

The Bilingual Writer: Two Estonian-Russian Cases and One Russian-Estonian Case¹

Irina Belobrovtsava

Abstract: The present article addresses the problem of literary bilingualism. Summing up linguists' disagreements concerning the content and scope of the notion of bilingualism, this article, which in its practical part addresses the situation of Russian-Estonian literary bilingualism, can be considered a prolegomenon to this subject. The problem of Estonian-Russian literary bilingualism is discussed on the basis of the poetic output of Jaan Kaplinski (whose native language is Estonian) and Igor Kotjukh (whose native language is Russian), both of whom have been active as bilingual writers for many years, and on the basis of a recently published novel by Kalle Käsper, *Чудо* (*Wonder*, 2017)—Kalle Käsper's debut as a Russian writer. The problem of literary bilingualism will be discussed in the framework of the following methods: stylistic analysis of the text, interviews with bilingual writers, and the analysis of bilingual writers' texts from the perspective of the presence of Russian/Estonian linguistic and cultural substrata.

DOI: 10.7592/methis.v17i21/22.14582

Keywords: bilingualism in present-day cross-cultural discourse, literary aspect of bilingualism, bilingual writers' literary output

Due to the very naming of the notion and in historical retrospective, bilingualism has been studied primarily by linguists, yet it is also a subject of interest of such disciplines as philosophy, psychology, sociology, social psychology, and literary criticism. Yet even linguists have discrepancies in their understanding of what bilingualism actually is. What is regarded as a classical definition of the notion is that of Uriel Weinreich, who stated that bilingualism is the individual's ability to know two languages, and switch from one language to another depending on the communicative situation.

In general and at first glance, linguists' attitude to bilingualism approaches the recognition of bilingualism as something that does not necessarily demand the equally ideal command of two languages (André Martinet); neither does it require equal proficiency in such competencies as understanding, speaking, reading, and writing in a foreign tongue (John T. Macnamara). This point of view is shared (with

1 Research for this article was supported by the institutional research grant "Estonia between East and West: The Paradigm of the Images of "Own", "Other", "Strange", "Enemy" in Estonian Cultures in the 20th Century" (IUT18-4) and the Centre of Excellence in Estonian Studies (CEES, European Regional Development Fund).

additions and reservations) by Eduard Blocher, Leonard Bloomfield and others. A more strict definition of bilingualism can be found, for example, in *Словарь лингвистических терминов* (*The Dictionary of Linguistic Terms*) by Olga Akhmanova (1969, 125), who agrees to understand *двуязычие* (diglossia) only as “a perfect command of two languages used in different communicative situations”.

Since the present article addresses the situation of Estonian-Russian literary bilingualism, I should say a couple of words about its specific character. While any language pair in the model “Estonian language vs a language X” can be studied objectively, on purely scientific grounds, virtually any inquiry into the situation of Estonian-Russian and Russian-Estonian bilingualism seems impossible without mentioning specific historical conditions: Estonian linguists remember the times of Russification, which was conducted twice: at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, while Estonia was a part of the Russian Empire, and after the establishment of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic in the 1940s. Passive resistance to imperial and Soviet policy was a matter of honour for Estonian intelligentsia, who managed to preserve the Estonian language until Estonia regained independence in 1991.

At times, such a firm resistance to Russification went beyond the scope of purely scholarly discussions, and resulted in speculative hypotheses that lacked well-grounded proofs. For example, according to the opinion of an authoritative Estonian linguist, Mati Hint, at the end of 1980 in an article which would later become a part of his book *Keel on tõde on õige ja vale* (*Language is the Truth, True and False*),

[. . .] bilingualism is an individual’s ability to use two languages equally or nearly equally (also in thoughts). The real bilingual can switch from one language to another even in the middle of a sentence. Bilingualism is achieved in the period of mother-tongue acquisition (until the age of five or six) in families or in foreign-language environments, not in a classroom. (Hint 2002, 309)

Having stated this, Hint made a reference to two already obsolete books by Alfred Koort (1938) and George G. Thompson (1962), which promoted the idea of bilinguals’ retarded development.

Following Martinet, who had stressed the fact that the problem of individual bilingualism should be studied more thoroughly, Hint stated that what have yet to be studied are the potential threats of bilingualism. He claimed that although 90 percent of pupils succeed in second-language-acquisition classes (having in mind the Russian language, the obligatory study of which was gradually taking more and more space in Soviet Estonia’s school curricula), the remaining 10 percent of pupils were likely to suffer from retarded development caused by bilingualism, thus losing the opportunity to succeed in their adult lives. The political underside of these state-

ments was clear to everyone: the language of a small nation had to be defended, and in *perestroika* times, the linguist preferred to make an unverifiable statement in order to defend his mother tongue regardless of the existence of such an experimentally-grounded work such as, e. g. *The Relation of Bilingualism to Intelligence* by Canadian scholars Elizabeth Peal and Wallace E. Lambert, who testified to advantages of bilingualism such as “mental flexibility, a superiority in concept formation, a more diversified set of mental abilities” (Peal and Lambert 1962, 20). That Hint did not refer to this or analogous works, e.g. those of Peter Ball, Howard Giles and Miles Hewstone (1984), in which bilingualism and its issues are not defined strictly as a linguistic phenomenon, can be explained not only by the political agenda itself, but also by the disadvantageous state of Soviet scholars (let me remind that we are talking about the late 1980s, i.e. about the Soviet period in Estonian history), who were cut off from the latest achievements in Western thought by the iron curtain.

During the 30 years following the publication of Hint’s article, scholars’ treatment of bilingualism changed radically. The most noteworthy change took place at the end of the century.

Most turn-of-the-century studies in this field addressed the cognitive aspect of bilingualism (Genesee 1989; Nicoladis and Secco 1998), and paved the way for a series of experiments by Ellen Bialystok and Michelle Martin Rhee, who in 2004 proved the existence of inborn bilingualism. What was also proved was the concept that bilingualism was formed through learning, i.e. after the completion of acquisition of the mother tongue. More appositely, refuting fears of bilingualism’s negative influence upon a fragile human psyche, science has come to the conclusion that bilingualism boosts cognitive abilities, and even prevents dementia in the elderly.

By the mid-20th century, the Cuban cultural theorist Fernando Ortiz introduced the notion of transculturality, implying the development of cultural synergy, i.e. “an individual’s simultaneous existence in the role of multiple identities in different cultures preserving footprints of each of them” (Proshina 2017, 158).

The process of globalization contributes to the growth of the number of bilinguals in everyday life; consequentially, the phenomenon of diglossy and polyglossy still preoccupies scholars’ minds. Yet the present article addresses a more specific aspect of bilingualism—bilingualism in literature, more precisely Estonian-Russian and Russian-Estonian literary bilingualism.

It should be noted that there are no discrepancies among definitions of literary bilingualism, unlike studies of bilingualism as a linguistic phenomenon: bilingual writers are those, who have perfect command of two or more languages—endowing them, as Rita Safariants (2007, 193) aptly said, with “multifaceted linguistic capital”. Since the very fact of the existence of literary bilingualism is beyond doubt, it is

surprising to come across a work under the essayistic rather than the scholarly title *Литературный билингвизм: за и против* (*Literary Bilingualism: Pro et contra*) [Valuitseva and Khukhuni 2015], as if a personal standpoint could question the phenomenon's very existence. What I see here is a subjective, judgmental aspect. Thus many scholars refer to Mikhail Alekseyev's opinion, who noted—in his study of French texts by August Strindberg, Algernon Charles Swinburne, and Oscar Wilde—that all these texts should have been edited, as they were marred by a “foreign accent,” and “inaccuracies from the viewpoint of a natural-born Frenchman.” As a result, Mikhail Alekseyev came to the conclusion that “writers' second-language acquisition ability has its limits, and the creative freedom in several languages turns out to be quite illusive” (Alekseyev 1981, 14).

The list of bilingual authors who were active as writers in French, yet did not enjoy French readers' recognition can be extended further. What comes to mind are the names of the great Russian 19th-century poets Alexander Pushkin and Fyodor Tyutchev; in a similar manner Marina Tsvetaeva's French poems were not perceived as originals, but rather as translations from Russian, and there are yet other examples.

The question of “bilingual equality” in the art of bilingual writers is being discussed continuously from various viewpoints. Having in mind the practical component of the present article, that is Estonian-Russian/Russian-Estonian bilingualism, it is interesting to note how often these studies refer to two Russian authors—Vladimir Nabokov and Joseph Brodsky, who worked in two languages (Vladimir Nabokov was also active to some extent as a French-writing author). This fact—and also the specific feature of the bilingualism of these two authors, namely that they started writing in English after they had established themselves as Russian writers—has already generated (and continues to generate) numerous scholarly articles. The reader should consult the above-mentioned work by Rita Safariants, also the contribution of Ilya Grigoryev (2005); Beaujour's (1989) book partly dedicated to Nabokov's case, and McMillin's (1994) article partly devoted to Brodsky's case.

Kseniya Baleyevskikh (2002), who studied the literary bilingualism of Andreï Makine, a French writer of Russian descent, summed up the most burning issues related to the analysis of bilingual authors:

- Why does the writer leave his native language's universe?
- Is there anything lacking in his native tongue?
- What does the writer gain, when he “enters” the culture of his “second home,” and what does this culture get in return?
- What is the intellectual trade-off? What does the writer lose as a result of the transition?

Some answers to these questions can be found in Vladimir Nabokov's preface to the Russian version of his autobiography, *Другие берега* (*Other Shores*), in which he stated that his switch from Russian to English was not a switch from the language of Pushkin and Tolstoy (i.e. from that of the major Russian cultural figures of the past), nor from the language of Russian periodicals (i.e. from that of the every-day sphere of language), but rather a switch from his individual mother tongue. He also stressed the fact that his farewell to the Russian language was tremendously painful. He repeated more or less the same in his numerous interviews, for example, in his interview with Robert Hughes, in September 1965: "[. . .] I stopped writing in my native tongue altogether except for an occasional poem [. . .]. My complete switch from Russian prose to English prose was exceedingly painful—like learning anew to handle things after losing seven or eight fingers in explosion" (Nabokov 1990, 54). We know that Nabokov's switch to English took place for various reasons, first the need to move from France to the United States in 1940 before the Nazi invasion, for fear for the life of his Jewish wife and little son. The second reason was the reduction of the readership in the Russian emigration. In his interview with Hughes, Nabokov mentioned Joseph Conrad, stressing his personal idiosyncrasy in the form of a word play on Conrad's last name: "[. . .] I differ from Joseph Conradically. First of all. He had not been writing in his native tongue before he became an English writer, and secondly, I cannot stand today his polished clichés and primitive clashes" (57).

Possible reasons for translingualism or linguistic migration are often explained by the comparison of "great" and "minor" cultures, and at times this results in making such conclusions as the following: "As history of literature shows, translingualism is always about moving toward the more prestigious language/culture or, to the language perceived as equal, and never vice versa." What stimulates this process is the fact that more prestigious cultures "make it possible to expand the horizons of self-expression [. . .] and self-affirmation providing the possibility to become famous outside of the ethnic group of origin" (Baleyevskikh 2001). And yet from my perspective, as I address the problem of Estonian-Russian bilingualism, I should both confirm and refute this statement.

There are three Estonian writers in my paper's focus: two of them, Jaan Kaplinski and Kalle Käsper, are native speakers of Estonian who *also* write in Russian. The third writer, Igor Kotjukh, in his collection of poems *Когда наступит завтра* (*When Tomorrow Comes*) (Tallinn, 2005) puts forward a somewhat ironic form of self-identification: "I can't consider myself an Estonian—my native language is Russian. I can't consider myself a Russian—my temperament is different." In one of his interviews he also says:

I cannot say for sure that I consider myself a Russian for the simple reason that the environment, I think, forms a person. [. . .] On the other hand, I cannot regard myself as an Estonian for a simple reason: my Estonian isn't without accent, it's not my native tongue. So, it turns out I should state that I equally cherish the fact I am a Russian, and the fact I am related to Estonia. So, a Russian living in Estonia. I can identify myself—through my mother tongue—as a Russian.²

In view of the already mentioned complicated status of the Russian language in Estonia, it is interesting how Kaplinski and Käsper explain why they occasionally write in Russian. Let me focus on Kaplinski first, as he is the most well-known of the three. At times Kaplinski stresses the fact that he switches to Russian spontaneously: “Recently, I’ve been writing poems in Russian only. You can find these poems in my book *Sõnast sõnatusse / Инакобытие (From Words to Wordlessness / The Next World* (2005). There was a long break before that. Then it just happened I started writing in Russian.”³ On May 12, 2015, in his interview with Elena Fanailova for Radio Liberty, the poet said that his motivation is twofold. On the one hand, it is prompted by his interest in the subject from his professional standpoint (Kaplinski studied linguistics). He is interested in comparing certain repeating archaic structures in Russian (*гуси-лебеди, тучи-облака, трава-мурава*, etc.) with analogous structures in some Finno-Ugric languages. The very idea that archaica is something that helps a language to survive drives Kaplinski to the conclusion that this *something* has always contributed to the survival of the Russian language against all odds (revolutions, counterrevolutions, etc.), and prompts him to make a statement, which is quite surprising to hear in the context of present-day Estonia: “I experience almost nostalgia for the Russian Empire.” In his poems in Russian, this feeling of nostalgia is expressed by means of the old spelling.

Here Kaplinski’s explanation brings to mind a well-known Japanese custom: after distinguishing oneself in something, one should change one’s given name or even one’s occupation: “I am an old man now, and what I want is to transform, to turn from a living classic (as they call me) into a pupil, a poet who is uncertain and far from being self-assured. I am surprised by the warm reception of my Russian poems. It’s like my second youth” (Fanailova 2015).

By the time he was awarded a prestigious *Русская премия* literary prize⁴ for his collection of poems *Белые бабочки ночи (White Butterflies of Night)*, Kaplinski man-

2 From Igor Kotjukh’s interview in 2016 to Jekaterina Belozerova, a Tallinn University student.

3 From Jaan Kaplinski’s interview in 2016 to Jekaterina Belozerova, a Tallinn University student.

4 This prize is awarded to writers in Russian living abroad.

aged to formulate his attitude to his writing in Russian in a more pronounced way. He said:

The Russian language is closer to me than any other foreign language. After all, it's almost my second native tongue. Russian colleagues and readers seem to comprehend me better than, say, Englishmen or Americans. [...] I'm a linguist, and writing in another language is a big challenge. It is difficult, and this difficulty makes me happy. And what also gladdens me are my discoveries in the Russian language, its structure, its semantics. (Logosh 2016)

The case of Käsper and his novel *Чудо (Wonder)* is of a different order. Käsper's interest in Russian developed, according to the author's own account as a step-by-step process. He has always said that he wants to gain access to a wider audience. This corresponds completely to what theoreticians say about the pragmatic aspect of a language switch: the linguistic choice is prompted by a larger country and a "greater" culture. And yet one should not forget about the conditions surrounding the novel's creation. Until 2015, Käsper was a part of a very specific union: his wife was Goar Markosyan-Käsper, a recently deceased Russian prose writer of Armenian descent, and it was she who had translated her husband's works into Russian. According to Käsper, his wife

[...] had a much better command in Russian than I did. I can say that her Russian was outstanding. At the same time, although only she was credited as the translator, I always contributed to the translation process: Goar did not know the Estonian language well, so I always prepared the first draft of the upcoming translation, and then discussed the outcome with her. I had started writing *Chudo* in Estonian, but very soon it occurred to me that nothing would come out of this idea. The reason is that while I was writing something, I used to translate what I had just written spontaneously to Goar, so she could make her suggestions. [...] And as I do not have such an opportunity now, I made the decision to translate the text into Russian for the sake of controlling it.⁵

At first glance, the author's explanation here seems purely pragmatic. Yet it is worth re-reading Käsper's novel to understand that this text (balancing on the edge of a "human document", that which what we normally call "non-fiction" and a traditional fictional narrative about the death of the beloved woman and the unbearable feeling of one's powerlessness, about the destruction of the ideal Platonic that consisted of two halves) was written in Russian because it is a requiem *sui generis*. It is

5 From Käsper's letter from 24 February, 2018 to the article's author.

no accident that when the novel's narrator learns about his wife's mortal diagnosis, he thinks: "All [is] over. Now we are dead" (my emphasis—I. B.). Russian was the Käspers' *lingua franca*, and while this language is alive in the narrator's consciousness (as well as due to the specifics of this novel's genre), the beloved is alive in the author's consciousness.

Besides Kaplinski's and Käsper's self-explanatory strategies, another contributing factor that should be taken into account is that of escapism. Judging from its multiple definitions, escapism is a subject of current interest in postmodern culture. The escapism of the present is caused by various inner and outer reasons, yet primarily by the sharp decline in the status of the intellectual. According to Marshall McLuhan, the world nowadays is homogenized, and it is lacking in what he terms individuals' ability for emotional mixes (McLuhan 1994, 61). According to Tomislav Šola (2012, 77), the future of intellectuals is miserable: "Intellectuals have hardly ever had such a poor role in society as they do today. [. . .] We are facing hard times: an immediate future in which culture itself will have difficulty defending its own importance." In addition, while Šola writes about the situation in museums, and Aleksandr Guseynov's (2013) research is focused on work with teenagers, it is clear that the escapism of these two Estonian writers (and the escapist subtext is present in Kaplinski's switch to the Russian language) is related to their protest moods.

A logical question arising from Kaplinski's and Käsper's translanguaging is the question of whether they write well in their second languages, which in other words is the question of their linguistic competence. *En passant* I should note that both have degrees in the Humanities (Kaplinski in French and Applied Linguistics; Käsper in Russian);⁶ both speak Russian fluently, yet both need an editor for their published works.

Sergei Zavyalov was (and still is) the editor of Kaplinski's Russian poems. He also authored the afterword to Kaplinski's book *Белые бабочки ночи* (*White Butterflies of Night*). Charmed by Kaplinski's philosophical poetry, Zavyalov concluded his afterword with what reads like the renunciation of the importance of literary bilingualism:

And another important feature: it's not important at all in what language this conversation goes. Just like there are things more important than "poetry" [. . .], there are forms of human nature's expression more important than "language" (if it is not the language of a spring or sparrows), where

⁶ Igor Kotjukh has a degree in Estonian.

poems (destined to be written and unwritten at the same time), thoughts (destined to be born and remain unborn), and things (having names and unnamed) become equal. (Zavyalov 2014, 91)

This statement by Zavyalov can be compared to Nabokov's thoughts about the nature of artistic thought in general, and that of a bilingual writer in particular. Answering the question, "What language do you think in?" Nabokov said:

I don't think in any language. I think in images. I don't believe that people think in languages. They don't move their lips when they think. It is only a certain type of illiterate person who moves his lips as he reads or ruminates. No, I think in images, and now and then a Russian phrase or an English phrase will form with the foam of the brainwave, but that's about all. (Nabokov 1990, 14)⁷

Yet, in spite of what Zavyalov sees as the superlingual nature of Kaplinski's poetry, the editor's presence in *Белые бабочки ночи* (*White Butterflies of Night*) is quite apparent. And this presence is not about corrections of slips of pen; rather, it is more about suggestions (most likely confirmed by the author), which produce new semantic overtones and even new meanings. Let me give just one, yet a very vivid example.

Here is the initial text of Jaan Kaplinski's poem:

Мы все ныряем в неизвестном месте
будущее нахлынет на все что осталось от нас
следы на поверхности переродятся в круги
[...]
но те кто придут приплывут за нами
умеют лишь хрюкать и барабанить
не знают о жажде и не торопятся жить и петь⁸

7 African writer Bernard Dadié said that "a bilingual writer does not translate: the language of a text comes from the depths of his consciousness." He "[...] represents the meeting point of two currents, the point where something new is born as a result. This to a certain extent *estranges* him from the chosen language, and helps him to see this language from the outside [...] Multilingualism [...] serves the purpose of the spread of human thought, and promotes mutual understanding and solidarity" (Dadié 1968, 245).

8 Word-by-word translation: "All we dive in an unknown place / the future will cover everything left from us / traces on the surface will turn into circles [...] yet those who will come after us / only know how to oink and strike the drum / unaware of thirst, making time to live and sing" [my emphasis—I. B.]. The manuscript in the personal archive of the author of the article.

And here is the final text as published in his collection *Белые бабочки ночи* (*White Butterflies of Night*):

Р а н о и л и п о з д н о м ы в с е н ы р н е м в н е и з в е с т н о е
 б у д у щ е е н а х л ы н е т н а в с е ч т о о т н а с о с т а л о с ь
 с л е д ы н а п о в е р х н о с т и п е р е р о д я т с я в к р у г и
 [. . .]
 н о т е к т о п р и д у т п р и п л ы в у т з а н а м и
 у м е ю т л и ш ь х р ю к а т ь и б а р а б а н и т ь
 н е з н а ю т о с м е р т и и ж а ж д е и н е т о р о п я т с я ж и т ь и п е т ь⁹
 [Kaplinski 2014, 29]

Two major corrections in the first and the final lines of the poem (the substitution of the present tense for the future tense, the addition of “sooner or later”, i.e. always inevitably, and the addition of the word “death”, i.e. something that is present in the poem’s first version implicitly) make the poem easier to read, yet they do simplify the poem’s meaning.¹⁰

In the view of globalization, one can distinguish two tendencies: firstly, one can foresee a rapid growth in the number of bilingual writers, and secondly, these writers will have an unequal level of competence in the languages they use in art. Besides the factor of globalization, what also influences the situation of literary bilingualism is the very epoch of postmodernity, which regards literature as a game (with its double optics, the absence of hierarchy, etc).

This aspect of literary bilingualism manifests itself in the output of Kotjukh. The major corpus of his texts are poems written in free verse. In Russian literature free verse is something generally understood as a new epoch in the development of Russian poetry: “Nowadays, we see in Russian literature the birth of a new formation, more perfect than prose, and younger than prose. This is *vers libre*” (Chernyshov 2009, 3). Many postmodern Russian poets say that the traditional system of poetry is artificial (as if they were following Russian 19th-century prose writer Mikhail Saltykov-Shchedrin, who compared rhymed poetry to a walk along a rope with sit-ups after each step). One of the most well-known Russian advocates of free verse,

9 Word-by-word translation: “Sooner or later we all shall dive into the unknown / the future will cover everything that is left from us / traces on the surface will turn into circles [. . .] yet those who will come after us / only know how to oink and strike the drum / unaware of death and thirst, making time to live and sing” [my emphasis—I. B.].

10 The text of Käsper’s novel is also not free from Estonianisms.

Vladimir Burich (1989, 169), writes: “From the aesthetic point of view, conventional verses [traditional, rhymed—I. B.] embody the category of artificiality (one should not see in this word the negative sense, though), while free verse expresses the aesthetic category of the natural.”

What makes Kotjukh different from Kaplinski and Käsper is his desire to be present in two literatures—Russian and Estonian—with the same texts. Some of his poems, initially written in Russian, are self-translated into Estonian, while another portion is translated by poets writing in Estonian.¹¹ He is also becoming more and more conscious about his experience as a bilingual author. There are not that many statements of bilinguals concerning such experiences, yet there are remarkable descriptions of this phenomenon “from the inside”, such as those of an African writer Dadié (1968, 245), mentioned above, who said that “the language of a text comes from the depths of his consciousness,” and that a bilingual writer “represents the meeting point of two currents, the point where something new is born as a result. This to a certain extent estranges him from the chosen language, and helps him to see this language from the outside”. Kotjukh speaks of a more or less equivalent psychological state, when he says in his interview: “When I write poems, the inner translator in my head is always busy. [. . .] My head is writing a poem in two languages at the same time.”

This interesting self-description and some of Kotjukh’s translated poems that are almost word-by-word true to the original text, raise the question of the addressee of his bilingual poetry. Students of literary bilingualism pay serious attention to such aspects of bilingual writers’ works as the juxtaposition of two cultures, and the merging of two world views, which manifests itself in some specific features of national mentality, literary and linguistic structures, and psychological features. It is in this context that we should read Kotjukh’s explanations as to why he was so persistent in pursuing an exact translation of certain details of his poem:

When I lived in Võru [a small town in Southern Estonia], there was a station out there called “Radio Ring,” and there was always some music in the air, some ads, something about what’s going on in the city. And often the announcer said that everyone’s free to make his or her own ad, and all you need is just to pay some money, and dial the *erakuulutuste telefon* [the number for private announcements] 1616. And I really wanted my poem about Võru to have this stock phrase—*erakuulutuste telefon*, so when my translator offered something different, something

11 Problems of self-translation are beyond the scope of this study, and deserve a more thorough research.

closer to what I had written in the original, I just corrected that for *erakuulutuste telefon*. I just needed that stock phrase in my poem about Võru.”¹²

So, in the case of this poem, the ideal reader is not an abstract Estonian addressee, but a person living in the particular city the poem describes.

A counterexample can be found in Kotjukh’s poetic cycle “Красота неочевидных вещей” (“The Beauty of Non-Obvious Things”), where poems start from dates (without a year), as if they were diary entries. In the poem entitled in Russian “7 августа” (“August 7”) dates, names and events are “equalized” by the absence of capital letters:

разговоры: от шумеров до гитлера, от красных кхмеров до транстрёмера, от португалии до вырусского языка, от монаха сюаньтсана до родителей ленина, от финно-угорского субстрата до менделеева, от сапфо до набокова, от латинских максим до французских ругательств, от польши до лао-цзы, от ду фу до паровоза черепанова, от пия в до российских детективов, от эстонских народных песен до церковнославянского языка, от индонезии до куусинена, от римской империи до арво пэрта и тд и тп – с сергеем завьяловым в гостях у яна каплинского¹³ [Kotjukh 2017]

The cycle’s subtitle “Для 33 читателей” (“For 33 readers”), at first glance defines the ideal reader, yet when we start making guesses about the culture to which these 33 readers belong, the poem’s content becomes unhelpful— the scope of details is so broad. What we have here is, most probably, a postmodernist game, where burning issues are mixed with Estonian subjects (the Võru language, Estonian folklore, Arvo Pärt, the Finno-Ugric substrate), occasional Russian names (Mendeleyev, Lenin, Nabokov, Cherepanov) and, probably, multilingual interlocutors’ interests, i.e. those of Kaplinski, Kotjukh, and Zavyalov. Defining the mentality of this text’s addressee is not easy, and the author, most probably, takes this textual ambiguity into account, emphasizing the fusion of cultures, rather than the extent of their differences.

12 From Igor Kotjukh’s interview in 2016 to Jekaterina Belozerova.

13 conversations: from sumerians to hitler, from the khmer rouge to tranströmer, from portugal to the võru language, from the monk xuanzang to lenin’s parents, from the finno-ugric substrate to mendeleev, from sappho to nabokov, from latin maxims to french swear words, from poland to laozi, from du fu to cherepanov locomotive, from pius v to russian crime novels, from estonian folk songs to the old church slavonic language, from indonesia to kuusinen, from the roman empire to arvo pärt, and so on and so forth—with sergei zavyalov at jaan kaplinski’s

Kotjukh's evolution as a poet reveals his enthusiasm about the postmodern component of poetry. Estonian literary critics have already noticed the abundance of short forms in his poetic output (cf Kaus 2017), yet the linguistic aspect is of no lesser importance. Kotjukh plays with macaronic poetry, putting Estonian words into Russian texts to achieve comic effect. Yet there are also poems, in which the comic counterpart is not important; thus, when choosing between code-switching and mixing, Kotjukh chooses mixing.

He is surely aware that the “[. . .] postulate of the monolingual assumption presumes the need to preserve language purity and to avoid language mixing, most especially in the formal educational context” (Bernardo 2005), and if he chooses mixing, this choice results in his using some extralinguistic factors new to Estonian-Russian/Russian-Estonian literature. Yet what is new for Estonian literature has already been noticed elsewhere. Thus, in view of the problem of the addressee, David Stromberg stated in his foreword to the interview with an American prose writer, Anya Ulinich:

Ulinich uses transliterated Russian words throughout the book, and takes the liberty not to explain them all directly. At the art academy, Sasha is chided for drawing *babskie shtuchki* (loosely translatable as “chick’s stuff”) and then is asked “What’s next? Fairies? Little angels? Stepashka the Bunny?” Context fills in the lack of literal understanding, while those who understand Russian can appreciate a memory of the language. For a Russian speaker it’s an expressive moment, a way to enter the intimacy of that language while remaining in the exile of the Latin alphabet; for an English speaker, it is perhaps a reminder that underneath the seemingly understandable prose is a parallel one that is totally incomprehensible. (Stromberg 2007)

This is yet another evidence of how close (and dependent) the postmodern literary bilingualism is to globalization: the worldwide nomad camp (*мировое кочевье*, to use Marina Tsvetaeva’s metaphor) contributes to literary bilingualism, revealing more and more new features in it. In conclusion, it can be noted that at the present time, literary bilingualism is being seriously influenced by two phenomena—the process of globalization and postmodernism. If earlier translanguaging or linguistic migration was often explained by the comparison of “great” and “minor” cultures in favour of the more prestigious language/culture, and never vice versa, today, referring to the chosen problem of Estonian-Russian bilingualism, one can both confirm and refute this statement. As the number of bilinguals in everyday reality grows who are capable of understanding both languages in which the writer works, literary bilingualism is increasingly manifested as a postmodern game. Instead of code-switching, the writers use macaronic poetry that allows the author to achieve a

comic effect or demonstrate mixing as a way of co-existence in art (and probably in life). Future studies of literary bilingualism can comprehensively analyse the problem of the addressee of bilingual poetry and, even more clearly, show the importance of extralinguistic factors for literary bilingualism.

References

Akhmanova, Olga. 1969 = Ахманова, О. С. 1969. *Словарь лингвистических терминов*. Москва: Советская Энциклопедия. http://www.classes.ru/grammar/174.Akhmanova/source/worddocuments/_8.htm.

Alekseyev, Mikhail. 1981 = Алексеев, Михаил. 1981. "Многоязычие и литературный процесс." In *Многоязычие и литературное творчество*, edited by M. Alekseyev, 7–17. Ленинград: Наука.

Baleyevskikh, Xenia. 2001 = Балеевских, К. В. 2001. "Писатель-билингв: свой среди чужих?" *Ярославский Педагогический Вестник*, no. 3/4, 15–20. <http://www.wikidocs.ru/preview/78382>.

———. 2002 = Балеевских, Ксения Викторовна. 2001. *Язык как экспликация культурного опыта писателя-билингва: А. Макина*. Диссертация [. . .] кандидата филологических наук. Ярославль. <http://www.dslib.net/jazyko-znanie/jazyk-kak-jeksplikacija-kulturnogo-opyta-pisatelja-bilingva-a-makina.html>.

Beaujour, Elizabeth Klosty. 1989. *Alien Tongues: Bilingual Russian Writers of the "First" Emigration*. Studies of the Harriman Institute. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Bernardo, Allan B. I. 2005. "Bilingual Code-switching As a Resource for Learning and Teaching: Alternative Reflections on the Language and Education Issue in the Philippines." In *Linguistics and Language Education in the Philippines and Beyond: A Festschrift in Honor of Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista*, edited by T. Dayag and J. S. Quakenbush, 151–169. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259189348>.

Ball, Peter, Howard Giles, and Miles Hewstone. 1984. "Second Language Acquisition: The Intergroup Theory with Catastrophic Dimensions." In *European Developments in Social Psychology*. Vol. 2 of *The Social Dimension*, edited by H. Tajfel, 668–694. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511759154.015>.

Bialystok, Ellen and Michelle M. Martin. 2004. "Attention and Inhibition in Bilingual Children: Evidence From the Dimensional Change Card Sort Task." *Developmental Science* 7 (3): 325–339. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2004.00351.x>.

Burich, Vladimir. 1989 = Бурич, Владимир. 1989. *Тексты: Стихи. Удетероны. Проза*. Москва: Советский Писатель.

Chernyshov, Dmitri. 2009 = Чернышов, Дмитрий. 2009. "Заметки о "сверхпрозе"." *Литературные известия* 24 (28): 3.

Dadié, Bernar. 1968 = Дадйё, Бернар. 1968. "Люди между двумя языками." *Иностранная литература*, no. 4, 245–246.

Fanailova, Elena. 2015 = Фанайлова, Елена. 2015. "Бабочки ночи. Разговор с Яном Каплинским в программе "Культурный дневник"." Радио Свобода (Website), May 12, 2015. <https://www.svoboda.org/a/26990644.html>.

Genesee, Fred. 1989. "Early Bilingual Development. One Language or Two?" *Journal of Child Language* 16 (1): 161–179. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000900013490>.

Grigoryev, Ilya. 2005 = Григорьев, Илья Николаевич. 2005. *Литературный билингвизм В. Набокова (Синтаксическая интерференция в англоязычных произведениях писателя)*. Диссертация [. . .] канд. филол. наук. Пермь.

Hint, Mati. 2002. *Keel on tõde on õige ja vale*. Tartu: Ilmamaa.

Guseynov, Aleksandr. 2013 = Гусейнов, Александр. 2013. "Специфика эскапизма в контексте протестной активной личности." *Человек. Сообщество. Управление*, no. 3, 20–33.

Kaplinski, Jaan. 2014 = Каплинский, Ян. 2014. *Белые бабочки ночи = Бѣлыя бабочки ночи*. Таллинн: Kite.

Kaus, Jan. 2017. "Harjutada ja kaotada tasakaalu." In Igor Kotjuh. *Loomulikult eriline lugu: luuletused proosas*, translated by Aare Pilv, 79–87. Tallinn: Tuum.

Koort, Alfred. 1938. "Võõrkeel ja väikelaps." *Akadeemia*, no. 1, 33–43.

Kotjukh, Igor. 2017 = Котюх, Игор. 2017. "Красота неочевидных вещей: Стихи в прозе для 33 читателей. Опубликовано в журнале: Крещатик 2017, 3." Журнальный зал (Website). Accessed October 25, 2018. <http://magazines.russ.ru/kreschatik/2017/3/krasota-neochevidnyh-veshej.html>.

Logosh, Olga. 2016 = Логош, Ольга. 2016. "По-русски и «по-вырусски»: Поэт Ян Каплинский о Лермонтове, стихах как сильном лекарстве, косе и топоре." *Независимая газета*, August 11, 2016. http://www.ng.ru/ng_exlibris/2016-08-11/2_kaplinskiy.html.

McLuhan, Marshall. 1994. *Understanding Media: the Extensions of Man*. London, Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology. First published 1964.

McMillin, Arnold. 1994. "Bilingualism and Word Play in the Work of Russian Writers of the Third Wave of Emigration: The Heritage of Nabokov." *The Modern Language Review* 89 (2): 417–426. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3735243>.

Nabokov, Vladimir. 1990. "Interview to Peter Duval-Smith and Christopher Bursall in mid-July 1962." In Vladimir Nabokov. *Strong opinions, 9-19*. New York: *Vintage International*.

Nicoladis, Elena and Giovanni Secco. 1998. "The Role of Translation Equivalents in a Bilingual Family's Code-Mixing." In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Boston Literary Conference on Language Development*, vol. 1, edited by Annabel Greenhill, Mary Hughes, Heather Littlefield, and Hugh Walsh, 576–585. Sommerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Peal, Elizabeth and Wallace E. Lambert. 1962. "The Relation of Biligualism to Intelligence." *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied* 76 (27): 1–23.

Proshina, Zoya. 2017 = Прошина, Зоя. 2017. "Транслингвизм и его прикладное значение." *Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Вопросы образования: языки и специальность* 14 (2): 155–170.

Safariants, Rita. 2007. "Literary Bilingualism and Codeswitching in Vladimir Nabokov's "Ada"." *Ulbundus Review*, no. 10, 191–211.

Stromberg, David [ZeekFiction, pseud.]. 2007. "Russian as an American Language. A Conversation with Anya Ulinich." *Jewcy*, March 1, 2007. <http://jewcy.com/post/Russian-as-an-American-Language-A-Conversation-with-Anya-Ulinich-14430>.

Šola, Tomislav. 2012. *Eternity Does Not Live Here Anymore – A Glossary of Museum Sins*. Zagreb: Tomislav Šola. https://www.academia.edu/35488446/5_Escapism_lack_of_mission.pdf.

Thompson, George G. 1962. *Child Psychology: Growth Trends in Psychological Adjustment*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Valuitseva, Irina and Georgi Khukhuni. 2015 = Валуйцева, И. И., Г. Т. Хухуни. 2016. "Литературный билингвизм: за и против." *Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Вопросы образования: языки и специальность*, no. 5, 298–303.

Zavyalov, Sergei. 2014 = Завьялов, Сергей. 2014. "Русские стихи Яна Каплинского: возможно ли такое?" In *Kaplinski* 2014, 87–91.

Irina Belobrovtsseva—PhD in Russian literature, professor of Russian literature at Tallinn University. Main research interests: 20th–21st century Russian literature and culture, Russian culture in Estonia.

e-mail: [venefil\[at\]tlu.ee](mailto:venefil[at]tlu.ee)

Kakskeelne kirjanik: kaks eesti-vene kirjanikku ja üks vene-eesti kirjanik

Irina Belobrovtseva

Märksõnad: kakskeelsus tänapäeva kultuuridevahelises diskursuses, kakskeelsuse kirjanduslik aspekt, kakskeelsete kirjanike looming

Käesoleva artikli praktiline osa käsitleb vene-eesti kirjandusliku kakskeelsuse olukorda, teoreetilises osas võetakse kokku keeleteadlaste lahkarmumused kakskeelsuse mõiste sisu ja ulatuse üle. Eesti-vene kirjandusliku kakskeelsuse küsimust vaadeldakse eesti emakeelega Jaan Kaplinski ja vene emakeelega Igor Kotjuhi luuleloomingu põhjal. Mõlemad autorid on palju aastaid tegutsenud kakskeelsete kirjanikena. Samuti käsitletakse Kalle Käsperi hiljuti ilmunud venekeelset romaani „Ime“ (2017), mis oli Käsperi debüüt vene kirjanikuna. Kirjandusliku kakskeelsuse küsimust arutatakse stilistilise tekstianalüüsi ja kakskeelsete kirjanikega tehtud intervjuude abil, toetudes kakskeelsete kirjanike tekstide analüüsile, mis uurib vene/eesti keelelise ja kultuurilise aluskihi olemasolu nende teostes.

Üldjuhul on keeleteadlaste hoiak kakskeelsuse suhtes üsna lähedal kakskeelsuse tunnustamisele nähtusena, mis ei nõua ilmtingimata mõlema keele võrdset valdamist (André Martinet); samuti ei nõua see ka selliste oskuste võrdset valdamist nagu teisest keelest arusaamine, selle rääkimine, lugemine ja kirjutamine (John T. Macnamara). Enamik sajandivahetusel sel alal tehtud uurimustest käsitleb kakskeelsuse kognitiivset aspekti. Tõestati ideed, et kakskeelsus formeerus õppimise käigus, s.t pärast emakeele omandamise lõpetamist. Lükates ümber hirme, mis puudutavad kakskeelsuse negatiivset mõju haprale inimteadvusele, jõudis teadus järeldusele, et kakskeelsus hoopiski ergutab inimese kognitiivseid võimeid.

Erinevalt kakskeelsuse kui keelelise nähtuse uurimisest pole kirjandusliku kakskeelsuse definitsioonide vahel lahknevusi: kakskeelsed kirjanikud on need kirjanikud, kes oskavad hästi kahte või enam keelt. Seoses globaliseerumisega võib ette näha selliste kakskeelsete kirjanike arvu kiiret kasvu, kes ei oska oma loomingus kasutatavaid keeli võrdsel tasemel. Kirjandusliku kakskeelsuse olukorda mõjutab ka postmodernismi ajajärk, mil kirjandust peetakse mänguks.

Arvestades vene keele komplitseeritud olukorda Eestis, on huvitav jälgida, kuidas Jaan Kaplinski ja Kalle Käsper seletavad, miks nad mõnikord vene keeles kirjutavad. Kaplinski on märkinud oma professionaalset huvi sellele teemale vastu: ta on soovinud võrrelda teatavaid korduvaid arhailisi vene keele struktuure analoogiliste struktuuridega mõnes soome-ugri keeles. Tema venekeelsetes luuletustes väljendab nostalgiatunnet vanapärane kirjaviis. Kaplinski on ka väitnud, et teises keeles kirjutamine on kirjanikule suureks väljakutseks.

Käsperi huvi vene keele vastu tekkis kirjaniku enda väitel järkjärgult. Ta on alati öelnud, et soovib jõuda laiema lugejaskonnani. See on täielikus kooskõlas sellega, mida teoreetikud räägivad keelevahetuse pragmaatilisest aspektist: keele valiku dikteerivad suurem maa ja „suurem“ kultuur. Lisaks Kaplinski ja Käsperi enesestmõistetavatele strateegiatele tuleb arvesse võtta veel ühte tegurit – see on eskapism. Nimetatud kirjanike eskapism on seotud nende protestimeeleoludega.

Suhteliselt noort luuletajat Kotjuhi aga eristab Kaplinskist ja Käsperist tema soov eksisteerida ühtede ja samade tekstidega korraka nii eesti kui vene kirjanduses. Ta teadvustab ka ise järjest rohkem oma kogemust kakskeelse autorina. Ta rõhutab oma luules rohkem kultuuride ühtesulamist kui seda,

kui erinevad nad on. Tema areng luuletajana näitab luule postmodernistliku komponendi innukat omaksvõttu.

Kui varasemalt seletati translingualismi ehk keelelist migratsiooni tihti „suurte“ ja „väikeste“ kultuuride võrdlemisega, alati eelistades mõjukamaid keeli/kultuure, siis tänapäeval võib eesti-vene kakskeelsuse valiku raames seda väidet nii kinnitada kui ümber lükata. Kuna igapäevases elus kasvab kakskeelsete inimeste hulk, kes oskavad mõlemat keelt, milles kirjanik kirjutab, siis väljendub kirjanikuslik kakskeelsus järjest rohkem postmodernistliku mänguna. Koodivahetuse asemel kasutavad kirjanikud makaroonilist luulet, mis võimaldab autoril saavutada koomilist efekti või näidata segunemist kui üht võimalust kunstis (ja tõenäoliselt ka elus) kooseksisteerimiseks.

Irina Belobrovtseva – PhD vene kirjanduse alal, Tallinna Ülikooli vene kirjanduse professor. Peamised uurimisteemad: 20. ja 21. sajandi vene kirjandus ja kultuur, vene kultuur Eestis.
e-post: venefil[at]tlu.ee