

***Bogdana Pliushch***  
*PhD, Assistant professor*  
*Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv*  
*Kyiv*

## **INDIRECT TRANSLATION AND SOFT POWER: A VERBIS AD VERBERA**

Indirect translation (ITr) represents an innuendo of translation studies and a Delilah of translation practice. The essence of the concept of ITr constitutes one of the most understudied areas in translation studies as well as one of the most contentious topics in the global translation ecology.

Research on ITr and references to “a translation of translation” [3, p. 414] show that apart from “indirect translation” (G. Toury, H. Pieta, A. Rosa, A. Pym, I. Gambier, J. Spirk etc.), other TS terms such as “retranslation” (D. Bellos) or “relay translation” (C. Dollerup, J. St Andre, M. Ringmar) are used when considering any sort of mediated translation or translation through the third language. Moreover, the distinct lack of consensus on the appropriate term to denote the opposite of direct translation, i.e. translation from the original, is evident in the TS discourse all over the world. For instance, German *Translationswissenschaft* offers a range of different terms for ITr:

Weiterübersetzung (von Stackelberg), Übersetzung aus zweiter Hand (von Stackelberg) [10, p.2], Zwischenübersetzung etc. We posit that the term *indirect translation* as well as its correspondences in other languages (die indirekte Übersetzung, traducción indirecta, непрямой переклад, tłumaczenie pośrednie, непрямой перевод, tercüme dolaylı etc.) is the most appropriate when considering literary translation, as opposed to *relay interpreting* in oral translation, which highlights the process [9, p. 141] and not the product. As for *retranslation*, we use it in the meaning of “the act of translating a work that has previously been translated into the same language or the result of such an act, i.e. the retranslated text itself” [5, p. 233]. New translations can be indirect but that is no reason for confusing the two terms. Thus, ITr is a global translation phenomenon with a hectic metalanguage and not the least messy history of its practice. Throughout the centuries ITr was adhered to in translation from rare or “minor” languages due to the lack of professionals with the proficiency in the source text language etc. Thus, ITr was used as a soft power tool, helping to promote the yet unknown literatures and cultures. The aim of this article is to consider the correlation between ITr and soft power as well as rationale of its causality.

The term “soft power” was coined by American political scientist Harvard University Distinguished Service Professor J. S. Nye Jr. in 1990 in his book “Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power”. Professor Nye defines the concept of power as “the ability to affect others to get outcomes you want” (6, p. 94), whereas soft power lies in ability “the ability to obtain preferred outcomes by attraction and persuasion rather than coercion and payment” [7, p.19]. The prominent American political scientist also suggests that there is a plethora of paths a country can take in order to increase its appeal and, thus, to develop a certain soft power toolset. He outlines culture as one of the three resources of soft power, apart from political values and foreign policies [7:21]. Thus, literature and translation – the essential core of a national culture – constitute one of the multiple but surest ways of creating country’s appeal. It is always an aspiration of a least known national literature to gain visibility and acknowledgement and to contribute in that way to the promoting one’s national identity etc. ITr operates precisely within the niche

for enabling the so-called smaller literatures, i.e. non-English-speaking, to gain international literary market access.

Indirect translation has a very noticeable presence in the international intellectual capital exchange process and in the history of translation, predominantly as leverage in soft power production. Due to the length restrictions we are not going to scrutinize or enlist all the main examples of indirect translation in the world literary exchange system. The article is aimed at increasing the visibility of indirect translation's impact on the specific country's literature circulation, branding/ rebranding and marketing and its manipulative role in the process of soft power creation. The material for the study is based on some of the works of the most prominent representatives of the classics of the Ukrainian literature. And "classics really are only classics of any worth if they have a sense of the contemporary, if they speak to us." [3]. Having lived for some time in the Bavarian capital, Munich (Germany), the author of the given article had witnessed at first hand the absence of Ukrainian classic literature on the shelves of Munich book shops and supermarkets and, thus "no speaking to anyone" on the part of the best pieces of Ukrainian literary prose of the past centuries. Is this gap an indicator of the lack of interest (and, thus, of demand) on the side of German readership? The conspicuous reason for it is the lack of information, the imbalance of *Das Eigene* vs *Das Fremde* (Your Own vs Foreign)[2]. In this case, the German literary market is offering its cliental translated works of Jurij Andruchowytch (Yurii Andrukhovych), Serhij Schadan (Serhiy Zhadan), Oksana Sabuschko (Oksana Zabuzhko) and other Ukrainian contemporary writers and poets but none of the classics. Among the plethora of justifiable factors (symbolic, financial capitals, publishing houses' policies, futuristic business models etc.), is indirect translation of works by classics of Ukrainian literature.

ITr was used very often in rendering Ukrainian classics into other European languages as a soft power tool – an alternative to no translation. As stated above, ITr is considered to be a marginal practice and is rarely an open endeavour, thus, it is very difficult to find and identify samples of it. Moreover, the lack of demand/knowledge of Ukrainian classics in, for example, English/ German can also be explained by the fact that some of them "got lost" in ITr, i.e. they were framed as belonging to another country. For

example, Ivan Franko is considered to be one of the most prominent and brilliant Ukrainian authors of the XIX – XX centuries. He was a playwright, a novelist, a short story writer, a poet, a philosopher, a translator, a literary critic etc. A lot of his famous works (“Zakhar Berkut”, “Ukradene Schastyia”, “Boa Constrictor” etc.) were translated into German, English, Spanish and other major European languages indirectly, mostly through a mediating translation – a Russian TT. St Andre states that “mistakes made in the original translation are passed on to the relay translation, and more mistakes and distortions are added [...]” [11, p. 230]. In the case study of indirect translations of Franko’s works into European languages, not mistakes but framing comes to the fore. It correlates with the status quo of ITrs in TS by suggesting an explanation of ITr as an understudied phenomenon. “Pięta’s (2017, 200) bibliometric research covering scientific publications specifically dedicated to ITr shows that the overwhelming majority of authors are represented by just one publication” [8, p. 24]. There is a lack of material for research since a lot of indirect translations were presented as direct, hence the scarcity of research. For example, “Zakhar Berkut” (1882) by Ivan Franko is framed by the paratexts to its German translation (Sturm im Tuchla-Tal. Erzählung, Deutsch von Marga Bork. – Berlin: Verlag Kultur und Fortschritt, 1955) as a work originally written by a Russian writer – the foreword informs the reader that Franko wrote about Russia and Russian folk etc.. And translation analysis of its Russian translation (Russischer Originaltitel Захар Беркут, пер. П. Карабан, 1953) and German translation by Bork shows that the Russian translation was used as a ST for the German text. “Boa Constrictor” (1877) by I. Franko was also translated into English “from the Russian” (Franko I. Boa Constrictor and other stories, Moscow, 1957). Thus, in the SU ITr was utilized as a soft power tool under the pretense of promoting national literatures. Indeed, ITr can make a literary work visible to an international readership, simultaneously making it invisible to any sort of ratings/indexes and lists of the translations of the country of origin, which proves to be contradictory to the idea of soft power in general.

Thus, using ITr as a soft power tool, a certain cultural mediation capaciator proves to be alluring, especially for literatures of the smaller scope. However, in case of literary exchange, using soft dimension of attraction by trying to reach global readership at any

cost, even adhering to indirect translation, should involve a risk management strategy and ethics compliance monitoring. Otherwise, ITr can potentially result in producing an inefficient soft power, hampering country's image promotion and cultural appeal creation.

## REFERENCES

1. Bellos D. *Is that a Fish in Your Ear? The Amazing Adventure of Translation* / D. Bellos. – London: Penguin Books, 2012. – 390 p.
2. Bellos D. *The Myth and Mysteries of Literary Translation* / D. Bellos // (The WG Sebald Lecture), Webinar, June 29<sup>th</sup> 2020.
3. Bush P. *Translating classics: Balzac and Pla* / P. Bush // Boston University Seminar in Translation, Webinar, April 24<sup>th</sup> 2020.
4. Gambier Y. “La retraduction, retour et detour” / Y. Gambier // *Meta: Translators' Journal*. – 1994. – Vol. 39. – P. 413-417.
5. Gürcaglar S. *Retranslation* / S. Gürcaglar // *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (edited by M. Baker, G. Saldanha). – London&New York: Routledge, 2008. – P.233-236;
6. Nye J. *Public diplomacy and soft power* / J. S. Nye // *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. – University of Pennsylvania: Sage Publishing, 2008. – V. 616. – P. 94-109.
7. Nye J. *The information revolution and soft power* / J. S. Nye // *Current History*, 2014. – 113 (759). – P. 19-22.
8. Pięta, H. *Indirect translation: Main trends in practice and research* / H. Pięta// *Slovo.ru: baltijskij accent*, Vol. 10, no. 1. – 2019. – P. 21—36.
9. Ringmar M. *Relay translation* / M. Ringmar // *Handbook of translation studies*; [edited by Yves Gambier, Luc van Doorslaer]. –Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2012. – V.3. – P.141-144.
10. Ringmar M. “Roundabout Routes”: some remarks on indirect translations / M. Ringmar. – Leuven: Katholieke Universiteit, 2006. – P.1-14.

11. St. Andre J. Relay / J. St. Andre // Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies (edited by M. Baker, G. Saldanha). – London & New York: Routledge, 2008. – P. 230-232.