When Less Is More, or the Art of Choice: The Poetics of Atwood's "Surfacing" and Its Transfer in the Russian and Latvian Translations

Jānis Veckrācis

A text is only a picnic where the author brings the words and the reader brings the sense.

(Todorov, in Eco 1990: 144)

[A]n invisible landscape conditions the visible one.

(Calvino 1974: 20)

Introduction

The paper contributes towards the discussions of *Surfacing*'s poetics and of considerations related to the requirement of equivalent effect in literary (prose) translation, as both poetics and effect-related mechanisms have gained prominence in cognitive text linguistics and in the discourse on the respective translatological implications. The main areas of research in this paper include: (1) 'literary text' in the broadest conceptual meaning; (2) literariness and poeticity in light of translation; (3) the relationship of explicit/implicit information in the source text (ST), which may be represented both in micro-level units and through their integration into the text's macrostructure; (4) the respective means for transferring explicit/implicit information into the target text (TT) and the translator's task of making balanced choices. This theoretical overview provides the context for an insight (though with an element of subjectivity) into the poetic features (including the underlying 'forces,' general tone, and atmosphere) of Margaret Atwood's *Surfacing* (1972), an important 20th century novel; the paper is the first instance (to our best knowledge) of Atwood's techniques' being academically considered in the context of translation. These poetic features serve as an essential background and as a set of criteria for the next objective of this paper – an analysis of selected examples from the Latvian translation (translated by Silvija Brice) and Russian translation (translated by Inna Bernshteyn) that illustrate how even minor changes and additions, though acceptable in terms of their general literary features, may raise questions regarding translation quality given specific, poeticity-related requirements. The paper also seeks to provide insight into the applicability of a relatively literal (or close) prose translation.

Equivalent effect: the translator's task under ambiguous rules

An important and common starting point in the translatological discourse has been the principle of equivalent [aesthetic, artistic, emotional, implicative, communicative, total] effect. In the 17th century, Anne Dacier explained that a servile prose translation is an unfaithful approach; instead, a generous translation "clings closely to the ideas of its original, tries to match the beauty of its language, and renders its images without undue austerity of expression" (in Lefevere 2003: 12). Nicolas Perrot d'Ablancourt, while admitting that a word-for-word translation might sometimes produce an elegant text, notes: "I do not always stick to the author's words, nor even to his thoughts. I keep the effect he wanted to produce in mind, and then I arrange the material after the fashion of our time" (36). Many effective metaphors have been used to highlight the task. The main idea is, however, essentially the same: a word-for-word translation, or even a close translation, means inevitable failure, as literary translations should master more than the direct rendition of the text's verbal material. This implies the necessity of certain free zones for manipulations and transformations; the task is made even more complicated due to the fact that, as noted by Alexander Fraser Tytler (1992: 133), the degree of liberty in achieving ease and elegance in prose translation is more limited than in poetry translation. It is important to note that a translation which is verbally close to the ST does not mean that the translation process and the respective decision-making procedures are based on a simplified, literal approach: the acceptability of a literal (or close) translation may be a result of a detailed contrastive analysis.

The effect-oriented approach, which particularly applies to literary translation with its cognitive implications, has also found ground in more general linguistic discussion and literary studies where style and poetics are among the key concepts. Style basically resides "in the manipulation of variables in the structure of a language, or in the selection of optional or 'latent' features" (Fowler 1966, 15); it represents how language specifies a particular field of attention (Hansen 2012: 72), covering various issues including voice, otherness, foreignization, contextualization, and culturally-bound and universal ways of conceptualizing and expressing meaning (Boase-Beier 2014: 2). The implications, however, aggregate when we add considerations relating to literariness and poeticity, two concepts underlying the discussion proposed by Antonio García-Berrio. He suggests an essential distinction between *literariness*, which is a conventionalizable (foreseeable and optative) cultural choice resulting in a set of linguistic-aesthetic properties and characteristics of a text, and *poeticity* (including its three generic modes: denotative-expressive, fictional-narrative and imaginary-symbolic), which is an *unpredictable* (our emphasis) aesthetic effect and product-value determined by verbal, psychological, imaginary and cultural mechanisms. The universe of emotions and imagination as part of the reflexive experience, García-Berrio reasonably suggests, are two irrational areas of poeticity which cannot be ignored in a discourse on the poeticity of a literary text (García-Berrio 1992: 40–54). The ambient aspects, such as atmosphere and tone, though admittedly delicate and difficult to discuss, are also recognized as significant aspects of literary experience (see, for instance, Harrison et al. 2014: 13–14). Our study is largely based on these considerations, which highlight the importance of identifying the respective features of the text and to use the information derived thereof both directly and indirectly during the translation.

The aspects of subjectivity, ambiguity, and unpredictability in how a text builds its aesthetic effect have essential implications for the discourse of literary translation concerning a translator's choices, use of tools, and strategies — and finally, in the overall quality assessment of the translator's work. First, should those mechanisms of aesthetic effect which are activated by some verbal units of a text be identified, the next important inquiry would regard how they are related to and interact with other non-verbal mechanisms which are also necessary for an aesthetic response (for instance, the reader's personal 'history' or background, including experience, emotional condition, cognitive dispositions, etc.). We may only consider typical or *potential* effect. Second, though specific rules exist for the formation of complementary meanings leading to new meanings and the effect-forming elements similarly interact among themselves (Shcherba, in Lipgart 2016: 25), we may hardly imagine an exhaustive description of these elements and of the ways they are engaged in an interplay with each other. Nevertheless, it is possible to outline the most likely elements/mechanisms and suggest some open-ended conclusions.

Thus, when we examine the atmosphere of Margaret Atwood's novel, *Surfacing*, in order to acquire essential information before the translation, even if her own description of the novel as a ghost story (White 2009: 162) is accepted and the text is further approached according to this perspective we notice other essential themes and sub-themes. We may even come to the conclusion, in view of how remarkable and important those themes are, that the ghost theme is merely the general background (or a 'condition,' according to Atwood's notions), the narrative 'reason' to discuss all other themes which — and here we share the ideas of White — are related to submersion and self-discovery. It is possible that some readers see the ghost theme as the most prominent line of the narrative's development; indeed, many reviews describe the novel as a detective story (we did not have this generic association at any point of reading). This is another indication of different potential readings' precipitating ambiguity in the underlying setting of the text, thus also making the translator's task more blurred.

García-Berrio further defines that in a literary text, poetic words are characterized by plurifunctionality and aesthetic polysemy; the plurality of readings originates in a text's connotative periphery. He maintains that a text's respective potential and limitations depend on the breath of the author's conceptual idea, that idea's linguistic expression, and the reader's cultural and linguistic competence (García-Berrio 1992: 51) — and, we add, on the reader's aesthetic (including literary) preferences, which themselves are highly individual, dynamic, and subject to unguided change. This makes a reader-oriented translation approach a vague task, though some typical profiles of 'reading cultures' can be identified. It also makes it unlikely that an inclusive and reliable strategy of translation criticism with generally applicable sets of 'objective' criteria can be proposed.

Meanwhile, many other aspects of the relationship between poeticity and its potential effect could be discussed where a contrastive perspective brings added insights. Here we include one example: Vladimir Nabokov claims that some unease at the Russian version of his *Lolita* is also caused by the wordiness and requirement of detail (an aspect which is a focus

of this paper) in Russian when compared to the laconic and rich phrases used in the English version; the claim is confirmed by the study of Ekaterina Strel'nitskaya (2009). This also applies often to translations into Latvian; prima facie evidence of this is that everyday experience shows that the word count increases when translating a text into Latvian or Russian. Though a translator can minimize this effect by using efficient transformations, such efficiency may compromise a text's poetics. For instance, whether the same aesthetic effect is achieved in the Russian translation, *ja ponjal, chto do jetogo ona sozercala menja igrajushhimi glazami* (literally: 'I knew that until now she had looked at me with her playful eyes'), of *I knew her eyes had been laughing* (see the analysis in Strel'nitskaya 2009: 105) remains a question. We suggest that the sentence in Russian reads differently than that in English — and not just because of the details added to explain temporal relationships. More importantly, due to the necessity of explaining and compensating, the TT sentence exists somewhere between English and Russian; something foreign remains in the Russian sentence — some foreign impact is felt in the shadow. Though we agree that a literal translation would not be acceptable, and we suggest that the construction *ja ponjal, chto do jetogo ee glaza/vzgljad [description of her glance]* be preserved.

At a text's macro-level and beyond, poeticity is not only a feature of a text's artistic value but also the utmost embodiment of the artistic essence of the text's literariness. In the first place, the poetic nature of everything created in the author's words originates in an author's specific relationships with reality, existence, language, and their various resources. Secondly, every text is unique and individual (just like every author, reader, and translator). Meanwhile, every text, even an avant-garde literary work, is, to some extent, integrated into an existing literary/cultural tradition. This implies text's inter-/metatextual nature and relationship with semiotic and cultural memory and the various ways in which we organize our speech-related and cognitive activities[1]. In other words, individuality and uniqueness should be considered together with the various aspects of typical/systematic/universal elements of text, textuality (one of the concepts necessary to approaching the essence of interpretation which derives from plurality of meaning and the respective conflict for which, as noted by Andrew Benjamin (2014: 38), textuality is the main site), and texture, which are as important for productive literary experience as are innovations. Multiple other elements and techniques are also used to achieve the *effect-response* dichotomy — verbally marked or implicit *tension* (for instance, by means of various oppositions and paradoxes), surprise caused by the unexpected or by rule-breaking[2], et cetera. Atypical, or aesthetic, specificity — expected and accepted by

---

1   A figurative illustration of how cultural memory acts are presented in *Invisible Cities* by Italo Calvino: "This city which cannot be expunged from the mind is like an armature, a honey-comb in whose cells each of us can place the things he wants to remember: names of famous men, virtues, numbers, vegetable and mineral classifications, dates of battles, constellations, parts of speech. Between each idea and each point of the itinerary an affinity or a contrast can be established, serving as an immediate aid to memory" (Calvino 1974: 15).

2   It should again be noted that the experiences of the unexpected and life's mysteries are of a general, everyday character (though in a literary reading they are applied in a more active way): "Every object, be it earthly or heavenly, hides a secret. Every time a secret has been discovered, it will refer to another secret in a progressive movement toward a final secret. Nevertheless, there can be no final secret" (Eco 1990: 152). Eco adds that this perception should, however, not mislead us into any radical, reader-oriented theory of interpretation.

the receiver — is a key condition for readership in the case of literary texts dabbling in new 'poeticities.' Further analysis of the poeticity of Atwood's *Surfacing* shows that employment of such tension-forming resources is an important feature of the novel.

Thus it would be a flaw to assume, for instance, that a literary text is primarily driven by its stylistically marked units — take them out of the text, and they become meaningless. The integration and interaction of various elements at various levels of the text's world are essential to a translator's investigation both before and during translation. The history of literary translation shows that even at this investigation phase it is possible to achieve remarkable success. In the pre-translation phase, translators need to act similarly to literary critics: discover and examine relevant mechanisms and techniques as they determine the proper textual choices to make when producing a faithful TT.

The forces of a text's world act similarly to those which hold together subatomic particles; they include choices related to sequencing, proportionality, accentuation (interaction of the foregrounded/secondary elements), dynamic element 'positions' possessing some interpretation potential, et cetera. Dynamic positioning derives from a context which is never fixed and from the ongoing use of language (termed 'languaging' by Hiraga (2004: 224–225)). Terry Eagleton suggests that literature is less dependent on the circumstances from which it arose than it is open-ended — one reason why literary works can be subject to a whole range of interpretations (Eagleton 2013: 44). Literary works, Eagleton claims, are matrices which do not contain meaning but rather produce it (52), while readers themselves *play at* and *play* the text (Barthes 1989: 62–63). This is also a precondition for translation manipulations which open a 'free' area for different types of transformations. The aspect of *play* carries implications regarding a translation's quality assessment: every change and slight inaccuracy may not be regarded as important in terms of translation quality. Though this is not a new perspective (for instance, see Jacques Delille's ideas in the 18th century (in Lefevere 1992)), everyday observations show that scrutiny regarding 'technical' translation mistakes (or internal inconsistencies, a notion used by Katharina Reiss (2014) to describe simple translation errors due to an inadequate knowledge of the vocabulary or grammar of the SL; we also add factual mistakes to this category) still prevail over practical analysis, as this is the most easily accessible level of criticism. No translators, even the most outstanding masters, have fully avoided these "technical failures" — but if kept to minimum, such failures do not usually affect the general quality of translation. Though we cannot avoid a discussion of faults in the context of translation quality assessment, it is important to take maximal account of the subsequent contextual implications.

To sum up the above points, we should emphasize that the aspect of a text's effect both at the level of the ST and its translation is a reasonable theoretical and practical focus in literary translation, though generally applicable principles are hardly possible as the effect-related aspects are case-specific. Simplification and either-or conclusions are typical results of discussions where the confrontation of form and content or of source-, author- or reader-oriented translation approaches occur. Translation is the art of compromise and the art of balance — more fundamentally and in a more complex way than it is usually admitted. Such

compromise also applies to the above distinctions. Translators should be expert readers and possess vast resources and tools to identify and process the pluralities embodied in the text. Craft prevails over magic: most answers, including considerations regarding the effect(s) of a text and the respective processing of its elements, even those not presented verbally, can be found in the text itself or, more precisely, in the text's world.

The text's world: competence and choice in literary translation

As discussed in the previous section, competent translation, similarly to competent reading, starts with the ability to deconstruct the text, its poetic tools, approaches, and specific types of balances achieved by different means. Beyond the largely technical part of the procedure (for instance, analysis of the grammatical features and lexical material), the processing of the contextual and implicit aspects are more complex; at this level the changes and interpretations are riskier, as the considerations include some elements of uncertainty and subjectivity. Moreover, any processing under the principle of achieving the same effect in the TT as in the ST is mainly related with those verbal and non-verbal elements of the text which contribute to the text's poeticity-related features.

In the case of literary translation, competence requires a broader interpretation by forming some accord, for instance, between experience [from previous reading] and the ability to process new textual substance. This is particularly important when translating Atwood's novels, especially her early works which employ fresh literary techniques. As noted by García-Berrio, in terms of poeticity, 'new' is closely linked with exceptionality and deviation: the author surprises readers within certain limits of deviation in the text, while the reader's poetic competence is based on awareness of such difference (deviation) and of its limits (García-Berrio 1992: 58). Openness to accept the respective type of exceptional communication and its rules of the game, readiness to be directed and consciously disoriented — important axes of tension required for a poetic effect and for any professional craft which involves its processing. Atwood's *Surfacing* is an example of how new literary ideas and approaches are integrated into existing 'cultures' of writing prose texts. If the novel is perceived as ghost story, it is an unusual ghost story, intellectual and poetic. If it is a detective story, again, an atypical case. Thus, the circumstances of how the context of the novel is developed in the text, how it is pre-processed at the pre-reading (or pre-translation) phase, and how it is comprehended and understood in the actual reading and/or translation process might also be of non-standard nature.

Integration of new experience into the existing matrices formed by previous experience is probably one of the most relevant rules of literary reading. For literary translators it is a professional requirement of competence which may be developed and trained without overlooking spontaneity of understanding: as suggested by Gibbs (2003: 29), understanding literary texts and meaning construction are not matters of "accessing highly structured knowledge, in the form of

abstract prototypes, from long-term memory. Instead, text understanding is a dynamic activity that relies on concrete, often embodied information, which people creatively compose in the moment of reading." Dynamics are an important precondition for translation. On the other hand, regarding access to information, understanding, and meaning-preservation by translators and by the target readers, the conclusions should not be simplified. For instance, the discussion of translation as a loss (of meaning/effect/relevance/context) presupposes that readers of the original text are engaged in some perfect, loss-free communication though their competence; engagement and response are also subject to variations.

When meaning/sense (including, inter alia, emotional or affective meanings which are closely related to the inherent affective function of language), poeticity, interpretation, and translation are collectively discussed, implicit information stands out as a key issue. Given the qualities of the texture in *Surfacing*, this possesses double importance. The approach taken by Atwood reminds of Haruki Murakami's emphatic description of Fitzgerald's prose where "words are sucked upward with their ambiguities and multiple meanings intact, so that they bulge with implications and possibilities" (Murakami 2013: 174) — though, instead, logic and consistency are still largely present in the way the text is developed and presented, which makes Atwood's poetics non-standard and strong. For readers and translators this, however, means both an interesting challenge and a difficult task. As noted by Natal'ya Kuz'mina, implication is defined by a specific case of inverse proportionality: the fewer textual indicators, the higher a text's implicit energy and the more severe the necessary cognitive conditions for the reader's engagement in order to undertake the respective decoding actions (Kuz'mina 1999: 64). The translator's task is to maintain the same cognitive conditions and the same energy of implicature by also paying attention to the potential specific considerations relating to the target culture.

Another aspect which is important for the discussion of literary translation is the text world theory, where world is first a cognitively complex language event involving at least two participants and second a textured, real-life representation of the combination of text and context wherein only information which forms the *necessary* context is used[3]. For this purpose, by using the textbase (word-for-word processing over the course of a reading), readers assemble all the propositions (microstructure) into facts about what is happening in the text, which are further organized in a macrostructure according to specific cognitive strategies including citation, local deletion, generalization, and construction (cf. Stockwell 2002: 123, 136). To some extent, the same rules apply to macro- (textual and contextual) and micro-level (specific lexical and structural) translation decisions when in the production of the TT compromise strategies are considered in order to seek a balance between those aspects which may be preserved and recreated and those which are lost in weighing the potential capacity of the implied TT reader.

3   For illustration we may again use a passage from Calvino: "I speak and speak," Marco says, "but the listener retains only the words he is expecting, The description of the world to which you lend a benevolent ear is one thing; the description that will go the rounds of the groups of stevedores and gondoliers on the street outside my house the day of my return is another; and yet another, that which I might dictate late in life, if I were taken prisoner by Genoese pirates and put in irons in the same cell with a writer of adventure stories. It is not the voice that commands the story: it is the ear" (Calvino 1974: 135).

Text worlds are made up of a combination of *world-building elements* (time, location, characters, objects) and *function-advancing propositions*, which include (1) descriptive attribution and relational predications (horizontal development) (it should be noted that the elements may seem quite technical, thus raising less complicated translation issues; however, inconsistencies or mistakes can be observed when translators disregard these elements and the respective information which may be useful in order to 'locate' the text world and its sub-worlds along with the respective implications at more complex textual levels) and (2) actional function-advancers or events (vertical development). The text world also consists of a number of sub-worlds.

Further, literary texts represent a dynamic use of both foregrounded elements (including repetition, unusual naming, innovative descriptions, creative syntactic ordering, puns, rhyme, alliteration, metrical emphasis, the use of creative metaphor, etc.) and background elements (Stockwell 2002: 14–16). Various types of logical, prototypical sentence structures are used: for instance, the profiling of figure and ground as one would through 'zooming in' and 'zooming out' (cf. Hamilton 2003). Syntactic diversity is used in order to take different views of essentially the same scene, thus assigning participants or events different roles and changing the focus (Stockwell 2002: 58). Stylistic patterns highlight a particular feature by also maintaining constant renewal of stylistic interest through changes in the figure and ground relationship (18). Regarding these aspects, it should be noted that translators must identify the respective structural elements and their functions, including the role(s) played by new or non-standard elements. The ability to handle texts as creative (inventive) works of verbal art has previously been neglected, though this capacity is of particular importance to translators. Regarding this, it can be useful when writers assist their translators by organizing common workshops where specific aspects are discussed and explained.

Importantly, Nuttall outlines a characteristic feature of postmodernist literature where reconstruction presented in a narrative is itself a reconstruction and both these reconstructions and the respective markers (including explicit 'instructions' provided by the author) are part of a figurative play with the implied reader (Nuttall 2014: 98). Similarly, in modernist/postmodernist texts figures of speech may become an element of an upper-level device, intertextual references — multi-level semantic 'extensions' aimed either at suggesting new/complementary interpretations or at highlighting the subjectivity or irrelevance of the interpretations. When translators work with this type of literary text (and *Surfacing* is one of them), any decision should be weighed against its implications. From another perspective, liberties in literary translation also derive from some allowance for 'creative misunderstanding': a misunderstood textual element can become "true" when it is coherently integrated into the TT, strongly connected with the work's other elements (Benjamin 2014: 209) — or, more generally, the new integrity of the TT produces new truths in foreign linguistic and cultural environments while also restoring the potential of the original work to generate new meaning (Conti, Gourley 2014: xvii).

When the above considerations are applied to a translation situation, choice takes a prominent role. Choice is the main condition for the emergence of practical and theoretical

translation issues, and any discussion of the translator's choices by undertaking a detailed study of alternatives and potential motivations underlying each selection is more inclusive and productive than, as discussed above, focusing on technical translation mistakes. The translator's task begins with choice, and it remains key throughout the process — a shortage of alternatives or variants may be the most alarming translation situation, as this implies potentially compromised quality.

Choice takes us back to the discussion of motivated changes, equivalent effects, and translation quality. In this context, Susan Bernofsky (2013: 233) highlights the importance of revision, which can be compared with immersion: at the comprehension and decoding phase, the original text must be forgotten, and instead, translators must revisit the translated text and *imagine*[4] (our emphasis) the TL words which are most appropriate in the TT (here we add that the choices largely depend on the linguistic co-text and situational/communicative context). This approach is consistent with the notion of native (or in case of translation — target-language) intuition used by Robert T. Bell (1991: 204). Evidence for the complexity of find the right words also follows from the simple fact that it is not very often that the variants provided in dictionaries really suit the needs of literary translators.

One final note is needed on the concept of preciseness in literary translation, as the concept of change is central to this paper. Variations may be caused by a multitude of factors (we may refer to the notions of obligatory and optional shifts proposed by Raymond van den Broeck (in House 2015: 16) or to natural and directional equivalence used by Anthony Pym (2014: 6-42)). Some of the changes can be performed almost automatically or intuitively based on a translator's competence (important here are a translator's experience and feel for the language(s)) and the rich tools at the translator's disposal to contrastively process the respective units). Typical translation procedures include transposition and modulation. But translators should also have a degree of creative freedom, which needs to be considered, in addition to other ideas, in the context of the spontaneous character of language in general. A translator's freedom is important not only for textual 'benefits', but to preserve translators' role as text [re]creators in order to develop and maintain the artistic potential of the work. A translator must possess the capacity to ensure adequate poeticity in terms of intensity and range and implicit or explicit representation in the ST. In addition, though not acting independently, every talented literary translator develops an individual approach, including a specific way of processing and presenting units that contribute towards a text's poeticity. This implies two distinct aspects: (1) a translator's approach represents their way of translating a text; thus, the work of one translator may become a metatext of their idiostyle; and (2) the approach may form an implicit discourse with, or discussion of, other approaches. Consequently, a narrow approach must be avoided by investigating general tendencies in decision-making procedures and choices instead of scrutinizing the slightest imprecision, which itself can hardly provide insight into the matter under investigation.

4   We should note that imagination is important at different stages of translation, including ST's comprehension when translators need to look at the text and at the situation from aside and form a picture of structural (including grammatical), logical, and contextual relationships.

Moreover, a literary translator may or even should fulfill special missions: for instance, literary translations can revitalize certain vocabulary or provide direct or indirect inputs for artistic (verbal, compositional, poetic) innovation originating in the ST, which is further integrated into and transformed within the target culture.

Atwood's novel *Surfacing*: poetic features and their translation implications
Poeticity of *Surfacing*: primary aspects and features

Surfacing (1972) has attracted great attention, including academic discussion (incl. Cooke 2004, Irigaray 1985, Kottiswari 2008, Macpherson 2010, Meškova 2002, Palumbo 2009, Sugars 2006, Vevaina 2006, Wilson 2006). Translators should particularly take note of an important conclusion derived from academic investigations that Atwood is an intellectual and conceptual writer; she never makes randomized lexical, structural, or compositional choices; Atwood's technique implies her texts' inherent tension. In addition, as a poet, she applies some poetic techniques. For instance, Atwood's verbal and syntactic economy (Roberta White notes the *Surfacing* narrator's "increasingly intense mistrust of words and language" (White 2009: 162), while W. S. Kottiswari suggests that the 'surfacer' never trusts her own visions and struggles through imposed, inherited discourses to find her own 'dialect' (Kottiswari 2008: 20, 121). We also include the implications which follow from Luce Irigaray's ideas on silencing women (see Irigaray 1985)) as a contributing factor in forming the narrative's poetic character, intense associations, etc. Similarly, various 'double-deck' techniques (such as the use of paradox alongside strict logic and 'presence' of mind) form the text's poetic energy and foster the reader's engagement. Duplicity, oppositions, and contrasts are major features of this novel; they are also often made explicit ((1) *[...] from now on I'll have to live in the usual way, defining them by their absence; and love by its failures, power by its loss, its renunciation* (Chapter 26); (2) *"I'm not going to your funeral," I said. I had to lean close to her [...]* (Chapter 2; implication: getting closer may sometimes emphasize distance); (3) *"Do what you think best," she said from behind her closed eyes. "Is there snow?"* (Chapter 2; implication: to avoid a personal conversation and to focus on the outside world).

Rosemary Sullivan, presenting an insight into Atwood's language which is of particular importance to translators of the text, writes, "Even in moments of intense mystical perception, [Atwood's] language is the language of logic. She does not experiment with language, she does not go far enough" (in Cooke 2004: 76). This perception could still be caused by misinterpreted functions and interplay: rigidity of expression, logic as contrasted to the experiences described is the poetics of the specific descriptive narrative which, though written in the first person, is not only the narrator's own speech but also a neutral reflection (this consideration must be distinguished from the instances of direct speech where the speech of the characters may acquire distinct features (for instance, (1) *"'Ow are you?" Madame would scream*; (2) *"Gettin' many fish?" he asks*). The narrator's reflections are rarely expressed through

direct reference; one such occasion is observed in Chapter 8: *That's a lie, my own voice says out loud*). Or, as Nathalie Cooke (2004: 76) holds, "Clarity of expression is too valuable a weapon to sacrifice." Moreover, the specific expression may also be consistent with other features of the narrative (for instance, the narrator is nameless) aimed at assigning a more general nature to the experiences and insights discussed.

As it is not possible to provide a full-text analysis of poeticity of the novel, we only include some illustrative examples which represent typical and essential poetic features achieved by various techniques.[5]

A typical feature is the constant change of perspective, moving from the primary text's world to sub-worlds and back; thus different elements, events, and features of these worlds are foregrounded, forming vast space and networks of associations (including generalization of specific situations/observations/experiences/events). ((1) *He has peasant hands, I have peasant feet, Anna told us that. Everyone now can do a little magic, she reads hands at parties, she says it's a substitute for conversation* (Chapter 1); (2) *Above the bar is a TV, turned off or broken, and the regulation picture, scrolled gilt frame, blown-up photograph of a stream with trees and rapids and a man fishing. It's an imitation of other places, more southern ones, which are themselves imitations, the original someone's distorted memory of a nineteenth-century English gentleman's shooting lodge, the kind with trophy heads and furniture made from deer antlers, Queen Victoria had a set like that* (Chapter 3); (3) *But I admit I was stupid, stupidity is the same as evil if you judge by the results, and I didn't have any excuses, I was never good at them* (Chapter 3); (4) *Fear has a smell, as love does* (Chapter 9)). For translators this means being cautious when identifying markers of the various perspectives and when using them in the TT (including, for instance, choice of pronouns, impersonal expressions, etc.).

Similarly to some quite sarcastic, lexically elaborated character descriptions, irony is found throughout the novel; it is usually meaningful and implicative: ((1) *The bad kind is mottled gray and yellow. It was my brother who made up these moral distinctions* (Chapter 4); (2) *That was before we were married and I still listened to what he said* (Chapter 6); (3) *they thought he'd turned into a wolf; he'd be a prime candidate since he never went to Mass at all* (Chapter 6); (4) *[...] so I decided to pray too, not like the Lord's Prayer or the fish prayer but for something real. I prayed to be made invisible, and when in the morning everyone could still see me I knew they had the wrong God* (Chapter 8); (5) *Joe took the small hatchet and went with him. They were from the city, I was afraid they might chop their feet; though that would be a way out, I thought, we'd have to go back* (Chapter 9); (6) *Saving the world, everyone wants to; men think they can do it with guns, women with their bodies* (Chapter 21)). It goes without saying that the same features should be assigned to the TT by preserving the specific 'taste' of Atwood's subtle and elegantly disguised irony.

5   The following elements also represent a part of the three-level linguopoetic analysis (semantic level; metasemiotic level; metametasemiotic level or linguopoetic interpretation of the text in the light of its aesthetic effects) proposed by Lipgart (2016: 48–49) and can be used, in direct and indirect ways, for the empirical analysis. We should, however, note limited applicability of Lipgart's model as he provides hardly any insight into the criteria for the evaluation of the effects. Lipgart's description also does not explain the aspect of reader response which may vary to a great extent.

The text is characterized by verbal and syntactic economy; expression is often laconic, even abrupt (*That means I'm not supposed to observe him; I face front* (Chapter 1; see more examples below)). Even if the wordiness of Russian and Latvian (see the discussion above) is acknowledged as an objective feature, a similar approach of economy and implicatures should be maintained in the TT's production to the extent practicable.

Anxiety, paradoxes, oppositions, and the expression of ideas as if the narrator is cut short lead to aggravating tension and an atmosphere of the unsaid, of suspicion and distrust, and of mystery ((1) *Madame is waiting for me, hands outstretched in welcome, smiling and shaking her head mournfully as though through no fault of my own I'm doomed* (Chapter 2); (2) *The lake is tricky, the weather shifts, the wind swells up quickly; people drown every year, boats loaded topheavy or drunken fishermen running at high speed into deadheads, old pieces of tree waterlogged and partly decayed, floating under the surface, there are a lot of them left over from the logging and the time they raised the lake level. Because of the convolutions it's easy to lose the way if you haven't memorized the landmarks and I watch for them now, dome-shaped hill, point with dead pine, stubble of cut trunks poking up from a shallows, I don't trust Evans* (Chapter 3)).

World-building elements do not only belong to different sub-worlds; they can also be blurred or merged explicitly. This may indicate some loss of integrity, a falling-apart (*"That's where the rockets are," I say. Were. I don't correct it* (Chapter 1)). Here the syntactic structure leading to a certain level of explication is of particular importance; the TT's structure should recognize the same conditions.

The novel depicts delusion and the blocking of painful experiences (*I bite down into the cone and I can't feel anything for a minute but the knifehard pain up the side of my face. Anesthesia, that's one technique: if it hurts invent a different pain. I'm all right*. Contrast this with a significant comment by David: *If you close your mind in advance like that you wreck it. What you need is flow* (Chapter 1)).

Absence is a key concept, in its different forms: ((1) *What I want to do is shout "Hello!" or "We're here!" but I don't, I don't want to hear the absence* (Chapter 4); (2) *He was as absent now as a number, a zero, the question mark in place of the missing answer. Unknown quantity. His way. Everything had to be measured* (Chapter 12)).

Emotional tension (which may also signify, for instance, an element of estrangement) and/or metaphorical implications are, at the text's surface level, often achieved by ordinary lexical means ((1) *I passed my hand lightly over his shoulder as I would touch a tree or a stone* (Chapter 14); (2) *sandbox where I made houses with stones for windows* (Chapter 18, not to feel and see but, instead, to hide and turn into stone)).

Atwood uses many association-based figures of speech (the main one being comparison in the form of metaphors and similes): ((1) *father in the stern, head wizened and corded like a dried root* (Chapter 10); (2) *her voice was like fingernails* (Chapter 11); (3) *He was as absent*

now as a number, a zero, the question mark in place of the missing answer (Chapter 12); (4) *air filling with liquid syllables* (Chapter 15); (5) *he was trapped in the straitjacket sleeping bag* (Chapter 15, comfort as imprisonment); (6) *the spines fragile as petals* (Chapter 15)).

Another important feature is the use of 'double' figures of speech — a figure of speech that becomes another upper-level figure of speech (*She was very thin, much older than I'd ever thought possible, skin tight over her curved beak nose, hands on the sheet curled like bird claws clinging to a perch* (Chapter 2). The highlighted simile itself becomes a metaphor for willingness to live and to recover).

Explicit linkage of the novel's themes and main associations ensure narrative coherence — again a feature which requires careful and masterful processing in translation by noting any structural or lexical detail which could change the text's coherence or the reader's access to respective associations:

(1) compare the initial implications: *I bend and push myself reluctantly into the Lake* (Chapter 8, end of Part I), *On some of the pages were women's dresses clipped from mail-order catalogues, no bodies in them* (Chapter 10), *Perhaps for him I am the entrance, as the lake was the entrance for me* (Chapter 17), and *But nothing has died, everything is alive, everything is waiting to become alive* (Chapter 19, end of Part II), which are developed into the following figures and implications: *He trembles and then I can feel my lost child surfacing within me, forgiving me, rising from the lake where it has been prisoned for so long* (Chapter 20) and *When I am clean I come up out of the lake, leaving my false body floated on the surface, a cloth decoy; it jiggles in the waves I make, nudges gently against the dock* (Chapter 23);

(2) *I scraped the ends of crust into the stove and washed the plates, the water turning reddish blue, vein color* (Chapter 10; a metaphor forming a connection with other themes (the opening/healing of past wounds);

(3) *His face contorted, it was pain: I envied him* (Chapter 12, implicitly illustrates the narrator's inability to feel emotions discussed elsewhere in the novel);

(4) *The* words *went out towards the shadows, smoke-thin, evaporating. Across the lake a barred owl was calling, quick and soft like a wing beating against the eardrum, cutting across the pattern of her voice, negating her* (Chapter 14; related to several important subjects of *Surfacing*: language as something which splits a person apart and something incapable of fulfilling its functions adequately; nature as something more important, powerful, valuable, and divine than the human world; the overlapping of different worlds and perspectives or (single) reality, (single) truth as an illusion); this utterance coherently connects with the following passages at the beginning of Chapter 15: *Bird voices twirled over my ears, intricate as skaters or running water, the air filling with liquid syllables* and *At the cabin we could soak the clothes we'd been wearing, scrub the forest out of them, renew our coating of soap and lotion* (a metaphor for a return to the unnatural and artificial);

(5) *In the middle of the night silence wakes me* (Chapter 22) and *The light wakes me* (the first sentence of Chapter 24) — the road of self-discovery: silence (listening to oneself) and then light (insight).

Similarly, the text may include related references or the development of certain images and features by using coherent figures of speech ((1) in Chapter 5, Joe's description includes (i) *toes with the deprived look of potatoes sprouted in the bag* and, in the next paragraph, (ii) *the skin pallid as though he's been living in a cellar*; (2) in Chapter 24 (prose poetry, no full stops used): (i) *The animals have no need for speech, why talk when you are a word*; (ii) *I lean against a tree, I am a tree leaning*; (iii) *I am not an animal or a tree, I am the thing in which the trees and animals move and grow, I am a place*; (iv) *the air forming itself into birds, they continue to call*; (4) in Chapter 25 (again prose poetry): (i) *it isn't my father it is what my father has become*; (ii) (in the next paragraph) *From the lake a fish jumps / An idea of a fish jumps [..] How many shapes can he take*). It is important to not only preserve such features in the translation, but also to ensure the same preconditions for readers to identify and access them.

The interplay of explicit/implicit information may become an efficient eye-catcher; for instance, the following explicit information in parenthesis may be assumed, but is not stated in the text given the narrative's implicative nature: *The house is smaller, because (I realize) the trees around it have grown* (Chapter 4).

Surfacing in translation — some examples

When the Russian text (translated by Inna Bernshteyn) and the Latvian text (translated by Silvija Brice) of Atwood's novel *Surfacing* are compared and analyzed in view of the above qualities, we observe both translation success and arguably poor changes or choices. However, it is important to put these views in a broader framework of considerations which integrate or derive from theoretical poeticity- and context-related insights.

First, we should briefly comment upon the Latvian and Russian translations of the novel's title. The grammatical features of the English word *surfacing* (it functions both as gerund and participle), its implicit kinetic character, and respective associations serve the needs of forming the metaphorical meanings and poetic effects. The protagonist surfaces a lake (or, in fact, herself); surfacing implies that something becomes apparent or, in cognitive/psychological terms, understood.

The Latvian participle *iznirstot* (literally: 'rising to the surface') fulfills, to a great extent, the same functions and needs. It conveys the kinetic energy, upward movement, rising to the surface of water/emerging from a former state, etc. However, as to the poetic potential, we should note that, first, the stem itself does not contain an element of 'surface' (in Latvian: *virsma*; *virspuse*), and, second, the aspect of becoming aware is more implicit. Nevertheless, this is a reasonable choice and the poetic losses are insignificant; readers still can access the implications.

The Russian translation *postizhenie*, instead, highlights the aspect of understanding and becoming aware through detailed consideration and insight. Both the kinetic features and the associations between reaching a surface and understanding something important are less apparent and more implicit. These shortcomings are, however, balanced by the clues provided in the text, and we may assume that the implicit meanings are still accessible for readers. The translator's choice is a success, as any alternatives (for instance, the Russian noun *vsplytie*, which is a literal translation of *surfacing*, does not function as participle) would lead to heavier poetic losses.

A paragraph in Chapter 9 reads:

From time to time I paused, checking the fence, the border, but no one was there. Perhaps he would be unrecognizable, his former shape transfigured by age and madness and the forest, rag bundle of decaying clothes, the skin of his face woolly with dead leaves. History, I thought, quick.

The Russian translator has approached, in the decoding and interpretation phase, the ST sentence as a typical instance of Atwood's syntax (thus it may also be regarded as an element of narrative's poeticity) — syntactic ellipsis (it should, however, be noted that Atwood's verbal and/or syntactic economy does not usually cause comprehension issues; even in case of ambiguity, the very fact of ambiguity is quite explicit) (*History, I thought, [runs] quick*; syntactically: *History quick* — subject + adverbial modifier) — but has translated it in full-sentence form: *Istorija, dumala ja, bezhit bystro* (this and other Russian translations: Etvud 1985; syntactically: *Istorija bezhit bystro* — subject + predicate + adverbial modifier). The Latvian translation (this and other Latvian translations: Atvuda 1998), instead, is both verbally and syntactically literal: *Vēsture, es domāju, ātri* (p. 75) where the potentially omitted word *[steidzas] ātri* ('[runs] quick') could be easily added. Thus both translators have interpreted the ST syntax in a similar way, but have treated it in two opposite manners where, given the poetic features of the novel, the Latvian variant is arguably more reasonable (though in Latvian we could also consider, for instance, this syntactic variant: *Vēsture, es domāju, [ir] ātra*).

In many instances the Russian and Latvian translations illustrate rewordings which are close to the ST but may mostly be regarded as adequate. Importantly, they also provide evidence that the translation was a craft of subtle detail.

The respective Russian and Latvian translations of the ST sentence *I'm in the back seat with the packsacks; this one, Joe, is sitting beside me chewing gum and holding my hand, they both pass the time* (Chapter 1) are: *Ja sizhu na zadnem siden'e, s veshhami; jetot, kotoryj so mnoj, Dzho, sidit rjadom, derzhit menja za ruku i zhuet zhevatel'nuju rezinku — i to i drugoe ot nechego delat'*, and *Es sēžu aizmugures sēdeklī pie mugursomām; šis, Džo, sēd man blakus, košļā gumiju un tur manu plaukstu, abas nodarbes īsina laiku.* (p. 8)

When the Russian translation's tone is compared with the rather neutral tone of the ST, we observe slightly more explicit petulancy in the highlighted units (*jetot, kotoryj so mnoj, Dzho*

(literally: 'this, the one who is my companion, Joe') and *i to i drugoe ot nechego delat'* (literally: 'they both due to nothing to do')). The first Russian unit has also verbally expanded, though here a literal translation could be used. The modulation of the second unit is based on the TL requirements, as a literal construction would not be acceptable — though an alternative variant closer to the neutral tone of the ST is 'chtoby kak-to zanjat' vremja' ('to pass the time').

The Latvian translation (*šis, Džo* (literally: 'this one, Joe') and *abas nodarbes īsina laiku* (literally: 'both actions pass the time')) is more literal and more successful in view of the given requirements. Admittedly, this is one of many cases when a literal approach brings benefits in the context of this specific translation.

Atwood's irony is illustrated in this sentence: *He gave me one of his initiate-to-novice stares* (Chapter 1). The Russian and Latvian translations show different lexical and syntactic choices, but they are a success: *On ugostil menja snishoditel'nym vzgljadom posvjashhennogo* (literally: 'He treated me with the condescending look of the initiate') and *Viņš uzmeta man skatienu, ar kādu visu noslēpumu zinātājs noraugās uz nejēgu iesācēju* (p. 10; literally: 'He glanced at me glance by which somebody who knows all secrets looks at a foolish novice'). The type of hyphenated compound used in the ST is characteristic neither in Russian nor in Latvian — but both translators have moved beyond identification of this primary-level morphological issue to the next task of seeking expressions which would ensure the reader can grasp the text's irony as easily as in the ST. Respectively, the translations are almost idiomatic expressions: the typical/likely wordings should the narrator be a Russian or a Latvian person. Thus, changes and/or added items are motivated and necessary and irony is easy to identify and understand.

The translations of some units are, instead, arguable in view of the specific features of the novel's poeticity. Again, the less acceptable choices may be related to seemingly subtle aspects. For instance, the introductory part of *Surfacing* forms an atmosphere of uncertainty, insecurity, inexplicable sentiments, and expectation (*I can't believe I'm on this road again, twisting along past the lake where the white birches are dying, the disease is spreading up from the south*; *an accumulation of sheds and boxes and one main street with a movie theater, the itz, the oyal, red R burned out*; *I've driven in the same car with them before but on this road it doesn't seem right, either the three of them are in the wrong place or I am*). See also the following two sentences: *He's a good driver, I realize that, I keep my outside hand on the door in spite of it. To brace myself and so I can get out quickly if I have to* (Chapter 1). The idea of the second sentence is expressed in a balanced way which is typical for the novel and may even be regarded as an element of its poeticity: it is a logical, analytical explanation of narrator's state of mind while avoiding overly formal lexical and structural choices.

The respective translations show different approaches: *Vo-pervyh, opirajus', a vo-vtoryh, chtoby srazu vyskochit', esli chto* (literally: 'First, I lean, and second, to immediately jump out in case something happens') and *Lai nezaudētu dūšu un nepieciešamības gadījumā ātri tiktu laukā* (p. 8; literally: 'Not to lose my stomach and to get out quickly if needed'). The

explicit numerical distinction (*vo-pervyh* and *vo-vtoryh*) makes the Russian translation more formal, and the logical structure of the sentence is more explicit — which is not necessary and compromises the translation quality. In addition, the translation of the idiomatic unit *brace myself* ('pull oneself up'; 'get a grip on oneself') as *opirajus* ('lean' (for instance, against a railing)) arguably provides for less figurative implications than some of the idioms available in Russian (however, at least one additional lexical meaning of 'opirat'sja' is 'to rely on somebody,' which serves, to an extent, the need for accurate interpretive flexibility).

The Latvian translation uses an equivalent idiom for the ST item *to brace myself*, and the syntactic structure which is directly borrowed from the ST corresponds to the initial function.

In general, the Russian translation is characterized, contrary to the ST, by verbalism and arbitrary, inconsistent shifts between overly formal and colloquial expression. For instance, the Russian translation of the ST sentence *Still I'm glad they're with me, I wouldn't want to be here alone; at any moment the loss, vacancy, will overtake me, they ward it off* (chapter 4) reads: *No vse-taki ja rada, chto oni so mnoj, ne hotelos' by mne ochutit'sja zdes' v odinochestve; utrata, pustota gotovy nabrosit'sja na menja iz-za ugla, prisutstvie jetih ljudej sluzhit mne zashhitoj.*

The Russian translation *ne hotelos' by mne ochutit'sja zdes' v odinochestve* (literally: 'I wouldn't want to find myself here alone') may be regarded as an almost idiomatic equivalent of the ST unit in the given context — thus it is acceptable. Instead, the unit *gotovy nabrosit'sja na menja iz-za ugla* (literally: 'ready to pounce on me from the corner') features unnecessary figurativeness, making the expression more elaborate and emphatic than the ST unit. The final highlighted unit, *prisutstvie jetih ljudej sluzhit mne zashhitoj* (literally: 'the presence of these people serves to protect me'), is overloaded with additional information, when compared with the ST unit, and is expressed too formally.

This is not an issue in the Latvian translation of the respective units, where a more literal approach proves to provide, once again, certain benefits: *es negribētu būt šeit viena* (a literal translation of the ST unit), *tiklīdz mani grasās sagrābt* (p. 37; literally: 'as soon as I'm about to be taken over by') and *viņi to aizgaiņā* (literally: 'they take it away'). The Latvian word *aizgaiņāt* is a stylistically marked, colloquial word which can be considered an acceptable translation for the English phrasal verb *ward off*. The syntactic change in the Latvian translation — the use of connective *tiklīdz* ('as soon as') and the explanatory syntactic relationship utilized — is slightly contrary to the typically abrupt structuring of the ST units, but in this specific instance it does not cause any significant damage to the text.

Some added items or extended units in the Russian TT — *Oni ved' gorodskie, kak by ne ottjapali sebe stupni, hotja jeto byl by vyhod iz polozhenija, mel'knulo u menja v golove, togda by, hochesh' ne hochesh', prishlos' uezzhat'* — alter Atwood's laconic manner of narration: *They were from the city, I was afraid they might chop their feet; though that would be a way out, I thought, we'd have to go back* (Chapter 9). The Russian translation again aims at explaining

and making expression more 'complete' or 'smooth'; however, Atwood, never chatty in *Surfacing*, is an inventor who seeks new limits and new ways of developing literariness/poeticity, and smoothness may not be the most relevant criterion. Thus Russian language norms in this context must be considered and counteracted.

None of the above problems are observed in the Latvian translation, which indicates a consistency throughout the Latvian version of the text that does not exist in the Russian version.

From another perspective, the utterance *From the side he's like the buffalo on the U.S. nickel, shaggy and blunt-snouted, with small clenched eyes and the defiant but insane look of a species once dominant, now threatened with extinction. That's how he thinks of himself, too: deposed, unjustly. Secretly he would like them to set up a kind of park for him, like a bird sanctuary* (Chapter 1) is not just a description of Joe (more broadly, it highlights, in an almost sarcastic way, some aspects of men's attitude and self-perception, too); it also shows characteristic features of the novel — tonal irony and abrupt, flash-like syntactic constructions (for instance, *deposed, unjustly*) which may, among other implications, correspond to the respective cognitive processes of the protagonist. Both elements — irony and syntax of the ST — mean that every lexical and structural selection is of high importance in preserving the text's potential.

The Russian translation — *V profil' on napominaet bizona na amerikanskom pjatake, takoj zhe grivastyj i ploskonosyj, i glaza tak zhe prishhureny — norovistoe i gordoe sushhestvo, nekogda car' prirody, a teper' pod ugrozoj vymiranija. Sam sebe on imenno takim i predstavljaetsja: nespravedlivo svergnutym. Vtajne on hotel by, chtoby dlja nego uchredili kakoj-nibud' nacional'nyj park, nechto vrode ptich'ego zapovednika* — and the Latvian translation — *No sāniem viņš izskatās pēc bizona uz Savienoto Valstu pieccentu monētas, pinkains struppurnis ar mazām, piemiegtām ačelēm un izaicinošu, taču neprātīgu skatienu, kāds piemīt sugai, kura reiz bijusi valdošā, bet tagad ir pakļauta izmiršanas briesmām. Tieši tā viņš arī domā par sevi – kā par netaisnīgi gāztu no troņa. Klusībā viņš vēlētos, lai viņam ierīko tādu kā personisko parku, kaut ko līdzīgu putnu rezervātam* (p. 8) — show slightly different choices. For instance, the Russian colloquialism *pjatak* is an adequate translation of the ST *nickel*, but *ploskonosyj* ('flat-nosed') is closer to an antonym to *blunt-snouted*. More importantly, the fully developed, standard syntactic constructions (*takoj zhe grivastyj i ploskonosyj, i glaza tak zhe prishhureny* (literally: 'the same long-maned and flat-nosed look, and eyes squinty as well'); *nespravedlivo svergnutym* (literally: 'unjustly overthrown')) represent unmotivated deviations from the ST. The final sentence of the translated utterance, instead, is a balanced translation which includes no unnecessary items or structural reorganization.

In Latvian, the accuracy of the lexical choice *pieccentu monēta* is debatable: it is a formal-register equivalent of *nickel*; we suggest, instead, *pieccentience*: a colloquialism which has the advantage of being a closed compound, namely, a single word (similar to the ST item). We also note that adding *personisks* to *parks* (together: 'personal park') is an unmotivated change. Structurally, the Latvian utterance is also too well-developed by using complete, standard syntactic constructions, including a full construction for the ST unit *deposed, unjustly*: *kā par netaisnīgi gāztu no troņa* ('as unjustly deposed from the throne').

Thus, we may conclude that both translations feature a focus on lexical choices in order to preserve the ironic tone, but that in each the unique syntactic character is partly lost.

There are many other instances in the Russian translation where expression is made more precise and elaborate while ruining the balance of implicit/explicit information and thus contradicting the poeticity of the ST. The unit *"That's where the rockets are," I say. Were. I don't correct it.* (Chapter 1; here, importantly, implicature is highlighted by the text's formatting: italics for *were* are used in the text.) is translated in the following way: — *Vot tam stojat rakety, — govorju ja. Vernee* (literally: 'more correctly'), *stojali, no ja ne popravljajus'.* (The original tone is replaced by an explanation which cannot be regarded as a successful translation choice.) In addition, 'popravljat'sja' is rarely used in the meaning 'to correct one's own mistake'; more common meanings are 'to recover [after an illness]' or 'to put on some weight.' Consequently, we ask whether the translator intended to play with the alternative meanings, and, if such is the case, *why*, as no such implications follow from the ST item.

Again, the Latvian translation has strictly observed the features of the ST by preserving the item in italics: – *Re, tur ir raķetes, - es saku.* Bija. *Bet es neizlaboju* (p. 9).

Similarly, the underlined ST unit in *The closest Paul ever got to farming was to have a cow, killed by the milk bottle* (Chapter 2) has become considerably more informal and colloquial: *V Pole fermerskogo tol'ko razve to, chto odnazhdy on zavel bylo korovu, kotoruju skoro szhilo so svetu pokupnoe moloko* (literally: 'which was driven to death by purchased milk'): first, the neutral ST item *killed* is translated by a colloquial idiom *szhit' so svetu* (it highlights irony and thus is an acceptable choice), and, second, the ST item *milk bottle* (readers should themselves infer the respective implicature that milk bottles purchased in stores are meant) is translated as *pokupnoe moloko*, where no inference is needed as implicature is explained (thus the change lacks proper justification).

The Latvian translation again maintains a literal approach: *Pola augstākais lauksaimnieciskais sasniegums bija tas, ka viņš turēja govi, kuru nobeidza piena pudele* (p. 17; literally: 'which was killed by a milk bottle').

Meanwhile, it should be noted that the Russian and Latvian translators have handled the initial part of the sentence differently, but both modulations feature irony and are acceptable: *V Pole fermerskogo tol'ko razve to, chto* (literally: 'Paul is no farmer, except that') and *Pola augstākais lauksaimnieciskais sasniegums bija tas, ka* (literally: 'Paul's highest agricultural achievement was that').

As we continue the discussion, it is difficult to guess the reason why the Russian translation of the underlined unit in *Joe is still off in the place inside himself where he spends most of his time* (Chapter 5) is *Dzho vse eshhe gde-to vnutri sebja, gde on obychno prjachetsja* (literally: 'where he usually hides'). The Russian interpretation has vague motivation and thus is debatable.

The same applies to the Russian translation of the ST sentence *I stand there shivering, seeing my reflection and my feet down through it, white as fish flesh on the sand, till finally being in the air is more painful than being in the water and I bend and push myself reluctantly into the lake* (chapter 8): *Stoju v vode i drozhu, mne vidno sobstvennoe otrazhenie i nogi v tolshhe vody, belye, kak ryb'e mjaso, no postepenno v vozduhe stanovitsja eshhe holodnee, chem v vode* (literally: 'gradually it gets even colder in the air than in water'), *i togda ja prigibajus' i nehotja pogruzhajus' v ozero*, where for a metaphorical unit its 'face value' is provided, namely, its neutral meaning is explained (the metaphor is preserved in the Latvian translation). There is no apparent reason to undertake such a stylistic shift, as there is no justification in terms of the text's poetics; this can be viewed as a translation mistake.

Another item which needs a comment is the Russian translation of *push myself reluctantly into the lake: nehotja pogruzhajus' v ozero* (literally: 'immerse myself reluctantly into the lake'). The Latvian translation features the same lexical choice: *negribīgi iegrimstu atpakaļ ezerā* (literally: 'immerse myself reluctantly back into the lake'). In view of the metaphorical/poetic/conceptual significance of the implicit opposition 'immersing vs. surfacing' throughout the novel, every lexical unit which belongs to the respective semantic fields should be processed with special care. When items more remote from the semantic centers (one of them is 'immerse') are used ('push oneself into'), the same technique should be preserved in the TT. Instead, in both translations we observe a shift towards the center, thus making an unnecessary change in terms of foregrounding and implicatures.

In some rare instances, the literal approach in the Latvian translation becomes a trap. When we consider the translation of the ST sentence *There's no act I can perform except waiting* (chapter 6): *Nav nekādas rīcības, kuru es varētu veikt, ir tikai gaidīšana* (p. 48; literally: 'There is no action which I could undertake, there is only waiting'), it should be noted that the initial part of the sentence in Latvian sounds formal and awkward. In addition, it is not acceptable Latvian, as the collocation 'veikt rīcību' is atypical; instead, the verb form 'rīkoties' is preferable. We suggest, for instance, 'Nav nekā, ko es varētu pasākt, izņemot gaidīšanu' (literally: 'There is nothing I could undertake except waiting'; 'pasākt' – a colloquial sysnonym of 'rīkoties').

The Russian version is more acceptable, though again the extent of paraphrasing and interpretation can be discussed in view of the given the context: *Ot menja teper' trebuetsja odno: zhdat'* (literally: 'The only thing required from me: to wait'), especially in view of the many other alternative options, such as edinstvennoe, chto ja mogu delat – jeto zhdat.

The Russian and Latvian translations also show fundamentally different approaches to slang, and the use of slang in the Russian version is more questionable. For instance, the Russian and Latvian translations of the ST sentence unit *[..] everyone she knew was making a movie, and David said that was no fucking reason why he shouldn't* (Chapter 1) are *teper' vse ee znakomye snimajut fil'my, a Djevid rugnulsja i skazal, chto jeto eshhe ne rezon otkazyvat'sja ot zadumannogo* and *visi, ko viņa pazīstot, uzņemot filmas, bet Deivids atcirta, kas tas, velns parāvis, neliedzot uzņemt filmu arī viņam* (p. 10). The Russian translator has replaced

the slang word *fucking* with a description of David's expression (*Djevid rugnulsja* (literally: 'David cursed')) without using the word itself: Thus, more processing effort but less acceptable results. The translation date is, however, also important in this case. The Russian translation dates back to 1985, the final phase of the Soviet era, which was known for alterations in cases when the ST was considered not appropriate according to Soviet morale and spirit.

In Latvian, the slang word is preserved by using the most common and thus most appropriate Latvian equivalent *velns parāvis* ('fuck'; 'holy shit'). Moreover, David's annoyance is highlighted by replacing the neutral *David said* with *Deivids atcirta* (literally: 'David snapped').

Important observations can be made from the Russian and Latvian translations of the ST unit *"They must fuck a lot here," Anna says, "I guess it's the Church." Then she says, "Aren't I awful"* (Chapter 1): — *idno, zdes' muzh'ja v posteli retivy*, — *govorit Anna.* — *Katolicheskie nravy.* — *A potom dobavljaet:* — *Uzhas, chto ja govorju, da?* and – *Te laikam drātējas bez sava gala,* – *ierunājas Anna.* – *Baznīcas nopelns.* – *Tad viņa piebilst:* – *Vai es neesmu šausmīga?* The ST unit which includes slang is replaced by a semantic paraphrase without slang: *muzh'ja v posteli retivy* (literally: 'men are zealous in bed') which is arguably a poor substitute given the context and the personality and characteristic vocabulary of Anna. The Russian translator has also changed the next unit — compare *Katolicheskie nravy* (literally: 'Catholic morals') with *I guess it's the Church* — though we argue that nothing in the novel suggests this narrowing (from 'Church' to Catholic [church]) to be reasonable (the Catholics are only mentioned in chapter 6 by the protagonist: "'Maybe I'll be a Catholic,' I said to my brother; I was afraid to say it to my parents"). Similarly, the Russian translation also provides an interpretation for the third underlined unit of the ST: *Uzhas, chto ja govorju, da?* (literally: 'That's awful what I'm saying awful things, right?'), though acceptable Russian variants closer to the source expression and its level of implicature are also possible.

The only minor issue raised by the Latvian translation, which has none of the arguably poor choices discussed regarding the Russian translation, is the highlighted item of the ST unit *They must fuck a lot here*: *Te laikam drātējas bez sava gala* (literally: 'endlessly'). This is a stylistically more elaborate item than the plain and neutral ST item *a lot* (in Latvian: 'daudz'), which indicated Anna's simple vocabulary.

Some relevant translation-related issues can also be noted in the translations of the following dialogue:

> ST: *"Don't you dare," Anna says. "I don't like him kissing me when he has a beard, it reminds me of a cunt." Her hand goes over her mouth as though she is shocked. "Isn't that awful?"*
>
> *"Filthy talk, woman," David says, "she's uncultured and vulgar"* (Chapter 5).

RU: — *I ne dumaj dazhe, — govorit Anna. — Ja ne ljublju, kogda on celuet menja borodatyj, pohozhe na... — Ona upotrebljaet neprilichnoe slovo i srazu zhe prikryvaet rot rukoj, budto sama zhe ispugalas'. — Uzhas, chto ja govorju, da?*

LV: – *Neuzdrīksties! – Anna iesaucas. – Man nepatīk ar viņu bučoties, kad viņam ir bārda, tā man atgādina pežu. – Viņa aizsedz muti ar plaukstu, it kā justos šokēta. – Vai nav šausmīgi?* (p. 42)

The Russian translator has again avoided using slang (*it reminds me of a cunt – pokhozhe na... — Ona upotrebljaet neprilichnoe slovo* (literally: 'like... – She uses a four-letter word')). It is also unclear why the translator has substantially changed this description of Anna's reaction: *as though she is shocked — budto sama zhe ispugalas'* (literally: 'as though she is scared [by her own words]'). In the given context, shock indicating one's being surprised and upset due to one's own behavior instead of being frightened is a more likely emphasis; thus we may assume that the Russian translation slightly changes the focus of the comment.

More importantly, the Russian translation *Uzhas, chto ja govorju, da?* of the ST unit *Isn't that awful?* forms a coherent unity with a translation in Chapter 1 (*Aren't I awful. – Uzhas, chto ja govorju, da?* While in Chapter 1 the meaning is clear, this time it is difficult to objectively interpret the comment. It may mean being shocked by her feeling, by her association, or by the way she speaks; respectively, it could be utilized to preserve an expression which maintains the same level of ambiguity. This is the approach used by the Latvian translator (*Vai nav šausmīgi?* (literally: '*Isn't that awful?*').

Instead, the paraphrase/interpretation of *Don't you dare* allows for more flexibility due to its insignificant implicature. Both *I ne dumaj dazhe* (literally: 'Don't you even think about it') and *Neuzdrīksties!* (literally: 'Don't you dare!') are acceptable options: though we suggest, for instance, 'Pat nedomā!' ('Don't you even think about it'), which holds the same implication as the ST unit and is a simple and typical Latvian idiom used in similar contexts.

Conclusions

Text's literariness as a representation of the typical literary choices forming respective literary and reading 'cultures' is an important primary-level textual feature for poeticity — the specific, tension-forming interplay of various verbal and non-verbal elements of a text, arising from certain motivations. Poeticity as a product-value implies a more complicated relationship between a text and its readers, including the unpredictable, case-specific, effect-response mechanisms. Treating literature as an artistic creation means that new approaches and rule-breaking is almost a requirement. Thus, a translator's competence should include copious previous reading experience and ability to process new textual substance. The good news is that even innovative poetic approaches are to some extent integrated into the previous

literary/cultural tradition and follow some patterns which may be identified and processed in line with the conditions established at the text-world level. The translator's task is, similar to that of literary critics, to identify and maintain, to the extent possible, the respective mechanisms, features, and potential 'energy' of every respective element while also accepting that there is no loss-free communication.

Literary texts are characterized by plurifunctionality and aesthetic polysemy, while their perception and interpretation are subject to readers' unstable aesthetic preferences — which make distinctively reader-oriented translation approaches a risky endeavor. Thus, any single strategy of translation criticism with generally applicable sets of 'objective' criteria is not a trustworthy one.

In translatological studies, the comprehensive frameworks of poetic analysis need pragmatic application; this is achieved through focusing solely on elements related to the range of translation issues emerging from the main condition — the availability of alternative choices. Mastery of choice and balance — two aspects which largely depend on the linguistic co-text and situational/communicative context — lies at the heart of successful literary translation. Close reading uncovers various relationships embodied in the text and the respective implications of those relationships. Balanced selections and transformations are at least half of the job in ensuring quality literary target texts, keeping in mind that freedom in prose translation is limited.

'Technical' translation mistakes form the most easily accessible level of criticism, but it is important to take maximal account of contextual and poeticity-level implications.

When a detailed translation analysis is undertaken, item- or unit-level considerations should be balanced with upper-level criteria where the translator's approach may not be simplified. First, a seemingly literal (close) translation may be based on scrutiny regarding various linguistic and extra-linguistic aspects that finally determine a literal expression acceptable (thus, the procedure is by no means linear). Next, the translator's creative, or at least re-creative, freedom and his/her specific approach should be considered. Moreover, translators may also aim towards a special contribution, for instance by providing, in line with the poetic features of the text, inputs of artistic innovation into the target culture or including rarely used target-language words, thus enriching the active vocabulary of readers.

To analyze Atwood's *Surfacing* and its translations, her underlying approaches and writing techniques must be explored, identified, and understood. Atwood is an intellectual and conceptual writer, who even in her novels also remains a poet.

Translation requires the skills of rewording and paraphrasing. In general terms, both the Russian and Latvian translations discussed above feature outstanding selections, while in some cases the TTs illustrate decisions stretching beyond the margin of acceptability when consistency with the poeticity of the ST is considered. This particularly applies to the Russian translation, where the translator has made great efforts towards interpreting and/or

paraphrasing the respective ST items or units, mostly by means of modulation, in some instances moving away from the necessary result.

The analysis also shows the importance of temporality: some Russian translations (for instance, avoiding the use of slang) may be an echo of censorship and the ideology-driven Soviet approach of embellishing literary translations. This suggests the necessity of re-translation.

Atvuda, Mārgareta (1998). *Iznirstot*. Rīga: Atēna.

Atwood, Margaret (2012). *Surfacing*. Simon & Schuster. E-book.

Barthes, Roland (1989). *The Rustle of Language*. Translated by Richard Howard. Berkley: University of California Press.

Benjamin, Andrew (2014 [1989]). *Translation and the Nature of Philosophy*: *A New Theory of Words*. New York: Routledge.

Bernofsky, Susan (2013). Translation and the Art of Revision. Allen, Esther, Bernofsky, Susan (eds.). *In Translation. Translators on Their Work and What It Means*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 223–233.

Boase-Beier, Jean (2014). *Stylistic Approaches to Translation*. London: Routledge.

Calvino, Italo (1974). *Invisible Cities*. Translated by William Weaver. San Diego: A Harvest Book.

Conti, Christopher, Gourley, James (eds.) (2014). *Literature as Translation. Translation as Literature*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Cooke, Nathalie. (2004). *Margaret Atwood. A Critical Companion*. Westport: Greenwood Press.

Eagleton, Terry (2013). *How to Read Literature*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Eco, Umberto (1990). Interpretation and Overinterpretation: World, History, Texts. Dworkin, Ronald et al. (eds.). *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, pp. 141–202.

Etvud, Margaret (1985). *Postizhenie*. Translated by Inna Bernshteyn. Moskva: Raduga. E-book.

Fowler, Roger (1966). *Essays on Style and Language*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Books.

García-Berrio, Antonio (1992). *A Theory of the Literary Text*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Gibbs, Raymond W. (2003). Prototypes in dynamic meaning construal. Gavins, Johanna et al. (eds.). *Cognitive Poetics in Practice*. London: Routledge, pp. 27–40.

Hamilton, Craig (2003). A cognitive grammar of 'Hospital Barge' by Wilfred Owen. Gavins, Johanna et al. (eds.). *Cognitive Poetics in Practice*. London: Routledge, pp. 55–66.

Hansen, Thomas Illum (2012). Cognitive stylistics: Style and cognition in *Mrs Dalloway*. Kwiatkowska, Alina (ed.). Łódź Studies in Language. Vol. 26. Texts and Minds. Papers in Cognitive Poetics and Rhetoric. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, pp. 71–84.

Harrison, Chloe et al. (2014). Introduction: Cognitive Grammar in literature. Harrison, Chloe et al. (eds.). *Linguistic Approaches to Literature. Volume 17. Cognitive Grammar in Literature*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 1–18.

Hiraga, Masako K. 2004. *Metaphor and Iconicity. A Cognitive Approach to Analysing Texts*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Irigaray, Luce (1985). *This Sex Which Is not One*. New York: Cornell University Press.

House, Juliane (2015). *Translation Quality Assessment. Past and Present*. London and New York: Routledge.

Kottiswari, W.S. (2008). *Postmodern Feminist Writers*. New Delhi: Sarup & Sons.

Kuz'mina, Natal'ja (1999). *Intertekst i ego rol' v processah jevoljucii pojeticheskogo jazyka* [Intertextuality and its role in the evolution of poetic language]. Ekaterinburg: Izd-vo Ural.

Lefevere, André (ed.) (2003 [1992]). *Translation. History. Culture. Sourcebook*. London&New York: Routledge.

Lipgart, Andrej (2016). *Osnovy lingvopoetiki* [Introduction to linguopoetics]. Moskva: Librokom.

Macpherson, Heidi Slettedahl (2010). *The Cambridge Introduction to Margaret Atwood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meškova, Sandra (2002). *Sievišķā reprezentācijas latviešu un ziemeļamerikāņu literatūrā*. Promocijas darbs. Latvijas Universitāte.

Nuttall, Louise (2014). Constructing a text world for *The Handmaid's Tale*. Harrison, Chloe et al. (eds.). *Linguistic Approaches to Literature. Volume 17. Cognitive Grammar in Literature*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 83–100.

Palumbo, Alice M. 2009. On the Border: Margaret Atwood's Novels. Bloom, Harold (ed.). *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: Margaret Atwood—New Edition*. New York: Bloom's Literary Criticism, pp. 21–34.

Pym, Anthony (2014 [2010]). *Exploring Translation Theories*. 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge.

Reiss, Katharina (2014 [2000]). *Translation Criticism—the Potentials & Limitations. Categories and Criteria for Translation Quality Assessment*. Transl. by Erroll F. Rhodes. London and New York: Routledge. E-book.

Stockwell, Peter (2002). *Cognitive Poetics. An Introduction*. London: Routledge.

Strel'nitckaja, Ekaterina (2009). *Jemotivnost' i perevod: osobennosti jazykovoj peredachi jemocij pri hudozhestvennom perevode s anglijskogo jazyka na russkij* [Emotiveness and translation: peculiarities in transferring emotions in literary translation from Russian into English]. PhD Thesis. Moskva.

Sugars, Cynthia (2006). "Saying Boo to Colonialism": Surfacing, Tom Thomson, and the National Ghost. Moss, John et al. (eds.). *Margaret Atwood. The Open Eye*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, pp. 137–158.

Tytler, Alexander Fraser (1992). Essay on the Principles of Translation. Lefevere, André (ed.). *Translation. History. Culture. Sourcebook*. London&New York: Routledge, pp. 128–135.

Vevaina, Coomi S. (2006). Margaret Atwood and history. Howells, Coral Ann (ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to Margaret Atwood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 86–99.

White, Roberta (2009). Northern Light: Margaret Atwood's *Cat's Eye*. Bloom, Harold (ed.). *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: Margaret Atwood—New Edition*. New York: Bloom's Literary Criticism, pp. 159–182.

Wilson, Sharon R. (2006). Blindness and survival in Margaret Atwood's major novels. Howells, Coral Ann (ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to Margaret Atwood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 176–190.

Kad mazāk nozīmē vairāk jeb izvēles māksla: Mārgaretas Atvudas romāna "Iznirstot" poētika un tās apstrāde krievu un latviešu valodas tulkojumos

Jānis Veckrācis

Atslēgvārdi: poētika, estētiskā iedarbība, teksta pasaule, implicītā informācija, līdzsvarotas izvēles, prozas tulkošana

Rakstā uzmanības centrā ir ar teksta poētiku un teksta iedarbības nemainības principu saistītie apsvērumi daiļliteratūras (prozas) tulkošanas kontekstā. Lai īstenotu mērķi pilnvērtīgi analizēt Mārgaretas Atvudas romāna "Iznirstot" poētiskās iezīmes un to apstrādi krievu un latviešu valodas tulkojumā, sniegts īss ieskats daiļliteratūras tekstu konceptuāli tipoloģiskajos aspektos, kā arī aktuālajā teksta poētikas teorijā, kas savukārt ir priekšnosacījums, lai noskaidrotu Atvudas tekstā konstatējamās eksplicītās un implicītās informācijas līdzsvara un sadarbes iezīmes, kas var būt konstatējamas gan mikrolīmeņa vienībās, gan veidos, kādos tās ir integrētas teksta makrostruktūrā. Tulkotāja lēmumpieņemšanas aspektā īsi raksturota niansēta teksta lasījuma un tulkotāja kompetences nozīme. Attiecīgi sniegts Atvudas romāna poētikas raksturojums, kas līdztekus teorētiskajām atziņām izmantots tulkojumu kvalitātes analīzē tieši poētikas un implicītās/eksplicītās informācijas līdzsvara aspektā. Izpēte liecina, ka galvenokārt tieši krievu valodas tulkojumā šķietami nenozīmīgas izmaiņas un papildinājumi, kas vispārīgā situācijā būtu pieņemami, konkrētās poētikas noteikto kritēriju dēļ raisa šaubas. Tiek pētīts nosacīti tieša prozas tulkojuma pieejas piemērojamības jautājums un raksturoti šādas pieejas faktiskās izpausmes un izmantošanas kritēriji. Līdztekus tiek konstatētas vienības, kuru poētikas apstrādes kvalitāti nosaka nevis tulkotāja profesionālā meistarība, bet attiecīgajā laikā mērķkultūrā pastāvošie ideoloģiskie ierobežojumi un cenzūra.