

# Translation Policy of the 1950-60s in Georgia and its Influence on Translation of Ernest Hemingway's Fiction

Eter Churadze  
Tbilisi State University  
E-mail: [etosvireli@gmail.com](mailto:etosvireli@gmail.com)

## Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to illustrate how political ideology influenced the process of translating Ernest Hemingway's fiction in Georgia in the 1960s. The translation process of Hemingway's works in Georgia coincides with hegemony of the mainstream translation policy that stresses the supremacy of Soviet readers' worldview, aesthetic values and literary taste. The paper states that the general political ideology had a great impact on the main translation principles in Georgia that resulted also in modifications of literary translations. It means that ideology shaped the translation policy that the Georgian translators of Hemingway mostly accepted. This paper argues that the Georgian translations of Hemingway's works can be described as "realistic" having the features typical of translations performed in the middle of the 20th century.

**Keywords:** translation policy; realistic translation; Georgian translation; Hemingway

## 1 Introduction

As part of controlled professional authorship, the translation process was governed and directed by political ideology in the Soviet Union. This activity formed a new translation policy outlining thematic and aesthetic preferences for literary translation and requirements for a foreign text to be translated. The method under which any translation procedure was carried out was coined as "realistic". It was first formulated by Russians Chukovskii and Kashkin and later developed by Georgian Gachechiladze (Azov, 2013). The method was the source of pivotal translation policy in the Soviet Union as well as in Georgia. The policy stipulated that any source text translated into a target language had to conform to Soviet culture. Target texts had to be free from semantic calques, non-standard language forms and syntactic constructions. The translated text had to be adjusted to the mindset of the target audience in terms of adequate aesthetic values and political orientation.

Georgia, a country with authentic cultural traditions and a rich literary heritage, has a long history of literary translation that roots back to the Georgian translations from Persian of *Vis o Rāmin* and the *Shahnameh* in the Middle Ages (Gachechiladze, 1959). Literary translation was especially productive in the 19<sup>th</sup> century which gave to Georgia the Ivane Machabeli translations of Shakespeare, recognised as classic works of art. In the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the Soviet occupation of Georgia shaped cultural dependence of the country on the ruling cultural policy, which was in line with the political ideology. The cultural policy, intertwined with the language policy, enabled Russian to become the predominant language in the republics of the Soviet Union including Georgia and to play a crucial role in the formation of a uniform Soviet culture, confronting the sense of national identity. Despite

the process of cultural assimilation that had a harmful effect and the status of Russian, Georgia still enjoyed considerable cultural autonomy manifested in the unique Georgian art including literature and translation. The translation policy closely “related to the ideology, including language policy and hegemony” (Munday, 2008, p.12) and the cultural dependency, was not able to curb deep-rooted cultural traditions and entrenched values. This resulted in a large number of new works of national Georgian literature and literary translations. Literary translation, being partly the domain of free artistic expression and partly the sphere where the imposed aesthetic canon was important, greatly proliferated during Soviet times.

When it comes to translation methods and strategies in the 1950-60s in Georgia, it is significant to reflect on their forms and representations in respect of the acceptability of a particular author in the target Georgian readership and the place of the translated text in the Georgian literary system. As Toury (1995, cited in Munday, 2008, p.112) points out, “translation policy refers to factors determining the selection of texts for translation in a specific language, culture or time.” The dominant poetics mixed with the ideology and power govern the reception and acceptability of a literary text in any society (Lefevere 1992a, cited in Munday, 2008). The acceptance of Hemingway’s fiction in the Georgian culture and his acknowledgement as one of the most influential writers of the time in Georgia can be explained by the fact that Hemingway’s worldview and poetics did not contradict the Soviet political ideology and aesthetic principles of the 1950-1960s. However, through the influence of the literary taste and the ideology of the ruling regime, the translators produced texts that were fully compatible with the mainstream culture using various translation techniques, including modifications, additions and elisions. Consequently, Hemingway’s simple and neutral language was modified in certain respects. It means that, as Lefevere claimed when observing the interaction between ideology, poetics and translation, the ideology of the time and dominant poetics in the translation language culture dictated the translation strategy (Lefevere 1992a, cited in Munday, 2008). Thus, the popularity and modifications of Georgian translations of Hemingway can be explained with respect to the translation policy. As a result, Georgian translations were often heavily domesticated, interfering with the American author’s stylistic and semantic features.

The theoretical framework of the paper is drawn from Even-Zohar’s polysystem theory. As Even-Zohar (1978, cited in Munday, 2008, p.108) remarks, translated literature “may occupy a primary or a secondary position in the polysystem.” Thus, in the stratified polysystem, literature translated into Georgian can either represent a central system within the literary polysystem, new foreign models assuming primacy, or represent a peripheral system, “conforming to the literary norms of the target system” (Munday, 2008, p.109). The paper also studies a description of Georgian translations of two Hemingway short stories according to the methodology proposed by Toury that illustrates well the conformity to the target Georgian literary system. Toury incorporates a description of the translated text and the role of the sociocultural system in the three-phase methodology for descriptive translation studies. The methodology employed in the paper encompasses the following: to place the text within the target culture system, looking at its acceptability and/or significance; to compare the source and target texts for shifts, describing relationships between the source text and target text segments; and to make generalizations, reconstructing the process of translation for the source text and target text pairs (Toury 1995, cited in Munday, 2008).

## 2 Realistic Method of Translation

Hemingway's main novels and short stories, translated and published in the 1960s on the initiative of Vakhtang Chelidze, a highly productive and influential Georgian translator, reflect the key ideological and aesthetic principles relevant to the epoch in Georgia. The four-volume Hemingway edition in Georgian of 1965 followed the publication of Russian translations of Hemingway's major works chronologically as well as ideologically. The Russian translator Ivan Kashkin and his group through translating Hemingway not only determined the translation principles of Hemingway's fiction but also formulated the main trend of the Soviet translation school. The Georgian theoretical contribution to the Soviet translation school and to its ideological doctrine (namely, Gachechiladze's scholarly contribution) conditioned also the methods and principles of translating Hemingway into Georgian. According to this common trend, the translator working on a literary piece should translate "the spirit and not the letter of the text" (Burak, 2013, p.53). Without losing individual and stylistic characteristics, also historical and national specificities of foreign writers, target texts sound as if translators originally wrote them in the target language. The idea proposed by Kashkin is an "ontological paradox": the ontological paradox leads to "an imaginary abolishment of the need for translation" (Witt, 2016, p.57). However, the principles of the art of literary translation established by the "Soviet school of translation" elaborated the translation strategy that paved the way to the fledging Soviet translation policy.

Korney Chukovskii in his book *High Art (Высокое Искусство)*, published under a different title as a brochure as early as in 1919, initially shaped the principles according to which any literary work had to be translated into the Russian language. However, Givi Gachechiladze (1959, pp.101-102), a famous Georgian translator, reputable translation theorist and poet, pointed out that Chukovskii's book,

...despite its merits conveying translation lapses and mistakes in detail and depicting general and specific issues, did not give a unified and orderly conception of the art of translation. Although the scholarship did not stipulate the features of the literary translation method, yet it helped to ascertain the method with its rich material.<sup>1</sup>

The "realistic method" of translation first put forward by Kashkin, based on Chukovskii's views, was a solid ground for shaping "the key principles of the Soviet school of translation" (Burak, 2013, p.53) as a concept that implied a multilayered process. This process "entailed elisions and rewritings in order to adapt the foreign material to an 'ideal' Soviet reader" (Witt, 2016, p.57). A source text that could be far away from the Soviet taste and beliefs in many respects had to be reshaped and reconfigured through language aligning a target text to the Soviet readers' values. As the Soviet translation tradition was inextricably interwoven with political ideology, the deviation from the path already was perceived as a resistance to the political party and the regime. Kashkin, being a practicing translator rather than a theorist, dedicated most of his articles to the formation of the "Soviet school of translation" and its method. In addition, he strongly resisted different views existing in translation theory in the Union (Azov, 2013). Kashkin believed that literature-oriented translation, i.e. realistic translation, as he himself called it, was the only correct and ideologically sound direction. This

---

<sup>1</sup> Hereinafter my translation of Gachechiladze from Georgian.

direction was born as an analogue to the main Soviet method of literature called socialist realism, “the final stage of realism expressed in its highest form” (Gachechiladze, 1959, p.173). This method contradicted the “linguistic theory of translation” first formulated by Andrey Fedorov (1953) and the supporters of the method of “literal translation” (viz., literalism or *bukvalism*, as it was labelled by the rivals) propagated by several Russian translators, the “vice” of which was first discussed in Chukovskii’s *High Art* (Gal, 2001, p.30). The “vice” to Nora Gal (2001), a Russian literary critic and translator supporting the purity of the Russian language, meant loan-translations, words of foreign origin, and transposition of syntactic structures without any change.

Russian researcher and critic Azov (2013) assumes that political ideology on the supremacy of the Soviet order made an orientation to Soviet readers more natural rather than to foreign authors. The circumstances were rewording for the creation of realistic theory of translation and less beneficial for the adherents of literal translation or *bukvalism*. As Azov (2013) points out, this situation originated from the fact that faithful reincarnation of the source text contradicted the established language norms and the official ideology in the USSR. Kashkin and his team, the opponents of literal translation and linguistic theory, were zealously trying to damage reputation of rivals and other theories. This antagonistic approach was especially conspicuous with the community of “literal translators”, such as Evgenii Lann and Georgii Shengeli (Kashkin, 1951). They took account of the aspects of “literalism” in terms of word-for-word translation maintaining syntactic structures of the source text in translation. Apart from it, Lann believed that literal translation excluded translator’s co-authorship, elucidation of the text, additions and omissions in translation that were possible in realistic translation (Azov, 2013). For Lann, the main “goal of a translator was to give the reader an idea of the author’s ‘style’,” and in this endeavour precision played a major role (Witt, 2016, p.55). The basic hypothesis of the “bukvalists” (the advocates of *bukvalism*) is the impossibility to simply transfer grammatical constructions from one language into another. Nevertheless, it is possible to translate stylistic constructions. Hence, the style of the original can be easily reconstructed and stylistic features reflected (Azov, 2013). This translation restores idiomatic expressions and even syntactic structures of the source language. The realist translators viewed the bukvalists as supporters of literalism and linguistic foreignness (Kashkin, 1951) and their translations as unpatriotic (Witt, 2016). In contrast, in realistic translation the style of the original was not important, while preference was given to a reality, that is, to an author’s feelings and thoughts conveyed in the source text (Azov, 2013), that is, the most fundamental “elements that made the author and his work significant and topical” (Witt, 2016, p.56). Thus, the reader of a certain translation should have had an impression that a literary work was original but not translation.

Notwithstanding clearly different world outlooks, Gachechiladze (1959) deemed Fedorov’s work on linguistic theory of translation an important phenomenon in the field of translation theory. Fedorov (1953) believes that, when scrutinizing translation, it is necessary to examine the language used by translators, their analysis and evaluation. He remarks that the content of the original does not exist separately from the form; the content exists in unity with the form and in connection with linguistic units through which the form is materialised. In spite of the fact that Fedorov (1953, p.14) acknowledges proximity of translation theory and literary studies, he considers “translation theory

first and foremost to be a linguistic discipline.”<sup>2</sup> He investigates the ways of choosing language units in translation and characteristics of various functional styles. The Russian linguist puts forward a classification of correspondence on lexical, grammatical and stylistic levels incorporating all relevant and necessary prerequisites of the translation process (Fedorov, 1953). In general, the supporters of the linguistic theory of translation pay attention to general linguistic issues, interlingual transformations and lexicological problems. They recognise that the subject of the linguistic theory of translation is the modelling of translation process, the scientific description of interlingual transformation, i.e. rendering of a text into another equivalent text (Barkhudarov, 1975).

Kashkin’s circle, starting its activity in as early as in the 1930s, turned out to be more powerful and inherently determined the translation practice and policy of the following decades. Kashkin and his circle’s critical essays and appeals made it clear that this community was supporting the possibility of translation during which translations were tailored to the elite’s interests and adhered to the ideological demands. The translated texts had to correspond to the original yet avoid details of foreign texts. As Kashkin put it, a translation had to be precise, but the precision was not mechanical photography; it had to be done in a creative and truthful manner (Witt, 2016). Only such translations, “rendered in forms accessible to the Soviet readers” (Witt, 2016, p.56), could be acceptable and appropriate for them from the political point of view as well as from the perspective of social values. One of the best examples of this ideological translation was the Russian version of Hemingway’s novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. The novel underwent many censorial interventions, changes and alterations due to “the picture of the war presented, as well as the references to real people... perversion of facts related to the Spanish war” that seemed ambivalent, controversial, and negative for the Soviet political ideology (Kuznetsova, 2017, p.160). In terms of Venuti’s domestication/foreignization dichotomy, in its handling of the foreign text the method of realistic translation is domesticating and “conforms to values currently dominating target-language culture,” appropriating the foreign text to domestic cultural situations (Venuti, 2001, p.240). As for “literal translation”, it can be described as foreignizing, “motivated by an impulse to preserve linguistic and cultural difference by deviating from prevailing domestic values,” sending the reader abroad (Venuti, 2001, p.240). In other words, if we use Toury’s terms, the former type of translation will pass as adequate (to the source text) and the letter as appropriate (to the circumstances of reception) (Toury 1995, cited in Pym, 2007).

A more refined and advanced form of realistic translation was elaborated by Gachechiladze in 1959 in his seminal study *The Issues of Literary Translation: Problem of Realistic Translation* published in Georgian. As Gachechiladze (1959) states, word-for-word translation loses an aesthetic value, whereas free translation loses the unity of content and form. Realistic translation represents essential, typical and characteristic features, typical environment and national specificity, the unity of form and content of the original. Over the course of translating fictional prose, realistic description of the essence, intonation and rhythm of the original expressed in a syntactic form must be intertwined with its style, emotional and aesthetic impression. Generally, literature theorists see the process of translating and literary translation from the perspective of ideological, historical, extralinguistic

---

<sup>2</sup> My translation from Russian.

factors and literary traditions. Gachechiladze (1959) remarks that the denigration of literary translation to only linguistic units is a disdain of aesthetic part of translation. That is why translation has to be an adequate repetition of the aesthetics of the original.

It is obvious that in the USSR as well as in the republic of Georgia, where the main artistic method was socialist realism perfectly fitting in with the Soviet ideology and being in harmony with its policy, the “realistic method” of translation was accepted as the key method. As it turned out, this method was a leading practice also in translating Hemingway in the USSR. This fact was partly conditioned by Kashkin’s translations, being the first to translate Hemingway’s works in the Soviet Union. It is predictable that the realistic method would be employed later in most of the translations of Hemingway in Georgia. Accordingly, the basic theoretical framework for literary translation and literary taste dictated by the political rule, eminently influenced Georgian translations of Hemingway’s fiction in the 1950s and 1960s.

### **3 Hemingway in Georgian: Results of the Translation Policy**

Russian Kashkin and Georgian Gachechiladze’s attitudes towards literary translation laid the foundations of translation activity in Georgia at the time. It is evident that the Georgian translations of Hemingway could not be devoid of the standpoint the theoretical basis of which turned out to be realistic method of translation. Therefore, the translations are adjusted according to the main method. Burak (2013) argues that the Russian translators of Hemingway strived to enhance the stylistics and portraits of fictional worlds of the translations. The translators, although using “the traditional Russian ‘Aesopian language,’” highlighted “the cultural ‘other’” in Russian (Burak, 2013, pp.59-60). However, Burak does not estimate the clear reasons for changing linguistic terseness and ambiguity of Hemingway’s texts in Russian translations. We can explain the result of the translation method employed by the Russian translators from the perspective of the ideological intention. This ideological belief has given rise to the translations that enhanced the “vices” of the capitalistic world and emphasised human fate and personal tragedies in this “decadent” society. The poignancy of feelings and enlivened actions not only in Russian but also in Georgian translations should have been motivated by the stance calling for combat against “hostile” and “unvirtuous” social and cultural values prevalent in the United States of America and in the West in general.

Socialist aesthetics opposed modernism with a realistic mode of writing. As socialist realism was regarded as an authorised literary direction, the recognition of Hemingway as a realist author once again underlined the approval of his acceptance and integration in the Soviet reality. Prizel (1972) points out that the Soviet literary criticism set Hemingway apart from his contemporary Western writers such as Proust, Joyce, Kafka and Camus, in order to show that he was a better author than others, mostly because he was more realistic. Even in 1936 the Union of Soviet Writers, showing much interest in Ernest Hemingway’s work, sent his biography to the Central Committee, saying that it was “possible and necessary to win Hemingway over to the Soviet side” (Kuznetsova, 2017, p.160). Choosing Hemingway’s text for translation in the 1960s in Georgia was mostly determined by political ideology that governed the translation activities as well calling Hemingway “a writer with a universal voice” (Parker, 1964, p.500). Russian and Georgian left-wing political faith and convictions

well accommodated Hemingway's egalitarianism and simplicity. For this reason, the Soviet and the Georgian readers as well immediately fell in love with Hemingway's literary style and taste. Hemingway's equality, masculine values, antifascist, pacifist, proletarian, antimilitarist, and humanistic worldview met the political and cultural agenda of the nations and became an ideological cornerstone of the battle-seasoned country.

Together with Hemingway's ideology, the artistic side of his works was also attractive for Soviet critics (Prizel, 1972). This fact was especially tangible in the 1960s. The aesthetics of Hemingway's fiction was one of the main preoccupations of his critics in the Soviet Union, "as opposed to the political considerations of the late fifties" (Prizel, 1972, p.456). Hemingway's glorification in the Soviet republics coincides with the 1960s. None of other American writers was awarded with such appreciation in the USSR. This great interest to the American author can be explained by the fact that the Soviet readers received a Russian version of Hemingway's art that matched the mindset of the Soviet "lost generation" of the 1960s and 1970s. The generation was already "disillusioned with the remnants of Bolshevik values and the idea of socialism with human face" (Burak, 2013, p.68). For that, the new generation chose neither Kafka nor Proust, but it chose to read plain-spoken Hemingway (Burak, 2013). Apparently, Hemingway was equally acceptable for the political censorship and for an ordinary reader. Their liking and preferences for Hemingway were nurtured by absolutely different reasons and yet they concurred. Here we can trace Hemingway's universality that perfectly fit aesthetic and ideological views of the epoch. Consequently, literary world of the twentieth century faced Hemingway's new literary style. It is not surprising that many writers of the century were greatly influenced by his art. Hemingway's technique affected the style of many writers with its simplicity, objectivity and purity even in Georgia. Alkhazishvili (2009) writes that Georgian translations of Hemingway's works virtually changed Georgian fiction in general; they had a great influence on Georgian poetry and prose. The American author's impact on the Georgian literature can be traced in the literary aesthetics of young Georgian writers of the mid-twentieth century, including Guram Rcheulishvili who with his realistic documentary style and refined and compressed dialogues became one the most popular Georgian writers of his time.

According to Lefevere, in the literary system translation functions are controlled by three main factors: 1) professionals within the literary system, 2) patronage (the powers) outside the literary system, 3) the dominant poetics (Lefevere 1992a, cited in Munday, 2008). With regard to Lefevere's viewpoint, the professionals and powers within and outside the Georgian literary system, and the dominant aesthetics prepared the ground for Georgian translations of the Hemingway fiction. The three factors in play were: 1) the Russian and Georgian translation theorists of the 1950s elaborating the distinct translation policy and the qualified translators of Hemingway taking into account the ideological components and conventions of social realism, 2) the powerful political class dictating the literary translation strategy and regulating the distribution and acceptance of translations in the Union, and finally, 3) the existing lingua-cultural traditions expressed in exuberance, extremely metaphorical and loaded language. The metaphorical and loaded Georgian language employed in the translations of Hemingway can be explained by distinct literary conventions in Georgia. The modern Georgian literary language owes much to *The Knight in the Panther's Skin* (*Vepkhist'q'aosani* in Georgian), a twelfth-century Georgian epic masterpiece, written by Shota Rustaveli. The language of the epic

poem is very imposing, full of expressive means and aphorisms. The book has had immense cultural implications in Georgia incorporating philosophical thoughts, poetic art, humanist values, ideals and human virtues. The impact has been so powerful that it has shaped not only the cultural values of the nation but also the mode of the figurative and imposing style of the Georgian secular literature of the following centuries.

Hemingway's fiction translated into Georgian is closely in line with the target Georgian language and culture, aesthetic principles and literary taste. The style and colour of the original are altered, elevated and deprived of simplicity. The Georgian translations of Hemingway bear resemblance to the Russian translations, yet they are in a way different from the Russian texts. A comparative linguistic analysis proves that the Russian translations are not employed as intermediate texts by the Georgian translators as some of the literary translators of the twentieth century in Georgia used to do. However, the Georgian translations are stylistically marked, idiomatic and more vivid texts than the originals and even Russian translations. The emotionally charged Georgian translations can be exemplified by a number of passages from the translations of two Hemingway short stories ("A Clean, Well-Lighted Place" and "Old Man at the Bridge") accompanied by back-translations from English to Georgian and Russian. The compared English, Georgian and Russian paragraphs illustrate the degree of differences between the styles of the three texts:

### *A Clean, Well-Lighted Place*

---

The old man was a little drunk. (Hemingway, 2003:288)

Georgian: ბერიკაცი ცოტათი შეჭიკჭიკებულოდ. (Hemingway, 1965:156)

Back-translation: The old man became slightly tight.

Literal back-translation: The old man sang melodiously.

Russian: Старик подвыпил. (Hemingway, 1987:302)

Back-translation: The old man had a couple.

---

He has plenty of money. (Hemingway, 2003:288)

Georgian: ფული ჩეხქვითა აქვს. (Hemingway, 1965:156)

Back-translation: He has money to burn/pots of money.

Russian: У него уйма денег. (Hemingway, 1987:302)

Back-translation: He has lots of money.

Who cut him down?

His niece.

Why did they do it?

Fear for his soul. (Hemingway, 2003:289)

Georgian:

რა ხელი ექავებოდა?

სული არ წაუწყდესო, შეეშინდა. (Hemingway, 1965:157)

Back-translation:

Why was she itching to do it? (Why did she fight for him?)

She was afraid that he would lose/kill his soul.

Russian:

И к чему это она?

За его душу испугалась. (Hemingway, 1987:303)

Back-translation:

Why did she do it?

Fear for his soul/She felt fear for his soul.

You should have killed yourself last week. (Hemingway, 2011:289)

Georgian: ნეტა მართლა ჩაძაღლებულიყავი იმ კვირას. (Hemingway, 1965:157).

Back-translation: You should have pegged out last week.

Literal back-translation: You should have died like a dog last week.

Russian: Ну, что бы вам помереть на прошлой неделе. (Hemingway, 1987:302)

Back-translation: Well, you should have died/croaked last week.

I wouldn't want to be that old. An old man is a nasty thing. (Hemingway, 2003:289)

Georgian: ღმერთმა ნუ მიმაწევინოს მაგ ხანამდე. ბერიკაცზე საძაგელი რა უნდა იყოს. (Hemingway, 1965:158)

Back translation: God/Heaven forbid that I should live up to his age. There is nothing than an old man.

Russian: Не хотел бы я дожить до его лет. Противные эти старики. (Hemingway, 1987:303)

Back-translation: I would not want live up to his age. The old are nasty.

I don't want to look at him. (Hemingway, 2002:289)

Georgian: სულაც არ მეპიტნავენა მაგისი შეხედვა. (Hemingway, 1965:158)

Back-translation: I don't take it into my head whatsoever/It's not to my liking to look at him.

Russian: Не хочу и смотреть на него. (Hemingway, 1987:303)

Back-translation: I don't want even to look at him.

Each night I am reluctant to close up. (Hemingway, 2003:290)

Georgian: ხელი არ მემორჩილება ხოლმე, რომ ღამით კაფე დავკეტო. (Hemingway, 1965:160)

Back-translation: I force myself to close up the café every night.

Literal back-translation: My hand does not obey me to close up the café every night.

Russian: Каждую ночь мне не хочется закрывать кафе. (Hemingway, 1987:304)

Back-translation: Each night I am reluctant/I don't want to close up the café.

### *Old Man at the Bridge*

---

The peasants plodded along in the ankle deep dust. (Hemingway, 2003:57)

Georgian: მიღონდილობდნენ კოჭებამდე მტვერში ჩაფლული გლეხები. (Hemingway, 1965:353)

Back-translation: The peasants shuffled their feet in the ankle deep dust.

Russian: Крестьяне тащились, утопая в пыли по щиколотку. (Hemingway, 1959:611)

Back-translation: The peasants could hardly drag their feet in the ankle deep dust.

---

But what will they do under the artillery...? (Hemingway, 2003:58)

Georgian: კი მაგრამ, როგორ იქნებიან იმ ქარცეცხლში? (Hemingway, 1965:355)

Back-translation: But what they will do under the bursts of fire.

Russian: А что они будут делать, если обстрел? (Hemingway, 1959:612)

Back-translation: But what will they do under the artillery fire.

---

He was too tired to go any farther. (Hemingway, 2003:57)

Georgian: ოლაჯგანყვეტილს მეტი სიარული აღარ შეეძლო. (Hemingway, 1965:353)

Back-translation: He was drained of strength to go any farther/He was so fagged out that he could not walk any farther.

Russian: Он слишком устал, чтобы идти дальше. (Hemingway, 1959:611)

Back-translation: He was too tired to go any farther.

---

I will wait for a while. (Hemingway, 2003:58)

Georgian: პატარა ხანს სუღს მოვიტყვამ. (Hemingway, 1965:354).

Back-translation: Let me take a breath for a little while.

Russian: Я посижу еще немного. (Hemingway, 1959:612)

Back-translation: I will sit a little more time.

The language of the Georgian translations can be characterised as emotive. The emotiveness of the Georgian texts is mostly based on word choice that elicits more intense emotions than the source texts and even their Russian pairs. Notwithstanding the translators' use of simple syntactic structures typical for Hemingway, by using idiomatic expressions in great abundance they unconditionally alter the imagery of the source text. Linguistically scanty and simple source text is transformed into the diverse and ample translation, which is stylistically marked, emotionally loaded and exuberant. The Georgian target texts elicit rather deeper emotions. Hemingway's fiction was brought to Georgian

readers through Georgian translations. So the perception of his writing is nourished with the artistic taste of the translated texts. It is noteworthy that Hemingway achieved much acclaim and admiration in Georgia. This consideration makes us believe that the work of the translators significantly contributed to the creation of an image of Hemingway's fiction, which was ideologically as well as aesthetically close to the outlook of an ordinary Georgian reader. Accordingly, the translators' devotion to and participation in the reception of Hemingway in Georgia is immense.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the popularity of Hemingway's work considerably declined in Georgia. The small amount of Hemingway's fiction published over the last decades bespeaks the steep change in popularity that in its turn results in the reduction of the quantity of new translations. However, the fact that nowadays only the translations produced in the 20<sup>th</sup> century are published implicates the high value of these translations and infers their artistic and conceptual importance. These translations emphasise the main translation method of the past century that determines not only the significance of the translations themselves but also the image of Hemingway as a distinguished author. Toury suggested that being a translator involved playing a social role, rather than simply transferring phrases and sentences across a linguistic boundary. The Georgian translators of Hemingway took on a distinct role and, in Toury's terms, fulfilled "a function specified by the community" and did so in a way that was "considered appropriate in that society" (Toury 1995, cited in Baker, 2011, p.190).

It is worthwhile to note that, while one and the same writer can be translated into a target language several times, the Georgian translation school did not dare to translate Hemingway, one of the most read foreign writers in Georgia, once again even half a century later. There are only some exceptions, e.g. *The Old Man and the Sea* has been translated two times. It was first translated by Anna Ratiani in 1956 and later by Nana Ghambashidze in 1999. All other editions issued since 1965 have been virtually revised versions of the old four-volume edition of 1965. Even-Zohar (2012, p.167) argues that translation is not a phenomenon whose nature is "given once and for all, but an activity dependent on the relations within a certain cultural system." The polysystem of the Georgian national literature can be viewed "as one element making up the larger sociocultural polysystem" (Shuttleworth, 2011, p.197). Thus, the translator, translating Hemingway's text today using a different or the same translation strategy (either to evoke a sense of the foreign or to maintain the domestic lingua-cultural values) after its first edition, has to take into consideration not only the philological but also the aesthetic evaluation of the existing translation. Translators need to examine the effect of translations on the development of national literature and place in the larger sociocultural polysystem. The aesthetic and cultural reassessment of the old translations will evoke the need for their modern perception and ideological conceptualisation that might propagate inadmissible convictions, values and ideas. The place of Hemingway's fiction in the Georgian literary system today should be determined on the grounds of reconsideration of controversial ideological and ethical stance in Hemingway's works (including sexism and misogyny). The choice of the American writer's fiction to be translated in the future must be impelled by the condition whether the translated text will or will not serve as an important factor in the development of contemporary domestic literature by introducing aesthetic and ethical values and serve the larger sociocultural system. In addition, future translators venturing to translate Hemingway's fiction once again should always bear in mind the

development of Standard Georgian and results of its evolution. The Georgian language has been highly influenced by the western Georgian dialects over the last decades resulting in new literary and linguistic norms and stylistic principles. Furthermore, translating Hemingway into Georgian would be a challenge under favourable conditions and in the light of completely different cultural atmosphere and political situation free from the censorship-related interference. These circumstances might either make Hemingway even more popular in Georgia or completely undermine his image for the Georgian readers.

#### 4 Concluding Remarks

To sum up, the method of translation used by the Georgian translators of Hemingway is “realistic”. The method results in a politically motivated text and does not exclude alterations. The Georgian translations are subject to changes causing modifications to the author’s style according to the established ideological, aesthetic and cultural values and linguistic characteristics of the Georgian secular literature. The translations are domesticated, thus thoroughly tailored and adapted to national characteristics of the translation recipients. Hence, the Georgian translations of Hemingway, which are acceptable both for censorship and for readership, take on a secondary position in the Georgian literary polysystem.

We can speculate that the objective of the Georgian realistic translations of Hemingway and their publication was to raise awareness of the world famous American writer in the Georgian society and to enrich the national literary tradition that always favoured metaphorical and grandiloquent language structure with new literary principles, forms and tastes. The translation team working on Hemingway’s translation of 1965 fulfilled the objective: the Georgian language absorbed perfectly Hemingway’s poetics and artistic quintessence, even though the translations were imposing, expressive and stylistically marked. Regardless of the peripheral position which Hemingway’s literature assumed within the Georgian literary polysystem, it played an integral role in the formation of new aesthetics by strengthening the domestic literature and firmly implanted literary norms with new compositional patterns and techniques.

#### 5 Bibliography

- Alkhazishvili, G. 2009. Momavali tsarsuli [Future past]. *Chveni literatura [Our Literature]*. 10(15), pp. 34-41.
- Azov, A.B. 2013. *Poverzhennyye bukvalisty. Iz istorii khudozhestvennogo perevoda v SSSR v 1920-1960-ye gody [Defeated Bukvalists. From the history of literary translation in the Soviet Union in 1920-1960]*. Moscow: Izdatelskii dom Vysshey shkoly ekonomiki.
- Baker, M. 2011. Norms. In: Baker, M. and Saldahna, G. eds. *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London, New York: Routledge, pp. 189-193.
- Barkhudarov, L.S. *Yazyk i perevod (Voprosy obshchey i chastnoy teorii perevoda) [Language and translation (aspects of general and specific theory of translation)]*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodniye otnosheniya, 1975.
- Burak, A. 2013. The ‘Americanization’ of Russian life and literature through translations of

- Hemingway's works. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*. 8(1), pp. 50-72.
- Even-Zohar, I. 2012. The Position of translated literature within the literary polysystem. In: Venuti, L. ed. *The translation studies reader*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. London, New York: Routledge, pp. 162-167.
- Fedorov, A.V. 1953. *Vvedeniye v teoriyu perevoda* [*An introduction to the theory of translation*]. Moscow: Izdatelstvo literatury na inostrannykh yazykakh.
- Gachechiladze, G. 1959. *Mkhatvruli targmanis teoriis sakitkhebi: realisturi targmanis problema* [*The issues of literary translation: problem of realistic translation*]. Tbilisi: Sabchota sakartwelo.
- Gal, N. 2001. *Slovo zhivoye i mertvoye* [*Words living and words dead*]. Moscow: Mezhdunarodniye otnosheniya.
- Hemingway, E. 1959. *Izbrannyye proizvedeniya v 2-kh tomakh* [*The selected works in 2 volumes*]. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literatura.
- Hemingway, E. 1965. *Tkhzulebani*. [*Writings*]. Tbilisi: Literatura da khelovneba.
- Hemingway, E. 1987. *Proshchay Oruzhiye. Rasskazy*. [*A Farewell to Arms. Short stories*]. Dnepropetrovsk: Promin.
- Hemingway, Ernest. 2003. *The complete short stories*. New York: Scribner.
- Kashkin, I.A. 1951. O yazyke perevoda [About the language of translation]. *Literaturnaya gazeta* [*Literary Magazine*]. 1 December, pp. 2-3.
- Kuznetsova, E. 2018. Hemingway's transformations in Soviet Russia: On the translation of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* by Natalia Volzhina and Evgenia Kalashnikova. In: Baer, B. J. and Witt, S. eds. *Translation in Russian contexts: Culture, politics, identity*. New York, London: Routledge, pp. 159-173.
- Munday, J. 2008. *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London, New York: Routledge.
- Parker, S. J. 1964. Hemingway's revival in the Soviet Union: 1955-1962. *American Literature*. 35(4), pp. 485-501.
- Prizel, Y. 1972. Hemingway in Soviet literary criticism. *American Literature*. 44(3), pp. 445-456.
- Pym, A. 2007. Natural and directional equivalence in theories of translation. *Target*. 19(2), pp. 271-294.
- Shuttleworth, M. 2011. Polysystem. In: Baker, M. and Saldanha G. eds. *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London, New York: Routledge, pp. 197-200.
- Venuti, L. 2001. Strategies of translation. In: Baker, M. ed. *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*. London, New York: Routledge, pp. 240-244.
- Witt, S. 2016. Socialist realism in translation: The theory of a practice. *Baltic Worlds*. 9(4), pp. 52-58.