Source and Target Text-Orientation in Drama Translation

– An Analysis of Four Translations of William Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*

Sini Maisala
Master's thesis
University of Turku
School of Languages and Translation Studies
Department of English
English Translation and Interpreting
May 2010

Tässä pro gradu -tutkielmassa käsittelen lähde- ja kohdetekstikeskeisyyttä näytelmäkääntämisessä. Tutkimuskohteina olivat käännösten sanasto, syntaksi, näyttämötekniikka, kielikuvat, sanaleikit, runomitta ja tyyli. Tutkimuksen tarkoituksena oli selvittää, näkyykö teoreettinen painopisteen siirtyminen lähdetekstikeskeisyydestä kohdetekstikeskeisyyteen suomenkielisessä näytelmäkääntämisessä. Oletuksena oli, että siirtyminen näkyy käytetyissä käännösstrategioissa.

Tutkimuksen teoriaosuudessa käsitellään ensin lähde- ja kohdetekstikeskeisiä käännösteorioita. Ensin esitellään kaksi lähdetekstikeskeistä teoriaa, jotka ovat Catfordin (1965) muodollinen vastaavuus ja Nidan (1964) dynaaminen ekvivalenssi. Kohdetekstikeskeisistä teorioista käsitellään Touryn (1980) ja Newmarkin (1981) teoreettisia näkemyksiä sekä Reiss ja Vermeerin (1986) esittelemää *skopos*-teoriaa. Vieraannuttamisen ja kotouttamisen periaatteet esitellään lyhyesti. Teoriaosuudessa käsitellään myös näytelmäkääntämistä, William Shakespearen kieltä ja siihen liittyviä käännösongelmia. Lisäksi esittelen lyhyesti Shakespearen kääntämistä Suomessa ja *Julius Caesar*in neljä kääntäjää.

Tutkimuksen materiaalina oli neljä Shakespearen *Julius Caesar* -näytelmän suomennosta, joista Paavo Cajanderin käännös on julkaistu vuonna 1883, Eeva-Liisa Mannerin vuonna 1983, Lauri Siparin vuonna 2006 ja Jarkko Laineen vuonna 2007. Analyysissa käännöksiä verrattiin lähdetekstiin ja toisiinsa ja vertailtiin kääntäjien tekemiä käännösratkaisuja.

Tulokset olivat oletuksen mukaisia. Lähdetekstikeskeisiä käännösstrategioita oli käytetty uusissa käännöksissä vähemmän kuin vanhemmissa. Kohdetekstikeskeiset strategiat erosivat huomattavasti toisistaan ja uusinta käännöstä voi sanoa adaptaatioksi. Jatkotutkimuksissa tulisi materiaali laajentaa koskemaan muitakin Shakespearen näytelmien suomennoksia. Eri aikakausien käännöksiä tulisi verrata keskenään ja toisiinsa, jotta voitaisiin luotettavasti kuvata muutosta lähde- ja kohdetekstikeskeisten käännösstrategioiden käytössä ja eri aikakausien tyypillisten strategioiden kartoittamiseksi.

ASIASANAT: kääntäminen, lähdetekstikeskeisyys, kohdetekstikeskeisyys, näytelmäkääntäminen, William Shakespeare, runomitta

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1   Introduction

Translating Shakespeare is the translator's seventh heaven and worst nightmare, as Kersti Juva, the distinguished Finnish literary translator summarises (Petäjä, 2004). Despite the difficulties and due to delight, Shakespeare's plays have been translated into Finnish frequently. Paavo Cajander was the first translator who engaged himself in the challenging task to translate Shakespeare's entire drama production into Finnish. The task was challenging because there were only a few preceding drama translations and, therefore, Cajander had to establish the foundations of Finnish drama translation. Furthermore, Finnish drama literature was developing in the late 19th century and drama translations provided essential models for it. The scale of Cajander's work is represented by the fact that until 2004, there had only been single translations or some translation projects comprising a few plays. However, the Finnish publishing company WSOY began a large project to retranslate Shakespeare's drama production into Finnish in 2004. This time the project will engage approximately ten translators.

Since every translator resorts to contemporary and conventional translation strategies, the continuous translation and retranslation process of Shakespeare's works entails different approaches to translation and various solutions to individual translation problems. In addition to drama translation, translation theories have developed since the late 19th century. The changes in theory should be observable in translations from different periods, since the theory began to evolve radically in the late 20th century.

The translation process has been studied and analysed by many theorists who have developed their own theory of translation. Many emphasise that it is impossible to create universal translation rules, and such rules will always be beyond realisation and practice. Nevertheless, translation theories have been developed to meet the tendency to create norms. There are numerous attempts to create some normative or descriptive rules or theories that define the translation practice. Translation theories are necessary for translation and translation students, and, indeed, the field of translation theory is wide and colourful. In order to outline the field, one division may be made between source text-oriented (ST-oriented) and target text-oriented (TT-oriented) translation theories.

In ST-oriented translation the focus is, of course, on the ST, and the purpose is to convey aspects of the ST into the TT, for example, to preserve the sentence structure of the ST, or to produce a similar response in recipients in the TT audience to that of the ST audience. Catford (1965) introduces the notion of formal correspondence that operates mainly on the syntactical and lexical level of the language. Nida (1964) argues that the responses of the ST and TT readers should be comparable. On the other hand, in TT-oriented translation, the purpose is to follow the conventions of the target language (TL) and target culture, and it is more focused on the result of the translation process, that is, the TT. Moreover, theories of functional equivalence concentrate on the functions of the ST and TT and their correspondence (Vehmas-Lehto, 1999), whereas the skopos theory (Reiss & Vermeer, 1986) evaluates translation on the basis of the function of the translation, which can be different from that of the ST.

ST-oriented translation has dominated the history of translation theory from the classical period to the 20th century, since translators have mainly been concerned with the transference of the features of the ST; however, the most recent contemporary theories have concentrated on the TT and on the reader of the translation. In practice, theories are often mixed and used relatively, depending on the needs of the translation, on the text type, and on text function. Along with ST and TT-oriented translation, theories have concentrated on domestication and foreignisation (Venuti, 1995), which relate especially to literary translation. They involve the same strategies that are mentioned in the ST and TT-oriented translation theories, but they emphasise the translator's role as a cultural mediator and the responsibilities that the role involves.

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between translation theory and practice. I will especially concentrate on the source and target-text oriented theories and on their shift of focus from source to target text. The research question for the analysis is whether the shift of focus in theory can be seen in translations from different periods. My aim is to examine the orientation of translations from different periods, and the translation strategies these translations employ. The hypothesis of this study is that the shift of focus in translation theory can be seen in the translations as a change from source to target text-orientation. Shakespeare's translations are an excellent material for this study, because they involve numerous problems that the translator has to solve, and

because they have been translated into Finnish several times. My material consists of four translations of Shakespeare's tragedy *Julius Caesar*. The play was first translated by Paavo Cajander in 1883 and in 1983 by Eeva-Liisa Manner. Lauri Sipari translated *Julius Caesar* in 1997 for the stage and the translation was published in 2006. The fourth translation by Jarkko Laine was published in 2007.

I begin my study by viewing the extensive field of translation theories, concentrating on ST-oriented and TT-oriented translation theories and on their use in the translation of culture-specific expressions and phenomena. Thus in Chapter 2, I study the ST-oriented theories of Catford (1965) and Nida (1964). Then, in Chapter 3, I move on to the TT-oriented theories, introducing theories formulated by Toury (1980), Reiss and Vermeer (1986) and Newmark (1981). After this, I continue to foreignisation and domestication theories and discuss them briefly in Chapter 4.

In Chapter 5, I examine drama translation and, since the field is extensive and complex, try to focus on the principal features typical of drama translation. Then, I discuss Shakespeare's language and the special and stylistic features and problems it creates for the translator in Chapter 6. The different editions and folios of Shakespeare's plays are, however, beyond the scope of my study. It has to be taken into consideration that the language Shakespeare used is, of course, no longer used by native speakers, and therefore, translating Shakespeare is always a challenge to any translator. This problem has created numerous translations and retranslations all over the world; hence Shakespeare's plays, along with other classical texts, are constantly being retranslated. I will examine in Chapter 7 this continuous retranslation of Shakespeare's production and the reasons for it. The focus is on the history of translation of Shakespeare's drama production in Finland starting from Paavo Cajander, the icon of Finnish Shakespeare translation, who set the foundations for all his followers, finishing with today's translation project covering Shakespeare's entire production. In Chapter 8, I introduce the four Finnish translators who have translated Shakespeare's tragedy *Julius Caesar*: Paavo Cajander, Eeva-Liisa Manner, Lauri Sipari and Jarkko Laine. I have chosen to examine these four drama translations that have been published only in written form, for their universal nature, in contrast with theatre translations that are bound to a specific theatre production.

In Chapter 9, I analyse the four translations of *Julius Caesar* and present examples that characterise the translations and translators' strategies. I start by analysing the vocabulary and syntactic aspects. Translations of metaphors, wordplays and stagecraft are examined next. This is followed by a look into how the metre has affected the language of the translations. In the final chapters, I discuss the results of this study and the translators' motives for using certain translation strategies and outline some issues for further studies.

2   Source text-oriented translation

In the words of Toury, "[a]ny theory of translation accepting the reconstruction of ST's relevant features (including its textual relationships) in TT as a necessary […] condition for translation and postulating the 'functional' relationship […] as translation equivalence is an ST-oriented theory" (1980, p. 39). Many theorists have concentrated on ST-oriented translation and on means for transferring features of the ST into the translation. One of them is Catford who concentrates on translating the source language (SL) message into the TL.

2.1 Formal correspondence

Catford (1965) makes a distinction between a translation equivalent and a formal correspondent. He defines a textual translation equivalent as "that portion of a TL text which is changed when and only when a given portion of the SL text is changed" (p. 28). A formal correspondent, on the other hand, "is any TL category [unit, class, structure, etc.] which may be said to occupy, as nearly as possible, the 'same' place in the economy of the TL as the given SL category occupies in the SL" (p. 32). When defining a translation equivalent, Catford calls for a competent bilingual informant or translator who, to put his ST example into the Finnish TT context, translates *My son is six* as *Minun poikani on kuusi*. If *My son* is now replaced by *His daughter*, the TT must be changed for *Hänen tyttärensä*. Thus, a TL text *Minun poikani/Hänen tyttärensä* is the equivalent of the SL text *My son/His daughter*. Catford says commutation is effective when the textual equivalent is defined, and he recommends its use especially when equivalents are not as simple as in this example (p. 27-28).

Catford argues that a textual equivalent can be calculated on the basis of its occurrence in translations, and it can ultimately be generalised as a translation rule if the sample is large enough (29-31). That is, an equivalent for an English preposition could be found by calculating its translations in a translated text and choosing the most common one. This method of defining a translation equivalent is quite problematic, since Catford himself does not determine any qualifications for the translations included in the sample, and he does not even mention poor or flawed translations which should obviously be excluded. The differences between the SL and TL cultures are not mentioned, and translations seem to be born in a vacuum. Catford does briefly mention the term *situation* which may alter the formal equivalence and translation equivalents, but he does not define the situation accurately, and therefore it is rather difficult to say what he would do in a situation in which a ST situation is unknown to the TT reader. Furthermore, creating translation rules on the basis of statistical findings is impossible in practice. Synonymy and different semantic fields of certain translation equivalents impede the creation of reliable statistics. For instance, there are numerous situations in which a hyponym must be replaced with a superordinate and vice versa, because there are no suitable equivalents in the TL.

However, formal correspondence is not as strict as the notion of translation equivalents; Catford argues that in order to establish formal correspondence, it should be done at relatively high levels of abstraction. Furthermore, because formal correspondence is a rough estimation due to the unique nature of every language, it is obvious that the formal meanings of SL items and TL items can seldom be equal (p. 32, 36). The transfer of meaning is also hampered since parts of the TL do not have any established values in the SL, that is, they do not have SL meanings. Catford takes the word *sauna* as an example: in Finnish, *sauna* has a domestic connotation, whereas in a TT it has a foreign meaning for the TT reader. He continues that from a linguistic point of view, the SL and TL items seldom have the same meaning, yet it does not signify that they cannot function in the same situation. In a situation where there are many situational features common to the contextual meanings of both SL and TL, in other words, the contexts of ST and TT are similar or even equivalent, the result is a better translation than in an opposite situation. Therefore, Catford concludes that instead of selecting TL equivalents that have the same meaning as the SL items, the translator should find equivalents that have "the greatest possible overlap of situational range" (p. 49).

2.2 Dynamic equivalence

Nida compares translation to a communication situation (1964, p. 120) and introduces the concept of dynamic equivalence as his alternative to formal correspondence. He emphasises that there cannot be an absolute correspondence between the TT and the ST, but there can be an equivalence of two types, formal and dynamic (p. 156, 159). While a message itself is important in formal equivalence, in dynamic equivalence the focus is on the response of the recipient of the translation; this response should be equivalent to the one of the ST (p. 165-166). Nida argues that understanding the ST culture is not vital to the TT reader in order to understand the message, and therefore, the translator does not need to convey the style of the ST, but a natural expression in the TL (p. 159).

Nida discusses redundancy as a part of the difficulty of fitting a ST message into the TL. In addition to linguistic redundancy, there is cultural redundancy, which means that "in most instances any message in the SL will need to be filled out with at least some types of redundancy, so as to match the linguistic and cultural redundancy to which the original receptors had access" (1964, p. 130). Therefore, in order to create a meaning in the TL equivalent to that of the ST, the necessary redundancy should be added.

As Nida explains, the focus in dynamic equivalence translations is on the reader response (p. 166), but he admits that different readers have different responses and offers two solutions. The first possibility is to change the readers, that is, to educate them. The second option is to provide different texts to different audiences (p. 143). Nida defines a dynamic equivalence translation as "the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message" (p. 166). This definition, Nida says, excludes the unnatural wording and sentence structure of the formal equivalence translation and also the possibility of the translator writing an unfaithful version of the ST (*ibid.*). I will now focus on Nida's thoughts on a natural translation.

2.2.1 A natural translation and dynamic equivalence

Nida rejects formal equivalence by explaining that natural translation requires grammatical changes, such as shifting the word order or using verbs instead of nouns, due to the obligatory structures of the TL (1964, p. 167). But total naturalisation is not always possible, as Nida admits, since when translating terms which identify cultural

specialities, not all foreign association can be eliminated. When translating from a SL culture into a very different TL culture there will be many themes and descriptions that have a foreign association which cannot be naturalised.

Nida distinguishes five levels on which the naturalness of expression in the TL is essentially a problem of co-suitability. Those levels are (1) word classes, (2) grammatical categories, (3) semantic classes, (4) discourse types, and (5) cultural context (p. 168). He argues that a natural translation must agree with the context of the ST message, that is to say, for example, emotional poems should not lose their poetic expression at the expense of the semantic meanings of the words. Serious anomalies, such as vulgarities, colloquialisms or slang, which evidently are not suited for the context, are not acceptable in a natural translation. Nida puts in the same category anachronisms, which result either from a use of too contemporary or too old-fashioned language. In addition, ambiguities should not be avoided by providing exhaustive and complicated explanations, which weary the reader and which do not belong to a natural translation. Nida reminds us that languages sometimes have very different stylistic requirements and expectations for different types of discourse (p. 169). The naturalness of a translation can be measured by its suitability to the TL audience (p. 170).

Naturalness is one of the major differences between Catford and Nida's theories of equivalence, in addition to the concept of response. Nida differentiates dynamic equivalence from the formal one by stating that it involves many formal adjustments, especially if a literal translation produces a meaningless or a misleading expression in the TT (p. 170). According to Nida, intraorganismic features, which depend heavily on the cultural context of the language, suffer the most in the translation process, since they cannot always be translated naturally.

Nida establishes three criteria to evaluate all translating (p. 182): The first one is the efficiency of the communication process, that is, when a reader has to do as little decoding as possible; this is accomplished with as much redundancy as possible. The second criterion is the comprehension of intent which, according to Nida, covers both accuracy and fidelity. The third criterion is the equivalence of response which is, along with the second criterion, oriented either toward the source culture or the target culture, depending on within which cultural context the reader makes his or her response. Nida

adds that the translation should not be unfaithful to the content of the original message (p. 182-184). However, Nida does not clarify how the reader responses are defined. He does not specify the ST reader nor consider that reader responses may vary among the ST readers. He does not even mention the fact that there are differences between both the ST and the TT readers. In other words, Nida's theory of dynamic equivalence is difficult to realise in practice. Nevertheless, his statements about natural expression in TL take a step toward the concept of TT-oriented translation.

3   Target text-oriented translation

The two theorists discussed in the foregoing passage have both been concentrating on the transference of ST features into a TT, but Toury (1980) criticises these ST-oriented theories. As I mentioned above, he sees that the ST-oriented theory is a theory that accepts the transference of ST features into a TT as a necessary condition for translation and ignores the actual translation and the TL, with its restraints on any TL text (p. 39-40). He observes a gap between theory and practice, that is, between a theoretical definition of a translation and an actual translation, and the solution offered by an ST-oriented theory does not satisfy him: the problem of the gap between "the equivalence condition and the actual relationships" (p. 40) existing between the ST and the TT is solved by removing any TT which does not have a correspondence with a theoretical postulate from the discussion, in other words, such a TT is not a translation. Toury remarks that this is no solution from the standpoint of the TT, because the TT is regarded as a translation in the target literary system, and because it has certain relationships to its ST which are, according to the general definition of translation, equivalence relationships. Therefore, an ST-oriented theory is inadequate for "a descriptive study of translations and translation relationships as empirical phenomena" and it allows a student to understand only what translations are not (p. 40).

3.1 Descriptive translation studies

According to Toury, a translation has to be considered as a literary text within the literary system in order to be regarded as a literary translation, whereas it does not have to have any definitive relationship to a literary text of another literary system which is considered as its ST (1980, p. 43), only the very existence of relationships between the TT and the ST is presupposed for the TT to be regarded as a translation (p. 45). This

means that there are no presuppositions for a translation in order to be considered a text in the target culture; it has only to be a literary text. In other words, the translation does not need certain equivalences to the ST to verify its existence in the TL culture but only the status of a translation and of a literary text.

Toury remarks that translations are "textual-linguistic facts" only in the target textual tradition, since translations do not have any existence in the ST or in the SL, whereas the SL and ST may have an effect on the target culture and its textual and linguistic norms, not to mention that they even affect the fact whether or not the translation can be identified as a TL text. The latter means that the SL can affect the language of the TT in such a way that the translation cannot be considered to be comprehensive TL, and therefore it cannot be considered a TL text that can function in the textual system of the TL. Toury argues that a translation theory has to take into account the relationship between the TT and ST and, in addition, the relationship between the TT and TL or between the TT and the textual system of the TL or both (p. 28-29). Toury reminds us that "every literary text ... is also a literary utterance, i.e., an instance of performance in the framework of a certain literary system" (p. 36). Therefore, translations cannot be examined only in relation to the ST, but the target literary system has also to be taken into account.

The distinction between adequacy (i.e., the translation's tendency to follow the norms and textual conventions of the SL and source culture) and acceptability (i.e., the translation fulfils the requirements of the linguistic norms and textual conventions of the TL) has interested many theorists. Toury argues (*ibid*., p. 29) that every actual translation is placed between two extremes of adequacy and acceptability and uses both of them to a certain extent. He introduces the term *translational norm* that defines the mixture of adequacy and acceptability used in the translation. The norm is "the intermediating factor between the system of potential equivalence relationships and the actual performance, i.e., the reason for the functioning of certain relationships as translation equivalence" (p. 50). Toury participates in the discussion of equivalence, which he criticises as being too theoretical and far from practice. He suggests that translation equivalence is a functional concept instead of a material one, and therefore, in a TT-oriented approach, the TT is no longer a translation but it *functions* as a translation. He continues that when equivalence between the TT and ST is discussed,

the question is what type and degree of translation equivalence exists between the translation and its ST (p. 47).

Translational norms are models which both open and close options. The gap between "translational relationship" and "translation equivalence" is only apparent, because once the status of these two and their relationships are established, their incongruence can be resolved. This is done by projecting "the applicability of the norms from the entire domain of translational relationship onto the concept of equivalence". This requires that instead of the usual fixed notion, the concept of translation equivalence is flexible, wide-ranging and changing; furthermore, the norms are the most important factors which define the identification of "certain relationships between the TT ... and ST as those of equivalence" (p. 64). Toury suggests that "the entire set of possible TT-ST relationships" should be regarded "as the system of potential equivalence" (*ibid*.). He adds that descriptive translation studies intend to develop "the actual concept of translation equivalence" on the basis of "the norms governing the corpus under study" (*ibid*.).

Toury says that translation equivalence could be defined as phonemes are in phonetics, that is, by distinctive features that are separated on the basis of "the basic relational properties pertinent to translation and serving as a universal reservoir for accounting for any possible type of equivalence and translational relationship" (p. 67). He suggests that the definition of translation equivalence could be the "relationship between two linguistic utterances defining translation" or "distinguishing translation from non-translation" (*ibid*.). However, this does not mean that every possible relationship between the TT and ST functions as a translational relationship (p. 69).

3.2 The skopos theory

Reiss and Vermeer (1986) introduce the aspect of culture and the function of the TT. They argue that culture is as integral a part of the text as the linguistic aspect, and the TT usually has a different function than the ST, and in fact, the TT may have several functions (p. 27, 29). Reiss and Vermeer criticise traditional translation concepts and conceptions of the translation process as a two-phased method in which the translator only receives the message in the ST and encodes it to the TL. They remind us that the text itself is the primary translation target, not the actual words (p. 20), and also add

that, according to this two-phase-theory, machine translation would be completely possible since translation involves only receiving and encoding.

When translating any text, Reiss and Vermeer argue, the target group is always taken into consideration, consciously or unconsciously. For instance, a special field article will not be translated for an analphabetic audience. The translator should also translate in the manner the target culture's expectations concerning text form and function demand. For example, a classic piece of literature that is today read only by the young should be translated for them only (p. 49). However, it must be remembered that this produces texts that are bound only to a certain time and possibly to a very short period of time which, in my opinion, could be pointless given that the function of literature is to last from one generation to another, not only for the youth of the 90's. Reiss and Vermeer add that it is the translator who decides what is translated and when and how it is translated on the basis of the translator's knowledge of the source and target culture and the SL and TL. The function of the translation is the most important criterion of the translation process (p. 49), and so fulfilling the function of the translation is more important than the actual translation process (p. 58).

At this point Reiss and Vermeer introduce the Greek word *skopos* which stands for 'aim' or 'purpose' (p. 55). They say that the translation varies along with the skopos, and there is no absolute translation method or translation (p. 58). The translator has to make decisions relating to the skopos and the first step of the decision process is to define the skopos. The second step is to define the ST's hierarchy based on the skopos definition. The importance of the different parts of the ST can be evaluated before translation, and the actual time of the changes either before, during or after the process, is only a practical matter. I will take an example from Reiss and Vermeer (p. 59): if a Latin American book on cultural history is to be translated for European readers who do not have the necessary preliminary knowledge, an expert on the matter makes the necessary changes to the SL text before translation or after translation into the TL, or the translator does the changes. The third part of the translator's decision process is to fulfil the skopos. Reiss and Vermeer emphasise that the translation should primarily be an understandable TT, and the coherence between the ST and TT is a secondary feature, because the TL reader reads the translation as an independent text and does not compare it to the ST (p. 65-66).

Reiss and Vermeer also discuss the terms of adequacy and equivalence (p. 76-77). They argue that translation is adequate if the purpose of the translation is the basis for choosing TL signs, but the TT cannot be an equivalent of the ST, since it is impossible to translate in an equivalent way. However, the relationship between the TT and ST can be described as equivalent if these texts fulfil the same communication function equally in their own culture. In other words, equivalence is adequacy when the ST and TT maintain the same function. The translation situation, that is, the terms concerning the producing of the translation, for example the time of translation, must be taken into account when the equivalence between the ST and TT is evaluated (p. 81).

3.3 Newmark's communicative and semantic translation

Newmark (1981) appreciates the fact that the reader has been taken into consideration in translation and is no longer ignored. In *Approaches to translation*, he states that the "translator should produce a different type of translation of the same text for a different type of audience" (p. 10). However, Newmark reminds us that the reader response of the ST cannot always be reproduced, for instance in non-literary texts that use peculiarities of a language. He takes as an example Freud and his examples involving slips of the tongue and jokes, which require the translator to retain the German or use the unnatural language of literal translation. Newmark continues that the effect cannot be realised if a non-literary text deals with an aspect of the SL culture the TT reader is unfamiliar with, and if the ST is originally aimed only at the ST reader. Therefore, the translator cannot adapt the text towards the TT reader (p. 11).

Newmark also mentions those artistic works which are bound to a certain place and have cultural and national references and which can also be time-specific. Themes of human nature and behaviour can be transmitted to the translation, but the descriptions of a culture remote to the TT reader can be translated either according to the equivalent-effect principle or by reproducing the form and content of the ST. Newmark takes an example from Homer, whose *wine dark sea* would lose much if it were to be translated as the *sky blue sea*. In addition, he quotes Matthew Arnold (1928), who says that the equivalent-effect is impossible to achieve when translating Homer, since his audiences are unknown to us.

Newmark also discusses different types of losses of meaning. The basic one is "on a continuum between overtranslation ... and undertranslation" (1981, p. 7). There is also an inevitable loss of meaning when the ST refers to elements specific to the natural environment, institutions and culture of the SL area, as the substitution by the TL can only be approximate. In this case, the translator has many possibilities, since a foreign word or term can be transcribed (*directeur du cabinet*), translating it (head of the minister's office), substituting a similar word or phrase in the TL culture (Permanent Undersecretary of State), naturalising the word with a loan translation (director of the cabinet), adding or substituting a suffix from the TL, defining it, or paraphrasing (head of the Minister's departmental staff) (examples are Newmark's, p. 7-8). In the case of a cultural overlap in medical and mathematical texts, for instance, there is no substantial loss. Another loss of meaning occurs since languages differ in their lexical, grammatical and sound systems, and they also segment physical objects and intellectual concepts differently. Newmark proposes that corresponding words, idioms, metaphors, proverbs and so on should occur in the TT as frequently as they do in the ST. He adds immediately that the translator cannot always follow this rule due to, for example, its inherent contradictions.

According to Newmark (*ibid*., p. 8), a loss of meaning comes from the fact that the ST writer and the translator have different individual uses of language, since everyone has lexical idiosyncrasies and private meanings for a few words. He advises that unless the text prevents it, the translator should write in a natural style. Furthermore, since the two writers, that is, the ST writer and the translator, have different values and theories of meaning, there is also a loss of meaning. The translator may, for example, emphasise connotation over denotation, or search for ambiguities that cannot be found in the ST or a different emphasis that the ST writer has not intended to emphasise.

Newmark's contributions to translation theory are his concepts of communicative and semantic translation, of which the former "attempts to produce on its readers an effect as close as possible to that of obtained on the readers of the original" (p. 39). This definition is actually similar to that of Nida's dynamic equivalence. Semantic translation, on the other hand, "attempts to render, as closely as the semantic and syntactic structures of the second language allow, the exact contextual meaning of the original" (*ibid*.). In communicative translation, the translator works on the basis of the

ST and changes the elements of the foreign culture to those equivalent in the TL culture. Semantic translation preserves the foreign features but assists the TT reader to understand their connotations. Newmark generalises that a communicative translation is a smoother, simpler, clearer and more or less conventional text than a semantic translation, which is a more complex, more awkward and more detailed text.

Newmark argues (p. 42, 44, 46) that although communicative translation loses in semantic content, it may gain in force and clarity and is therefore better than semantic translation, which involves loss of meaning. In communicative translation, the translator can correct or improve the logic of the ST and also correct mistakes of fact and slips. The majority of non-literary writing has material that is suitable for communicative translation. However, if the specific language of the ST is as important as the content, the ST should be translated semantically. Important statements, such as speeches of heads of states need a translation in which the lexical and grammatical structure of the translation is as close to the original as possible. Accordingly, in non-literary works, for instance works on language and psychology, facts of language, such as wordplay and ambiguity, should be fully reproduced in the SL and then explained in the TL, whereas in literary works they must be reproduced only in the TL. Newmark does not believe that communicative translation should be semantic and vice versa, because "there is a contradiction ... between meaning and message" (p. 51): meaning is complicated and many-levelled, and during communication the meaning is reduced as generalisation and simplification takes place, whereas a message does not cover the entire meaning, only part of it. For example, when a table is mentioned, one can think about a dining table or a coffee table, but understanding the message does not require a specific definition of the type of the table.

Newmark reminds us (p. 62-63) that the translator faces many problems with communicative translation. One of them is to decide to what extent the basic message should be simplified. Along with simplification, it has to be decided which parts of the text and message are emphasised. The readers' level of intelligence must also be defined and the translator must be careful not to insult the intelligence of the TT readers. Newmark points out that the greatest problem of a communicative translation is the fact that in order to measure its success, the reader's reactions need to be examined.

Newmark clarifies the difference between literal and semantic translation: in literal translation, the translator is loyal to the norms of the SL but in semantic translation to the author of the ST. The semantic translation may also, as the last resort, have to interpret or explain otherwise meaningless metaphors in the TL. He continues that when translating a non-modern text, the TT has to be put into modern language. In addition, if there is symbolism and expressive elements inaccessible to the TT reader, the translator has to make their comprehension possible. Therefore, it cannot be said that the translator's duty to his author is not to communicate the meaning of the ST to the TT reader. On the other hand, Newmark argues, in artistic texts, the author does not intend to communicate with the reader, and neither should the translator. The translator enables readers to listen or understand the described events. There is no need to convey 'the meaning' of an artistic text, because the author does not explicitly express it in the ST (p. 63-64). In other words, the translator does not have to portray every possible interpretation of the events or reasons behind characters' actions. The readers should be the ones that interpret of the text.

3.4 From source text to target text-oriented translation

In the field of translation theory, the emphasis has changed from ST-orientation to TT-orientation. Since the first functionalist theories, the skopos theory among them, the function of the translation has been more important than the transference of the features of the ST. For instance, Toury stresses that before understanding a translation process or translations, their purposes have to be determined, because any act of translation depends on those purposes which, for their part, are mainly dependent on the target pole, that is, the commissioner of the target culture, who initiates "the intertextual, inter-cultural and interlingual transfer" (1980, p. 30). Moreover, Newmark argues that it is necessary that the text always appears to be written naturally, and the translator should not use a word or phrase which has an intuitively unnatural or artificial sound (1981, p. 128-129). All in all, there seems to be a fain agreement among translation theorists on the importance of fluency and intelligibility in a translation.

Bassnett (1995) says that Brazilian translators have created a new metaphor in which the translator is presented as a cannibal who devours the ST and produces something completely new in its place. Bassnett demonstrates how the conception of translation has changed by comparing the Brazilian metaphor to the 19th century conception of

translation which can be reflected as a relationship between a master and his servant. In this kind of translation process, the translator either took the ST and improved it or approached the ST humbly and carefully and treated it with respect and fidelity (p. 14-15). These metaphors show the transition from ST-oriented to TT-oriented translation as well as the improvement of the position of the translator – not to mention the foreignisation of the foreign metaphor that could be upsetting to some readers.

4   Foreignisation and domestication

The concepts of foreignisation and domestication are concerned with ST-oriented and TT-oriented translation, respectively. According to Kwieciński, domestication is "the accommodation of the target text to the established TL [or target culture] concepts, norms or conventions", whereas foreignisation is seen as "the introduction into the target text of concepts and language forms that are alien to and/or obscure in the target language and culture" (2001, p. 13-14). Schleiermacher, Berman and Venuti are theorists who have dealt with foreignisation and domestication, mainly in relation to literary translation, and who all prefer foreignisation.

Schleiermacher was the first theorist that defined the theory of what later became known as foreignisation and domestication, in the beginning of the 19th century. Schleiermacher argues in his essay *On Different Methods of Translating* (1813) that the translator has only two options, either to bring the reader to the ST writer or to bring the writer to the TT reader. He called these methods as approach 1 (reader-to-author) and approach 2 (author-to-reader). The approached were later defined as foreignisation and domestication, which I will employ here. His definition of translation is inflexible, since there is no place between the two extremes of foreignisation and domestication. In Schleiermacher's example of domestication, the translator makes the ST writer write as a TL speaker or writer. However, Schleiermacher himself does not accept domestication, since the TT reader should be able to feel the strangeness of the translation and be conscious of the differences between a foreign language and the TL (p. 229-231). Ruokonen (2004) clarifies that to Schleiermacher strangeness means strangeness in the language. As a Romantic, Schleiermacher evaluates the linguistic format and the impression it creates and argues that the translator should convey the same image and impression he or she gained from the original language. He disagrees

that the elements of a language could be shifted and replaced, however desirable and necessary, even if the content remains the same, and yet, he approves of the process in which the translator compensates in one place for what he or she cannot translate in another, that is, makes up his inability to translate, for example, a certain word. Although Schleiermacher requires the translator to preserve the linguistic structures of the ST, he excludes the possibility of writing an awkward text and talks of a text which is skilfully "bent" towards the TL. However, Ruokonen (*ibid*.) says that Schleiermacher's translations were considered incomprehensible and difficult to read and that he has been criticised for elitism.

Berman (1984; translated in 1992) continued from Schleiermacher's line of thinking. Berman argues that every culture is dependent on translations and the foreign elements imported by them, although every culture resist translations and anything foreign in their pursuit of total self-sufficiency (p. 4). He believes strongly that if the translator uses ordinary adaptation, he or she has betrayed both the ST and even translation itself. He argues that the essence of translation is to be the mediator, the initiator, and introduce foreignness to a culture; otherwise translation is nothing. He stresses the role of translation as one that expands languages and protects communication systems from homogenisation. According to Berman, a translation without any implication of strangeness is a bad translation (p. 4-5) and a translation which does not seem to be a translation at all is necessarily a bad translation. By the same token, if a text is obviously a translation it does not mean that it is a bad translation (p. 155).

Venuti has probably contributed the most to the discussion of foreignisation and domestication, despite the fact that he has concentrated mostly on Anglo-American practices and cultures. He remarks in *The Translator's Invisibility* (1995) that the very choice of the original work to be translated can be an act of foreignisation, as it can either reinforce beliefs in the target culture about the source culture, or it can open a new point of view to the TL readers. Venuti criticises the domesticating translation in the United Kingdom and the United States for writing English-language values into the TT and thus enabling the readers to recognise "their own culture in a cultural other" (p. 15). Indeed, in their Introduction to *Constructing Cultures*, Bassnett and Lefevere call the phenomenon of deleting everything foreign and exotic the "Holiday Inn Syndrome" (1998, p. 4), which can be seen in the majority of the translations into English.

Venuti suggests that, in translations into English, foreignisation could be used to resist ethnocentrism, imperialism and cultural narcissism, since the domesticating strategy has so far reduced the ST's foreign elements in Anglo-American culture. Venuti argues that in order to do justice to the ST, the translator has to violate the TL and deviate from its norms, for example, by using marginal discourse or archaisms, in order to create an unfamiliar feeling (1995, p. 20). Venuti's hostility, especially as expressed in *The Translator's Invisibility*, towards a fluent, readable translation that could even be consumable is not far from the same elitism that Berman and Schleiermacher could not avoid. In addition, he ignores the cultural situations in, for instance, South America and Africa, which both have a long history of colonialism and foreign dominance, especially when he criticises Nida's dynamic equivalence in Bible translation (p. 21).

Venuti's solution in *The Scandals of Translation* (1998, p. 12) to avoid translations for the elite only is to create a generally readable text which is only momentarily interrupted. Such a minorizing translation could be clear enough to be understood by a "wide range of readers", and therefore "cross boundaries between cultural constituencies". Despite his softer approach, his translation of Tarchetti's *Fosca* found its audience among "elite readers" who were familiar with strange forms of language (*ibid*., p. 18). Moreover, when he used a British pronunciation of the word *herb*, that is, *a herb* instead of American *an herb*, the copyeditor of the publisher asked him "What can you mean by this?" (*ibid*., p. 16). But is this the reaction Venuti wants from his readers? After all, literature is rarely based on linguistic oddities or intelligible expressions: an author has something to say and expresses it through the events and characters. Literature based solely on the language, such as James Joyce's novel *Finnegans Wake*, is not usually translated because the most essential part, that is the language, cannot be transmitted to another language as such, and the content is subsidiary. As Kersti Juva said in her recent lecture at the University of Turku (Juva, 2009), the unessential features of the ST, such as dialects, can be ignored since there are other strange features in foreign literature which compensates the loss of a peculiar feature. The TT-reader does not usually have any problems to separate a translation of a product of foreign literature from a product of domestic literature.

Milton (2003) questions Venuti's emphasis on the Anglo-American culture and other "hegemonic centres" which have generally resisted translation and also asks whether the difficult foreignised text alienates its readers from the foreign (p. 567-568). Milton looks at foreignisation from the point of view of the readers whose language and tastes have usually adapted everything from a foreign language. He also introduces a new aspect to the acceptance of the foreign: could it also mean openness to the foreign domination? However, I will not discuss this issue here, since it is not in the scope of this paper, although it is a very interesting point of view.

Milton takes an example from the late 19th century Brazilian writer Marchado de Assis, who criticises by means of his translations the tradition of copying straight from the original. For instance, Marchado translated Edgar Allan Poe's poem *The Raven* without even trying to recreate Poe's special effects. His theory on improving the Brazilian literature includes the idea that although the writer cannot escape his metropolitan origins, he or she can start from the beginning and ensure that the literature of the colony is not a reproduction of that of Europe. The ST is a mere "metropolitan base" for the new literature, which should not have any imported stylistic features (Milton, 2003, p. 569-570). This approach obviously leads to questions about the relationship between the ST and the TT, and whether there is any relationship at all. In every culture and in all times literature has learned and absorbed features of foreign literature, translated or not, and has begun its evolution and development using the previous literature as its basis for creating new and characteristic expressions, uses of language and writing. Translators are not in the position to create new literature in the target culture but to introduce the knowledge of the past and present, not to mention styles and literal devices of the masters of literature into the target culture. To take an example from another field of creative art, Picasso would have never created cubism without the influence of the European surrealism in the early 20th century.

Another viewpoint for foreignisation is that of China. Milton (2003) quotes Nam Fung Chang (1998) as saying that faithfulness is the priority in translation in China, and strange linguistic and stylistic elements are even desirable because they are evidence the translator has let the TT speak through him or her. Fluent translations are in fact suspicious, and indicate that the translator has intervened in the translation process too much (p. 570). As Milton points out, the cultural domination is more culture-specific

than Venuti presents. Other European countries which do not tend to be as dominating as, for example, France and Britain, accept foreign words and phrases more easily and are not so eager to hide the major role of translation in their culture.

5   Drama translation

When studying drama translation, it is necessary to establish the difference between the terms 'drama' and 'theatre'. 'Dramatic texts', as Aaltonen (2000) defines them, can function in both literary and theatrical systems as the word 'drama' refers to a written text and a theatrical performance, whereas the term 'theatre texts' is applied to dramatic texts used only in the theatre. The distinction between the two terms is flexible since dramatic texts can belong to both or one of the systems and, in addition, they can shift from one system to the other and also move in and out of them (p. 33). Consequently, 'drama translation' covers a text translated for both the literary and theatrical systems and 'theatre translation', on the other hand, includes only the translations for the theatrical system. Furthermore, written dramatic texts do not need the theatrical system and vice versa, the theatrical system does not need dramatic texts in order to function (p. 34).

According to Aaltonen, the system, literary or theatrical, for which the translation is done determines the expected, accepted and tolerated translation strategies (p. 39). For instance, dated translations can be tolerated in the literary system but have to be revised if they are to be used in a stage production. The reason for the difference between the two systems is due to their different natures: the theatrical system emphasizes immediacy and orality, whereas the literary system gives priority to the permanence of the written language. Accordingly, there are different rules in both systems for choosing translation strategies. Furthermore, the audiences of theatre and drama translations impose their own expectations, because theatre translation is performed for a collective and immediate audience. Drama translation, on the other hand, is also done for the individual reader who can go back to an unclear part and has time to think about what has been said (p. 40-41).

A typical feature of theatre translation, and also of drama translation, is rhythm. Ellonen (1998) argues that the translator does not have to think about numerous variations for a

word but he or she has to consider whether a longer or shorter equivalent should be used in order to make the rhythm work for the actor (p. 41). Different languages have different rhythms, but the rhythm of the language is not as essential as that of the characters and events. For instance, it makes a great difference whether a person speaks in short sentences in a concise way or babbles in long sentences. Ellonen reminds us that the actor can utter a word in numerous different ways but poor rhythm cannot be corrected with elocution. The translator should preserve the length of the sentences as they are in the source text, since this is essential to the rhythm of the character. There are many translations in which the personality of a character has been changed from a taciturn speaker to a smooth and eloquent talker or vice versa, by adding or removing subordinate clauses (*ibid.*). The Finnish Shakespeare translator, Rossi (1998) agrees, and states that there is a condition for translating classical plays written in verse. This means that in the Finnish translation, the language must include the characteristics of the source text, the actor should be able to speak the lines, and the audience has to understand the text although it is not accustomed to poetic expression. The target language should not be forced to obey rules which are unnatural to it (p. 80).

Contrary to the general assumption, the language spoken on stage should not be natural and easy, that is, the language that can be heard in everyday situations. According to Ellonen (1998), the speech on stage has to be concise and stylized; therefore, the suffixes that are typical and copious in Finnish are the first to be removed from the translation, as well as other short words (p. 46). As Juva argues (1998), it is easy to ruin a translation by filling the text with empty and useless words, and thus the translator should not try to create all the characteristics of colloquial language. She says that, in the end, translating a dialogue for the stage is creating an illusion and not imitating actual colloquial speech (p. 53).

6   Shakespeare's language and translation problems

William Shakespeare (1564-1616) wrote his works in a world which was questioning its historical heritage and, at the same time, opening up to new social, political and cultural styles. As Serpieri puts it, "everything was in movement in a dynamic way typical of the Baroque period with all its close associations with illusions" (2004, p. 27). Since Shakespeare described and interpreted this world, his language became dense and

turbulent. The English language was developing radically at the time, and Shakespeare was able to see the possibilities of a free and rich language which was not bound by any rules or norms (Pennanen, 1967, p. 154). He created hybrid registers and styles and was able to activate various senses of many words, make them work together or set one against the other (Serpieri, 2004, p. 27).

Although Shakespeare's language seems to us special because of the unique tone of his verse, according to Pennanen (1967) its typical feature is its normality. Shakespeare did not use any special language of his own, neither in regard to the vocabulary nor the structures. He employed relatively few features which were typical of the Elizabethan age but which were only temporary and eventually vanished. Shakespeare's language was the one used in the royal court, and therefore, people of all social classes in his audience could relate to his language in one way or another although they did not necessarily use it. This is where the characteristics of Shakespeare's language originate from: during the Elizabethan time, especially abundance was admired along with conciseness, the sublimity of conceit, mellifluousness and the fullness of references (*ibid.*, p. 154-155).

The main problem with translating and, in fact, reading Shakespeare's texts is that there is a gap of 400 years between the modern audience and the language he used. The difficulties do not lie in the spelling or in the morphology or syntax; on the contrary, they are relatively easy to master. As Pennanen states (p. 156), the problems arise from the outmoded words, changed or no longer used meanings of words, metaphors, wordplays and comparisons which are based on ancient events, beliefs and conceptions, and the allusions which refer to them. Furthermore, Bonnard (1952, cited in Pennanen, 1967) points out that some stylistic structures cause difficulties, such as anacolutha, in which there is an incongruence within a single sentence: hendiadys, by which two nouns joined by a conjunction are used instead of a noun and a modifier; ellipsis; and the use of an adjective instead of an abstract concept representing the main word and vice versa. In addition, some problems are caused by confusion of train of thought, entanglement of different linguistic structures, extremely short expressions and unexpected shifting from one thought to another which seems to have no connection to the first. Metaphors are another problem and there are quite many words, expressions and verses the meaning of which has not yet been clarified (p. 156).

Shakespeare's language is above all old and, most importantly, not spoken anymore, but it is also a complex structure of alternating prose and verse. According to Kermode (2000, p. 3), it was typical of the time that plays were partly written in verse. Thus, the translator has to solve the basic problems such as choosing between free and metred verse and also between prose and verse. The translator has to remember that in Shakespeare's plays the variation between prose and verse is also used to represent social and dramatic contrast. Even though lower-class characters speak in prose and verse is spoken by socially elevated people, Blake (1983) reminds us that this distinction should not be emphasised too much. There is considerable alteration within prose and verse and one of these could appear in situations in which the other would be expected (p. 28). Blake also points out that we cannot say whether the prose used by the lower-class characters in Shakespeare's plays was colloquial as we do not know much about the colloquialism of Elizabethan English. According to Blake, Shakespeare's language was not as colloquial as that of his contemporaries, and furthermore, the "absence of elevation and embellishment is not the same thing as colloquialism" (p. 39).

In addition, as Déprats (2004a) says, Shakespeare's texts are "interwoven with inherent ambiguities and polysemous puns specific to English, with its network of homophones and semantic ambivalence" (p. 133). In fact, the translator has to make choices constantly when translating Shakespeare: the translator is "torn between contradictory imperatives which any translation will necessarily rank in order of importance" (*ibid.*). Indeed, Shakespeare's texts are, as Déprats observes, a texture made up of effects of irony and perspective. Serpieri (2004) summarizes the translation process on the linguistic level as constantly making choices on the rhythmic, metric, syntactic, stylistic and rhetorical levels (p. 32).

According to Déprats (2004a), the speciality of Shakespeare's texts is in "an almost uninterrupted chain of magnetic words, of thoughts and images forming radiating constellations". Therefore, the metaphor in Shakespeare's text should not be expanded into a phrase or a sentence so as to preserve the specific structure of words of the source text, "nor should the strange violence of an image be made more commonplace for the sake of intellectual comprehension" (p. 144-145). He also claims that the text should not be smoothed, the metaphors pruned or the text made easier to speak or breathe. Yet he

says that Shakespeare wrote his plays for speaking mouths and breathing lungs (p. 137). I strongly disagree with Déprats, as does the practice in drama translation, since it is indispensable that the audience understands the lines and metaphors the moment they hear them. The immediacy of the performance dictates that the translation cannot sound foreign to the audience as it has no time to stop and admire, or rather contemplate, a strange image or line.

Déprats encourages the translator to create new forms instead of being satisfied with using existing expressions and phrases. This would be ideal as long as the new expressions are easily understood by the contemporary audience and do not confuse the meaning of the play. Déprats also supports the idea that the translator should favour the source language over the target language and "stick closely to the physical aspect of the language" (p. 145). Yet, he expects the translator to keep in mind the "listening eye" rather than the "reading eye" and create a translation in imaginative and spontaneous language. Furthermore, today's audience should be able to relate to the language used in the translation. Déprats supports, in my opinion, the same utopia of translation as many others: the translation should conserve every aspect and feature of the source text and dazzle the audience of the target text with extraordinary language. Instead, the audience is more likely to be confused and to reject the language of the translation than embrace it as a unique masterpiece.

Déprats claims that the difference between the semantic and phonetic structures of the source and target language "often results in an impoverishment of the translated text" in reference to the texture of the text (2004a, p. 133). However, I find it hard to agree with Déprats' argument as the impoverished result cannot be blamed on the structural differences of two different languages, but only on the translator's lack of effort to compensate for the untranslatable features in some other part of the target text. In other words, the combination of two differently structured languages does not automatically lead to poor or impoverished translation.

6.1 Translating iambic metre into Finnish

Although the differences between the structures of the source and target language do not automatically lead to poor translations, they present many difficulties for the translator. One problematic language pair is English and Finnish as their structures are quite

different. Pennanen (1967, p. 168) argues that Shakespeare's Finnish translator faces serious problems especially with verse, since the structures of the English and Finnish language differ radically; in fact, they are opposites. The morphology and syntactic structure, and also the word formation of English are analytical, whereas Finnish is synthetic in its structure; its words are long, usually much longer than the English words. Moreover, in English, the typical metre is the iambic one, whereas in Finnish the emphasis is on the first syllable which makes the trochee, that is, a downward metre, natural for the Finnish language. It could be said that the Finnish translator faces insuperable difficulties, but practice has proved this assumption wrong as numerous translations of high quality are made from English into Finnish.

In order to continue the discussion about metre, I will now introduce the most common metres that are used in English and Finnish. A foot is a unit of one metre and one foot is a combination of two or more syllables, of which the first or the last is stressed. When the stress is on the first syllable of a foot, the metre is said to be downward. When the stress is on the last syllable of a foot, the metre is said to be upward (Palmgren, 1986, p. 307). In examples where Finnish is examined, I will mark a stressed syllable with "+" and unstressed with "o". The most common downward metres are *trochee* (+o) and *dactyl* (+oo) and those of upward metres are *iamb* (o+) and *anapaest* (oo+) (*ibid.*). It has to be noted that the metres do not follow the division of words or lines. The trochee is typical of Finnish and the iamb of English.

Three quarters of English poetry are written in *blank verse*. It is based on unrhymed lines of iambic pentameter, which consists of five iambic feet (*ibid.*, p. 316), as in this example of Shakespeare's Sonnet 18, in which ᴗ symbols an unstressed syllable and ⁄ a stressed syllable:

```
ᴗ   ⁄       ᴗ   ⁄        ᴗ    ⁄         ᴗ   ⁄       ᴗ   ⁄
So long |   as men |    can breathe |    or eyes |    can see,
ᴗ   ⁄       ᴗ    ⁄        ᴗ    ⁄        ᴗ    ⁄       ᴗ   ⁄
So long |   lives this |    and this |   gives life |   to thee.
```

<div align="center">(Blank verse, 2010)</div>

Blank verse was adapted from the unrhymed Greek and Latin *heroic verse*, and soon after it was introduced in 16th-century Italy, it became the standard metre of Italian renaissance drama. In the early 16th century, the verse was introduced to England by Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey. However, it was Shakespeare that created the greatest

English dramatic poetry by using the line and the instrument of blank verse (Blank verse, 2010). The blank verse used by Shakespeare consists of three three-lined stanzas, or quatrain, and ends with a two-lined stanza, or couplet, and they have a certain pattern of end rhyme: abab cdcd efef gg (Palmgren, 1986, p. 316).

In Finnish, the stress is on the first syllable and there cannot be two successive stressed syllables. If a word consists of three or more syllables, the secondary stress is on the syllable following the unstressed syllable, that is, on the third, fifth, and so on. The last syllable of a word is usually unstressed; however, if the secondary stress is on a short syllable, it will shift to the following long syllable (Hakulinen *et al.*, 2004, §13). Furthermore, one-syllabic words are not considered stressed (Martin, 2009). The iambic metre employs an unusually large number of one-syllabic words, whereas the trochee prefers two-syllabic words. Some of the Finnish conjunctions are one-syllabic and most of the other conjunctions can be shortened by an omission of the final vowel and they are suitable for beginning an iambic line. Therefore, the syntactic structure in an iambic poem is usually more complex and diverse than in a trochaic poem (Leino, 1982, p. 304).

Leino (1982) mentions that although the standard Finnish language employs syntactic emphasis of different degrees in ordinary writing and speech, the poetic language uses this stylistic instrument exceptionally frequently. Usually, the emphasis that the poetic language employs is uncommon or foreign in the standard language. A frequent word order permutation is the inversion of an attribute and its main word, as can be seen in the following line from Mantere's poem *Vapaussodasta palaaville pojilleni* (1918): *oi, onneani oivaa, / iloan' ihanaa.* There can also be other elements between the attribute and its main word, despite the fact that they might be inverted, as in Rytkönen's poem *Juhannus* (1930): *ja läikähtelee mieli / nyt nuori lämpöään.* A postpositional clause can be inverted or broken (*alas laskeutua*), an adverb can be placed before its main word (*julmasti on sen sovittanut*), the subject can be after its predicate verb (*on sen sovittanut Caesar*) and an auxiliary and its main verb can change places.

Other deviations in the syntactic structure are that the subject or object is removed from its place and replaced with a pronoun, as in Kianto's poem *Oulunjärvellä* (1900): *Mun korpeni rauhaa syvää –/ sitä iäti siunaelen!* In this example, the object, *korpeni rauhaa*,

is replaced with a pronoun *sitä* in the second line although the meaning would be conveyed without the repetitive pronoun. Also, modifiers that relate to a nominal form of a verb can relocate from their regular place. An example of this can be seen in the poem *Erämaan laulu* (1930) by Rytkönen: *tää ammoin on mennyttä aikaa, / jota enää sä löydä et*. Here, the first word of the modifier *ammoin mennyttä aikaa* is relocated before the verb it is related to, *ammoin on mennyttä aikaa*. (Examples from the poems are from Leino, 1982, p. 265-267, other examples are from the translations of *Julius Caesar*).

Leino (*ibid.*) points out that standard language emphasises the subject by replacing the neutral word order SVC (subject-verb-complement) with an order ending with a verb, SCV. In poetic language, this is more common, although the purpose is not to emphasise the subject. An inverted word order, SCV, is represented in Larin-Kyösti's poem (1918): *Hän joukkojansa johti / ja ryssät pakoon löi*. The neutral word order would be: hän johti joukkojansa / ja löi ryssät pakoon. In addition, it is not uncommon that, in poetic language, the verb is placed in the beginning of a sentence in situations where it would be unusual in the standard language. This has occurred in Jylhä's poem *Ehtoo joulun alla*: *Lepäs aivan edessä uudet / ja kirkaat luistimet* (examples are from Leino, 1982, p. 266). Leino discovered in his study that the use of unusual word order variants has been diminished because the majority of the aberrations he encountered were among the older poems and the newer poems contained less unusual word variants (*ibid.*, p. 267).

Enwald (2000), in a study of translational solutions in poetic translation, has found that translating with metre leads to shortening or lengthening of words, clichéd rhymes, repetitive affixes and archaisms. All these mean sacrifices for the Finnish language as they are not natural to it. Although some may have claimed that the greatest problem for Finnish is that it is an unproductive language in rhyming compared to German, English and French, Enwald disagrees and says that a greater problem is the different length of words. If the translator tries to preserve the metre of the source text, some of the information of the verse has to be sacrificed. There cannot be as much content, for instance, in a Finnish line as there is in a German one because the Finnish words are not at concise as in Germany. Other options, Enwald argues, are reducing, combining, rearranging the inner order of a line or even the order of the lines. On the other hand,

Enwald mentions that the hymn book reform in Finland showed that, in Finnish, the iambic metre does not have to be full of shortenings and interjections. In fact, the majority of our old artistic poetry, which does not include folklore, employs the iambic metre (Leino, 1982, p. 62). Therefore, Enwald argues, the iambic metre is not the primary problem for the translator (2000, p. 188-189).

Despite the fact that the iambic metre is not the greatest problem in Finnish translations, Enwald says that translations which follow the metre of the source text are problematic since following a certain metre ties the translator as well as the translation. Enwald refers to "professor translations" in which the rhythm, or "the dance" of the poem, as Enwald calls it, is lost in the slavish following of the metre. She reminds us that if a poem is rough by nature and has "flaws" in it, the translator should not be too eager to follow the chosen patterns and improve the poem but instead let it live its rough and uneven life (*ibid.*).

6.2 Archaic or modern language

One problem of translating Shakespeare that has to be solved first is the approach to the language and the historical aspect: in short, the translator has to decide whether to use either foreignisation or domestication. The two extremes are to use either archaic language corresponding to 16th century English or the most contemporary language. Pennanen argues that the translator should choose, or rather create a form of language which would not be anachronic in either period (1967, p. 158).

In Finnish, the historical aspect of the language itself is quite problematic because our written language developed later than that of English; in fact, when Shakespeare wrote his plays and English flourished, Michael Agricola had just founded the Finnish literary language with his first translations (Pennanen, 1967, p. 168). Therefore, it is difficult to trace a period the language of which would correspond to Elizabethan English. If the translator chooses to use archaic language, should the new-born, undeveloped literary language be used or perhaps a language which some writers and authors have adapted but which is still developing and enriching, for example, Finnish in the late 19th century? The question is difficult and perhaps that is one of the reasons why our translations are being updated in contemporary language, with only few voices demanding archaic translations. Pennanen argues that a good translation should differ

very little from the modern language but, at the same time, it should invoke similar associations and connotations in the target audience as Shakespearean English invokes among the modern British (*ibid*.).

However, with the French language, the discussion about using archaic language is possible and meaningful. Georges Banu (1928), as Déprats (2004b) mentions, yearns after the French language from the Middle Ages, the Renaissance and other later centuries, a language which has already disappeared and been forgotten. Banu argues that the translation and translator of ancient texts can bring back forgotten words and "rekindle the existence of things" (p. 68). The French translator Marcel Schwob (1986) objects strongly to modernized translation and, interestingly, compares modernizing Shakespeare to translating Rabelais into Voltaire's language (cited in Déprats 2004b, p. 68). But, as Déprats observes, Schwob and Morand in their translation of *Hamlet* use only few archaisms and forgotten words. In fact, the archaic effect is created by rhetorical processes such as using high register and elevated literary language, rare words and dispensing with regular syntax (*ibid*., p. 68–69). This demonstrates a situation in which theory does not correspond to practice and that practice should be the basis of theory.

6.3 Translating Shakespeare's stagecraft

One aspect of drama must be taken into account in every drama and theatre translation: how the translation works on stage. Déprats (2004a) emphasizes that the translation needs to follow the rhythm of the breath in order to work on stage. He quotes a French Shakespearean actor, Jean Vilard, who says that translators cannot find the rhythm which characterizes good plays, and that translations do not "breathe" so that the actor could be carried along on the breath of the text (p. 137). Déprats reminds us that Shakespeare's plays are above all written for the stage and for the actors who utter the lines. Therefore, the theatrical dimension of the play, that is, its vocal energy, must be preserved when translating for the stage. In my opinion, this can also be applied when the translation is not aimed for the stage only; the theatrical dimension must be preserved in all translations whether for a specific theatre production or for a book; otherwise the translation does not fulfil its function of representing a play, or it has a different function (e.g. modifying the play to a tale).

However, there is more on stage than the words and the actors uttering them: there is also action indicated in the lines, the characters, and in the rhythm. There are few, if any, direct stage directions in Shakespeare's plays, but there are implicit directions in the texts. Styan (1967) has argued that Shakespeare's verse is full of implications about how it is to be delivered (p. 54-58). As Déprats explains, movement is included in the poetic word itself, and the actor's gestures are suggested in the words in the shape of subtle muscular promptings or gestural hints (2004a, p. 138). Styan feels that the implications can be found in the words selected and that some of the instructions are explicit, as in *Hamlet*, in which the Ghost 'stalks away' (1.1.53) and in *Romeo and Juliet* where Juliet approaches Friar Lawrence's cell with 'O, so light a foot' (2.6.16) (Styan's examples, 1967, p. 53).

Implicit instructions are also expressed through rhythm, images and prosody which Shakespeare uses to imply how the actor should use his voice and body. A further example of these implicit instructions, according to Déprats, is the repetition within the text which requires immobility (2004a, p. 139.). Styan explains that the sound of the words and the rhythm function as a guide toward the emotions and gestures intended (1967, p. 142). The rhythm of a line can indicate the character's mood. For instance, short and concise clauses demand a fast reading and they signal an excited or upset state of mind, whereas longer clauses which have a repetitive structure that requires a slow or calm utterance can suggest a peaceful spirit. Repetition is an important factor in the rhythm of the lines. According to Styan, the reiteration of a word or phrase always indicates the pace and pitch of speech. Repetition can create a simple rhetorical effect, such as repeatedly hitting the same note. Repetition can also indicate a mind under stress or reminding the audience of the theme of the scene by emphasising it through reiteration (*ibid*., p. 148). For example, in *Julius Caesar*, the characters' state of mind is often expressed by repetition which highlights the lines by repeating certain words or phrases.

Déprats introduces Brecht's term *gestus* which he applies to the potential gestures and cores of theatricality. The actor's physical deportment and behaviour towards others are included in the *gestus* (*ibid*., p. 140). Stylistic elements, rhythm, phrasing, syntactical breaks, redundancies, repetitions, metrical structures and verse schemes – in short, all the formal elements, are included in the *gestus*. Naturally, implications are also included

in the structure of the verse: whether in the measure of time provided by the iambic pentameter, in the dramatic effect of metrical variations, in breaks in metre or in incomplete verse. Déprats criticizes translators for having too often a tendency to amplify an incomplete verse in their translation, which signifies that the translator ignores and removes the implication of gesture. In his opinion, the translator ought to be able to "stay close to the physical reality of the original text and to its sensorial and material aspects" and still preserve the brilliancy and the poetic fertility of the source text by constantly bearing in mind the theatrical dimension of the text (*ibid*., p. 141-142).

7   Retranslating Shakespeare in Finland

What makes a text a classic? One feature is that a text lasts from one generation to another and, even after centuries, audiences with different backgrounds can relate to it. This can happen only if a text can be interpreted in many different ways and every generation and different culture can find new aspects of it. Gerbel reminds us why Shakespeare is retranslated:

> Every generation will find in Shakespeare something new, something that escaped and slipped from the attention of the previous age, and every century will turn to the study of Shakespeare with new zeal and affection, wherein all foreign literatures will be constantly enriched with new translations of his works. (Gerbel, vii)

As one reason for retranslations, Déprats mentions the language which turns old-fashioned quickly, but names, as the second reason, the fact that a translation cannot embrace all the limitless, open-ended dimensions of a text. The third reason is as simple as the desire to translate classical text again; the fact that there are numerous previous translations cannot hold back this artistic desire. Yet, he notes that the constant retranslation does not mean an inconstant and divided approach but "an attempt to meet the challenge of creating, for each new period, a lively, new bond with the play to be translated" (2004a, p. 144). This last reason mentioned by Déprats is applicable to many translators, and, as Kersti Juva has stated, translating Shakespeare is something marvellous for a translator with its challenges and rewarding outcome (Petäjä, 2003). The second reason is still current as all Shakespeare's metaphors and neologisms have not been completely clarified and some are explained in new ways. The changing language is problematic with earlier and modern translations because the translations

and their language turn anachronic in the course of time. This can be seen in the history of translating Shakespeare into Finnish.

The first of Shakespeare's plays arrived in Finland in the repertoire of foreign theatre companies during the 18th century. In the beginning of the 19th century, Swedish and German translations of Shakespeare's plays were read in literary gatherings (Paloposki, 2007, p. 130). The plays arrived in Finland as translations and translations into Finnish were made using translations into another language as a source text. Literature was in its infancy in the beginning of the 19th century as there was almost no published literature in Finnish: the first Finnish novels were published in the late 1860's, as late as three decades after the first Swedish novels (Aaltonen, 2003, p. 105, 109, 111).

In the late 19th and early 20th century, Finnish drama literature started to develop; and drama translation provided vital models for this (*ibid.*, p. 111, 112). The Finnish Literature Society (SKS) played an important role in drama translation, especially when it initiated its grand project to translate all Shakespeare's plays into Finnish, apparently, according to Rissanen, on Paavo Cajander's initiative (2007, p. 202). The translation project began in 1878, was finished in 1912 (Aaltonen, 2003, p. 116), and comprised 36 translations, all except the controversial *Pericles*, whose author has not been verified. Cajander's work was challenging because the Finnish literary language was still developing and thus constantly changing. Therefore, he had to revise his translations as new editions were published. Nonetheless, his translations were outdated as early as the 1930's (Niemi, 2007, p. 131). Since then, until the 21st century, there has not been another comprehensive project to translate Shakespeare's entire production, although there have been small-scale initiatives or single translations by different translators throughout the 20th century. For instance, Yrjö Jylhä translated seven plays (Pennanen, 1967, p. 159). In 2004, the publishing company WSOY started the second project of translating Shakespeare's plays and this time it will involve approximately ten translators (Pyrylä, 2004).

According to Aaltonen, translating plays for the theatre, but not necessarily for the stage, has always been typical of Finnish drama translations (2003, p. 104-105). Drama translations were essential for the Finnish theatre and for its development in the late 19th century, and today half of the plays on Finnish stages are translated from various

languages. The classics are still performed on stage in Finland, but the modern profit-based orientation has reduced their frequency as they do not attract the modern audience as much as they used to (p. 120). In modern theatre, controversial adaptations of classics have become a common method to attract audiences. For instance, Kristian Smeds' direction and dramatisation of Väinö Linna's Finnish war classic *Tuntematon sotilas* (*The Unknown Soldier*), premiered in 2007, was a rough and polemic adaptation – and sold out. Another recent successful adaptation is Leo Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina* which the director, Andriy Zholdak, has adapted for the modern stage. The status and the importance of the director of a play are typical of the modern Finnish theatre. Since the 1960's, the director has created a new interpretation, and finally labelled the play or the performance with his name. Kalle Holmberg and Jouko Turkka are good examples of directors whose name defines the performance more than the original author. This need for custom-made translations and licence to adapt plays is still basic practice in the Finnish theatre (*ibid.*, p. 121).

8 Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* and its Finnish translators

In this chapter, I briefly introduce *Julius Caesar* and its Finnish translators. I concentrate on issues that might have an effect on their translations, whether it is their personal achievements or the cultural context where they have translated the play. No translation is created in a vacuum, and therefore, it is important for the analysis to know in which context and situation the translators have worked. Their background also helps to clarify the motivations for the translations and for the approaches that the translators have employed in their translations.

8.1 *Julius Caesar*

Shakespeare's tragedy *Julius Caesar* was first performed in 1599. It was the first play in the new Globe Theatre (Kermode, 2000, p. 85). It describes the conspiracy against Julius Caesar, the Roman dictator, his murder and its aftermath. One of the themes is deception: Caesar is deceived by his friends, Brutus is deceived to assassinate Caesar, and Antony deceives Brutus to believe in his good intentions and to allow him to give the funeral speech to the crowd, and thus allowing Antony to destroy the crowd's support for Brutus. Characteristic of this play is that it can be performed in any time and in any costume – whether in togas, military uniforms or modern suits – and it would not

lose any meaning. As Kermode notes, *Julius Caesar* is an intensely political play and this has a strong effect on its language (p. 86). According to Kermode, in Shakespeare's time, Romans were supposed to have spoken with "constrained dignity" (p. 87); thus the dialect in *Julius Caesar* differs so much from its antecedent *Romeo and Juliet* and the following *Hamlet*. The speech of the characters, excluding that of the crowd, seems to be that of Romans, "conscious of the honour of being Romans" (p. 87). Kermode reminds us that the characters of the play were the contemporaries of Cicero who was seen as an important model of Renaissance style (*ibid.*).

The play begins with a scene that depicts the background of the play. Two tribunes meet commoners celebrating Caesar's victory over Pompey and order them to return to their homes and mourn for the defeated Pompey whom they once loved. The opening scene sets an opposition between a capricious public sentiment, which has changed from supporting Pompey to favouring Caesar, and the higher class represented by the tribunes, who are supporting the defeated Pompey. In the following scene, a soothsayer tells Caesar to beware the ides of March (i.e., the 15th day of March), but Caesar ignores the warnings. Cassius begins to manipulate Brutus for his conspiracy by mocking Caesar's weaknesses and falling sickness. Then Casca gives an account of the events outside the stage, telling that Caesar was offered a crown three times. Every time Caesar denied the crown, and the crowd loudly cheered. In the same scene, we find out that Caesar is suspicious of Cassius. The scene ends wits Cassius' self-satisfied soliloquy.

Immediately, there is a storm, and Casca describes divine portents of the night. He has seen a slave whose hand was burning but was not harmed, a lion walking in Capitol, horrified women that swore they had seen men in fire. Cassius turns the omens to support his conspiracy, and with the other conspirators he plans how Brutus is persuaded to the conspiracy. The second act begins with Brutus reasoning about the murder of Caesar. When the conspirators join him, he is convinced that Caesar must be assassinated and they agree on murdering Caesar but not Antony, Caesar's closest ally. After the conspirators have exit, Brutus' wife, Portia, sees that he is troubled, and persuades him to share his worries. In the following scene, Calpurnia, Caesar's wife, tells about her ominous dream and is concerned of his safety if he goes to the Senate, but again, Caesar ignores her warnings.

In the third act, the conspirators stab Caesar in the Senate. Antony persuades Brutus to allow him to give a funeral speech by promising that he will speak no evil of the conspirators. However, Antony manages to set the crowd against the conspirators who escape from Rome the moment Antony finishes his speech and the crow leaves the Capitol in fury. Antony and Octavius Caesar gather an army to defeat the conspirators who have also prepared themselves for war. Before the crucial battle at Philippi, Brutus and Cassius quarrel about the corruption in the armies. The intense argument ends with a sentimental reconciliation which is interrupted by a poet who enters Brutus' tent and becomes the common target of Brutus and Cassius' scolding. The next day, Brutus and Cassius soon realise that they have lost the battle and both take their own lives rather than are defeated by Antony and Octavius.

We can see in *Julius Caesar* the alteration between prose and verse which is typical of Shakespeare's plays; the most famous example from this play is Brutus' and Anthony's funeral speeches. As Brook (1976) argues, prose is also used for reasoned argument in Shakespeare's plays. This can be seen in the difference between Brutus and Anthony who speak in prose and verse, respectively: Brutus' speech is based on reason and logic, whereas Anthony's speech is emotional (p. 161). In their funeral speeches, the differences between the two characters become obvious. Brutus believes he knows what the common people want to hear and that he knows he can gain their support with reason. On the other hand, Antony knows what the crowd wants and he gains their support by appealing to their emotions towards a celebrated leader.

Manipulation is essential in *Julius Caesar*, because everyone tries to manipulate someone. Brutus attempts to manipulate his companions to believe that they should assassinate Caesar only for noble and unselfish reasons. Cassius manipulates Brutus to join the conspiracy and to believe that Brutus makes the decisions on the assassination. Antony manipulates the crowd into a rage against the assassinators, and even Portia, Brutus' wife, manipulates Brutus to tell her his problems.

8.2 Paavo Cajander

If we needed an example of a translator who has been canonized through his translations, Paavo Cajander (1846-1913) would be the first to mention. There are some translations that readers find perfect and see no need for new updated translations. As

Shurbanov and Sokolova say, "sometimes singular achievements tend to block out the simple fact that 'great translations' exist in a dynamic world" (2004, p. 95-96).

Paavo Cajander translated his first novel, J. J. Wecksell's Daniel Hjort in 1877. The translation was awarded a prize by the SKS and one of the reasons was that the translation preserved the poetic beauty of the source text, and it was also concise and short, not much longer than the original (Niemi, 2007, p. 71). Constant cooperation with the SKS, the Finnish theatre and Kansanvalistusseura, an adult education organisation, meant that Cajander was to work as a literary translator permanently, and in the 1880's translation became his whole-time occupation. Cajander's first translation of Shakespeare was *Hamlet*, and the SKS ordered other Shakespeare's plays to be translated (p. 72). According to Rissanen (2007, p. 202), Cajander himself suggested the translation of Shakespeare's entire production. *Romeo and Juliet* was followed by *Hamlet*, and in the following three decades altogether 36 translations were added to the SKS series of Shakespeare's plays, all by Paavo Cajander (Niemi, 2007, p. 73-74).

Cajander revised almost every one of his translations, especially those of Runeberg, Topelius and Shakespeare, when new editions were published. This was partly due to the fact that especially from the late 19th century to the beginning of the 20th century, the written Finnish language developed rapidly and the translator had to take into consideration the changing norms of the linguistic community (Niemi, 2007, p. 131). Despite the challenging conditions, Cajander succeeded in his difficult task. Rissanen claims that Cajander's translations can be compared with other contemporary translations of any other language in style and accuracy (2007, p. 205). Niemi adds that Cajander's translation of *Hamlet* was highly appreciated by contemporary critics, especially for its language (2007, p. 74). According to Rissanen, a modern reader cannot help but admire the richness of his expression, although the changes in the language that have taken place during over a century can be seen in Cajander's translations. He does not resort to too much decorativeness and he mastered the noble speech of the court as well as the lush rambling speech of the common people (2007, p. 205).

8.3 Eeva-Liisa Manner

Eeva-Liisa Manner (1921-1995) is best known as a poet, but she was also a translator and playwright. In her article about Manner, Hökkä (2007) mentions that Manner

translated texts of some 150 authors. Manner was first and foremost a poet and she felt it necessary to expand her poetic linguistic work to all her writing. She also liked to translate plays as they are controllable. Her first poetic translations were published in her first poem collection *Mustaa ja punaista* in 1944 and they comprised the translations of German poets. In the late 50's she started to translate children's literature, and in the 60's she began to write her own plays and also translate plays and radio plays, which eventually became the largest area of her translation work. The number of her translations of novels and short stories is significantly smaller than that of plays, but they were more important to her personal literary career. In addition to Shakespeare, she translated Herman Hesse, Georg Büchner, Oscar Parland and Kawabata. Translation of Shakespeare was Manner's interest during her later years and the culmination of her career as a translator. Her translation of *Julius Caesar* was published in 1983. Apparently, she retranslated some Shakespeare's plays on the basis of Cajander's translations (Pennanen, 1967, p. 159). However, in regard to *Julius Caesar*, there is no mention of this, but the similarities between Cajander's and Manner's translations imply that she has used Cajander's translation as the basis for her own translation. Because of the unclear circumstances, I will not examine the similarities between Cajander and Manner's translation in my analysis.

In Manner's childhood home, German and Swedish were spoken besides Finnish. She translated mostly from Swedish, German and English, and she also used other translations to support her own work. For instance, she translated Japanese novels by comparing translations into other languages. Manner has stated that the translator has to master not only the source language but also the target language and overcome the fatal influence of the source language, thus creating a translation that fulfils its function, on conditions set by the translator, not by the source text.

8.4 Lauri Sipari

Sipari started as a translator when he was a first year student in the Theatre Academy. He turned to Työväen Näyttämöiden Liitto, the official Association of Amateur and Professional Theatres in Finland, which gave him Henrik Ibsen's *Hedda Gabler* to translate, despite the fact that he did not speak Norwegian (Sipari, 1983, p. 49). Sipari has also written numerous plays, adaptations, dramatisations and radio plays (*Helsingin Sanomat*, 20.3.1997). Sipari was the rector of the Theatre Academy from 1997 to 2005

(*ibid.*, 3.12.2005). He does not regard himself as a translator but as a playwright. He has translated a few plays written in prose, and also works by Lilian Hellman, Edward Albee and eight of Shakespeare's plays, of which *Julius Caesar* was translated for the stage in 1997 and published in 2006 (Sipari, 1983, p. 49; Vuori, 1999; Zilliacus, 2007). Sipari began translating Shakespeare in 1970 when a Finnish director, Jotaarkka Pennanen needed the translations of three monologues from *Hamlet* for his television adaptation. Later he translated the entire play for stage, and has since also translated *Romeo and Juliet*, *Julius Caesar* and *Coriolanus* (Sipari, 1983, p. 51).

Sipari claims that translating classics such as Shakespeare's plays cannot be compared to his other translations. In his opinion, it is comparable to writing his own play since they are both difficult and mentally demanding (1983, p. 49). He has a practical view of his predecessors: Sipari has noted that the old translations of Shakespeare are not useful for him as they are translated for their own time and from the translator's personal starting points. Thus, they are not important for his translations and he does not feel any need to rebel against them (Lahdelma *et al.*, 1983, p. 58).

8.5 Jarkko Laine

Jarkko Laine (1947-2006) was a Finnish writer who also translated, mainly from English and later also from Norwegian. He translated plays and novels by Shakespeare, Mark Twain and Leonard Cohen, to name just a few. He has a large lyrical production comprising 23 collections of poems and also a total of 12 novels or collections of short stories, in addition to plays and aphorisms (Liedes & Lehtinen, 2007, p. 170-173). Laine had an important role as a lyricist in the career of a Finnish rock star, Rauli "Badding" Somerjoki during the 70's, and translated many lyrics for Badding's hit songs (Numminen, 2007).

Laine was the editor-in-chief of *Parnasso*, an important literary journal in Finland, between 1987 and 2002, and also the chairman of the Union of Finnish Writers from 1988 until 2002 (Liedes & Lehtinen, 2007, p. 169). His time as chairman ended in hostile circumstances and as Numminen says, when electing a new chairman for the Union, the majority of the participants of the meeting were almost revengeful against the long-term chairman. Zilliacus (2007) implies that the translation of *Julius Caesar*, a play of political plotting, was Laine's "last will" to the literary field, an answer to his

dethronement from the Union. This might have influenced his translation and the strategies he used. Firstly, Zilliacus says, Laine's translation was not commissioned, and there was no previous agreement or contract on it; he just offered it to a publisher. Secondly, the translation is very domesticated; for instance, Laine wrote the entire play in prose, and the translation also includes such lexical features as replacing both *sword* and *dagger* with the Finnish *puukko*. In the source text, the language is clearly divided into users of elevated and lower style language, and it is linguistically balanced; however, in Laine's translation the language is not as smooth as in the original and there is no difference between characters with regard to elevated style. As I mentioned above, *Julius Caesar* can be played in any time and in any costume, and still preserve the meaning of the play. There is always the possibility that the translator has other motives for translating a certain play than simply a love for the arts.

9   Analysis of the four translations of Julius Caesar

The material of this analysis consists of four translations of William Shakespeare's tragedy *Julius Caesar*. The play was translated into Finnish first by Paavo Cajander in 1883. He revised his translation for the second edition, which was published in 1913. Because the changes made in the second edition were only typographical or reflected the developments of the Finnish language and all the changes are well recorded, I will analyse the second edition. The second translation of the play, by Eeva-Liisa Manner, was published in 1983. Lauri Sipari translated *Julius Caesar* in 1997 for the stage and the translation was published in 2006, probably as a revised version. The fourth translation by Jarkko Laine was published in 2007. I will also use Norman Sanders' (2005) and E. A. Saarimaa's (1923) commentaries in the publications of the play in English and Finnish, respectively.

The focus of my analysis is on the relationship of the translations to their source text and on their equivalence to the original text. In other words, I examine whether the translations follow the syntactic structure, word order or metre of the original and how they compensate or explain expressions or wordplays unfamiliar to the Finnish reader. I compare the stagecraft of the translations to that of the source text in order to determine whether the translators have preserved the implicit stage directions that can be found in Shakespeare's play and whether they have made other alterations. I also analyse

whether the language in the translations is fluent Finnish, whether the language has anachronisms or other characteristics that might affect their intelligibility. The analysis begins with vocabulary and syntactic aspects, continues with metaphors, wordplay and stagecraft, and finally, the metre of the translations.

The analysis is based on my subjective reading and findings. The statements concerning the fluency of the language or other linguistic aspects are based on my knowledge and intuition of Finnish. There may be different opinions about the intelligibility or interpretation of a text– and there should be, since texts are ambiguous, and different readers interpret and read texts differently depending on their background and knowledge.

I have collected the examples used in the analysis by comparing the four translations to the source text and also comparing the translations to each other. Occasionally, the translators have employed similar translational solutions and the translations differ little from each other. I have not considered these translations relevant for this study, and thus, I have not employed them. When translators had used different solutions, when they had included additional information or when they had modified the play in some aspect, I have included them in the analysis. Naturally, I cannot present all the analysed cases in this study. Therefore, I have chosen to discuss examples that best represent the different aspects of my analysis. An attempt is made to explain how they represent the differences between the translations, how they depict the style of the translators and what is their relationship to the source text.

9.1 Vocabulary

The first aspect I will analyse is vocabulary in the translations of *Julius Caesar*. In the first scene of the first act, two tribunes, Flavius and Marullus, meet the commoners who are celebrating the victorious Caesar and demand them to stop rejoicing and to go home. The scene contains humorous wording and joking by the commoners, which agitates the two tribunes. In this scene, it is easy to see the differences between the four translations. In the first line of Flavius, he uses the expression *idle creatures* of the joyful commoners when he orders them to cease the celebration: *Hence! home you idle creatures, get you home* (1.1.1). One meaning of *creature* is human being and it can be used as a term of scorn, pity or endearment (Collins English Dictionary online, 2006).

When the word is qualified with *idle* the latter association can be excluded, especially since the tribunes act arrogantly towards the commoners.

Cajander has translated the expression *idle creatures* to *laiskat juhdat[1]* (p. 3), which refers to lazy workhorses and has the connotation of senseless creatures and also that of a worker. Manner uses *laiskiaiset* (p. 7), Sipari *tyhjäntoimittajat* (p. 47) and Laine *laiskamadot* (p. 7). These words convey the meaning of lazy people or people who do nothing and could be used when speaking to an equal. In other words, Cajander has conveyed the arrogant and superior attitude of the two tribunes who speak to lower class people, whereas the three others have not included this attitude as explicitly. Furthermore, *juhta* includes a similar connotation of a senseless and even inferior being as *creature* in English. Therefore, Cajander's translation is closest to the source text, since it conveys the meanings and connotations of the original expression, that is, the tribunes' contempt for the commoners, the reference of lazy workers and of an animal. However, this does not mean that the translation is awkward. On the contrary, *juhta* is deeply rooted to Finnish language and brings the translation close to the target culture.

Cajander uses some outdated words and expressions in his translation, which is understandable, because the Finnish language was developing rapidly, especially in the late 19th century, when he was translating Shakespeare's plays. He uses words that are now incomprehensible despite the help of the context, for example, *tiisti* (meaning *rakki, penikka*, that is, 'dog') (p. 85), *totkut* (*sisälmykset*, 'entrails'), (p. 36) and, *hairaus* (*erehdys*, 'error' or 'mistake') (p. 91) which originate from the late 18th century (Kulonen, 2000). Manner and Sipari use only a few expressions which may appear as a disapproved use of language or as unexpected lexicon for a Shakespeare play. Some examples are swearwords, such as *hitto*, *jumaliste* and *jumalauta*. But in general, their vocabulary is quite neutral and conventional Finnish, which can be assumed not to be anachronic in the near future.

Laine, on the other hand, seems to have selected a different starting point for his translation, because it differs from the others radically. He uses many modern expressions and words which are colourful and may arouse strong reactions among the

---

[1] All the examples presented in this study are written as they appear in the original text.

audience. Taking into consideration the style of the play and its characters, some of Laine's solutions are unnecessary, since they are not consistent with the style of the line or play, and they stand out at the expense of the other lines and words. Laine uses words such as *tyyppi* and *nuija* (of a person), *bonus*, *morkata*, *krapula*, *tahtotila*, *horoskooppi*, *markkeerata*, *paskanpuhuja*, *perseenuolija*, *joukkotiedotus* and *tilannekatsaus* which are typical of modern Finnish. Other words or expressions that are not coherent with the style of the play are, for instance, *kauppatori*, *korpilakko* and *avohakkuu*; *valmiit, paikoillanne, hep*; *Heil Caesar, Mein Führer!*; and *Vedä päähäs, vähämies*. The stylistic contradiction can be seen in one of Brutus' line:

BRUTUS: Brutus had rather be a villager
              Than to repute himself a son of Rome
              Under these had conditions as this time
              Is like to lay upon us. (1.2.172-175)

Laine: Brutus mieluummin jyväjemmarina eläisi kuin stadin kundiksi itseään kehuskelisi niin tylyissä oloissa kuin tämä aika näyttää osaksemme sysäävän. (p. 17)

The contradiction of style in this line is between the colloquial vocabulary and Brutus' use of third person when talking of himself. The use of third person gives the impression of an elevated style, whereas the words *jyväjemmarina* and *stadin kundiksi* are very colloquial, and the first is somewhat derogative and the second is a slang word used in the capital of Finland. The effect can be confusing to the audience: what should it think of a noble Roman who speaks like an aristocrat but uses words that are typical of the common people. Laine's translation could be compared to a situation in which a Shakespearean actor would perform Hamlet's monologue using Cockney.

Despite the differences in the vocabulary of the translators, the division between the translators with respect to the use of target text-oriented approaches, is not always clear: in the first act of the first scene, Shakespeare's expression [*y*]*our infants in your arms* (1.1.40) has been domesticated by Cajander and Manner, who both use an everyday word for infants and employ very colloquial expressions that annoyed mothers could easily say to their disruptive children. Cajander has translated the clause as [*k*]*akarat helmoissa* (p. 4) and Manner *kakarat kintuissa* (p. 8). Sipari and Laine have selected a milder translation the style of which is literal, and it can be used, for instance, in sentimental poems as well as in everyday life: Sipari has translated it *lapset sylissänne* (p. 49) and Laine *pienet lapset sylissänne* (p. 9). In other words, Cajander and Manner

have selected a very target text-oriented approach, whereas Sipari and Laine have chosen neutral expressions. They also follow the style of the Romans' speech in Shakespeare's play: as Kermode explains (2000, p. 87), the Romans speak as we would imagine noble people to speak, that is, using sophisticated and elegant language without colloquial expressions.

Another example can be found in the translations of the word *fools* (1.3.65). Cajander and Manner have translated the word as *narri* (p. 19 & 21), Sipari as *hullut* (p. 67) and Laine *idiootit* (p. 26). The first two translations are the two obvious possibilities, that is, the two connotations of the word *fool* can be translated in either way. Laine, however, has chosen a stronger expression, which sounds colloquial in the context, in the speech of a noble Roman.

Despite the noble character of the Romans, Shakespeare has included colourful words in the lines. When speaking of some women, Casca uses an expression [*t*]*hree or four wenches* (1.2.271). Belittling style is clear in the source text, in the word itself and in the context, and the four translators have been able to convey this style. However, all translators do not employ as strong expressions as Shakespeare. Cajander has translated the line as *kolme tai neljä luuskaa* (p. 15), Manner as *pari piikaista* (p. 17), Sipari as *kolme tai neljä typykkää* (p. 62), and Laine as *naisenpuolta*. Later on, Laine uses the word *muijat* of the same women (p. 21).

Luuska, which is used by Cajander, is a strong expression which has a derogatory and despising connotation, since it refers to a skinny, poor horse or a nag (Grönros *et al*., 2006). The three later translations are not as strong as the one of Cajander, since all of them refer to inferior beings, but do not necessarily convey contempt, only lack of respect. Manner uses the word *piikainen* that means a female servant, especially one working at a farmhouse and refers to ancient circumstances, and therefore, she includes one of the archaic meanings of *wench*, the other being a prostitute. The diminutive form which she uses can be interpreted here to convey the meaning of unimportance of *wench* (Collins English Dictionary online, 2006). The ambiguity of *wench* is not conveyed in Manner's translation and this causes problems in the translation: *piika*, which has a connotation of rural life, cannot be connected to the Roman Empire where there were only slaves, and people living on farms rarely came to the capital. In other words,

piikainen is culture-specific and bound to a certain period of time, and thus, the naturalness of the target text is disturbed. Laine uses *muija*, which is often used as derogatory and is also colloquial (Sadeniemi *et al.*, 1983). Sipari's *typykkä,* on the other hand, can be considered quite a neutral word, but it can also have a belittling connotation depending on the situation. Used in this scene of the play the belittling connotation may not be explicit to the audience.

In the last act of the tragedy, when Brutus, Cassius, Antony and Octavius Caesar meet on the plains of Philippi before the battle, there is another colourful line that enables the translators to use their creativity. Cassius says the line to the young Octavius who is on Antony' side, but the latter insult in the second clause is directed to Antony, known of his preference to entertainment and festivities.

CASSIUS: A peevish schoolboy, worthless of such honour,
             Join'd with a masker and a reveller! (5.1.61-62)

Cajander: Kurikas vesa, tuot' ei ansaitse hän,
             Se juomarin ja rentun seuralainen. (p. 85)

Manner: Pentu ei ansaitse surmaa moista
             – juopon rellestäjän rattopoika. (p. 79)

Sipari: Sen arvoinen et ole, sinä pojannulkki,
             tuon vanhan pellen, hulivilijuopon liittolainen! (p. 155)

Laine: Hölmö koulupoika, ei alkuunkaan sellaisen kunnianarvoinen,
             naamiaispukumiehen ja juomaveikon seuralainen. (p. 109)

Cajander has translated *peevish schoolboy* with an expression *kurikas vesa* the meaning of which is quite close to the original, and the translation is, or was at the time, vivid and distinctive. *Juomari* and *renttu* are not as close to the original text as *kurikas vesa* nor as colourful, but they convey the meaning of an irresponsible person. Manner has translated the first insult only as *pentu* which does not include the translation of *peevish*, and the insult loses some of its power. However, Manner compensates this in the next line where she has added an offensive word describing Octavius as *rattopoika* after the insult towards Antony. Sipari has not translated the word *peevish* at all, but unlike Manner, he does not compensate the omission in this Cassius' line. His translation of *reveller*, that is, *hulivilijuoppo,* is anachronic to Caesar's time, but it is very characteristic of the target language. Laine has translated *masker* with *naamiaispukumies* which, again, is a contemporary expression but the two other translations, *hölmö koulupoika* and *juomaveikko,* are not peculiar to any specific time.

All four translations are colourful and convey the insulting nature of Cassius line, although the two earlier translators seem to utilize more the potential for insulting available in Finnish.

9.2 Syntactic aspects

One aspect that has been of interest in translation theory is the syntactic structure of the source and target texts. Early theorists argued that the syntactic features of the source text should be transferred to the target text, but today theory and practice disagree strongly on this argument. In fact, the requirement of syntactic correspondence has been largely ignored, because a fluent and natural translation is not possible if syntactically foreign features are included in the target text. The easiest syntactic aspect to analyse in this study is the word order, since it is easy to compare word order of the four translations and there are unambiguous examples of the effect of the source text to the word order. In addition, there are a few other syntactic aspects that can be analysed. The different nature of the source and target languages reduce the number of syntactic features that can be transferred from English to Finnish. Thus, any English influence on the Finnish syntax would be rather awkward and, as a result, the influence has been almost completely eliminated from the syntax of the target text. The few instances are too scattered to be analysed in this thesis. The effects of English can be seen in other elements of the translations.

The change from source text orientation to target text orientation can be seen in the first scene of the first act, in which a shoe-maker describes his trade to the tribunes. In this line, there is also a wordplay that is based on the homonymy of *soles* and *souls*. I will discuss the translations of the wordplay in Section 9.4; here, observations are presented on word order.

SECOND CITIZEN: A trade, sir, that I hope I may use with a safe conscience;
            which is, indeed, sir, a mender of bad soles. (1.1.13-15)

Cajander: Semmoista ammattia, jota, toivoakseni, saatan hyvällä omallatunnolla
            tehdä; sillä minä, totta puhuen, korjaan huonoa saattoa. (p. 3)

Manner: Joo herra, semmoinen ammatti jota voin harjoittaa hyvällä
            omallatunnolla: paikkaan rajoja. (p. 7)

Sipari: Pohjatyö, herra, rehti pohjatyö; sillä tosiaankin, minä pohjaan
            pohjattomat. (p. 48)

Cajander follows the wording and word order of the source text, which produces an awkward expression in Finnish with words breaking the natural fluency of the line: *toivottavasti*, *totta puhuen* are not in their natural place, but they break the line of thought as their equivalents in the source text. Manner uses similar wording as Cajander: she employs a relative clause and the expression *hyvällä omallatunnolla.* However, in Manner's translation, there is a more neutral word order than in Cajander's translation. Sipari and Laine have a different approach: both have left out the relative clause and have simplified the lines. Sipari employs repetition and a clause without a predicate before the semicolon, and has included the expression *sillä tosiaankin* in its conventional place in the beginning of the finite clause. Consequently, we can say that Sipari and Laine have used target text-oriented translation, whereas Cajander has preserved some features of the source text, especially the word order.

There is similar awkwardness in Cajander's and Manner's translations of the following lines because they employ a strange word order.

CASCA: Are you not moved, when all the sway of earth
Shakes like a thing unfirm? ...
Either there is a civil strife in heaven;
or else the world, too saucy with the gods,
Incenses them to send destruction. (1.3.3-4, 11-13)

Cajander: Sua eikö hirvitä, kun vankka maakin
Kuin heikko ruoko horjuu? ...
Sisäinen joko sota taivahass' on
tai mailma, ynseänä jumalille,
Heit' yllyttännä turmaa tuomaan meille. (p. 17)

Manner: Etkö sinä pelkää, kun itse maakin
vapisee kuin hauras ruoko? …
Taivaassa puhjennut on sota varmaan,
tai maailma, julkeana jumalille,
yllyttää heitä hävitystä tuomaan. (p. 19)

Sipari: Eikö teitä hirvitä, kun koko luonnonjärjestys
huojuu pohjaa vailla? …
Joko taivaassa taistellaan, tai jumalat
suuttuneena maailman röyhkeyteen
ovat lähettäneet tuhon (p. 65)

Laine: Sinäkö et ole moksiskaan, vaikka koko maailma huojuu kuin huterat
rakennustelineet? … Joko taivaassa käydään sisällissotaa tai sitten
maailman hävyttömyys jumalia kohtaan on yllyttänyt heidät
kylvämään tuhoa meidän niskaamme. (p. 24)

Again, Sipari and Laine use a neutral word order in their translations, and thus, the lines are effortless to follow and understand. In Manner's translation, there is one line with one reversed word order, *puhjennut on sota varmaan* which would be more fluent if *puhjennut* were in the end of the clause. In Cajander's translation, there is an awkward word order, which creates lines that are difficult to understand. In fact, there is a significant difference between Cajander and Manner's translations of the first two lines. In Manner's translation, they are fluent and easy to understand and follow, especially when compared to Cajander's translation of the same lines. Syntactically they both are correct, since the word order of the Finnish language is flexible, but a fluent expression would require a different word order. When Cajander and Sipari's translations are compared, the difference in the fluency and natural expression is evident.

However, the main reason for the awkward word order in Cajander's translation is not the source text and its word order, since they do not have any resemblance. The most important reason for the word order is the fact that Cajander employs iambic metre, which I shall discuss later in this paper. The iambic metre may also be the reason for two peculiar words in Cajander's translation: *mailma* has probably been modified in order to create a two-syllabic word instead of a three-syllabic word and the dialect word *yllyttännä* is employed with the intention of producing one syllable more in contrast to *yllyttää*. Therefore, it can be said that in these lines the word order of the source text did not have a negative effect on the translations.

Next, let us see how the source text has affected the syntax of the translation. This is apparent in Cajander's translation only, but the other translations are presented here for the purpose of comparison.

CASSIUS: Then, Brutus, I have much mistook your passion;
By means whereof this breast of mine hath buried
Thoughts of great value, worthy cogitations. (1.2.48-50)

Cajander: Siis ymmärsin sun, Brutus, aivan väärin,
Poveeni tuohon sen vuoks peitin monta
Suur'arvoist' aatetta ja oivaa tuumaa. (p. 8)

Manner: Siispä tunteistasi erehdyin,
rintaani hautasin ties miten monta
ylevää aatetta ja oivaa tuumaa. (p. 11)

Sipari: Siis olen ymmärtänyt väärin mielialasi, Brutus,
ja suotta sydämeeni haudannut ajatuksistani
arvokkaimmat, ja painavimmat pohdiskelut. (p. 53)

<pre>
Laine: Olen siis ymmärtänyt tunnetilasi täysin väärin ja siksi haudannut
              rintani uumeniin monta suuriarvoista ajatusta, mainiota mietettä. (p.
              13)
</pre>

The word order of Cajander's translation again deviates from the neutral word order and it can be explained by the use of iambic metre; therefore, I shall not analyse the word order of this example; instead, I will briefly discuss a pronoun that Cajander employs, and which is not typical of the Finnish syntax. In the translation of *this breast of mine*, Cajander has included the pronoun in his translation, *poveeni tuohon*, which would not be employed in a natural use of Finnish. In modern spoken Finnish, a similar phenomenon can be found in the tendency to add demonstrative pronouns in places where an article would be employed in English, for instance, *se tyttö, ne Virtaset* (Larjavaara, 2001). A similar transference occurs in Cajander's translation: he has included the pronoun of the source text into a Finnish clause which would be understandable without it. This is an explicit example of the effect of the source text language, which cannot be seen in the other translations. The fact that the other translators have avoided the use of the pronoun is perhaps caused because today awareness of the influence of the English articles and pronouns on Finnish has increased, which is the reason why the other translators have been conscious of their use of pronouns.

9.3 Metaphors

When translating metaphors, the translator has many alternatives. The metaphor can be translated word for word, using an equivalent metaphor of the target language, or it can be explained. In my next example, Cassius compares Brutus' nature to precious metal that can be bent, and therefore loses its valuable character. Cassius has been able to manipulate Brutus, known to be a noble man, to participate in his conspiracy against Caesar. There is a quibble between *mettle* and *metal* (Sanders, 2005, p. 130). The metaphor is based on the metal-interpretation of the word.

<pre>
CASSIUS: Well Brutus, thou art noble; yet, I see,
              Thy honourable mettle may be wrought
              From that it is disposed... (1.2.309-311)

Cajander: Niin, jalo olet, Brutus; mutta huomaan
              Ett' oiva luontos vieraantua saattaa
              Pois tarkoituksestaan. (p. 16)

Manner: Ylevä olet, Brutus, mutta huomaan:
              jalo metalli voi taipua
              ja menettää luonteensa. (p. 18)
</pre>

Sipari: Niin Brutus, olet jalo, ja silti
            voi jalon metallisi näköjään
            muuttaa halvemmaksi. (p. 64)

Laine: Niinpä niin, Brutus, tolkun mies olet kyllä, mutta huomaan että
            kunniallinen luonteenlaatusi voi olla manipuloinnille altis. (p. 23)

We can see that Cajander follows Shakespeare's line division and he has translated only the mettle-interpretation of the lines. This produces a translation which is not easy to understand, since *tarkoitus* is not connected with the word *luonto*: in Finnish, it cannot be said that *luonto*, that is, 'character' has *tarkoitus* ('purpose' or 'goal'). In other words, Cajander stays close to the source text instead of translating the source text metaphor, based on the metal-interpretation of the spoken word, with a metaphor in the target language. Manner has translated the metaphor by including a metaphoric expression *jalo metalli*, 'precious metal', into her translation. She uses an expression which says that precious metal can lose its character, *luonne*. Although *luonne* refers to inanimate beings or matter, it is not usually associated with precious metal. In addition, the connection between Brutus and the mention of precious metal losing its character is too weak for the audience to notice it. The metaphor that Brutus is like the described precious metal is not easily detected by an uninitiated audience.

Sipari and Laine have explained or clarified the metaphor. Sipari uses a word that refers to the lost value of precious metal, *halpa*, and because precious metals are compared to cheap, worthless metal, *halpa* is likely to be associated with metal. Sipari has clarified the connection between the precious metal and Brutus by expressing that it is the precious metal of noble Brutus that can be changed into a cheap metal: *Niin, Brutus, olet jalo... voi jalon metallisi... muuttaa halvemmaksi*. Laine has omitted the metaphor and employs an explanatory translation, based on the mettle-interpretation, expressing that Brutus' honourable character can be manipulated. In addition to explaining Brutus' alterable character, Laine's translation also clarifies that Cassius manipulates Brutus, which is one of the most important themes of the play. Laine has translated *noble* as *tolkun mies*, meaning 'a man of reason'. Although reason and honour are esteemed characteristics, *tolkku* is not connected in this translation to the following *kunniallinen luonteenlaatusi*. Also, *tolkku* belongs to informal use of language and appears inappropriate in the context. In other words, Laine employs target text-oriented strategies by using a colloquial word and by including a conspicuously explicit interpretation of the character into his translation. Sipari also uses a target text-oriented

strategy by using an explanatory translation but he has not emphasised his interpretation. Cajander and Manner's translations are not as easily understood as Sipari and Laine's.

In the following example, the tribunes scold the commoners who are on their way to celebrate victorious Caesar for forgetting the defeated Pompey. Marullus compares the commoners to blocks and stones in order to describe their indifference to Pompey that was loved before Caesar defeated him.

MARULLUS: You blocks, you stones, you worse than senseless things!
O you hard hearts, you cruel men of Rome... (1.1.38-40)

Cajander: Te kivet, pölkyt, tunnottomat kurjat!
Pii-sydämiset te, julmat Rooman miehet! (p. 4)

Manner: Te kivisielut, tunnottomat moukat,
piisydämiset, julmat Rooman miehet! (p. 8)

Sipari: Te pölkyt, kivet,
pahemmat kuin elottomat möykyt!
Oi, te kovasydämiset, julmat Rooman miehet… (p. 49)

Laine: Te pölkkypäät, piisydämet; puulla ja kivellä enemmän tuntoa on kuin teillä! Voi teitä kovasydämisiä, julmia Rooman miehiä… (p. 9)

The metaphor of the nature of the commoners is presented well in Cajander's translation, *tunnottomat kurjat*. Cajander has omitted the comparison, *you worse than senseless things*, and therefore, the connection between *kivet*, *pölkyt* and *tunnottomat kurjat* is not as derogatory as in the source text in which the commoner as said to be worse than cold stones. Manner's translation *kivisielut* is explanatory. She has also left the comparison untranslated and this has caused the translation to lose some of its power as a colourful insult. Laine has explained the metaphor with a complete sentence and his translation appears to be easier to understand than the previous translations. Laine employs target text-oriented translation most clearly since he has explained the metaphor quite explicitly. Interestingly, Sipari has translated the lines almost word for word, but his translation is as easy to follow and understand as Laine's translation. Apparently, in the translation of these lines, both source and target text-oriented solutions produce fluent and understandable translations.

Although Laine's explanatory translation was successful in the previous example, the following example demonstrates that the translator can be too explicit from the point of

view of the purpose of the source text. In the line given here, Casca brings news to Cassius and Brutus, but is not very precise of the two tribunes' fate, and exits without further explanation after this line.

> CASCA: Marullus and Flavius, for pulling scarfs off Caesar's images,
> are put to silence. (1.2.285-286)

> Cajander: Marullon ja Flavion on suu tukittu, kun riistivät pois virveet Caesarin kuvapatsailta. (p. 15)

> Manner: Marullus ja Flavius ovat virkaheittoja nyt, koska he riistivät juhlahöyhenet Caesarin kuvapatsailta. (p. 18)

> Sipari: Marullus ja Flavius on vaiennettu, koska he repivät koristeita Caesarin patsaista. (p. 63)

> Laine: Murellus ja Flavius ovat päätyneet mykkäpojiksi, kun riistivät koristeita Caesarin patsailta. Rauha heidän muistolleen. (p. 22)

The expression *put to silence* has many possible interpretations. For instance, the tribunes may have been detained or they have been killed. Cajander and Sipari have successfully conveyed the ambiguity of the expression with similar Finnish expressions. Cajander's translation *suu on tukittu* and Sipari's translation *on vaiennettu* can refer to elimination by imprisonment or death. Manner uses the word *virkaheitto* which refers to someone that has been discharged of position and it can also playfully refer to an object that cannot be used (Grönros *et al.*, 2006). Her translation is also ambiguous although *virkaheitto* does not imply as clearly as Cajander' and Sipari's translations to the elimination of a person. Laine, on the other hand, has translated the expression as ambiguously as the others, but he has added a clause that does not have an equivalent in the source text, *Rauha heidän muistolleen*. The clause expresses explicitly that the tribunes have been killed and there is no ambiguity in the translation. It can be said that Laine has domesticated his translation substantially, and thus, brought his own interpretation of an ambiguous expression into the target text. This is coherent with his other solutions in the translation.

9.4 Wordplay

Wordplays produce similar translation problems to metaphors, and the alternatives for their translation are also numerous. In the first scene of the first act, a shoe-maker employs wordplay when answering to the tribunes' enquiries concerning his trade. Although I have used the same line as an example of syntactic aspects in Section 3.2, I will present the original lines and the translations again in order to facilitate the reading

of the analysis. The wordplay is based on the homophony of *soles* and *souls* (Sanders, 2005, p. 116), and cannot be transferred to Finnish as such.

SECOND CITIZEN:	A trade, sir, that I hope I may use with a safe conscience; which is, indeed, sir, a mender of bad soles. (1.1.13-15)
Cajander:	Semmoista ammattia, jota, toivoakseni, saatan hyvällä omallatunnolla tehdä; sillä minä, totta puhuen, korjaan huonoa saattoa. (p. 3)
Manner:	Joo herra, semmoinen ammatti jota voin harjoittaa hyvällä omallatunnolla: paikkaan rajoja. (p. 7)
Sipari:	Pohjatyö, herra, rehti pohjatyö; sillä tosiaankin, minä pohjaan pohjattomat. (p. 48)
Laine:	Minun ammattini, hyvä herra, on luonteeltaan sellainen että voinen hyvällä omallatunnolla sanoa sen tuottavan korkoa. (p. 7)

The principal purpose of the wordplay is to confuse the tribunes, and the translations manage to convey this meaning, but, at the same time, they also confuse the audience.

Manner's translation, *paikkaan rajoja*, does not have a connection to the trade of a shoe-maker, but it not obvious for the modern audience. The word *raja* may imply to *kenkäraja* which is used to refer to a worn-out or broken shoe. The audience may have difficulties in connecting these lines directly to the ones where the shoe-maker reveals his trade. The other translations are more comprehensible and easier to be connected to a shoe-maker's trade and the translators employ ambiguity successfully. Cajander employs the homonymy of *saatto* which can refer to a funeral procession or to accompanying someone. The latter meaning can be connected with the shoe-maker's trade, but they are not easily connected in this context. Sipari combines the abstract word *pohjatyö* with a more concrete *pohjata*. Sipari has omitted the word *conscience* as it is not significant for his translation of the wordplay. He has, however, compensated the omission by adding an adjective *rehti* to characterise the trade that the shoe-maker mentions, *pohjatyö*. Laine uses a homonym *korko* which refers to a heel of a shoe and to the monetary 'interest'. He has also included a translation of *conscience*, which, in his translation, can be connected with the translation of the wordplay because it includes connotations to economics, particularly the notions of profit and interest, which can be interpreted to be connected with shameless action. Taking into consideration that Shakespeare's wordplay probably also confused the original audience into thinking of other trades than that of a shoe-maker, Manner's translation is closer to the source text as it does not give much hint of the trade, whereas the other translations do have a more

obvious connection to the trade and they help the audience more towards understanding the wordplay.

The shoe-maker soon uses another wordplay which employs the homophones *awl* and *all* and also the homonymy of *meddle* which can have the meaning of 'to interfere' and 'to have sexual relations' (Sanders, 2005, p. 116).

SECOND CITIZEN:	Truly, sir, all that I live by is with the awl: I meddle with no tradesman's matters, nor women's matters, but with awl. (1.1.23-25)
Cajander:	Niin, herra, naskali yksin se minua elättää. Minä en kamasaksain asioihin ryhdy, enkä saksattarien liioin, muulla kuin naskalillani. (p. 4)
Manner:	Joo herra, naskali minut elättää. Minä en pistä kärsääni ihmisten asioihin, mutta naskalini pistän. (p. 7)
Sipari:	Näin on, herra, elän naskalista yksin. En sekaannu kauppaan, en naisiin; ... (p. 48)
Laine:	Niin se on, minun onneni naskalini kärjessä on. Minä en ammattiyhdistyspomojen asioihin puutu enkä heidän vaimojensakaan, mitä nyt pikku piikilläni reikää tökin. (p. 8)

In Cajander' and Manner's translation, the word *naskali* could be interpreted to serve as a phallic symbol, but the second meaning of *meddle* has not been conveyed clearly in Manner's translation. She has included the word *asia* in her translation which excludes the other meaning of meddle and employs only the meaning 'to interfere', especially because she employs a modification of an expression that can only be used in the meaning of interfering: *pistää nenänsä (kärsänsä) toisten asioihin*. Hence, the translation excludes the ambiguous interpretation of the wordplay. Sipari and Laine have enabled the ambiguous interpretation, but with different solutions. Sipari uses *sekaantua*, which has the same meanings as its equivalent, *meddle*. However, he has omitted the last clause of the source text, *but with awl*, which, in fact, culminates the shoemaker's wordplay by implying that he does meddle with women's matters. In other words, Sipari has omitted the pun and at the same time made the translation less indecent. On the other hand, Laine's translation of *meddle* is similar to that of Manner because he uses the word *asia* which, again, excludes the ambiguity. However, Laine compensates this by using an adaptation of the final clause by one that clearly implies sexual relations: *pikku piikilläni reikää tökin*. Unlike Sipari, Laine has included the pun into his translation making the wordplay as colourful as Shakespeare's.

Cajander's translation is interesting, because he employs the verb *ryhtyä* which has now lost its meaning of attack, touch and start sexual intercourse (Meri, 1982). In modern Finnish *ryhtyä* refers only to the meaning of to begin something (Häkkinen, 2004). Consequently, the wordplay is not transferred to the majority of the modern audience, especially when it is combined with an outdated word, *kamasaksa* meaning junk pedlars. However, when the translation was published, the wordplay was most probably understood. For the modern readers, *ryhtyä* can easily be replaced with *sekaantua*, in order to see how the wordplay functions. Although Cajander has included *asia* in his translation, the ambiguity has been transferred into the target text, because he has translated the last clause as *muulla kuin naskalillani*. Here, the awl can be interpreted as a phallic symbol. In addition, he has included a skilful wordplay: *kamasaksa* and the word *saksattaret*, meaning German women, have a common stem, *Saksa*. In this wordplay, it can be interpreted that instead of being women from Germany, *saksattaret* are women of the pedlars.

From the point of view of source and target text orientation, Cajander has retained the essential words of the original wordplay, that is, *meddle*, *tradesman*, *women* and *awl*, hence, he transfers the wording of the original wordplay into the translation, with all its nuances. He also uses a verb *ryhtyä* which has lost the meaning that is essential for Cajander's translation. This has produced a wordplay which his contemporaries have understood, but the modern audience may not comprehend the references of the wordplay. Manner uses the word *kärsä*, which does not seem to have any connection neither to the original, the translation nor the possible wordplay; there is no ambiguous wordplay in her translation. She has also removed the reference to tradesmen and women. Sipari translates *tradesman* and *women*, but he also omits the translation of the final clause which could make the ambiguity clearer to the audience. Laine plays with the ambiguity of *naskali*, and makes it very explicit that the shoe-maker refers to sexual relations. In fact, he employs an expression that is an explanation of the expression used in the source text. Therefore, Laine explicates the meaning and interpretation of the lines for the audience and takes it into consideration more than the previous translations.

I will take yet another example from the punning shoe-maker, who again answers the tribunes' inquiries with a wordplay based on the word *surgeon* and the two meanings of *recover* which are, first, 'to re-sole' or 'patch', and second, 'to regain health' (Sanders,

2005, p. 117). The shoe-maker continues with a proverbial expression *as proper men as ever trod upon neats-leather* meaning "as handsome men as ever walked in shoes made of cowhide" (*ibid.*)

SECOND CITIZEN:	I am, indeed, sir, a surgeon to old shoes; when they are in great danger, I recover them. As proper men as ever trod upon neats-leather have gone upon my handiwork. (1.1.25-29)

Cajander:	Niin, toden totta, minä olen vanhain kenkien haavalääkäri; kun ne hengenvaarassa ovat, autan minä niitä. Ei ole sitä sievää lehmännahkan polkijata, joka ei olisi liikkunut kätteni töillä. (p. 4)
Manner:	Totta vie, koska olen vanhojen kenkien välskäri, kun ne ovat henkiheitolla, minä niitä autan. Ei ole niin hienoa ja herraskaista naudannahan tarvitsijaa, joka ei olisi tepastellut minun kätteni töillä. (p. 7-8)
Sipari:	[S]itä vastoin olen kenkävanhusten välskäri, kun ne pahasti irvistää, minä ne hoidan. Joka koskaan on nahkaa tallannut, on tallannut kätteni työtä. (p. 48)
Laine:	Olen vanhojen virsujen kirurgi; kun niitä uhkaa ennenaikainen kuolema, minä kursin ne kokoon. Espanjan nahasta tehdyistä saappaista sopii vaikka laulaa, mutta minä luotan alapäässäkin kotimaisuuteen. (p. 8)

All the translations are similar, since everyone is based on the connection between a doctor or surgeon and a patient. Cajander and Manner use an expression that refers to the danger of losing one's life, although Manner's word *henkiheitto* is no longer in active use but its meaning can be concluded quite effortlessly. Laine's translation refers to the same danger of loss of life but he has added the word *ennenaikainen* ('premature'), and its function in the wordplay is to refer to the repairing of shoes if they can be repaired. Sipari has utilized the verb *irvistää* which can refer to a grimacing person or to shoes that have been split. Thus, he has employed a word that, in this context, is associated mainly with shoes but it also refers to the patient of a surgeon. It can be said that his wordplay refers the most to the trade of a shoe-maker, and therefore, it is more understandable to some extent.

Laine uses the word *kirurgi* as the equivalent of *surgeon*. Surgeon is dated to the 14th century (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2010) and the word surgery originates from the words *hand* and *work* which would suggest that in Shakespeare's time surgery would have differed from the ordinary practice of medicine. However, in Laine's translation, the Finnish word *kirurgi* appears too modern despite the fact that *kirurgi* has been mentioned in a written document first in 1747 (Häkkinen, 2004). In fact, it has

referred to a barber and a person tending wounded soldiers, *i.e.*, *välskäri* (Grönros *et al*, 2006). The reason for the archaism is the fact that the word is now associated with modern medicine (Häkkinen, 2004).

The proverbial expression is more complex to translate, since there is no similar expression in Finnish. All but Laine have translated it with an expression that conveys the meaning of the original without any explanation. Laine, however, has replaced the expression with his own wordplay, which refers to an option to sing about boots made of Spanish leather and that the shoe-maker relies on domestic products when the lower part of the body (*alapää*) is in question. The first clause, *Espanjan nahasta tehdyistä saappaista sopii vaikka laulaa* is an allusion to Bob Dylan's song *Boots of Spanish Leather* (1964), which is understandable considering Laine's musical background as lyricist. It is also an allusion to a modern world, and therefore, in my opinion, too anachronic in a play set in the period of ancient Rome. The second clause is an obvious sexual reference since *alapää* means the genitals and anal region (Grönros *et al*., 2006) and has no connotation to legs or feet. In this case, it could be considered that Laine's translation of these lines does not fulfil the expectations of a translation but is rather an adaptation. I will discuss Laine's translation strategies and his domesticating approach in more detail in Chapter 10.

My next example is a line in which Laine has domesticated his translation to the extent that it must be considered an adaptation. The wordplay is based on the homophones *hart* ('deer, stag') and *heart*, and it cannot be transferred into Finnish. Antony is grieving by Caesar's dead body and is lamenting the death and loss of a great leader.

> ANTONIUS: O world, thou wast the forest to this hart;
> And this, indeed, O world, the heart of thee. (3.1.207-208)

> Cajander: Oi maailma!
> Sin' olit tämän ruunuhirven puisto;
> Hän, toden totta, mailma, oli ruunus. (p. 51)

> Manner: Oi maailma!
> Sinä olit kruunuhirven puisto;
> hän toden totta oli kruunusi! (p. 48-49)

> Sipari: Oi Maailma, olit tämän peuran metsä;
> ja tämä oli totisesti, maailma, sydämesi! (p. 108)

> Laine: Voi, maailma, mihin korpilakkoon tätä sydäntä sanottiin, mihin
> avohakkuuseen turhaan, kun miehet hirvimetsässä ampuvat, (kuka
> osuu karjaporttiin? Kuka kruunupää on maassa?) (p. 63)

Cajander employs the polysemy of a dialectal and by now obsolete form of the word crown, *ruunu*, and Manner uses the same polysemy but with *kruunu*. Here the word *kruunu* refers to the antlers of an elk and to a crown. The translations are quite close to the source text and they state that the world was the park to the elk, referring to Caesar, and that Caesar was the heart of the world. Thus, there is a connection between the world and Caesar. The two translators try to transfer the wordplay as closely as possible to the target text, and the result is satisfactory although 'crown' does not have the same connotations as 'heart'. Sipari has omitted the wordplay and has translated the content of the wordplay: the world was Caesar's proper place and that Caesar was the heart of the world.

Laine, however, has decided to replace the original wordplay with another and to combine the translation of these two lines with the translation of the following lines. First, the translation is very difficult to understand because it is problematic to find a connection between an unauthorized strike (*korpilakko*), clear cutting (*avohakkuu*), elk-hunting (*hirvimetsä*) and a gate made for cattle (*karjaportti*) (Vilppula, 1999). There is a connection between hunting and the murdered Caesar, but altogether, the meaning of the translation is incomprehensible. In the translation, there are anachronisms and words that are not appropriate in a play that is situated in ancient Rome. Laine's translation could be again classified as an adaptation since he has taken the content of Shakespeare's lines but has modified it so that it the target text has little connection to the source text.

In the following example, Laine has again taken a radical approach to wordplay, but the other translators also use different translation solutions. In the following line, there is a pun between the words *Rome* and *room*, which were presumably pronounced similarly in Elizabethan English (Sanders, 2005, p. 125). Cassius is trying to convince Brutus of Caesar's dangerous nature by emphasising Caesar's aggrandisement.

> CASSIUS: Now is it Rome indeed, and room enough,
>   When there is in it but one only man. (1.2.155-156)
>
> Cajander: Se totta Rooma on, ja kyllin ruumaa,
>   Jos siinä vaan on ainoakin mies. (p. 11)
>
> Manner: [The lines of the source text have been omitted.] (p. 14)

Sipari: Tämäkö on Rooma, avara Rooma,
            johon mahtuu yksi ainut mies? (p. 57)

Laine: Rooma on vanhassa sanakirjassa Ryömi, ja tilaa kyllä riittää, kunhan
            siellä kontikoi vain yksi mies. (p. 16)

Cajander has tried to transfer the wordplay into Finnish by using words that are pronounced quite similarly, *Rooma* and *ruuma*, and words that resemble those of the source text (*room*, pronounced /ˈruːm/, and the Finnish *ruuma* /ˈruːma/). This has created a stilted wordplay: Despite the fact that in some Finnish dialects *ruuma* can refer to space in general (Häkkinen, 2004), *ruuma* is mostly associated with the space in a ship for storing cargo. Therefore, the associations of *ruuma* are not similar to those of the word *room*, especially to its meanings of space and extent (Collins English Dictionary online, 2006). Cajander's solution to transfer the wordplay into the translation has not created an adequate result, whereas Sipari's solution to transfer only the meaning of the wordplay seems more efficient. Sipari has repeated *Rooma* and added a qualifier *avara*, meaning 'spacious' or 'roomy'. Hence, it is expressed that Rome should be spacious enough to have more than one great man in it. His text conveys the content of the wordplay instead of the actual pun, which makes it an understandable translation.

Laine has created his own wordplay by using two words that he has apparently invented, that is *Ryömi* and *kontikoida*, which cannot be found in Finnish dictionaries. *Ryömi* is the third person past tense of the verb *ryömiä*, 'crawl', which originates from the word *roomata* that is derived from an Estonian word *röömata* (Itkonen & Joki, 1969). The stem of the word *kontikoida* has probably been derived from the words *kontata* and *kontti* and the stem has been connected with the verbal suffix *-koida*. If the associations of these two words, that is, *ryömiä* and *kontata*, are considered, there appears to be some connection between *Ryömi* and *kontikoida*. In the first clause, it is said that Rome is *Ryömi* according to 'the old dictionary'. This clause alone is incomprehensible and when it is followed by a clause meaning that there is enough space, it is strange. Laine's translation, which includes a combination of two fictitious words and a reference to an old dictionary, requires time to contemplate; however, the audience of a play does not have the required time and Laine's solution to create a very target text-oriented and at the same time anomalous translation does not fulfil the demand for intelligibility of drama translation.

Manner has omitted the wordplay from her translation, which is an acceptable translation solution with a wordplay that cannot be transferred to the target text. In fact, she has resorted to omission in her translation several times. On one hand, omission ignores the source text because it is too difficult to translate or it would lose meaning in the translation process. The translator may also consider the source text passage insignificant for the translation or with respect to the content of the text and for those reasons it can be omitted. On the other hand, omission honours the fluency of the target text which might suffer if the translator were not capable of producing an adequate translation. There is always a loss of meaning in omission, because the source text is not entirely transferred to the target language. Omission does not always cause damage, if the omitted part is not significant or relevant for the story, its events or the characterisation of the text. It is the translator's decision whether a passage can be omitted without any loss in style or content. This passage discussed above is, in my opinion, significant in the course of the events because it describes Caesar as an ambitious man who will destroy his competitors and has to be eliminated for that reason. Since manipulation is an important theme in the play, the line should be translated. The omission cannot be justified by the difficulty of translating a wordplay since the other translators have been able to create more or less acceptable solutions.

9.5 Stagecraft

It is typical of Shakespeare's plays that there are few, if any, stage directions. The directions of how to deliver the lines are given implicitly in the words of the play. For instance, in *Julius Caesar* Portia says to Brutus *and, upon my knees, I charm you* (2.1.270). Instructions can be given in the form of rhythm or in broken metre which dictate how the lines can be uttered, as discussed in Section 6.3. The translator should remember this in the translation process. On the other hand, the natural rhythm of the target language has also to be taken into account, since the actors have to be able to utter the lines on stage (Déprats, 2004a, p. 135). However, in some occasions, the most natural expression in the target language is not always the best alternative. Sometimes the rhythm of the play or the character is disturbed by too short a translation. This has occurred in the following example, in which Manner and Sipari employ a very typical expression of the target language.

CASSIUS: There's a bargain made. (1.3.120)

Cajander: Kauppa siis on tehty. (p. 21)

Manner: Sovittu. (p. 22)

Sipari: Sovittu. (p. 70)

Laine: Kauppa on lyöty lukkoon. (p. 28)

The problem in Manner' and Sipari's translations is the rhythm of the expression. In the source text, the line cannot be uttered hastily which is indicated in its structure. The rhythm of the line signals that the line should be said in a solemn way. Manner and Sipari have translated the line into a short and concise clause which is characteristic of Finnish. However, the original line is longer than the two translations and there is a reason for this: two conspirators, Cassius and Casca agree on the assassination of Caesar after a long and emotional discussion, and the conspiracy is sealed with this line. It is not coherent with the earlier discussion that such a great project is sealed with a single word. The translations include wrong stage directions for the actor, who can now say the line fast and even interpret that Cassius says the line in careless spirit. Cajander and Laine's translations are more suitable for the solemn atmosphere of the situation since they consist of four words, and hence, the lines are longer than the one-word translations. All four translations are natural and fluent, but the translations that are close to the source text are more suitable for the rhythm of this line.

There is a similar problem with the next line: there is no co-ordinating conjunction between the clauses and the utterance of the line depends on its interpreter, whether the reader, actor or director of the play. In this line, Caesar ignores the soothsayer's warnings of the ides of March and the length and rhythm of the line indicates that Caesar does not leave the situation hastily, but has time to consider the situation and to say more than one word.

CAESAR: He is a dreamer; let us leave him:–pass. (1.2.24)

Cajander: Uneksija! Pois tiekseen! – Tulkaa nyt. (p. 7)

Manner: Uneksija! Matkoihisi. –Mennään. (p. 10)

Sipari: Hourailija. Jääköön. Jatketaan. (p. 52)

Laine: Horoskooppien laatija. Antakaa miehen olla. Lähdetään. (p. 12)

All translators employ a noun when translating the first clause of the line: Laine uses an expression consisting of two nouns, *horoskooppien laatija*, and others use one word. Sipari has translated the second clause with a predicate, Manner with a noun, Cajander with a two-word clause and Laine with a complete sentence. The last part of the line, the word *pass*, Cajander has translated with two words and the others use one word. From the point of view of the rhythm, Laine's translation is the closest to the rhythm of the source text since it is longer than one word. The lack of a conjunction causes that the lines cannot be uttered hastily but there is still a problem with the rhythm of the translations. The first three translations are difficult to utter fluently, since they are concise and, for instance, Sipari's translation resembles a list. Laine's translation is longer and its rhythm is easier to utter and it conveys all the possible interpretations of the original line. Cajander and Manner use an exclamation mark in their translation which prevents the calm and untroubled interpretation of the line. Although Laine conveys the rhythm of the source text in his translation, he has taken the target text into consideration better than the other translators, since the line is more fluent and easy to utter.

Repetition is one aspect of implicit stage directions since it gives the lines a certain rhythm and signals the pace of the lines. Therefore, repetition is an important aspect in the target text and should be considered when translating the text. In the following line, Cassius describes the night and strange phenomena he has seen, and apparently compares Caesar with the peculiarities of the night. There are two repetitions that rhythm the line, the first is on the first two lines and the second is on the lines from five to eight. The reiteration indicates certain stillness from the actor who has to rhythm the movement to the rhythm of the lines. In other words, the actor restrained by the rhythm and has to adjust his gestures to it.

> CASSIUS:
> 1   You look pale, and gaze,
> 2 And put on fear, and cast yourself in wonder,
> 3 To see the strange impatience of the heavens:
> 4 But if you would consider the true cause
> 5 Why all these fires, why all these gliding ghosts,
> 6 Why birds and beasts from quality and kind–
> 7 Why old men, fools, and children calculate;
> 8 Why all these things change from their ordinance,
> 9 Their natures, and pre-formed faculties,
> 10 To monstrous quality; ... (1.3.59-68)

Cajander: Kalvas olet, pelkäät,
             Ja tuijottelet, ihmetyksiin vaivut,
             Kun näet näin oudon kiihkeänä taivaan.
             Vaan tosisyytä mietipäs, mit' ovat
             Nuo tulet, harhaavat nuo haamut kaikki,
             Miks poikkee pedot, linnut luonnostaan,
             Miks ennustaapi vanhus, laps ja narri;
             Nuo kaikki miksi tavastaan ne muuttuu,
             Päämäärästään ja alkuolennostaan
             Noin luonnottomiks, … (p. 19)

Manner: Kalpea olet, Casca,
             pelosta vapiset, kun räjähtää taivas.
             vaan syytä mieti. Mitä mahtaa olla
             nuo tulet, harhailevat haamut kaikki,
             miksi linnut, pedot vaihtaa karvaa,
             miksi ennustavat vanhus, lapsi, narri,
             miksi kaikki käyvät luonnonvastaisiksi
             ja erkanevat tosiolennostaan … (p. 21)

Sipari: Kalpenet, ja tuijotat,
             ja kauhistut, ja äidyt ihmettelemään,
             kun näet oudon hurjistuneen taivaan.
             Mutta mieti todellista syytä,
             miksi kaikki nämä lieskat, liitelevät haamut,
             miksi linnut, miksi pedot toimivat
             vastoin luontoaan, miksi hullut,
             vanhukset ja lapset ennustavat,
             miksi kaikki vieraantuvat laadustaan,
             tavoistaan ja taipumuksistaan
             oudoiksi ja luonnottomiksi … (p. 67)

Laine: Näytät kalpealta, pälyilet ympärillesi, ja heti alat pelätä ja siunailla,
             kun taivaan näet tavallista kärsimättömämpänä. Mutta jos vähänkään
             miettisit mikä todellisena syynä on kaikkiin näihin tuliin, vaeltaviin
             aaveisiin, siihen miksi linnut ja pedot käyttäytyvät luonnonvastaisesti,
             miksi vanhat miehet, idiootit, lapset ennustavat, miksi kaikki niin
             muuttuu siitä minkä Luoja alun perin tarkoitti aina hirviöiksi asti …
             (p. 26)

The first repetitive structure is on lines 1 and 2, in which Cassius describes Casca's state with four qualities (*pale*, *gaze*, *fear* and *wonder*). The repetition is preserved in Cajander' and Sipari's translations since there are the four qualities and they both employ the four qualities. Manner has included only two qualities and Laine three, and they have lengthened the lines, that is, made them more fluent and easier to utter, which has caused the loss of the repetition and rhythm. Sipari uses co-ordinating conjunctions in the same place as in the source text, which does not produce a very fluent expression in his translation. However, the rhythm is similar to the source text, and it resembles a list. Cajander does not use as many conjunctions as there is in the source text and his translation is more natural than Sipari's. At the same time, the rhythm is not as coherent as in the source text.

The second repetition, based on the word *why*, is preserved completely only by Sipari; the other translators have reduced the repetition and made it less palpable. They have repeated the word *miksi* three times out of five. In addition to the rhythm, the difference between Sipari's translation and the others is the emphasis of the strange phenomena. The emphasis is created when the question *why* is asked and the interrogative stresses the following peculiarities as in a list of abnormalities. In Sipari's translation, every peculiarity is emphasised separately, whereas in the other translations, only some phenomena are stressed and some are mentioned beside them. Therefore, the stage directions in the rhythm are not conveyed in the translations, and the translations give the actor different aids and directions to interpret the lines than the source text.

In the next example, Cassius makes the decision to assassinate Caesar the following day, before Caesar's establishment as a king. The repetition in these lines emphasises the crucial decision. The rhythm of the repetition also intensifies the atmosphere of the scene because the beginning of every line, and clause, should be uttered with similar emphasis. This slows the rhythm of the scene and indicates that Cassius says these lines in a solemn way.

> CASSIUS: Therein, ye gods, you make the weak most strong;
> Therein, ye gods, you tyrants do defeat:
> Nor stony tower, nor walls of beaten brass
> Nor airless dungeon, nor strong links of iron,
> Can be retentive to the strength of spirit… (1.3.91-94)
>
> Cajander: Jumalat, näin te heikon vahvaks teette!
> Jumalat, näin tyrannit kukistatte!
> Ei kivilinnat, takovaski-tornit,
> Ei tunkat tyrmät, vahvat rautakahleet
> Voi hengen voimaa estää … (p. 20)
>
> Manner: Jumalat, näin heikon vahvaksi te teette!
> Jumalat, näin tyrannin kukistatte!
> Ei kivitornit, vahvat vaskilinnat,
> ei tylyt tyrmät, raskaat rautapannat
> voi hengen voimaa estää … (p. 21-22)
>
> Sipari: Tällä, jumalat, te vahvistatte heikon;
> tällä, jumalat, te lyötte tyrannit.
> Ei kivitorni, vaskimuurit,
> ei vankityrmät, rautakahleet riitä
> vangitsemaan hengen voimaa … (p. 68)
>
> Laine: Sillä tavoin te jumalat heikosta teette kaikkein vahvimman, sillä tavoin te jumalat hirmuhallitsijoita kaadatte. Eivät kiviset tornit, eivät vaskesta taotut muurit, eivät vankityrmät, joissa ilma ei kierrä, eivät vahvat rautakahleet, voi hengen valtaa estää … (p. 27)

Cajander, Manner and Sipari have preserved the concise structure of the lines by using short clauses and repetition. Laine has not conserved the concise structure of the source text, and therefore, Laine's translation is not as powerful and intense as the other translations. He uses the expression *vaskesta taotut muurit* instead of *vaskimuurit*, which makes the line less concise and is not similar with the shorter expressions *kiviset tornit* and *vankityrmät*. He has translated *airless* with a relative clause *joissa ilma ei kierrä* which breaks the repetitive structure of the sentence, and thus the rhythm is not regular, or give indications of how the line should be performed. This has resulted in a translation that does not make the scene more intense or distinguished as a crucial moment. This example, along with the previous two, demonstrate that from the point of view of the stagecraft and rhythm, the target text-oriented translation has more defects than the source text-oriented translation. Especially in a play written in verse, the rhythm and repetition is significant element and should be transferred into the translation.

In addition to implicit stage directions, there are many directions that are quite explicitly expressed in character's lines, such as in the following example, where Brutus' wife, Portia, asks her husband to confide in her. The stage directions are explicitly expressed in the clause, *upon my knees*, which indicates that Portia utters the successive lines on her knees.

PORTIA:	You have some sick offence within your mind,
	Which, by the right and virtue of my place,
	I ought to know of: and, upon my knees,
	I charm you … (2.1.268-271)
Cajander:	Sun sielussas on tuskan kipu, jota
	Tilani oikeudella tietää tahdon.
	Rukoilen polvillani … (p. 32)
Manner:	[S]ielusi on sairas,
	ja minulla vaimonasi oikeus
	on saada tietää syy ja tuskan aihe.
	Polvillani pyydän … (p. 33)
Sipari:	[E]i ruumista vaan mieltä vaivaa jokin
	josta minun, asemani oikeudella, pitäisi tietää;
	ja anon polvillani,
	Polvistuu (p. 85)
Laine:	[S]inä haudot mielessäsi jotakin sairasta, josta minulla aviosäätyni
	nojalla on oikeus tietää – minä sinua rukoilen polvillani … (p. 42)

All translators have translated the instructions with expressions that are quite close to the source text, transferring the directions into the translations. However, Sipari has added into his translation proper stage directions outside the lines. This does not affect the content of the play, but is an interesting addition, especially, since Sipari is very experienced in the field of theatre. He has obviously considered this direction to be so important that it had to be expressed separately between the lines. Later in the scene, Brutus asks Portia to get up, and although there are no stage directions in the source text, Sipari has again added into his translation a direction for Portia to stand up.

There are two stage directions in the lines of the next example. *Feeble tongue* indicates the manner in which the lines of Caius Ligarius should be uttered, and the fact that he is wearing a scarf is expressed in Brutus' line, *to wear a kerchief*.

> LIGARIUS: Vouchsafe good-morrow from a feeble tongue.
> BRUTUS: O, what a time have you chose out, brave Caius,
>   To wear a kerchief! (2.1.313-315)
>
> Cajander: L: Suo heikon äänen tehdä hyvä huomen.
>   B: Voi, mihin aikaan, uljas Cajus, liinaan
>   Sa kääriyt! Oi, ett'et olis sairas! (p. 34)
>
> Manner: [Ligarius' line has been omitted.]
>   B: Siteissä yltäpäältä! Oletko sairas? (p. 34)
>
> Sipari: L: Ota vastaan heikon kielen hyvä huomen.
>   B: Oi Gaius, valitsitpas ajan sairastua!
>   Saisit olla terve! (p. 87)
>
> Laine: L: Heikoin kielenkantimin saanen hyvää huomenta toivottaa.
>   B: Voi, Caius, sinä rohkea mies. Pääsi olet joutunut verhoamaan
>   huppuun – ei kai se tarkoita että olet kipeä! (p. 44)

Manner has not translated Ligarius' line in which it is expressed that he speaks with *a feeble tongue* but has not compensated it. There is no obvious reason for her solution since the line is not completely insignificant or difficult to translate, but it is coherent with the omissions in other parts of her translation. In this example, the omission causes a loss in the target text, since there is one stage direction less to instruct the actors or the director. Thus, Manner's solution does not fulfil the needs of the stagecraft nor the content of the play, and it impoverishes her translation.

On the other hand, Sipari has added stage directions concerning Ligarius' garment after the stage directions informing that Ligarius enters the scene: *Gaiuksella huivi päässä* (p. 86). In the source text, the kerchief is instructed in Brutus' line, but Sipari has omitted

the direction. In addition, Sipari has included stage directions after Ligarius' line where he states *I here discard my sickness!*; Sipari has translated the line as *riisun sairauteni!* and has added directions in which Ligarius throws the kerchief away: *Heittää huivin pois* (p. 87). The other translators have preserved the instructions in the line, but have not included any additional stage directions in neither one of the examples. There are some editions of Shakespeare's plays in which there are additional directions where Ligarius abandons his kerchief, but it is difficult to know which edition or editions of the play the translators have used as their source text.

Moreover, Sipari has edited the stagecraft of the play in two other occasions. First, he has modified one stage direction in order to create physically easier and less complicated directions to implement on stage. The directions are at the beginning of the first scene of the third act in which Caesar arrives to the Senate and enters the Capitol, and Shakespeare expresses the directions simply: *CAESAR enters the Capitol, the rest following*. Cajander and Laine express that Caesar enters the Capitol, Manner employs a superordinate of Capitol, that is, the senate, *Caesar menee senaattiin* (p. 42), but Sipari has adapted the directions: *Caesar ja hänen seurueensa menevät eteenpäin. Caesar istuutuu johtamaan puhetta* (p. 99). In Sipari's translation, the actors are directed only to move forward, but not to enter anywhere and he has omitted the directions where the senators are instructed to rise. Caesar's preceding line indicates that they are moving into the Capitol, *Tule Capitoliumille* (*ibid.*), but it is not included in the directions. Also, Sipari has omitted the stage directions expressing where the scene takes place at the beginning of the scene: *Before the Capitol*. This translation may apparently facilitate the staging of the scene as it gives the impression that there are not many directions, but, in my opinion, it also excludes the possibility to see the staging directions of the scene immediately. With Sipari's translation, the set designer has to interpret the scene in order to understand the starting point of the staging. The staging cannot be changed or adapted if there is no knowledge of the original staging directions.

The second adaptation that Sipari has executed is in Act 4, where he has combined the second and the third scene. In the end of the second scene, Shakespeare has written stage directions for the soldiers that are present in the scene to leave the stage. In the stage directions of the third scene, Brutus and Cassius enter Brutus' tent. In Sipari's translation, there are only directions saying that all but Brutus and Cassius exit, *Kaikki*

poistuvat paitsi Brutus ja Cassius (p. 133), and the dialogue continues without any interruption. This solution affects the rhythm of the events of the play, because the first encounter of the indignant companions and the following intense dialogue between them is not separated as distinctively as in the source text.

In short, the other translators have included the stage directions of the source text into their translations, whereas Sipari has omitted some of the instructions expressed in the words of a line and replaced them with explicit stage directions. He has also adapted Shakespeare's explicit stage directions and combined scenes. Although these solutions do not affect the content of the target text significantly, they raise interesting questions of the translation of stage directions. After all, Sipari is foremost a playwright and he has been the rector of Theatre Academy (see Section 8.3), and therefore, he has an inside opinion of drama and stagecraft. Should the implicit instructions be translated explicitly in addition to or instead of the explicit stage directions? What is the translator's role in the interpretation of a play, if all the implicit directions are not discovered and translated explicitly? Is it not part of the professional competence of directors and actors to be able to interpret the play and discover the implicit directions if plays have been translated? However, these questions are not within the scope of my thesis and they have to be answered in other studies.

9.6 Metre

In this chapter, I analyse the metre that the translators use and how the metre affects the translations. In this analysis, secondary stresses are marked as unstressed if they are followed by a primary stress. This follows the method that Leino (1982) uses, and it is employed because the consideration of secondary stress would complicate the analysis too much and the scope of this thesis does not allow a thorough examination on the entire problem of metre. Furthermore, it has to be remembered that the determination of stressed and unstressed syllables is subjective, and as I mentioned before, it depends on the reader's background and interpretation. I have attempted to examine the metrical structure of the translations not by considering the interpretation of the lines but on the basis of the grammatical rules of Finnish stress and the lines consisting of stressed and unstressed syllables.

First, I will demonstrate that the prose translations do not differ from each other as much as the metric translations. Brutus' and Antony's funeral speeches in the second scene of the third act are good examples for this purpose, since Brutus speaks in prose and Antony in verse. Thus, the prose and verse translations can be easily compared, and it can be determined whether the verse has an effect on the language. I will take quotations from the four translations of Brutus' speech, in order to compare the language in the translations in prose.

ANTONIUS:	[C]ensure me in your wisdom; and awake your senses, that you may the better judge. If there be any in this assembly, any dear friend of Caesar's, to him I say, that Brutus' love to Caesar was no less than his. If, then, that friend demand why Brutus rose against Caesar, this is my answer,–Not that I loved Caesar less, but that I loved Rome more. (3.2.16-23)
Cajander:	Tuomitkaa minua viisaudessanne, ja teroittakaa aistinne, voidaksenne paremmin tuomita. Jos joku on tässä seurassa, joku Caesarin rakas ystävä, hänelle sanon, että Bruton rakkaus Caesariin ei ollut hänen rakkauttaan vähempi. Jos sitten kysyy tämä ystävä, miksi Brutus Caesaria vastaan nousi, niin vastaan näin: en senvuoksi että Caesaria vähemmän rakastin, vaan senvuoksi että enemmän rakastin Roomaa. (p. 55)
Manner:	Punnitkaa sanani viisautenne mukaan, ja teroittakaa aistinne voidaksenne punnita paremmin. Jos täällä on joku Caesarin rakas ystävä, hänelle sanon, ettei Brutuksen rakkaus Caesariin ollut hänen rakkauttaan vähempi. Jos tämä ystävä sitten kysyy, miksi Brutus nousi Caesaria vastaan, on vastaus tämä: en siksi että rakastin Caesaria vähemmän, vaan siksi että rakastin enemmän Roomaa. (p. 52)
Sipari:	Arvioikaa minua järjellänne, teroittakaa ymmärryksenne, että voitte paremmin tuomita. Jos joukossa on joku Caesarin tosi ystävä, hänelle sanon, ettei Brutuksen rakkaus ollut vähäisempi. Ja jos tämä ystävä sitten kysyy, miksi Brutus nousi Caesaria vastaan, on vastaukseni: ei siksi että rakastin Caesaria vähemmän, vaan koska rakastin Roomaa enemmän. (p. 113)
Laine:	Olkaa kriittiset minua kohtaan viisaudessanne ja teroittakaa aistinne, jotta paremmin osaisitte kritisoida. Jos tässä joukossa on joku Caesarin hyvä ystävä, kuka tahansa, niin hänelle minä sanon, että pienempi ei ollut Brutuksen rakkaus Caesaria kohtaan. Ja jos tämä ystävä vaatii saada kuulla, miksi Brutus sitten nousi Caesaria vastaan, niin tässä on minun vastaukseni: En siksi, että rakkauteni Caesariin olisi hiipunut, vaan siksi, että Roomaa minä rakastan enemmän. (p. 68)

All the translations are natural and fluent Finnish, and there are only minor differences, including one unconventional word order in Cajander's translation (*Jos sitten kysyy tämä ystävä*). Cajander's use of commas and the spelling of *senvuoksi* can be ignored as phenomena of a developing language.

I will now take a few lines from three of the translations of Antony's speech. I will exclude Laine's translation because he has translated the entire play in prose, and it is

not useful for this study to compare a prose translation to a metric one. Here are the three translations and my interpretation of their metres.

<pre>
ANTONIUS: They that have done this deed are honourable;–
           What private griefs they have, alas, I know not,
           That made them do it;–they are wise and honourable,
           And will, no doubt, with reason answer you...
           For I have neither wit, nor words, nor worth,
           Action, nor utterance, nor the power of speech,
           To stir men's blood: I only speak right on;
           I tell you that which you yourselves do know... (3.2.216-19, 225-28)
</pre>

<pre>
Cajander: 1 Tuon työn on, nähkääs, tehneet kunnon miehet.   o(+) o + o + o + o + o
            2 Mit' yksityist' on vihan syytä ollut   o + o + o + o + o + o
            3 tekoonsa heill', en tiedä; viisait' on he   + o + oo + o + o(+)o
            4 Ja kunnon miehiä, ja työstään varmaan   o + o + o + o + o + o
            5 Vastaavat itse…   + oo+ o [+ o + o + o]
            6 Ei äänt', ei liikenteitä ole mulla,   o + o + o + o + o + o
            7 Ei päät', ei kielt', ei sananvoimaa, jolla   o + o + o + o + o + o
            8 Vois kansaa kiihoittaa. Vaan suoraan haastan   o + o + o + o + o + o
            9 Ja kerron mitä tiedätten jo itse. (p. 61-62)   o + o + o + o + o + o

Manner: 1 Tuon rikoksen on tehneet kunnon miehet.   o + o + o + o + o + o
            2 Mitä yksityistä kaunaa heillä   + o + o + o + o + o
            3 on ollut, en tiedä, viisaita he ovat   o + oo+ o + o + o + o
            4 ja kunnon miehiä, ja työstään varmaan   o + o + o + o + o + o
            5 vastaavat itse, viisaita kun ovat…   + oo+ o + o + o + o
            6 Ei ääntä, ei kieltä, eleitä ole mulla,   o + oo+ o + oo+ o + o
            7 ei nokkeluutta eikä sananvoimaa   o + o + o + o + o + o
            8 joka kansan nostaa kapinaan.   + o + o + o + oo
            9 Puhun suoraan, enkä mitään uutta,   + o + o + o + o + o
           10 minkä kerron, tiedätte jo itse. (p. 58-59)   + o + o + o + o + o

Sipari: 1 Ne, jotka tämän tekivät, ovat kunnian miehiä.   o + o + o + oo+ o + oo+ oo
            2 Mitä omia syitä heillä oli tekoonsa,   + o +oo+ o + o + o + o(+)
            3 oi, en tiedä. He ovat viisaita ja kunniallisia,   oo+ oo+ o + o + o + o + o + o
            4 ja epäilemättä selittävät teille syynsä aikanaan… o + oo + o + o + o + o + o + o +
            5 Minulta puuttuu äly, sanat, arvovalta, taito,   + oo+ o + o + o + o + o + o
            6 veret sytyttävä puheen voima; minä puhun vain.   + o + o + o + o + o + o + oo
            7 Kerron minkä tiedätte jo itse… (p. 122)   + o + o + o + o + o
</pre>

If the lines are examined independently, we can see that every line of Cajander's translation ends with an unstressed syllable and all but lines 3 and 5 begin with an unstressed syllable. The majority of the lines are combined of an iambic pentameter, that is, there are five stressed syllables and, thus, five iambic feet in one line, which is a characteristic of blank verse. If the lines are examined as an entity consisting of feet and as a rhythmic entity that continues over the line division, as they should be, we find that the metric variation is greater. As a result of the trochaic nature of Finnish, every line ends with an unstressed syllable. If the line division is ignored and the entity of metres is considered, it can be seen that the final unstressed syllables form a part of an anapaest which continues on the next line. This breaks the iambic pentameter of single lines into

an iambic-anapaestic metre. Therefore, the two stressed syllables which begin lines 3 and 5 are, in fact, a part of an iamb. Manner's translation is similar to Cajander's, since the majority of the lines end with an unstressed syllable, and she also employs the iamb-anapaest. However, the last two lines are composed of trochaic pentameter. The first four lines of Sipari's translation are composed of an iamb-anapaest, but in the last three lines he uses a trochee-dactylic metre. However, if the preceding lines from the beginning of Antony's speech are also considered, the metre is trochee-dactylic in every line.

From the point of view of the language, the metre, which is not typical of Finnish, also causes unnatural use of language. This can be seen in Cajander's translation where he uses altogether nine shortenings of words and, in line 9, he has lengthened a word, *tiedätten*, in order to make the last syllable stressed. The word order of his translation is especially confusing in lines 2 and 3 where the subject has been removed to the end of the clause and the complement of the verb, *yksityistä vihan syytä*, has first been divided and then the latter part has been placed between the two verbs. In addition, the clause itself is difficult to understand even without the complicating word order. Manner has repeated the word *ja* in line 4, but she has not repeated *ei* in line 6. '*Ei eleitä*' would be coherent with the preceding and following expressions in which the negation is repeated. Sipari uses an exclamation *oi* in line 3, and as a result, the line begins with a dactyl. He does not use a conjunction in lines 5 and 6 which would have been required in standard language with such a long list of virtues. Consequently, the most awkward language can be found in Cajander's translation in which there are many shortenings and lengthenings of words. Manner and Sipari have been able to create the iambic-anapaestic metre with other resources, but not completely fluently. The differences between the three translations, especially in the word order, are in accordance with Leino's findings of the frequency of the word order variations: in the two more recent translations, the translators have not resorted to unusual word order as much as Cajander.

The following lines are also from Antony's speech and there are some evident effects of the iambic metre in Cajander and Manner's translations.

```
ANTONIUS:    I come to bury Caesar, not to praise him.
             The evil that men do lives after them;
             The good is oft interred with their bones;
             So let it be with Caesar. The noble Brutus
             Hath told you Caesar was ambitious:
             If it were so, it was a grievous fault;
             And grievously hath Caesar answer'd it. (3.2.78-84)
```

Cajander: 1 En Caesaria kiitä, mutta hautaan.   o + oo + o + o + o
            2 Pahatpa työmme usein eloon jäävät,   + oo + o + o + o + o
            3 Mut hyvät haudatahan luumme kanssa.   o + o + o + o + o + o
            4 Niin käyköön Caesarinkin. Jalo Brutus   o + o + o + o + o + o
            5 Hän sanoi vallanahnaaks Caesarin;   o + o + o + o + o + o +
            6 Jos oli niin, se oli julma rikos,   o + o + o + o + o + o
            7 Ja julmast' on sen sovittanut Caesar. (p. 57) o + o + o + o + o + o

Manner: 1 En Caesaria kiitä, mutta hautaan.   o + oo + o + o + o
            2 Pahat työmme usein eloon jäävät,   + o + o + o + o + o
            3 vaan hyvät luiden kera haudataan.   o + o + o + o + o +
            4 Niin käyköön Caesarinkin. Ja Brutus   o + o + o + oo + o
            5 vallanhimoiseksi moitti häntä.   + o + o + o + o + o
            6 Jos totta, niin se oli raskas rikos,   o + o + o + o + o + o
            7 ja raskaasti myös sovitti sen Caesar. (p. 54) o + o + o + o + o + o

Sipari: 1 Tulen hautaamaan Caesarin, en ylistämään häntä.   + o + oo + o + o + o + o + o
            2 Paha elää tekijänsä jälkeen,   + o + o + o + o + o
            3 hyvä menee usein hautaan luiden kanssa –   + o + o + o + o + o + o
            4 niin myös Caesarin. Jalo Brutus   + o + oo + o + o
            5 sanoi että Caesar oli vallanhimoinen.   + o + o + o + o + o + o +
            6 Jos näin oli, se oli raskas virhe   oo+ oo + o + o + o
            7 ja raskaasti sai Caesar maksaa siitä. (p. 116)   o + o + o + o + o + o
```

Cajander again employs iambic-anapaestic metre in his translation and all the lines, apart from the first line, consist of five feet. In fact, the structure of five feet is similar to the iambic pentameter that Shakespeare used. It may be that Cajander has tried to create an iambic-anapaestic pentameter in his translation with the intention to mimic Shakespeare's metre. Manner employs the same metre as Cajander and there are five lines that include a pentameter. Sipari uses the trochee-dactylic metre in his translation and there seems to be no coherence in the number of the feet per line.

In Cajander's translation, there are three shortenings of words, in lines 3, 5 and 7 and lengthened words in lines 2 and 3. The first lengthening, *pahatpa*, is produced with a common suffix in the standard language, *-pa*, but the second one, *haudata<u>han</u>*, is made of a suffix related to the dialect of Western Finland, and thus, it does not seem appropriate in the lines of a Roman. In addition, there are some syntactic anomalies that Leino (1982) has described: In the first line, the object and predicate have been inverted, *Caesaria kiitä*, and in the last line, the subject, object and predicate are in a reverse order, *on sen sovittanut Caesar*. In lines 4 and 5, the subject has been removed from its

place and replaced with a pronoun, *Jalo Brutus / Hän sanoi*. There is a combination of two permutations in the second line, *työmme usein eloon jäävät*, where both the adverb and the modifier of the verb have been removed from their usual place. In line 5, there is a complex syntactic structure, *Hän sanoi vallanahnaaks Caesarin*, in which a relative clause has been replaced with an expression that refers to calling somebody something, *nimittää* or *kutsua joksikin* (Grönros *et al.*, 2006), but this expression is usually used with a partitive case of the subject, *Caesaria*.

Manner does not employ as many alterations as Cajander although they both have translated the lines in iamb-anapaest. Three of Manner's lines (lines 1, 2 and 4) are similar, almost identical, to Cajander's corresponding lines. Thus, there are same permutations in the first two lines, that is, the clauses C*aesaria kiitä* and *työmme usein eloon jäävät*, but she has not lengthened or shortened any word in her translation. She has omitted a predicate verb in line 6, *Jos totta*, and the last line has an awkward word order, *raskaasti myös sovitti sen Caesar*, where all the elements, the subject, object and adverbs, have been removed from their neutral place. Sipari has translated the lines in the trochee-dactylic metre which has produced a fluent translation without any word or word order alterations. Thus, his solution of not using the metre of the source text has produced fluent and natural translation, although Sipari has semantically been the most loyal to the source text. It appears that Cajander and Manner have tried to employ a poetic style in their translations, whereas Sipari uses a language that resembles the written Finnish.

If the word order alterations or word lengthenings and shortenings are used sparingly, they do not necessarily hinder the understanding of the lines. However, if the methods are used frequently within a few lines, they complicate the understanding and make the lines exhausting to read. This can be seen in the translations of the following Cassius' line.

> CASSIUS:  Yes, every man of them; and no man here
> But honours you; and every one doth wish
> You had but that opinion of yourself
> Which every noble Roman bears of you–
> This is Trebonius. (2.1.90-94)

| Cajander: | 1 Kyll', ihan kaikki; heiss' ei ole yhtä, | o + o + o + o + o + o |
| | 2 Jok' ei sua kunnioittais; kaikki toivoo | + oo + o + o + o + o |
| | 3 Ett' itsestäsi sull' ois sama luulo, | o + o + o + o + o + o |
| | 4 Mi joka kunnon roomalaisell' on. | o + o + o + o + oo |
| | 5 Täss' on Trebonius. (p. 26) | + o + oo |
| | | |
| Manner: | 1 Tuttuja kaikki, ja kunnioittavat | + oo + oo + o + oo |
| | 2 sinua, toivoen että itsestäsi | + oo + oo + o + o + o |
| | 3 on sinulla yhtä hyvät ajatukset | o + oo + o + o + o + o |
| | 4 kuin Rooman miehillä. Tämä on Trebonius. (p. 27) | o + o + oo + oo + oo |
| | | |
| Sipari: | 1 Tunnet, joka miehen; ja joka ainut | + o + o + oo + o + o |
| | 2 kunnioittaa sinua; ja toivoo että ajattelet itsestäsi | + o + o + o + o + o + o +o+o+o+o |
| | 3 kuten jokainen kunnon roomalainen sinusta. | + o + oo + o + o + o + oo |
| | 4 Tässä on Trebonius. (p. 77) | + oo + oo |

The first observation of Cajander's translation is the copious shortening of words: there are altogether eleven shortenings of which seven are produced with an apostrophe. The abundant use of apostrophes creates a disordered appearance. I have included in the number the two dialectal forms of the pronoun *sinä*, in lines 2 and 3, *sua* and *sull'*, of which the last is again shortened. The lines are translated in iambic-anapaestic metre and it is created by using numerous shortenings. There is also incongruence in the second line, *kaikki toivoo*, in which the verb is conjugated in singular although it should be in plural. Another alteration can be found in line 3 where the object, *itsestäsi*, has been removed from the end of the clause before the other sentence elements. In addition, in line 4, the predicate has been placed to the end of the clause, *joka kunnon roomalaisell' on*.

In the first line of Manner's translation, there are two ellipses of which the first is an ellipsis of the predicate (*ovat*) and the second of the subject (*kaikki* or *he*). This produces incomplete clauses, *Tuttuja kaikki* and *ja kunnioittavat / sinua*, that are difficult to understand since there is no implication in the first clause that its subject is the unrepeated subject of the following clause. In other words, if there were a predicate in the first clause, the second clause would be easier to comprehend. Moreover, the inverted word order of the subject and complement of the first clause complicates the understanding of the ellipsis, since without the combination of inversion and ellipsis, the second clause would be more comprehensible. In the second and third line, there is a similar inversion of elements as in line 3 of Cajander's translation, as the object *itsestäsi* is placed in front of the other elements of the sentence, *on sinulla yhtä hyvät ajatukset*. She also uses an inverted order of the predicate and subject in line 3, *on sinulla*. The two approximate variations make the clause difficult to understand. The number of

these methods is curious, because Manner uses the trochee-dactylic metre that can be produced without many alterations in the syntactic structure. However, the poetic language is very expressive and there are more deviations from what is considered usual use of language than in the prose language, for instance, and the use of these aberrations is not restricted to the iambic poems (Leino, 1982, p. 265).

Sipari, on the other hand, has also translated the lines in trochee-dactyl, but he does not employ any of the variations that Manner or Cajander use. He has expanded the first clause by adding a predicate, *tunnet*, and therefore, he is able to use in the second clause a different subject than in the first. By employing a neutral word order in the following clauses, he has created an easily understandable sentence. In general, Sipari's translation is fluent and intelligible, and this has been achieved by sufficient deviation from the source text.

Another problem that the metre causes is related to performability. Although actors are trained to utter their lines clearly and in a way that the audience can understand them, they cannot pronounce the lines if their rhythm is impossible to pronounce (Depráts, 2004, p. 137). For example, Cajander uses *Cassion* which is a genitive form of Cassius' name and also an outdated conjugation form. This produces lines that are impossible to pronounce fluently and naturally, such as the following line of Caesar: *Nälkäinen, ontto Cassion on katse* (p. 12, underlining mine). The last syllable of *Cassion* and the following verb, *on*, are difficult to pronounce successively, and therefore, the actor has to either pronounce the verb obscurely or weakly, put stress on the one-syllabic verb, which is not typical of Finnish, or pause before it. This problem in the particular example can be caused by the fact that Cajander was creating a drama translation and possibly disregarder questions of performability, or that he uses the iambic-anapaestic metre. In general, performability might be ignored if the translator does not remember to consider especially one part of the audience of the translation, that is, the actor.

The restrictions that the metre imposes on the translation can be seen in the following example. Laine's translation is included here, because in this example, it can be seen that explanatory and comprehensible translations are not necessarily long. In this line, Brutus tries to reassure Cassius, who has blamed Brutus for not acting as his friend, that they are still friends and troubles are the reason for his withdrawn behaviour.

BRUTUS:                          Cassius,
                    Be not deceived: if I have veil'd my look,
                    I turn the trouble of my countenance
                    Merely upon myself. (1.2. 36-39)

Cajander:       Cassius,
                    Sin' älä pety. Muotoni jos peitän,
                    Niin katseheni sekasorron käännän
                    Vaan omaan itseeni. (p. 7)

Manner:         Cassius, älä pety. Katseeni jos kaihdan,
                    mieleni ahdistuksen itseeni vain käännän. (p. 11)

Sipari:           Cassius, älä anna sen pettää. Jos olen ollut sulkeutunut,
                    niin vain pitääkseni murheet itselläni. (p. 53)

Laine:            Cassius, älä anna pettää itseäsi. Jos verhoankin katseeni, niin se johtuu siitä
                    että rauhattoman ilmeeni vain omalle sisimmälleni näytän. (p. 13)

Cajander employs the iambic-anapaestic metre and two of the lines consist of five feet. In general, his translation is difficult to comprehend, and the reader has to return to the lines in order to understand them. Cajander's translation requires some reasoning, for the clauses do not have an apparent connection: *muoto* and *katse* are not usually collocated with each other, and veiling one's shape, *muotoni jos peitän*, does not have the same connotations as the trouble of one's countenance. *Katseheni sekasorto* is ambiguous and because it is not a common expression, its interpretation is complicated. Moreover, the meaning of *pettyä* is not comparable with the meaning of to be deceived and it is not appropriate in the situation. The context is helpful for interpreting these lines, but for the audience, the context does not explain the meaning of the lines enough.

Manner has also translated *deceive* with the verb *pettyä* and the following lines do not help the interpretation of the sentence. However, Manner has translated the original *look* with its closest equivalent, *katse,* and the intelligibility of her translation is greater than in Cajander's translation. The reason for this is that Manner uses an equivalent of *the trouble of my countenance* that is not the closest to the source text but descriptive, *mieleni ahdistuksen*. Sipari employs a more explanatory strategy, since he uses interpretive translations, *sulkeutunut* and *pitääkseni murheet itselläni*. They do not exclude any interpretations of the source text but lose in the artistic and poetic force. Laine, on the other hand, is semantically loyal to the source text: he has included the closest equivalents of *veil'd my look* and *the trouble of my countenance*, that is, *verhoankin katseeni* and *rauhattoman ilmeeni*. However, in order to facilitate the understanding of the lines, he has complemented the conditional clause with *niin se*

*johtuu siitä että* which connects the veiled look with the troubled countenance. The result is more artistic and less explicit than Sipari's translation. This example demonstrates the differences between the translators. Cajander and Manner have used iambic metre to create a poetic expression unlike Sipari and Laine, who aim for an intelligible language.

This example also demonstrates that an understandable translation of a concise source text can be translated loyally if the structure of the text is simplified enough. The result is, obviously, longer and less concise than the original, as in Laine's translation, and it would certainly affect the metre of translation if it were used. However, explanatory translations are not necessarily longer than loyal translations. Both Cajander and Sipari's translations are comprised of 14 words, Manner's 11 and Laine's 19. Manner and Cajander have not been able to create a concise but intelligible translation, whereas Sipari's translation is the opposite, concise and comprehensible.

In the third scene of the fourth act, after Cassius and Brutus have ended their intense argument and have reconciled their differences, a poet enters their tent to order them to seize arguing and to settle their differences. Obviously, he has only heard their quarrel and is not aware of the reconciliation. Cassius and Brutus answer the poet arrogantly and slightly humorously:

> CASSIUS:   Ha, ha! how vilely doth this cynic rime!
> BRUTUS:    Get you hence, sirrah; saucy fellow, hence!
> CASSIUS:   Bear with him, Brutus; 'tis his fashion.
> BRUTUS:    I'll know his humour, when he knows his time:
>            What should the wars do with these jigging fools?–
>            Companion, hence!
> CASSIUS:                      Away, away, be gone! (4.3.131-136)

These lines provide an opportunity to use humorous language and creativity in the target text, but the humour should be restricted. There are allusions to the classical Greek philosophy and Shakespeare's time. The translations differ in many aspects and many strategies have been applied to them. The most notable aspect that distinguishes the translations is the employed strategies, which I shall also discuss.

> Cajander:   C: Ha, ha! Kuin kehnot on sen rentun riimit!
>             B: Pois, lurjus! Mene tiehes, hävytön!
>             C: Suvaitse häntä: tapa häll' on moinen.
>             B: Sen tiedän, jos hän tietää aikansa.
>                Mit' ilviöillä sodassa on virkaa?
>                Pois täältä, mies!
>             C:                    Pois! Tiehes! (p. 75)

Manner: [The lines of the source text have been omitted.] (p. 71)

Sipari: C: Hah hah! Onpas kyynikolla kurjat riimit.
B: Painu ulos! Ulos viisastelemaan!
C: Älä suutu Brutus; tuo on hänen tapansa.
B: Siedän hänen tapansa, kun hän tietää aikansa.
   Mitä sota tekee noilla hytkyvillä hölmöillä?
   Ulos siitä, ukko!
C: Menes nyt, mene, mene! (p. 140-141)

Laine: C: Hah hah hah, johan putosi koiralta suusta riimihärkää.
B: Antaa vetää, hyvä herra, mokomakin paskanpuhuja.
C: Koeta kestää, Brutus, mieshän on vain mitä on.
B: Minä siedän hänen huumoriaan silloin kun hän tietää milloin on sen aika.
   Mitä ihmettä on sodassa tekemistä näillä sanataiteen opiskelijoilla? Tulehan
   tänne, kaippari.
C: Nyt otat jalat allesi, pois, pois, kuin jo ois. (p. 94)

There are some references in the source text that may be explained in a translation. First, *the cynic* refers to a member of a Greek philosophical sect that was not characterised for its philosophy but its unconventional behaviour (Cynic, 2010). Sipari uses a footnote to explain the reference to the philosophical group, the origin of its name, its principal line of thoughts and the well-known cynic, Diogenes. Sipari has also explained the expression *hytkyvillä hölmöillä* with a footnote in which he explains that the poet was likely to have accompanied his performance with music and dance. Sipari is the only translator of the four that employs footnotes. This has enabled him to transfer foreign features into the target text, that is, use source text-oriented translation strategies, and maintain the translation intelligible for the reader. However, this applies only to the reader of the play, not the audience of a theatrical performance who cannot read the translator's footnotes. I discuss this further in the next chapter.

With regard to the metre employed in the translations, Cajander's use of iambic metre affects the structure of the translation as we have seen in the previous examples. However, his translation takes the audience into consideration more than that of Sipari; he does not use foreign features but there are words typical of Finnish in his translation, that is, *renttu* and *suvaita*. He also employs a word that cannot be found in dictionaries, *ilviö*, but it resembles the Finnish word *ilveilijä*, meaning a silly person, clown or joker. Apart from the syntactic structure, his translation is successful in transferring the circumstances, content and the objective of the source text, and above all, the style of his translation is close to that of the source text. Cajander does not exaggerate the humour, but he uses vivid language.

Sipari has translated the lines in trochee, which can be seen in the word order and clarity of the language. In fact, his translation is not very different from the contemporary written Finnish. This affects the style of the lines, because there is a loss of poetic expression. Cajander has apparently tried to convey the poetic style of the source text into the translation, whereas Sipari has wanted to create a style and metre that follows the contemporary practice of dramatic texts and drama translation.

I want to discuss translations strategies of the two other translators, because this example depicts the differences between the strategies quite well. Manner employs very target text-oriented approach as she has omitted the character of the poet from the scene, along with Brutus' order for the armies to spend the night at the location: Cassius and Brutus reconcile their differences and their dialogue continues from the exit of the poet that is expressed in the source text. Although the incident may appear insignificant for the content of the play, it is important in view of the development and portrayal of the characters; the collective offence of the poet strengthens the relationship and partnership between the two friends. This is vital especially as they are preparing to war against Antony's and Octavius' armies; hence, Manner's translation loses in meaning. As we have seen before, this is a common strategy in her translation. The omissions impede a comprehensive interpretation and analysis of the play because she has omitted lines that help to understand reasons behind character's actions and opinions.

Laine's translation, however, reflects the overall objective of his translation of the play. Laine has translated the word *cynic* as a dog, *koira*, which is associated with the cynics, for the word originates from a Greek word meaning doglike (Antisthenes, 2010). Next, in the translation of *rhyme*, he uses a wordplay that is not in the source text but is appropriate in the context. The word *riimihärkä* refers to salted, hung beef and the first part of the word, *riimi*, also means rhyme. Therefore, in Laine's translation, *johan putosi koiralta suusta riimihärkää*, there are two references, one to a dog and a piece of meat and the other to a poet and rhyme. In addition, dog is used to refer inferior beings and here the word conveys the despising attitude of the two men towards the poet.

In the next line, Laine has translated *saucy fellow* as *mokomakin paskanpuhuja* which refers to a person who speaks nonsense, and *paskanpuhuja* is as disapproved as its

equivalent, *bullshit*. Laine has also omitted the second *hence*. Laine uses a typical expression of Finnish, *mies on mikä on*, as the translation of *'tis his fashion*. Laine's translation of *jigging fools* has again many dimensions, since *sanataiteen opiskelija* refers to a novice or a young person, which is offensive when used of a poet who has just said of himself: *For I have seen more years, I'm sure, than y*e (4.3.130). However, *opiskelija* strongly refers to the modern world and the student of its educational system; in Finnish, the appropriate word would be, for instance, *oppilas*, that is used of Plato as the student of Socrates. In the same line, Laine uses a dialectal word meaning boy, *kaippari*, which may not be familiar word for all Finnish-speaking persons. Finally, before the poet exits the scene, Cassius tells him to leave with a rhythmic expression, *Away, away, be gone*, which Laine has translated as rhythmically but using a phrase typical of Finnish, *pois, pois, kuin jo ois*. The phrase is modified from a phrase *niin kuin olisi jo* in order to make it rhyme, perhaps to ridicule the poet once more. These examples are demonstrations of Laine's domestication in which the source text is ignored and the translator has adapted the text. The adaptation does not fulfil the expectations for translation of Shakespeare's play. It violates the style of the previous translations of Shakespeare and is likely to be noticed among the other translations. I will discuss Laine's motives in the next chapter.

## 10 Discussion

It can be said that the styles of the four translators are quite different. Cajander uses the metre of the source text which is an unnatural metre for Finnish, and thus, has to use an awkward word order and shortenings of words. This can be said of his entire translation of *Julius Caesar*. He does use words and expressions that are in active use even today and his language is not as difficult to read as Shakespeare's language is to a modern English-speaking person; however, he uses means that complicate the understanding of the text and make the translation outdated for modern stages. The most important method he uses is iambic metre, which does not follow the common metre of Finnish and forces the translator to use language that is not typical of a native user. Manner's translation is almost similar to Cajander's work, and this causes the same problems in her translation. Although she employs more expressions that are typical of present-day Finnish, she has in some instances translated the text at the expense of intelligibility.

Word order, metaphors and wordplays which are translated by transferring some of the features of the source text have produced lines that are difficult to understand.

Sipari has a different approach, since the clarity of the language is his priority over the features of the source language. He uses in most instances conventional Finnish expressions and has translated Shakespeare's iambic metre in trochee. Laine has the most radical approach to the target text, because it seems to be more important than the source text. He has added words and even sentences that do not have an equivalent in the source text and he uses colloquial expressions that are rarely used in the translations of Shakespeare's plays. In fact, Laine's translation can be called an adaptation because at times he ignores the source text and writes his own text instead of a translation of the source text. His purpose seems to produce a controversial translation, and his translation methods and solutions are in accordance with his purpose.

From the point of view of source and target text-oriented translation, it can be said that all of the four translators have chosen target text-oriented translation method, since the translations are easy to understand and fluent Finnish. However, the translations are situated differently between the two extremes of source and target text-oriented translation. Cajander's translation is closest to source text-oriented translation, then comes Manner's translation and Sipari's translation is situated after Manner's translation, quite close to target text-oriented translation. Laine's translation is situated at the extreme of target text-orientation, or it could be said that his translation has moved beyond the extreme and is, in fact, an adaptation.

Although the translators have had different approaches to translation, they all have considered the performability of the translation. The translations are written to be performed on stage and the lines to be uttered. Even though the plays may not have had a specific production for which they were translated, the nature of dramatic texts demands that the translator always considers the performability of the translation. There cannot be expressions too strange to understand and follow, language too difficult to pronounce and remember, or too many words or expressions which are not familiar to the audience. Cajander must have known that his translations could be performed on the stage of the recently founded Finnish Theatre and his work would be used as an example for the following drama translations. His position as the pioneer of Finnish

drama translation can have lead Cajander to adapt a metre that produces problems to the language, although the respect for Shakespeare is a more likely reason for the use of the iambic metre. However, Manner, Sipari and Laine have experience of the theatre and literary world, since all of them have written and translated plays. This can be seen in their use of language which is more fluent than Cajander's and in their more diverse translation solutions.

The degree of target text-orientation is reflected by translation strategies the translators use. Cajander follows the metre of the source text and does not provide explanatory translations for foreign features that he has transferred from the source text. On the other hand, he uses expressions peculiar to Finnish and has replaced foreign features with more familiar ones. Cajander does not sacrifice the semantic aspect of the Finnish language, and in general, his vocabulary is understandable and close to present-day Finnish. Manner has also chosen to follow the iambic meter in most of her translation, but she does not use as many shortenings and exclamations as Cajander does; her language is easier to read and listen, because she has not followed the iambic metre as strictly as Cajander. It also appears that she has had more resources to employ iambic metre because, as Leino (1982) discovered, there are fewer abnormalities in the Finnish caused by the iamb in the more recent Finnish poetic translations than in the older. Manner has usually clarified the meaning of foreign features with explanatory translations, which takes the target audience and the fluency of the translation into consideration. Sipari and Laine use fluent language in their translations and they are easy to read. They have chosen target text-oriented strategies for the translation of metre. Sipari has translated verse in a trochee metre that is typical of Finnish; Laine has rejected the verse of the source text and translated the entire play in prose, thus avoiding the challenges of metre. Both Sipari and Laine use expressions that are less concise than those in Cajander' and Manner's translations, and therefore, easier to understand. They also explain foreign features as much as possible, either with footnotes or mostly with explanatory translations. In other words, they have chosen to follow the target text-oriented approach in their translations.

From the perspective of the target text, the translators have succeeded to a varying extent. Cajander's translation has not endured the development of language and poetry. It contains some outdated words, and the iambic metre is now rarely employed in

modern poetry. This has made the iambic metre an awkward and strange linguistic device in modern poetry and drama where trochee or free metre are preferred. Nevertheless, his translations of Shakespeare's work have almost become as distinguished as their source texts and they are cited more than the newer translations. The reason is that Cajander's translations are skilfully made. The language is vivid and he has been able to create a similar variety of nuances and styles that exists in Shakespeare's works. The problem in Cajander's translation is that the Finnish language, and poetic expression have developed radically since Cajander translated Shakespeare's plays. After all, Cajander's translation represented the best poetic expression and translation achievements in Finnish at the time, but today they are largely outdated.

Manner had a problematic starting point, since she has most probably translated the play on the basis of Cajander's translations. There are some lines that she has retained and some she has enhanced with a few small changes. This demonstrates the quality of Cajander's translations, since the number of changes made is remarkably small. Manner's translation of *Julius Caesar* is distinguished from the others by the use of omission. She has omitted lines for unknown reasons and without any compensation. A typical example is the omitted line of a citizen in the second scene of the third act. Antony is about to start his funeral speech, and a citizen says: *'Twere best he speak no harm of Brutus here* (3.2.72). The omission of this line excludes the implication of the crowd's admiration for Brutus, which is essential in the course of the events. There is a loss of meaning since the line had a significant purpose in the play. Various other omitted lines are also relevant for the events of description of characters, and therefore, the source text is not taken into consideration. The solution is target text-oriented, because the source text is completely ignored in the omission, but it also affects the target text negatively.

Sipari has translated the play following the conventions of contemporary translation practice: the translation is fluent and understandable Finnish and he employs interpretative translations when he transfers foreign features into the target text. Sipari differs from the other translators in the use of explanations: he is the only one who employs footnotes. He resorts altogether to 20 footnotes in his translation to explain historical references and facts, and some explanatory facts of the source text. Partly it

gives the theatre production the possibility to alter the performance since they know how the play is meant to be performed but they can adapt it to correspond to the requirements of contemporary theatre. Footnotes have enabled Sipari to transfer foreign features into the target text without interpretative translations within the lines. Consequently, this removes the translator's responsibility for intelligibility to the theatre because the translator does not have to explain the foreign features to the audience and the task is shifted to the director. Furthermore, Sipari has ensured that his translation is not controversial in any aspect. The foreign features are well explained, the metre and language are fluent and conventional and metaphors and wordplays are easily understood. It will stand time better than Cajander's translation, but it is not likely to be remembered as long. This is because the translation is fairly colourless and Sipari has polished most of the edges from the translation. This can be seen, for instance, in the wordplay based on the homophony of *awl* and *all* (see Section 9.4). The sexual reference was almost omitted and shoe-maker's character appears not as cunning and vivid as in the source text. Sipari has not been able to retain the nuances that can be found in Shakespeare's text and language, which impoverishes the pleasure which the audience receives from the translation.

Laine's translation is the opposite of Sipari's. It is vivid, colourful and certainly personal. However, Laine's translation is so personal that it raises a question about its relationship to the source text: has Laine transferred the meaning, style and other features of the source text into Finnish or has he created a text on the basis of Shakespeare's play? In the first case, the result would be called a translation of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, but the second alternative would result to an adaptation of the play. The answer can be found in the translation methods Laine uses. First, he has written the entire play in prose, even the lines that Shakespeare wrote in verse. This is a drastic method, but acceptable for the intelligibility of the target text. Second, he uses explanatory translations when he has transferred foreign features to the target text, which is a conventional solution in contemporary translation. Thirdly, Laine employs numerous words and expressions that are specific to Finnish culture and that do not always have an equivalent in the source text. The play takes place in Rome, but there are place names that exist only in Finland. For example, in Turku, in Laine's home town there is *kauppatori*, ('marketplace, market square'), and *stadin kundi* can only mean a man living in the capital area. Laine also uses expressions that clearly refer to Finnish

culture, such as *korpilakko,* or words that describe phenomena of the modern world, for instance, *bonus*, *joukkotiedotus*, *tilannekatsaus* and *markkeerata*. Fourth, there are allusions to modern culture, as the allusion to Bob Dylan (see Section 9.4). Finally, Laine has not tried to translate the source text but has included an adaptation of the text as discussed in Section 9.4. On the whole, the three last target text-oriented translation methods that Laine uses are enough to suggest that his target text is indeed an adaptation.

What were the motives for Laine to create a highly domesticated target text? It is quite certain that he was not motivated by Shakespeare's use of language, since Laine adapted the language comprehensively. Nor were the artistic reasons behind his decision to adapt the play to correspond to the modern Finnish culture. He had three predecessors of whom Cajander was the best known, and he had to stand out. In addition, it is accepted in theatre to adapt plays in order to make them controversial and create a play that will attract attention nationwide. Jouko Turkka, Kalle Holmberg and Kristian Smeds have all directed controversial plays that have been praised in the theatre world. Perhaps these two reasons affected Laine's decision to make an adaptation that definitely differed from the previous translations of *Julius Caesar* or other Shakespeare's plays.

However, if we consider the situation in which Laine has translated the play, we might understand his motives better. Laine was the editor-in-chief of a literary journal, *Parnasso,* and also the chairman of the Union of Finnish Writers (Liedes & Lehtinen, 2007, p. 169). Laine was removed from both posts in hostile circumstances and some considered his treatment unjustified. Zilliacus (2007) implies that Laine translated *Julius Caesar* as his "last will" to the literary field. Zilliacus' statement is reasonable, because the play is intensely political and it describes a dethronement of a beloved leader, a similar situation which Laine had confronted at the beginning of the decade. Also, as I have mentioned before, this play can be situated in any time or place, and it is an excellent play for the purpose Zilliacus refers to. If Laine's motives were indeed to scold his opponents, some of his translation solutions are understandable. The domestication of the vocabulary refers to the modern world and thus implies that the events may take place in present-day Finland. It might even be located in Laine's home town, Turku, because in the translation, Caesar's body is taken to *kauppatori*. In

addition, the adaptations and style that Laine uses definitely result in a controversial translation which is noticed in the literary field. Whatever Laine's motives were, it is certain that his translation will not stand time. The translation is full of references to the modern world and society which will be outdated in a few decades or earlier.

My study started from the question of the relation between translation theory and practice. The question is difficult to answer, but this study shows that when translation theory was still slowly developing, Cajander, among other translators, was able to take the target text into consideration. There were tendencies to preserve some features of the source text. In Cajander's translation it is the metre and yet, the general purpose was not to introduce the structure of the English language to the Finnish audience, but the artistic work with its events and characters. The functional translation theories and modern translation studies have introduced new approaches to translation and new solutions to old translation problems. This has led to a situation where Sipari and Laine have translated the same source text very differently and both have had their translation published and performed. But were Sipari and Laine aware that they were applying functionalist theories? Neither of them is a professional translator, although they have worked in many different professions and have an extensive experience of the theatre. It is not likely that they have familiarized themselves with the history of translation theory. It is possible that owing to the functional translation theories, target text-oriented translations have become more acceptable and the domesticating translations have familiarised Sipari and Laine to contemporary translation approaches. Functional translation theories have also created a more tolerable audience and situation in which both translators have been able to publish their translations despite the fact that they employ quite different solutions.

Perhaps it could be said that until the beginning of the 20[th] century, translation theory tried only to describe the common practice and ideals of translation instead of creating new principles and strategies. It was only after the first pioneering theories began to pay attention to the target text in addition to the source text that the theorists and the translators became more aware of the different possibilities of translation methods. The shift of focus in theory may have increased the number of the accepted translation methods which translators were able to employ. When theorists began to think of new approaches to translations, translators were able to apply more target text oriented

solutions than when source text-orientation was the most important approach. It is evident that theorists began the revolution of theory by analysing contemporary translations and the methods that had been used in them, in order to understand how the source text was transferred to the target language and which features were preserved or omitted. After the first revolutionary discoveries, theorists were able to develop progressive theories that enabled the translators to consider translation from new points of view. In other words, I believe that theory focuses on describing the rules that guide practice and at the same time, it may develop new approaches. Practice follows the development of theory and adapts its findings and novelties into translations. It is a symbiosis that benefits one another, and a circle that never ends.

## 11 Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between translation theory and practice. I concentrated on source and target-text oriented theories and on the shift of focus from source to target text. The research question for the analysis was whether the shift of focus of theory can be seen in translations from different periods. The hypothesis of this study seemed to receive support from the analysis, since there were more target text-oriented translation strategies used in the newer translations than in the older.

I began my study by introducing the translation theories that were either source or target text-oriented. The earliest theories, such as those of Catford and Nida, were concerned on the transference of the features of the source text; the target text was almost neglected since there were only a few, if any, demands for its function. However, Toury observed that the target text had certain prerequisites in order to function in the target culture. For functional translation theories it was not sufficient that the source text had been transferred into the target language; the translation was perceived to have a function of its own which had to be fulfilled in order for the translation to be considered acceptable. However, in literary translation, there appears to be an eternal desire among theorists to emphasise the inclusion of foreign features of the source culture or language in to the target text. Since the early 19$^{th}$ century to the present day, from Schleiermacher to Venuti, the theorists still wish to cultivate the target audience by transferring foreign features that can make the target text awkward or strange.

After introducing the main translation theories of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, I described the typical features of drama translation. Then, I presented the characteristics of Shakespeare's language and translation. I pointed out that translating Shakespeare's work has many characteristics that differentiate it from the translation of other literary authors. Shakespeare's use of language is unique in its style, nuances, metre or wordplay. The translator faces numerous problems with Shakespeare's language, most obviously because it dates back to the 16<sup>th</sup> century. The differences between English and Finnish present challenges to Finnish translators, but despite the difficulties, there are many successful and impressive translations. After discussing the translation problems of Shakespeare's language, I discussed the history of translating Shakespeare in Finland and introduced four translators, Paavo Cajander, Eeva-Liisa Manner, Lauri Sipari and Jarkko Laine, who have translated Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* into Finnish. I described the context and circumstances in which the translators worked and produced their translations in order to understand their translation strategies.

The material of my study thus consisted of four translations of William Shakespeare's tragedy *Julius Caesar*. Cajander translated the play in 1883, Manner in 1983, Sipari in 2006 and Laine in 2007. I examined the source and target text-orientation in these translations and compared the solutions of the translators from the point of view of the source and the target text. I analysed the vocabulary and syntactic aspects of the translations. I compared the methods the translators used when they translated metaphors, wordplay, stagecraft and metre. The results were fairly expected, since the most recent translations portrayed more target text-orientated translation strategies than the preceding translation.

The language of Cajander's translation is by now outdated, whereas the language of the other translators is present-day Finnish: the translations were published within the past three decades. Cajander uses the iambic metre, which has lead to sacrifices in the Finnish language which is trochaic by nature. Manner also uses the iambic metre but her Finnish is more fluent and less awkward. However, Cajander's translation is by no means incompetent but a skilful piece of work. When it was published, it was considered to be an unprecedented achievement of translation and poetic expression. Manner and Sipari's translation solutions follow the contemporary approaches to

translation. The language is fluent and easy to follow, and the strangeness caused by the foreign features transferred from the source text is relieved by using explanatory translations. Manner occasionally employs omission in her translation, which evidently tends to create a loss of meaning in the target text. Sipari uses footnotes to explain the foreign features in the target text, which hampers the understanding by the audience who cannot see the footnotes. Laine has a domesticating approach in his translation. He uses words that are pertinent to the modern world and culture-specific expressions which can only relate to the contemporary target culture and language. Laine has also modified the text to such an extent that there is no relation between the source and target text, and therefore, it can be called an adaptation.

The results of the analysis were expected and interesting; the four translations use different translation methods, but all have resulted in a functional target text. However, the scope of this study is limited to four translations and there is room for a further study of the subject. After all, Shakespeare has been translated into Finnish since the early 19[th] century and every play has been translated at least twice; numerous plays have several translations. Therefore, it would be enlightening to examine contemporary translations and compare them with translations from other periods. In other words, there is an opportunity to execute a diachronic and synchronic study of the translations of Shakespeare's plays. It remains for future studies to determine whether translations from different periods can be classified on the grounds of approaches to translation or whether different translation methods have been used diversely through different periods of time.

# Suomenkielinen lyhennelmä

**Lähde- ja kohdetekstikeskeisyys näytelmäkääntämisessä: Analyysi William Shakespearen *Julius Caesar* -näytelmästä**

Tämän tutkielman tarkoituksena oli selvittää, miten lähde- ja kohdetekstikeskeisyys ovat muuttuneet näytelmäkääntämisessä. Halusin tutkia, miten eri aikoina tehdyissä käännöksissä näkyy kääntäjän suhtautuminen lähde- ja kohdeteksteihin ja heijastelivatko ne teoreettisen painopisteen siirtymistä lähdetekstikeskeisestä kääntämisestä kohdetekstikeskeiseen kääntämiseen. Tutkimuksen hypoteesina oli, että käännöksissä on siirrytty lähdetekstikeskeisestä kohdetekstikeskeiseen kääntämiseen. Oivallinen materiaali tutkimukseen löytyi William Shakespearen näytelmien suomennoksista, joita on tehty tasaisin väliajoin 1800-luvun lopusta lähtien. Valitsin analyysin materiaaliksi Shakespearen tragedian *Julius Caesar*in neljä suomennosta.

## Lähde- ja kohdetekstikeskeinen kääntäminen

Ensin kartoitin käännösteoreettista kenttää ja keskityin teorioihin, jotka voidaan luokitella lähde- tai kohdetekstikeskeisiksi käännösteorioiksi. Touryn mukaan lähdetekstikeskeiset teoriat edellyttävät jonkin lähdetekstille merkityksellisen ominaisuuden, kuten esimerkiksi tekstuaalisten suhteiden, siirtämistä kohdetekstiin, jotta kohdeteksti voi toimia lähdetekstin käännöksenä (1980, s. 39).

Catford (1965) edustaa lähdetekstikeskeisyyttä, sillä hän keskittyy etenkin lähdekielisen merkityksen siirtämiseen. Catford määrittelee käännösvastineen (*translation equivalent*) olevan se osa kohdetekstiä, joka muutetaan, kun vastaava osa lähdetekstistä muutetaan. Muodollinen vastaavuus (*formal correspondence*) puolestaan syntyy, kun minkä tahansa kategorian (yksikkö, luokka, rakenne) voidaan sanoa toimivan useimmiten samassa paikassa kohdekielen järjestelmässä kuin lähdekielessä. Catford toteaa, että muodollinen vastaavuus toimii parhaiten mahdollisimman abstraktilla tasolla. Lähdekielisen merkityksen siirtämistä vaikeuttaa se, että lähdekielen asioilla ei ole kohdekielessä samoja merkityksiä. Esimerkiksi sana *sauna* tarkoittaa suomalaiselle tuttua asiaa, kun taas kohdetekstin lukijalle sana merkitsee vierasta ilmiötä. Catford tähdentää kuitenkin, että vaikka lähde- ja kohdekielen merkitykset eivät ole samoja, se

ei tarkoita, että ne eivät voisi toimia samassa tilanteessa. Kääntäjän tulisikin kiinteiden käännösvastineiden sijasta valita vastineet, joiden merkitykset ovat tilanteen mukaan mahdollisimman yhteneväiset.

Nidan (1964) vastine muodolliselle vastaavuudelle on dynaaminen ekvivalenssi (*dynamic equivalence*). Nidan mukaan lähde- ja kohdetekstin välillä ei voi olla ehdotonta vastaavuutta, mutta muodollinen ja dynaaminen ekvivalenssi ovat mahdollisia. Muodollisessa vastaavuudessa varsinainen merkitys on tärkeä, kun taas dynaamisessa ekvivalenssissa painopiste on kohdetekstin lukijan reaktiossa. Reaktion pitäisi vastata lähdetekstin lukijan reaktiota. Nida selventää, että lähdekulttuurin ymmärtäminen ei ole oleellista kohdetekstin lukijalle, jotta tämä ymmärtäisi viestin. Tämän vuoksi kääntäjän ei tarvitse välittää lähdetekstin tyyliä, vaan tuottaa luonnollinen kohdekielinen ilmaisu. Nida ei tarkenna, miten lähdetekstin lukijan reaktio määritellään tai mitataan. Nida ei myöskään huomioi, että lukijoiden suhtautuminen tekstiin voi vaihdella niin lähde- kuin kohdekielisten lukijoiden välillä huomattavasti. Edellä mainituista syistä Nidan teoriaa on vaikea toteuttaa käytännössä. Hänen vaatimuksensa luonnollisesta kohdekielisestä ilmaisusta on kuitenkin lähellä kohdetekstikeskeisen kääntämisen asettamia vaatimuksia.

Toury (1980) havaitsee lähdetekstikeskeisten teorioiden ja käytännön välillä aukon: teoreettinen määritelmä ei vastaa varsinaista käännöstä. Toury lähtee siitä, että kohdetekstillä ei tarvitse olla yhteyttä lähdekielen kirjalliseen järjestelmään, jotta se katsotaan käännökseksi. Kohdeteksti on käännös, jos sillä on yhteys lähdetekstiin. Kuitenkaan mikä tahansa yhteys ei riitä. Touryn mukaan käännösteoria ei voi koskea vain lähde- ja kohdetekstin välisiä suhteita, vaan sen on otettava huomioon myös sekä kohdetekstin ja kohdekielen että kohdetekstin ja kohdekielisen tekstuaalisen järjestelmän välinen suhde. Toisin sanoen kohdetekstiä ei voi tarkastella vain suhteessa sen lähdetekstiin vaan myös suhteessa kohdekielen kirjalliseen järjestelmään.

Reiss ja Vermeer (1986) edustavat funktionaalisia käännösteorioita. He tuovat kulttuurin käsitteen käännösteoreettisen keskusteluun ja tähdentävät, että kulttuuri on yhtä olennainen osa tekstiä kuin kielelliset ominaisuudet. He myös korostavat kohdetekstin funktiota, joka on usein eri kuin lähdetekstin funktio. Kohdetekstillä voi itse asiassa olla monta eri funktiota. Näiden funktioiden toteuttaminen on

käännösprosessin tärkein kriteeri ja siten myös itse prosessia tärkeämpää on toteuttaa kohdetekstin funktiot. Reiss ja Vermeer käyttävät Kreikan sanaa *skopos*, joka tarkoittaa päämäärää tai tavoitetta. Käännös muuttuu skopoksen mukaan, eikä siten ole yhtä ainoaa oikeaa käännöstapaa tai käännöstä. Kääntäjän tulee aina ensin määritellä käännöksen skopos ja sen jälkeen päättää, mitkä lähdetekstin osat ovat skopoksen kannalta merkittäviä. Reiss ja Vermeer painottavat, että käännöksen on oltava ensisijaisesti ymmärrettävä kohdeteksti ja että lähde- ja kohdetekstin yhteneväisyys on toissijaista. Kohdekielinen lukijahan lukee käännöstä itsenäisenä tekstinä eikä vertaa sitä lähdetekstiin.

Newmark (1981) esittelee omat käännösteoreettiset käsitteensä, kommunikatiivisen (*communicative translation*) ja semanttisen kääntämisen (*semantic translation*). Kommunikatiivisessa kääntämisessä tarkoituksena on aiheuttaa kohdetekstin lukijoissa mahdollisimman samanlainen vaikutus kuin lähdeteksti on sen lukijoissa saanut aikaan. Käännös tehdään lähdetekstin perusteella ja kääntäjä muuttaa vieraan kulttuurin elementit kohdekielen kulttuurin vastaaviksi elementeiksi. Semanttisessa kääntämisessä puolestaan pyritään ilmaisemaan lähdetekstin tarkka kontekstuaalinen merkitys niin hyvin kuin kohdekielen semanttiset ja kieliopilliset rakenteet sen sallivat. Semanttinen käännös säilyttää vieraat piirteet, mutta kääntäjä auttaa lukijaa ymmärtämään niiden konnotaatiot. Newmark selventää, että kommunikatiivinen käännös on tasaisempi, yksinkertaisempi, selkeämpi ja tavanomaisempi kuin semanttinen käännös, joka on vaikeampi, jäykempi ja yksityiskohtaisempi. Newmark toteaa, että vaikka kommunikatiivisessa käännöksessä semanttinen sisältö kärsii, se on kuitenkin selkeämpi ja tehokkaampi kuin semanttinen käännös, jossa puolestaan merkitys kärsii.

Vieraannuttaminen ja kotouttaminen perustuvat lähde- ja kohdetekstikeskeisiin teorioihin. Kwieciński (2001) toteaa, että kotouttaminen tarkoittaa, että kohdeteksti mukautetaan kohdekielen käsitteiden, normien ja tapojen mukaiseksi. Vieraannuttamisessa taas kohdetekstiin sisällytetään käsitteitä ja kielimuotoja, jotka ovat vieraita tai epäselviä kohdekielessä ja -kulttuurissa. Schleiermacher (1813) määritteli ensimmäisenä vieraannuttamisen käsitteen 1800-luvun alussa. Hänen mukaansa kääntäjällä on kaksi vaihtoehtoa: joko käyttää vieraannuttamista ja tuoda lukija lähdetekstin kirjoittajan luo tai kotouttamisen kautta tuoda kirjoittaja kohdetekstin lukijan luo. Berman (1992) väittää, että kääntäjän tarkoitus on olla välittäjä ja tuoda

91

vieraus kohdekulttuuriin ja että ilman vierautta käännös on turha. Berman korostaa, että käännösten tarkoitus on laajentaa kielten ilmaisuvalikoimaa ja estää kommunikaatiojärjestelmien yhdenmukaistuminen. Venuti (1995; 1998) on vaikuttanut merkittävästi keskusteluun vieraannuttamisesta ja kotouttamisesta. Hän arvostelee Britannian ja Yhdysvaltojen käytäntöjä, joissa kohdetekstit kotoutetaan angloamerikkalaisten arvojen mukaisiksi ja siten kohdetekstin lukijoiden on mahdollista tunnistaa oma kulttuurinsa myös vieraan kulttuurin kuvauksessa. Venuti ehdottaakin, että englanninkielisissä käännöksissä vieraannuttamista voitaisiin käyttää, jotta etnosentrismiä, imperialismia ja kulttuurista narsismia voitaisiin vähentää. Ongelmana vieraannuttavissa käännöksissä on niiden vaikealukuisuus, jonka vuoksi niitä lukee vain eliitti.

**Näytelmäkääntäminen**

Näytelmäkääntämistä käsiteltäessä on tärkeä erottaa termit näytelmä ja teatteri toisistaan. Aaltosen (2000) mukaan näytelmätekstit käsittävät sekä kirjallisessa että teatterijärjestelmässä toimivat tekstit, sillä näytelmä viittaa sekä kirjoitettuun tekstiin että teatteriesitykseen. Teatteriteksteillä viitataan puolestaan vain teatterissa käytettäviin teksteihin. Tästä voidaan päätellä, että näytelmäkääntäminen kattaa käännökset, jotka on tarkoitettu sekä kirjalliseen että teatterijärjestelmään, ja että teatterikääntäminen sisältää käännökset, jotka on tarkoitettu teatterijärjestelmään. Soveltuvat käännösstrategiat määritellään sen järjestelmän mukaan, johon käännös tehdään. Järjestelmät ovat erilaisia, sillä teatterissa painottuu välittömyys ja suullinen esitystapa. Kirjallisessa järjestelmässä taas kirjoitetun kielen pysyvyys korostuu. Tämän vuoksi eri järjestelmissä on käytettävä eri käännösstrategioita.

Teatterikäännöksen, ja myös näytelmäkääntämisen, tyypillinen piirre on rytmi. Ellosen (1998) mukaan kääntäjän ei tarvitse miettiä monia eri vaihtoehtoja sanan käännökselle, vaan hänen pitää keskittyä valitsemaan rytmiin sopiva sana. Eri kielillä on eri rytmi, mutta kielen rytmiä tärkeämpi on näyttelijöiden ja tapahtumien rytmi. Esimerkiksi lyhyin lausein ytimekkäästi puhuva henkilö eroaa huomattavasti henkilöstä, jonka puhe on pulppuilevaa ja koostuu pitkistä lauseista. Ellonen muistuttaa, että näyttelijä voi lausua sanan useilla eri tavoilla, mutta huonoa rytmiä ei voi korjata taidokkaallakaan lausunnalla. Kääntäjän tulisikin säilyttää lauseiden pituus sellaisena kuin ne ovat lähdetekstissä, sillä se on hahmon rytmin kannalta olennaista. Monessa käännöksessä

vähäpuheisesta hahmosta on tehty sulava ja kaunopuheinen – tai päinvastoin – pelkästään lisäämällä tai poistamalla sivulauseita. Rossi (1998) toteaa, että runomitassa kirjoitettujen klassisten näytelmien kääntämisessä on tiettyjä ehtoja: suomenkielisessä käännöksessä tulee olla lähdetekstiin kuuluvia ominaisuuksia, näyttelijöiden on pystyttävä lausumaan repliikit ja yleisön on ymmärrettävä teksti, vaikka se ei olisikaan tottunut runolliseen ilmaisuun. Hän korostaa, että kohdetekstiä ei pidä pakottaa noudattamaan sääntöjä, jotka ovat sille luonnottomia.

**Shakespearen kieli ja sen tuomat käännösongelmat**

William Shakespeare (1564–1616) kirjoitti teoksensa maailmassa, joka kyseenalaisti oman historiallisen perintönsä ja avautui samaan aikaan uusille sosiaalisille, poliittisille ja kulttuurisille tyyleille. Koska Shakespeare kuvaili ja tulkitsi tätä maailmaa, hänen kielestäänkin tuli tiivistä ja levotonta. Englannin kieli kehittyi tuohon aikaan suuresti ja Shakespeare näki mahdollisuudet vapaaseen ja rikkaaseen kieleen, jota eivät säännöt tai normit sitoneet (Pennanen, 1967). Hän yhdisteli rekisterejä ja tyylejä ja pystyi käyttämään monien sanojen eri merkityksiä ja sai ne toimimaan yhdessä tai toisiaan vastaan (Serpieri, 2004). Pennanen vakuuttaa, että vaikka Shakespearen kieli vaikuttaa erikoiselta hänen säkeidensä ainutlaatuisen soinnin vuoksi, Shakespearen käyttämän kielen tyypillisin piirre on normaalius. Shakespeare ei luonut omaa erikoiskieltään sanaston eikä rakenteenkaan osalta. Hän käytti suhteellisen vähän niitä Elisabetin ajan kielelle tyypillisiä ominaisuuksia, jotka olivat lyhytikäisiä ja katosivat lopulta kielestä. Shakespearen kielen ominaisuudet ovat peräisin niistä Elisabetin ajan ihanteista, jotka suosivat kielen runsautta, ytimekkyyttä, ajatuskuvien ylevyyttä, sulosointuisuutta ja viittausten täyteläisyyttä. (1964, s. 154–155)

Kääntäjälle suurimmat ongelmat aiheutuvat neljän vuosisadan erosta Shakespearen kielen ja nykyajan yleisön välillä. Ongelmat eivät johdu oikeinkirjoituksesta tai kieliopista, vaan vanhentuneista sanoista, muuttuneista tai käyttämättömistä sanojen merkityksistä, kielikuvista, sanaleikeistä ja vertauksista, jotka perustuvat muinaisiin tapahtumiin. Bonnard (1952) lisää, että ymmärtämistä hankaloittavat muiden muassa tyylilliset rakenteet kuten anakoluutti, hendiadyoin, ellipsi, adjektiivin käyttäminen pääsanan edustaman abstraktin käsitteen sijasta ja erilaisten kielellisten rakenteiden sekaantuminen. Myös sanojen metaforinen käyttö hankaloittaa kielen ymmärtämistä.

Lisäksi monien sanojen, sanontojen ja säkeiden merkitystä ei ole vielä pystytty täysin selvittämään.

Shakespearen kielelle tyypillistä on myös monimutkainen rakenne, jossa proosa ja runomitta vaihtelevat. Kääntäjän on siis valittava ensinnäkin vapaan mitan ja mitallisen runon väliltä sekä proosan ja runomitan väliltä. Kääntäjän on lisäksi muistettava, että proosan ja runomitan vaihtelulla ilmaistaan myös sosiaalista ja draamallista eroa. Usein alempien yhteiskuntaluokkien edustajat puhe on proosaa ja ylempien luokkien henkilöt puhuvat runomitassa. Blake (1983) muistuttaa, että eroja ei pidä korostaa liikaa, sillä emme voi tietää, onko Shakespearen alempiluokkaisten henkilöhahmojen käyttämä proosa sen ajan puhekieltä. Blaken mukaan Shakespearen näytelmien kieli ei ollut tyypillistä puhekieltä, jota hänen aikalaisensa puhuivat.

Shakespearen runomitan kääntäminen on hankalaa suomentajalle, koska lähde- ja kohdekielet ovat rakenteeltaan vastakkaiset: englanti on analyyttinen kieli, jolle tyypillinen runomitta on nouseva mitta eli *jambi*, kun taas suomen kieli on synteettinen ja sen tyypillinen mitta on laskeva eli *trokee*. Runomitan yksikkö on runojalka, joka koostuu kahdesta tai useammasta tavusta, joista ensimmäinen tai viimeinen on painollinen. Nousevassa mitassa sanapaino on viimeisellä tavulla ja laskevassa paino on ensimmäisellä tavulla. Merkitsen painollisen tavun "+"-merkillä ja painottoman "o"-merkillä. Yleisimmät laskevat mitat ovat *trokee* (+o) ja *daktyyli* (+oo) ja nousevista mitoista yleisimmät ovat *jambi* (o+) ja *anapesti* (oo+). Mitat eivät noudata sana- tai säejakoa (Palmgren, 1986). Silosäe (*blank verse*) perustuu riimittömään jambiseen pentametriin, joka koostuu viidestä runojalasta. Shakespeare osasi käyttää silosäettä mestarillisesti ja loi sen avulla parhainta englanninkielistä näytelmärunoutta (Blank verse, 2010).

Runomitta vaikuttaa kieleen huomattavasti. Leino (1982) on huomannut, että suomenkielisen jambimittaisen runon syntaksirakenne on yleensä vaikeampi ja vaihtelevampi kuin trokeemittaisen. Jambissa käytetään usein yksitavuisia sanoja ja trokeessa kaksitavuisia. Suomessa jotkin konjunktiot ovat yksitavuisia ja monista muista saa loppuheiton avulla yksitavuisia, joten niitä esiintyy jambisissa runoissa paljon. Runollisessa kielessä myös syntaktista painotusta käytetään enemmän kuin tavallisessa kielessä. Siksi runokielessä esiintyy useita erilaisia

sanajärjestysmuunnoksia. Enwald (2000) on puolestaan havainnut, että jambin käyttö aiheuttaa joko uhrauksia säkeen sisällössä tai sanojen lyhennyksiä ja pidennyksiä ja runsasta huudahdussanojen käyttöä. Hän painottaa, että runon luonnollista rytmiä on kuunneltava mieluummin kuin noudatettava orjallisesti valittua mittaa.

Shakespearen kääntäjän on lisäksi päätettävä, käyttääkö hän vanhaa vai modernia kieltä. Äärimmäisinä vaihtoehtoina on käyttää joko 1500-luvun englantia vastaavaa kieltä tai nykyaikaista kieltä. Suomen kielen kohdalla kääntäjän ongelmana on se, että englannin kukoistuksen aikaan Mikael Agricola oli vasta luomassa suomen kirjakieltä. Pennanen toteaa, että kääntäjä voi luoda kielimuodon, joka ei ole kummallekaan ajalle tyypillistä. Hyvä käännös ei eroa modernista kielestä paljoakaan, mutta se herättää yleisössä samanlaisen vaikutuksen kuin Shakespearen englanti aiheuttaa nykyajan brittiläisessä yleisössä.

Myös Shakespearen näyttämötekniikka (*stagecraft*) on erikoislaatuista. Shakespearen näytelmissä on hyvin vähän näyttämöohjeita. Näytelmän repliikkeihin on kuitenkin sisällytetty epäsuoria ohjeita siitä, miten repliikit pitää lausua. Joskus ohjeet ovat varsin selvästi ilmaistu, kuten *Hamlet*issa Haamu "*stalks away*" (1.1.53), tai *Julius Caesar*issa Portia pyytää "*upon my knees*" (2.1.270). Epäsuorat ohjeet ilmaistaan myös rytmin, kielikuvien, toiston ja prosodian avulla. Myös runomitan, epätäydellisen mitan ja kesken jääneen mitan kautta ilmaistaan ohjeita esitystavasta. Kääntäjän onkin pidettävä epäsuorat näyttämöohjeet mielessä koko käännösprosessin ajan. (Déprats, 2004a)

**Shakespearen kääntäminen Suomessa**

Klassikkoteoksia on käännetty usein uudelleen ja Shakespearen kohdalla kyse on useista käännöksistä. Déprats mainitsee vanhenevan kielen yhdeksi syyksi uudelleenkääntämiseen. Yksittäinen käännös ei voi myöskään tulkita ja selittää kaikkia tekstin loputtomia ulottuvuuksia, joten uusilla käännöksillä koetetaan paikata kääntämättä jääneitä merkityksiä. Kolmas syy on taiteellinen kunnianhimo, joka saa monen kääntäjän tarttumaan haasteeseen aikaisemmista käännöksistä huolimatta.

Ensimmäiset Shakespearen näytelmät saapuivat Suomeen ulkomaisten teatteriseurueiden mukana 1700-luvulla. Ruotsin- ja saksankielisiä käännöksiä luettiin lukupiireissä 1800-luvun alussa (Paloposki, 2007, s. 130). Suomenkielinen kirjallisuus

oli vielä lapsenkengissä 1800-luvulla. Vuosisadan lopulla suomenkielinen näytelmäkirjallisuus alkoi hiljalleen kehittyä, ja näytelmäkäännökset olivat tärkeitä malleja. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuralla oli suuri merkitys näytelmäkääntämisessä etenkin, kun se aloitti Paavo Cajanderin kanssa projektin, jonka aikana Shakespearen koko näytelmätuotanto käännettiin suomeksi. Käännöksiä syntyi vuosien 1878 ja 1912 välillä yhteensä 36 (Aaltonen, 2003). Cajanderin käännöstyötä hankaloitti alati kehittyvä suomen kieli ja hän korjasikin käännöksiään aina uusien painosten yhteydessä. Kuitenkin käännökset olivat vanhentuneet jo 1930-luvulle tultaessa (Niemi, 2007). Vasta vuonna 2004 aloitettiin vastaava urakka, jossa kaikki Shakespearen näytelmät käännetään uudelleen.

**Kääntäjät**

Paavo Cajanderin (1846–1913) käännökset ovat saavuttaneet Suomessa kanonisoidun aseman ja niitä lainataan yhä ahkerasti. Cajanderin tunnetaan etenkin Runebergin ja Shakespearen käännöksistä. Cajanderin käännöstyön haasteena oli suomen kirjakieli, joka kehittyi nopeasti 1900-luvun vaihteessa. Vaikeista olosuhteista huolimatta Cajander onnistui työssään hyvin ja hänen käännöksensä olivat aikansa parhaimpia ja aikalaisten arvostamia. Myös Cajanderin runollinen ilmaisu oli laadukasta ja taitavaa. Rissanen (2007) korostaa, että vaikka kieli onkin ajan myötä muuttunut, nykylukija voi ainoastaan ihailla Cajanderin kielen rikasta ilmaisua.

Eeva-Liisa Manner (1921–1995) tunnetaan parhaiten runoilijana, mutta hän oli myös kääntäjä ja näytelmäkirjailija. Shakespearen kääntäminen alkoi kiinnostaa Mannerta myöhempinä vuosina ja käännökset olivat hänen kääntäjäuransa huipentuma (Hökkä, 2007). Pennasen (1967, s. 159) mukaan Manner ilmeisesti käänsi Cajanderin käännösten pohjalta joitakin näytelmiä, mutta *Julius Caesar*in yhteydessä tästä ei ole mainintaa. En kuitenkaan analyysissani tutkinut Cajanderin ja Mannerin käännösten vastaavuuksia.

Lauri Sipari aloitti näytelmäkääntämisen ensimmäisen vuoden opiskelijana Teatterikorkeakoulussa. Shakespearen kääntämisen hän aloitti 1970-luvulla. Sipari on kirjoittanut myös lukuisia näytelmiä, adaptaatioita, dramatisointeja ja kuunnelmia. Hän oli Teatterikorkeakoulun rehtorina vuosina 1997–2005. Hän pitää itseään ensisijaisesti näytelmäkirjailijana eikä kääntäjänä.

Jarkko Laine (1947–2006) oli monipuolinen runoilija ja kirjailija, joka myös käänsi näytelmiä ja romaaneja ja käänsi sanat moneen Rauli "Badding" Somerjoen esittämään kappaleeseen. Laine oli myös *Parnasso*n pitkäaikainen päätoimittaja vuosina 1987–2002 sekä Suomen Kirjailijaliiton puheenjohtaja vuosina 1988–2002. Hänet kuitenkin syrjäytettiin puheenjohtajan asemasta ikävissä olosuhteissa. Zilliacus (2007) sanoo, että Laineen käännös *Julius Caesar*ista oli tämän testamentti kirjallisuuden kentälle ja vastaus hänen syrjäyttämiselleen Kirjailijaliitosta.

**Analyysi Shakespearen *Julius Caesar*in suomennoksista**

Tutkimusmateriaali koostuu neljästä Shakespearen *Julius Caesar* -näytelmän suomennoksesta. Cajanderin käännös ilmestyi vuonna 1883, ja hän korjasi käännöstään vuonna 1913 julkaistun toisen painoksen yhteydessä. Käytin toista painosta, sillä siihen tehdyt muutokset koskivat oikeinkirjoitusta tai suomen kielen kehitystä ja kaikki muutokset on hyvin merkitty. Mannerin suomennos ilmestyi vuonna 1983, Siparin käännös julkaistiin vuonna 2006 ja Laineen käännös vuonna 2007. Vertailin käännöksiä sekä lähdetekstiin että toisiin käännöksiin ja siten löysin eroja, jotka ovat syntyneet eri käännösratkaisujen ja -strategioiden vuoksi. Sisällytin tutkielmaani näistä eroista esimerkkejä, jotka kuvasivat käännösten välisiä eroja hyvin. Analyysissä keskityin käännösten käyttämään sanastoon ja syntaksiin, metaforien, sanaleikkien, näyttämötekniikan ja runomitan kääntämiseen. Lopuksi vertailin käännösten tyyliä.

Sanaston osalta havainnot olivat odotettuja, sillä Cajanderin käännöksissä esiintyi muutamia vanhentuneita ja käytöstä poistuneita sanoja kuten *tiisti* eli rakki, *totkut* eli sisälmykset ja *hairaus* eli erehdys. Manner ja Sipari olivat käyttäneet melko tavanomaista sanastoa, jonka voisi olettaa säilyvän ymmärrettävänä vielä vuosia. Laineen käyttämä sanasto oli kuitenkin hätkähdyttävän nykyaikaista. Hänen käännöksessään esiintyivät muiden muassa sanat *tyyppi* ja *nuija* (henkilöstä puhuttaessa), *bonus*, *krapula*, *horoskooppi*, *morkata*, *markkeerata*, *paskanpuhuja*, *perseennuolija*, *jyväjemmari*, *stadin kundi*, *joukkotiedotus* ja *tilannekatsaus*. Käännöksessä oli myös tiukasti suomalaiseen kulttuuriin liittyviä sanoja näytelmän tyyliin sopimattomia ilmaisuja, kuten *kauppatori*, *korpilakko*, *avohakkuu*; *valmiit, paikoillanne, hep!*; *vedä päähäs, vähämies*; *Heil Caesar, Mein Führer!* Laineen sanasto heijastelee myös hänen käännöksensä yleistä tyyliä.

Käännösten syntaksi oli melko tavanomaista, mutta sanajärjestyksessä oli joitakin poikkeamia etenkin Cajanderin käännöksessä. Runomitassa epätavallinen sanajärjestys selittyy jambin vuoksi tehdyillä muutoksilla, mutta myös proosakäännöksessä oli paikoin muutettu suomen neutraalia sanajärjestystä lähdetekstin sanajärjestystä muistuttavaksi. Muissa käännöksissä sanajärjestystä ei ollut muutettu yhtä paljon, mutta myös Mannerin käännöksessä oli paikoin poikettu tavanomaisesta sanajärjestyksestä.

Metaforien ja sanaleikkien käännösratkaisuissa oli havaittavissa eroja lähde- ja kohdetekstikeskeisyydessä: Cajander on pysytellyt lähellä lähdetekstiä ja kääntänyt jopa erään homonyymeihin perustuvan sanaleikin lähes suoraan. Huonosti suomen kielellä toimivia sanaleikkejä hän ei ole selittänyt, vaan on kääntänyt suoraan lähdetekstistä. Parhaimmillaan sanaleikit on kuitenkin käännetty yhtä eläviksi kuin ne ovat lähdetekstissä. Manner on koettanut selittää joitakin kielelliseen ominaisuuteen perustuvia kielikuvia ja sanaleikkejä, mutta hän on myös jättänyt kääntämättä sanaleikkejä. Sipari on noudattanut vallitsevaa käännöstapaa ja kääntänyt kielikuvat ja sanaleikit selittäen. Vaikka tuloksena on helposti ymmärrettävä käännös, se on myös latistunut, sillä Sipari ei ole pystynyt luomaan Shakespearelle ominaista kielellistä särmikkyyttä. Laine on myös käyttänyt selittäviä käännöksiä, mutta hän on myös adaptoinut sanaleikkejä ja lisännyt muun muassa alluusion nykyajan populaarimusiikkiin.

Shakespearen epäsuorat näyttämöohjeet on havaittu ja käännetty vaihtelevasti. Esimerkiksi toiston avulla ilmaistut ohjeet on sivuutettu useammassa käännöksessä ja toisto rikottu. Lähdetekstin lähellä pysytellyt Cajander on yleensä kääntänyt myös toiston. Sen sijaan repliikeissä olevat selkeät ohjeet on huomattu ja käännetty. Esimerkiksi Portian repliikissä ollut ohje *"upon my knees"* (2.1.270) esiintyy kaikissa käännöksissä. Tosin Sipari on lisännyt käännökseensä suoria näyttämöohjeita joko epäsuorien rinnalle tai niiden tilalle. Sipari onkin muokannut lähdetekstin näyttämöohjeita huomattavasti. Hän on jopa muuttanut näytelmän rakennetta yhdistämällä neljännen näytöksen toisen ja kolmannen kohtauksen.

Kääntäjät ovat ratkaisseet runomitan kääntämisen eri tavoin. Laine on kääntänyt koko näytelmän proosamuodossa, joten hänen käännöstään en ole voinut analysoida tässä

yhteydessä. Sipari on kääntänyt runomitallisen tekstin laskevassa mitassa, eli noudattanut kohdekielelle ominaista mittaa. Cajander ja Manner ovat säilyttäneet lähdetekstin jambisen runomitan, tosin Manner on käyttänyt välillä myös trokeista mittaa. Ratkaisut heijastuivat selkeästi kieleen ja ymmärrettävyyteen. Siparin käännös on sujuvaa ja helposti ymmärrettävää. Cajanderin käännös on vaikeasti hahmotettavaa, sillä hän on käyttänyt paljon sanojen lyhennyksiä ja pidennyksiä ja muuttanut neutraalia sanajärjestystä. Toisaalta Mannerin nousevan mitan käännös on ymmärrettävämpää kuin Cajanderin. Syynä tähän lienee suomen kielen runoilmaisun kehitys Cajanderin ja Mannerin käännösten ilmestymisen välillä.

Tyylillisesti käännökset eroavat toisistaan huomattavasti. Cajanderin ja Mannerin nousevan mitan käännökset luovat taiteellisen vaikutelman, kun taas Siparin ja Laineen käännökset ovat tavanomaista suomea. Toisaalta ymmärrettävyys on jälkimmäisissä parempi, sillä ratkaisut ovat mahdollistaneet selittävien käännösten ja selkeämpien lauserakenteiden käytön. Laineen tyyli eroaa muista käännöksistä huomattavasti ja käännöksestä onkin ilmeisesti haluttu tehdä epätavallinen Shakespeare-käännös tai mukaelma.

**Lopuksi**

Lähde- ja kohdetekstikeskeisyyden kannalta tarkasteltuna Cajander on käyttänyt vähiten kohdetekstikeskeisiä käännösratkaisuja, sillä hän on monessa suhteessa pysytellyt lähellä lähdetekstiä. Muut kääntäjät eivät ole olleet yhtä uskollisia lähdetekstille. Manner on käyttänyt selittäviä käännöksiä ja ainoana kääntäjänä jättänyt kääntämättä joitakin lähdetekstin kohtia. Sipari puolestaan on muokannut näyttämötekniikkaa huomattavasti. Hän on myös hyödyntänyt alaviitteitä käännöksessään, jolloin hän on voinut säilyttää lähdetekstin piirteitä, jotka ovat kohdeyleisölle vieraita. Laine on adaptoinut kohdetekstin huomiota herättäväksi käyttämällä Shakespearen käännöksille epätavallisia tyyliä ja sanontoja.

Laineen adaptaation syynä lienee ollut huomion herättäminen. Zilliacus (2007) on sanonut, että käännös oli Laineen testamentti kirjalliselle kentälle, joten tätä tarkoitusta varten huomion herättäminen on tarpeellista. Laineen motiiveista kertoo myös poliittisen näytelmän valinta, sillä *Julius Caesar*issa ystävät pettävät rakastetun johtajansa ja lopulta tuhoavat itsensä. Taiteelliset vaikuttimet eivät ainakaan olleet

Laineen käännöksen takana, sillä hän ei ole säilyttänyt Shakespearen kielelle tyypillisiä nokkeluuksia tai runomittaa. Suomen teatterissa on myös tyypillistä tehdä klassikkonäytelmistä uusia versioita, joille hankitaan huomiota tekemällä niistä rajuja ja epätavallisia adaptaatioita.

Tämä tutkimus keskittyi yhden Shakespearen näytelmän, *Julius Caesar*in, käännöksiin. Jatkotutkimus on kuitenkin tarpeellista, sillä Shakespearen muistakin näytelmistä on tehty useita käännöksiä eri aikakausina. Tietyn aikakauden käännöksiä voisi verrata keskenään ja sen jälkeen verrata niitä muiden aikakausien käännöksiin. Näin saataisiin kattava kuva näytelmäkääntämisen kehityksestä, lähde- ja kohdetekstikeskeisyydestä ja eri strategioiden yleisyydestä tiettyinä aikoina.

# References

PRIMARY SOURCES:

Shakespeare, W. 1913. *Shakespearen Draamoja II*: *Julius Caesar*. Translated by Paavo Cajander. 2nd edition. Helsinki: SKS.

Shakespeare, W. 1983. *Julius Caesar*. Translated by Eeva-Liisa Manner. Helsinki: Tammi.

Shakespeare, W. 2006. *Julius Caesar*. Translated by Lauri Sipari. Helsinki: WSOY.

Shakespeare, W. 2007. *Julius Caesar*. Translated by Jarkko Laine. Turku: Enostone.

Shakespeare, W. 2007. *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*: *Julius Caesar*. London: Wordsworth Editions.


SECONDARY SOURCES:

Aaltonen, S. (ed.) 1998. *Käännetyt illuusiot*: *näytelmäkääntäminen suomalaisessa teatterissa*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.

Aaltonen, S. 2000. *Time-Sharing on Stage*: *Translation in Theatre and Society*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Aaltonen, S. 2003. Shakespearen merkitys suomalaisessa kulttuurissa. In Lilius, P. & Makkonen-Graig, H. 2003, 99-125.

Antisthenes. 2010. In *Encyclopædia Britannica online*. Retrieved March 14, 2010, from http://www.britannica.com

Arnold, M. 1928. *Essays literary and critical*. London: Dent.

Bassnett, S. & Lefevere, A. 1998. *Constructing Cultures*: *Essays on Literary Translation*. Clevedon etc.: Multilingual Matters.

Bassnett, S. 1995. *Teoksesta toiseen*: *Johdatus kirjallisuuden kääntämiseen*. (editing and translation supervision by Riitta Oittinen). Tampere: Vastapaino.

Berman, A. 1992. *The Experience of the Foreign*: *Culture and Translation in Romantic Germany* (translated by S. Heyvaert). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Blake, N. F. 1983. *Shakespeare's Language*. Houndmills: MacMillan Press.

Blank verse. 2010. In *Encyclopædia Britannica online*. Retrieved March 14, 2010, from http://www.britannica.com

Bonnard, G. A. 1952. Suggestions towards an edition of Shakespeare for French, German and other continental readers. *Shakespeare Survey* 5, 10-15.

Brook, G. L. 1976. *The Language of Shakespeare*. London: André Deutsch.

Calamnius, I. 1900. *Lauluja ja runoelmia*. Porvoo.

Catford, J. C. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*: *An Essay in Applied Linguistic*. London: Oxford University Press.

Chang, N. F. 1998. Politics and poetics in translation: Accounting for a Chinese version of 'Yes Prime Minister'. *The Translator* 4: 2, 249-272.

*Collins English Dictionary online*, 2006. 8th Ed. Retrieved March 14, 2010, from http://ezproxy.utu.fi:2054/mot/turkuyo/netmot.exe?motportal=80

Cynic. 2010. In *Encyclopædia Britannica online*. Retrieved March 14, 2010, from http://www.britannica.com

Delay, F. 1928. Georges Banu. Le traducteur de verre. Théâtre/public 44.

Déprats, J. 2004a. Translating Shakespeare's stagecraft. In Hoenselaars, T. (ed.), 133-147.

Déprats, J. 2004b. Translation at the crossroads of the past and the present. In Homem, R. C. & Hoenselaars, T. (eds.), 65-78.

Ellonen, A. 1998. ”Niin että jos vain ajattelenkin sinua”. In Aaltonen, S. (ed.), 40-48.

Enwald, L. 2000. Lyriikan kääntäminen ja sen kritiikki. In Paloposki, O. & Makkonen-Graig, H. (eds.), 176-189.

Gerbel, N. V. (ed.) 1880. *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*, 3$^{rd}$ edition. St Petersburg.

Grönros, E-R., Haapanen, M., Heinonen, T. R., Joki, L., Nuutinen, L. & Vilkamaa-Viitala, M. (eds.). 2006. *Kielitoimiston sanakirja*. Helsinki: Kotus/Gummerus.

Hakulinen, A., Vilkuna, M., Korhonen, R., Koivisto, V., Heinonen, T. R. & Alho, I. 2004. Iso suomen kielioppi. Helsinki: SKS. [Electronic version.] Retrieved April 17, 2009, from http://scripta.kotus.fi/visk/sisallys.php?p=13.

*Helsingin Sanomat* 20.3.1997 Sipari Teatterikorkeakoulun johtoon. [Electronic version.] Retrieved November 13, 2008, from www.hs.fi/arkisto.

*Helsingin Sanomat* 3.12.2005. Professori Ylioppilasteatterista. Lauri Sipari 60. [Electronic version.] Retrieved November 13, 2008, from www.hs.fi/arkisto.

Hoenselaars, T. 2004. *Shakespeare and the Language of Translation*. London: Arden Shakespeare.

Homem, R. C. & Hoenselaars, T. (eds.) 2004. *Translating Shakespeare for the Twenty-first Century*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Häkkinen, K. 2004. *Nykysuomen etymologinen sanakirja*. Helsinki: WSOY.

Hökkä, T. 2007. Eeva-Liisa Manner. In Riikonen, H. K., et al. (eds.), II 488-492.

Itkonen, E. & Joki, A. 1969. *Suomenkielen etymologinen sanakirja IV*. Helsinki: Suomalais-ugrilainen sanakirja.

Juva, K. 1998. Puhekieli ja kirjakieli. In Aaltonen, S. (ed.), 49-53.

Juva, K. 2009. Lecture on literary translation, University of Turku, December 9, 2009.

Jylhä, Y. 1931. *Viimeinen kierros*. Porvoo.

Kermode, F. 2000. *Shakespeare's Language*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Kianto, I. 1900. Höyhenkengälle. In Calamnius, I. (ed.).

Kulonen, U-M. 2000. *Suomen sanojen alkuperä: Etymologinen sanakirja*. Helsinki: SKS.

Kwieciński, P. 2001. *Disturbing Strangeness*: *Foreignisation and Domestication in Translation Procedures in the Context of Cultural Asymmetry*. Toruń: Edytor.

Lahdelma, T., Kovala, U. & Ollikainen, A. (eds.) 1983. *Draaman kääntämisestä*: *Kääntäjäseminaari Jyväskylässä 2.-3.7.1982*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopiston kirjallisuuden laitos.

Larin-Kyösti. 1918. *Taiston tiellä*. Hämeenlinna: Karisto.

Larjavaara, M. 2001. Määräinen artikkeli – suomessa? *Kielikello* 4. Retrieved March 15, 2010, from http://www.kielikello.fi

Leino, P. 1982. *Kieli, runo ja mitta*: *Suomen kielen metriikka*. Helsinki: SKS.

Liedes, P. & Lehtinen, T. (eds.) 2007. *Elämä kuin runo – yhtä tosi: Muistissamme Jarkko Laine*. Helsinki: Johnny Kniga.

Lilius, P. & Makkonen-Graig, H. 2003. *Nerontuotteita maailmalta: näkökulmia suomennosten historiaan*. Helsinki: MonAKO, Helsingin yliopisto.

Mantere, N. 1918. *Valkea maa*. Hämeenlinna: Karisto.

Martin, A. 2009. Metrinen herätys. *Kääntäjä* 2, 1-3.

Meri, V. 1982. *Sanojen synty*. *Etymologinen sanakirja*. Jyväskylä: Gummerrus.

Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2010. Retrieved March 14, 2010, from http://www.merriam-webster.com

Milton, J. 2003. The Nation, Foreignization, Dominance, and Translation. In Petrilli, S. (ed.), 555-579.

Morand, E. & Schwob, M. 1986. Hamlet. In Shakespeare, W. 1986.

Newmark, P. 1981. *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford etc.: Pergamon Press.

Nida, E. A. 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating*: *With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: Brill.

Niemi, J. 2007. *Paavo Cajander*: *Suomentajan ja runoilijan muotokuva*. Helsinki: SKS.

Numminen, M. A. 2007. Jarkko, muurinmurtaja! In Liedes, P. & Lehtinen, T. (eds.), 21-30.

Palmgren, M-L. 1986. *Johdatus kirjallisuustieteeseen*. Porvoo: WSOY.

Paloposki, O. & Makkonen-Graig, H. (eds.), 2000. *Käännöskirjallisuus ja sen kritiikki*. Helsinki: AKO, Helsingin yliopisto.

Paloposki, O. 2007. Shakespearea suomeksi ensi kerran: Ruunulinna. In Riikonen, H. K., et al. (eds.), I 130-132.

Pennanen, E. 1967. Shakespearen kielestä ja sen suomentamisesta. In *Juhlakirja Kauko Kyyrön täyttäessä 60 vuotta 24.11.1967*. Tampere: Tampereen yliopisto, 152-173.

Petrilli, S. (ed.) 2003. *Translation Translation*. Amsterdam & New York: Rodopi.

Petäjä, J. 2004. Suomentajan tähtihetki ja kauhun paikka. *Helsingin Sanomat* 25.1.2004. [Electronic version.] Retrieved October 23, 2008, from www.hs.fi/arkisto.

Pyrylä, T. 2004. *Aina yhtä ajaton Shakespeare*. WSOY online 23.4.2004. Retrieved March 20, 2010 from http://wsoy.fi/yk/news/show/119?category=-1&max=10&offset=70&archendyear=2004&archyear=2003

Reiss, K. & Vermeer, H. J. 1986. *Mitä kääntäminen on*: *Teoriaa ja käytäntöä* (shortened and translated by Pauli Roinila). Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Riikonen, H. K., Kovala, U., Kujamäki, P. & Paloposki, O. (eds.) 2007. *Suomennoskirjallisuuden historia I & II*. Helsinki: SKS.

Rissanen, M. 2007. Paavo Cajander. In Riikonen, H. K., et al. (eds.), I 201-205.

Robinson, D. 1997. *Western Translation Theory*: *From Herodotus to Nietzsche*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Ruokonen, M. 2004. Schleiermacher, Berman ja Venuti: kolme käännösteoreettista näkökulmaa vieraannuttamiseen. In Tommola, J. (ed.), 63-80.

Rytkönen, A. 1930. *Yksinäisyyden sävel*. Runoja. Helsinki: Otava.

Saarimaa, E. A. 1923. Selityksiä. In Shakespeare, W., 99-109.

Sadeniemi, M., Ervasti, E., Heikinheimo, H., Helkiö, O. E., Hämäläinen, S., Joki, A. J., Keinonen, A., Koilo, T. O., Mattila, P., Paavolainen, R., Peltola, R.,

Piiroinen, T., Rainio, J., Simojoki, J., Siro, P., Säätelä, A., Tervonen, V. & Vuoriniemi, J. (eds.) 1983. *Nykysuomen sanakirja*. 2, part 3 and 4, L–R. 8th edition. Porvoo: WSOY.

Sanders, N. 2005. Commentary. In Shakespeare, W. 2005, 115-200.

Schleiermacher, F. 1813. On Different Methods of Translating (translated by Douglas Robinson). In Robinson, D. 1997, 225-238.

Serpieri, A. 2004. Translating Shakespeare: A brief survey of some problematic areas. In Homem, R. C. & Hoenselaars, T. (eds.), 27-49.

Shakespeare, W. 1923. *Julius Caesar*. Translated by Paavo Cajander. 3rd edition. Helsinki: SKS.

Shakespeare, W. 1986. *Hamlet*. (Translated by Morand, E. & Schwob, M.) Paris: Gérard Lebovici Editions.

Shakespeare, W. 2005. *Julius Caesar*. London: Penguin Books.

Shurbanov, A. & Sokolova, B. 2004. Under Communism: Bulgaria and beyond. In Hoenselaars (ed.), 82–97.

Sipari, L. 1983. Kokemuksia näytelmätekstin kääntämisestä II. In Lahdelma, T., Kovala, U. & Ollikainen, A. (eds.), 49-54.

Tommola, J. (ed.) 2004. *Kieli, teksti ja kääntäminen*: *Language, text and translation*. Turku: Turku University.

Toury, G. 1980. *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.

Vehmas-Lehto, I. 1999. *Kopiointia vai kommunikointia? Johdatus käännösteoriaan*. Helsinki: Finn Lectura.

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

Venuti, L. 1998. *The Scandals of translation*: *Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London & New York: Routledge.

Vilppula, M., Takala, U., Aapala, K., Ainiala, T., Kamppi, N., Korhonen, T., Paronen, J., Pohjola, K., Rouvala, K., Vehmaskoski, M. & Vuorenpää, P. 1997. *Suomen murteiden sanakirja V*. Helsinki: Kotus/Edita.

Vilppula, M., Takala, U., Ainiala, T., Kamppi, N., Korhonen, T., Koskelo, A., Paronen, J., Pohjola, K., Rouvala, K., Tuominen, E., Vehmaskoski, M. & Vuorenpää, P. 1999. *Suomen murteiden sanakirja VI*. Helsinki: Kotus/Edita.

Vuori, J. 1999. Shakespeare kääntyy yhä uudestaan - välillä ehkä haudassaankin. *Turun Sanomat* 14.11.1999. [Electronic version.] Retrieved October 16, 2008, from http://arkisto.turunsanomat.fi.