Roman Tashlitskyy,
National University of Ostroh Academy, Ostroh

HETEROGLOSSIA IN TRANSLATION
(BASED ON UKRAINIAN TRANSLATIONS OF "ROMEO AND JULIET" BY WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE)

Стаття розглядає можливості застосування теорії "багатоголосся" Михайла Бахтіна у перекладі як формі комунікації.
Ключові слова: *"багатоголосся", переклад, комунікація*

The article regards the possibilities of applying Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of heteroglossia to translation as a form of communication.
Key words: *heteroglossia, translation, communication*

The idea to correlate Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of heteroglossia with translation is not new. About a quarter of a century ago Caryl Emerson, a prominent Bakhtin scholar and translator, gave a positive answer to the question whether Bakhtin offers us a theory of translation: "In the widest sense, yes, inevitably: in essence translation is all man does" [Emerson 2, 23]. However, there hardly has been any research where Bakhtin's theory was used in practice, at least on the material of Ukrainian translations of "Romeo and Juliet".

The use of Bakhtin's theory out of the context he used it has also become popular. For example, as Elzbieta Tabakowska point out, "recent work in linguistic stylistics refers more and more often to the writings of Mikhail Bakhtin, and notably to his concept of the internal dialogism of the word" [Tabakowska 6, 71]. His theory is suitable for analyzing translations because it is in translation where the word's meaning multiplies, creating what can be referred to as "polyphony." That is to say, the word acquires new meanings, which, as in our case, are reinforced by differences in time and space; Tabakowska, particularly, stresses these important factors as well: "Polyphony is created by individual contexts-particular complexes of spatio-temporal and sociocultural factors" [Tabakowska 6, 73]. Other researchers, like Michael Holquist, pay considerable attention to these aspects as well, adding other, less significant, but nevertheless potentially influential factors for the meaning of the word.

Dialogism assumes that at any given time, in any given place, there is a set of powerful but highly unstable conditions at work that will give a word uttered then and there a meaning that is different from what it would be at other times and in other places. The conditions that make for such differences are to be found in the nature of language, but include other factors as well. Conventional forms of analysis would dismiss some of these other factors as inappropriate or trivial: details such as differences in the weather, in the physical condition of the speakers, for example [Holquist 3, 105].

Thus, the potential the word has in terms of reaction to multiple contexts

can be regarded as a dialogue: the author's contexts with the translator's ones and what is realized in the corresponding "voices. "

Let us return to the analysis of the four Ukrainian translations of the drama by William Shakespeare "Romeo and Juliet. " In the course of the analysis I introduce Bakhtin's concepts contained in the theory of heteroglossia and integrate them to my concept of communication of "voices" by specific examples from the original and its Ukrainian translations. The choice of the examples is based on showing the tendencies in the translators' "voices" I noticed before in their most intense manifestation.

The notion of heteroglossia is defined by Bakhtin as "another's speech in another's language, serving to express authorial intentions but in a refracted way. Such speech constitutes a special type of double-voiced discourse. It serves two speakers at the same time and expresses simultaneously two different intentions: the direct intention of the character who is speaking, and the refracted intention of the author" [Bakhtin 1, 324]. According to Bakhtin, "All words have the 'taste' of a profession, a genre, a tendency, a party, a particular work, a particular person, a generation, an age group, the day and hour. Each word tastes of the context and contexts in which it has lived a socially charged life; all words and forms are populated by intentions" [Bakhtin 1, 293]. In the original it is not "taste" but "пах-нет" or "smell" [Бахтин 7, 106], which is distinct, for one has to bite something to feel a taste, but a smell can be sensed even involuntarily. In my case it means that one does not have to intentionally look for a meaning of a word-it pops up itself. In other words, as Bakhtin states, "Contextual overtones (generic, tendentious, individualistic) are inevitable in the word" [Бахтин 7, 293].

Since I am not a native speaker of English and my "sense of smell" can fail me in distinguishing specific moments of heteroglossia, I decided to first look at a translation and then refer back to the original, verifying whether an "odd" place in translation is the same "odd" in Shakespeare or whether it might indicate a "voice" of a translator. I start from Kulish's translation, the most picturesque one, since he uses some archaic language and intensive domesticizing:

Самсон. Грицьку, даю слово, не попустимо так собі допікати.
Грицько. Ні, ні; а то будемо печеними.
Самсон. Я кажу, як розізлимось, дак добуваймо меча.
Грицько. Еге-ж; та коли б не збув єси плеча [Куліш 10, 5].
In Shakespeare it is:
Sampson. Gregory, on my word we'll not carry coals.
Gregory. No, for then we should be colliers.
Sampson. I mean, and we be in choler, we'll draw.
Gregory. Ay, while you live, draw your neck out of collar [Rom. 1. 1. 4-9].

The first "oddity" that strikes is the transformation of the name "Gregory" into "Грицько" or "Hrytsko," which is the familiar (and less dignified) form of the Ukrainian "Hryhoriy. " One can assume that Kulish decided to use this name to make it closer to Ukrainian readers, and he believed the diminutive

form more appropriate because Gregory is a servant. So another's "voice" is strongly felt even in such neutral dramatic elements as the cast of characters.

Then in Shakespeare there's a play on words "coals-colliers-choler-collar," which besides the denotative meaning can be Shakespeare's "voice" as a witty man. Moreover, the author could probably express some contemptuous attitude to colliers ("coal carriers" or "term of abuse" from the dirtiness of the trade and the reputation of colliers for cheating) [Shakespeare, Ed. G. Blakemore Evans 4, 68]. Kulish omits Shakespeare's play on words and offers his own instead: "допікати" (literally--bake, here--harass) and "печеними" (baked) thus neglecting Shakespeare's "miner's" "voice" and introducing his "baker's" one. This "voice" makes Kulish closer to the audience of undereducated readers, mostly in rural areas, whom Kulish meant to enlighten by means of exposing them to the world masterpieces. At the same time, on the general level the "voice" of witty servants is preserved in the translation.

Mysyk's version:

Сансоне. Кажу ж, Грегорі, ми не потерпимо знущання.

Грегорі. Авжеж, хай нам перше руки й ноги потерпнуть.

Сансоне. Адже ми потерпаємо від гніву, кажу.

Грегорі. Гляди лишень, поки живий, щоб тобі горлянка не отерпла. [Мисик 11, 4].

Mysyk does not follow Shakespeare's metaphors literally and presents his own play on words "потерпимо-потерпнуть-потерпаємо-отерпла" or "tolerate-stiffen-endure-stiff. " So again, "colliers" are out of the text. This can mean that Shakespeare's "voice" involving "colliers" was probably more acceptable in the context of his time, so it did not survive in the new context: mines for the Ukrainian reader were not a very widespread image to allude to. One can also observe that Mysyk introduces the new word "знущання" ("humiliation") into his translation. Related to his impossibility to publish his translations under the current political system, one can assume that humiliation was a key feeling he must have encountered in his creative activity; no wonder this "voice" appeared in the translation.

And finally Hozenpud:

Самсон. Клянуся, Грегорі, вони не почорнять нам носа.

Грегорі. Ні, бо ми ж таки не вуглярі!

Самсон. Я хочу сказати, що коли розпалюся, то схоплю навіть не роз-палене вугілля, а меч.

Грегорі. А доки ти живий--стережись вугільної ями! [Гозенпуд 9, 11]

In his translation Shakespeare's coal vocabulary is seen, though a bit distorted: "почорнять носа-вуглярі-вугілля-вугільної ями" or "blacken nose-miners-coal-coal pit. " At the same time, the play of words "choler-collar" disappears. One can assume that Hozenpud's inclination to follow the author literally this time played to his advantage. Steshenko's version is very similar to Hozenpud's.

Connecting the abovementioned analysis to the theory of Bakhtin, I compare the function of the other "voice" in the novel, as described by Bakhtin, with the

other (translator's) "voice" in translations: "the speech of others is introduced into the author's discourse (the story) in concealed form, that is, without any of the formal markers usually accompanying such speech, whether direct or indirect" (Bakhtin 303). Since the examples demonstrate that in the translations the translator's "voice" is introduced in addition/instead of the author's "voice," one can conclude that the same principles apply to translations independent from the genre of the original text.

Having compared the original and several translations of "Romeo and Juliet" with regard to the Bakhtin's theory of heteroglossia, I have seen that this theory can be successfully used in the comparative analysis of translations. The main postulates of Bakhtin's theory, particularly the presence of two voices in character's speech (the actual "voice" of a character and the hidden "voice" of the author), find its continuation in translations and thus show that translators are "secondary authors", in some cases even with the tendency to become primary authors: that is to neglect the original "voice" to some degree and substitute it with their own. The notion of charcter zones can be instrumental in comparing the "voices" of characters created by the author to the ones created by the translator. An adjusted model of Bakhtin's idea of word intention's dispersion toward the object makes it possible to use his scheme not only pertinent to the original text but to translations as well. Particularly, it became possible to trace a specific "voice" from the author to the translator, and then to the final reader.

Works Cited

1. Bakhtin, Mikhail. "The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin. " Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998.

2. Emerson, Caryl. "Translating Bakhtin: Does his Theory of Discourse Contain a Theory of Translation?" // University of Ottawa Quarterly. Vol. 53, No 1 (1983): 23-33.

3. Holquist, Michael. "'Otherness,' Polyphony, Dialogue. " / Critical Essays on Mikhail Bakhtin. Ed. Caryl Emerson. New York: G. K. Hall, 1999. P. 95-107.

4. Shakespeare, William. "Romeo and Juliet. " Ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

5. Shakespeare, William. "The Norton Shakespeare. " Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. New York: W. W. Norton, 1997.

6. Tabakowska, Elzbieta. "Linguistic Polyphony as a Problem in Translation. " / Translation, History, and Culture. Ed. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. London: Cassell, 1995. P. 71-78.

7. Бахтин М. "Вопросы литературы и эстетики. Исследования разных лет. " Москва: Художественная литература, 1975.

8. Вороний, Микола, ред. "Ромео і Джульєта. " Вільям Шекспір. Пер. П. О. Куліша. Харків: Український робітник, 1928.

9. Гозенпуд, Абрам, пер. "Ромео і Джульєтта. " Вільям Шекспір. Харків: Мистецтво, 1937.

10. Куліш, Пантелеймон, пер. "Ромео і Джульєта. " Уїльям Шекспір. Львів, 1901.

11. Мисик, Василь, пер. "Ромео і Джульєтта. " Вільям Шекспір. Харків: Прапор, 1988.