

GABRIELĖ ŠALČIŪTĖ-ČIVILIENĖ  
*King's College London*

## STRANDS IN LITERARY ENGLISH-TO-LITHUANIAN TRANSLATION CRITICISM IN LITHUANIA SINCE 1990

### 1. Introduction

Although relatively young and still expanding, the discipline of Translation Studies (TS) continues bringing diverse and challenging insights to the studies of language, concerning its communicative aspects, language creativity, inter-linguistic contacts, authorship issues, digital applications, and other areas. With a longstanding history of translation practice and yet still at an early stage of academic legacy, it offers a potential for interfacing with various disciplines in order to trigger and challenge new approaches by adapting methods and tools born or developed at the interface with and of other disciplines (e.g. corpus linguistics, ethnographic studies, stylometry, etc). Once some issues are settled on a temporary basis, new aspects and questions arise in this vast and cross-fertilizing field. The question of what makes this field so rich and ever growing is yet to be answered. An in-depth view needs to reflect on how it interacts with other fields and how it responds to the demands of actual practices in translation industry and to the changing role of language studies within and outside the humanities. Within a global context, the Anglo-American tradition of thought and scholarship seems to have contributed a great deal to translation theory which in return continues to heavily influence theories and studies born outside this tradition. The theory of translation received a boost and expanded its horizons, especially, in the 80s when Even-Zohar launched Polysystem Theory to capture multiple interdependencies of the environment in which the translator operates and in the 90s when Gideon Toury outlined the objectives and the method of Descriptive Translation Studies. In other words, theory made an attempt to tie theoretical assumptions in with observation and reflection upon practices. After transforming its object of study into the epitome of complexity, the theory itself could no longer confine itself to Anglo-American-centred views and data, which seems to be limiting the growth of the field without contributions from language-specific studies from across cultures. But how do a number of minority language and culture groupings, among them Lithuanian, perform against the Anglo-American-dominated scholarship? Is critical Lithuanian scholarship visible and rich enough to contribute to what has been already observed and described? Is our historical experience of roles, functions and practices of translation distinctive enough to be researched in-depth, given that scholarly tradition faced constant disruptions and ideological transformations; are our tools and human resources potentially effective enough to challenge the views and theories backed up by a long history of scholarly endeavour; can we manoeuvre our national scholarship built on studying such a low-demand language as Lithuanian into the current global context of research?

Leaving these questions open for scholarly discussion and criticism of knowledge, the current article aims to review the scope and issues raised in the domestic critical discourse reflecting on the Lithuanian translations of Anglo-American literary titles of fiction. The discourse surveyed is represented by critical reviews and scholarly articles published after 1990 and gathered from across a number of both academic and popular journals, such as *Kalbų studijos*, *Darbai ir Dienos*, *Kalbotyra*, *Gimtoji kalba*, *Knygų aidai*, *Vertimo studijos*, *Lituanus* (the most significant repository of Lithuanian fiction and poetry translated in English published by American Lithuanians), *Respectus Philologicus*, *Žmogus ir žodis*, *Kalbos kultūra*, *Archivum Lituanicum*, *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica*, *Nemunas*, *Rubinaitis*, and a few newspapers, including *Literatūra ir menas* and *Šiaurės Atėnai*. Since the independence from the Soviet occupation, domestic Translation Studies

(TS) and, especially, its subfield Literary Translation Studies (LTS) have failed to give an adequate and timely response to a wealth of literary translation production. The state of TS in the domestic context can be observed and evaluated with respect to the content of academic programmes, their responsiveness to the labour market needs, the theoretical capital that scholars draw on in research and academia as well as specific assumptions and approaches of critical discourse, with the latter of which the current article is concerned.

Although it was back in 1979 when a Lithuanian dissident writer and translator Venclova (1979) wrote that „the role of translations in Eastern Europe has not been as widely analyzed as the original literature and the arts“, this statement remains relevant to the Lithuanian context even today after 40 years. Provided that political censorship of the repressive Soviet system is no longer an obstacle to express and disseminate a genuine interest in the matter, the lack of consistent research and data-building seems somewhat of a paradox. However tempting it is to track down the sociological path and roots of this phenomenon, the present survey does not strive to analyze in-depth the reasons of why literary translation criticism assumed its current shape in the domestic academia and media. Instead, it persists to survey some directions into which domestic LTS has branched out, in hope to open up potential pathways for further research and theory construction.

## **2. Translation quality as a premise to all discussion**

The current pace and share of overall translation in Lithuanian is rather huge, in particular, if compared with the situation under the Soviet regime. Not only the numbers of translations of Western authors increased, marginalizing national authors and languages (including Russian) of the former Soviet block, but also the habits and patterns of reading, translating and teaching translation have changed since Lithuania moved from a centralized and planned economy to a market-driven economy. The short postcolonial period has produced some very dramatic changes whose fundamental impact on culture and society will only become fully understood with the passage of time through revisiting, contrasting and comparing the colonial and the postcolonial at several stages.

### **2.1. Relating domestic literature and translation**

Translation theory discerns two major functions of translated literature with respect to the domestic literature of the target culture – that is, primary and secondary roles. In its more central roles, translation is seen as a source that brings new forms, enriches and revives domestic literature, whereas its peripheral role is often to import world literature into the target culture.

According to the survey by CEATL (Conseil Européen des Associations de Traducteurs Littéraires), translations from other languages into Lithuanian made 51% of 1545 new works of literature published per year in Lithuania in 2007/2008. This data is further enhanced by the official 2009 statistics by Lietuvos nacionalinės Martyno Mažvydo bibliotekos Bibliografijos ir knygotyros centras ([http://www.lnb.lt/doc/bkc/statistika\\_2009.pdf](http://www.lnb.lt/doc/bkc/statistika_2009.pdf)) which states that the average print-run of translated fiction literature in 2009 was 2.3 thousand copies, almost twice as much as the print-run of the original domestic fiction – that is, 1.2 thousand copies. Even without sociological research on reading habits and traditions, these figures imply that a market share for domestic fiction literature is estimated by publishers as twice smaller than for translated fiction. It is noteworthy that today translations of Western authors continues to outweigh publishing national literature in the context of more population being fluent in some Western language, especially English. Back in spring 2010, while teaching a course on Translation Theory and Practice at VPU (Vilnius Pedagogical University), I asked my group of almost 100 fourth-year BA-degree students if they read domestic literature at all. No positive answer followed, which does not surprise

immensely but alerts to possible implications for culture at large. There is probably no reason to enlarge on this case as representative of our young generation or symptomatic of postcolonial culture; however, it sparks off an interest in exploring readership habits and possible correlations with economical, social, and cultural factors of the market.

The uniform response by language students points into the direction of comparing the image of translated literature with the image of domestic literature. The market tendencies leave no doubt that the latter does not trigger the same demand as the translated literature, in particular, of Western authors. The look into the recent past when the Soviet Lithuanian literature was tightly controlled by censorship might bring insight to the present trends in readership and publishing. The themes, narratives and symbols of Lithuanian literature were generated and steered to develop in accordance to ideological propaganda. Guided literature writing was not struggling for content but rather for exerting and strengthening the dominance of institutional power over community. Whether it remains difficult for domestic literature to dissociate from the inertia of practices and images defined in the past, or whether it finds no way how to reinvent its expressive inventory and go beyond historically-determined regional interests is an area of profound investigation that might need to draw not only on current and new studies in literature, especially comparative literature, but also anthropology, history, and social sciences.

Little research is available on intersections and correlations of translation and original literature within the same literary system; however, a few attempts have been already established that could be taken as a basis for further research and discussion. For example, Venclova (1979) marks that the quality of translations done during the Soviet period was higher than that of Western translators due to the fact that many writers who did not come to terms with the regime and did not compromise on their writing quality became translators – as a matter of fact, very good translators. Translation offered a professional shelter and a form of subsidy for writers. One can intuitively sense that translation today as a resort of professional fulfilment attracts translators with different background and for very different reasons. Despite all good intuition, quality-related aspects of translation and literature need to be defined clearly in terms of what quality meant then and what it means now, what determines the features of good/bad and popular/unpopular translations and original literature, or what is different about readers, publishers and translators/writers then and today, which is also subject to historical and social changes. Pursuing these questions in the construction of LTS research and theory demands amassing extensive databases and corpora for extracting observable data that would allow examining linguistic, stylistic, cultural, historical and social dimensions of both translated and non-translated literatures. With respect to translation alone, Doherty (1991) notes it is reliable to address the issue of quality when in possession of several versions of the same title. Unfortunately, the Lithuanian market is too small to be generous in producing even several versions for the same title. Nevertheless, there is a stock of alternative translations of some English titles to launch a comparative study of diachronic and synchronic aspects across variant translations. Variable data could be derived from, for example, variant translations of William Shakespeare's *Sonnets* (transl. by Alfonsas Šešplaukis-Tyruolis, Aleksys Churginas, Sigitas Geda, Tautvyda Marcinkevičiūtė), Herman Melville's *Moby-Dick* (transl. by Irena Balčiūnienė, Povilas Gaučys), Upton Sinclair's *The Jungle* (transl. by Kazys Puida, Vincas Daukšys, Antanas Milukas), George Orwell's *Animal Farm* (transl. by Fabijonas Neveravičius, Arvydas Sabonis and Virgilijus Čepļiejus, Edita Mažonienė), Ernest Hemingway's *The Old Man and the Sea* (transl. by Romualdas Lankauskas, Jeronimas Brazaitis), Richard Bach's *Jonathan Livingston Seagull* (transl. by Lilija Talmantienė, Jovita Liutkutė), and J. M. Barrie's *Peter Pan* (transl. by Kristina Aurylaitė, Rūta Montvilienė). Although the current scarcity of versions and editions limits theory-building research into diachronic and synchronic aspects of variation, the scope can be extended by including variant translations of other language pairs, e.g. French – Lithuanian, or German – Lithuanian.

## 2.2. Contextualizing research into translation production

Venclova (1979) rightly observes that domestic literature produced under the Soviet regime was shaped as needed by ideology; therefore, some translations were selected to compensate for social and cultural deprivation of national literature. Loyal to his dissident role, Venclova (ibid.) stresses the importance of critical accounts of Soviet culture. From today's perspective, one could add that critical views on literary culture and culture at large should be extended to include the critique of the present post-colonial period as it continues to derive and refine many values and modes of practices from the colonial period. Today our culture is marked by socio-political and -economical disruptions (e.g. high levels of emigration, continuous top-down reforms of education, low profile and prestige of the humanities, etc.) that affect negatively the traditions of academic and cultural practices. The production of scholarship, studentship, literary artefacts, cultural artefacts and so on seem to be abundant but we scarcely analyze how the transformed culture now and then continues producing transformed entities for which part of our society seeks alternatives within its own culture or in other cultures and languages. Institution-engineered circumstances (e.g. the Tsarist law forbidding the print and the distribution of Lithuanian books, Soviet demolition of national institutions established during the inter-war period, standardization of modern Lithuanian reducing the variety of Lithuanian dialects) transformed literature and translation at various historical periods and political systems. In every period, the domestic practices of introducing world literature through translations have created various inconsistencies in the representation of certain authors, sometimes blocking the publication of some writers due to censorship or translating less prominent titles than the ones critically acclaimed in the source text (ST) culture, e.g. the case of Philip Roth's *Indignation* (Zabielaitė 2010b). The selection of titles for translation is a complex system of filters, as Venclova puts it, whereby only part of world literature becomes visible as compulsory, marketable, popular, and debatable for some purposes. Keeping an eye on larger contextual issues, some large-scale and collaborative historical and ethnographic study on translation practices in Lithuania is yet to emerge. It needs to raise questions that were forbidden or untimely during the previous periods and to revisit the ones that have been already posed but their answers have turned into too rigid truths serving some sort of ideology.

## 2.3. Pedagogical shift in translation theory paradigm

Despite its young age, global TS have embraced several significant shifts in theory paradigm, including cultural and sociological turns. But there are more turns for translation theory to take. The emphasis on quality (e.g. its evaluation, definition, or management) in translation research sets the expectation for literary translation training (if such exists in a given culture) to include theoretical assumptions and in return to give its feedback on the applicability and teachability of those theoretical assumptions. In my search for a domestic study on literary translation training, I have failed to identify a single article produced within 20 years of independence, which would tackle challenges, problems, and techniques of this area.

Although critics and scholars acknowledge that the issue of quality and its management in translation in general and literary translation in particular is significant, it has never been studied on the basis of large data and from many perspectives. There is a gap in TS/LTS dealing with training literary translation trainers, analyzing failures and successes of applying theory in teaching literary translation, evaluating the impact of formal and informal literary translation training on quality and the like. The disengagement of our domestic academia from maintaining and teaching both translation criticism and literary translation is more than surprising. Literary translation has become a significant commodity for publishers but it is dangerous to hand the role of shaping literary translation culture over to publishing industry alone.

The potential research areas may include a vast range of empirically observable, describable and testable aspects of translation practices, such as a role of academia in training or under-training translators in order to meet labour market demands, a publisher's role in securing and managing quality, a publisher's perception of literary translation quality, an editor's contribution to quality management, models of quality management, a translator's responsibility and engagement in managing, securing and promoting quality, the impact of high- and poor-quality translated literature on the dissemination of world literature and the construction of domestic literature, etc. However disputable the views and methods of defining the concept of quality may be, it remains one of central concerns to both theory and practice since removing it from research or pushing it onto the margins of TS means to ignore a considerable part of culture. Despite the fact that literary translation output outweighs a demand for other types of translations at present, no domestic tertiary programme would offer opportunities for specialization or focused training in literary translation methodology and theory, not even at least, through the system of electives. For example, the Department of Translation and Interpretation Studies at VU (Vilnius University) trains translators for dealing with EU documents and its English Philology Department offers a general course in translation theory and practice; KTU (Kaunas University of Technology) trains technical translators in the BA and the MA programmes; VDU (Vytauto Didžiojo Universitetas) offers a one-term course in literary translation for MA-degree students of English; VPU (Vilnius Pedagogical University) offers a one-term general course in translation theory and practice in the BA programme of English philology; KU (Klaipėda University) gives a course in translation theory and a course in practice in the BA programme of English philology. LLVS (Lithuanian Association of Literary Translators) seems to be the only party pursuing an objective of educating literary translators and critics writing on literary translation by organizing focus-events, such as workshops on literary translation and critical review writing, contests and nominations for best and worst performances. Specific circumstances under which publishing and academia industries operate as well as their subsequent behaviour patterns and implications for culture deserve a thorough analysis and evaluation from a socio-historical perspective.

There are three areas where our research and scholarship in LTS strongly underperform, that is, the availability of large data, the application of standards in translation and teaching translation as well as the analyses of discourse and language change within literary and translation paradigms. Little has been said about teaching standards for a very simple reason – that is, we do not seem to have any in place. At this stage it is unlikely to have a discussion about what standards, models, patterns and tools we have inherited from the previous generations of translators or what traditions we are further to nurture since we do not have a well-established historiographic research in this area. Disconcerting for theory but even more so for teaching, the lack of knowledge of what is going on in training for literary translation is a missing link between theory and practice. One more vital question concerns the sustainability of these standards: do we have enough resources, knowledge, conditions, and the like to secure that once a good practice or an academic programme continues. In history we have faced many disruptions due to wars, occupations, economic instability, and migrations. Today the distance between academia and industry is wide in some cases, i.e. academia continues training specialists that industry does not need or is incapable of keeping (e.g. graduates in English language and literature often choose to work as sales managers, or as foreign language teachers at best). On the other hand, academia does not invest in preparing specialists for some growing industries or areas (e.g. no literary translation programme is in place). We hardly have a benchmarking system to say if we put the right kind and sufficient effort to support research and practice standards at the institutional level (e.g. Lithuania still does not have accreditation system for translators in place). At the publishing level, there is no mechanism to define, defend and implement such standards and norms, given that those who commission translation work (publishers, state institutions, private clients, etc.) might have a very different understanding of translation standards. By saying the last thing, it is important to revisit and define

our approaches to the concept of text and textuality. The practice of translation, regardless of a variety of its definitions and theories, is still very text-based and text-oriented; therefore, both translation theory and translation teaching are dependent on how the text is treated and approached. A poor quality of translation often signals not merely poor knowledge of language(s) and culture(s) (though this should not be excluded) but, more importantly, impoverished understanding of what the text might mean, contain and entail, reducing the concept of the text to linear strings of sentences that contain words to be translated one after another.

### 3. Translation as a linguistic act

Despite its chaotic growth and often insufficient institutional (academic and governmental) support, the current stage of domestic TS and LTS is marked by some positive changes as compared to the Soviet period. First, it has received wider attention from scholars in different fields, including computing for linguistics, cultural studies, sociology, etc. Second, it has been evolving by gradually branching out into specialist fields, for example, children's literature translations studies (CLTS) or machine translation (MT) studies.

Although the language of the text (either original or translated) is dependent upon contextual factors, some research focuses on analyzing linguistic aspects alone in order to systematically describe differences and similarities of language use across texts. Tymoczko (2005: 1083) maintains that systematic investigation into linguistic differences among languages pertains to an early stage of TS. Nevertheless, this strand seems to offer further opportunities because linguistic descriptions largely depend on methodologies of reading, interpreting and describing the text. For example, authorship studies and corpus-based applications in textual studies use methodologies of chunking texts into lexico-syntactic items and counting their distributions. As long as a search for meaning structures continues yielding new results (collocations and phonaestemes are good examples of late discovery), linguistic description is a secured material for comparative research and theoretical dispute.

#### 3.1. Bottom-up and top-down trends

Within a linguistic strand of research on literary translation, the majority of academic articles focus on applying a bottom-up approach. This strand of studies examines how textual elements on word-order and sentence-order levels are transformed in translation. The following list surveys some items of concern: loanwords (Miliūnaitė 2004), lexical gaps, especially those arising from morphological asymmetries (Cvilikaitė 2007), lexical pseudo-equivalents in the translations of Fielding's *Bridget Jones's Diary* and Wurtzel's *Prosac Nation* (Stankevičienė 2002), cohesive devices (Buitkienė 2010), infinitive and infinitival constructions (Bernotaitė 2005), semantic inadequacies and compensatory lexical measures (Končius and Nausėda 2006), translation shifts on grammatical, lexical and pragmatic levels of the text (Baranauskienė and Kriščiūnaitė 2008), contrastive analysis of extenders in English-Lithuanian pairs across several text types, including prose (Ruzaitė 2010), idioms in the translations of Agatha Christie's *Appointment with Death* (2001) and *Death on the Nile* (1977) (Strakšienė 2009), noun-incorporating constructions in the translations of Charles Dickens' *David Copperfield* and Ernest Hemingway's *A Farewell to Arms* (Žukauskienė and Roikienė 2006), denominal verbs in the translation of Ken Kesey's *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* (Roikienė and Narmontienė 2008), misinterpretations of the function of word order in the English translation of Balys Sruoga's *Dievy miškas* (Petronienė 2007). All these small-scale studies of typological character register stylistic preferences and differences between English and Lithuanian with respect to some lexical item or grammatical category. As a body of work pursuing in the same direction, it forms a valuable pool of data for the field of comparative stylistics whose significance for language studies and translation is flagged by Labutis (2006). Moreover, the extended applications of this

data could prove useful for learning more about the differences between the translated Lithuanian and the original Lithuanian – the issue which has so far received little attention among domestic scholars.

Alternatively to a micro-structural focus, fewer scholars attempt to analyze translation strategies of rendering textual items from a top-down perspective linking textual evidence with genre and context issues (e.g. Danytė 2006; Ragaišienė 2006, 2008; Rudaitytė 2006; Zabielaite 2006; Satkauskytė 2006). The articles by Ragaišienė (2006, 2008), who teaches the only course on literary translation available in the domestic academia, stresses the importance of conceptual approach to the text and its translation production. In her review of Helen Fieldings' novel *Bridget Jones's Diary* (Ragaišienė 2006), the scholar argues at length about the dynamic nature of the text in the text-reception environment and points to the heterogeneous character of the text woven from intertextual cross-references and allusions. From this perspective, the scholar carries out a character-centred comparative textual analysis of the ST and the TT. Despite the fact that Ragaišienė (ibid., 171) draws on a very traditional notion of equivalence, the scholar shows how a wider perspective on the intertext affects the strategies of reading and rendering the text – that is, how the discursive elements contribute to character-representation and how these elements are sensitive to lexical choices. This case in point provides an obvious example of the literary text foregrounding intertextuality as a means of meaning-generating. Under different circumstances when intertextuality is not an intentional product of writing, both the translator and the researcher face a technical and methodological dilemma on different accounts, e.g.: how to efficiently track intertextual relations; whether to make them explicit to the target readers or not; whether making them explicit would contribute to transferring meaning of the ST or would add new meanings, etc. Domestic LTS has not given much attention to researching the meaning generated at a higher-order level of the text. The crucial issue here is to revisit the inventory of critical approaches to the text in the domestic literature and literary translation criticism of which we do not have a clear and uniform view at the current moment.

Critical evaluation tends to make judgements about the quality of translation in relation to its original counterpart. Between two extremes, the TT can be viewed either as a surrogate artefact created in the process of translating a literary work or as a valuable literary version capable to affect the receiving culture and to trigger further creative responses in the TT language, i.e. generating alternative translations, inspiring new narratives in the TT language and nurturing critical discussion cultures. Although scholars working in this strand do mention that translation is, in the first place, a cultural communication, they often focus on mistakes or instances of misreading and misinterpretation in translations. Rarer are the cases of analyzing creative and successful instances of translation as a result of consistent strategies employed by translators. For example, Petrauskas (1988) urges scholars to research the translations of experienced translators (usually of the Soviet generation) for pooling the bank of data as representative of quality translation that meets the criteria of versatility, expressiveness, and linguistic purity. Such a database or a quality corpus might facilitate research for theory construction as well as might be very useful for literary translation training. On the curious note, Marcinkevičienė (1996: 76) highlights a few examples of 'overdoing' in selecting equivalents for a set of English motion verbs that add extra connotative or metaphorical value to the meaning of the text, though, as is a typical case in typological research, it does not go further in discussing how lexical shifts contribute to thematic transformations of the text.

### 3.2. Strategy-focused research

The idea that the translator has to deal with the unfamiliar and render it either through domestication or foreignization serves as a basis for descriptive classificatory analyses in a number

of publications. For example, Mikutytė (2005) typologizes instances of realia translation. Balčiūnienė, a prolific translator and critic writing on translation issues since long before 1990, analyzes ways of recognizing and rendering citations and allusions (1980), reviews methods of rendering realia (2005b), surveys translation criticism (2005c), gives an extensive comparison of swearwords across languages (2006b), addresses problem areas related to rendering titles of prose (2007). Pažūsis (2008) goes on to classify the cases of translating word play. All these attempts contribute to gathering data dependent on text-chunking theories and methodologies, by which TS establishes and then re-evaluates its epistemes. It is worth noting that domestic LTS describes and in return builds data by using the descriptive terminology devised within the tradition of describing other languages than Lithuanian, drawing heavily on Anglo-American theory. In other words, descriptive studies apply imported taxonomies prescriptively, which does not allow domestic literary translation theory to address its language-specific problems in full. To avoid this methodological pitfall, domestic LTS need, first, to test the actual cases of applying these descriptors and, second, to reflect on testing procedures and tentative outcomes for critical evaluation. Failure to do so may lead to fallacies in systematizing data-driven observations about differences and similarities among languages.

Drawing on his rich experience as editor and translator, Žirgulys (1979: 289) attempted to systematize his knowledge of inappropriate translations, i.e. to classify inappropriate cases of Lithuanization of culture-specific foreign elements such as adaptation or translation proper applied to rendering the Russian evocative names of literary characters. The very concept of inappropriateness is vague and needs to be defined each time it is used because it may evoke many things depending on a view taken. The cases that Žirgulys describes are not norm-defiant because no prescriptive rule about how to interpret the symbolic meaning of a character name exists. Such norms or rather tendencies come from existing practices or from new practices that depend on the interpretation of both texts and their translation. In this particular case, through discussing examples, the editor sets a tentative norm of how to deal with evocative names in fiction, which as a specific practice might be related to translation and TS culture. Although the editor refers to the examples of the Russian literature translated into Lithuanian, the issues of mistranslations, excessive codification and adaptation for the target text (TT) audience provide the grounds for taking further the discussion about cross-linguistic data, method evaluation and re-evaluation, given new contexts and new data, in order to define and systematize the (mis)renderings of translators.

### 3.3. Focus on error analysis

Domestic criticism often evaluates actual translations against the codified target-language norms. A number of reviews and some articles focus on cases of *translationese* understood as an overly literal rendering of the ST, which produces unnatural and often incomprehensible wording and structures in the TT language. Miliūnaitė (2004) gives a lively account of the use of loanwords that have Lithuanian equivalents, observing what translations lose and gain if a loanword is selected. In her review of the translation of *Sophie's Choice* (translated by Auksė Mardosaitė, Alma Littera, 2002), Mataitytė (2002) praises the translator's choice for using a typically Lithuanian syntactic structures (claimed not to be present in other languages) that are rarely used by Lithuanians themselves, i.e., *Past Tense Verb + Future Active Participle* and *Past Tense Verb + Pronoun in Accusative + Gerund Participle*. Alternatively, Stričkus (2009) discusses in great detail many examples of extreme word-for-word rendering in the translation of Katzenbach's novel *The Madman's Tale* (translated by Ieva Pukelytė, Tyto alba, 2006). The scholar cites multiple errors that do not comply with the TT language norms and shows where the reader would fail to recognize and appreciate the value of the original work. The typical errors include the following: using borrowings when a more natural and typical Lithuanian equivalent is expected, calquing the phrases and word order of the original,



word redundancy, morphological mistakes, lack of cultural adaptation for culture-specific realia, and many other. In her review of the Lithuanian translation of the Lithuanian author Laima Vincė writing in English, Šakavičiūtė (2009) enumerates many ST-TT pairs that illustrate translationese as a result of too literal rendering of the ST wording. Judging by linguistic evidence alone, it is difficult to decide if the translationese of this kind are a product of too close following of the ST structures or an outcome of a more dynamic character, including some idiosyncratic features of the translator's style stemming from particular educational and professional background and knowledge. Furthermore, Petrauskas (2003, 2008) examines a number of cases of word-for-word rendering and calquing syntactic structures, in particular, in translations done and published after 1990, which shows a pattern of translation practices today. Since this data cannot be contrasted with data of translations done before 1990, it is too premature to conclude that excessive calquing or other issues are representative of some period or generation. Vabalienė (2000) also describes failures to recognize and decipher English idiomatic expressions. Violating the TT language rules and norms, failure to adapt translation culturally and psychologically (i.e. if the novel is for young readers, the translation should be aware of age- and culture-sensitive language it transfers) as well as misinterpreting meaning-generating components (word, phrase, sentence or sound patterns, discourse elements, etc.) produce a kind of literary surrogate. The impact that these surrogate translations have on readership may be too significant to be ignored by criticism. Instead of performing any of the expected functions, i.e. enriching domestic literature, promoting original literature, educating the reader, etc., these translations seem to do the opposite by transforming reading activities in a negative way. In other words, the reading horizons shrink rather than expand for the reader. Nevertheless, domestic criticism often chooses to address this issue in a fragmentary manner and to abandon the idea of a large-scale or in-depth analysis of poor-quality translations, arguing it would be a waste of time.

Unsettled disputes about how to tackle some very practical language-specific issues (e.g. how to apply formal knowledge about language in practical tasks of translation) partly hinders the development of translation theory and standards. There are clashes among translators and codifiers, the former drawing on experience arising from the practice of translating and the latter fostering the standard form of Lithuanian by dealing with an influx of new words and syntactic structures. It is not unusual for translators to express their negative views against codification attempts that impose restrictions on translating choices and leave little space for meaning and form negotiation (Rudaitytė 2006; Jonušys 2007b). Outside the range of English-Lithuanian translations, Dilytė (2006) discusses how the target language norms create tensions in translating synonym-abundant Latin texts into Lithuanian, trying to triangulate her choice by means of referring to genre (legal texts) requirements, register-sensitive vocabulary and Lithuanian dictionaries prescribing stylistic values to vocabulary. The translator notices that rigid *a priori* norms differentiating words in terms of register can rarely be applied in translation practice if the translator opts for source-text-oriented approach. This probably hints about challenges that Lithuanian lexicography and codification faces. Although Dilytė (2006) gives examples from her practice of translating the Latin texts; however translators working with a number of other languages share similar problems. The Lithuanian language policy instantiated by the authoritative dictionaries establishes a rigid hierarchy of vocabulary use due to which a great number of words are marked as colloquial and considered inappropriate for written discourse. As a result, a great number of synonyms receive a low-frequency status which limits their use in some discourses though they might seem plausible choices to render sense. The use of synonyms is rigidly marked along the stylistic scale in Lithuanian, where many non-standard forms would be viewed as confined to lower styles of spoken language, dialect or slang. From a comparative perspective, we currently know little about how knowledge derived from the standardized representations of meanings differs from context-derived knowledge across Lithuanian, English and other language pairs. It would be valuable to link our

studies of stylistic variation, its representation, typologies and relation with standard varieties to similar studies in other languages.

Although tensions between translators and codifiers, whose rigid policies and instructions are maintained by editors in the pre-publishing phase and critics in the post-publishing phase, seem irreconcilable, it is important to acknowledge that language codifiers were among the early critics of translation practice in Lithuania (Ambrasas-Sasnava, 1980: 65). It is hardly of any use to blame it all on the dominance of English and translations from English in the Lithuanian language and culture. It is also often misleading to believe that the negative impact of English is coming from poor translations from English into Lithuanian. Poor quality translations characterized by linear and word-for-word rendering have been known in translation practice before the growth of the role of English – that is, during the Soviet regime when Russian was a dominant language of international as well as domestic communication across countries and ethnic minorities. Inevitable linguistic contacts and interferences could be also observed in the period when Polish had a dominant role in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Bilingualism or even plurilingualism in Lithuanian culture has its long standing history: some language clichés and idioms that evoke particular culture-specific imagery (metaphors, proverbs, sayings, etc.) have been naturally interwoven into everyday speech and has survived until nowadays. Therefore, it seems a valid step to investigate the relationship of the Lithuanian language in use with its multiple intertextual (the author of this article treats the concept of the intertext as textual connectivity not only between discrete texts but also discourses) leads to cross-linguistic cultural contacts. The problem of Lithuanian absorbing other linguistic interferences, despite rigid domestic language-planning policies, seems to be caused partly by a marginal status of domestic literature among its readership and a low-profile of literary translation in academia and publishing industry.

### **3.4. Text-centered analysis**

A comparative investigation into linguistic (and, inevitably, cultural, social, historical, etc.) aspects of literary texts is dependent on a text-centred theory of translation that, ideally speaking, would aim to interpret the text and its translation from a holistic perspective, including various levels and aspects of text production. As a matter of fact, text-centred analyses also depend on what theory subsumes them to be, which is subject to socio-historical constraints. Therefore, domestic LTS needs to survey, describe and assess critically what epistememes and values constitute text-centred analyses in research. Tentative questions might include the following theoretical considerations: what the text means to the reading and writing communities across traditions; whether and how the concept and function of the text changes over time; what is distinctive about the literary text; what constitutes it; what part of what constitutes the literary text is dealt with in translation; how the reader, the translator, and other stakeholders view the text in general and the literary text; how these views interact and compete with each other; how the concept of the text determines the development and application of translation techniques and methods; whether a specific way of analyzing and breaking the text into constituent parts and structures allow us to transfer what we intend to transfer, and the like. Text-centred research of language entails methods and descriptions of constituent parts, such as lexemes, phrases, collocations, n-grams and the like. And text-centred research of translation inevitably examines how adequate is the translation in terms of transferring those textual items from the ST to the TT. Regardless of many theories and attempts to define equivalence, translation scholars agree that the concept is still vague and incapable of determining the standard for good translation. For example, Nord (2005: 25) argues that the existing criteria used to define the appropriateness of translation rely too much on dichotomic distinctions.

TS have attempted to measure equivalence between the ST and the TT by devising variable systems of translation units. Masaitienė (1996) introduces the concept of equivalence for

Lithuanian scholars by drawing mainly on Koller's classification though translation theory is rich in different classifications. She also tests how unit categories and descriptors apply in literary translation samples of her choice. This is probably the most consummate attempt to illustrate equivalence on different textual levels of literary texts in the Lithuanian context. However, the major problem with units in general is that there is no experiment that would aim to divide all the text (the ST or the TT) into units to confirm how valid and practical this approach is. The first question that arises is which classificatory system to choose. Each system is very individual and often captures only some items (often the items that language studies identify as lexemes). There is no knowledge on how the translator really deals with the text throughout, i.e. whether he/she consistently chunks texts from the beginning to the end of the text; how to deal with overlapping units because it is impossible to neatly mark the text as consisting of a unit following another unit; how to juxtapose and compare the ST and the TT even if one finds some way of dividing texts into clear-cut blocks of items.

There are very few articles or reviews that would examine translations from a stylistic perspective which requires employing a text-centred analysis. The article by Ragaišienė (2006) discussed earlier in this survey is a good example of a holistic approach to multiple and complex interdependencies of a linguistic detail. Furthermore, in a brief review, Burbaitė (2010) highlights some stylistic inadequacies of capturing the tone, connotations, and stylistic means (e.g. removing the parentheses) of the ST in the translation of C.S. Lewis' novel *The Horse and His Boy*. Zabielaite (2006) places the translation of Tom Pynchon's *The Crying of Lot 49* in a larger context of the effect that the original created in the ST culture and goes on to examine the textual means employed to create an innovative narrative, arguing that the translator is expected to transfer the lexical and syntactic means of the ST because they contribute to generating meanings, creating a narrative voice and setting a mood. In my article comparing William Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury* Part I and its translation into Lithuanian (Šalčiūtė-Čivilienė 2008), I show how the application of a word-frequency analysis may reveal differences between the ST and the TT where the translator for some reasons chose to use more lexically varied vocabulary than the original, thus changing the narrator's manner in translation. Miliūnaitė (2010) surveys several translated literary texts (mainly from English and a few from Finnish, Dutch, Italian, and Russian) in terms of how translations transfer character-specific spoken discourse that deviates from standard language norms. The Lithuanian language scholar classifies the cases into 2 broad categories, i.e. physical & psychological characteristics and social status. Drawing on descriptive findings, the scholar offers some general guidelines regarding the ways of transferring marked lexico-syntactic structures into Lithuanian. Kaikarytė (2010) reviews the translation of Catherine Sanderson's *Petite Anglaise* and highlights the translator's stylistic choices for rendering character- and culture-specific items mainly derived from the linguistic and cultural contacts of English and French.

Although the reviews by Burbaitė and Zabielaite build their arguments on very few examples of paired sentences (e.g. 3 sentences only in Zabielaite 2006), the positive thing is that they raise questions about the translatability of stylistic symmetries, which provides hypotheses for further examination. It may take time before these complex questions are ever re-addressed in our academia and critical discourse as research in this area requires applying advanced tools (computer-assisted text-analytics), large data to support the analysis, and robust methodology. All the previously discussed cases examining linguistic items could be drawn upon for speaking about style in a broad sense with a view on textual items clustering into meaning-generating patterns.

With relative data and many loose ends in theory, domestic LTS evolves under the influence of strong Western traditions. Therefore, it faces at least two challenges of growth: first, it has to cope with everything that arises as new under market- and culture-specific conditions and,

second, it has to respond with considerable critical awareness to the already established theories and views that have evolved in their specific contexts.

#### **4. Translation culture and socio-cultural aspects of translation practice**

The previous section outlines the scope of critical discourse focusing on the linguistic aspects of translation since this strand of research gathers various subsets of data vital for cross- and inter-disciplinary studies in languages. At one extreme of the research spectrum is a large-scale systematic investigation into linguistic aspects which is rarely capable of accounting for the holistic cross-interaction of textual dimensions. At the other extreme is a focus on small-scale research of individual texts treating narratives as self-containing worlds in a complex way. Since the latter type of research enables the scholar to extract data of a manageable size, it also allows for examining how various dimensions cut across the text and affect the reading. Comparative studies show that language use is embedded in both collective culture and personal experiences. This idea is a widely accepted theoretical postulate in translation criticism and theory, both in Anglo-American and domestic contexts.

##### **4.1. Translator's perspective**

Since the interest in the uniqueness of translation element (translator style, translation language, translationese) as opposed to authorial style is relatively a new trend in TS research, domestic scholars get under-explored opportunities for triangulating a number of research questions, e.g. whether the analysis of actual translations can reveal the style of the translator, how far the translation may deviate from the original work to be still seen as translation rather than loose adaptation or even an original narrative based on intertextual relations, etc. Some domestic scholars argue that the translator can achieve a successful compromise on transferring the style of the ST and delivering the norm-regulated TT if the translator comes from a bi-cultural background (Danytė 2006; Rudaitytė 2006). Although the idea is not original and resonates with some opinion in global TS, it is worth exploring what bicultural background implies, what exactly are differences between translations by biculturals and non-biculturals, what patterns characterize and constitute differences on the textual level, how background (education, experience, etc.) factors influence stylistic choices. Differences between the bicultural translator and the non-bicultural one might be subtle. Tracing them in the text is dependent upon a theory and a methodology of defining differences between the authorship of the ST and the authorship of the TT. Some research has already generated data confirming that translationese, understood as ST interference and impact upon the TT language (alternative to the concept of translationese as extreme literal translation), is traceable as linguistic and statistical evidence (Puurtinen 2003). It is possible that methods and approaches of authorship attribution studies that draw heavily on computing for linguistics can be replicated for the purpose of investigating the imprint of the translator's style on translation. It makes a search for the translator's idiosyncrasies as opposite to translationese and mainstream patterns of language use an ever exciting area to explore. However, this research field is currently capable of raising hypotheses and testing methods rather than treating variable outcome as conclusive findings for defining some theory due to a number of unsettled problems, such as limited data (e.g. the domestic Parallel English-Lithuanian Corpus currently contains only 70 000 parallel sentences) or insufficient cases of statistical research for LTS (see Rybicki (2006) on stylometric differences between translation versions in Polish).

Like other components of translation industry, translator profile is subject to historical changes. The fact that the literary translator often deals with literature as a writer, editor or both has been long taken for granted, but this norm seems to have changed nowadays. Gailiūtė (2007) gives an insider's look at the relationships among translators, publishers, editors and readers.

Although her essay does not pursue any scholarly objectives, it raises some critical awareness of sociological aspects and routines in translation, including the issues of wages, translator training perspectives as part of a publisher's agenda, a reader's response and involvement, and the like. Apart from the already mentioned stakeholders in translation production, the least visible role is that of the translator trainer. I have so far failed to identify a single article or review dealing with literary translator training that would address the following issues: the goals and methods of literary translation training, trainer's training, the trainer-translator relationship, the relevance and influence of training upon the overall understanding of the text, and many other questions. Gailiūtė (2007: 3) points to a self-educating route that the contemporary translator would usually follow in Lithuania. Drawing on my practice, I happened to teach the students who had some experience in working as translators with no previous formal tertiary education or training either in translation or philology. Our situation is curious in that there is neither academic nor commercial institution providing formal training in literary translation. Moreover, there is no nationwide accreditation system in place for regulating the labour market for translators. Practice is the primary source of learning in combination with some rudimentary knowledge provided by many domestic philology departments, workshops organized by LLVS, online networking among translators, translation criticism media, and collaborative cases when editors are commissioned for translation projects. Most importantly, we know little about this area from an ethnographic perspective before we could turn it into epistemological knowledge. This grey area in the pedagogy of translation that domestic criticism and translation studies at large fail to cover and address is posing problems for translation scholars not only in the domestic context but also in the global context, that is, the analysis of translation training needs awaits its thorough and critical investigation (Kelly 2008).

A rare sub-genre in literary criticism is a reflection upon the translation by the translator himself/herself. The article by Rudaitytė (2006) blends a scholarly survey of some prominent ideas in translation theory and a self-reflective comment on her translation of Ian McEwen's novel *Amsterdam*. This mode of critical discourse may provide useful data on a translator's reasons and motivation for certain choices that may back-up substantially the analysis of the production of translations. However, it is difficult to agree with the assumption of the scholar that "literary translation is hardly possible to teach and learn" (ibid., 187). It is not clear if the writer argues for teachability or, the contrary, unteachability of literary translation. First, by saying this, the scholar-translator contradicts the very essence of her article whereby she shares and communicates her choices over some very difficult cases such as puns. In general, the article elucidates the motives behind her choices, thus providing observable data of rendering stylistic items on the lexical level. Second, the scholar often draws on what she observes as a tendency in translation practice, e.g. the frequency of using shifts in translation, which testifies that literary translation in practice relies on some strategies and patterns that can be observed, accepted (or discarded) and passed down in translation training and criticism. Another self-reflective account is provided by Balčiūnienė (2010) on her translation of the uncensored version of Jack Kerouac's *On the Road*. The translator discloses ideological underpinnings of the original and its translation both during the years of Soviet censorship and now. Through its readership, the translation propagated counter-culture ideas, thus lending a symbolic value to the original, which faced analogous censorship in the U.S. at the early stage of publishing.

In a narrow sense, translation theory and practice create their own cultures as systems of practices, beliefs, views, ideologies, and behaviour patterns embedded in and nurtured by other knowledge and culture systems. Individual strategies and patterns of translation link to a larger context of other individual and collective strategies as well as translation norms and preferences. For example, the translations of the *Harry Potter* series received quite a wide critical response in domestic reviews with respect to the methods of rendering the proper names of its characters (Ger

2007; Kižlienė 2008; Končius 2010; Jaleniauskiene and Čičelytė 2010). By drawing on the semantic explanation of the proper names in the *Harry Potter* series, Ger (2007) criticizes the Lithuanian translator for using mixed strategies of either transliterating them or translating their semantic meaning. The article seems to lack an intertextual approach to discussing the issue. For example, it might have checked the Lithuanian translation against the *Harry Potter* translations into other languages since no alternative translation in Lithuanian is available. It is risky to make judgements about the equivalence of isolated items alone (in this case, evocative names of literary characters), first, without examining the issue on the basis of extensive observable data and, second, by overemphasizing the ST-supremacy over the historically and culturally-determined specificity and dynamism of the receiving target culture. Moreover, the critical review might have examined the cases under query along the lines of both loss and compensation instead of semantic loss alone. In response to Ger's comments, Kižlienė (2008) defends the strategy of mixing the patterns of name translation and brings similar examples from the *Harry Potter* translations into other languages; however she further questions the very motivation of separate cases and the lack of editorial interference at the pre- and post-publishing stages (i.e. the series was published in several editions). Končius (2010) continues grouping cases as either appropriate or inadequate by comparing them occasionally with translations in other languages like Polish, German and French. He tentatively states that the Lithuanian version contains many inconsistencies that negatively affect the quality of translation. However, apart from making an assumption about the tight translation schedule that possibly affected inconsistencies, the scholar does not bring real evidence from outside the text – that is, the motivation of the translator to opt for one or another strategy of translation. Moreover, it is not clear within which theoretical or didactic framework the scholar differentiates adequate vs. inadequate approaches to the translation of character names. It is a fundamental issue to define the concept of adequacy for even a small-scale study as this one since the concept itself has been given many interpretations in literature on translation (see Nord 2005: 25–40). The dialogue on this matter is further reinforced by Jaleniauskiene and Čičelytė (2010) who consolidate their effort and compare name translation across a small collection of English and German literature for children translated into Lithuanian. Their view is that translating proper names in literature is rooted in culture (hence we need to know the context before moving on to critical comments on the appropriateness of strategies). One can note that once practices are established, they propagate, modify, or cease operating, around which other translating patterns and practices evolve. Unlike Ger (2007) who criticizes the translator of *Harry Potter* along two clear-cut dimensions, i.e. transliteration vs. translation, Jaleniauskiene and Čičelytė (2009) observe strategies as tendencies rather than isolated cases, and employ a 4-fold categorization on a continuum of shifting from foreignization to domestication within a larger context of discussing the changing ways of translating as motivated by linguistic habits, existing norms, creative choices, interpretation, etc.

These examples bring a case in point that a methodological problem persists in domestic criticism, i.e. isolating either selected data from its larger context of the whole text or selected samples from a larger body of other texts. The culture of criticism itself may need to undergo paradigmatic shifts in order to have valid and replicable procedures of evaluation in place. However repetitive this may sound throughout the current article, yet research and criticism unanimously share an emphasis on extensive data collection, classification and use. Doherty (1991: 50) argues it is necessary to collect observational data on "language-specific instantiations of the universal principles that can be expected to determine the use of a language over and above its specific grammar" and of building a theory of comparative stylistics on the basis of comparing different translation versions. Another emphasis is on triangulating approaches in order to challenge and test existing methodologies. For example, against the traditional practice in translation theory, evaluation and research, Baker (2001) suggests shifting the theoretical paradigm of examining style in literary translations from a source-oriented approach to a target-oriented approach by focusing

on the distinctive style of resulting translations. As a result, her changing perspectives has yielded TEC (The Translational English Corpus) whose interface allows users to examine written texts translated in English by relating them to the factors of gender, nationality, occupation, publisher, etc.

Relatively new in the global context, the TT-emphasis on translation production in research and criticism may be a timely initiative. It may take many years for the writer to write an original literary work though these practices also change and stratify more than before by yielding different types, genres and modes of literature. Given that a literary work has a lasting aesthetic and cultural value, it becomes an object of an academic scrutiny from various perspectives. Viewed as an outcome of creative writing, its meaning and impact on other works and culture usually receive a number of interpretations and evaluations. Theoretically speaking, literary translation as a type of interpretation may be expected to treat the original work and be treated itself in an equally academic way. A great demand and interest in Western literature, especially Anglo-American, after Lithuania gained independence set a huge pace for the turnover of literary translation production, which should require qualified translators working under quality conditions. There is no statistical data on translation time or rate per title translated after 1990. Otherwise a thought-provoking analysis of social factors across some EU countries, the 2007/2008 comparative survey by CEATL (Conceal European des Associations de Traducers Litterers) on the working conditions of literary translators does not include a time factor whose examination might reveal inconsistencies and pressures that jeopardize literary translation quality. However, drawing on word-of-mouth information and discussions with some domestic translators, it seems that literary translators in Lithuania are usually commissioned for three months, in some extreme cases even for one and a half month. The asymmetry between two efforts is significant, i.e. it takes a few months for our translators to render the literary work that brews for months and years in the head and the heart of the author.

#### **4.2. Publishing culture**

Although it is possible to derive an overall impression of the quality of a translated text during the first reading, the analysis of what implications various constraints have on translation, literary production and reading culture still awaits its proper attention. Even for an experienced translator, tight time constraints mean negotiating and compromising on rendering adequately the value, meaning and style of the text. The author's search for particular words, structures, sounds, and patterns might become a linear chase for word after word in translation production, disregarding what depths of thought could be reached through reading the text. A rapid pace of translation output and a specific role of publishers on the market turn translation into a kind of commodity rather than a craft. A methodological debate over balancing product-orientation vs. process-orientation seems to be superseded by the practices and modes of the translator-publisher partnership, driven by the need to deliver quickly. Danytė (2006: 196–197) notes that a publisher or a commissioner have often more power over writing and reading cultures than an author or a reader. The scholar refers to these agents involved in text production as the "competing forces" of a cultural system. Therefore, it is crucial to systematically examine the publisher's strategies of recruiting translators, initiating translation project, launching and marketing a translation, and the like, in correlation with the output of translation quality. Instead of looking at this issue from a narrowly local perspective, research in this strand may benefit from allocating the problem within a larger geo-political context of Eastern and Central Europe and extending further to practices in countries that share similar economical, historical and social problems, a similar low-demand status of national languages, and a similar low-profile status in the world economy. For example, the Turkish translation scholar Tahir-Gürçağlar (2007) discusses the correlations of low-quality literary translations with publishing policies and advocates for developing a methodology of historiographic

mapping of all actual translations and their socio-economic factorship, including pointers to publishers and translators in order to filter for socio-economic variables and factors.

Since publishing industry has acquired powers over literature like never before, it is important to account for the implications of publishing practices (e.g. policies of selecting titles, targeting readers, resisting or supporting authority, shaping new genre, introducing literary taxonomies, etc.) on literature, translation, literacy and readership. Within a current variety of publishing houses in Lithuania, one can observe how publishers find their niche market and reach for their target audience. For example, the Oriental scholar Švambarytė (2008) discusses the practices of the Lithuanian publisher Obuolys to capitalize on the attractiveness of exotic cultures, like China and Japan. However, the practice of this publishing house is to commission translations from the secondary sources, usually English. A closer analysis of the translated texts by this scholar also shows that the translators shift from Russian sources to English sources though Russian versions are not bibliographically mentioned as such, which may imply that the publishing house has – or chooses to have – little control over the quality of translations. As the scholar argues, managing the quality of translation entails not only the ethical standpoint of the translator and the publisher but also the policy of protecting the rights of other translators on the market. Theoretically, economic, cultural and political pluralism seems to be an asset that should contribute to improvements in quality in many areas of life, culture and industry, including translators and translation, especially after the years of repressive practices of the colonial regime. However, pluralism does not seem to be leading direct to quality. For example, Jonušys (2006) compares the translation (published in 1989 and 1991) of George Orwell's *Animal Farm* done by Arvydas Sabonis and Virgilijus Čepļiejus with its newer translation by Edita Mažonienė (published by Jotema in 2005). The translator notes that the new edition of this title would have been a timely investment; however, the new variant failed to establish itself as an alternative interpretation due to its low quality in comparison to the old one. Paradoxically, decentralized publishing may follow practices that may rip authors or cultures of their rights to be represented properly, specialist translators devoting years to acquire skills may be less competitive against second-hand translators using second-hand sources, a reader may not get a better product, which is so natural to talk about when it comes to commodities such as electric appliances or clothes, but is irrelevant when culture and thought products are involved.

Like Švambarytė (2008), Petrauskas (2008) also examines a particular kind of the disguised intertext in his analysis of the translation of Margaret Atwood's short story "The Age of Lead". He identifies some Russian language influence in the translation of the English phrases or idioms. It is by all means premature to conclude whether this is due to a Russian version consulted as an intermediary source in interpreting the meaning of the original or to the linguistic habits of the translator that imprint on his language. Therefore, this case offers an interesting vein in researching the intertext(s) through language contacts. This type of intertextuality, whether due the intentional consultation upon several sources or to automated language habits, obscures those textual elements that characterize the authorship of the ST. Translation exegesis may disclose more author-distancing factors if it treats the TT as a kind of text production with its unique origin. For example, Miliūnaitė (2009) states that it is impossible to identify from the translations made by different translators and mainly from English translations what constitutes or characterizes the style of Haruki Murakami whose literature has been extremely popular among Lithuanian readers. Comparing Murakami's stylistic variation in Japanese and stylistic variation across his translations in Lithuanian may elucidate how a combination of publishing strategies transfigures authorship in translation.



### 4.3. Editor's perspective

The editor may also be one of those agents either contributing to effacing the style of the author or helping the translator to struggle through the constraints of the target language on one side and the interference of the source language on the other. The editor's role in authorship representation should be given more attention in theory, especially in the current context of changing practice paradigms, i.e. the editor was one of key figures in publishing original and translated literature during the Soviet period but now publishers would rarely employ the editor. Balčiūnienė (2006a) notes that the word *editing* implies many things, that is, it may refer to cosmetic changes, inconsistent correction, extensive corrections and re-translation, inappropriate changes, and grammatical changes made to the text. Drawing on her rich experience, the translator explains how important she found the role of editors in managing the quality of her translations. She adds that publishers should make it a norm to employ editors, copy-editors and proofreaders for expertise in dealing with texts. Miliūnaitė (2009) addresses some issues of the editor-translator interaction in the context of negotiating over a selection of variants in literary translation (variants here defined as a wider notion than synonyms as they cover also those cases that are morphological variants of stylistic connotation). Despite a socio-historical area where this question usually arises, the article still focuses on analyzing linguistic issues rather than social interactions between the editor and the translator in moulding the final product for the recipient culture. Petrauskas (1988) reveals that it was a common practice to impose responsibility upon editors for maintaining the quality of translations during the Soviet years. An editor would often have to nearly re-translate the entire work. Balčiūnienė (2005b; 2005c) mentions individual stylistic preferences of some editors working under the centralized rule. She (2007) also brings some evidence from her personal experience as to a changing role of editors in decision-making contexts. Facts about editorial practices, styles, and interventions are scattered across sources, which makes the subject poorly observable. Since the collaboration between the translator and the editor becomes seamless after the product is published, part of knowledge about editorial contribution and stylistic intervention should be available through the records of edited materials whose availability would allow translation scholars to document changes to the translator's work and inquire into the motifs of those changes.

Knowledge about actual editorial contributions to translation is even more fragile today as the editor's role has undergone an enormous transformation due to a variety of publishing practices. During the Soviet period editing encompassed many tasks at the pre-publishing stage, but now it is either nominal or non-existent, i.e. bibliographies of titles often show that many translations do not have editors. This considerable shift in practice also awaits its thorough examination from a sociological as well as a linguistic perspective. Some articles and reviews are concerned with the fact that the bibliographies of many translations done after 1990 are incomplete as they do not indicate the editor. The absence of the editor's name usually implies that editing was handed down to the translator (self-editing) (see Satkauskytė 2006 on the translations of John Fowles), or the editor's interference is not always consistent – that is, mistakes remain in the text or some ST words or phrases are rendered differently across the text or its editions (see Kižlienė 2008; Kaikarytė 2009). A quick look at the balance of courses that translation training programmes at the domestic academia offer today shows that training in editing and the target language (Lithuanian) is not given enough attention. The fact that publishing industry has reduced the role of the editor as well as that neither academic nor vocational programmes respond to this change has pedagogical and methodological implications. This situation poses a question: whether and how translators-to-be are and should be prepared to cope with the task of self-editing in order to deal with the inevitable ST language interference? If none of the parties bring solutions, we will be facing how a reduced control over language and, eventually, content quality turns into a norm.

#### 4.4. Readership culture

Petrilli (2006: 195) argues that „the reader expects the translator to act as a mere mouthpiece, a mechanical transformer, convertor". This firm statement is built upon a prescriptive argument of translation theory rather than actual knowledge about reader expectations towards translating practices. Common knowledge suggests that reality is often very different from what we ideally expect to be happening. This is a classical case of a priori vs. a posteriori premises of theory. Since translation norms and preferences both in theory and practice change over time, should not we expect the readers change their expectations, beliefs and demands for translation style, quality, or value? If we presume that a contemporary reader differs from a reader some years ago and readers of different backgrounds and in different cultures, then how could we learn about this? Similarly, Končius (2010) does not escape prescriptiveness of his argument about reader response. He (ibid., 38) criticizes the translator of the *Harry Potter* series for a semantic transfer of some character names, stating that such attempts might have a negative impact on representing the translated work and thus be unacceptable for a great part of readers. However it is not clear if the scholar refers to the Lithuanian translation of *Harry Potter* or some other specific cases. Without thorough ethnographic analysis, it is only possible to speculate about reader responses, accepting the fact of translation as an artefact that has set a certain trend of literary representation.

Some data about readers could be gathered through interviewing translators in order to assess, first, how and whether the target reader profile influences the translator; second, how the translator behaves as a reader himself/herself; third, how different a reader is the translator when reading and translating (writing) a literary work. In the first case, qualitative ethnographic research could definitely reveal a great deal about this grey area concerning readership, but in the current context it is unlikely to happen in our academic environment as it requires large resources and time. Moreover, ethnographic research could use equally readers, translators, publishers and editors as multiple respondents in order to amass large data on views, practices and policies as well as to examine where they correspond and divert from each other. With respect to the translator as a reader, research could use the established technique of Think Aloud Protocols (TAP) as a secondary source for eliciting data. On the other hand, TAP is still very much an approach *in vitro* rather than *in vivo*. Due to its scale and size, qualitative sociological or ethnographic research will be always facing the problems of manageability and sustainability. Nevertheless, both TS and LTS need to strive towards building and employing ethnographic methodologies in order to gain insight into what is really happening within publishing and translating communities (I intentionally use this wide concept of community since translating is hardly a narrow area of specialization or profession today). Another reason to treat with reserve presuppositions about an ideal reader with ideal expectations is that today the philological culture is affected and formed by diverse publishing industry and volatile market factors rather than by traditional academia. Moreover, publishing itself does no longer need to come from academic or scholarly background. Publishers set a pace of disseminating literary works and their translations, engineer reader needs and need analysis, influence both directly and indirectly the models and quality of translation, etc. Therefore, the exegesis of translated texts should not overlook industry-related factors. For a case in point, Subačius (2008) critically explores the translation of the academic novel *Will in the World* by Stephen Greenblatt. His bitter remark about the underdeveloped state of philological culture in Lithuania addresses different parties involved in shaping academic products, among them translations of the titles that have academic value in the ST culture. For example, the scholar points to the marketing decision to embed the quotations of critical appraisal within the text page of translation (ibid, 20), which transforms the authorial style and violates authorship integrity. According to Subačius (ibid.), the failures of the translator, the editor, and the publisher to deliver the value of the book result from the lack of thorough familiarity with the previous translations and treatments of Shakespeare, insufficient familiarity with a novel genre, rigid typologies of genre by

domestic academia, and the tradition of literary criticism to exploit biographical data too extensively for meaning interpretation.

In her evaluation of the transfer of intertextual dialogues between the author's discourse and John Donne's poetry cited in-text in *The Calligrapher* by Edward Docx, Šeibokaitė (2008) also entertains the idea that conceptual engineering (or lack of it) is responsible for the quality of translation. Since the poetry cited in the narrative was translated by the Lithuanian poet prior to another translator rendering the narrative alone without mutually coordinating the process, eventually poetry translation was isolated from the context of the narrative. As a result, intertextual interactions present in the original narrative were lost in translation. The scholar (ibid.) goes on to revise various asymmetries between the original and the translated, ranging from translation strategies (not clear though whether the choice was made by the translators or the publisher) to the designs of ST and TT book covers which also may predetermine how a reader receives the text.

Investigation into a reader's perspective might be most productive if conducted as ethnographic research. Petrilli (2006: 194) states that it is the reader's belief that the translator faithfully transfers the aesthetic, stylistic, linguistic, etc. identity of the original text and remains "completely transparent", which in return implies that the translator should strive for a kind of anonymity in targeting the reader. This is somewhat a naive statement, isolated from the actual context of the triangular author-translator-reader relationship in the world that in some part grows ever more bilingual and even plurilingual. The reader who knows at least two languages to a greater or lesser extent is hardly to take this statement for true as he/she is inevitably aware of diverging points at which both the languages may say something similar but in different ways or have lexical gaps to the extent at which the speaker might find it impossible to explain cultural differences. A bilingual reader might have different reasons to read a translated text. It is though a question to examine if the reader cares and wants to see less of the translator and more of the author before reading the translation since. Ambrasas-Sasnava (1978: 66) mentions a practice during the Soviet period of involving the reader to evaluate the translation before its publication. This pre-publication evaluation commissioned by a publisher included some forms of eliciting feedback on translational quality, such as written critical reviews or professional evaluation at focus meetings. There is no survey available to shed light on current pre-publishing practices and implications of controlling, reviewing, and negotiating the meaning with readers (i.e. editors, reviewers, peers, and lay readers). A critical response has been moved to the post-publication phase and has lost its significance for managing translation quality.

With respect to the impact of the reader on translation, Danytė (2006: 195) argues that „translated texts are windows to other worlds for their readers“. In other words, readers are motivated to read the translated texts because they are tempted to learn about another culture. True though this assumption is in many cases, it does not cover for all the motives leading the reader to read translations. But one can always relate the choice of reading with some cultural factor or, in other words, one can view a translator's choice as part of culture-determined practices. Considering the role of the translated text, it leads to examining the reasons of introducing the translation (the known or expected readership may be a dominant factor here), the effect of launching the translation, the reception of the translation which inevitably entails a particular response and interest of the reader in the original text, its author and possibly a larger context. Let us not forget far-reaching intertextual relationships whereby the translated text in one language may provide a context for the translator translating into another language, e.g. the previously discussed cases of translating Chinese writers by largely combining several secondary sources (Švambarytė 2008). Thus, apart from leading into another culture, the translated text may set a new trend of responses of various kinds in the receiving culture (e.g. alternative translations may come afterwards, a certain critical response may follow, the translation may influence the target

language by importing some catchphrases or ideas for the target culture film-makers, writers, etc.). It is also valid to question a culture-focus factor as a central need for reading translations. How many readers would really seek to learn about another culture in the age of consumer culture when buying a detective, sci-fi, or romance story? With respect to these genres, it is rather a popular assumption that domestic literature has no strong traditions in this trend. The popular image of one's own culture, language and literature also plays a crucial role in reader's choices whose sociological and cultural significance and implications upon reading and literacy issues is yet to be examined.

## 5. Historicizing literary translation practice and studies

For developing a larger perspective on the issues of translation, TS tends to add a historical dimension to the study of linguistic and cultural aspects of translation, to theoretical considerations and the use of metaphors in critical responses, and to the examination of intersecting and parallel contacts of languages in order to better explain the origins and motivation of practice and theory. It is vital to be able to establish some point at which to look backwards and re-assess how and what has developed to reach its current state, in particular, in the contexts where rewriting histories and imposing the practices of the *Other* has long been part of culture.

### 5.1. Filling gaps of theory with historical accounts

Historicizing TS and LTS may imply a few things. First, it examines the historical developments of one or another aspect of translation practice and theory. Second, it places linguistic or cultural aspects of the text within a socio-historical context in order to reach for extralinguistic factors that might facilitate the exegesis of text production. As previously mentioned, a top-down approach to text analysis is a rare case in domestic LTS despite its capacity to bring evidence from outside the text and to reveal differences and similarities that would otherwise remain unnoticed. For example, Danytė (2006) examines and evaluates the strategies of translating culture-specific items in Lithuanian translations of Canadian literature within a larger historical context by following 3 historical stages – that is, interwar, Soviet and postcolonial periods. The comparison of historically determined practices shows that ideological filtering is observable even today in the selection of translating Canadian literature that represents white Canadian society, circumventing critically acclaimed literature by minority writers of Canada. The scholar also takes into consideration the fact that postcolonial translation have been funded by official bodies of Canada, which shows how translation is used as a propaganda medium for engineering the image of culture.

Apart from a few historical overviews of translation practice and thought during some historical periods (see Balčiūnienė (2005c) for a broad survey of translation theory in the 16<sup>th</sup>–21<sup>st</sup> c.c.), there has been no fundamental research done neither on linguistic, literary nor historico-social aspects of translating in Lithuania since 1990. The earlier most fundamental publications include a monograph by Ambrasas-Sasnava (1978), a concise survey of translation under Soviet censorship by Venclova (1979) and a versatile collection of articles on translations in poetry and fiction (1986). St-Pierre (1993) argues that it is necessary to historicize the studies of translation because critical discourse is a form of historical discourse. Among various themes of historical significance, he mentions "conservation" which triggers a number of questions related to the selection, circulation, and retranslation of translated texts. The scholar also distinguishes between the role of censorship in translation and translation as "a means of avoiding censorship" (ibid. 67). In the domestic critical discourse, it is worth mentioning Venclova (1979) who gives a concise and informative overview of Soviet censorship's methods of selecting titles for translation, setting quotas and print-runs, setting up filters to control literature and translation production as part of the programme of Russification of the Lithuanian culture and population. He also gives examples of

writers and poets who refused to disseminate Soviet propaganda through literature by retreating into the enterprise of translation. These are curious cases that have their counterparts in the history of Soviet translation in other former Soviet countries (see Cotter (2008) for his thought-provoking account of a Romanian case). However, the topic of translation and censorship during the colonial period has not been revisited largely in domestic critical discourse after 1990, except for some surveys of censorship in literature in general (see Gudaitis 2010).

Historiographic research may reflect a great deal on inconsistencies and limitations of translation theory in a global context. For example, Cotter (2008) brings to attention a case of reversing the application of Lawrence Venuti's dichotomy of foreignization as a means of resistance to dominating power vs. domestication as a means of power-imposing in the context of Soviet Romania where the opposite was true, i.e. foreignization meant suppression for Romanians. This sets a good example of a Western-born view gone wrong if applied without taking into consideration regional, national, and historical specificity. The comparative analysis of translation in the Soviet period and today, not losing sight of interdependencies between the periods, each echoing and reviving ideas and practices from other periods and cultures, is yet to be thoroughly conducted. This approach again would require access to a large number of texts (of and on translations) in order to draw conclusions on the basis of an empirical analysis of observable data. Discarding the significance of the Soviet period in TS today may only generate a gap in theory. It is important to acknowledge the impact that the not so distant period makes upon the practices of academia and media. It is also important to acknowledge and evaluate the real and often reciprocal relationship between the writing of the original literature, translation production and other cultural practices of a certain period. Under the Soviet regime, writing became institutionalized to the extent that it lost its intimate relationship with the personal experiences of the writer, thus ranking individual experiences and views as the *Other* in comparison to the officially maintained collective discourse. Kelertienė (2006: 143–144) offers a reverse perspective on this issue in her highly invigorating interpretation of Soviet Lithuanian literature, deciphering the meanings of Soviet themes, symbols, signs and patterns as a disguised critique of the Soviet occupation. The lack of historical research on the impact of Soviet discourse on translation, literature and culture possibly imply that we underrate the historical importance of those texts that promoted collective and repressive ideologies. Treated as documentary objects, propaganda-laden texts may bring evidence on the language and culture of the period that have inscribed their structures and images onto present communication. These texts await being digitized and used in the ethnographic and anthropological studies of language and culture.

## 5.2. Historical perspective on norm change

Observing the use of language in some reviews and articles under query, I have noticed that the quality of translations is often assessed on the basis of a few examples isolated from a larger context or some biased theoretical assumptions (e.g. drawing on prescriptive norms of standard Lithuanian). It is probably more acceptable for reviews than for scholarly articles to express opinions about translation quality with less focus on showing the rhetoric of argument and conclusion due to the limited format of the review genre. However, scholarly articles need to be explicitly concerned with the methodologies of conducting research towards building a balanced theory. Therefore, it is valid to consider how to include and examine empirical data and use it as evidence of 'bad' translations, also asking what are the circumstances that motivate the translator to translate this or another way. Since Lithuania has undergone dramatic political changes over the past hundred years (the rise of the national state during the inter-war years, 50 years of the Soviet occupation eradicating national identity, and the restoration of independence into the global market), its cultural practices have also changed, affecting every area of human activity. Therefore, TS and LTS need to reflect on their diachronic aspects in order to pin down shifts in translation

paradigm. Calling new approaches and patterns as ill practices is often a result of a narrow analysis that does not relate to historical evidence or research. For example, Končius (2010: 35) claims that preserving the foreign form of character names in adult literature has been a traditional approach in domestic translation practice. This statement is highly questionable since it is observed that foreignization of names has been used side by side with localization (domestication) of names since 1990 only (see Danytė 2008). Instead of criticising new ways of translating names, Danytė (ibid.) systematically describes them as a change in norms of literary translation since 1990, which allows more freedom in transliterating and transcribing. Regrettably, a descriptive research on historical changes in literary translation and its theory has not received much attention in Lithuania despite its obvious value and methodological significance for theory.

Knowledge and evidence of how norms and standards change may contribute a great deal to theory dealing with translation quality assessment and management. Therefore it is natural to retrospect and compare differences of norms, definitions and practices of 'good' translation then and today. Žirgulyš (1979: 332), the editor, translator and scholar of the Soviet period, marks in general terms that translations of the inter-war years were of a poor quality, arguing that they were determined by the focus of publishers on profit alone. It is difficult to have a definitive view on his comment for at least two reasons. First, the editor wrote during the period where a negative view on most textual practices before Sovietisation was simply a prerequisite to secure one's social position and job. Second, it is disputable if it is valid to assess the quality of inter-war translations (or any other historical period) from a Soviet or a post-colonial perspective, using the recent descriptors and concepts, knowing how different the socio-historical conditions of literary and translation production were. Is not the rhetoric of present critical concepts and mode of thinking construing the problems of the past rather than identifying them? Ideology at any time might be a powerful factor transforming historical memory and discourse. For example, Petrauskas (1988) discusses a case of a high-quality translation done by the translator whose name was erased from the official discourse and his work (authorship) appropriated by others because he was condemned for escaping to the West after WW2. This single case is not enough to draw any conclusions about differences in quality and norms of period-bound translations but it definitely urges to examine this gap in the history of inter-war translations, in the meantime, avoiding making the same mistakes when treating the Soviet-period translations.

### **5.3. Language contacts and hegemonies**

Despite the immediate value that a period-bound approach adds to research, it needs to draw on some conceptual basis in order to examine a mechanism of cause and effect. For example, Danytė (2006) combines historicizing the study of Lithuanian translations of Canadian literature with a cultural perspective on translation artefacts. Thus, she notices that translation in that particular case has often served as an alternative media of representing culture in comparison to news media which at different historical periods limited the coverage of Canadian culture. Vaičėnienė (2010) also addresses a similar issue concerning the representation of Lithuanian culture through translations. The scholar compares several data sources regarding the print-runs of Lithuanian national literature, literary translations into Lithuanian and literary translations published in US and UK by drawing on Lawrence Venuti's claim that a political and cultural hegemony makes domestic literature dominate over translations. Once the scholar supports this hypothesis about the correlation between the ratio of national literature vs. translation with its cultural status, she does not venture to examine at least tentatively the roots and implications of this competitive relationship. It might be helpful to examine the given socio-historical situation by applying the following culture-related categories: minority language vs. minorized language, languages of limited diffusion (LLD), such as Lithuanian, vs. languages of unlimited diffusion (LUD), such as English, and postcolonial vs. neocolonial. It is worth re-evaluating the current status of Lithuanian

language (and, eventually, culture), asking if it is a minority language *per se*, or a language that has been minorized over the period of time, e.g. its use limited during the Soviet period and now in the global context dominated by Anglo-American linguistic and cultural hegemony. Furthermore, languages categorized as LLD might not necessarily be culturally invisible but this is not a case with Lithuanian culture. From a cultural perspective, the postcolonial transition is marked with changes in power relations whereby Lithuanian has failed to gain a significant position in some areas of culture (i.e. low demand of national literature) because the power and prestige of Anglo-American culture has replaced the former prestige of the Russian language in Lithuania.

Tentatively speaking, a historical investigation into translation may also account for the forms of expression and linguistic contacts (interests, citations, translations disguised as allusions or vice versa) born at the intersections of original literature and translation. For example, Elizabeth Novickas, the translator of Gavelis' novel *Vilniaus Pokeris* into English, in her interview (Stankevičiūtė 2009) notes that it was fairly natural for her to translate the novel into English as if the writer wrote in Lithuanian under the influence of the writers he read in English. His novels are considered revolutionary (i.e. promoting and importing the element of the Western *Other* to resist the Soviet *Other*) in comparison to the traditional and regional manner of mainstream Lithuanian literature. A pervasive dialogue with other writers in other languages in the discourse of the writer who masters several foreign languages is a *terra incognita* for translation theory and studies. The works of some innovative Lithuanian writers could be examined in relation to cross-literary and cross-linguistic dialogues. For example, the poet Vytautas Mačernis was known to speak several languages. His poetry is assessed to be characterized by nominal structures not characteristic of the Lithuanian language (Kubilius et al. 1997: 327). This area is not an obvious act of translation proper as it takes place primarily at the thought level before being cast in words. A case when the reading of the ST in one language and the writing in another language may produce literature considered original in the target language is discussed in Žalys (1988: 49-53) who focuses on the origins of the 19<sup>th</sup> c. Lithuanian ballad genre inspired by the reading, interpretation, adaptation and translation of Polish ballads. Despite its heterogeneous and referential nature, the Lithuanian ballad manifested itself as a piece of creative literature. These various examples of cross-linguistic and cross-cultural writing cases may be viewed in relation to theories about the intertext. The concept of intertextuality seems to cover the issues of references and ties among texts on the verbal level but it rarely accounts for ideas, visions, experiences and the like migrating or simply occurring simultaneously in different cultures. Chesterman (2005) entertains the concept of memes to reflect on the dissemination of cultural structures and entities in and through translation, which extends a discussion about translation far beyond the notion of translation as verbal communication.

Furthermore, Jonušas (2010) outlines the scene of intensive multi-cultural and multi-linguistic contacts in the urban culture, which could be explored further as a historical context for a more detailed content analysis of sample texts. He stresses variable contacts between the Polish and the Lithuanian languages and cultures in inter-war Lithuania, which is an interesting period for scholars to examine the migration of thoughts, ideas, symbols, and images (e.g. Polish literary journals publishing Lithuanian literary output, which naturally entails some scholarly and non-scholarly readership response in a highly bilingual context). It is noteworthy that the urban culture before WW1 and during the inter-war years is marked by multilingual communication and contacts because the major Lithuanian towns were polyglot (e.g. Vilnius, Kaunas, and Klaipėda). The distribution and nature of polyglotism changed after both the Nazi and the Soviet occupations took place: e.g. ethnic Jews, Lithuanians, Germans, etc. were reallocated or replaced through a schemed deportation of the local population and through an influx of Russian population, all accompanied by rapid industrialization and town community expansion. For example, Kaunas turned from a polyglot into a Lithuanian-speaking town during the Soviet period. In the context of these large social and political changes, the altered language distribution and role inevitably had their impact

on all aspects of text production. The examination of cross-cultural contacts through literary and translation production during the pre-colonial inter-war period may be coupled with and compared to similar research of the period in Eastern and Central Europe since the region shares a rich history of intensive polyglot contacts within the context of rising national states, identities, and literatures from the 16<sup>th</sup> to the 20<sup>th</sup> c.c.

An emerging trend of research deals with translations produced earlier than the 20<sup>th</sup> c., which offers an opportunity for establishing historiographic studies about early translation practices in Lithuania. For example, Lamanuskaitė Geriguis (2007) examines a curious case of the adaptation and translation of *Robinson Crusoe* by the historian Simonas Daukantas upon the model of Campe's German adaptation in the 18<sup>th</sup> c. The translation is treated as a document for examining its ideological underpinnings because the famous Lithuanian historian aimed to express his dissident political views towards the Tsarist rule over Lithuania in the 19<sup>th</sup> c. Missing fragments are further added by TS scholars analyzing translations from and into other languages than English, for example, Baltrušaitytė (1999) tackles the issues of the 19<sup>th</sup> c. translation of Chodzko's text from Polish into Lithuanian mixing the High and the Low dialects. Urbutis (2000) expands on the linguistic aspects of the translation of Wujek's sermons from Polish into Lithuanian by Mikalojus Daukša in the 16<sup>th</sup> c. Kavaliūnaitė (2003) focuses on postpositional locatives in the Lithuanian translation of the Old Testament done by a Lithuanian Calvinist Samuel Boguslaus Chylinski in the 17<sup>th</sup> c. Although these examples do not fall strictly under the category of literary translation, it is vital to include them in diachronic studies of literary translation for several reasons. First, historical evidence of early translations – whether literary or non-literary – does not abound in general. Second, literary practices were highly hybrid genre- and language-wise due to an ethnically rich and polyglot culture in Lithuania in the 16<sup>th</sup>–19<sup>th</sup> c.c. For example, it was not uncommon to juxtapose several languages in staging dramas in Vilnius in the 16<sup>th</sup> c. (Venclova 2006). From a historical perspective, translation could be viewed as a practice not only from one into another language but also across languages. Surveys of the history of individual translations and the historical interconnections of literature and translation might bring forth interesting opportunities for research and specialization not present currently in our academia.

The domestic LTS is dominated by synchronic research. Diachroni studies demand resources that are not readily available due to historical and technological disadvantages, such as the destruction of archives and libraries during the Soviet period, censorship, the lack of large repositories of digitized texts and access to them, insufficient computer literacy among humanities scholars, low level and support of interdisciplinary research in domestic academia, etc. In attempt to historicize literary translation criticism, it is also vital to assess the role and implications of technological advancement. In her overview of how research areas cluster within TS, Tymoczko (2005) mentions research in technology among other strands. Although Machine Translation and corpus-based research are not new topics in domestic TS, it is rarely a topic in LTS. In addition, the spread of technology into the humanities field and the growth of interdisciplinary research sparks off an interest in the recent observable changes leading to future predictions, i.e. how corpus-based methods and approaches in linguistics and literary studies have affected reading and writing activities; how the ways of digitizing and archiving texts have affected the industry of translation as well as the role and working patterns of the translator (e.g. working with digital format); how a much faster accessibility to resources, clients and readers has influenced translation as a process and a product (e.g. using digital tools, such as databases, references, libraries rather than paper-based dictionaries and old-fashioned libraries); what impact does it have on translation training; whether it secures or impairs translation quality and translation training (e.g. inexperienced translators often abuse automated translation). The wealth of aspects and concerns in this area seems inexhaustible, turning a whole new page for both diachronic and synchronic trends of research.



## 6. Constructing literary translation criticism

Although the dissemination of translation-related issues in media is wide, the current survey of literary translation criticism implies that today we can talk mostly of separate groups of interest, the thematicity of which has been discussed above in this article, but not of a large tradition or a school of literary translation in Lithuania. For literary translation criticism to perform its social, educating and culture-shaping roles, we need to foster an active critical response both inside and outside academia. Despite significant historical changes, domestic translation studies lack a paradigm shift – that is, we keep applying and testing borrowed theories (e.g. formerly theories of the Russian school and now Western theories) instead of deriving theories from language- and culture-specific research placed in a more ethnocentric context. In addition, we need to find a place for teaching and analyzing translation criticism in the tertiary curricula.

### 6.1. Distinctiveness of literary translation criticism

The distinctive and multi-faceted function and nature of literature and literary translation subsequently impose different tasks and posit different questions to a literary translation critic than non-literary texts do. Despite universal issues that translation theory often aims to tackle across texts, critical discourse on literary translation should not be losing sight of text- and context-specific objectives that the translator pursues when dealing with literary texts. The function of the text and the nature of textuality are considered prominent characteristics of literary texts. For example, Āurišin (1991: 114) stresses the function of creativity of "artistic" (literary) translation rather than a "transpositive" function by focusing on the discourse-related aspect of translation. According to his view, artistic translation is distinctive from other text-specific translations because it is "a product of interliterary communication". Furthermore, Riffaterre (1992: 204–217) notes that other types of discourse differ from fiction discourse in terms of the semiotic nature of literary textuality "that integrates semantic components of the verbal sequence (the ones accessible to linear decoding) – a theoretically open-ended sequence – into one closed finite semiotic system, the very existence of which is not manifest until readers become aware of the connection between the text and an intertext". In his concise and highly informative review of how theoretical definitions of literary translation changed over time, Hermans (2007: 77–93) notes that criteria for defining the distinctiveness of literary texts from non-literary texts have been always subject to dispute which remains unsettled. However, on a final note, he implies that a translation scholar is one more stakeholder whose views and stance add to the dynamism of translation practice and theory.

Ambrasas-Sasnava (1980: 67) claims that translation principles, methods, challenges and other historically specific issues across all the periods are still far from being given a complete description and evaluation by translation historians and critics in Lithuania. Since the publication of the textbook on translation by Armalytė and Pažūsis (1990), no other fundamental work – neither didactic nor critical or historical – has been published in this area during the past 20-year period. After independence from the Soviet regime a few scholars have ever attempted to address an issue of domestic literary translation criticism, or to be more precise, its absence. For example, Petrauskas (2003) notices the lack of both criticism and analysis as a form of sustaining the quality of literary translation the foundation of which, in his view, was laid by the older generation of translators who mainly worked during the colonial period. In discussing the critical attitude towards the Lithuanian translation of Ezra Pound, he draws on some parallels with translation norms and critical responses in Canada, where he has worked and lived for the past years. Petrauskas (*ibid.*) initiates a dialogue maintaining critical intertextuality whereby one critical text would respond and draw upon another. This is a rare case in our critical discourse today: it demonstrates a disposition towards withdrawing from rather than entering into dialogue. Jarutis

(2005) and Baublys (2005) report on a meeting organized by the Lithuanian Association of Literary Translators during which the speakers unanimously agreed that the domestic literary translation criticism was barely visible. Moreover, this situation can be seen as symptomatic of overall literary criticism. The reports also note that the current critical thought is impoverished by the rigor of formal genre (mainly reviews and scholarly articles) and discourse and urges critics to embrace other dialogue-promoting forms, such as informal peer evaluation, written peer reviews, etc. This gap has socio-economic and cultural underpinnings, such as the orientation of academia towards profit-generating programmes of training technical translators for EU jobs rather than literary translators (and scholars) for the domestic market, insufficient funding and low profile of cultural media, insufficient support and management of translation quality, low wages of editors and translators, etc. The statement needs to be taken further to examine the reasons and implications of this situation on translation production.

Back in 1979, when the computer-assisted language and text research in Lithuania was a utopian idea, Ambrasas-Sasnavas (1980: 76–77) argued that a comparative research whereby translation is examined in alignment with its source gives an indispensable depth and weight to the evaluation of translation quality. In his opinion, criticism rooted in empirical approaches to texts provides one of the best methods and sources for forging skills of novices in translation. Marcinkevičienė (1996: 67) also flags the gap in this area, that is, the lack of comparative and contrastive analyses of linguistic systems within a descriptive framework. In response to a number of critical comments on translated literature, Balčiūnienė (2005a, 2005c) questions the methodological grounds on which some cases of domestic critique are built. Although very few scholars have attended to this area, it brings rare attention to the importance of meta-awareness of tools, methodologies, and approaches in criticism.

Deriving norms, procedures, techniques, text units, taxonomies, and teaching guidelines from comparison-based research has long proved to be a valid and productive approach; however, the domestic practice of writing critical reviews does not exploit the benefits of this method to the full. A large number of reviews of translated books present the reader with the value of the original book, saying a few words about translation, usually either approving or disapproving of its quality in general, or focusing exclusively on the promotion of the source alone. Balčiūnienė (2005c) reports that translation reviews were written in as much the same style during the Soviet period as they are today. The aim of these reviews is mostly to give a brief introduction to a piece of the world literature (registering the fact of a new publication and informing the reader of this fact) and often reinforces the promotion of a commodity rather than the culture of reading. Critical discourse abounds in promotional reviews, e.g. on Roth's *Indignation* translated by Gabrielė Gailiūtė (Zabielaitė 2010), Graham Swift's *Waterland* translated by Laimantas Jonušys (Zabielaitė 2010), Paul Bowles' *The Sheltering Sky* translated by Jūratė Nauronaitė (Jonušys 2007a; Meškauskaitė 2007) and the like. Viewing them under the category of critical writing is really a disputable issue. Some other reviews may be more concerned with literary and educational values of translated fiction. For example, Dilytė (2002) highlights the literary and moral values of Lucy Maud Montgomery's novel *Anne of Green Gables*. She discusses the major themes, such as harmony and balance between culture and nature, and illustrates them with the quotations from the Lithuanian translation. The tiny last paragraph is dedicated to say a few praising words about translation quality with respect to its integrity with the Lithuanian language norms. This type of discourse is useful to orientate the reader in the large amount of literature reaching the reader through translations; however, recommendations do not link well to translation-related issues. The article by Satkauskytė (2006) could be viewed within the same trend of educating for reading material. It discusses in full length the literary significance, style and status of John Fowles from a perspective of literature criticism. It also mentions the significant context of publishing the original and translations; however, balance-wise, the scholarly reflection upon the quality of translations is

given inadequately little attention, confining the review to a few cited cases. Given a high critical ranking of Fowles among domestic literary critics, flagging a few syntactic and grammatical mistakes is not sufficient for examine how Fowles' literary works are transfigured in the receiving culture. It demands amassing larger textual data and applying a more holistic approach to quality and adequacy assessment. However fragmentary and impressionistic the comments on translation quality are in these reviews, they provide some hypotheses to be tested and examined in further scholarly research.

## 6.2. Some methodological issues of critical discourse

On the technical side, quite many scholarly articles do not avoid pitfalls of maintaining the consistet application of methods. In particular, this relates to some articles on research that logically demands applying quantification methods. For example, Buitkienė (2010) claims she has applied a content analysis to cohesive means in literary translations from English into Lithuanian. However, the article does not show how a content analysis is driven to the point of quantifying the presence of all the items under a chosen category within the ST and the TT, possibly focusing on diverging and converging cases. Alternatively, despite arguing for advantages of a corpus-based analysis for translation research, Cvilkaitė (2007) does not give at least a quantitative summary of morphological gaps identified in the parallel English–Lithuanian corpus, due to which the scope of her research remains unknown. Furthermore, Butkuvienė (2004) quantitatively examines the cases of generalization and concretization by comparing two samples – one of the literary text and the other of the technical text. A minor issue is that the scholar expands on other cases of linguistic transformation despite her focus claim. However, the major fallacy lies in the fact that the scholar compares the use of techniques across two genres on an infirm basis. The genre-related samples represent the opposite patterns of language directionality – that is, the literary sample is translation from English to Lithuanian and the technical sample comprises Lithuanian–English translations. In a large-scale research, it might be valid though to compare how translated and original discourses differ per genre category with respect to patterns and techniques dependent on the directionality of language pairs, translator's profile, or other factors.

Another methodological problem arises from a narrow focus or failure to show how research relates to larger data either in the same language or across several languages where domestic research lacks such data. For example, Labutis (2006) contends that comparative stylistics might offer solutions to bridge a gap in translation studies and to bring valid data for translator trainers but the whole argument is built on explaining the objectives of functional grammar. In the wake of Labutis (2006), Petronienė (2007) examines "communicative inadequacies" between Balys Sruoga's novel *Dievų miškas* and its English translation *Forest of the Gods* by the writer's American-Lithuanian granddaughter Aušrinė Byla. Due to the limited amount of data presented (the scholar fails to inform that 3 cases discussed come from her PhD thesis), the lack of quantitative findings as well as the lack of similar research at large, it is difficult to adequately assess how valid, replicable and productive this approach to asymmetries across languages is, especially given that asymmetries may arise for many reasons, i.e. they may result from pervasive intentional strategies or unconscious habits of the translator as well as from systemic linguistic differences rooted in longstanding language traditions or literary canons. Petronienė's research stands alone waiting for similar studies to emerge. However, her attempt to compare how languages differ in terms of expressing functional sentence perspectives (FSP) seems to offer an interesting vein in TS and comparative stylistics.

Some metadiscoursal issues in critical discourse include argumentation style, terminology definition and citation distribution. On the intertextual level, some articles by younger scholars show that they are citing both Western and Russian translation scholars by accessing secondary

sources rather than drawing on the primary sources (Končius and Nausėda 2006). Bernotaitė (2005) also falls into the trap of citing the domestic must-theorists Armalytė and Pažūsis with reference to their 1990 landmark textbook though the textbook (the only one of this kind in the Lithuanian academic bibliography) is a composite of theories and taxonomies borrowed from Anglo-American and Russian scholars and illustrated by examples taken from Lithuanian translations, but with no theory of their own. In their case, examples are singled out to support theories built on research in other languages rather than building a theory derived from Lithuanian-specific data. Furthermore, some articles show discrepancies between theoretical arguments and empirical analysis. For example, Baranauskienė and Kriščiūnaitė (2008) start in a promising way by revising and consolidating the inventory of taxonomies for translation shifts at various levels of the text before they move to analyze the translation of Gilbert's novel *Eat, Pray, Love*; however the empirical part describes and quantifies a narrow category of translation inadequacies and mistakes (ibid., 26). Apart from a variety of methodological issues, the majority of problems seem to result from leaving research halfway between generating hypotheses and testing them or between collecting empirical data and describing it, with only part of data or part of concepts tested. On a positive note, as long as we keep ourselves aware of digressions and shortcomings in the construction of academic discourse, fallacies may generate an engrossing possibility for further research.

### 6.3. Competing philological perspectives

The body of articles in particular shows that there are two diverging and often competing perspectives on TS and LTS, especially when assessing translation quality in terms of linguistic aspects. The competing views are propagated within different academic backgrounds – that is, by Lithuanian language scholars on the one hand, and by Lithuanian scholars of English philology on the other hand. Since both the scholarships stem from different traditions, it bears on their methodologies and research questions. Due to geopolitical and historical factors, the development of text studies in Lithuania can be often linked to philological traditions in Slavonic cultures; whereas Lithuanian scholars of the English language draw heavily on Anglo-American contexts. For example, like many other Lithuanian language scholars, Miliūnaitė (2009) addresses the issues of language use within a framework of Russian formalist (e.g. I.R. Galperin) and the Prague school of structuralist theories that measure style variation across genres, styles, and text types mainly against the definition of a standard variety. In particular rigid are classifications and evaluation derived from limiting the analysis of texts and language use to 5 functional styles, which is a reductionist approach to language variation and creativeness in text production. The five-fold system of textual functionality is far from exhausting the potential of textual medium to yield creative variables on the lexical, syntactic, and narrative levels. Miliūnaitė (ibid.) also uses the notion of literary language which needs to be treated with critical reserve because it implies that language use may be defined by some finite inventory of static qualities.

Furthermore, Miliūnaitė (2009) states that differences among language variants are objectively determined. On the one hand, she rightly urges language codifiers to access more often corpora tools for tracking diachronic changes in language use (see Miliūnaitė 2008). On the other hand, her comments on criteria for selecting variants (2009) in translation rely too heavily on the sources of codified language, such as DLKŽ (*Didysis lietuvių kalbos žodynas*). It is noteworthy to mention here that standard Lithuanian is a human-engineered variety at large the core of which was established and codified in the 20<sup>th</sup> c. Alternatively, Kniūkšta (2001) points out some inconsistencies of codification in the mentioned dictionary. He also discusses cases where codifiers extend the rules in order to create a uniform pattern of use against the natural patterns present in the living language of dialects, saying that the rules of codifying are becoming more rigid, more uniform and more artificial than before (2001: 59). Since codification comes into conflict with

natural language use, Kniūkšta argues for promoting flexible norms which paradoxically will become more stable if they were to tolerate those variants of norm that really exist in language use (ibid., 67).

It is commonplace to blame the dominance and spread of English in our academia and cultural life for corrupting Lithuanian in written and spoken discourses. The process of corruption (though the meaning of this concept needs to be revised) started long before independence or rather was a historical part of language in use. What codifiers define as corrupted uses should be linked to natural interferences of other languages that historically co-existed with Lithuanian within the socio-political and -historical contexts. Moreover, the use and attitudes towards Lithuanian have been always influenced by competing ideologies of its users and planners. The role of Lithuanian has undergone dramatic changes due to external factors, e.g. as a socially inferior language during the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, as a forbidden print language for 40 years under the Russian Tsarist rule, as a minor language during the Soviet occupation for 50 years, or nowadays as an official state language and one of EU minority languages. Language change also correlates with internal tensions among its users. For example, the rigid engineering of creating and implementing a standard variety of Lithuanian took place at the expense of marginalizing and often suppressing local dialects in result of which some dialect varieties died out. Vaicekauskienė (2010: 168) mentions that measures against dialects were taken to the extreme during the Soviet period, e.g. forbidding children to speak in their dialect at school even during breaks. The hegemonic status of a standard variety might have set up a mechanism of compensation whereby users seek for alternative sources of linguistic supply (e.g. for Russicisms and Anglicisms in other languages) once they lose access to an internal variety.

Both the perspectives contribute to TS/LTS research as they derive their knowledge and views from rich backgrounds and traditions. However, in order to foster the growth, they need to look for convergences, i.e. searching actively for mutual points and interests for maintaining a dialogue rather than widening the existing gap in theoretical considerations. These separate academic communities need to overcome a few hurdles born inside their fields. Despite a variety of interests in research, domestic scholars of English do not seem to have a solid text-centred methodology (or methodologies) to follow for theoretical or practical purposes. This is partly due to educational background, that is, translation scholars representing English philology community need to show a good knowledge of systemic differences of the two languages at least. However, it seems that both the parties can say much more about one language they deal with, which distances their views and stances at the moment. Moreover, little is known about the preferences, norms, or paradigmatic shifts in translated Lithuanian (as opposed to non-translated Lithuanian) whose distinctiveness as a variety is a way too obvious to ignore it.

Vaicekauskienė (2010: 170) notes that today the advocates for strengthening the role of standard Lithuanian by fencing off other linguistic interferences use more rigid policies and measures than ever before. The insistence of language policy makers on Lithuanizing and thus domesticating strategies in translation may be rooted in historical resistance against the colonial practices to foreignize the Lithuanian language and literature. The current domesticating practices may be seen too insensitive and inadequate to meet the needs of language users from today's perspective but it definitely has its own historical legacy. The current policy of standard language planning seems a protective measure that the state takes to preserve the national in the global context. On the other hand, our identity is strongly associated with national awareness of the symbolic value of Lithuanian for historical studies in Indo-European languages.

### **Summarizing notes**

The current survey of critical discourse representing the Lithuanian thought on literary translation by all means does not cover all instances of publication in cultural and academic media after 1990. For example, it does not examine interviews that might bring valuable insights to the views, objectives, beliefs, and experience of translators. Scholarly theses also offer material for examination as a form of critical discourse. Instead of bringing a qualitative research to the point of saturation, the survey clusters some tentative research questions and sets hypotheses for criticism of knowledge about TS/LTS as well as for construing data-driven theory. LLVS in a way started building a digital collection of articles, reviews and interviews which is of great use for all those interested in LTS. However, the collection is far from complete and is limited to papers that were produced in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup>–21<sup>st</sup> c.c. In the future its creators might need to revise the functionality of search interface to help qualitative and quantitative research.

The problem of the current state of translation theory and its capacity to address the issues of translation practice globally and adequately so that it could feed in some valuable insights into translation training and translation criticism lies in several issues. Western theories in their vast range are to a great extent theories built on guidelines on what translation could and should be and on insufficient data within and across languages as well as language networks. Analyses so far are still isolated from a vast number of other analyses due to technological pace of working with data or even making that data available (isolated from a vast number of other actual translations set against a great variation of historico-social circumstances). Even though some international scholars who engage in writing and translating (e.g. an Italian writer, scholar and translator Umberto Eco, an American scholar Lawrence Venuti translating from Italian, French and Catalan, a scholar Susan Petrilli translating scholarly works from English into Italian) have made outstanding attempts at theory-building, their experientially-driven theories are limited to specific contexts. Moreover, the elaborate theory in one language should be carefully tested across other languages due to linguistic differences and similarities, differences in the development of historico-social circumstances, dominating literary paradigms, technological state-of-the-art, etc. In other words, once language- or culture-bound theories emerge, it is ideal to see whether they are applicable and replicable in the studies of other languages and cultures.

There is no single theory but many theories stemming from describing actual translations and within actual contexts of description. Although Anglo-American scholarship still dominates TS, Descriptive Translation Studies urging to describe data and devise theory rather than prescribe theory and devise data has naturally triggered theory to diversify through descriptions of language-bound data and cases. With new digital tools and methods emerging for collecting, describing and evaluating data, theoretical notions are yet to be tested and epistemologies redefined against what they actually assert at the moment. These circumstances set even more challenging goals for Lithuanian scholars. First, we have little observable data at our disposition in digital format for observation and investigation. Second, we have not reached standards of using digital tools widely enough in educating both practitioners for work and scholars for critical studies and research. Third, our critical tradition is undergoing changes, moving away from the influence of Russian to Anglo-American (variably French or German) scholarship, whose perspectives and inventories of beliefs, views, techniques as well as theoretical and descriptive concepts differ. Our scholars may also need to consolidate or cross-tabulate data assuring that at least small-scale studies are compared across languages, e.g. a comparative analysis per data set or per hypothesis in English and Lithuanian may cross-pollinate with similar research into the French–Lithuanian pair. The findings of individual research and small-scale data are to be repeatedly canvassed each time a block of new findings and new data is added to the pool of theories and methodologies. It is time we started to think of our individual research not only as a credit to personal academic profile but

also as a contribution to national academia and global community. Fourth, apart from applying research tools and methods in TS/LTS, we need to think of supporting and sustaining the very application of theories and data through cross-institutional and cross-departmental collaboration in order to upscale the progress of research and to place LTS in a more interdisciplinary area, as otherwise LTS faces a risk to remain a marginal area of study, criticism, and culture at large. Despite both academic and cultural media dealing with language issues, the domestic culture of critical response to literary translation is yet to mature to be able to foster reading and writing communities. An intense and engaging critical approach to translation quality and publishing could otherwise raise the awareness of the reader giving him/her a differentiated view on the products of literary translation.

Finally, for the national school of LTS to emerge, it needs to consolidate its wide-spread effort across academia and media and to imprint its language- and culture- specific ideas on the global map of TS by pursuing two immediate objectives: 1) launching a large historiographic project for revisiting the recent past of literary translation and rediscovering its distant past; 2) supporting the collection of large linguistic data in digital format necessary for cross- and interdisciplinary studies of text (both source and target) production

### References

- Ambrasas-Sasnavas, K. 1978: *Vertimo mokslas*, Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Ambrasas-Sasnavas, K. 1980: Lietuvių vertimo teorijos užuomazgos. E. Matuzevičius, A. Valionis (red.), *Meninio vertimo problemos*, Vilnius: Vaga, 63–84.
- Armalytė, O. and Pažūsis, L. 1990: *Vertimo teorijos pradmenys*, Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas.
- Balčiūnienė, I. 2010: Palūžusieji ir palaimintieji kelyje. *Bernardinai.lt*, <http://www.bernardinai.lt/straipsnis/2010-02-17-irena-balciuniene-paluzusieji-ir-palaimintieji-kelyje/40533>
- Balčiūnienė, I. 2007: Ar lengva vertėjui įmint pavadinimo mįslę? *LLVS seminar*, 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2007, <http://www.llvs.lt/?recensions=311&hightlights>
- Balčiūnienė, I. 2006a: Ranka rankon: vertėjas ir redaktorius. *LLVS seminar*, 10<sup>th</sup> May 2006, <http://www.llvs.lt/?recensions=47&hightlights>
- Balčiūnienė, I. 2006b: Keiksmožodžių vertimai. *LLVS seminar*, 6<sup>th</sup> December 2006, <http://www.llvs.lt/?recensions=229&hightlights>
- Balčiūnienė, I. 2005a: Perskaičius Ritos Miliūnaitės straipsnį apie skolininę leksiką vertimuose. *LLVS conference Sava ar svetima*, 7<sup>th</sup> May 2005, <http://www.llvs.lt/?recensions=30&hightlights>
- Balčiūnienė, I. 2005b: Apie realiųjų vertimą. *LLVS conference Sava ar svetima*, 7<sup>th</sup> May 2005, <http://www.llvs.lt/?recensions=34&hightlights>
- Balčiūnienė, I. 2005c: Verstinės literatūros kritikos apžvalga. *LLVS seminar Vertimo kritikos situacija ir perspektyvos*, 18<sup>th</sup> October 2005, <http://www.llvs.lt/?recensions=35&hightlights>

- Balčiūnienė, I. 1980: Citatos ir aliuzijos vertimuose. E. Matuzevičius, A. Valionis (red.), *Meninio vertimo problemos*, Vilnius: Vaga, 147–158.
- Baltrušaitytė, J. 1999: Jono iš Svisločės (1823) žemaičių kalba ir vertėjo tapatybės problema. *Archivum Lituanicum* 1, 96–105.
- Banevičius, A., Matuzevičius, E., Visockas, V. (red.) 1986: *Meninio vertimo akiračiai*, Vilnius: Vaga.
- Baranauskienė, R., Kriščiūnaitė, I. 2008: Transformation peculiarities in the Lithuanian translation of *Eat, Pray, Love* by E. Gilbert. *Jaunųjų mokslininkų darbai* 4 (20), 22–28.
- Baublys, K. 2005: Vertimo kritika merdėja. *Literatūra ir menas*, 2005 m. spalio 28 d., [http://www.culture.lt/lmenas/?leid\\_id=3068&kas=straipsnis&st\\_id=7605](http://www.culture.lt/lmenas/?leid_id=3068&kas=straipsnis&st_id=7605)
- Bernotaitė, J. 2005: Translating the infinitive and infinitival constructions. *Jaunųjų mokslininkų darbai* 3 (7), 160–167.
- Buitkienė, J. 2010: Are the same cohesive patterns used in English and Lithuanian texts? *Kalbų studijos* 16, 28–32.
- Burbaitė, R. 2010: Kai Narnijos žirgas lietuviškai prabilo... *Literatūra ir menas*, 2010 m. vasario 12 d., [http://www.culture.lt/lmenas/?leid\\_id=3271&kas=straipsnis&st\\_id=16064](http://www.culture.lt/lmenas/?leid_id=3271&kas=straipsnis&st_id=16064)
- Butkuvienė, K. 2004: Generalization and concretization in the context of translation transformations (Translating from English into Lithuanian). *Jaunųjų mokslininkų darbai* 2, 6–13.
- Chesterman, A. 2005: The memetics of knowledge. H. V. Dam, J. Engberg, H. Gerzymisch-Arbogast (eds.), *Knowledge Systems and Translation*, Mouton de Gruyter, 17–31.
- Comparative income 2007/2008*, 2008: Conseil Européen des Associations de Traducteurs Littéraires (CEATL), <http://www.ceatl.eu/docs/surveyuk.pdf>
- Cotter, S. 2008: The Soviet translation: Romanian literary translators after World War Two. *Meta: journal des traducteurs=Meta: Translator's Journal* 53 (4), 841–859.
- Cvilikaitė, J. 2007: The cases of non-equivalence between English and Lithuanian: a corpus based solution. *Kalbotyra* 57 (3), 46–55.
- Danytė, M. 2008: Literatūrinio vertimo normų pokyčiai Lietuvoje po 1990-ųjų metų. *Kalbų studijos* 12, 51–56.
- Danytė, M. 2006: Lithuanian translations of Canadian literature. *Darbai ir dienos* 45, 195–213.
- Dilytė, D. 2006: Sinonimų paieškos gimtosios kalbos aruoduose. *LLVS seminar* Lietuvių sinonimikos spindesys ir skurdas. Aukštojo stiliaus problema lietuvių kalboje, 25<sup>th</sup> October 2006, <http://www.llvs.lt/?recensions=142&highlights>
- Dilytė, D. 2002: Pasiilgusiems harmonijos. *Rubinaitis* 2 (22), 31–32.



- Doherty, M. 1991: Reliability of observational data: towards a theory of comparative stylistics. *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction* 4 (1), 49–61.
- Đurišin, D. 1991: Artistic translation in the interliterary process. *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction* 4 (1), 113–127.
- Gailiūtė, G. 2007: Labai optimistiškas pasakojimas apie Lietuvos vertėjus. *Knygų aidai* 3, 1–6.
- Ger, M. 2007: Haris Poteris ir vertimo keblumai. *Šiaurės Atėnai*, 2007 m. rugpjūčio 25 d., [http://www.culture.lt/satenai/?leid\\_id=858&kas=straipsnis&st\\_id=5403](http://www.culture.lt/satenai/?leid_id=858&kas=straipsnis&st_id=5403)
- Gudaitis, L. 2010: Uždusinti žodžiai: Sovietinė cenzūra pokario Lietuvoje. *Metai* 5–6, 93–109.
- Hermans, Th. 2007: Literary translation. P. Kuhiwczak, K. Littau (eds.), *A Companion to Translation Studies*, Multilingual Matters Ltd, 77–91.
- Jaleniauskiėnė, E., Čičelytė, V. 2009: The strategies for translating proper names in children's literature. *Kalbų Studijos* 15, 31–42.
- Jarutis, V. 2005: Vertimų gaivalas ir jų vertinimo viltys. *Metai* 11, 156.
- Jonušas, J. 2010: Tarpkultūrinės komunikacijos prielaidos tarpukario Lietuvoje: visuomeniškumo jausmas ir tautinės tapatybės sklaida. *Kalbų studijos* 16, 89–93.
- Jonušys, L. 2007a: Susitelkusi tamsa. *Šiaurės Atėnai*, 2007 m. rugsėjo 29 d., [http://www.culture.lt/satenai/?leid\\_id=863&kas=straipsnis&st\\_id=15469](http://www.culture.lt/satenai/?leid_id=863&kas=straipsnis&st_id=15469)
- Jonušys, L. 2007b: Apie džipą, anūką ir kitus skriaudžiamuosius. *Šiaurės Atėnai*, 2007 m. gruodžio 15 d., [http://www.culture.lt/satenai/?leid\\_id=873&kas=straipsnis&st\\_id=15623](http://www.culture.lt/satenai/?leid_id=873&kas=straipsnis&st_id=15623)
- Jonušys, L. 2006: Vertimo mįslė – leidybos mįslė. *Literatūra ir menas*, 2006 m. liepos 7 d., <http://www.llvs.lt/?recensions=50&highlights>
- Kaikarytė, A. 2010: Recenzija: Catherine Sanderson. Mažoji anglė Paryžiuje. Iš anglų kalbos vertė Ema Bernotaitė. Vilnius: Vaga, 2009, 424 p. *Gimtoji kalba* 10, 20–23.
- Kaikarytė, A. 2009: Garry Kilworth. *Dėlionė*. Iš anglų k. vertė Rolanda Strumilienė, red. Romėna Račkaitytė Čėpaitienė. Vilnius: Gimtoji kalba, 2008. 240 p. *Gimtasis žodis* 12, 13–16.
- Kavaliūnaitė, G. 2003: Postpozicinių vietininkų sistema Chylinškio Naujojo Testamento vertime. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 49, 33–49.
- Kelertienė, V. 2006: Įvadas knygai *Come into My Time*. V. Kelertienė, *Kita vertus: straipsniai apie lietuvių literatūrą*, Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 129–177.
- Kelly, D. 2008: Training the trainers: towards a description of translator trainer competence and training needs analysis. *TR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction* 21 (1), 99–125.

- Kižlienė, D. 2008: Dar kartą apie Harij Poterį ir vertimo keblumus. *Literatūra ir menas*, 2008 m. balandžio 11 d., [http://www.culture.lt/lmenas/?leid\\_id=3185&kas=straipsnis&st\\_id=12584](http://www.culture.lt/lmenas/?leid_id=3185&kas=straipsnis&st_id=12584)
- Kniūkšta, P. 2001: *Kalbos vartosena ir tvarkyba*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos instituto leidykla.
- Končius, V. 2010: Vaikų literatūros vertimo problemos: J. K. Rowling "Hario Poterio" serijos veikėjų vardai. *Kalbų studijos* 17, 34–39.
- Končius, V., Nausėda, A. 2006: Semantinio neadekvatumo kompensacijos būdai Jerome K. Jerome romano *Trise valtimi (neskaitant šuns)* vertime į lietuvių kalbą. *Jaunųjų mokslininkų darbai* 1 (8), 164–170.
- Labutis, V. 2006: Semantizuota funkcinė gramatika ir vertimo problemos. *Kalbotyra* 56, 94–99.
- Lamanauskaitė Geriguis, L. 2008: Discovering the Lithuanian reinscription of *Robinson Crusoe*: a literary construct of nineteenth century cultural, political and historical discourses in Lithuania. *Lituanus* 54 (4), [http://www.lituanus.org/2008/08\\_4\\_07%20Geriguis.html](http://www.lituanus.org/2008/08_4_07%20Geriguis.html)
- Marcinkevičienė, R. 1996: Tarp Scilės ir Charibdės: originalo kalbos įtaka vertimui. *Darbai ir dienos* 2 (11), 67–78.
- Masaitienė, D. 1996: Apie vertimo ekvivalentiškumą. *Darbai ir dienos* 2 (11), 79–86.
- Mataitytė, I. 2003: Williamo Styrono *Sofi pasirinkimas*. *Gimtoji kalba* 3, 13–15.
- Meškauskaitė, A. 2007: Pasiklydę dykumoje. *Nemunas* 34, 9.
- Mikutytė, J. 2005: Realijų rūšys ir vertimo būdai. *LLVS conference Sava ir svetima*, 7<sup>th</sup> May 2005, <http://www.llvs.lt/?recensions=29&highlights>
- Miliūnaitė, R. 2010: Individualizuota kalba ir jos vertimas. *Gimtoji kalba* 2, 3–16.
- Miliūnaitė, R. 2009: Variantiškumas verstinės grožinės literatūros kalboje. *Gimtoji kalba* 5, 3–14; 6, 5–16.
- Miliūnaitė, R. 2008: Bendrinės kalbos norminimas: pusiausvyros beiškant. *Kalbos namai: LLVS conference Lietuvių kalba XXI amžiaus pradžioje*, 7<sup>th</sup> November 2008, [http://www.kalbosnamai.lt/images/dokumentai/miliunaites\\_kult\\_kongreso%20pranesimas\\_2008.pdf](http://www.kalbosnamai.lt/images/dokumentai/miliunaites_kult_kongreso%20pranesimas_2008.pdf)
- Miliūnaitė, R. 2004: Būrimas ramune: pateisinama nepateisinama. *Literatūra ir menas*, 2004 m. spalio 22 d., [http://www.culture.lt/lmenas/?leid\\_id=3020&kas=straipsnis&st\\_id=5561](http://www.culture.lt/lmenas/?leid_id=3020&kas=straipsnis&st_id=5561)
- Nord, Ch. 2005: *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis*, Amsterdam–New York: Editions Rodopi B. V.
- Pažūsis, L. 2008: Kaip į lietuvių kalbą verčiami angliški kalambūrai (Ways of Rendering English Puns into Lithuanian). *Vertimo studijos* 1, 58–80.

- Petrilli, S. 1992: The task and the mask of the translator (Chapter from „Translation as Listening and Encounter with the Other in Migration and Globalization Processes Today”). *TTR: traduction, terminologie, redaction* 5 (1), 192–198.
- Petrauskas, V. V. 2008: Kelios pastabos apie Margaret Atwood apsakymo „The Age of Lead” – „Švino amžius” vertimą. *LLVS*, <http://www.llvs.lt/?recensions=503&highlights>
- Petrauskas, V. V. 2003: Kam šiandien reikalingas Ezra Pundas? *Šiaurės Atėnai*, 2003 m. vasario 8 d., [http://www.culture.lt/satenai/?leid\\_id=639&kas=straipsnis&st\\_id=1582](http://www.culture.lt/satenai/?leid_id=639&kas=straipsnis&st_id=1582)
- Petrauskas, V. V. 1988: Lietuviškoji meninio vertimo mokykla? *Literatūra ir menas*, 1988 m. rugsėjo 10 d., 2.
- Petronienė, E. 2007: The order of thought and the order of words. *Kalbotyra* 57 (3), 204–210.
- Puurtinen, T. 2003: Genre-specific features of translationese? Linguistic differences between translated and non-translated Finnish children's literature. *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 18 (4), 389–406.
- Ragaišienė, I. 2008: Intertekstualumo ir kultūrinės informacijos perteikimo problemos Helenos Fielding *Bridžitos Džouns dienoraščio* vertime į lietuvių kalbą. *Kalbų studijos* 13, 44–50.
- Ragaišienė, I. 2006: Representation of character in translation: Helen Fieldings' *Bridget Jones's Diary*. *Darbai ir dienos* 45, 171–186.
- Riffaterre, M. 1992: Transposing presuppositions on the semiotics of literary translation. R. Shulte, J. Biguenet (eds.), *Theories of Translation*, The University of Chicago Press.
- Rybicki, J. 2006: Burrowing into translation: character idiolects in Henryk Sienkiewicz's trilogy and its two English translations. *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 21 (1), 91–103.
- Roikienė, D., Narmontienė, K. 2008: Denominal verbs in translation from English into Lithuanian. *Jaunųjų mokslininkų darbai* 4 (20), 52–57.
- Rudaitytė, R. 2006: Excitements and Pitfalls: translating Ian McEwan's novel *Amsterdam*. *Darbai ir dienos* 45, 187–193.
- Ruzaitė, J. 2010: Translation equivalents of vague language items: a study of general extenders in a parallel corpus. *Kalbų studijos* 16, 33–38.
- Satkauskytė, D. 2006: Johnas Fowlesas Lietuvoje, arba populiarumo rizika. *Literatūra ir menas* 2006 m. lapkričio 3 d., [http://www.culture.lt/lmenas/?leid\\_id=3116&kas=straipsnis&st\\_id=9660](http://www.culture.lt/lmenas/?leid_id=3116&kas=straipsnis&st_id=9660)
- St-Pierre, P. 1993: Translation as a discourse of history. *TTR: traduction, terminologie, redaction* 6 (1), 61–82.
- Stankevičienė, L. 2002: English-Lithuanian lexical pseudo-equivalents. *Kalbotyra* 52 (3), 127–136.

- Stankevičiūtė, R. (interview) 2009: Lrytas.lt biblioteka: 51. R. Gavelis „Vilnius Poker“. *Lietuvos rytas*, 2009 m. sausio 30 d., <http://www.lrytas.lt/-12333043271232334026-lrytas-lt-biblioteka-51-r-gavelis-vilnius-poker.htm>
- Statistika 2009*, 2010: Vilnius: Lietuvos nacionalinė Martyno Mažvydo biblioteka, <http://www.lnb.lt/doc/bkc/statistika2009.pdf>
- Strakšienė, M. 2009: Analysis of idiom translation strategies from English into Lithuanian. *Kalbų studijos* 14, 13–19.
- Stričkus, J. 2009: John Katzenbach. *Pamišėlio istorija*. Iš anglų kalbos vertė Ieva Pukelytė. Vilnius: Tyto alba, 2006. *Gimtoji kalba* 2, 12–19.
- Subačius, P. 2008: Akademinis romanas. *Knygų aidai* 4, 16–21.
- Šakavičiūtė, D. 2009: Kudė jie tei daru? Apie Donžuaną operoje *Karmen* ir morkų kotus [Laima Vincė. *Vaiduoklė svetainėje*, vertė V. Bėkštienė, Gimtasis žodis, 2007]. *Literatūra ir menas*, 2007 m. vasario 27 d., [http://www.culture.lt/lmenas/?leid\\_id=3226&kas=straipsnis&st\\_id=14304](http://www.culture.lt/lmenas/?leid_id=3226&kas=straipsnis&st_id=14304)
- Šalčiūtė-Čivilienė, G. 2008: Rendering Benjy's narrative in the Lithuanian translation of William Faulkner's novel *The Sound and the Fury*. *Žmogus ir žodis* 3 (10), 52–61.
- Šeibokaitė, A. 2008: Ką išduoda Edward Docx'o romano *Kaligrafas* vertimas į lietuvių kalbą? *Knygų aidai* 5, 23–27.
- Švambarytė, D. 2008: Auksinio Obuolio serija – kas tai? *Literatūra ir menas*, 2008 m. vasario 28 d., [http://www.culture.lt/lmenas/?leid\\_id=3179&kas=straipsnis&st\\_id=12307](http://www.culture.lt/lmenas/?leid_id=3179&kas=straipsnis&st_id=12307)
- Tahir-Gürçağlar, Ş. 2007: Chaos before order: network maps and research design in DTS. *Meta: journal des traducteurs = Meta: Translators' Journal* 52 (4), 724–743.
- Tymoczko, M. 2005: Trajectories of research in translation studies. *Meta: journal des traducteurs = Meta: Translators' Journal* 50 (4), 1082–1097.
- Urbutis, V. 2000: Kaip Mikalojus Daukša vertė Jokūbo Vuiko naujadarus. *Archivum Lituanicum* 2, 99–106.
- Vabalienė, D. J. 2000: Piteris Penas lietuviškai. *Rubinaitis* 1 (13), <http://rubinaitis.lnb.lt/index.php?-199345476>
- Vaicekauskienė, L. 2010: Lietuvių kalbos norminimo šimtmetis. *Naujasis židinys-Aidai* 5–6, 165–172.
- Vaičėnienė, J. 2010: Literary Translation in Anglo-American and Lithuanian Contexts (1990–2008). *Kalbų studijos* 16, 67–70.
- Venclova, T. 2006: Vilnius/Wilno/Vilna: the Myth of Division and the Myth of Connection. M. Cornis-Pope, J. Neubauer (eds.), *History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe II*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 11–28.

- Venclova, T. 1979: Translations of world literature and political censorship in contemporary Lithuania. *Lituanus* 25 (2), [http://www.lituanus.org/1979/79\\_2\\_01.htm](http://www.lituanus.org/1979/79_2_01.htm)
- Zabielaitė, D. 2010a: Apie istorijos ir gyvenimo „kodėl?“. *Šiaurės Atėnai*, 2010 m. liepos 2 d., 9.
- Zabielaitė, D. 2010b: Apie apmaudo kilnumą. *Šiaurės Atėnai*, 2010 m. liepos 16 d., 8.
- Zabielaitė, D. 2010c: Be literatūrinės didybės. *Šiaurės Atėnai*, 2010 m. lapkričio 8 d., 9.
- Zabielaitė, D. 2006: Thomas Pynchonas: apie hierofaniją žodžių šlamšte. *Knygų aidai* 4, 17–21.
- Žalys, A. 1988: *Lietuvių literatūrinė baladė*, Vilnius: Vaga.
- Žirgulytė, A. 1979: *Prie redaktoriaus stalo*, Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Žukauskienė, J., Roikienė, D. 2006: Translating the noun incorporating constructions from English into Lithuanian. *Jaunųjų mokslininkų darbai* 4 (11), 35–40.

*Gauta 2010 m. gruodžio 29 d.  
Priimta 2011 m. balandžio 11 d.*

*GABRIELĖ ŠALČIŪTĖ-ČIVILIENĖ*  
*Department of Digital Humanities*  
*King's College London*  
*26–29 Drury Lane, London*  
*WC2B 5RL Unighted Kingdom*  
[ [gabriele.salciute-civiliene@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:gabriele.salciute-civiliene@kcl.ac.uk) ]