraseological units reveals the effect of some deforming tendencies. Such are qualitative impoverishment and the destruction of expressions and idioms that in turn have a flattening effect. Additionally, the focus of the analysis is the use of such expressions in character speech in order to construct a character with specific traits that in case of Pearu, result in a man of conflicting character who can be both menacing and comical. The analysis demonstrates that a selection of phraseological units in the source text has been translated by using relative equivalents that convey the comic effect. The translation of some phraseological units conveys their literal meaning while compromising on the rich sounds of the original. Although the flattening effect of some deforming tendencies mentioned above is

present, the character of Pearu occasionally still shines through in translation and the selection of phraseological expressions has not significantly deformed the rhythmic pattern that conveys the orality of character speech.

### 3.3 Sentence structure in the character speech of Pearu and its translation

According to the analysis of dialogue excerpts specified in Appendix 3 (pg.39-53), various deforming tendencies occur on the sentence level in the translation of the character speech of Pearu and will be further discussed below.

The prominent deforming tendencies that can be observed in the translation are ennoblement, clarification and expansion, respectively signifying the rewriting of sentences in a more elegant or rhetorical manner with an aim to make the text more fluent, adding clarifications to specify context or hidden meanings and the resulting expansion of text volume. One example would be the translation of *olin Ø enne sind, jään Ø pärast sind kua* (Tammsaare 1964: 26) where the adverb of place *seal*, or *there* in English, that has been marked with the symbol Ø has been omitted, whereas in translation *I was **there** before you came and I'll be **there** when you're gone* (Tammsaare 2019: 25) the adverb is present. A similar effect is present where the sentence *siht lõikaks kruavi pikuti pooleks, pool Ø minu, pool Ø sinu* (Tammsaare 1964: 38) lacks the compound verb *oleks*, or *would be* in English, to express intention and also implies that the ditch would be split into two halves, one for each neighbour. One of the effects of such elliptical sentences is to create a sense of orality, as if the two neighbours were really conversing. The translation as *the property line **would** follow the ditch along the bottom, half **would** be mine and half yours* (Tammsaare 2019: 39) has leaned towards a different direction, explaining in more detail how the property line would split the land between the neighbours, as such clarifying

the reference of the source text. The addition of the compound verb *would be* also has an expanding effect. Clarification and resulting expansion is also present in the translation of *ja mina maksan poole, sina poole* (Tammsaare 1964: 38) as *and you **would** pay half **the** cost and I the other half* (Tammsaare 2019: 39), where it is explicitly stated that the cost of the ditch is what the neighbours will split while the source text implies it within the context.

Further discussing the orality of character speech, the disruptive effect of ennoblement and rationalization could be seen also in the translation of *sinul on rohkem vett, las minul olla rohkem kruavi, sellepärast seisku ta muidu niisama minu mua sees, et aga oleks üsna minu krundil* (Tammsaare 1964: 41). While a complex by structure, the cumulation of multiple ideas into one sentence without clear transition also gives it a sense of orality. The translation of the text, respectively *you've got more water, so I should have more ditch. That's all there is to it. Just let it all be on my land* (Tammsaare 2019: 41), reads much clearer as it has been divided into several individual sentences. Following this pattern, it would be expected that for the sake of consistency the same approach has been used with the next sentence, also complex and winding, but the structure of *mätta tahan sellepärast ühele poole, et mina pean oma muad sinu vee eest kaitsma, mitte sina oma muad minu vee eest* (Tammsaare 1964: 41) has been left unchanged in its translation as *I want the dirt on my side, because I've got to shield my land from your water, but you don't have to shield your land from mine* (Tammsaare 2019: 41). It could be explained with the first sentence being more obscure and potentially difficult to read. Regardless, considering the patterns noted beforehand, such as the occasional lack of verbs, adverbs or other elements and also the uninterrupted cumulation of thoughts within one sentence, the restructuring of the first sentence results in the eradication of that effect.

In extended sentences that are usually incident to moments of deep emotion for Pearu, rationalization could also be observed. A good example would be a passage from the monologue

of Pearu who has come to seek reconciliation with Andres after the burial of his farmhand, Juss, and turns to address Mari, the widow of the late Juss –

Alati on sul nii rõõmus nägu ja aeva laulujaal suus, kuula ja imesta. Aga nüüd oled ära lõppend, põle sul änam ossi ega tussi. Kõik Jussi pärast. Veart mees oli see va sauna–Juss, ei mina teda laida. (Tammsaare 1964: 194)

You used to be a wonder—always a smile on your face and a song on your lips—but now...now you're barely with us, neither tits nor ass —and all because of Juss. He was a worthy fellow. Yes, Juss the cottager—there was nothing wrong with him. (Tammsaare, 2019: 196)

Contrariwise to the recurring tendency towards complex sentences, the character speech of Pearu is surprisingly articulated, whereas in the translation the punctuation has been revised to create a much longer complex sentence. Considering the emotional context this might be an attempt to convey the said emotionality and in current the rationalization does not have a deforming effect as it results in a sentence structure that conveys orality quite well. Another passage from the same monologue reveals an opposite approach where a rambling long sentence has been split into two.

Aga kui mu kõrva puutus, et Andres, see kallis nuaber – kange vanamees on ta, hästi kange – Jussi haulal on lugend ja laulnd – Hundipalu Tiit kiitis –, siis nutsin ma suure jaalega Hundipalu Tiidu kaelas ja ütlesin temale, et oh miks ei kutsutud mind Jussi hauale lugema ja laulma. (Tammsaare 1964: 195)

When I heard that my tough neighbor read from the good book and sang at Juss's grave—Hundipalu Tiit praised his reading and his singing—it **made me cry out loud. I threw my arms around Tiit's neck** and asked him why I wasn't invited to read and sing at Juss's grave. (Tammsaare 2019: 197)

In this approach ennoblement and clarification is also present in the translation where the transition between the two sentences occurs – *siis nutsin ma suure jaalega Hundipalu Tiidu kaelas ja ütlesin temale* has been split into *it made me cry out loud* and *I threw my arms around Tiit's neck*. In current example, the translation does not have a deforming effect as the revisions do not significantly disrupt the rhythm. At the same, the translation of a sentence selected from the same dialogue portion implies ennoblement, as the as the conditional *kui su lehmad oskavad Ø, eks siis las sõidavad* (Tammsaare 1964: 122) has been elaborated as *if your cows know how*

*to do that, let them try* (Tammsaare 2019: 128). In backtranslation the result would be *kui su lehmad oskavad seda teha, eks siis las proovivad*, thus resulting in sentences that are longer, more explanatory and also have lost a percentage of their original orality expressed in colloquial sentence structures.

Another interesting phenomenon to note in the character of Pearu, and the dialogues in *Truth and Justice*, volume I in general, is the use of repetitions and rephrasing as a stylistic element. For example, a dialogue between Andres and Pearu discussing the digging of the ditch begins with a paraphrastic *mina võin ka üksi kaevata, kui vett tahan lasta, vee jooksmata panna* (Tammsaare 1964: 38) where the act of draining the water is paraphrased in another clause. This creates an image as if Pearu is taling off or thinking out loud while discussing their future plans. In the translation *I could dig it alone if I wanted to let the water drain* (Tammsaare 2019: 38) the repetition has been abandoned. While the repetitive element adds nothing semantically, it harmonizes with the remainder of the dialogue between two neighbours, where the repetitive *pool minu, pool sinu* and *mina maksan poole, sina poole* (Tammsaare 1964: 38) is used. These phrases are respectively translated as *half would be mine and half yours* and *you would pay half the cost and I the other half* (Tammsaare 2019: 39) and show signs of ennoblement and expansion, therefore no more working as devices for conveying orality. Repetitive patterns can also be seen in the use of *või mees, või kolmas jääb* (Tammsaare 1964: 26) during the first meeting of the neighbours where Pearu uses the adverb *või* in the beginning of two consecutive sentences in his speech to express his superiority. What stands out in the source text is the use of the repetitive phrase *kahju teind* (Tammsaare 1964: 98) in two separate sentences that links them two Pearu. The context in which this specific pattern occurs is also a standard example of the character speech of Pearu where several clauses are conjoined into one winding sentence. The original *näh, tahtsin sulle endale näidata, mis kahju nad teind, et kui minu loomad vahel*

*juhtuvad, siis tead* (Tammsaare 1964: 98) has been translated into a more structured *I just wanted you to see what they did. That way, if mine happen to do something, you'd know* (Tammsaare 2019: 101). The rewriting of this type of sentence as a more fluent passage of two sentences definitely makes it easier to read but also once again loses the chaotic element that is recurrent in the original. Also, the repetitive *kahju teind* has been left out, whereas in the following translation of *tahan sulle ainult näidata, mis su hobused kahju teind* as *I just want you to see what damage they did* the mention of damage has been included. This could be argued to be an indication of the destruction of linguistic patterns that Tammsaare has observed in constructing the character of Pearu. The use of linking repetition *aga mis see minusse puutub* can also be observed in the sentences *aga mis see minusse puutub, kui mina tahan oma heinamuad kasta* and *aga mis siis see minusse puutub, et sinu karjamua vett täis* (Tammsaare 1964: 122). Similar to the effect discussed, the repetition creates a conversational flow within the dialogue between the two neighbours, such as one would perceive in an oral back-and-forth argument. The pattern has not been followed in full in the translation where the respective segments have been translated as *it's not my problem; I just want to flood my meadows* and *what've I got to do with your flooded pastures* (Tammsaare 2019: 128-129). While the effect of the destruction of linguistic patterns could be argued to be present in the sense that the repetitive clauses linking the character speech of Pearu in different parts of the dialogue have been removed, it does not remarkably affect the rhythm of the specific dialogue segment. In addition to the abovementioned, the most prominent example of the use of repetitions (in the form of alliteration) in the character speech of Pearu is during his conversation, or monologue, with Krõõt, the wife of Andres towards whom Pearu has had an attachment since their first encounter by the rye field. In these discourses, the repetition is even melodic. For example, also found in Appendix 3 (pg.50) –

„**Vuatan ja vuatan**,“ rääkis Pearu, „ratas käib, nii et pulki ei näegi. Ja ikka ühe jalaga, ühe jalaga ... **Minu eit sõtkub Ø kahe jalaga**, vokk teeb ikka **sorr, sorr, sorr**, sinu vokk aga aina **vurr, vurr, vurr**.“ (Tammsaare 1964: 101)

“**I just keep watching**,” said Pearu. “The wheel turns so fast that you can’t see the spokes—and all with just one foot. **My old woman pushes the treadle with both feet** and her wheel goes **buzz, buzz, buzz**, while yours goes **whirr, whirr, whirr**.” (Tammsaare 2019: 104)

The comparison of the two excerpts shows that the repetitive pattern has occasionally been lost, for example in the translation of *vuatan ja vuatan* as *I just keep watching* and *ja ikka ühe jalaga, ühe jalaga ...* as *and all with just one foot*. In current example, the alliterative pattern has been conveyed in the translation although clarification has been used in translating *minu eit sõtkub Ø kahe jalaga* as *my old woman pushes the treadle with both feet*. The symbol Ø marks the absence of object in the source text whereas it has been added in the translation for the sake of clarity.

The analysis of sentences and rhythmic patterns present in the text indicates the occasional influence of deforming tendencies of translation, such as the destruction of rhythms. The main causes behind such effects are the rationalization and ennoblement that is, respectively, the revision of punctuation and rewriting of sentences with an aim to produce more fluent passages. While fluency can be an important factor in the positive reception of a literary work, the specific characteristics of character speech should once again be considered. One of such characteristics being orality and oral speech is not always characterized by fluency or logical succession or proper use of language. This is demonstrated by the manner how Pearu ones speaks in short elliptical sentences only to switch to long winding exchanges some pages later. Although in occasions sentence structures more comparable to oral speech have been adhered to, there are also occasions where different deforming tendencies, such as rationalization, ennoblement and clarification, have disrupted the oral rhythm of the character speech conveyed in the original.

## CONCLUSION

Current bachelor's thesis provides an overview of the representation of the character speech of Pearu Murakas in the novel *Truth and Justice*, volume I by A.H. Tammsaare and its translation, *Vargamäe*. The concept of character speech has been discussed from the perspective of what constitutes a character speech, how it has been presented by Tammsaare and how the translators of *Vargamäe* have approached and managed challenges connected to translating character speech. The translation has been analysed on the basis of the theory of deforming tendencies of translation by Antoine Berman (2000) and the analysis of Maria Mandri (2013) of the use of dialect in the character speech of *Truth and Justice*, volume I.

Translating literary works is a demanding task that requires careful consideration of many factors, such as choice of language, cultural allusions present in the source text and many other aspects. An important phenomenon present in most works of prose is character speech, that is the monologues and dialogues of the characters. The typical features of character speech are the pursuit for orality which can manifest in many ways, such as the use of non-standard language, colloquial forms of speech and sentence structures not inherent to written language. Such structures were also found to be present in the character speech of Pearu Murakas and were used to convey different aspects of his personality and to occasionally create a comical effect.

Translating character speech presents challenges that could be dealt with different methods in order to convey the literal and allusive meanings hidden within the original text, for example, the translator might decide to domesticate anything foreign or attempt to convey it by the means of exoticization. Phraseological expressions often have equivalents in other languages that could be employed and those that do not have a direct equivalent could be matched with an expression with a similar meaning. A dialect could be rendered into more general colloquial

language to produce orality or matched with a dialect of equal context in the target language. Meanwhile, with every translation strategy comes the risk of erasing the unique nature of the source text, for example, by neutralizing the elements that make it unique or replacing them with images inherent to the target audience culture. A theory of the deforming tendencies of translation proposed by Berman also considers such risks and their potential consequences.

The deforming tendencies of translation can be closely linked to the elements that are inherent to character speech – the use of non-standard language, phraseological units and other eloquent expressions and the rhythm of the text. Other deforming tendencies that are often incident to the translation of literary works are rationalization, clarification, expansion and ennoblement that all aim towards creating a fluent and more homogenous text with the risk of once again erasing the uniqueness of the original. Adding or removing elements from the original or restructuring its sentences might also cause the destruction of the general rhythm of the literary work, although in regards to work of prose this is more difficult due to the volume of the work.

The analysis of the source text and its translation revealed the presence of abovementioned deforming tendencies on various levels and occasions. On the most extensive level, that is the translation of sentences as a whole, the predominant deforming tendencies were ennoblement, expansion, rationalization and destruction of rhythms, resulting in loss of orality. On many occasions, sentences were restructured in a manner where one complex sentence became several shorter ones, disrupting the flow of speech that conveyed a sense of orality and was often used in the original to represent moments of high emotion. In regards to elliptical sentences, clarification and expansion could be noted in the form of omitted words or clarifications having been added, resulting in longer sentences that once again disrupted the rhythm of the character speech the original attempted to reproduce.

On the level of individual elements, such as phraseological units, linguistically rich expressions or dialectal forms, the deforming tendencies were also present. In the source text, the dialectal forms were heavily present in the character speech of Pearu, significantly distinguishing it from the one of other characters of the novel. As one of the strategies for translating the novel, the translators had decided to neutralize the dialect. This brought about the effacement of superimposition of languages where tension between two different aspects of the same language, such as dialect and common language, is destroyed. At the same time, translating the dialectal forms present in the character speech of Pearu would have proven very difficult as Tammsaare used dialectal forms of different regions across Estonia. The neutralization of dialect has been compensated with other methods, such as the use of emotive particles, exclamations and contracted forms.

In regards to translating phraseological units present in the character speech of Pearu, the predominant deforming tendencies were qualitative impoverishment and the destruction of expressions and idioms. Such tendencies are respectively the result of replacing a source language expression of rich imagery with one in the target language that lacks the richness and the loss of idiomatic expressions due to them not having satisfactory equivalents in the target language. Nevertheless, the majority of idiomatic or phraseological expressions proved to be translated by using equivalent or similar units that conveyed the comical effect and a sense of orality presented in the original. The translation of some phraseological expressions proved to be easier than the others for their specific form of representation being very common across languages, such as the use of expletives in the form of *go to X* in both languages.

The deforming tendencies of translation could be observed throughout the thesis on a different scale, being most perceptible in the analysis of the translation of full sentences of the character speech. Although on many occasions the effect of such tendencies was not disruptive

to the overall structure of character speech and the intended orality, comical element and emotionality was still conveyed in translation. Where the deforming tendencies did have a negative effect, it resulted in loss of orality and destruction of rhythms.

## List of references

### Primary sources

- Tammsaare, Anton Hansen. 1964. *Tõde ja õigus. I jagu*. [Truth and Justice. Volume 1]. Tallinn: Eesti Riiklik Kirjastus.
- Tammsaare, Anton Hansen. 2019. *Vargamäe*. Feldbach, Inna and Alan Peter Trei (Tsnsl.) Glasgow: Vagabond Voices.

### Secondary sources

- Babič, Saša, Piret Vooglaid. 2019. Sõimuväljendid: saatmine olematusse [Swearing: Dissolution into nothingness]. Available at [https://doi.org/10.7592/MT2019.74.babic\\_vooglaid](https://doi.org/10.7592/MT2019.74.babic_vooglaid), accessed May 8, 2020.
- Berman, Antoine. 2004. Translation and the Trials of the Foreign. In Lawrence Venuti (ed). *The translation Studies Reader*, 284–297. Routledge. Available at [https://translationjournal.net/images/e-Books/PDF\\_Files/The%20Translation%20Studies%20Reader.pdf](https://translationjournal.net/images/e-Books/PDF_Files/The%20Translation%20Studies%20Reader.pdf), accessed April 21, 2020.
- CALDT = Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary and Thesaurus. 2020. Dialect. Available at <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/dialect>, accessed April 28, 2020.
- Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary and Thesaurus. 2020a. Telly. Available at <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/telly>, accessed April 21, 2020.
- Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary and Thesaurus. 2020b. The apple doesn't fall far from the tree. Available at <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/apple-doesn-t-fall-far-from-the-tree>, accessed April 28, 2020.
- EKI = *Eesti keele käsiraamat*. 2007. Leksikoloogia. Available at <http://www.eki.ee/books/ekk09/index.php?id=544&p=6&p1=5>, accessed April 29, 2020.
- ELC = Estonian Literature Centre. 2020. A. H. Tammsaare. Translations. Available at <http://www.estlit.ee/elis/?cmd=writer&id=39986&grp=x2>, accessed April 27, 2020.
- FES = *Eesti fraseologismide elektrooniline alussõnastik* [The Electronic Dictionary of Estonian Phraseology]. 2011. Käbi ei kuku kannust kaugele. Available at <http://www.folklore.ee/justkui/sonastik/index.php?f=4&f1=2&m=27123&id=27149>, accessed April 28, 2020.
- Fludernik, Monika. 2009. *An Introduction to Narratology*. Routledge. Available at [https://www.academia.edu/24608900/An\\_Introduction\\_to\\_Narratology](https://www.academia.edu/24608900/An_Introduction_to_Narratology), accessed April 21, 2020.
- Hennoste, Tiit. 2004. Köneldud näidend ja suuline keel [A spoken play and oral speech]. *Teater. Muusika. Kino.*, 5, 39-44. Available at <https://www.digar.ee/arhiiv/nlib-digar:136562>, accessed April 21, 2020.
- Horton, David. 2003. Non-standard Language in Translation: Roddy goes to Germany. *German Life and Letters*, 51:3, 415-430. Available at <https://doi-org.ezproxy.utlib.ut.ee/10.1111/1468-0483.00107>, accessed April 21, 2020.
- Lala, Masimova. 2018. Concept of phraseological units. Functional, structural and semantic classification of phraseological units. *World Science*, 6(34):8, 11-14. Available at [https://doi.org/10.31435/rsglobal\\_ws/12062018/5885](https://doi.org/10.31435/rsglobal_ws/12062018/5885), accessed April 29, 2020.

- Leppihalme, Ritva. 2000. The Two Faces of Standardization. *The Translator*. 6:2, 248-269. Available at <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13556509.2000.10799068>, accessed April 28, 2020.
- LDOCE = Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. 2020a. Asshole. Available at <https://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/asshole>, accessed May 8, 2020.
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. 2020b. Be a piece of shit/crap. Available at <https://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/be-a-piece-of-shit-crap>, accessed May 8, 2020.
- Mandri, Maria. 2013. *Murdekasutus A.H. Tammsaare "Tõde ja õigus" I osa tegelaskõnes* [Dialectal use in the character speech of A. H. Tammsaare's Truth and Justice part I]. Available at <http://hdl.handle.net/10062/30475>, accessed April 21, 2020.
- Mandri, Maria. 2015. Murdelisest tegelaskõnest "Tõe ja õiguse" I osas [Dialect in the Speech of Characters in A. H. Tammsaare's Truth and Justice Part I]. *Methis. Studia humaniora Estonica*, 12:15, 135-154. Available at <https://doi.org/10.7592/methis.v12i15.12120>, accessed April 21, 2020.
- Mihkla, Karl. 1938. Tõsielulisi tüüpe ja motiive A. H. Tammsaare teoseis [Realistic characters and forms in the literary works of A. H. Tammsaare]. *Eesti Kirjandus*, 1, 37-41. Available at <https://www.digar.ee/arhiiv/nlib-digar:44388>, accessed April 21, 2020.
- Mel, A. Igor. 2012. Phraseology in the language, in the dictionary, and in the computer. *Yearbook of Phraseology*, 3:1 31-56. Available at 10.1515/phras-2012-0003, accessed May 05, 2020.
- Must, Mari, Aili Univere. 2002. *Põhjaeesti keskmurre. Häälikulisi ja morfoloogilisi peajooni* [Central dialect of North Estonia. Main phonological and morphological features].
- ODLT = The Online Dictionary of Language Terminology. 2020. Pragmatic particle. Available at [http://www.odlt.org/ballast/pragmatic\\_particle.html](http://www.odlt.org/ballast/pragmatic_particle.html), accessed April 27, 2020.
- Raudsepp, Ernst. 1938. Koomilise sugemeid A. H. Tammsaare loomingus [Comical motifs in the works of A. H. Tammsaare]. *Eesti Kirjandus*, 1, 4-20.
- Siimisker, Leenu, August Palm. 1978. *A. H. Tammsaare. Pildikroonika eluteest ja -tööst* [A. H. Tammsaare. His life and career in pictures]. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat.
- Sillaots, Marta. 1926. "Tõde ja õigus". Arvustus [Truth and Justice. A review.]. *Looming*, 9, 1019-1013. Available at <https://www.digar.ee/arhiiv/nlib-digar:44388>, accessed April 21, 2020.
- Subbotina, Victoria. 2013. Challenges of Translating Phraseological Units. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 70:1, 1487-1492. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.216>, accessed May 25, 2020.
- Sõgel et al = Laul, E, E. Nirk, H. Puhvel, E. Sõgel, A. Vinkel. 1969. *Eesti kirjanduse ajalugu, III köide* [Anthology of Estonian Literature, Volume III]. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat.
- Sõgel et al = Kalda, M, H. Peep, H. Puhvel, E. Sõgel, A. Vinkel. 1981. *Eesti kirjanduse ajalugu, IV köide* [Anthology of Estonian Literature, Volume IV]. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat.
- Tüür, Kadri. 2003. Kohalik ja võõras "Tõe ja õiguse" I osas [Native versus stranger in Part 1 of Truth and Justice]. *Keel ja Kirjandus*, 10, 736-751. Available at <https://www.digar.ee/arhiiv/nlib-digar:195647>, accessed April 21, 2020.
- Vaino, Maarja. 2019. Film "Tõde ja õigus" kirjandusuurija pilguga [The film "Truth and Justice" through the eyes of a literary researcher]. Available at <https://www.temuki.ee/archives/2035>, accessed April 27, 2020.
- VEÜ = Välis-Eesti Ühing. 2020. Toimetuskolleegium. Available at <https://www.valiseesti.org/toimetuskolleegium/>, accessed May 5, 2020.

## Appendix 1

This appendix includes excerpts from the dialogue speech of Pearu representing the use of dialect in the source text and its translation into the English language. Dialectal word forms and their respective translations have been marked in bold and have been used for the translation analysis of dialectal word forms in the analytical part of the thesis.

Source language text	Translation
<p>„Kui mõtlen vahel, <b>kudas</b> sa siis tulid, laps süles, tulid ja seisid, seisid ja küsisid, et kuule, sina Oru vanamees, miks sa, sinder, selle <b>aja</b> siit maha oled <b>lõhkund</b>, siis, kallis <b>üleaja</b> eit, siis ma <b>änam</b> ei <b>lõhkundki</b>, käed kohe <b>änam</b> ei <b>hakand</b> aeda kinni, nii et sai tõeks vana Saalomoni sõna: kes vana aeda lõhub, sellele hakkab uss kätte kinni.“ (Tammsaare 1964: 100)</p>	<p>“I think sometimes of <b>how</b> you came that day, carrying your baby, how you came and stood there and asked, ‘Hey old man from Valley Farm, why the hell did you knock down the <b>fence</b>?’ Then, <b>neighbor</b>, I <b>couldn’t</b> do any more, <b>couldn’t</b> lay my hands again on that fence. As old Solomon said, ‘Whoever tears down the old fence will be bitten by a snake.’” (Tammsaare 2019: 104)</p>
<p>“Kuule, sina <b>nuabrimees!</b> <b>Veart</b> eit oli sul. Niisukest <b>änam</b> ei tehta!” (168)</p>	<p>“Hey, <b>neighbor!</b> You had a <b>treasure</b> of a wife. They <b>don’t</b> make ‘em like that anymore. (104)</p>
<p>„Tere <b>kua</b>, kallis nuabrimees!» hüüdis Pearu Andresele. «Sina ei tule ega tule mind <b>vuatama</b>, mina tulin siis sind. Kuda sa elad ja oled <b>kua</b>? <b>Põle</b> sind millalgi <b>näind</b>. Kõrtsis sa <b>änam</b> ei käi, <b>surnuajale põle</b> minul asja, seal <b>suaks</b> sinuga kokku. Ootasin, et kutsud mu <b>kua</b> Jussi maha viima, aga ei ühti, laulsid ja lugesid ilma oma <b>nuabrimeheta</b>.“ (194)</p>	<p>“Hello, neighbor!” Pearu called out to Andres. “You never come to <b>see me</b> anymore, so I came to see you. How’ve you been? <b>Haven’t</b> seen you in ages. You <b>don’t</b> come by the tavern and I have no business at the <b>graveyard</b>. I thought you might invite me to help bury Juss, but you went ahead, singing and praying without your <b>neighbor</b>.” (196)</p>

## Appendix 2

This appendix includes excerpts from the character speech of Pearu where phraseological units are present. Similar to Appendix 1, the phraseological units and their respective translations have been marked in bold and have been selectively used for the translation analysis of character speech in the analytical part of the thesis.

Source language text	Translation
<p>„Mis teine kord, tule täna, tule. Mina maksan või terve kõrtsi eest, <b>sest põle keda kuraditki.</b>“ /.../          „Naine!“ hüüdis Pearu. „Toome naise sisse, las naine joob ka, <b>ega temagi suu seinapragu ole.</b>“          (Tammsaare 1964: 26–27)</p>	<p>“What other time? Come on, I could buy out that whole tavern <b>without giving it a thought.</b>” /.../          „Your wife!“ exclaimed Pearu. „Bring her in! Let her have a drink, as well. <b>She gets as dry as anybody.</b>”          (Tammsaare 2019: 24-25)</p>
<p>„Aga siis on sinul kruavist rohkem <b>parist</b> kui minul,“ arvas Pearu, „sinul on rohkem vett kui minul.“ /.../          „Ka <b>minu kõrvu puutus</b> sedamoodi juttu,“ ütles nüüd Pearu, „aga ma pidasin naljaks, arvasin, et Madis <b>ajab muidu tühja lori.</b>“          (39)</p>	<p>“But then you’ll get more <b>use</b> out of the ditch than I,“ calculated Pearu. „You have more water than I do.” /.../          “That’s <b>what I heard</b> too,“ Pearu said, „but I thought it was a joke, and Madis <b>was just talking nonsense.</b>”          (39)</p>
<p>„Kuulsin karjumist, tulin vaatama, et kas õige teised <b>paha peale pääsind</b> või.“          (80)</p>	<p>“But where are the pigs?” Krõõt asked. “I heard shouting and came down to see if they’d <b>gotten out to make trouble.</b>”          (87)</p>
<p>„<b>Mine, kus kurat!</b>“ andis Pearu talle tervituseks kaasa.          (99)</p>	<p>“<b>Go to hell!</b>” Pearu wished him in reply.          (102)</p>
<p>„<b>Kaevasime temaga kahasse kruavi</b>, las vesi <b>jookseb kahasse.</b>“ /.../          „Tahtsin teisele <b>püksid tuliseks teha</b>, aga jätsin niisama – vesi oleks niikuinii jooksuma suand.“          (101)</p>	<p>“<b>We dug a ditch together</b>, to let the water <b>drain for both of us.</b> /.../ I wanted <b>to make his butt burn</b> for that, but I let it go; the water was going to run anyway.”          (105)</p>
<p>„Kas sa tulid, kui su hobused mu kapsa <b>ära radjasid?</b>“ sähvab Pearu.</p>	<p>Pearu snapped back, “Did you come when your horses <b>trampled</b> my cabbages?”</p>

<p>„Aga kui sinu <b>karvanäss</b> veel minu akna alla tuleb, siis lasen ta surnuks!“ karjus Pearu. (122)</p>	<p>“And if your <b>mangy mutt</b> comes under my window again, I’ll shoot him!” Pearu yelled. (128)</p>
<p>„<b>Saadana silmamunad!</b>“ (128)</p>	<p>“<b>You piece of crap.</b>” (130)</p>
<p>„Ega siin te <b>raipeaed</b> ole!“ (139)</p>	<p>“This isn’t your <b>slaughterhouse!</b>” (141)</p>
<p>„Ah sa <b>oled ikka veel kangust täis!</b>“ hüüdis Pearu. „Küll mina su <b>kaelakünnapuid mudin.</b>“ „Maksan su kõrtsiletil <b>kui mustlase setuka kinni ja kasi, kus kurat!</b>“ (149–150)</p>	<p>“Well, <b>you’re still full of fight!</b>” shouted Pearu. “I’ll <b>stretch that neck of yours!</b>” “I’ll pay you off, <b>like paying for a gypsy’s horse, and then you can go to hell!</b>” (152-153)</p>
<p>„/.../ Tema oli ka minu eidest, sellest minu <b>lambasihvrest</b> parem, sest minu eit põle niisuke, kui oli sinu eit. /.../“ (170)</p>	<p>“/.../She was better than my <b>sheepfaced</b> old lady. /.../” (171)</p>
<p>„/.../ Aga nüüd <b>oled ära lõppend, põle sul änam ossi ega tussi.</b> /.../ Mangu köstrit, mangu õpetajat, ei tule teised, <b>ligundid</b>, kirikumeeski põleks tulnd, kus nüüd seda, aga näe, Andres tõmbab raamatu taskust ja laseb laulu lahti. /.../ Ma ei sua muidu, kui pühin silmi, lähen tahakambri ja pühin seal (Pearu pühkiski silmi, sest seal olid pisarad) ning ütlen siis oma eidele, oma <b>lambasihvrele</b>, et Eespere Andres, see mu kallis nuabrimees, on ikka täismees, virutas mu siis kõrtsis põrandale, kaks korda virutas, sest miks ma puutusin sind ja Jussi, kallis Mari. /.../“ (194–195)</p>	<p>“Hello, Mari! You used to be a wonder—always a smile on your face and a song on your lips—but now...now <b>you’re barely with us, neither tits nor ass</b> —and all because of Juss. You can plead with the parson, you can plead with the pastor, but those <b>assholes</b> won’t bend. /.../ At home I go into the back room to wipe them.” Pearu wiped them then, for there were tears in his eyes, “and I tell my old lady, the <b>sheepface</b>, that my neighbor Andres is a real man.” (196-197)</p>

### Appendix 3

This appendix includes dialogue excerpts that have been collected from the first 200 pages of Truth and Justice, volume I and their respective translations. The excerpts include dialogues between Pearu and Andres, Pearu and Krõõt and Pearu and Jaagup, his farmhand. These extracts have been used in the analysis of the character speech of Pearu and its translation on the sentence level and have also been presented here in wider context to, if necessary, facilitate understanding the contrast between Pearu and other characters of the novel.

Source language text	Translation
<b>Pearu and Andres</b>	
„Tere ka, üleaedne,“ julges uus Vargamäe peremees vanale öelda, kes teda pika pilguga mõõtis.	“Well, hello neighbour,” the new master of Vargamäe ventured to the old master who stood sizing him up.
„Mis su tere, va sitikas, kua maksab,“ vastas Pearu. „Või sina oledki...“	“Who wants your hello, you insect?” Pearu said. “So you’re the...”
„Mina, mees, näh,“ pistis uus peremees vahele.	“I’m the man,” the new master interjected.
„ <b>Või mees!</b> “ osatas Pearu. „Mõni mees nüüd, kes koha võtab, kust mina kaks peremeest välja löönud. Löön ka sinu.“	“ <b>A man!</b> ” Pearu said mockingly. “Hah! What kind of man would buy a place I already driven two owners from? And now I’ll drive you out, too.”
„Kolme armastab jumal, kolmas jääb,“ ütles Andres.	“Third time’s the charm. I’ll be staying,” Andres said.
„ <b>Või kolmas jääb!</b> “ osatas Pearu jällegi. „Mina jään kua. <b>Olin enne sind, jään pärast sind kua.</b> Olen ja jään. Minu vastu põle ükski suand, ei sua ka sina. Minu nimi on Pearu Murakas.“	“ <b>Oh, so third time’s the charm!</b> ” Pearu taunted him. “I’ll be staying too. <b>I was there before you came and I’ll be there when you’re gone.</b> There I am and I’m not leaving. Nobody gets the better of me, and that means you too. My name is Pearu Murakas.”
„Minu nimi on Andres Paas. Mehe vastu olen alati saand, kurat saab kahe vastu.“	“My name is Andres Paas and the only one who can get the better of me is the devil.”
/.../ Ja kui korvidega juba saksatuppa mindi, pöördus Pearu oma naabri poole, öeldes:	/.../ Heading back to the saloon, he turned to Andres.
„Tule, ma annan sulle õlut.“	“Come on, I’ll buy you a beer.”
„Ei ma täna tule ühti, kallid üleaedne, mõni teine kord, siis,“ punnis Andres vastu.	“Sorry, neighbour, not today. Some other time,” Andres resisted.
„Mis teine kord, tule täna, tule. Mina maksan või terve kõrtsi eest, sest põle keda kuraditki.“	“What other time? Come on, I could buy out that whole tavern without giving it a thought.”
Ta võttis Andresel käe alt kinni ja tahtis ta saksatuppa viia. Aga see ajas sõrad vastu ning	He took Andres by the arm and tried to drag him into the first-class saloon.

<p>ütles: „Las see kord jääda seks, kallid üleaedne, mul naine ootab väljas vankril.“      „Naine!“ hüüdis Pearu. „Toome naise sisse, las naine joob ka, ega temagi suu seinapragu ole. Mina maksan! Kõrtsmik, pudel naiste viina!“      (Tammsaare 1964: 26–27)</p>	<p>But Andres dug in his heels and said, “Let it go this time, neighbour. My wife is waiting outside in the wagon.”      “Your wife!” exclaimed Pearu. “Bring her in! Let her have a drink, as well. She gets as dry as anybody. It’s on me! Landlord, a bottle of women’s wine!”      (Tammsaare 2019: 24-25)</p>
<p>„Peab rehnutti pidama,“ arvas Pearu viimaks.  <b>„Mina võin ka üksi kaevata, kui vett tahan lasta, vee jooksmata panna.“</b>      „Muidugi, kes seda nüüd, muidugi võib üksi, aga kahekesi tuleb odavam,“ ütles Andres.      „Kruav tuleks siis otse sihile,“ arutas Pearu.      „Kõige parem, kui otse sihile, mätas ühetasa mõlemale poole,“ vastas Andres.  <b>„Siht lõikaks kruavi pikuti pooleks, pool minu, pool sinu.“</b>      „Just nii: pool minu, pool sinu,“ kinnitas Andres.  <b>„Ja mina maksan poole, sina poole?“</b>      „Mina poole, sina poole.“      „Aga vesi? Kuidas sellega jääb? Ka pooleks, mõlemad lasevad ühepalju?“ küsis Pearu.      „Noh, vett juba mõeta ei saa,“ naeratas Andres. „Igaüks laseb teda, nagu süda kutsub, üks rohkem, teine vähem.“      „Aga siis on sinul kruavist rohkem parist kui minul,“ arvas Pearu, „sinul on rohkem vett kui minul.“      „Seda küll,“ oli Andres nõus, kuid lisas kohe juurde: „Aga kraav kaitseks sinu maad vee eest rohkem kui minu oma: minu vesi kipub sinu poole, mitte vastuoksa. Samuti on minul lugu Aasemega: tema vesi valgub minu krundile, minu oma ei lähe tema poole ajadeski.“      /.../      Juba pidigi kogu küsimus päevakorrast ära langema, aga siis tuli Andresel hea mõte üleaedset pisut õrritada, et ehk aitab see. Ta tähendas nagu möödaminnes:      „Mina mõtlesin tänavu maksu mis maksab algust teha. Rääkisin juba sauna–Madisegagi, tema oleks valmis kohe käsi külge panema.“</p>	<p>“Let me think about it,” said Pearu at last. <b>“I could dig it alone if I wanted to let the water drain.”</b>      “Of course, you could, but it’s cheaper to do it together,” said Andres.      “So the ditch would run straight along the property line?” Pearu pondered.      “Straight along the line would be best, piling the sod up equally on either side,” said Andres.  <b>“The property line would follow the ditch along the bottom, half would be mine and half yours.”</b>      “Exactly. Half would be yours and the other half mine,” Andres confirmed.  <b>“And you would pay half the cost and I the other half?”</b>      “I would pay one half and you the other.”      “And the water? How about that? Shouldn’t we divide it as well, so each drains as much as the other?” Pearu asked.      “Well, water we can’t measure,” Andres smiled. “Each would drain as much as he pleased, one more, the other less.”      “But then you’ll get more use out of the ditch than I,” calculated Pearu. “You have more water than I do.”      “That’s right,” Andres agreed, quickly adding, “but the ditch would protect your land more than mine, for it’s my water that tends to flood your fields and not the other way around. I have the same trouble with Aaseme; his water floods my land, but mine wouldn’t flow into his if I pushed it.”      /.../      The whole subject would’ve dropped, but then Andres decided to tease his neighbour a little and see if that would help. He remarked casually, “I was thinking of starting this year,</p>

<p>„Ka minu kõrvu puutus sedamoodi juttu,“ ütles nüüd Pearu, „aga ma pidasin naljaks, arvasin, et Madis ajab muidu tühja lori.“</p> <p>„Ei, ma rääkisin temaga. Aga muidugi, kui ma üksi kaevan, siis mitte sihile, vaid keset oma krunti, nii et läheks paremalt poolt ümber Jõessaare. Piirikraavi tõmbaks aga kahe saare vahelt läbi. Kraav tuleks seal küll sügavam, aga see oleks ainult lühikese maa peal. Saarte taga langeks vesi veel paremini.“</p> <p>„Aga kuhu sa poole vett paned, selle, mis minu krundi poole kipub, kui sa kruavi keskpaigast läbi tõmbad?“ küsis Pearu.</p> <p>„Kus ma ta ikka panen,“ vastas Andres, „eks ta jookse, nagu jumal talle tee näidanud – läbi sinu maa jõe poole. Selle, mis Aaseme poolt tuleb, püüan ma kraaviga kinni, aga teisele poolele ei saa suurt midagi parata.“</p> <p>Pearu mõtles ja lausus siis:</p> <p>„Aga ega Madis tänavu seda kruavi valmis sua, heinaaeg varsti juba käes.“</p> <p>„Ei saa tänavu, siis saab tuleval aastal,“ vastas Andres rahulikult. „Aga nõnda ei jäta ma seda, kaua need loomad ikka kurekarjamaal rübelevad.“</p> <p>„Jah, eks ta ole,“ lausus Pearu mõttes, ilma et oleks otsustanud küsimust ühele või teisele poole.</p> <p>(38–39)</p>	<p>regardless. I spoke to Madis the cottager and he’s ready to put his hand to it right away.”</p> <p>“That’s what I heard too,” Pearu said, “but I thought it was a joke, and Madis was just talking nonsense.”</p> <p>“No, I did talk to him. Of course, if I do it myself, I won’t dig along the property line, but down the middle of my land, so the ditch runs to the right of Jõessaare. And the borderline ditch would go between the two patches of dry land. The ditch would have to be deeper there, but only for a short stretch. Behind the dry lands the water would collect even better.”</p> <p>“And then what would you do with the other half of your water, the half that will flood my land if you dig your ditch in the middle?” asked Pearu.</p> <p>“What can I do about it?” said Andres. “It will go as God allows it, through your land and into the river. I’d catch the water that’s coming from Aaseme in my ditch, but I can’t do much about the rest.”</p> <p>Pearu thought a while and then said, “Madis won’t be able to finish the ditch this year. It’s nearly hay time.”</p> <p>“If he can’t do it this year, he’ll finish next year,” Andres said calmly. „But I won’t leave it the way it is. How long can I let my animals struggle in that marsh?”</p> <p>“Yes, that’s right,“ said Pearu thoughtfully, without making up his mind one way or the other.</p> <p>(38-40)</p>
<p>„Sinul on rohkem vett, las minul olla rohkem kruavi, sellepärast seisku ta muidu niisama minu mua sees, et aga oleks üsna minu krundil,“ seletas Pearu. „Mätta tahan sellepärast ühele poole, et mina pean oma muad sinu vee eest kaitsma, mitte sina oma muad minu vee eest. Sinu kasu pärast tahan, et sinupoolne kallas oleks ilma vallita ja et vesi pääseks vabalt kruavi. Pealegi on muld minu oma ja peab minu mua peale suama. Kruavimees muidugi ei armasta mätast ühele poole laduda, aga küll mina ise Madisega selle asja pärast reagin ... Kui</p>	<p>“You’ve got more water, so I should have more ditch. That’s all there is to it. Just let it all be on my land,” Pearu explained. “I want the dirt on my side, because I’ve got to shield my land from your water, but you don’t have to shield your land from mine. It’s for your own good that your side has no bank, so the water goes straight into the ditch. And besides, the dirt is mine and must stay on my land. Of course, the digger won’t like piling the dirt on just one side, but I’ll talk to Madis about that myself. So if you’re all right</p>

<p>nõnda tahad, siis kaevame kruavi kahasse, sina maksad poole, mina poole.“ /.../ „Las käia!“ hüüdis Andres viimaks. „Olgu nõnda! Kraav sinu maa sees, mätas sinu pool küljes. Tahab Madis selle tõttu süllast rohkem, maksad sina, minul pole sellega asja.“ „Küll mina Madisega reagin,“ vastas Pearu. (41)</p>	<p>with it, we'll dig the ditch together; you'll pay half and I'll pay half.” /.../ “Let's do it!” Andres exclaimed. “The way you want: the ditch on your land and the sod on your side. If Madis asks more for doing it this way, you'll have to pay; it's not my problem.” “I'll talk to him,” said Pearu. (41-42)</p>
<p>„Su mäsasetukal ehk tänagi minu regi taga,» pöördus Pearu lõpuks otseteed Andrese poole. Andres vastas ägedalt: „Sul põle omal niisukestki setukat aiste vahel.“ „Minul?!“ hüüdis Pearu. „Mul hirnub täkk kõrtsi reiaall. Tahad, lasen sinugi mära karata? Lasen muidu, ilma kopikata. Tahad?“ „Sinu täkk on juba kahekümne aasta eest ruunatud,“ irvitas Andres naabrile vastu. See ärritas Pearut ja ta vastas: „Aga minu reega sõidad sa, kõnn, siiski.“ „Veel täna õhtul saad ta kätte,“ ütles Andres. „Sõida aga sõida, ma võin ta sulle vaesele kinkida,“ ütles Pearu uhkelt. „Niisugust risu ei tee ma ise ega võta ka teiselt kingiks vastu,“ vastas Andres. (71–72)</p>	<p>“I bet that old nag of yours is pulling my sled right now,” said Pearu, facing down Andres. “That horse you got hitched up out there doesn't come close to matching mine,” Andres answered hotly. Pearu shouted, “Listen, that's a real stallion I got neighing out there under the tavern roof. Does your mare need a stud? Take him, no charge. Want him?” “That stallion of yours was gelded twenty years ago,” Andres sneered. Irritated, Pearu retorted, “But you're using my sled, aren't you, you worm?” “You're getting it back tonight,” Andres said. “Ah, go ahead and use it, you poor beggar. I could give it to you for free,” said Pearu arrogantly. “I could never make such a piece of junk, and I wouldn't take it as a gift,” Andres replied. (76–77)</p>
<p>„Mis vigurit sa mängid, et hobuseid kätte ei anna?“ küsis Andres Pearult. „<b>Näh, tahtsin sulle endale näidata, mis kahju nad teind, et kui minu loomad vahel juhtuvad, siis tead,</b>“ vastas Pearu. „Kui nad kahju on teind, eks siis tee raha õigust,“ ütles Andres. „Ma andsin poisile ju kümme rubla kaasa, kas sest ei piisand?“ „Sinu raha ma ei taha, seda panna mul omalgi küll,“ sähvas Pearu. „Mis sa siis tahad? Hobuseid pandiks või?“ küsis Andres. „Ei taha,“ vastas Pearu. „<b>Tahan sulle ainult näidata, mis su hobused kahju teind.</b>“ „Seda ei taha ma näha, ennem tasun kahju, nagu kord ja kohus.“</p>	<p>“What the hell are you up to, not letting my horses go?” Andres demanded. “<b>I just wanted you to see what they did. That way, if mine happen to do something, you'd know,</b>” answered Pearu. “If there was damage, I'll pay for it,” said Andres. “I gave my man ten rubles. Wasn't that enough?” “I don't want your money; I've already got plenty of that trash,” retorted Pearu. “Then what do you want? To keep the horses in hock?” Andres asked. “No, I don't,” said Pearu. “<b>I just want you to see what damage they did.</b>” “I don't need to see. I'll pay for it, fair and square.”</p>

„Tule ja vuata, mis nad kapsas teind, viljaaunadest ma ei reagigi,“ kutsus Pearu.

„Ei tule,“ vastas Andres järsult. „Sinu loomad käisid minu orast tallamas, ajasin ma nad kinni või kutsusin sind vaatama? Tegin ainult aja ette, kust sina kevadel kiusuks maha lõhkusid. Tegin sinu loomadele aja ette, minul omal põle seda aeda tarvis.“

„Ja nüüd tahad, et ka mina peaks sinu hoostele aja ette tegema?“ küsis Oru.

„Mina ei taha sinult midagi, ainult anna hobused kätte,“ ütles Andres.

„Enne lähme vuatame kahjud üle,“ arvas Pearu.

„Enne hobused kätte,“ nõudis Andres.

„Siis hobuseid ei sua,“ ütles Pearu kindlalt.

„Kes neid mulle keelab?“ küsis Andres. „Kes julgeb keelata?“

„Mina!“ karjus Pearu vastu. „Mina, Pearu Murakas!“

„Sina, sitavares?!“ osatas Andres. „Kus mul õige hobusekeelaja väljas! Tahan näha, kes julgeb takistada, kui mina oma hobuseid tahan koju viia.“

„Kuule, nuabrimees,“ ütles Pearu nüüd ähvardavalt, „see asi läheb protsessi alla.“

Aga Andres ei pannud seda mikski ja hakkas karjaaia poole minema, kust hobused paistsid.

„Kaeba või keisrile, aga hobused viin ära,“ ütles ta.

Nüüd pistis Pearu suure häälega lõugama, sest muud ei julgenud ta üleaedse vastu ette võtta. Karjumise peale jooksis kogu majarahvas kokku.

„Ma ajan sulased su kallale,“ ähvardas Pearu Andrest.

„Tulgu aga seia, küll ma neile näitan, kudas Luukas õlut teeb,“ vastas Andres. Ise pani ta hobustele karjaaias pätsed pähe ja tõi nad sealte välja, et koju minna.

„Kus Krants on?!“ hüüdis Pearu. „Krants! Võta teda! Kisu! Kisu lõhki!“

„Hoia, et ta änam minu ukse alla kükitama ei tule, muidu löön ta maha!“ hüüdis Andres Pearule vastu.

“Come and see what they did in the cabbage field; not to mention the grain sheaves,” Pearu insisted.

“No, I won’t,” said Andres sharply. “When your animals trampled my young shoots, did I pen them up or demand that you look at it? What I did was put up a fence to keep them out, where you had busted it down last spring. It was just for your animals; I didn’t need it for mine.”

“And now you want me to build a fence to keep your horses out?” asked Pearu.

“I don’t want anything from you; just give me my horses back,” said Andres.

“We’ll go and look at the damage first,” Pearu said.

“My horses first,” Andres insisted.

“Then you don’t get the horses.” Pearu was firm.

“And who’s going to keep me from taking them?” demanded Andres.

“Me!” Pearu shouted. “Me, Pearu Murakas!” “You, shithead!” Andres sneered. “You horse thief! I’d like to see anybody stop me if I want to take my horses home.”

“Listen, mister,” Pearu said menacingly, “I’ll take you to court.”

Andres paid no attention and started toward his horses.

“Take it to the Tsar, for all I care. I’m taking my horses,” he said.

Pearu began screaming at the top of his lungs; he didn’t dare try anything more with his neighbor. Hearing the noise, all his people ran outside.

“I’ll have my men get you,” Pearu threatened.

“Let them come any closer and I’ll show them who’s going to get who,” said Andres. He bridled the horses in the yard and brought them out to take home.

“Where’s my dog?!” Pearu screamed. “Krants! Go get him! Tear him to pieces!”

“You better keep him from shitting at my door, or I’ll kill him!” Andres shouted back.

“And if your mangy mutt comes under my window again, I’ll shoot him!” Pearu yelled.

<p>„Aga kui sinu karvanäss veel minu akna alla tuleb, siis lasen ta surnuks!“ karjus Pearu.      „Rabapüssiga vist?“ pilkas Andres.      „Küllap leidub mõni muugi krihvel,“ vastas Pearu.      /.../      „Head päeva, teisepere rahvas!“ hüüdis ta enne minekut pilkavalt.      „Mine, kus kurat!“ andis Pearu talle tervituseks kaasa.      (98–99)</p>	<p>“With what, a big fart?” Andres said mockingly.      “Better than that. You’ll see,” Pearu answered.      /.../      “Good day, neighbors,” he called out mockingly.      “Go to hell!” Pearu wished him in reply.(101-102)</p>
<p>„Mul välja all loodheinamua, lasin teisele vee peale, paneb rohu mühama,“ annab ta seletuseks.      „Aga, armas inimene, minu karjamaa on ju ka vee all,“ ütleb Andres. „Lehmad peaks aina lootsikuga sõitma.“  <b>„Kui su lehmad oskavad, eks siis las sõidavad,“</b> pilkab Oru peremees.      „Kuule, kallid üleaedne, see põle ju ometi nali, asi on väga tõsine,“ räägib Andres.  <b>„Aga mis see minusse puutub, kui mina tahan oma heinamuad kasta,“</b> vastab Pearu ja pöörab talitades selja Andrese poole.      „Kas siis tõesti pidin mina selleks kraavi eest pool raha maksma, et sina võiks minu karjamaale vett paisutada?“ küsib Andres.      „Ma paisutan vett oma heinamuale, mitte sinu karjamuale,“ seletab Pearu.      „Tule ometi ise vaata, mis lepiku all sünnib,“ kutsub Andres.      „Kas sa tulid, kui su hobused mu kapsa ära radjasid?“ sähvab Pearu.      „Mis siis see seia puutub?“ küsib Andres.  <b>„Aga mis siis see minusse puutub, et sinu karjamaa vett täis on?“</b> küsib Pearu vastu.      „Sina paisutad seda vett.“      „Mina paisutan vett ainult oma heinamuale.“      „Mina nõuan, et sa oma tammi maha võtad.“      „Sina nõuad?“ osatas Pearu. „Kes oled sina? Oled sa mõni vallatalitaja või kohtumees? Kes võib nõuda, et mina oma kruavis ei tohi vett paisutada?“      „Omas kraavis,“ kordab Andres. „Aga see põle ju ainult sinu kraav, mina maksin poole hinda. Madis võib tunnistada.,,</p>	<p>“The soil is thin beneath these fields, so I thought flooding it would make the hay grow thicker.”      “But that puts my pasture under water,” said Andres. “My cows would need a boat to go out there.”  <b>“If your cows know how to do that, let them try,”</b> mocked Pearu.      “Listen, neighbor, this is no joke. It’s serious,” said Andres.  <b>“It’s not my problem; I just want to flood my meadows,”</b> said Pearu, turning his back on Andres.      “Are you really telling me that I paid for half the ditch so you could flood my pastures?” asked Andres.      “I’m damming the water into my meadows, not your pastures,” explained Pearu.      “Come see for yourself what’s happening beneath the alders,” said Andres.      Pearu snapped back, “Did you come when your horses trampled my cabbages?”      “What’s that got to do with it?” asked Andres.  <b>“What’ve I got to do with your flooded pastures?”</b> Pearu shot back.      “You’re damming the water.”      “I’m damming it for my meadows.”      “I demand that you destroy your dam.”      “You demand?” Pearu mocked him. “Who are you? A government official? Who’s to stop me from damming my own ditch?”      “Your own ditch,” repeated Andres. “It’s not just your ditch. I paid for half of it. Madis’ll swear to it.”      “But it’s on my land. You don’t need Madis to know that.”</p>

<p>„Aga kruav on minu mua peal, seda tead ilma Madisetagi.“</p> <p>„Ah siis selleks oligi sul vaja kraavi täiesti oma maa peale saada?“ küsib Andres.</p> <p>„Ega ma loll ole, et ma oma raha eest hakkas teise mua peale kruavi kaevama,“ vastab Pearu pilkava muigega.</p> <p>„Ah siis mina olen see loll?“ küsib Andres uuesti.</p> <p>„Seda tead ise paremini kui mina,“ sähvab Pearu.</p> <p>„Küsin sinult veel kord: kas võtad kraavil tammi eest või ei?“ ähvardab Andres.</p> <p>„Sinul pole sellega midagi pistmist,“ vastab Pearu ja teeb asja eemale nihkuda, sest Andrese hääl ja tegumood ajavad talle nagu hirmu peale. „Kruav on minu ja tamm on minu, ainult vesi on sinu. Ära lase oma vett minu kruavi, siis põle mul midagi paisutada.“</p> <p>„Ei võta sina ise kraavil tammi eest, siis lõõn mina ta minema ja lasen vee jooksmas,“ ütles Andres nüüd. „Oma karjamaad ei luba ma leotada. Võid kaevata minu peale, kui tahad.“</p> <p>Ütles ja läks kähku kodu poole.</p> <p>/.../</p> <p>Vahe oli siiski olemas: Andres pistis laia suuga naerma, nii et piip hambust porri kukkus, kuna Pearu suure häälega vandus:</p> <p>„Kes kurat seda on teind!“</p> <p>„Mitte kurat, kallid naaber, vaid jumal ise: tema ei võind sinu verist ülekohtu sallida ja lasi veel endal tammi lõhkuda,“ vastas Andres naabri vandumisele.</p> <p>„Küll ma sinule ja su jumalale näitan!“ ähvardas Pearu. „Saadana silmamunad!“</p> <p>(100–101)</p>	<p>“Oh, so that’s why you wanted it all on your own land,” said Andres.</p> <p>“I’m not dumb enough to dig a ditch with my money on somebody else’s land,” answered Pearu mockingly.</p> <p>“So I’m the dumb one?” asked Andres.</p> <p>“If you say so,” snapped Pearu.</p> <p>“One more time: Are you going to take down the dam or not?”</p> <p>“You got nothing to say about it,” replied Pearu, edging away from Andres, who was starting to look threatening. “The ditch is mine and the dam is mine. Only the water is yours. Don’t let your water come into my ditch and I’ll have nothing to dam.”</p> <p>“If you won’t take down the dam, I’ll do it myself and let the water flow,” said Andres.</p> <p>“You’re not going to flood my pasture. You can file a complaint against me if you want.”</p> <p>Then he turned and headed home without looking back.</p> <p>/.../</p> <p>Andres broke into a broad laugh, dropping his pipe into the dirt, while Pearu cursed, “Who in the hell did this?”</p> <p>“Not hell, but heaven. God couldn’t bear to see your injustice, and He let the water take out the dam,” answered Andres.</p> <p>“I’ll show you and your God!” Pearu threatened. “You piece of crap.”</p> <p>(104–105)</p>
<p>„Tulge korjake oma raisk minu mua pealt ära!“</p> <p>„Ta, sinder, on surnud koera seia vedanud,“ ütles Matu.</p> <p>„Ää sa valeta seal, võrukael!“ karjus Pearu, kes poisi sõnu kuulis. „Või mina vedand. Aga kes ajas koeraga minu mua peal tedrepoegi taga? Kes ässitas koera minu kallale? Mul seared praegu veel verised.“</p> <p>/.../</p>	<p>“Come and take your corpse off my land!”</p> <p>“That bastard dragged the dog over there!” said Matu.</p> <p>“Stop lying, you little rascal!” shouted Pearu.</p> <p>“He says I dragged it here, but who do you suppose was on my land, chasing grouse with his dog? And guess who set the dog on me? There’s still blood on my legs.”</p> <p>Andres jumped across the ditch, followed by Matu and Juss. They found the dog between the hummocks and examined the ground</p>

<p>Nõutult seisid nad laiba ees. Kas ta ära viia või sinna jätta?</p> <p>„Ma toon ta oma maa peale,“ ütles poiss ja tahtis koeral tagajalust kinni võtta.</p> <p>„Las ta olla,“ ütles peremees. „On tema ta seia toond, siis tehku temaga, mis tahab, milleks meie oma käsi hakkame määrima.“</p> <p>Neid sõnu kuuldes karjus Pearu natukese maa pealt: „Kasige mu mua puhtaks! Ega siin te raipeaed ole!“</p> <p>„Oled ise ta raipeajaks teind, siis olgu,“ vastas Andres. „Ainult välja pead mulle selle raibe maksma.“</p> <p>„Sinule välja?“ hüüdis Pearu. „Vii ta ära, mul pole teda tarvis, ma kingin ta sulle. Ässita raibe veel minu kallale.“</p> <p>„Ära tiku sina mu karjapoisi kallale, siis ei tule ka minu koer sinu, raibe kallale,“ vastas Andres.</p> <p>„Raibe on su koer, raibe on su poiss ja raibe oled sa ise, mitte mina!“ karjus Pearu.</p> <p>(139)</p>	<p>there, but saw no bloodstains. The three of them stood around the body, wondering what to do. Should they take it away or not?</p> <p>“I’ll bring it back to our land,” said the boy, reaching for the dog’s hind legs.</p> <p>“Leave it,” said the master. “He brought it over here and he can do with it what he wants. Why should we dirty our hands?”</p> <p>Pearu, standing nearby, shouted, “Clean up my land! This isn’t your slaughterhouse!”</p> <p>“It’s you who turned it into a slaughterhouse,” said Andres, “but this is one corpse you’ll have to pay for.”</p> <p>“Pay you?” called Pearu. “Take it away; I don’t need it. I’m giving it to you for nothing. And just try sending it to me again.”</p> <p>“You leave my herder alone, and my dog won’t come after you, you shit,” Andres shot back.</p> <p>“I’m a shit? Your dog is a shit, your herder is a shit, and you, too, are a shit,” Pearu yelled.</p> <p>(141)</p>
<p>„Kuule, sina nuabrimees! Veart eit oli sul. Niisukest änam ei tehta! Vargamäe silmad ei sua änam niisukest näha. Hallelooja ! Sinu kadund eide terviseks! Issand olgu meile armuline!“</p> <p>/.../</p> <p>„Kallis nuabrimees,“ hakkas ta sellele rääkima, „veart eit oli sul, seda tulin ütleva. Nüüd on sul kurvad päevad, sest niisukest eite ei ole änam ja teist niisukest põle ühelgi olemas. Mina kurvastan ka, aitan sul kurvastada, kallis nuabrimees ... Tegin eilse päeva ja terve öö sinu eidele sulastega teed. Aga sulased hakkasid öösel porisema, ei taht sinu eidele teed teha, siis tegin üksi, ilma poisteta. Tegin, jah, teed ning mõtlesin: seal ta nüüd on see nuabrimehe elu, oli teisel eit, oli teisel veart eit, aga nüüd änam ei ole. Ja siis ma mõtlesin, et ma lõhkusin sel korral aja rukki eest ära ja su sead läksid rukkisse, tahtsin näha, mis sa teed, kui näed, et sead minu rukkis ja et mina aja maha lõhkusin. Aga sina ei tulnd, tuli sinu eit – nüüd viisime ta ära, Essuke olgu temaga! – nonäh, tuli sinu eit ja ütles niisuguse pehme jaalega: „Kallis</p>	<p>“Hey, neighbor! You had a treasure of a wife. They don’t make ‘em like that anymore. We’ll never see the likes of her around here again. Hallelujah. Here’s to your late wife! And Lord have mercy on us all.”</p> <p>/.../</p> <p>“My dear neighbor,” he started, “you had a treasure of a wife; that’s what I came to tell you. Now your days are filled with sadness, because your wife is no more and there’s no other like her. I, too, grieve, and I’m helping you grieve, dear neighbor. All day yesterday and through the night, my men and I prepared the road for her. During the night, the men began to grumble. They didn’t want to work on the road for your wife, so I continued on my own. I was fixing the road, yes, and I was thinking—this is what my neighbor’s life comes to. Once he had a wife, a worthy wife, and now he has none. And I remembered how I once knocked down the fence around the rye field, and your pigs got in. I wanted to see what you’d do, but it wasn’t you who came, it was your wife—Lord be with her, we just bore her away—and she spoke so softly,</p>

nuabrimees, miks sa aja eest ära lõhud, meie sead lähvad ju sinu rukkisse?“ Veart eit oli sul, tundis rehnutti – sead lähvad mu enda rukkisse! Ja ma vastasin temale, et kallis nuabri perenaine, mul on aeda teisale vaja, sellest see lõhkumine ja sigade rukkisse laskmine. Aga tema – Essuke ülendagu tema hinge! – tema tundis rehnutti, nii veart eit oli sul, tundis ja ütles: „Kuule sina, nuabrimees, sina ei reagi tõtt, sina luiskad.“ Just nõnda ta ütles seekord: „sina luiskad“. Aga mina valetasin siis lausa, lõhkusin aeda kiusu pärast, tahtsin sind kiusata. Ja siis ütles sinu eit veel: „Kui sa aja tahtsid rukki eest ära lõhkuda, miks sa siis meile enne ei öelnd, et oleks teand loomad ära ajada?“ Ning, kallis nuabrimees, siis hakkas mul sinu eide ees häbi seal lõhutud aja juures, sest tema tuli, laps süles, sigu ajama. Ja ma tahtsin ise sigadele rukkisse järele minna, aga sinu eit hakkas sigu heleda jaalega kutsuma, ikka põssa, põssa, põssa, kotsu, kotsu, kotsu (Pearu katsus kadunud Krööda häält, maksku mis maksab, järele teha). Ning sead ajasid kõrvad kikki, kuulatasid ja pistsid siis jooksmata, aina sennapoole, kust kostis hele jaal. Nüüd ei ole enam seda ajaauku, kus sinu eit siis seisis, sina tegid ta kinni. Ja seisku ta nõnda seal igavesti, mina teda ei puutu, seisku mälestuseks, et sinu kadund eit kutsus siis sigu minu rukkist. Aga kui sead, sindred, kõik rukkist välja tulid, palja kutsumisega, ja sinu eidele järele truavisid, siis tahtsin ka mina sinu sigadega kaasa truavida, pangu sinu eit mind kas või oma sigadega ühte lauta... Ning nüüd, kallis nuabrimees, oleme siis kahekesi, peame sinu eide matukseid. Öösel, kui soosilda tegin, mõtlesin, et mis meist kahest nüüd küll suab. Kui sinu eit alles elas, lepitas ikka tema meid, sest tema oli meist mõlemast parem. Tema oli ka minu eidest, sellest minu lambasihvrest parem, sest minu eit põle niisuke, kui oli sinu eit. Peksteski põle minu eit nii hea, kui oli sinu eit peksuta. Nüüd on ta aga surnud, ning kui tegin öösel ja täna, pühapäeva hommikul, päev tõusis juba, soos silda, mõtlesin, et nüüd

‘Dear neighbor, why have you knocked down the fence? Now our pigs will go into your rye field.’ What a worthy wife. She knew how to manage things. The pigs went into my own rye field. I told my dear neighbor’s wife that I needed the fence somewhere else—that’s why I knocked it down and let the pigs in—and she—Lord be with her—she knew what to do and said, ‘Listen neighbor, that’s a fib. You’re not being truthful.’

“That’s what she said, ‘You’re fibbing,’ but really I was just plain lying. I smashed the fence out of spite. Your wife said one more thing, ‘If you wanted to knock down the fence, why didn’t you let us know, so we could’ve kept the animals away?’ Dear neighbor, I felt so ashamed in front of your wife, standing beside the smashed fence, because she’d come with a baby in her arms to drive the pigs back! I wanted to go into the field after the pigs myself, but your wife began calling them with her gentle voice, ‘Here, piggy, piggy...’” Pearu tried hard to imitate the late Krööd’s voice as best he could. “And the pigs raised their ears, listened, and started to trot toward her ringing voice. There’s no longer a hole in the fence where your wife was standing. You repaired it and so may it always be. I won’t touch it. Let it stand there, as a memorial to your wife calling the pigs from my rye field. When all the pigs came out of the rye and ran after her, I wanted to run, too, even if I ended up in the pigsty with them. Now, dear neighbor, here we are, us two, observing your wife’s funeral. At night, while I worked on the causeway, I started wondering what would become of us. When your wife was alive, she always got the two of us to make up, because she was better than either of us. She was better than my sheepfaced old lady. My wife was not equal to her. Even when I beat her, she was not as good as your wife without a beating. And now your wife’s dead. I was working on the causeway in the marsh and, as the sun was rising, I thought, ‘Well, here we are—two poor, old men at Vargamäe.’ If we quarrel,

<p>oleme kaks vaest vanameest Vargamäel. Kui lähme riidu, ja riidu me lähme, siis põle änam, kes ütleks hea sõna, vuataks hea silmagagi. Aga sinu eidel olid head silmad. Ja siis hakkas mul hirm seal soosillal minu ja sinu pärast siin Vargamäel. Nagu kaks kärbest istume siin sitahunniku otsas, kõnnime ja peame aru ning tühised on kõik meie arupidamised ja suured rehnud. Seni kui elas sinu eit, oli meil ikka hea elu. Riidlesime mis riidlesime, aga ega me sellepärast halvasti eland. Me olime muidu niisama kaks kanget vanameest, üks ei kuuland ja teine ei and järele! Aga nüüd! Sinu veart eit on nüüd surnud, peame kahekesi tema matukseid ja mäletame oma kurja pattu. Ja põle änam kedagi, kes meid näeks ehk kuuleks, sest ... „ (168–170)</p>	<p>and quarrel we will, there’s no one to make peace now, no one to speak with good words and see with good eyes. Your wife had good eyes. There on the causeway, I got scared for us both, here at Vargamäe like two flies on a pile of shit. All our schemes mean nothing. As long as your wife was alive, our lives were good. We fought a lot, but that didn’t mean our lives were bad. We were just two tough fellows—one who wouldn’t listen and one who wouldn’t give in! But now your worthy wife is dead and we are celebrating her funeral and remembering our sins, and there’s no one now to listen to us, or look after us...” (170-171)</p>
<p>„Tere kua, kallis nuabrimees!“ hüüdis Pearu Andresele. „Sina ei tule ega tule mind vaatama, mina tulin siis sind. Kuda sa elad ja oled kua? Põle sind millalgi näind. Kõrtsis sa änam ei käi, surnuajale põle minul asja, seal suaks sinuga kokku. Ootas, et kutsud mu kua Jussi maha viima, aga ei ühti, laulsid ja lugesid ilma oma nuabrimeheta.“  „Ega mina matuksele–kutsuja olnd, kutsuja istub seal,“ ütles Andres Marile näidates.  „Tõsi jah, ega sina, kallis nuabrimees,“ oli ka Pearu nüüd nõus. Ja Mari poole pöördudes hüüdis ta: „Tere kua, Mari! <b>Alati on sul nii rõõmus nägu ja aeva laulujaal suus, kuula ja imesta. Aga nüüd oled ära lõppend, põle sul änam ossi ega tussi. Kõik Jussi pärast. Veart mees oli see va sauna–Juss, ei mina teda laida.</b> Ja minu kallis nuabrimees – me riidleme küll kahekesi, aga ma armastan teda –, nojah, kallis nuabrimees, tema ei jäta, tema ei jäta kunagi, olgu see köster, kirikuõpetaja või mina, Oru Pearu. Sellepärast ma armastangi teda, et ta ei jäta. Mangu köstrit, mangu õpetajat, ei tule teised, ligundid, kirikumeeski põleks tulnd, kus nüüd seda, aga näe, Andres tõmbab raamatu taskust ja laseb laulu lahti. Vänge mees, veart mees! Ma tulin temaga leppima. Olen küll pisut purjus, aga sest põle ühti, nuabrimeeste asi, muidu ei</p>	<p>“Hello, neighbor!” Pearu called out to Andres. “You never come to see me anymore, so I came to see you. How’ve you been? Haven’t seen you in ages. You don’t come by the tavern and I have no business at the graveyard. I thought you might invite me to help bury Juss, but you went ahead, singing and praying without your neighbor.”  “‘It wasn’t my place to invite anybody. It was hers,” said Andres, pointing to Mari.  “‘You’re right, neighbor. It wasn’t up to you,” agreed Pearu.  Turning to Mari, he exclaimed, “Hello, Mari! <b>You used to be a wonder—always a smile on your face and a song on your lips—but now...now you’re barely with us, neither tits nor ass—and all because of Juss. He was a worthy fellow. Yes, Juss the cottager—there was nothing wrong with him.</b> My good neighbor Andres doesn’t give in, not him, not ever—not to the parson, not to the pastor, and not to me, Pearu. That’s why I love him, because he never gives in. You can plead with the parson, you can plead with the pastor, but those assholes won’t bend. So Andres pulled a book out of his pocket and got everybody singing. He’s a tough fellow and a worthy man! I came here to make up with him. I’m a little pickled, but</p>

julge, ei ole südant ega kuraasi, sellepärast. Sina, sauna–Mari, oled nüüd jälle nagu pere–Mari, lehmamullikagi tõid peresse. Jah, nõnda'p see sinugi elu käib. Oli sul mees ja kõik, tegi sulle lehmalaudagi, elasid saunas, aga mis on inimese elu – nagu rohi vikati ees. On veel lapsed sul, omad lapsed ja pere lapsed, üks, kaks, kolm (Pearu lugese sõrmedel) ... viis, kuus last, sinul endal kaks ja Kröödal neli, kokku kuus. Jah, oli see Eespere perenaine üks veart inimene, ainult nõrga verrega, suri ära, ei pidand Vargamäel vastu. Aga minu eit peab, tema peab küll ... Nojah, suri ära õnnis perenaisuke, sinu hoida jättis oma tütre ja poja. Sellest saab Vargamäel peremees, kange peremees saab. Aga kahju on kadund perenaisest. Sinust on kua kahju, sauna–Mari. Sest vuata, kui ma mõtlen, et ma seekord Andresele kõrtsis nõnda ütlesin, ja et siis Juss – Essuke aidaku teda taevariiki! – nojah, et Juss ... Ma ei sua muidu, kui pühin silmi, lähen tahakambri ja pühin seal (Pearu pühkiski silmi, sest seal olid pisarad) ning ütlen siis oma eidele, oma lambasihvarele, et Eespere Andres, see mu kallis nuabrimees, on ikka täismees, virutas mu siis kõrtsis põrandale, kaks korda virutas, sest miks ma puutusin sind ja Jussi, kallis Mari. **Aga kui mu kõrva puutus, et Andres, see kallis nuaber – kange vanamees on ta, hästi kange – Jussi haua on lugend ja laulnd – Hundipalu Tiit kiitis –, siis nutsin ma suure jaalega Hundipalu Tiidu kaelas ja ütlesin temale, et oh miks ei kutsutud mind Jussi hauale lugema ja laulma.** Kas mina ei ole veart mees? Sest kui ei kõgise kõster ega õgise õpetaja, siis teeb Oru Pearu oma toru lahti ja laseb kuulda, nii et Jusski hauas kuuleb ... Ja veart mees on see minu nuabrimees, sellepärast tulid temaga leppima. Sinuga, Mari, lepin kua, et ma kõrtsis nõnda ütlesin... Rahu olgu Jussi põrmule surnuaia taga! Kui lumi ära sulab, lähen tema hauda vaatama. Sina ise, Mari, võtad mu käest kinni ja viid mu sinna, käsikäes lähme Jussi vaatama, ja sinu kõrval tahan talle issameie ära lugeda, sest „oh inimene usinast, sa vuata

that's nothing between neighbors. If I weren't, I wouldn't have the guts to come. Mari, you're Mari of the farm once again. You even brought your pet cow with you. Well, that's the way your life turned out. Once you had a husband and he built a shed for your cow and you lived in the cottage, but what's a life anyway? Just a blade of grass before the scythe. And you have children—your own and the farm's. One, two, three,” he counted on his fingers, “four, five, six children. Two of your own and four of Krööts's, so six altogether. Yes, the mistress of the farm was a fine person, except that her blood was weak and she died—just couldn't make it at Vargamäe. Now, my old lady, she can make it. She'll survive, but the blessed mistress died, leaving the girls and the boy for you to look after. The boy will become master of Vargamäe, and a tough one, too. I feel so sorry about the mistress, and I feel sorry for you, too. You know, when I think about what I said to Andres in the tavern...and then Juss, God rest his soul...that he could...I can't help but wipe my eyes. At home I go into the back room to wipe them.” Pearu wiped them then, for there were tears in his eyes, “and I tell my old lady, the sheepface, that my neighbor Andres is a real man. He knocked me down twice in the tavern, but he was right to do it. I had no reason to go after you and Juss. **When I heard that my tough neighbor read from the good book and sang at Juss's grave—Hundipalu Tiit praised his reading and his singing—it made me cry out loud. I threw my arms around Tiit's neck and asked him why I wasn't invited to read and sing at Juss's grave.** Am I not worthy? If the pastor was a bastard and the clerk was a jerk, then Pearu would've opened his mouth and sang out with such a roar that even Juss would've heard it in his grave. My neighbor is a worthy man, so I came to make up with him. I want to make up with you, too, Mari, over my words in the tavern. Just let Juss rest peacefully there beyond the graveyard! When the spring comes and the snow melts, I'll go

<p>vara, hilja“. Anna mulle oma väike käsi, Mari..., (194–195)</p>	<p>visit his grave. Mari, you can take me by the hand and lead me there. Hand in hand, we'll go see Juss, and I will read the Lord's Prayer standing next to you. 'Be ready for salvation, come it late or soon.' Give me your little hand, Mari.” (196-197)</p>
<b>Pearu and Krõõt</b>	
<p>Naabri perenaist nähes jättis Pearu karjumise ega lõhkunud ka aeda enam. Ta ootas ja vahtis, kuni naabri naine tema juurde jõudis. Siis ütles ta pooleldi naljatades, pooleldi tõsiselt: „Teisepere perenaine tuleb õige ise lapsega sigade karja.“ „Kus need sead siis on?“ küsis Krõõt vastuseks. „Kuulsin karjumist, tulin vaatama, et kas õige teised paha peale pääsind või.“ „Ei tea, kus nad nüüd on,“ ütles Pearu, „läksid teised esteks rukkisse.“ „Miks sa siis aja maha lõhud?“ küsis Krõõt. „Siin põle mul temast lugu, puid oli mujale vaja,“ vastas Pearu ja vahtis ise häbelikult kõrvale. „Oleks ometi enne meile öelnud, me ei oleks siis loomi omapead kesale last. Ega siin olegi jumal teab mis võtta, seerivad niisama teised põllul ümber,“ seletas perenaine. „Aga kuidas teisepere perenaine nüüd sead rukkist kätte saab, laps süles?“ küsis Pearu, nagu ootaks ta, et Krõõt teda appi kutsub. /.../ Nüüd muutus perenaise hääl veel valjemaks ja heledamaks, ning kui sead üksteise sabas üle piiri oma põllule tulid, ei osanud Pearu muud teha, kui aga imestades ja siunates öelda: „Vuata sindreid! Ma'p uskunudki. Aga nuabri eidel on nii hele jaal, et ... „ (80–81)</p>	<p>When he saw the neighbor's wife, Pearu stopped shouting and tearing down the fence. He waited and watched as she approached. Then he said, half-jokingly and half-seriously, “Is the neighbor's wife coming herself, with her baby, to herd the pigs?” “But where are the pigs?” Krõõt asked. “I heard shouting and came down to see if they'd gotten out to make trouble.” “I don't know where they are now,” said Pearu, “but a little while ago I saw them heading for the rye field.” “And why are you taking down the fence?” Krõõt asked. “I don't need it here and I could use the pickets someplace else,” said Pearu, looking away, embarrassed. “If you'd told us before, we wouldn't have let the animals loose on this fallow. Lord knows there's nothing much to eat down here anyway. They just wander around,” said the woman. “But how will the neighbor's lady get the pigs out of my rye with a baby in her arms?” asked Pearu, expecting her to ask him for help. /.../ Now she called in an even louder and higher voice, and when the pigs crossed one after another into their own field, Pearu could only say, “Look at those bastards! I can't believe it. What a fine voice my neighbor's lady has.” (87)</p>
<p><b>„Vuatan ja vuatan,“</b> rääkis Pearu, <b>„ratas käib, nii et pulki ei näegi. Ja ikka ühe jalaga, ühe jalaga ... Minu eit sõtkub kahe jalaga, vokk teeb ikka sorr, sorr, sorr, sinu vokk aga aina vurr, vurr, vurr. Veart vokk! Ja näpud muudkui siblivad ja sikutavad ...</b></p>	<p><b>“I just keep watching,”</b> said Pearu. <b>“The wheel turns so fast that you can't see the spokes—and all with just one foot. My old woman pushes the treadle with both feet and her wheel goes buzz, buzz, buzz, while yours goes whirr, whirr, whirr. What a</b></p>

Kui mõtlen vahel, kudas sa siis tulid, laps süles, tulid ja seisid, seisid ja küsisid, et kuule, sina Oru vanamees, miks sa, sinder, selle aja siit maha oled lõhkund, siis, kallid üleaja eit, siis ma änam ei lõhkundki, käed kohe änam ei hakand aeda kinni, nii et sai tõeks vana Saalomoni sõna: kes vana aeda lõhub, sellele hakkab uss kätte kinni. Teibad ja roikadki jätsin sinnapaika ja seal on nad tänapäevani. Võivad sinna mädaneda, mina neid änam ei puutu, teised ei tohi puutada. Vanamoor küll ütles mulle, et eks korja puudki maast ära, aga mina vastu: see põle sinu asi, mina ise pean teisepere eidega rehnutti aja pärast ja kõik. Vanamoor läks siis ise rukkilõikuse ajal näppupidi kallale. Aga mina pörkasin talle peale, et kes on Tagapere Orul peremeheks, mina või tema. Kui mina ütlen, et las olla, siis peab olema. Aga mul on kange eit, tema oma jonn ei jäta. Tema kandis minu salaja, ikka teivas teiba järele, roigas roika järele koju, kirvega katki ja paja alla. Ühel ilusal päeval lähen vuatama – puid ei ole. Kus on? Keegi ei tea, keegi põle näind. Vuata, kallid üleaja pere–eit, nõnda tegin ma, kui kuulsin su jaalt ja nägin sigu, kes jooksid su sabas. Oleks ajaaugu uuesti kinnigi teind, aga oli sinu ees häbi. Tõsijutt, häbenesin ... „ Pearu peatus pisut, aga kui Krõõt midagi ei lausunud, algas ta uuesti:

„Vurr, vurr, vurr! Vurr, vurr, vurr! Vurr, vurr, vurr! Kui sina põleks siis tulnd ega sigu kutsund, ma oleks kõik aja maha lõhkund, puudki oleks ära vedand. Aga nüüd ei lõhkund. Kui tahad, teen ajaaugu uuesti kinni, teen kinni ja siis on seal kohal kaks aeda, minu aed ja sinu vanamehe aed, las nad seista seal kõrvu kahe põllu vahel piiri peal. Kange vanamees on sul, pagana kange! Sitke mees! Üle kõrvenurga! Kaevasime temaga kahasse kruavi, las vesi jookseb kahasse. Tahtsime kahekesi minna esimest vett laskma, aga meie poisisinder torgand tammi eest ära, niisuke sindri poiss on mul. Tahtsin teisele püksid tuliseks teha, aga jätsin niisama – vesi oleks niikuinii jooksuma suand. Vesi jookseb ikka, kui tammi ees ei ole, aga teisepere sead

spinning wheel! And your fingers just keep pulling and drawing so fast. I think sometimes of how you came that day, carrying your baby, how you came and stood there and asked, ‘Hey old man from Valley Farm, why the hell did you knock down the fence?’ Then, neighbor, I couldn’t do any more, couldn’t lay my hands again on that fence. As old Solomon said, ‘Whoever tears down the old fence will be bitten by a snake.’ I just left the poles and pickets where they were on the ground, and they’re still there today. They can rot there for all I care, and nobody else can touch them either. My old lady asked why I don’t pick up that lumber, and I said, ‘It’s none of your business. I have some things to settle with the neighbor’s wife about the fence, so just let it be.’ During the rye harvest, she went and grabbed them, but I jumped on her and asked who is the master of the Valley Farm, her or me. If I say let it be, just let it be. But I’ve got a stubborn wife who lets nothing go. She carried the wood home, one piece at a time, chopped it up and used it for firewood. Then one bright day I go down to have a look and there’s no lumber anywhere. Where is it? Nobody knows. Nobody’s seen it. You saw, mistress, the way I acted after I heard your voice ring out and saw the pigs following you. I would’ve closed the hole in the fence, but I felt ashamed. Honestly, ashamed.”

Pearu stopped talking, but when Krõõt didn’t say anything, he started up again.

“Whir, whir, whir! Whir, whir, whir! Whir, whir, whir! If you hadn’t come then and called the pigs away, I would’ve knocked the whole fence down and hauled the wood away. But I didn’t do that. If you want, I’ll close the gap now, so there’ll be two fences, my fence and your husband’s. Let them both stand there, side by side between the two fields. Your husband’s a tough man, tough as hell. And strong! The strongest in these parts. We dug a ditch together, to let the water drain for both of us. We wanted to go together and let the first water flow through, but my boy

<p>jooksevad, kui kuulevad perenaise heledat jaalt ... „          „Üleia peremees,“ ütles Krõõt, „hakka nüüd õige koju minema, eit ehk ootab.“          (100–101)</p>	<p>knocked the weir out, the damned kid. I wanted to make his butt burn for that, but I let it go; the water was going to run anyway. Water always runs if there’s no weir, but the neighbor’s pigs run when they hear the mistress’s ringing voice.”          “Neighbor,” said Krõõt, “you should go home now. Your wife may be waiting.”          (104-105)</p>
<p><b>Pearu and farmhand Jaagup</b></p>	
<p>„Mis palka?“ karjus Pearu. „Sa oled mulle rohkem kahju teind, kui su palk veart.“          /.../          „Peremees valab minu jao oma emapuudele kastaks.“ Nõnda ütles Jaagup ja sülitas, nagu olekski ta juba peremehe klaasist rüübanud.          „Ah sa oled ikka veel kangust täis!“ hüüdis Pearu. „Küll mina su kaelakünnapuid mudin.“          „Küllap näis, kumb kummal nad mudib,“ vastas Jaagup.          „Ah sa ähvardad mind?“ küsis Pearu.          „Mis mina sust ähvardan,“ vastas Jaagup.          „Mis on sulasel peremeest ähvardada.“          „Säh, joo viina!“ pakkus Pearu. „Lepime ära. Kõrtsmik, korv õlut!“          Pearu pakkus ja pakkus oma klaasi, aga Jaagup ei teinud seda nägemagi.          „No rüüpa ükski kord minu klaasist,“ mangus Pearu, „siis maksan siinsamas kõrtsiletil su palga välja.“ Pearu tahtis nähtavasti, maksku mis maksab, sulasega leppida.          „Poiss, ligund, võta klaas vastu, kui peremees pakub!“ hüüdis kõrtsmik Sama nõu andsid ka kõrtsilised. Kuid sulane oli oma otsuses kindel: ei võtnud.          „Mine siis p...e!“ karjus Pearu lõpuks Jaagupile. „Tänasest päevast põle sa enam mu sulane! Asjad viisid Eespere Andrese juurde, sinna mine ka ise. Mis mulle ei kõlba, see on temale paras. Kui palju on sul veel palka saada? Maksan su kõrtsiletil kui mustlase setuka kinni ja kasi, kus kurat!“          Ning kui sulane saadava summa oli nimetanud, ladus Pearu raha kõrtsiletile ja kutsus kõrtsmiku tunnismeheks.</p>	<p>“What wages?” screamed Pearu. “You’ve done me more damage than your wages amount to.”          /.../          “The master can pour my drink on his trees,” he said, spitting as if he’d already taken a drink from the glass.          “Well, you’re still full of fight!” shouted Pearu. “I’ll stretch that neck of yours!”          “We’ll see who does what to who,” answered Jaagup.          “Are you threatening me?” asked Pearu.          “How can I threaten you?” Jaagup asked. “A farmhand can’t threaten a master.”          “Come on, have some vodka!” offered Pearu.          “Let’s put an end to it. Bartender! A basket of beer!”          Pearu kept offering drinks, but Jaagup acted as if he didn’t hear.          “Take just one sip from my glass,” Pearu pestered him, “and I’ll put your wages right on the counter.”          It seemed he wanted to make up with his man at any cost.          “Listen, you young squirt,” shouted the tavern keeper. “Take the drink when your master offers it!” The other customers echoed his sentiment, but the farmhand stuck to his guns and wouldn’t touch the glass.          “Up your ass then!” Pearu finally yelled at Jaagup. “From now on, you’re not my farmhand! You took your things up to Hill Farm, so you can go there, too. What’s not good enough for me is good enough for him. How much money do you have coming? I’ll</p>

„Kasi mu silma alt!“ karjus Pearu Jaagupile.  
 „Ega sa Vargamäel ole, et nõnda karjud,“  
 lausus poiss raha tasku pannes.  
 „Kas nüüd rüüpad mu klaasist?“ küsis Pearu  
 Jaagupilt.  
 „Maksa enne kõik mu rahapalk välja,“ vastas  
 sulane. „Niikuinii läheb ta mul muidu kaotsi.“  
 „Rüüpa enne viina,“ tingis Pearu.  
 „Ei, enne kõik rahapalk, riidekraam võib  
 jääda,“ vastas sulane.  
 Kõrtsmik astus mõlema vahele lepitajaks,  
 öeldes: „Tehke mõlemad ühekorraga,  
 peremees annab raha, sulane võtab viina.“  
 „Nõnda olen nõus,“ ütles sulane. Pearu  
 mõtles pisut.  
 „Üks ta mats puha,“ ütles ta viimaks,  
 „sulasest niikuinii meest põle.“  
 (149–150)

pay you off, like paying for a gypsy’s horse,  
 and then you can go to hell!”  
 Jaagup named a sum and Pearu put it on the  
 counter, asking the tavern keeper to witness  
 it.  
 “Now get out of my sight!” yelled Pearu.  
 “You’re not at Vargamäe now, where you can  
 shout as you like,” said the young man,  
 putting the money in his pocket.  
 “Will you have a drink now?” Pearu asked  
 Jaagup.  
 “Pay me my whole year’s wages first,” said  
 the farmhand. “I’ll lose my temper if you  
 don’t.”  
 “Take a drink first,” Pearu insisted.  
 “No, my year’s wages first. You can keep the  
 clothing,” said the man.  
 The tavern keeper stepped between them to  
 make peace, saying, “Do it both at once. The  
 master hands over the money, the farmhand  
 takes a drink.”  
 “I’m fine with that,” said Jaagup.  
 Pearu thought for a moment. “It’s alright with  
 me,” he finally said. “This farmhand is no  
 man anyway.”  
 (152-154)

## RESÜMEE

TARTU ÜLIKOOL

ANGLISTIKA OSAKOND

**Kadri Koitsaar**

**Translating Tammsaare: Pearu Murakas' character speech in *Vargamäe*, volume I of *Truth and Justice***

**Pearu Muraka tegelaskõne A.H. Tammsaare romaani „Tõde ja õigus“ I osas ja selle tõlkes**

Bakalaureusetöö

2020

Lehekülgede arv: 55

Annotatsioon:

Käesoleva bakalaureusetöö eesmärgiks on analüüsida tegelaskõne kui ilukirjandusliku võtte tõlget Antoine Bermanni deformeerivate tendentside teooria taustal. Lähtematerjaliks on võetud A.H. Tammsaare romaani „Tõde ja õigus“ I osa ja selle tõlge inglise keelde, „Vargamäe“.

Töö koosneb kolmest osast. Esimene osa annab ülevaate romaani tõlkijatest, nende hariduslikust taustast ja motivatsioonidest romaani tõlkimiseks. Teine osa on jagatud kolmeks alajaotiseks, millest esimene annab ülevaate tegelaskõnest kui ilukirjanduslikust võttest. Teises alajaotises vaadeldakse lähemalt Pearu Muraka tegelaskõnet ja selles esinevaid põhielemente ning kolmandas alajaotises võetakse kokku tegelaskõne tõlkimisega kaasnevad väljakutsed ja võimalikud ohud. Teises osas antakse ülevaade ka peamistest teoreetilistest allikatest, milleks on Antoine Bermanni (2000) deformeerivate tendentside teooria ja Maria Mandri (2013) analüüs murdekeele kasutamisest romaani „Tõde ja õigus“ I osa tegelaskõnes. Kolmas osa hõlmab Pearu tegelaskõne võrdlevat analüüsi ja on jagatud neljaks alajaotiseks. Esimene alajaotis käsitleb analüüsiks kasutatud metoodikat ja ülejäänud kolm hõlmavad analüüsi, mis toimub väiksemalt üksuselt suuremale, see tähendab hääliku tasandilt lause tasandile. Teises ja kolmandas alajaotises on analüüsitud vastavalt Pearu tegelaskõnes esineva murdekeele ja fraseologismide tõlget ja sellega kaasnevaid deformeerivaid tendentse. Kolmas alajaotis võtab peatüki kokku, keskendudes Pearu tegelaskõne tõlkimisele lause tasandil ja kaasnevatele deformeerivatele tendentsidele.

Analüüsitav materjal on kogutud romaani „Tõde ja õigus“ I osa eestikeelse eksemplari esimeselt 200 leheküljelt ja sobitatud tõlkevastetega. Analüüsitavate elementide valimisel on lähtutud kogutud taustainfost selle kohta, milliseid võtteid A.H. Tammsaare kasutas Pearu Muraka

tegelaskõnes suulisuse efekti saavutamiseks. Sellisteks võteteks on näiteks murdekõne ja fraseologismide ning varieeruvate lausestruktuuride kasutamine vastavalt olukorra meelestatusele jne. Dialekti ja fraseologismide tõlke analüüsi kasuks otsustasin lisaks seetõttu, et need lisavad tegelaskõnele olulist keelelist rikkust, mis aga võib osutada tõlkes problemaatiliseks.

Võrdlevas tõlkeanalüüsis ilmnemid ülalnimetatud probleemid, kuigi mitte läbivalt. Murdekõne neutraliseerimise tagajärjel kadus tõlkest kahe keeletasandi, st murdekeele ja tavakeele, vaheline eristus ja sellega ka oluline osa Pearu tegelaskõne värvingust. Samas tuli läbi töötatud kirjanduse põhjal ka tõdeda, et murdekeele tõlkimine on keeruline ja selle kompenseerimiseks kasutatud lühendvormid, hüüatused jms elemendid olid tõenäoliselt parem lahendus suulisuse edasi andmiseks. Fraseologismide tõlkes oli oluline roll neis sisalduva keelelise rikkuse edasi andmisel, mis kohati õnnestus tänu väljendite laiale levikule üle erinevate keeleruumide, kohati aga lõppes väljendi neutraliseerimisega. Üldiselt säilis fraseologismide tõlkes nende roll koomilise elemendi kandjana. Lause tasandil analüüsis oli deformeerivaid tendentse märgata kõige enam, seda eriti lünk- ja kiillausete selgemaks ja liigendatumaks kirjutamise kujul. Arvestades Tammsaare püüdlust jäljendada tegelaskõnes võimalikult realistlikult suulisust, mõjus nimetatud ilustamine tõlkes kohati pigem tegelaskõne eesmärki kahjustavalt.

Paratamatult on osa Pearu tegelaskõne spetsiifikast tõlkes kaduma läinud ja seda osaliselt deformeerivate tendentside mõjul. Tõlkes on osutunud probleemseks spetsiifiline keelekasutuse, st murdekeele kasutamine, mida on keeruline tõlkida usutavalt ühelt keeleruumilt teisele. Keeletasandite vahelise pingest kadumisest hoolimata pole murdekeele neutraliseerimine mõjunud hävitavalt suulisusele üldiselt, kuid on mõjunud kahjustavalt koomilisele elemendile, mida Pearu tegelaskõne lähtetekstis tihti kandis. Suulisus on säilinud tänu muudele tõlkevõtetele, näiteks lühendatud sõnavormide, suuliste hüüatuste kasutamise ja lähtetekstis leiduvate fraseologismide mõttelt küllaltki originaalilähedane edasi andmine. Lausetasandil on kohati kadunud Pearule omased kiillaused, lünklaused ja ägedad, kuid lühikesed sõnavalingud, mis on asendatud selgema kirja kirjapildiga, kuid suulisuse vaatepunktist kohmakamate keelenditega.

Märksõnad: Inglise keel ja keeleteadus, tegelaskõne, tõlketooria, võrdlev tõlkeanalüüs

## **Lihtlitsents lõputöö reprodutseerimiseks ja lõputöö üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemiseks**

Mina, Kadri Koitsaar,

1. annan Tartu Ülikoolile tasuta loa (lihtlitsentsi) enda loodud teose

Translating Tammsaare: Pearu Murakas' character speech in Vargamäe, volume I of *Truth and Justice*,

mille juhendaja on Katiliina Gielen PhD,

1.1. reprodutseerimiseks säilitamise ja üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemise eesmärgil, sealhulgas digitaalarhiivi DSpace-is lisamise eesmärgil kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse tähtaja lõppemiseni;

1.2. üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemiseks Tartu Ülikooli veebikeskkonna kaudu, sealhulgas digitaalarhiivi DSpace'i kaudu kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse tähtaja lõppemiseni.

2. olen teadlik, et punktis 1 nimetatud õigused jäävad alles ka autorile.

3. kinnitan, et lihtlitsentsi andmisega ei rikuta teiste isikute intellektuaalomandi ega isikuandmete kaitse seadusest tulenevaid õigusi.

Kadri Koitsaar

Tartus, 26.05.2020

**Autorsuse kinnitus**

Kinnitan, et olen koostanud käesoleva bakalaureusetöö ise ning toonud korrekselt välja teiste autorite panuse. Töö on koostatud lähtudes Tartu Ülikooli maailma keelte ja kultuuride kolledži anglistika osakonna bakalaureusetöö nõuetest ning on kooskõlas heade akadeemiliste tavadega.

Kadri Koitsaar

Tartus, 26.05.2020