III. VERTIMO TEORIJA IR PRAKTIKA / BADANIA NAD TEORIĄ I PRAKTYKĄ PRZEKŁADU

Iryna Odrekhivska

Ivan Franko National University of Lviv
Hryhoriy Kochur Department of Translation / Interpreting Studies and Contrastive Linguistics
Universytetska Str., 1, Lviv 79000, Ukraine
E-mail: irynaodr@gmail.com
Research interests: translation theory, translation historiography, translation sociology, translation and identity

TRANSLATION EDITOLOGY: CONCEPTUALISING THE UNKNOWN KNOWN INTERDISCIPLINARY AREA OF TRANSLATION STUDIES

The present article is an attempt to examine the status, present the legitimacy and underscore the complexity of the field of 'translation editology' within a broad interdisciplinary framework of Translation Studies. This area of translation research is focused on the theoretical and critical reflection on the editorial and publishing practice of translated literature. The overriding objective of the paper is to elaborate an interpretative mechanism of editorial practices in translation and to portray its practical application. Following this line, a three-layer model of translation editorial analysis is suggested. While at the micro-level the functional structural analysis elicits how the text is mediated through specific instances of language use, the meso-level relates to interpersonal dimension centring on translator's relation to the authorial intentions and the way of their actualisation and concretisation. The macro-level of analysis is discursive, reviews the editor's "tendentious rewriting" or manipulation of the target text. This model is probed in the analysis of 1983 editorial work performed by Victor Koptilov for the re-publication of 1912 Ukrainian translation of Longfellow's masterpiece "The Song of Hiawatha".
KEY WORDS: translation editology, editorial practice of translation, editor, translation interpretation.

Introductory remarks

It became axiomatic to posit Translation Studies as an interdiscipline which presently resonates with the advances in sociology of literature, cultural semiotics and discourse studies. In this light, translation is widely viewed as a social and cultural action (cf. Bassnett, Lefevere 1990, Venuti 1995, House 2015). A complex and vast ground for translation sociology has been advocated, dealing with "sociology of the agents in the translation process", i.e. the role of translators, individual and collective agents in translating, "sociology of the translation process", i.e. the constraints during the production of translation as well as "sociology

of translation as a cultural product", i.e. transfer mechanisms that shape translations (Wolf 2007). Following this line of reasoning, it is essential to accentuate that the final "social" product – a published edition of translation – is an outcome not only of the scrupulous and insightful work of the translator (who, beyond doubt, is also as Anthony Pym (1998: 5–6) puts it "a socially constructed subject"), but also of an extensive web of interactions between versatile actors (editors, publishers, reviewers, literary scholars et al.) in the target medium. To substantiate, the concepts of "non-functional translation" (Nord 2006: 44) or "non-serviceable *translatum*" (Vermeer 2000), calling for the texts further editing/appropriation so as to make them "comprehensible" to the target audience, clearly stress the prevalence of acceptability over adequacy in translation and manifest the importance of considering the post-translation stage. Based on such contention, there has been much discussion in the last decades about the concept of "social" and "intentionalist" editing. With regard to translation, a change of emphasis from the "static" comparative model, limited to source and target text correspondence (Chesterman 2012: 109), to "non-linear" network or nexus model, involving an interplay of many agents (Pym 1998; Koskinen 2008), do present a firm ground to examine the status as well as to elaborate a comprehensive mechanism and epistemological foundation of *editorial studies of translation,* or *translation editology*.

Translation Editology: "What is in the Name?"

The problem scope of translation editology as a specialised domain of Translation Studies in its interdisciplinary locus has never been placed into the epicentre of research. Translation editorial practices were either concisely discussed, being secondary or peripheral to other translation concepts (Коптілов 1982, Губарець 2012), or elicited through the prism of one methodological position-taking. For instance, Peeter Torop (Тороп 2015: 28–29) predominantly adhered to cultural semiotic dimension in his treatment of editing practice in translation. Guillermo Sapiro (2008) reflects on global and national editorial policies, and on existent asymmetries in the world book market under globalisation. What still seems to be missing is a complex, relational theoretical model which would enhance the interpretation (with regard to all internal peculiarities and implications) of the process of "translation transfer" from the draft form to the printed edition. Of great value, in this line, is the conceptual contribution of French school of genetic criticism with their central notion of "avant-texte", i.e. a critical assemblage of writers' notes, sketches, drafts, manuscripts, proofs and correspondence, and their chief concern in reconstructing the process of writing.

It is noteworthy that Anton Popovič (1975: 20) turned the study of translation editing to a more advanced footing in the disciplinary "mapping" of the science of translation, singling out the branch of *praxeology of translation* that opens three areas of research, namely translation sociology, methodology of translation criticism and editorial practice of translation. Other translation theoreticians tend to connect the field of translation editing to the area of translation criticism. Undoubtedly, the latter approach may be considered quite rational, since translation analysis and its criteria of translation quality assessment

are fundamental and applicable in both areas. In this line, the Slovak scholar Jan Ferenčik (1981) proposed a rather "fertile" demarcation line between applied translation criticism, i.e. the main critic is the editor (or editorial team) in the publishing process, and social translation criticism, i.e. it deals with the reviews on the published edition and the actual reception of it. However, in our view the main difference between these domains – translation criticism and editorial practice of translation – lies in the agency factor and productive character (in the latter case) of the polilogue between the author of the source text, author of its translated version and the editor as well as the publisher who legitimate the literary product for the target readership. In order to understand the editorial inclusions as well as the significance of publisher's selection choices, one has to reconstruct the whole space – *habitus* – in which the editor acts, thinks and relates with the others. What is more, the publisher's criteria and strategies for the selection of books to be translated, the commission and editorial policy with "internal", ethical norms are those often-neglected topics that bring to the foreground the role of intermediaries in translation. Controversial editorial programs or innovative editorial practices, presenting stylistic alternatives and being polemic to some conventions in the target culture of translation, do justify the importance of dealing with translation editology.

The view on translation editing as a merely stylistic polishing of the target text was a dominant position-taking in early translation research that reflected on the poor quality of translation. Namely, Ivan Franko – a prominent Ukrainian translator and initiator of Translation Studies in Ukraine (early 20th century) who was *inter alia* an editor of "Literary-science Herald", a central literary periodical with a powerful influence on the whole Ukrainian literary system and culture of the time – was emphasising the large-scale role of the editorial work with translation in his seminal 1911 paper: "When the translation is written rather grammatically and does not err in obvious absurdities, there are editors and publishers who would give it in print. Accordingly, the number of translations of questionable quality increases. <…> the frequency of periodicals forces to haste. It leads to the problem that translations performed by the unskilled and quite inexpert people as well as hurriedly published without external reviewing and critical evaluation turn out to be mediocre and meaningless"[1] (Франко 1983: 10–11).

Franko applies herein the sense of "grammatical" translation type according to the paradigm of Romanticist Hermeneutics, namely Friedrich Schleiermacher's distinction between grammatical, i.e. linguistic, and psychological understanding of any artistic text. Hence, Franko appeals against literal (word-for-word) translation that often distorts the content of the original and calls for utmost attention to macrostylistics of the text under analysis, taking into due consideration rhetorical and formulating nuances. This translation manifesto was further developed into basic principles of the editorial practice of translation presented by V. Koptilov in his 1982 textbook: "It is worth editing only eminently good translations. Unsuccessful translations should not be edited in the attempt to "bring them up" to the so-called mediocre level, but are to be substituted by new, more outstanding

---

[1] My translation throughout – I. O.

ones"; "Purposeful editing should go along with the regardful consideration of the founding version of the target text presented by the translator. By protecting the interests of the original author as well as the reader from absurdities and errors in translation, the editor is to show empathy to the creative style of the translator" (Коптілов 1982: 66).

The largest part of editing is devoted to textual work, although the reflection on translation editorial practice cannot be just narrowed to the technical (linguistic) improvement of the translated work. In our view, it is only half or even one quarter of the story.

A. Popovič (1971: 96) spoke of the editor as an adaptor of the final version, as a mediating factor between the prevailing language norms and the text of translation. An editor becomes an implementer of the directives which the publishing institution has adopted under the influence of readers' habits. Predominantly, each and every editor attempts at accommodating the work to the horizon of expectations of the target readership in order to meet their aesthetics. Editorial work on translation may lead to its abridgment, further adaptation of either (1) the reader to the text by adding footnotes and commentaries or (2) the text to the target reader by a set of deforming strategies. In this sense, an editor can even become a "co-author", whether open, announced or anonymous (Špirk 2009). Thus, Popovič (1971: 97–98) summarises that the position of the editor is, in principle, threefold: (1) the editor takes an independent position from the literary and temporal norm in the attempt to surpass it; (2) the editor identifies oneself with the dominant, prevailing literary and language norm and is, as a matter of fact, its implementer; (3) the editor sensitively finds balance between the text of the translator and the normative requirements of the given literary epoch.

Undeniably, every translator becomes the first editor of his work, since the proofreading phase and, hence, self-editorial practice is the final stage in the hermeneutic process of any translation task. Interestingly, translator's self-editing may even lead to self-censorship when one heavily intervenes and appropriates his/her version to social, literary and ideological considerations of the target medium. Central to the research is the stage of "secondary editing", i.e. editorial practice in the publishing institution, when the agency factor may be quite visible, causing even a derivative production. Last but not least, the post-publishing editing should be distinguished, when the translation is commissioned for republication and, therefore, needs editorial revision anew. In this context, P. Torop (Тороп 2015: 28) mentions that the entire editorial "renovation" of earlier translated texts distorts their internal integrity and breaks the perceptual unity, leading to the case when many readers give preference to older and outdated but more solid translations.

To unite all reflections within one comprehensive framework, a three-layer model is offered to provide an explanatory and critical mechanism of translation editorial practice. At the micro-level, an editor or an analyst is working on the *functional-structural analysis of the target text* as compared or even contrasted to the original as well as to other metatexts (previous translations of the work, commentaries of the authorial work in the target culture, etc.). Convincingly Juliane House points out, "one should not forget that translation is, at its core, a linguistic act" (2015: 2). The editor concentrates on how the text is

mediated through specific instances of language use by shaping a dialectal view between lingual structure and its function. The meso-level can be elucidated as *phenomenologically hermeneutic*, applicable when the editor attempts at endeavoring the interpersonal dimension, i.e. translator's relation to the authorial intentions, the way of their actualisation and concretisation. To variable degrees, the editor intrudes into the intersubjective space adopted between the translator and the author, at times even defines the superior and inferior "actor", re-considers the fusion of two horizons and explores "the added value" inscribed into the text by the translator's interpretation. Finally, the macrolevel, presumably called *discursive,* centres on the editor's manipulation of the target text, his "tendentious rewriting" of it. All the above-mentioned three levels form one unified whole, so there is no strict demarcation line between them, however, by analysing the editorial practice at all three levels we arrive at a vivid picture of the translation production.

The Song of Haiwatha:
From 1912 Ukrainian translation to its 1983 editorial version

The case study offered in this paper would enhance our position and support the explanatory mechanism of translation editology. The Ukrainian translations of the monumental Native American epic poem *The Song of Hiawatha* by H. Longfellow are addressed. All renditions so fully exhibit different orientations that the Ukrainian translation culture has had in its history: from (1) the first 1896 free interpretation done into Ukrainian by Panas Myrnyi via the Russian intermediate translation performed by Ivan Bunin, (2) Olexandr Oles' Ukrainian translation, published first in 1912 and then in re-edited form provided by Victor Koptilov in 1983 and (3) K. Shmyhovskyi's "Soviet-epoch" Ukrainian translation, to the (4) translation into the Ukrainian language done in the US (published in Ukraine only in 2004) by Oksana Solovey, an émigré-writer who left Ukraine in dramatic times of WWII. The present paper will give prominence to the 1983 editorial practice of Victor Koptilov, a well-known Ukrainian translator and translation critic, to the Oleksandr Oles' 1912 translation of *The Song of Hiawatha*. The editorial project was commissioned by the State Publishing House of Literature for Children "Veselka", arising from which V. Koptilov was to present an "updated" version of any of the existing three translations (we exclude Solovey's version that was not available in Ukraine due to the "iron curtain"). It is noteworthy that among the listed translations V. Koptilov chose the one authored by Oleksandr Oles, thus an aesthetic connection or, in other words, an intersubjective link between the editor and the translator should be emphasised. This Ukrainian translation is exemplary in terms of rendering the lyrical tone and musicality of the original, finding adequate stylistic parallels in the target language and refusal from radical domestication. In overall, Koptilov's editorial work lies in retaining bright features of Oles' idiostyle and preserving characteristics that make this epic poem a world classic, but also making it "accessible" and delightful to the readers of the late 20th century. To note, in 1999 the "authentic" Oles' translation was reprinted without any editorial interference into the text, but with a new preface mentioning that in the previous 1983 edition the translated text

underwent some ideological "smoothing", social levelling and insignificant cuts (Longfel-
low 1999: 8). Therefore, it is now possible to compare and contrast two versions focusing
on the editing strategies at the micro-, meso- and macro-level.

At first, it seems that the editor merely substituted archaic Ukrainian grammatical
structures, obsolete words and colloquial expressions with the late 20th century norma-
tive lexical constructions. For instance, the following lexical changes were introduced:
*лісна – лісова, остатись – зостатись, згуки – звуки, на мент – на мить, ставний –
статний, могучий – могутній, поступ – хода, борьба – двобій, гущина – нетрі,
властолюбний – владолюбний* etc. Archaic forms in the declension of the pronoun "he"
(*крикнув до його, гримить на йому зброя*) were alternated with the current ones (*до
нього, на ньому*) as well as outmoded pronouns *сей, се* were changed for *цей, це*. An-
other noticeable feature in the edited version is the introduction of the vocative case to
the Ukrainian nouns, for example: "*Гей, боюн!*" – "*Гей, боюне!*". However, apart from
such reasonable modifications at the micro-level, intentional shifts in the imagery and
ideational structure of the text are apparent and seem incongruous.

It is essential to underline that the 1983 Ukrainian publication of *The Song of Haiwa-
tha* was to accompany the reading list in the subject of World Literature for middle and
high school students, so the educational function of the edited translation is to be taken
into account as well. From this parameter, it is of interest to reflect on the translation and
the edited version of the final part of the opening Prologue that addresses the readers by
asking to listen to the legendary song about Haiwatha, his faith in God and human strength
(see Table 1).

Table 1. **Extract from the Prologue to *The Song of Haiwatha*, its 1912 Ukrainian translation
and 1983 edited version**

Source text	Oleksandr Oles' translation	The edited version of Oles' translation by Victor Koptilov
Ye whose hearts are fresh and simple, Who have *Faith in God* and Nature, Who believe that in all ages Every human heart is human, That in even savage bosoms There are longings, yearnings, strivings For the good they comprehend not, That the feeble hands and helpless, Groping blindly in the darkness And are lifted up and strengthened; Listen to this simple story, To this Song of Hiawatha! (Longfellow 1999: 13)	Ви, в чиїм серці не погасла *Віра в Бога* і природу, *В іскру Божу* у людини, Ви, хто знаєте, що завжди Людське серце знало муки, Знало сумніви і сльози І у царство правди рвалось, Що крізь темряву глибоку *Нас веде рука Господня* І підтримує у стомі, – Ви послухайте сей щирий, *Сей* переказ *первостайний,* Пісню *сю* про Гайавату (Longfellow 1999: 12)	Ви, хто в серці не згасили *Віри в істину* й природу, *В іскру правди* у людини, Ви, хто знаєте, що завжди Людське серце знало муки, Знало сумніви і сльози І у царство правди рвалось, Що крізь темряву глибоку *Нас веде рука провідна* І підтримує у стомі, – Ви послухайте цей щирий, *Цей* переказ *стародавній,* Пісню *цю* про Гайавату (Лонгфелло 1983: 9)

Source: created by the author.

Oleksandr Oles preserved the appeal to the belief in God intended for the readers and even intensified it in the next line by adding the image "*іскра Божа у людини*", i.e. a divinely conferred power, charisma in every human. What is more, at the end of this stanza the translator amplified the structure by introducing a syntagma "*Нас веде рука Господня*" (literal translation: "We are led by the hand of Lord"). Beyond doubt, in the former Soviet Ukraine – under communist ideology and the politics of atheism – this address had to be substantially altered to fit into the predominant discourse. In the edited version, the belief in God was transferred into the belief in truth – "*віра в істину*", "*в іскру правди*", whereas the "hand of Lord" was neutralised and trivially replaced with "*рука провідна*", literally "under the guidance hand". Given this scenario, we contend an obvious ideological intervention of the editor into the translated text, since his choices are conscious and deliberately prime the generally preferred wordings and semantic associations to frame the translation into the proper social representation.

The aforementioned word choices have an apparent ideological motivation in the edited version of the translation and display a discursive presence of the editor in the target text. To substantiate, a totally neutral passage of the source text – "*Fiercely the red sun descending / Burned his way along the heavens, / Set the sky on fire behind him, / As <u>war-parties</u> when retreating, / <u>Burn the prairies on their war-trail</u>*" (Longfellow 1999: 85) – was located by the translator in the Ukrainian cultural and historical context: "*Гнівно сонце опускалось / І палило за собою / Небо полум'ям червоним, / <u>Як степи отаман палить</u>, / Коли ворог настигає*" (Longfellow 1999: 84). The prairies are rendered as "*steppes*", a grass land plain that occupies a large territory of Ukraine, whereas a "*war-party*" became an "*otaman*" in the translation, i.e. a title of supreme commander in Ukrainian Cossack army. The combination of the image of "steppe" and "otaman" sounds quite logical in the target "appropriated" translation, since Zaporizhyan Sich, an autonomous Cossacks' polity in the 16th–18th centuries, was located in the steppe region. However, the editor's intrusion to the last but one line of the mentioned extract has a more severe consequence: "*Як, буває, степ <u>вождь</u> палить, / Коли ворог наступає*" (Лонгфелло 1983: 66). The lexeme "*otaman*" was substituted by V. Koptilov with a word "*вождь*" that, in fact, implies two meanings: on the one hand, it means "chief" which may be considered a rather common title of a Native American Indian leader, but then the neighbouring lexeme "steppe" in this context is totally out of place; on the other hand, the lexeme "*вождь*" (leader, chief) was typical of Soviet rhetorics, notably in such metaphoric wordings as "вождь народів" (about Stalin), etc. In this scope, the editor ideologically filters the translation and rewrites the translator's domesticated version of the passage to accommodate it to the other target medium. To sum up, the prominent stylistic nuances incorporated into the target text by the editor reflect an underlying ideology.

Conclusions

The general value of discussing the sphere of translation editiology lies in retrospective assessment of the editorial strategies and overall policies in translation production in order to create a prospective ground for providing the quality of publications of translations-to-be. In this line of reasoning, the fundamental framework elaborated within translation editiology is interdisciplinary and embraces three aspects of editorial analysis. The micro-level can be named as cross-linguistic examination leading to correcting and improving the lingual structure of the translated text as compared to the original. The meso-level constitutes the hermeneutic dialogue that focuses on the voice of the translator both as a co-author of the target text and as a representative of the original author in the target culture. The analysis at the macro-level is discursive which attempts at reviewing translation as a social representation with a multitude of prescribed functions. Undoubtedly, this paper is only a partial and quite limited reflection on the theoretical and methodological potential of translation editiology. Among the promising fields are further studies of the factual materials that would elicit their editorial programs.

References

BASSNETT, S., LEFEVERE, A., 1990. Introduction: Proust's Grandmother and the Thousand and One Nights: The 'Cultural Turn' in Translation Studies. In: Eds. S. Bassnett, A. Lefevere. *Translation, History and Culture*. London, New York: Pinter, 1–13.

CHESTERMAN, A., 2012. Models in Translation Studies. In: Eds. Y. Gambier, L. van Doorslaer. *Handbook of Translation Studies.* Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 108–114.

FERENČIK, J., 1981. Kritika prekladu (Problemy jej sucasneho vyvinu). *Slavica Slovaca*, 16, 2, 122–129.

HOUSE, J., 2015. *Translation Quality Assessment: Past and Present*. London, New York: Routledge.

KOSKINEN, K., 2008. *Translating Institutions*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

LONGFELLOW, H., 1999. *The Song of Haiwatha*. Kyiv: Veselka Publishers.

NORD, C., 2006. Translating for Communicative Purposes across Culture Boundaries. *Journal of Translation Studies*, 9 (1), 43–60.

POPOVIČ, A., 1971. *Poetika umeleckého prekladu. Proces a text*. Bratislava: Tatran.

POPOVIČ, A., 1975. *Teória umeleckého prekladu: Aspekty textu a literárnej metakomunikácie*. Bratislava: Tatran.

PYM, A., 1998. *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

SAPIRO, G., 2008. Translation and the Field of Publishing. A Commentary on Pierre Bourdieu's "A Conservative Revolution in Publishing". *Translation Studies*, 1 (2), 154–166.

ŠPIRK, J., 2009. Anton Popovič's Contribution to Translation Studies. *Target*, 29 (1), 3–29.

VENUTI, L., 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*. London, New York: Routledge.

VERMEER, H., 2000. Skopos and Commission in Translational Action. In: Ed. L. Venuti. *Translation Studies Reader*. London, New York: Routledge, 221–232.

WOLF M., 2007. The Emergence of a Sociology of Translation. In: Eds. M. Wolf, A. Fukari. *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1–36.

ГУБАРЕЦЬ, В., 2012. *Редактор і переклад. Основи видавничої роботи з відтвореними текстами.* Тернопіль: Навчальна книга – Богдан.

КОПТІЛОВ, В., 1982. *Теорія і практика перекладу*. Київ: Вища шк. Вид-во при Київ. ун-ті.

ЛОНГФЕЛЛО, Г., 1983. *Пісня про Гайавату*. Ред. В. КОПТІЛОВА. Київ: Веселка.

ТОРОП, П., 2015. *Тотальний переклад*. Вінниця: Нова книга.

ФРАНКО, І., 1983. Каменярі. Український текст і польський переклад. Дещо про штуку перекладання. In: І. Франко. *Зібрання творів*. Т. 39. Київ: Наук. думка, 7–20.