

# On Performativity and Perception in Early Estonian-Language Theatre Translation

*Katiliina Gielen, Maria-Kristiina Lotman*

**Abstract:** The present article will address the role of translation in the very first stage of Estonian language theatre history, during the so-called August Wiera period in the activities of the Vanemuine Society. We aim to map and define the early Estonian translational drama through the concepts of “self” and “other” considering its performative aspect. Four tentative categories emerge when looking at the mechanisms of theatre translation of the time that can be described as degrees from total domestication to foreignization.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7592/methis.v22i27/28.18449>

**Keywords:** theatre translation, drama translation, performative translation, self and other

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. The performativity of translation and “self” and “other”

Translation and especially drama translation as a performative practice is not a new concept. Douglas Robinson, for example, has claimed that translation is a language act, a use of language, and in order to analyse it he has proposed an approach that emerges from performative linguistics<sup>1</sup> (for more on the concept see Robinson 2002, 6–10); what is more, borrowing from Bakhtin, Robinson looks at translation as an activity of double voicing (on translator’s voice in theatre see also Sofo 2016). According to Robinson’s approach, in the case of translation we are dealing with a performative practice that not only communicates the structures of the source text/culture, its topics and ideas, but that also conveys the attitudes and beliefs of the translator, all the aspects that influence the translator’s interpretation: what gets emphasised and what not. That means that the translator is a performative agent (on the translator as a performer see also Zanotti 2009, 81–83) whose voice adds a layer to the original. Stefano Muneroni (2012, 297) says that drama translation is “an operation that exists not only as interpretation and representation, but also as re-enactment and transformation of cultural material, within both the source culture and the target culture.” Thus, drama translation is associated with active agency as

---

<sup>1</sup> Robinson distinguishes between “constative” and “performative” linguistics. According to him, constative linguistics includes methodologies aimed at “freezing” language as an abstract sign system, while performative linguistics explores how language is used or “performed” in speech situations.

well as cultural change, whereas from page to stage performative practice must, to a certain extent, involve staging of cultural differences.

Apart from the main problem of researching translational texts for theatre, that is, the issue of dealing with complicated multilayered polycoded structures, an important aspect of theatre and drama translation is that it is a collective practice (for a more detailed discussion see Brodie 2018, 105–54), whereas the initial translated text may change during the staging but also during the ensuing stagings. This means that the changes and inconsistencies are already inscribed in the practices connected with theatre translation. When a translated text is staged, new agents are added, along with new performative levels. Erika Fischer-Lichte (2006, 2463) has even claimed that the tension between textuality and performativity that varies according to the situation is constitutive of theatre. When producing and performing a play, the agency of a director and that of a performer come into play, and what is more, also the agency of a viewer also enters the scene: due to the performative processes an encounter occurs between the actors/performers and the audience/viewers the result of which is that the audience becomes excited, affected and influenced by the processes on stage (Fischer-Lichte 2011, 98); that means that theatre is dialogic by its nature. However, translation is by its nature also a dialogic process, since the translators are not merely mediators, but operate on the borders of self and other, bringing new phenomena into the culture and, at the same time, increasing the dialogic capability both inside their culture as well as spurring a dialogue with other cultures (Torop 2008, 375–76). Moreover, borders do not only separate but unite, and the dialogue inside borders is to a large extent determined by the dialogues held on borders (Torop 2011, 87). In the case of theatre translation, the dialogicality is to an even larger extent multidimensional, since it involves complex levels and agents.

Theo Hermans (1996) has shown how translation is, among other things, also an index of cultural self-definition, offering an insight not only to what is transposed from the “other” culture, but also what is re-coded as (our) own, and what is not mediated since it is too unfamiliar and lies outside the boundaries of the local environment. Translators are always part of a system, that is, they always translate in a particular context with an aim to meet certain expectations. The choices they make and positions they take in this context makes translators active agents in the process of cultural transfer, and as the activities and contexts of people are socially determined, translators are active social agents. (Hermans 1996, 9–10) Thus, apart from being a mediator and a creator, a drama translator also has a performative function as a cultural and social agent.

Following from the above-described notion of the performativity of the translator, the present paper will address the concept of “other” and ask what such “other” entails, how it is enacted and what is its relation to the perception of “self” in the early Estonian drama translation context. We have devised four broad categories based on the degree of domestication to exemplify and map the mechanisms of translation used to communicate theatre texts to early Estonian theatre audiences.

The issue of “self” and “other” is one of the central questions here that surfaces on the most different levels. It can be seen in the repertoire politics, discussions on theatre, criticism and reviews, but also in translational choices. However, the opposition of “self” and “other” in Estonian context means the relationship and self-definition against other (European) cultures that are perceived to stand hierarchically on a higher position, but also more exotic and distant cultures as can be seen from several very popular performances in the Wiera theatre. Historically the Estonian and Baltic German cultures have been in a strained relationship, regarding each other in terms of “cultural other”: the Baltic Germans exercising a typical colonial attitude of enlightening and educating the lesser, but never regarding it as equal (for further discussion on the relationship of Estonians and Baltic Germans in view of postcolonial discourse see Plath 2008, 37–64; on the development of Estonian cultural identity see Jansen 2007), whereas the Estonians accepted mimicking the Baltic Germans’ cultural practices as a means for development, including the imitation of theatrical structures (Saro 2006, 59; Saro and Pappel 2008, 129), although it was often publicly denied (Saro 2020, 37).

We propose that in the early Estonian drama translation the double voice of the translator is especially pronounced. It is first motivated by the fact that drama translation is already historically a relatively free translational genre (see, for example, Aaltonen 2000: 38–46) in which manipulating with time, space and culture is widely accepted. What is more, it is accompanied by the translation norms of the period that allowed any text to be translated quite freely: omissions, additions, adaptations and rearrangements of different texts and parts of texts were accepted and even normative (Lange 2015, 21, 179; Mits 2012, 74). Being the first study on translation mechanisms in early Estonian theatre, our article suggests a classification and analysis of the different manipulations used in the drama translational practices of the time, that is, late 19th century Estonia.

The fact that new performances were promptly and amply introduced in periodicals shows that both the people involved in theatrical activity as well as the critics of the time were aware of the impact theatre had on the society and culture. Thus, when we look at the expectations for theatre expressed by the critics of the time and through that how theatre impacted the society, what it wanted to change,

we can distinguish between the aspirations regarding the audience and more generally the entire society: to educate, cultivate, shape, but alongside these we can also see cultural aims: to enrich, validate, empower, add value. What is of importance here is the creation of Estonian(-language) theatrical genres and languages that prepared the ground for their further development and diversification. Despite all this, we must not forget the entertainment function of theatre: the choices of repertoire and translation strategies are often justified by the need to offer the audience leisure activities and entertainment. Keeping the entertainment function of the theatre in mind, the translators may, for example, erase or add characters or plot lines they consider either boring or difficult to understand.

Although Lawrence Venuti (1995) distinguishes between foreignization and domestication in translation, with a higher degree of detailing, four different mechanisms can be brought out that are used to mediate a foreign culture (Carbonell i Cortés 2003, 155). Firstly, *total domestication* (the “other” is domesticated to represent the “self,” that is, the source text is assimilated to the target culture), secondly, *familiarization* or *partial domestication* (the “other” will remain, the “otherness” is preserved and recognised, but adapted and approximated to the target audience), thirdly, *foreignization* (the “other” is presented markedly as not the “self”), thirdly, and lastly, *conscious omission of the other* (the “other” as too unfamiliar is left unmediated; reasons for non-translation may be given in metatexts (on the corresponding semiotic processes see in more details Carbonell i Cortés 2003). Apart from theatre translation being an under researched subject, this paper is the first attempt to classify and map these phenomena in early theatre translation history in Estonia.

Such categorization, however, can only be tentative since most translations operate on the axes where total domestication inhabits one end and foreignization the other. Theatre text has a polycoded structure, where different verbal, visual and auditory sign systems are integrated into a complex construction, and as with other genres, most of the theatre translations exhibit both foreignized and domesticated elements. What is more, in early theatre translation domestication and foreignization practices can be observed on both verbal as well as structural level, i.e. adding, deleting or restructuring the presentation of information pertaining to both content and expression planes. The question is which of the codes of this complex system become/are chosen to be dominant. The fact is that even the most foreign can, at a certain point in time or in certain form, appear in Estonian or any other culture as own; for example, Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet* was not staged in the Wiera period and as a matter of fact was properly translated into Estonian only in 1935, but Johann Kantswey’s *Mihkel and Liisa, or Have a look, what greed can do* that premiered

in the Vanemuine in 1876 and talked about the tragic fate of two young lovers, covered a similar ground and has been perceived as Estonian *Romeo and Juliet* (Põldmäe 1978, 166), although it was also criticised, since the suicide of a young lover was perceived as implausible and thus a strange event in local circumstances. Thus, “self” and “other” are not objective distinctions, but take form through an interaction between different agents, whereby not only performativity plays an important role in this equation, but also perception. These notions are not neutral and adopt certain attitudes: similarly to the practices that are considered our own, there is one type of “otherness” that is perceived as deplorable and another “otherness” that is welcomed, admired and aspired towards.

### 1.2. Subject, aims, material and methods used

Our study aims at viewing the concepts of “self” and “other” through the translated and staged drama texts and their reception in the early Estonian theatre, covering the period of August Wiera’s activities in the Vanemuine, that is, the Wiera theatre (1880s and 1890s). The present study draws heavily from a chronological corpus of translational theatre texts that we have been compiling, a corpus that extends from the earliest known translations until 1945. Relying on other archival materials (playlists, manuscripts, playbills, etc.) stored in the Estonian Cultural History Archives as well as the Vanemuine theatre archives, memoirs of the people concerned in theatrical activity of the time (Reinhold Sachker, Hugo Techner, August Wiera, etc.), reviews and criticism published in periodicals, but also a comparative analysis of translated drama texts, we will take a semiotic approach to the phenomenon, since the translation of theatre texts inevitably also incorporates the transposing and recoding of different auditory and visual elements.

We differentiate between theatre and drama translations as according to Aaltonen (2000, 33–38) the latter concerns translation of the written text and the former translation of the theatrical work. Aaltonen (2000) shows that drama and theatre are different phenomena: a drama might not reach the stage and that theatre performance does not have to use drama texts at all. What we mean by drama translation is the translation of verbal codes; in case of theatre translation, however, the mediation of the entire complex polycoded system, by which certain codes are transposed and others recoded. Whereas adaptation, a traditionally prominent translation strategy, is, like Aaltonen (2000, 75) also claims, likewise a theatre translation strategy, and as such concerns the non-verbal codes to an even greater extent than verbal codes. Although a comprehensive study of the translation of relevant visual and auditory codes might be complicated, it is still possible through the

descriptions and memoirs of the contemporaries as well as preserved photographs and drawings of scenic design.

For us the formation of the Estonian cultural self-definition and the development of national identity during the 19<sup>th</sup> century serves as a backdrop to the translational phenomena stemming from the representation of “self” and “other” as analysed in the article. The invigorated cultural sphere of the time, theatre included, has played a significant and under researched role in the identity development.

## **2. The Wiera period in Estonian theatre translation history: performances of the eighteen-eighties and nineties**

1865 marks the year of the founding of the Vanemuine Cultural Society in Tartu, which was originally meant to coordinate and spur the activity of Estonian male choirs, but soon expanded its activity to stage Estonian-language plays (see also Põldmäe 1978, 12–16).

Estonian national theatre history proper starts with a translation – Lydia Koidula’s<sup>2</sup> adaptation of Theodor Körner’s *The Cousin from Bremen* (*Der Vetter aus Bremen*) that was staged by the Vanemuine Society in 1870 under the title *The Cousin from Saaremaa* (*Saaremaa onupoeg*; see Põldmäe 1978, 142–45; on the difficulties differentiating the original and translational in early Estonian theatre see also Saro and Pappel 2008, 126). The following decade was carried by national awakening and is frequently referred to as Koidula’s theatre.

Starting out during the national awakening, theatre functioned as a channel for cultural development; however, soon it found itself serving the increasing appetite for entertainment, became financially responsible for its production and despite the passionate organisers who wanted to explore different facets of theatrical activity, needed to keep serving the popular taste.

From 1872, August Daniel Wiera (1853–1919), a young energetic carpenter’s apprentice with a considerable musical ear (Sachker in Kirepe 1974, 11), became involved in the work of the budding theatre. August Wiera’s career quickly took off, and by 1878 he was appointed to lead the activities of the orchestra, choir, and drama performances in the Vanemuine Society. Thus, the last twenty years of the 19<sup>th</sup> century theatre in Tartu can tentatively be called the Wiera period. Although not solely responsible for the staging of the plays, he was definitely in charge of organising the work of the theatre including finding and designing the repertoire as well as arrang-

---

2 Lydia Koidula was an Estonian poetess, who had an active role in the national awakening of Estonia. In addition to her original writings she translated and adapted German poetry, translated and wrote plays and assisted her father, Johann Voldemar Jannsen, in editing the country’s first weekly newspaper.

ing the music, training the actors and singers. Musical interludes and songs were characteristic to the Wiera period and gave a jump start to a three-genre theatre that still exists in Tartu – the Vanemuine.

There is a diversity of people and practices through which drama as a genre was imported into the Estonian language. First of all, theatre itself was not new or unknown in Estonia since various German theatres, such as the Tartu German Craftsmen Society's Theatre, regularly staged plays in German and hosted travelling German theatre companies (see Põldmäe 1978, 142). Many Estonian craftsmen, members of such German societies, visited the performances and in the wind of national awakening, an audience for the Estonian theatre was formed and the demand for plays in Estonian grew quickly. The flood of theatre translations into Estonian that followed the 1870s showed various degrees of adaptation, assimilation and acculturation.

In the case of early Estonian-language theatre, the "self" is constructed and defined through oppositions with different degrees of "otherness" (see also Saro and Pappel 2008). On the surface, the self is built on local language, names, realia and circumstances, but a closer look reveals deeper moral and ethical implications: sometimes the encounter with the "other" can be detrimental and even dangerous, while the "self" is worth holding on to. At the same time, the cultural superiority of the "other" can widely be perceived. Periodicals of the time reflect constant comparisons with both local German theatres as well as theatres outside Estonia: "The artistic skills of neither the Estonian actors nor theatres can be compared with those of other, educated nations as yet" (anonymous 1888a, see also Vilde 1886). Thus, this otherness is connected to a certain inferiority, an aspiration to be comparable, similar or equal to the "other" that is perceived to be in a culturally higher position. Local German newspapers were closely monitored as well, and in his memoirs Heinrich Rosenthal (Estonian theatre activist) proudly mentions the praise of Koidula's *The Cousin from Saaremaa* in both *Dörptsche Zeitung* and *Neue Dörptsche Zeitung* after its premiere in 1870 (Rosenthal in Kirepe 1974, 17). Indeed, on the one hand, there was praise, but on the other hand, Estonian attempts at theatre were looked at with a certain ironic patronage. For example, although with approval, the aforementioned coverage also remarks that instead of female actresses, Estonian gentlemen in skirts populate the scene (see *Dörptsche Zeitung* 25.06.1870, No. 143).

### 2.1. Repertoire and translation choices in early Estonian language theatre

The repertoire of early Estonian language theatre heavily depended on several factors. Firstly, the taste of the paying audience, craftsmen and traders in the case of Tartu, who formed the majority of both the actors as well as the audience, needed

to be taken into account. The titles of the plays reflect the target audience and its preferences: tailors, shoemakers, milkmaids (August von Kotzebue's *Tailor Vips or Who knows what good this is* (*Rätsep Vips, ehk kes teab mis tarwis see hää on*, originally *Schneider Fips oder Die gefährliche Nachbarschaft*, 1873), Emanuel Schikaneder's *Shoemaker Tikko and his Wife or The living dead couple* (*Kingsepp Tikko ja tema naine ehk elavalt surnud abielupaar*, 1873), Wilhelm Mannstaedt's *Milkmaid from Ilumäe* (*Ilumäe piimatüdruk*, originally *Das Milchmädchen von Schöneberg* 1887)). The topics prevalently concerned either marital or monetary affairs, outsmarting and trickery in both domains. The Vanemuine Society started out in the 1870s with a repertoire centred around local Estonian circumstances. During the first decade, the work of local authors (Lydia Koidula, Carl Robert Jakobson, Juhan Kunder) was utilised to the maximum (see Kask 1970, 66) and translated plays were modified to reflect local circumstances. Genre wise, especially towards the end of 1880s, at the height of Wiera period, the repertoire consisted of melodramas (Ernst Raupach's *Jenowewa* (1886), Theodor Körner's *Tooni* (1887), Salomon Hermann von Mosenthal's *Debora* (1888), Friedrich Halm's *Griseldis* (1890)), simple comedies (by mostly German and mostly early 19th century playwrights such as August von Kotzebue, August Wilhelm Iffland, Emil Pohl), and occasional morality plays alternated with large-scale musical performances on exotic topics (Pius Alexander Wolf's / Carl Maria von Weber's *Preziosa* (1883), August von Kotzebue's *Fatiniza* (1884)). Wiera's dislike of Estonian language originals and his admiration of foreign settings is well documented: he "much preferred the pieces by other nations" (Techner in Kirepe 1974, 30) and "had no interest whatsoever in original pieces on serious topics" declining any offers by saying: "write a play with accordion and songs, and then we'll talk" (Kitzberg 1956, 481).

Secondly, the repertoire had to be chosen from the material that was not only suitable, but available. Reinhold Sachker (1843–1919), the director and organiser of the theatrical activity in the Vanemuine Society before Wiera, has documented writing one play in 1872 (*Tailor Zippet*, originally *Rätsep Zippet*) to enrich the repertoire, but realising that he "lacked fantasy to be a playwright" he purchased a German-language collection of plays by Kotzebue, possibly the only one available, translated it "with the help of a student called Leilov" and "adapted it to match the Estonian ways" (Sachker in Kirepe 1974, 9). Such adaptation to reflect the local situation or "the Estonian ways," with an aim to appeal and relate to the audiences, is also described by Põldmäe (1978, 143) in regard to Koidula's *The Cousin from Saaremaa*, where Koidula adds an entire page to the original text criticising the state of the public schools in Estonia.

Thirdly, there was a constant lack of actors, especially skilled female actors (see Kärner 1922, 6), for acting was generally associated with promiscuous behaviour, and actors were considered to be “dilettantes, comedians, night workers” (Konsa in Kirepe 1974, 6). Whereas in the beginning of the 1870s female roles were often taken up by male actors, and not without criticism (see Põldmäe 1978, 144–45), then later actresses did perform, but preferred to do so using pseudonyms. The shortage of actors had an impact on translation strategies as well. Thus, for example, the cast of 12 characters in Iffland’s original German language play *The Bachelors* (*Die Hagestoltzen*, 1793) has been reduced to 6 in its Estonian translation (*Linnas ja Maal*, 1875). Manipulating the text this way both the level of the performativity as well as the agency of the translator increases, since they became responsible for cutting lines of action that in its turn resulted in a changed narrative.

Fourthly, repertoire choices were also connected to and mirrored what was performed in the local German theatres. The latter often served as a model and point of reference to early Estonian-language theatre. Wiera describes how he kept an eye on the Tartu German Craftsmen Society’s Theatre, jotting down performances he wanted to stage with his company (Wiera in Kirepe 1974, 53). There have also been attempts to reconcile and unite the endeavours and audiences of these two different language theatres. For example, Eduard Vilde (1886) stresses the educational role of theatre and the fact that Germans are ahead of Estonians in this respect. Local Estonian and German theatres should cooperate, Estonians could learn from the Germans, but German theatres should also start staging Estonian plays: “the Estonian-speaking German public would love to see Estonian performances” (Vilde 1886).

What is more, censorship also tacitly plays a role in the choice of repertoire as well as establishing the dynamics between the translational “other” of the time. Techner describes the struggle to get permission to play *Fatinitza* in 1892: “I rewrote the piece to depict the conflict between the French and the Arabs in Africa instead of the Hungarians and Turks. Alas, we did not get the permission to play it then. We dropped it.” (Techner in Kirepe 1974, 27) This exemplifies that censorship influences both the choice of repertoire and translation strategies, serves as a motivating factor for omissions and conceptual changes, and in some cases results in the elimination of the work from repertoire.

## 2.2. The role of non-verbal codes in early Estonian translations for theatre

Musical theatre is by nature a more universal phenomenon, becoming localized or “own” mainly through the local performers (Saro and Pappel 2008, 136). Music and songs often accompanied the early Estonian-language German plays making

them more attractive for the audience. The practice itself originates from the (local) German theatres (Saro and Pappel 2008, 128) and the very first Estonian language play *The Cousin from Saaremaa* (1870) also had two songs in it that were not present in the original. It has been documented that popular solo or choir songs often travelled from one play to the other. A march from Richard Strauss' *The Gipsy Baron* (*Mustlasparun*, originally *Der Zigeunerbaron*) in 1889 reappeared in Raupach's *Jenowewa* (first staged in 1886) even though the historical time and circumstances in these plays were very different: "The choir sang "bullet from a gun flies like wind" (*püssi kuul, nagu tuul*) even though the soldiers on the scene were carrying spears (Techner in Kirepe 1974, 31). Johann Voldemar Jannsen's original play *King of Udumäe* (*Udumäe kuningas*, 1894) that was allegedly staged only because Wiera could incorporate some musical pieces into it, was criticised because of the songs that were perceived as not inherent to Estonian theatre nor in accordance with the plot: "New music and novel artistic duets do not suit an Estonian national dramatic work that, by the way, is set into the Middle Ages. We need more of Estonian music for choirs: Estonian tunes for Estonian plays! A foreign tune sounds cold and callous." (Anonymous 1894) This explicitly shows the aspiration of the critics to encourage the Estonian theatre to use Estonian original cultural heritage that at the time was still mostly folkloric.

Elements of scenic design can be used either to reduce and hide or stress the foreignness. Hugo Techner (in Kirepe 1974, 28) describes the ambition, ways and means of the creation of a markedly exoticized environment on stage for Jules Verne's *Around the World in 80 Days* (1891):

[...] we had an entire cave painted. A ship and palm trees, a train [...]. I made four big snakes and painted them. These could be moved by a thin string. [...] there were two men inside one elephant costume, they both had to crouch, one with his hand up inside the trunk, the other holding his hand inside the tail. [...] The turbans were large discs stuffed with seaweed.

Hence, visual stage codes, props and costumes among other things appear to be important means of constructing the "other" on stage. This way the non-verbal codes played a significant role in rendering and interpreting what was foreign in the process of building the "self."

### 3. Translating the "other" in the early Estonian-language theatre

#### 3.1. "Self" and "other" in early Estonian theatre translations

A systematic analysis of the early translations, be it parallel text comparison or research into the sociology of translators, is not possible due to the gaps in the

material that are no longer possible to fill: a large number of texts has not come down to us and is known only through titles from coincidental archival finds or occasional ads in periodicals of the time; data on translators is absent or incorrect; often the names of the original authors and titles cannot be found, not to mention other circumstances associated with translation such as information concerning the choice of the translational repertoire or translation process, etc. Therefore, we have taken an approach based on sporadic snapshots into the history of theatre translation to show some of the translation related phenomena that we have been able to map.

The main concern of the present paper is the volatile and multi-faceted relationship between “self” and “other” in the early Estonian translational drama: in which way and how such a relationship materialises and is perceived, what are the means a theatre uses to meet the expectations of the audiences and how this relationship is reflected on the textual level in translations from a foreign language and context.

The tensions between “self” and “other” in early Estonian theatrical history emerge implicitly in the choices of the repertoire, translational decisions/solutions and matters regarding staging, and such tension can also be seen explicitly from the disputes inside theatrical circles as well as in criticism covered in periodicals.

The issue of repertoire is one of the most discussed and visible topics in the early Estonian theatre, Wiera’s Vanemuine included. A perpetually sounding accusation by the critics is: too many foreign plays, too little good original Estonian material (see, for example, Parv 1888, Treffner 1890, anonymous 1892 and others). The tendency towards translational material is reflected in the list of plays that were performed in Wiera’s period: a couple of new original plays as opposed to a dozen new translations a year.

An anonymous critic in the *Postimees* describes the lack of original plays also, and especially in the Vanemuine, stating that the actors’ skills do allow performing in the Estonian language and that sometimes one original play “can move the hearts of the audience more than several translations,” since originals portray the lives of the people, and the foreign plays have often “no importance whatsoever for the life in Estonia” (anonymous 1888b). A recurring criticism is that foreign plays might be too unfamiliar (anonymous 1897), corrupt the taste (Saal 1892) and morals (Järv 1886, anonymous 1890; disputes on the 1897 production of *Fatinitza* see Kärner 1992, 12): “not everything is good and commendable that comes from the ample source of the foreign play-writing reservoir” (anonymous 1889a). The critics also complain about the quality of translation (Rosenthal 1874, anonymous 1885, Vilde 1893, anonymous 1894), and, especially in the context of elaborate musical performances, that Estonians might be incapable of understanding the fancy foreign

material since Estonians lack the glorious past, grand nobility and ground-breaking politics (Liiv? 1888). The fear of Germanisation is also one of the issues taken up and criticised: “Why is the focus not on the Estonian authors [. . .] the Vanemuine could take up the works of Russian, Finnish, and Latvian authors” (Treffner 1890). It is true, except for a single Russian (Alexander Pushkin’s *The Miserly Knight*, originally Скупой рыцарь, in Estonian *Kitsi rüütel*, 1881) and French (Destouches’s (Philippe Néricault’s) *Triple Wedding*, originally *La Triple Marriage*, in Estonian *Kolmewõrdsed pulmad*, 1883) language translations, most of the early translations come from German authors or through the German language.

The reasons for such a translational surge of foreign material are twofold: emerging Estonian authors were few and far between and those few were cautious about writing for theatre, since in the case where the play was not published, there was little hope for remuneration, but also for the lack of skill and experience (see Techner in Kirepe 1974, 27). Translating, on the other hand, was a relatively easy and more affordable task and could be and was often done by members of theatre staff.

On some occasions the production of foreign translational dramas was justified by the scarcity of original material and that the originals were boring and did not draw the audiences to theatres (Parv 1888). What is more, some critics viewed original dramas to be both technically and aesthetically inept (anonymous 1892) or not capable of “educating the hearts of the audiences, refreshing their minds, elevating their spirits, and broadening their horizons” (Rosenthal 1897).

The Vanemuine Society even implemented regulations regarding the balance between original Estonian and foreign performances, apparently to ensure that at least a few original plays were performed yearly. The terms of the permit Wiera signed in 1891 that enabled him to stage performances in the Vanemuine Society, but left the financial responsibilities to him, stipulate: 30–35 productions a year from which at least 2–3 should be original Estonian plays (Kask 1970, 76; Palamets 2006, 51). Such steps give witnesses to the intention to foster and develop Estonian own original drama, but also hint at the importance of the issue of “self” and “other,” constructing an identity by comparison and contrast, in the context of theatre.

### 3.2. Total domestication

By total domestication we mean works that are presented as originals, that is, they have a translational basis, but have been reworked to an extent that the foreign element is erased or hidden or perceived as local, and it is possible to categorise them as original compositions. The voice of the original author is not audible, and the voice of the translator overpowers the entire work, becoming dominant on every level. Such works were either domesticated during their first translation, or they

gradually became domesticated through editing for different stagings. Such translations usually completely alter the play on multiple levels and become adapted to a degree that it is difficult to perceive them as translations.

It would not be surprising to find translational origin in many early originals, while it is difficult and sometimes impossible to find their source texts. These works are characteristically translocalized, renamed and referred to by the name of the translator: Lydia Koidula's (Theodor Körner's) *The Cousin from Saaremaa* (1870), Friedrich Reinhold Kreutzwald's (Ernst von Houwald's) *Lighthouse (Tuletorn, originally Der Leuchtturm, 1871)*, Johann Voldemar Jannsen's (August von Kotzebue's) *The Dream of Pärmi Jaak (Pärmi Jaagu unenägu, 1873)*, to name just a few known Estonian cases. Such adaptation practice was common to the period in general, not only in Estonia, but elsewhere in Europe too (see for example Rossel 1994).

The origins, however, are difficult to establish also because the translation has travelled a long way and sometimes shifted the original genre. For example, while Theodor Körner as the author of the source text for *The Cousin from Saaremaa* is somewhat known, it is less recognised that the original of Lydia Koidula's second play *Maret and Miina or Betrothal birches (Maret ja Miina ehk kosjakased, 1870)* was based on a story by Johann Voldemar Jannsen, *Neighbour's Daughters (Naabri tütreid)* that in its turn was an adaptation of W. O. von Horn's story. (See also Põldmäe 1978, 146; Saro and Pappel 2008)

It is possible to observe a dramatic work gradually and through different editions becoming totally domesticated. *The Dream of Pärmi Jaak* is based on a play by August von Kotzebue (*Der Trunkenbold [The Drunkard]*), which in its turn is based on Ludvig Holberg's comedy *Jeppe on the Hill (Jeppe på Bjerget)*, staged in 1722 (for more details see Suits 1927). Kotzebue's play was first translated into Estonian as early as 1824 by Peter A. J. Steinsberg (the translation is lost). The translation was picked up again and edited by Johann Voldemar Jannsen in 1873 (republished in 1993). Jannsen emphasised comical elements in the play, neutralised it somewhat (a revolting peasant is substituted with a drunkard), intensified the marital conflict, added moral points and made the language more colloquial, inserted proverbs and sayings (Põldmäe 1978, 158). The structure of the play in Estonian translation has seen radical changes, the two-act comedy has become a three-act comedy. The domestication of character names is conducted on a very sophisticated level using total domestication for the names of simple country folk (Pärmi Jaak, Liisu, Mats), but bringing in German names (with slightly Estonianised spelling) for the manor-related characters (Anken, Marihken, Hans). Such a practice can also be observed elsewhere, for example in the translation of Destouches's *Triple Wedding (Kolmewõrdsed pulmad, 1883)*. Moreover, the activities of *The Dream of Pärmi Jaak* are

set into the Estonian context created with the help of domesticated realia: place names, food, currency, measurement units, Estonian verses and songs, but also the dynamics between the characters. This play has since been considered as Jannsen's original, at best presented as in Rudolf Põldmäe's study (1978, 14): "a play based on Kotzebue."

### 3.3. Familiarization or partial domestication

According to our estimation, familiarization is the most used approach in the translation of plays during the period of early Estonian-language theatre. This approach brings the dramatic text somewhat closer to the audience, but it is still performed by the theatre and received by the audience and critics as something foreign and translational. We can here distinguish between familiarization as a method that means a partial domestication of the whole text, and familiarization strategies that concern the familiarization of certain levels of text and/or the familiarization of certain individual elements. In both cases the extent of rewriting the text may vary greatly: sometimes the original is quite freely transferred to the Estonian context Estonianising the names of the characters, replacing the titles and realia, and simplifying the content and the expression plane of the source text to match the expectations of the Estonian audiences; however, sometimes the drama work still carries the elements of the source culture and the voice of the original author enters into a dialogue with that of the translator. These are not totally erased, and it is possible to perceive the piece as translational, not local.

Karl August Hermann's free familiarization and production of August Wilhelm Iffland's light comedy *The Bachelors* (*Die Hagestoltzen*, 1793; in Estonian translation *Linnas ja maal*), premiered first in 1873 in St. Petersburg and later also in the Vanemuine Society. In the foreword to the published play, Hermann (1875, 3) stresses the translation strategy, saying that he has "made the play into the Estonian language, not put it into Estonian," meaning that the play has not just been translated but also customised for the Estonian stage. The translator clearly stresses the fact of adaptation, taking into account the means and needs of local theatre. He further connects the extent of simplifications to the lack of skilled actors: "In German the play has 5 acts and 12 characters, from which 3 acts and 6 characters remain in my remake, for the way it originally was, is hard to play" (Hermann 1875, 3). Although in Hermann's case the reason is said to be the inadequacy of actors, this practice also enabled the translator/playwright to modify the plot of the play to match local circumstances, and thus, engage with the audience on a more personal level. Hermann claims: "The main principles of the play have remained the same, the face of the play has, however, been totally altered. My aspiration has been to fit it to match the

life of our people as much as possible, and this is the way I will pass it on to the audience" (Hermann 1875, 3).

Comparative analysis of texts by Iffland (1793) and Hermann (1875) shows conceptual changes in the plotline but the retention of formal elements. The plays both start with a scenic description of a room in a mansion with a sofa and a person stretched out on it, ready for a monologue. But here the differences on the conceptual plane start: Iffland's sofa is inhabited by the servant Valentin, in the Estonian translation the master of the house Reinhold starts speaking. Their monologues also have different foci. Iffland's Valentin regrets not having an education and thus a better outlook on life, Hermann's Reinhold ponders upon coming into means by hard work but having no friends. From the opening scene the plays continue in the same vein, Estonian following closely the setting and formal elements of the German original, but conveying, with the help of similar characters, a slightly different story. Thus, the technical framework such as settings and general character descriptions, the balance of monologues and dialogues is similar to the original, but the morals stress the local Estonian reality: Reinhold has worked hard and has become a free man with financial means, but he is lonely. Such comical dramas with an emphatic moral point apparently had a didactic function, but not only. In some sense the real "self" is being constructed here, the one that deviates firstly from the Germans in the original and secondly gives guidelines to the local "self."

However, there were works that were translated by our current contemporary standards, with no cuts made in characters or storyline, noticing and imitating stylistic markers such as metaphors, repetitions, parallel constructions, etc. August von Kotzebue's light farce *The Confusion or the Wag* (*Der Wirrwarr, oder Der Muthwillige*, 1803), translated by a later Estonian playwright August Kitzberg in 1878 (in Estonian by the name *Wirrwarr*), has a complicated plot line revolving around marriage and conning out an inheritance. The topic as well as the genre were deemed suitable for Estonians since "it had no lengthy and boring monologues" allowing "one joke be followed by another" (anonymous 1882). All the characters are present (some nameless extras are even added) and although the names of the characters are Estonianised, meaningful names get a translational counterpart. Kitzberg's translation follows the dialogues quite precisely, sometimes even rigidly in the 1878 version. The translator's voice does occasionally manifest itself carrying along the recognizably national mentality: in the opening scene of *Wirrwarr* in the original as well as the translation, three main male characters are seated in a living room of a manor, sleeping. These are the two suitors and the father (Herr von Langsalm/Jaak Tasantus) of the maiden (Doris/Dooris). As the name of the father suggests, he is slow and lazy, sleeping whenever he can. Kitzberg, however, has inserted a telling

remark explaining the constant leisure that must have been (and still is) an unfamiliar topic to Estonians: the German father sleeps earnestly “schläft nie anders als im Ernst” (Kotzebue 1836, 4), but in Estonian the father sleeps, also earnestly, but a clarification “whenever he finds a moment” (“Isa magab ju, kui ta vähe mahti saab, ikka nõnda, et ta ei näe ega kuule”; Kotzebue 1878, 3).

Kotzebue’s *Wirrwarr* was well liked by contemporary audiences (Pöldmäe 1985, 126–27) and only four years after its first appearance in 1878, it was staged again under the title *Priidu Kuldnupp and his Half a Million* (*Priidu Kuldnupp ja tema pool miljonit*). The records state that we are dealing with a new translation by Ludvig Menning, the drama director in the Vanemuine at the time. However, the analysis revealed that this is an edition of Kitzberg’s translation, and most probably the original was not consulted at all. What is interesting is that the text is set in much more domesticated circumstances: the activities take place in an Estonian cottage, and the language has got a colourful local coating, made more speakable and more idiomatic. Such a tendency can often be noticed in case of dramatic works that by different stagings gradually lose their foreignness picking up local elements until they are interchangeable from the local original works.

In most of the familiarized plays we encounter similar principles: original structures are simplified, a versified original is translated into prose, proper names are familiarized, and through the translator’s voice local circumstances can be seen. Although plays translated using familiarization were generally well received, there are, however, also examples where the foreignness is perceived to an extent that critics feel the need to point it out separately. From Vilde’s review on Wilhelm Mannstaedt’s musical drama *Milkmaid from Ilumäe* (*Ilumäe piimatüdruk*) in 1896 we read: “There is no other such play like this *Milkmaid from Schöneberg* among the Sunday theatres of Berlin that is so hokey, such an oddity with stale jokes. Half-clad in an Estonian attire, fitted into by the translator, makes it ever more awkward” (Vilde 1896). Here the foreignness is perceived to an extent that the critic felt the need to point it out separately. However, the issue does not only concern the foreignness, but the ineptness in blending the foreign and the local culture.

### 3.4. Foreignization

Foreignization in the context of early Estonian theatre translations would include cases that exhibit a noticeable number of foreign elements in the title of the work (toponyms, proper names, etc.), character names, realia, setting, context and sometimes also language. In addition to that the foreignness may be supported by other non-verbal auditory and visual stage codes. In such a case we can still distinguish between the methodical and coherent manipulation of the entire text and a

text where only certain levels have been systematically foreignized, still with an aim to make a difference between the “self” and the “other.” It is important to note that even single borrowed codes or elements may perceivably foreignize the text.

The Wiera theatre was the first to make an attempt in 1885 to stage a classical drama play, *Muhamed*, Jaan Bergmann’s translation of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe’s (unpublished) translation and rework of Voltaire’s play *Mahomet* (1736). Exotic themes proved to be very popular and the 1980s and 1890s saw productions such as Richard Genée’s comic operetta *Don Trabuco of Trabucillos or a groom from the land of moors* (*Don Trabuco di Trabucillos ehk Peigmeees Mooramaalt*, 1887), Richard Strauss’ *The Gypsy Baron* (*Mustlasparun*, 1889), Jules Verne’s *Around the World in 80 Days* (*Reis ümber maailma 80 päevaga*, 1891), etc.

The first translations of William Shakespeare’s plays, *The Merchant of Venice* (*Wenedigu linna kaupmees*, 1888) and *The Taming of the Shrew* (*Kangekaelse taltsutus*, 1889), also found their way to the Estonian stage in the Wiera period. These plays may be perceived as an attempt to redeem Estonian theatre and its light repertoire choices and show its presence among the “cultured” peoples. Shakespeare was well known to the audiences through German translations and German theatres and the Estonian-language performances were received with certain expectations that also foreshadowed the translational decisions. The Shakespearean plays were welcomed by the audience (Kask 1970, 69) but while some critics praised and congratulated the Vanemuine for such an important step (anonymous 1888c, anonymous 1889b) others sided with the emerging Estonian cultural elite: Estonians are still not mature enough to handle such serious world classics with appropriate dignity (anonymous 1888a).

Both plays retained some of their foreignness: Antonio, Bassanio, Portia, Shylock, Katherina and Petruchio all operate on the stage and do it according to the Shakespearean plotline and in Italy. The cultural and historical realia are also there (that is, the use of ducats as monetary units). However, both plays were translated into prose and featured many cuts, deviations and shifts in emphasis (Pöldmäe 1985, 153–60). The director, Hugo Techner, found a way to highlight contemporary societal issues that would be of importance to the then audiences: Shylock’s tragedy was overthrown by the stress on class relationships such as arranged or inter-class marriage, thus, the courtship scenes became the centre of the play that in the original is more known for the absence of love rather than its presence. The audience is said to have enjoyed themselves by drawing parallels between Katherina and Petruchio in *The Taming of the Shrew* and the idle life of the Estonian nobility – the Baltic Barons, but lost a sense of humour when Petruchio treats the tailor rudely: Petruchio “is often harsh and unjust with servants and people who have not

deserved such fate, therefore the audience can no longer look kindly upon him, even though he reaches the much expected goal with his wife in the end" (Anonymous 1889c). It was thought that Shakespeare is misunderstood or mistranslated since surely he "has not taken the matter this far and treats especially the tailor in a friendly manner" (anonymous 1889c; see also Kask 1970, 70). Hereby the relationship between what is associated with and what is perceived as "other" can be seen working on different levels. The choice of a more serious repertoire and an attempt to present it in a consciously foreignized way would refer to breaching the gap between "self" and "other," creating a sense of belonging with the other, "cultured" people. However, the interaction that happens between the text, the stage and the audiences shows the dichotomy between intention and perception.

At the same time the idea as to what constitutes the "self" comes clearly through from the criticism regarding Karl August Hermann's original Estonian play *Auction or a tale about the life of the destitute* (*Oksjon, ehk lugu vaese rahva elust*) (Rosenthal 1874): not everyone is fit to write or translate plays, you need skills and a natural talent since "here each page shows that the writer lacks skills in Estonian and writes like a German in his manner and thought." Here the critic's deplorable attitude towards the use of Germanised Estonian can be seen: where the local material is presented by means that are perceived as foreign or borrowed, the foreignization is considered in negative terms.

### 3.5. Conscious omission

Conscious omission concerns both leaving some levels of a work untranslated, but also rendering entire works or even genres improper or unsuitable for the target audience. In this respect also the choice of repertoire may be quite telling, for example the fact that no great classical tragedies were staged in the Wiera period. In a review, allegedly by Juhan Liiv<sup>3</sup> (1888), a number of texts are mentioned that would be pointless to present to the Estonians: *Hamlet*, *Faust*, *Don Juan*, *The Robbers*; instead "scenes of simple family life in a cottage would be suitable, maybe even translations that show the societal classes and their ways. That is it." Our analysis showed that as a strategy, omission is extremely widespread in early Estonian theatre translation. Under observation here are those cases where the omission can be seen to be performative: the aspirations, attitudes and opinions of the translator and theatre manifest itself through it. Such omissions may be motivated

---

3 This assumption, supported also by Põldmäe (1985, 48) seems plausible, since Juhan Liiv worked at the newspaper *Sakala* at the time.

by the lack of skills from the part of actors (see above anonymous 1888a), or else, the omissions can be justified by the expectations and estimated level of the target audience, in which case, typically, either entire parts of the play, characters and lines of activity are left out, or the more complicated levels of a play such as codes concerning versification, poetic structure, comical situations are consciously omitted (for the justifications for the prose translations of Shakespeare's plays see in anonymous 1888a, Õis 1888; on the translation of *Griseldis* into prose see Parv 1892). Sometimes, however, the criticism is directed towards the inability of the translator to use the omission strategy. For example, the translation of *A Hundred Roubles for the Trouble* (*Sada rubla vaevapalka*) was criticised because of the translator's inability to leave out a part or two or to redesign it in a more correct and truthful way (anonymous 1886).

#### 4. Conclusion

Theatre translation can be seen as an interaction between texts and audiences with a historical socio-cultural moment in time and space, where context determines both the choice of genre as well as translation strategy. As translation is a cultural practice and culture in turn is translational, mapping and analysing early theatre translations also allows us to get an insight into the state of cultural affairs at that particular moment in time, late 19<sup>th</sup> century in the present case. Early theatre translation is performative by nature: it creates genres, generates stage language, brings Estonian theatre into a dialogue with other European theatres, and takes an active role in establishing Estonian cultural identity. Such performativity manifests itself especially on the level of drama translation: the agency of the translator emerges quite clearly through translational manipulations and choices. The focus of our article is performativity in the context of "self" and "other" in the emerging Estonian-language theatrical culture of the end of 19<sup>th</sup> century. We have studied the interaction between what is considered to be own and what is seen as the "other" through the theatre translations: what are the principles of the translators for transposing and recoding the foreign in a local culture, whether and in what ways does the voice of the translator manifest itself and, through criticism, how did the audience receive the translational "other."

The operations observed include total domestication, familiarization, foreignization and omission, keeping in mind that more than one of these may be seen at work on the different levels at the same time. The most common of the strategies can be said to be familiarization, a strategy that to a great deal shapes the appearance of the theatre of the time. Whereas familiarization seems to meet the expecta-

tions of the audiences, foreignization, even if it is a rare occasion and concerns only certain codes, gets noticed and creates the most discussion.

It can be seen from the analysis that certain levels of drama translation are generally more susceptible to manipulation: these are first and foremost levels connected to the expression plane, such as the composition, form, and versification techniques, but also the cultural and social codes (realia, names, circumstances). However, manipulations can occur also on the level of the content plane: ideological and conceptual messages can become altered, sometimes even the plot.

The analysis supported the hypothesis that the voice of the translator is even more prominent during the period when drama as a genre is imported into the local language. It can become rather explicit at times, for instance when the translator incorporates social criticism into the text (e. g., see above the case of Hermann's translation of Iffland's *The Bachelors*). In this respect, in addition to entertainment a theatrical translation functions as a moral compass, it educates and acculturates, and does that very often by examining the concepts of "self" and "other."

To conclude with, all of the four ways of interacting with the "other" that are brought out in this paper occupy a certain place in the development of the cultural identity of Estonians, helping to understand not only the dynamics of cultural change, but also to conceive of the ways a young and budding culture gives meaning to and perceives its own "self." This is when theatre translation starts playing a so far underestimated role through which many a phenomenon of the time can become visible. Even though the foreign ways are seen as culturally superior and more sophisticated, a warning against the indiscriminate import of it is often voiced by the critics. The cultural "other" is at the same time something that enables one to identify and understand the "self," grow and become stronger, but on the other hand it can be perceived as dangerous and unwanted, something to be hidden away, omitted or rejected in the translations. Operating on the borderlines of "self" and "other," accommodating their own concepts to the rules of the theatre and genres, taking into consideration translation norms, social context, expectations of the audience and critics, the drama translator not only creates new culture that would serve as a basis for the original drama tradition, but also actively participates in the creation of the emerging young cultural identity in Estonia.

### **Acknowledgements**

Research for this paper was supported by base funding of the University of Tartu (grant nr PHVLC21924). We are grateful to Riina Oruaas, Elin Sütiste, Piret Lotman and the reviewers for the comments and suggestions.

---

## References

- Aaltonen, Sirkku. 2000. *Time-sharing on Stage: Drama Translation in Theatre and Society*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Anonymous. 1882. "Näitemäng." *Olevik*, October 26, 1882.
- Anonymous. 1885. "Uuemad sõnumed." *Olevik*, November 01, 1885.
- Anonymous. 1886. "Seltsielu. Löbustused. Kirjandus." *Olevik*, June 09, 1886.
- Anonymous. 1888a. "Näitemäng." *Postimees*, February 04, 1888.
- Anonymous. 1888b. "Küsimine eesti näitlejatele, iseäranis aga "Vanemuise" näitlejate seltsile." *Postimees*, November 01, 1888.
- Anonymous. 1888c. "Eestimaalt." *Virulane*, January 25, 1888.
- Anonymous. 1889a. "Seltsielu. Löbustused. Kirjandus." *Olevik*, July 31, 1889.
- Anonymous. 1889b. "Näitemäng." *Postimees*, October 10, 1889.
- Anonymous. 1889c. "Seltsielu. Löbustused. Kirjandus." *Olevik*, October 16, 1889.
- Anonymous. 1890. "Sõnumid Tartust." *Postimees*, May 17, 1890.
- Anonymous. 1892. "Eesti näitemängust ja näitlejatest." *Postimees*, October 24, 1892.
- Anonymous. 1894. "Kohalikud sõnumid." *Postimees*, August 08, 1894.
- Brodie, Geraldine. 2018. *The Translator on Stage*. New York: Bloomsbury.
- Carbonell i Cortés, Ovidi. 2003. "Semiotic alteration in translation. Othering, stereotyping and hybridization in contemporary translations from Arabic into Spanish and Catalan." *Linguistica Antverpiensia. New Series – Themes in Translation Studies* 2, 145–59. <https://doi.org/10.52034/lanstts.v2i.82>.
- Destouches (Néricault, Philippe). 1883. *Kolmewõrdsed pulmad: Naljamäng kahes waatuses*. Tartu: H. Laakmann.
- Fischer-Lichte, Erika. 2006. "Performatiivsuse esteetika poolt." *Akadeemia* 18 (11): 2457–72.
- . 2011. "Etenduse analüüsi probleeme." *Valitud artikleid teatriuurimisest*, compiled by Luule Epner, 59–100. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Hermann, Karl August. 1875. *Linnas ja maal. Lustimäng kolmes järgus*. Tartu: H. Laakmann.
- Hermans, Theo. 1996. *Translation's other. An Inaugural Lecture delivered at University College London on Tuesday 19 March 1996*. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/1668908.pdf>.
- Iffland, August Wilhelm von. 1793. *Die Hagestoltzen. Ein Lustspiel in 5 Aufzügen*. Leipzig: Georg Joachim Göschen.
- . 1875. *Linnas ja maal: Lustimäng kolmes järgus*. Tartu: H. Laakmann.
- Jannsen, Johann Voldemar. 1993. *Näidendid*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Jansen, Ea. 2007. *Eestlane muutub ajas. Seisusühiskonnast kodanikuühiskonda*. Tartu: Eesti Ajalooarhiiv.
- Järv, Jaan. 1886. "Veel Eesti näitemängust." *Virulane*, February 04, 1886.
- Kask, Karin. 1970. *Teatritegijad, alustajad*. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat.

- Kirepe, Lilian, toim. 1974. *Kui päikest sõelaga tehti ehk kuidas "Vanemuises" möödunud aastal rahva rõõmuks ja kasuks näitemängu mängiti*. Tallinn: Teatri- ja muusikamuuseum.
- Kitzberg, August. 1956. "Punga Mardi" etendamise puhul "Vanemuises". In *Valitud teosed II*, 477–82. Tallinn: Eesti Riiklik Kirjastus.
- Koidula, Lydia. 1870. *Saaremaa Onupoeg: Eestikeele näitemäng*. Tartu: [W. Gläser].
- Kotzebue, August von. 1836. *Wirrwarr oder der Muthwillige. Eine Posse in Fünf Akten*. Leipzig: Eduard Kummer.
- . 1878. *Wirrwarr: Lustmäng wiies järkus / Saksa keelest Kotzebue järel ümber teinud A. Kitzberg*. Jurjev: Schnakenburg.
- Kreutzwald, Friedrich Reinhold. 1871. *Tuletorn. Üks kurblik näitemäng, kahes vaatuses*. Tartu: W. Gläser.
- Kärner, Jaan. 1922. *Eesti teatri ajalugu I*. Tallinn: T. Mutsu.
- [Liiv, Juhan?] 1888. "Eesti näitemäng." *Sakala*, June 23, 1888.
- Lange, Anne. 2015. *Tõlkimine omas ajas. Kolm juhtumiuuringut eesti tõkelooost*. Tallinn: TLÜ Kirjastus.
- Mits, Krista. 2012. "Pilg ingliskeelse kirjanduse tõlgetele 18. sajandi lõpust 20. sajandi algusveerandini." *Methis* 9/10. Tõkeloo erinumber, edited by Anne Lange, Daniele Monticelli, 70–87. <https://doi.org/10.7592/methis.v7i9/10.569>.
- Muneroni, Stefano. 2012. "Culture in text and performance: The translation and dramaturgy of Osvaldo Dragún's Tres historias para ser contadas." In *Translation Studies* 5 (3): 296–311. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14781700.2012.701940>.
- Parv, Jaan. 1892. "'Griseldise' kohta seletuseks." *Postimees*, December 07, 1892.
- Palamets, Hillar. 2006. *Kümme vakka teatrisoola*. Tallinn: Kirjastus Ilo.
- Plath, Ulrike. 2008. "'Euroopa viimased metslased': eestlased saksa koloniaaldiskursis 1770–1870." In *Rahvuskultuur ja tema teised*, edited by Rein Undusk, 37–64. Tallinn: Underi ja Tuglase Kirjanduskeskus.
- Pöldmäe, Rudolf. 1978. *"Vanemuise" selts ja teater 1865–1880. Eesti teatriloovihikud*. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat.
- . 1985. *"Vanemuise" teater 1881–1906. Eesti teatriloovihikud*. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat.
- Robinson, Douglas. 2002. *Performative Linguistics. Speaking and Translating as Doing Things with Words*. London: Routledge.
- Rosenthal, Heinrich. 1874. "Jälle kaks Eestikeele näitemängu." *Eesti Postimees*, September 18, 1874.
- . 1897. "Kirjandusest." *Postimees*, May 13, 1897.
- . 1912. *Kulturbestrebungen des estnischen Volkes während eines Menschenalters (1869–1900)*. Reval: Cordes & Schenk.
- Rossel, Sven Hakon, ed. 1994. *Ludvig Holberg: a European Writer. A Study in Influence and Reception*. Amsterdam: Atlanta.
- Saal, Andres. 1892. "Eesti näitemäng." *Olevik*, May 11, 1892.
- Saro, Anneli. 2006. "Influence of the Nation State on Estonian Theatre." *Art History & Criticism* 2: 59–64.

KATILIINA GIELEN, MARIA-KRISTIINA LOTMAN

- . 2020. "Becoming Estonian, European, Western and Nordic in Estonian Theatre and Theatre Historiography." In *From Local to Global: Interrogating Performance Histories*, 37–42. Stockholm: The Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, Stockholm University.
- Saro, Anneli, and Kristel Pappel. 2008. "Eesti teater: oma ja võõras." In *Rahvuskultuur ja tema teised*, edited by Rein Undusk, 125–38. Tallinn: Underi ja Tuglase Kirjanduskeskus.
- Sofo, Giuseppe. 2016. "The Voice(s) of The Tempest(s) – Listening to the Translator's Voice on Stage." *Palimpsestes* 29. <https://journals.openedition.org/palimpsestes/2311>. <https://doi.org/10.4000/palimpsestes.2311>.
- Suits, Gustav. 1927. "'Permi Jago unnenäggu" a. 1824. Kadunud ja jälleleitud käsikiri." *Eesti Kirjandus* 21 (8): 417–32.
- Torop, Peeter. 2008. "Translation as communication and auto-communication." *Sign Systems Studies*, 36.2 (2): 375–97. <https://doi.org/10.12697/sss.2008.36.2.06>.
- . 2011. *Tõlge ja kultuur*. Tallinn, Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Treffner, Hugo. 1890. "Lühikene kuukroonika." *Oma maa* 2, 146.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *Translator's Invisibility*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Vilde, Eduard. 1886. "Eesti näitemäng ja tema tulevik." *Virulane*, January 21, 1886.
- . 1893. "Tallinna vaheleib." *Postimees*, September 04, 1893.
- . 1896. "Kohalikud sõnumid." *Postimees*, February 05, 1896.
- Zanotti, Serenella. 2009. "The translator and the author: two of a kind?" In *Perspectives on Literary Translation Proceedings of the International Conference, Università per Stranieri of Siena*, May 28–29, 2009. Siena: LIT Verlag.
- Õis, Gustav. 1888. "Keel ja kirjandus. Venedigu linna kaupmees." *Postimees*, April 29, 1888.

---

**Katiliina Gielen** – PhD in Estonian translation history, is a Lecturer in English Language and Translation Studies at the Department of English Studies, University of Tartu. Her main fields of research include literary translation history and theory, comparative literature and gender studies.

e-mail: [katiliina.gielen\[at\]ut.ee](mailto:katiliina.gielen[at]ut.ee)

**Maria-Kristiina Lotman** – PhD, Associate Professor at the University of Tartu. Her research interests are ancient verse, its metre, rhythm and versification systems; typological analysis of quantitative verse; semantics of verse; translation of poly-coded structures.

e-mail: [maria.lotman\[at\]ut.ee](mailto:maria.lotman[at]ut.ee)

## **Performatiivsusest ja tajust varases eesti teatritõlkes**

*Katiliina Gielen, Maria-Kristiina Lotman*

**Võtmesõnad:** teatritõlge, draamatõlge, performatiivne tõlge, oma ja võõras

Artikkel on pühendatud Eesti teatritõlke loo varaseimale järgule 19. sajandi teisel poolel, kui eestikeelne professionaalne teater tegi siinmail oma esimesi samme. Tähelepanu all on eelkõige nn Wiera teater, millest kasvas hiljem välja üks Eesti mõjukamaid kultuurinähtusi, riigi ainus kolmeliigiteater Vanemuine. Uurimismaterjali moodustavad nii selle repertuaari kuulunud tõkelavastused kui ka nende retseptisioon. Artiklis kaardistatakse ja analüüsitakse selle aja teatritõlget „oma“ ja „võõra“ suhete kaudu, uurides nende vastassuhet performatiivsest aspektist lähtudes: kuidas tuleb teatritekstides esile tõlkija hääl ja milliste strateegiatega on võõrast omakultuuri transponeeritud ja rekodeeritud.

„Oma“ ja „võõra“ suhe on Eesti varase teatritõlkeloo üks kesksemaid küsimusi, mis tõuseb esile kõige erinevatel tasanditel. Seda võib näha repertuaaripoliitika vaidlustes, teatripoleemikas, arvustustes ja ülevaadetes, kuid ka tõlkevalikutes. Need mõisted ei ole neutraalsed ja seostuvad erinevate hoiakutega: nõnda nagu omaks peetavate struktuuride puhul, on ka võõrasust sellist, mida taunitakse ja soovitatakse vältida, ja ka sellist, mida tunnustatakse, kiidetakse ja imetletakse. Nii selle aja teatritegijad kui ka kriitikud teadvustasid endale teatri kultuurilist ja ühiskondlikku mõju ning teatrit oodati publiku õpetamist ja kasvatamist, kuid lisaks sellele ka laiemat panust kultuuri rikastamisse ja väärimdamisse. Selle kõrval oli tähtis ka teatri meelelahutuslik funktsioon: nii repertuaarivalikuid kui ka tekstimanipulatsioone põhjendati sageli vajadusega pakkuda publikule lõbusat ajaviidet. „Oma“ materjali ja selle loomise praktika puudumisel mängiski sellel varasel etapil tähtsat rolli just tõlkedraama.

Materjali täpsemaks analüüsiks on uurimuses eristatud nelja mehhanismi, mis kirjeldavad „võõra“ ülekandmist omakultuuri: 1) täielik kodustamine, mille puhul lähtetekst assimileeritakse sihtkultuuri; 2) osaline kodustamine, mille puhul jääb sihtteksti tajutat võõrasus, ent seda on siiski publikule lähemale toodud ja mugandatud; 3) võõrapärastamine, mis tähistab „võõra“ markeeritud eristamist „omast“ ning 4) „võõra“ sihilik väljajätt, kui võõrast peetakse liiga kaugeks, et seda kodupublikule esitada. Et aga teatritõlge on keeruline polükodeeritud struktuur, on analüüsis silmas peetud, et enamgi kui teistes kirjanduse põhiliikides opereerib tõlkija korraka eri mehhanismidega ning võib osa elemente ja koode üle kanda kodustades, teised aga võõrapärastades. Sealjuures on publik ja kriitikud vahel isegi kõige võõramaid struktuure ja elemente vastu võtnud algupärase ja omana, s.t „võõras“ ja „oma“ kujunevad eri agentide koosmõjul, kusjuures tähtsat rolli mängivad siin nii performatiivsus kui ka taju.

Artiklis näidatakse, et kõigil neljal analüüsitud mehhanismil on eesti varases teatritõlkepraktikas oma koht, kuid neist levinuim on osaline kodustamine, mis kujundab suurel määral selle aja teatri näo ja näib vastavat ka publiku ootustele. Teisalt jääb mõnikord just võõrapärastav kõige rohkem eristuma ja kõneainet pakkuma, isegi kui tegu on haruldase ja erandliku sündmusega. Tõlgete eri tasandite analüüsist tulevad esile küllaltki märkimisväärsed erinevused tõlkemanipulatsioonide määras: kõige vabamalt käsitletakse väljendusplaaniga seotud tasandeid, nagu näiteks kompositsiooni, vormi ja värsitehnikaid, ent teisalt ka kultuurilisi ja sotsiaalseid koode (reaale, nimesid, olusid). Manipulatsioone leidub siiski ka sisutasandil: muutuda võivad ideoloogilised ja kontseptuaalsed sõnumid, vahel koguni süžee. Peale lisanduste kohtame sageli ka väljajätte ning needki võivad teatud mõttes olla performatiivsed: selle strateegia kaudu tulevad

## S U M M A R Y

samuti esile tõlkija ja teatri taotlused, hoiakud ja hinnangud. Väljajätud võivad olla ühelt poolt motiveeritud näitlejate puudulikest oskustest, teisalt aga võidakse neid põhjendada sihtpubliku ootuste ja eeldatava tasemega – tüüpiliselt on siis jäetud välja keerulisemaid värsitehnilisi koode, lihtsustatud kompositsiooni ja poeetilist struktuuri ning vähendatud algupärandi koomikat.

Üks artikli hüpoteese on, et eesti varases draamatõlkes on tõlkija hääle eriti selgelt väljendunud: asjaolule, et tegu on juba ajalooliselt vabama tõlkežanriga, lisanduvad ka ajastuomaset vabad tõlkenormid, sh väljajäetude, lisanduste, muganduste ja kompilatsioonide aktsepteerimine, mis lubasid tõlkijatel tekstidega üsna meelevaldselt ümber käia ja neid enda eesmärkidele vastavalt ümber kirjutada. Nii pole tõlkija mitte üksnes vahendaja ja looja, vaid osaleb multiagentses teatripraktikas samuti ühe agendina, kes võib olulisel määral lavastust mõjutada. Originaaltekstide ja tõlgete võrdlev analüüs toetas püstitatud hüpoteesi: ilmnes, et mõnikord on tõlkija hääle eksplitsiitne – nt kui tõlkija oma ühiskonnakriitikat või õpetussõnu näidendisse sisse põimib – vahel üksnes aimatav väikeste muudatuste kaudu, kuid siiski alati tajutav.

Eesti varase draamatõlke performatiivsus avaldubki esmalt tõlkevalikute tasandil: tõlkija agentsus tuleb tõlkemanipulatsioonide kaudu üsna selgelt esile. Ent veel olulisem on, et draamatõlget võib vaadelda ka kui tekstide ja publiku vahelist interaktsiooni oma sotsiokultuurilises kontekstis. Nii on varane teatri-tõlge performatiivne ka oma laiemas kultuurilises mõjus: see loob žanre, genereerib eesti teatri lavakeelt, suhestab eesti teatrit muu Euroopa teatriga, osaleb aktiivselt eestlaste kultuurilise identiteedi kujundamisel. Selle analüüs aitab mõista nii kultuuriarengu dünaamikat kui ka seda, kuidas noor arenev kultuur ennast tajub ja mõtestab suhtluses võõraga. Just siin on ka draamatõlkel oluline ja seni ehk liiga vähe tähelepanu pälvinud roll ning mitmedki oma ajastu fenomenid tulevad selles eriti hästi esile. Võõrast peetakse küll sageli kultuuriliselt kõrgemaks ja arenenumaks, kuid teisalt hoiatatakse sageli ka võõralt põllult valimatu noppimise eest. Võõras on ühtaegu midagi, mis aitab ennast paremini mõista ja identifitseerida, kasvada ja tugevamaks saada, ent samas võib selles olla ka midagi, mida tajutakse ohtliku ja soovimatuna, nii et seda tuleks tõlgetes peita või koguni täielikult kõrvale heita.

**Katiliina Gielen** – PhD (eesti tõlkelugu), Tartu ülikooli inglise keele ja tõlketeaduse lektor. Peamised uurimisvaldkonnad hõlmavad ilukirjanduslikku tõlget, selle ajalugu ja teooriat, võrdlevat kirjandusteadust ja soouuringuid.

e-post: katiliina.gielen[at]ut.ee

**Maria-Kristiina Lotman** – PhD, Tartu Ülikooli dotsent. Tema peamised uurimishuvid on antiikvärss, selle meetrum, rütm ja värsisüsteemid; kvantiteeriva värsi tüpoloogiline analüüs; värsisemantika; polükodeeritud struktuuride tõlge.

e-post: maria.lotman[at]ut.ee