

Sholem Aleichem in Estonian and Lithuanian: An Attempt of Translation Comparison

Anna Vershik

Tallinn University, Tallinn, Estonia

Abstract. The article provides a comparison between Estonian and Lithuanian translation of two stories from Sholem Aleichem's collection *Railroad Stories*. The analysis is conducted in the framework of descriptive approach that views translation as a complex process involving not just two texts and two linguistic systems but the entirety of cultural setting (traditions, norms, position of the author within a certain literary system, other texts by the same author, borders between own and foreign elements, translation norms etc) in the source and the recipient culture. For the purpose of text analysis, concept of dominant (the focusing component in the work) is employed. The dominant in *Railroad Stories* includes (1) verbosity, which is a constituent part of Sholem Aleichem's humour (2) story within a story, (3) so-called Jewish rhetoric, (4) depiction of surrounding multilingualism. Translation cultures in Estonia and Lithuania are similar but there is more familiarity with Jewish/Yiddish culture in Lithuania. The dominant is preserved in both translations, although not entirely: the wholes of the story cycle is broken in the Estonian translation and one layer of "story within a story" is removed; in the Lithuanian translation some repetitions are omitted, thus affecting verbosity; both translations delete multilingualism (utterances in other languages than source and target language) to an extent.

Keywords: Translation, Sholem Aleichem, Estonian, Lithuanian

1. Introduction
2. Historical Context
 - 2.1. General History
 - 2.2. Yiddish (Jewish) Culture in Estonia and Lithuania
3. Translation Culture in Estonia and Lithuania
4. Translation as a Complex Multidimensional Process
5. Analysis
 - 5.1. Preamble
 - 5.2. Background Information and Text Choice
 - 5.3. Overall Packaging and Metatexts
 - 5.4. Verbosity, Rhetoric, Appellations to the Reader
 - 5.5. Items from Other Languages
 - 5.6. Idioms and Fixed Expressions
 - 5.7. Cultural Terms
 - 5.8. Other Choices: Transliteration and Personal Names
6. Conclusions
- References
 - Primary Sources
 - Translations
 - Secondary Sources

1. Introduction

The purpose of the article is to compare translations of Sholem Aleichem's works into Estonian and into Lithuanian, namely, stories from the cycle *Ayznban-geshikhtes* (Railroad Stories, 1909). The paper analyses the translators' strategies and decisions in a comparative perspective. It will be shown that, although translations differ somewhat in their approach,

and the translators' background is different as well, translations are similar in the sense that they seek to familiarize their audiences with Sholem Aleichem without much domestication via deletions and omissions.

It is rather evident that first of all there appear translations from Yiddish into "big" languages like English, Russian, French or German: in fact, it is via these translations how literatures in lesser used/small languages such as Yiddish become known to a wider audience. Due to the lack of translators who are proficient in Yiddish, a translation into a third language occurs through the medium of English or German (for instance, this was the case with the Finnish translation of *Marienbad*). In this context, it is remarkable that translators both into Estonian and Lithuanian, Aron Tamarkin and Dominikas Urbas respectively, were proficient in Yiddish and translated from the original.

Recently a collection of articles on translations of Sholem Aleichem's works was published (Estraiikh, Finkin, Hoge and Krutikov 2012) and it is quite telling that the contributors discuss general cultural context and problems of translatability or translations into major languages (with an exception of Schwartz 2012 who touches to some extent upon his translation strategy into Danish and my own article on creating a tradition of Estonian translations). However, there is little if any research on translation and reception of Sholem Aleichem's works into small and lesser used languages. A comparative research into translation of Sholem Aleichem is almost lacking, too. In this view, it makes sense to compare Estonian and Lithuanian translations. Both Estonian and Lithuanian fall into this category (respectively, about 1 million and 3 million speakers) and both countries have somewhat similar sociocultural profile and political history. At the same time, history of Jews in both countries and laypeople's familiarity with Yiddish (Jewish) culture differ, which means that the two translators' tasks differed to an extent.

The Estonian publication has the title *Kuuskümmend kuus* (Sixty six) and the Lithuanian one *Trys našlės* (Three widows) and both appeared in 1959, which was not a coincidence. After the death of Stalin and the end of anti-Jewish repressions, the decision to commemorate Sholem Aleichem's 100th birth anniversary in 1959 had a double objective: first, the commemoration as such, second, a signal that Jewish (Yiddish) culture is not banned anymore and publications in/translations from Yiddish are acceptable (see Estraiikh 2012, Krutikov 2012, Gruschka 2012). The decision to commemorate Sholem Aleichem's anniversary was of a high importance for the entire USSR (see details in Estraiikh 2012) and it was apparently a centralized policy to translate Sholem Aleichem into languages of USSR. Both countries were then under the Soviet rule (1940-1991) as Soviet republics and, therefore, were not entirely free in planning and implementing their own cultural policies. In 1987 the Lithuanian translation appeared under a different title *Apysakos* (Stories) in the prestigious foreign classics series *Pasaulinės literatūros biblioteka* (Library of World Literature); the volume also included some earlier translations of Sholem Aleichem's works. It is a slightly edited version with added metatexts; a systematic comparison between the two editions remains outside the scope of the present article.

It seems counter-intuitive to mechanically compare original and translation and to view translation solely as a structural linguistic or cognitive-linguistic process, especially when discussing translations of fiction. I choose a descriptive approach, dwelling on polysystem studies (Even-Zochar 1990) and concept of total translation (Torop 1995) and translation as (auto)communication (Jakobson [1959] 1971, Levý 1967, Monticelli and Lange 2014, Torop 2010, Torop and Osimo 2010) that allow to provide a broader perspective. In order to understand decisions (see Levý 1967, Zabalbeascoa 2005: 195 on translation as a decision making process) for renditions of particular elements of the original, it is necessary to have a general picture of the translation culture, text choices, the position of the original within the source culture and receiving culture, ideology, translator's background, his/her command of languages and activities as a translator as a whole. In the words of Hermans

(2009: 35), descriptive approach "... wants to study translations as they are, and to account for their occurrence in nature".

The structure of the article is as follows. First, I will describe the general historical context in Lithuania and Estonia and familiarity with the Jews and Yiddish culture. Afterwards Estonian and Lithuanian translation cultures will be discussed in brief. Then I will turn to relevant issues in descriptive studies and discuss the concept of dominant and attempt to determine what is the dominant in Sholem Aleichem's stories, including his humour. and translators' background provided. Finally, background information of the translators and analysis of two translated stories from the collection, *Der nes fun hoyshane-rabe* (The Miracle of Hoshanah Rabbah) and *A khasene on klezmer* (A wedding without musicians) will be presented with a discussion on the choice of the texts, metatexts and what happens to the dominant.

2. Historical Context

2.1. General History

Estonia and Lithuania share some common traits and history, despite obvious linguistic and cultural differences; see Kasekamp (2010) for a concise comparative treatment of the Baltic countries. A similar geographical position at the Baltic coast at the crossroads of competing powers, belonging to the same empires, be it Russian Empire or USSR, a short period of independence (1918–1940) oppositional identity during the Soviet era and subtle resistance to Russification provide enough common ground. Both Estonia and Lithuania belonged to the Russian Empire, both were successful in creating modern standard Estonian/Lithuanian and becoming a modern nation, both enjoyed a short period of independence (1918-1940) and were a part of USSR as a result of the occupation and annexation (1940-1991) and, therefore, subject to general Soviet ideology and sociocultural policies. The latter fact, among other things, affected publishing and translation.

After the worst Stalinist repressions were over, the ideological pressure diminished to an extent and more space for creativity and literatures in the national languages was allowed (although not without ideological restrictions). Covert cultural resistance to Sovietisation in the Baltic republics existed all the time; previous memories and practices, including a certain translation culture from the era of independence (1918–1940) was implicitly present. Censorship and mainstream ideology notwithstanding, translation of fiction provided a little bit more freedom than publishing original prose (see Monticelli and Lange 2014 on Estonia and Venclova 1979 on Lithuania). Translation of fiction allowed to preserve some degree of communication with the free world (representing new authors and bringing new images into circulation, see Lange and Baljasny 2010). In this way, individual cultural interest and linguistic competence of translators helped to counterbalance and outsmart the official cultural policies.

There seemed to exist an intuitive understanding among the literary community that that translation plays a crucial role in the development and sustainability of small languages and cultures, a fact well known to scholars in translation studies (Even-Zohar [1976] 2000, 1997, 1998). The history of translation under the Soviet rule is more amply described for Estonia (Monticelli and Lange 2014). As for Lithuania, there are some studies on translations in Lithuania — Pažūsis (2014) concentrates on linguistic aspects of translation into Lithuanian; some post-1990s developments are described in Šalciūtė-Čivilienė (2011) — but in general such a history has to be researched and written yet.

2.2. Yiddish (Jewish) Culture in Estonia and Lithuania

As far as Jewish history is concerned, the two countries differ a lot. Jews settled in the Great Duchy of Lithuania in the 14th century and formed impressive communities and centres of learning. In the independent Lithuania (1918–1940), they constituted the largest minority (7–8% of the population). Jews were mostly multilingual, almost all understood Yiddish, even if some chose a different language of education or artistic expression (see Atamukas 1998: 161 ff on Jewish-Lithuanian cultural symbiosis, Sužiedėlis 2004). Some translations from Yiddish into Lithuanian appeared before WW II, including Sholem Aleichem's works; see Siaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė (2017) on Jewish-Lithuanian cultural contacts, including translations.

Almost all Lithuanian Jews perished in the Holocaust; very few were rescued and some spent the war years in evacuation. Nevertheless, after World War II some Yiddish-speakers were still around. It is relevant that due to the long common history of living side by side, some Lithuanians were fluent in Yiddish, among them Dominikas Urbas (1908–1996), the translator into Lithuanian. To the best of my knowledge, nothing is written about Lithuanians who knew Yiddish and it is impossible to estimate the number of such people and the degree of their command in Yiddish.

Even after the destruction of Lithuanian Jewry and decline of Yiddish and subsequent anti-Jewish Soviet policies, an average Lithuanian would be aware about Jewish presence in the country's history. It may be assumed that in 1959, when the Lithuanian translation appeared, not much time had passed and many remembered Jews firsthand. Nowadays this had become a more distant memory, although an educated person would have some understanding about Jews and their culture due to Holocaust education, various works about Jewish history of Lithuania in Lithuanian (Atamukas 1998, Eidintas 2002) and monographic treatments of literary contacts between literatures in various languages (Kvietkauskas 2007).

Estonia presents an entirely different picture: it never belonged to the Pale of Settlement and Jews arrived there as late as the second quarter of the 19th century, originating from outside the Pale (mostly Courland and later from other areas where North-Eastern Yiddish varieties were spoken). They were mostly middle-class, acculturated, urban multilingual dwellers and formed a tiny community. Needless to say, there were no shtetls in Estonia. During the first period of independence (1918–1940) Jews used opportunities provided by the legislation on cultural autonomy and formed clubs, societies, associations of various profile, yet their number was about 4,400 in 1935 and their share in the population was never higher than 0.4 %. Thus, the majority had little or no knowledge about Jews and their culture (on Estonian Jewry see Vershik 2012 and references therein); Jewish protagonists of Sholem Aleichem and other classics were very much unlike urban middle class Estonian Jews. For an Estonian reader, I. L. Perets whose works were to some extent translated in the 1920s–1930s described a foreign, distant world.

However, cultural distance per se is not an obstacle for a meaningful informative translation. In fact, such a distance is gradually overcome through systematically appearing translations from that culture. The development of translation culture and tradition as well as a growing body of translations of particular literatures from particular languages, no matter how different, helps to decrease mental distance between the source and the receiving literature and culture. Aron Tamarkin (1915–1969), the Estonian translator, was among the creators of such a tradition (Vershik 2012). In this case, difference in familiarity with Jews and Yiddish literature means that translators into Lithuanian and into Estonian had to make slightly different decisions and elaborate different strategies at times.

3. Translation Culture in Estonia and Lithuania

Translation culture in a given society sets a general frame for a translator. Tradition of translation from a certain language may have particular conventions (for instance, whether Hebrew origin cultural terms in Yiddish, such as names of holidays, artefacts etc are transliterated to match Yiddish, Ashkenazic or Modern Hebrew pronunciation). In some cultures, extensive metatexts are uncommon while in others, such as Estonian and Lithuanian, they are often considered as necessary, especially when translating from lesser familiar languages, including Yiddish.

A study of translation culture is a separate task that would require scrupulous analysis of large text corpora. Nevertheless, three issues can be listed that are without doubt a part of Estonian and Lithuanian translation culture (see Vershik 2012): (1) translation from the original is preferable (although Monticelli and Lange 2014, pp. 102–103, report about certain cases where a translator was reprimanded for translating from original rather than from a Russian translation); (2) metatexts (footnotes, endnotes, explicit comments by translator about culture, history, allusions to other texts, prefaces, glossaries); (3) editing by a professional editor or another translator who in ideal knows the language of the original (that is, an editor would compare the original and the translation).

Sometimes these conditions are not fulfilled, for instance, when metatexts are not needed. Absence, presence and the character of metatexts also depends on the publication format, i.e., whether a translation appears in a periodical or series, there may be compulsory elements. In post-WWII Lithuania and Estonia there hardly were many translators or editors with the knowledge of Yiddish. Contrarily, in Lithuania such an editor was available (see more in Section 5.2)

If a tradition of translation from a certain language is very new or almost absent, the more important becomes a role of an individual translator. This applies to Yiddish literature both in Lithuania and Estonia. An analyst has to look at the background of the translator (command in the language of the original and other languages) and at his/her activities (a translator may also be an author of original works of fiction or poetry, a scholar; he/she may prefer certain authors or authors from a certain period, representatives of some literary movement etc).

4. Translation as a Complex Multidimensional Process

Scholars in the descriptive framework have argued that in order to analyse a translation it is not enough to compare original and translation (works by Itamar Even-Zohar, Gideon Toury, Theo Hermans, André Lefevre and many others). House (2015: 126) who provided a model for translation assessment admits that it remains open how much an individual translator's background and specificity of his/her working context can be taken into account. Still, I believe that when translation of fiction or poetry is under consideration, personality and background of the translator becomes especially relevant when very few if any works have been translated from a certain language and a certain literature. In that case, the translators are pioneers and pave the way for later translations.

There exists a number of models of translation description and it appears that all have some advantages and disadvantages (for an overview, see Hermans 2009, pp. 50–71). But all scholars within the descriptive school of thought agree that comparison of the source and target texts is but one component of the analysis. For example, Torop (1995) in his framework of total translation explains that a text (both original and translation) is more than just a text: both exist within a cultural context, time and place; both are parts of larger text corpora. For instance, one has to think about other works of the same author and when they were

published; whether a given text is isolated or a part of a collection; within the target culture one has to take into account different translations of the same text; other translations from the same literature; their reception; position of the work in the source and in the target culture (importance, influence, central or peripheral position) and so on. The more text has been interpreted, discussed and mediated, the more strongly the text is tied to the culture (Torop 2016).

Understandably, the whole complexity of the original cannot be reproduced in the translation, and a translator has to constantly make choices. A source text has implicit connections to other texts by the same author and to the cultural tradition of the time but these connections are not always visible to the translator or even if they are, there may be a problem of their rendition (Torop 1995, pp. 67–68). Within the logic of Torop's model, one set of decisions concerns metatextual translation, i.e., which elements of the original can be conveyed by textual means (translation in the strict sense) and which ones should be placed into footnotes, endnotes, prefaces etc. Metatexts become crucial if the culture of the original is distant and/or unfamiliar to the reader. Thus, metatexts help to reveal and explain implicit qualities of the original.

Very often such decisions are intuitive, as not every translator has interest in translation theory; yet every translator of fiction would agree that at some point decisions and choices are to be made. Not all choices are up to a translator, for instance, what Lambert and Van Gorp ([1985] 2014, pp. 52–53) call preliminary data in their analysis (presentation and packaging, i.e., whether the title of the origin, the language of the origin, the name of translator is mentioned; chapter, paragraph etc division preserved, and so on) may be dictated by the publisher etc.

As far as the text itself is concerned, the question is, at large, not about isolated occurrences or particular instances but about characteristics of the original that are most striking and have to be preserved in any case because without them the work be something else and produce a different effect on the reader. The sum of such characteristics is called dominant. The concept was introduced in 1935 (published later in 1981) by Roman Jakobson may be helpful for analysis: 'The dominant may be defined as the focusing component of a work of art: it rules, determines, and transforms the remaining components. It is the dominant which guarantees the integrity of the structure' (Jakobson 1981 [1935], p. 751).

It may prove difficult to identify the dominant in objective terms: more generally speaking, this is something that holds the original work together. Various things may constitute the dominant: specific choice of style, use of regional or social varieties, use of other language items, mood, intonation, sentence length, type of humour and any combination of these parameters. Dominant may be misunderstood or distorted on purpose due to normative, ideological and other considerations. As Torop (2010) states, preservation of the dominant is highly relevant for translation. If a translator misunderstands or misrepresents the dominant, then the translation would become merely "information about original".

Although defining dominant is subjective and depends on the background knowledge of an analyst, I will try to formulate issues that constitute the dominant in Sholem Aleichem's works in general and about his humour in particular, based on several studies of Jewish humour and Sholem Aleichem's style.

- (1) **Verbosity.** Early scholars such as Wiener ([1941] 1986) and Sadan ([1959] 1986) have pointed out high eloquence of Sholem Aleichem's protagonists. In short stories and in particular in the *Railroad Stories*, protagonists held lengthy monologues where they talk in complex sentences with repetitions, self-repairs, and reiterations. According to Finkin (2009: 95-86), it is a feature of Jewish humour where "a long joke [is] clothed as a literary narrative". In a more general spirit, Zabalbeascoa (2005: 193) subdivides humour into word play vs. narrative.

Although sometimes Sholem Aleichem does introduce world play, mostly it is the logic of his narrative that is his preferred humour device.

Verbosity may be manifested in a more specific form as shown in (2) and (3).

- (2) **Story within a story.** Some novels are constructed as a series of letters (*Marienbad, Menakhem Mendl*) but also monologues provide an opportunity of layering of several stories. For instance, *Railroad Stories* are constructed as a travelling salesman's notes where the salesman reports narratives (mostly monologues) he had heard from accidental co-travellers. Within the story told by a co-traveller there may be another story told by another person to the co-traveller etc. This recurring device in Sholem Aleichem's prose amplifies verbosity: telling a story within a story within a story requires clarifications, additional references to various participants whose story is being retold (numerous insertions like "he says", "the other one says" and so on).
- (3) **Jewish rhetoric that includes constant appellation to the hearer** (Finkin 2009, p. 87 and references within; Safran 2016, Tannen 1981) **and also parody of learned style:** quotations and pseudo-quotations from Torah and Talmud, use of reasoning and refined argumentation in mundane situations (see discussion in Finkin 2009). The element of parody of learned style may be more or less prominent and vary from story to story. Appellation to the hearer means insertion of phrases like "you can imagine this" or "what would you think about this" as well as elements of so-called *lehavdil* language (from Hebrew *lehavdil* 'to separate') that emphasizes the distinction between Jewish and non-Jewish matters, between good and bad things, i.e., *nit do gezogt*, literally 'this should not be mentioned here' and the like.
- (4) **Other languages:** sometimes Hebrew or Aramaic (or gibberish that is supposed to look like Hebrew or Aramaic), German, Germanized Yiddish, German as spoken by Yiddish-speakers. The list of other languages also includes languages of the environment: Ukrainian (the language of the co-territorial majority), Russian (language of the Empire, administration but also of some Russified Jews). This list is not limited to standard varieties but also may include jocular adaptations of Russian items into Yiddish, Russian as spoken by Jews, items that are between Russian and Ukrainian etc. In other terms, Sholem Aleichem demonstrates multilingualism of his protagonists and their environment.

The following sections will provide analysis of the translation. I will discuss each translator's background and activities, choice of texts, metatexts, dominant (as outlined in section 4), rendition of culture-specific items and idioms.

5. Analysis

5.1. Preamble

The corpus of Sholem Aleichem's texts in both languages differs. First translations appeared in the Lithuanian-language Jewish periodical *Apžvalga* (1935–1940) and also in a separate collection (see Zingeris 1987: 427 on pre-war translations and translators). The Lithuanian translations that will be analyzed below appeared in the collection *Trys našlės* (Three widows) and include the eponymous story *Trys našlės* (Dray almones; Three widows),

Menachem-Mendelis (fragments from *Menakhem Mendl*) and *Komivojažieriaus užrašai* (literally, Notes of a Travelling Salesman, which is a subtitle of *Ayznban-geshikhtes*, Railroad stories). The Estonian translation appeared in the series *Loomingu Raamatukogu*, a weekly established in 1957 that published mostly translations (Monticelli and Lange 2014: on its importance for Estonian culture). It contains a longer story *Mayn ershter roman* (My first romance), a couple of short stories not belonging to series and four stories from *Ayznban-geshikhtes*. Thus, four texts appeared in both Estonian and Lithuanian translation in 1959: *Der nes fun Hoyshane rabe* (The Miracle of Hoshanah Rabbah), *A khasene on klezmer* (Wedding without musicians), *Gymnazye* (The Gymnasium), *A zeks un zekhtsik* (A game of Sixty Six), of which I chose the first and the second one.

The Miracle of Hoshanah Rabbah tells about an encounter that takes place during Hoshanah Rabbah (the day when one's destiny for the coming year is decided and sealed in heaven) between a local Jew, Berl the Vinegar Maker, and an orthodox priest. Berl loves all kind of machines and admires the locomotive that is waiting at the station without the wagons. The priest comes up and asks what he is doing. When Berl replies, the priest challenges him and tells him to show how the locomotive works. They both get onto the locomotive and the priest accidentally presses a wrong button, putting the locomotive into motion. While Berl is trying to stop the machine, the priest panics and scolds Berl and does not allow him to do anything. The locomotive is moving at a horrible speed and all stations on the line are alerted. Berl and the priest go into philosophical discussions, the priest blames Berl but Berl tells him that everyone's destiny has just been decided and sealed and if they are supposed to perish, they perish and if not, then not. Meanwhile all coal is used up and the locomotive stops. This is a miraculous salvation and the local Jews have a really great holiday.

The plot of *A Wedding without Musicians* is centred around Jews in fear of a pogrom. Pogroms have happened in the vicinity but not in that particular shtetl. Some pogrom activists from elsewhere threaten to come to that shtetl. Everyone is scared, the local authorities summon up Cossacks to provide protection but it is a question, who arrives earlier, the Cossacks or the troublemakers. Finally, the locomotive arrives to the station without wagons: as it is a slow train that has long stops during which the wagons are unhooked, the troublemakers decide they will have a drink, as well as the conductors and other assistants. The locomotive driver follows the timetable and does not care about the rest of the train, so he arrives alone. When the mob finally arrives, the Cossacks are already waiting for them.

All translations from Yiddish, Estonian and Lithuanian are mine.

5.2. Background Information and Text Choice

Let us turn to the translators' background. The Estonian translator Aron Tamarkin (1915–1969) was a graduate of the Yiddish section in Tallinn Jewish Gymnasium. He was multilingual from his early years, which was typical for Estonian Jews of that generation. Modern research on multilingualism emphasises that the notion of mother tongue and native speaker is sometimes blurred in multilinguals with complex linguistic biographies and the degree of proficiency and order of acquisition are not always decisive criteria for determining one's mother tongue. The topic has been recently dealt with in translation studies as well (Pokorn 2005). It is safe to say that both Yiddish and Estonian were Tamarkin's active languages and he was not translating from a foreign language into the mother tongue but rather operating with two very familiar languages (or two mother tongues, if you wish). This is an important point because choices and decisions cannot be explained by insufficient knowledge of the source language and culture in this case.

Tamarkin was not a professional translator. He had music education and during the Soviet era worked as the director of The Estonian Theatre and Music Museum. To the best of my knowledge, *Kuuskiümmend kuus* was his only work as a translator. The editor of the series was Otto Samma who did not know Yiddish, so most probably the translation was edited without comparison to the original.

It is impossible to establish now how the choice of the texts for translation was made and why the decision was made to break the wholeness of *Railroad Stories*. The chosen parts do work on their own but a reader gets a somewhat different impression of Sholem Aleichem's writings if he or she reads these translations only.

The biography of Dominikas Urbas (1908–1996) is rather different. He had a background in philology and is sometimes called a classic of Lithuanian translation, having an impressive list of translated work from French, Russian, German, Polish, Latvian and Yiddish (including such authors as Dostoyevsky, Rabelais, Zola). Urbas worked as an editor for the publishing house Vaga. His first translations of Sholem Aleichem's *Tevey der milkhiker* (Lithuanian *Tevejė Pienininkas*; Tevey the Milkman) and *Motl Peysi dem khazns* (Lithuanian *Motelis*; Motl) appeared in 1959 and then were republished together with other translations in the mentioned volume of 1987. It is impossible now to estimate Urbas' proficiency in Yiddish but he probably acquired it through his Jewish neighbours in the pre-war time (Zingeris 1987, pp. 427–428).

In contrast to the Estonian translation that appeared in the series, *Trys našlės* appeared as a separate book and included all of *Railroad Stories*. The editor of both the 1959 and the 1987 edition was Chackelis Lemchenas (1904–2001), a polyglot, whose first language was Yiddish, a professional lexicographer, who tried his hand as a translator from Yiddish into Lithuanian before World War II. One cannot know exactly what the division of labour between the translator and the editor was and how many suggestions the latter made.

5.3. Overall Packaging and Metatexts

The importance of metatexts was discussed above. The striking difference between the two translations is that the Lithuanian one entirely lacks metatexts. The second edition contains a long afterword presenting a general context of Yiddish literature, Sholem Aleichem's biography and works and earlier translations into Lithuanian, explanation of Jewish cultural terms and customs and some historical events of the time as well as the translator's background (Zingeris 1987). In the Estonian translation the title of the original is lacking and it is not known what edition the translator used. Yet the language of the original is mentioned (translated from Yiddish). The Lithuanian translation has the title of the original.

In the Estonian version, the metatexts are rather short, apparently, in accordance with the format of the series. The introduction is less than one page and, interestingly, does not place Sholem Aleichem within a Marxist/Soviet ideological framework (see discussion in Vershik 2012, p. 188), which would be rather usual for Soviet publications. Sholem Aleichem is portrayed as depicter or all strata of contemporary Jewish society without any references to the ideology. Some of his works are mentioned in the preface but not *Railroad Stories*. The preface is unattributed.

Other metatexts are footnotes explaining Jewish cultural realities (henceforth references to the original will be presented as ShA: no of page, and to the translations as E (Estonian): no of page and L (Lithuanian): no of page), for instance: "During *hoyshtayne rabe* it is supposedly decided the destiny of every person for the next year. According to believes, each person is issued a certain "certificate" from heaven about his/her destiny. Translator" (E: 9, footnote 1). *The Miracle of Hoshanah Rabah* (E: 9–14) has 3 footnotes, all explaining the high holydays. The story *Wedding without Musicians* (E: 15–18) has 2 footnotes, one explains

that the constitution of 1905 was followed by numerous pogroms (E: 15) and the other provides translation of a Russian phrase (E: 16). Both stories have little cultural realities and thus metatexts are kept to minimum.

5.4. Verbosity, Rhetoric, Appellations to the Reader

In general, verbosity is preserved in both translations but since in the Estonian translation the stories are extracted from cycle, the device of story within a story does not work at all levels: the reader sees only one layer where a co-traveller tells a story to the author. In fact, this is not the author or his alter ego who talks in the first person but the travelling salesman; thus, there is more distance between the author and the narrative than the translation displays. This information is simply not available to the reader.

Appellations to the hearer/reader, rhetorical questions and other elements of Jewish rhetoric are mostly preserved in Estonian, for instance:

(1)

Original

Ir fort dokh shoyn mit undzer "leydikgeyer", borukh-ha-shem, di andere vokh. Veyst ir dokh min hastam di teve zayne? (ShA: 114).

'You've been already riding with our "idle-goer" [slow local train], blessed be the name [of God], for the second week. Sure you know its habit?'

Estonian

Te sõidate meje "logelejaga", jumal tänatud, juba teist nädalat. Küllap olete juba tema harjumusi tundma õppinud? (E: 9)

'You've been riding with our "idle-goer", God should be praised, already for the second week. Sure you have already learned its habits?'

Lithuanian

Važinėjate mūsų "Dykūnu", ačiū dievui, jau antra savaitė. Tai, tur būt, jau pažinote jo prigimtį? (L: 203).

'you are riding our "idle-goer", thanks god, already for the second week. So, maybe, you already know its nature?'

Lehavdil language may be difficult to deal with because there are no fixed expressions in Estonian corresponding to Yiddish *lehavdil* and the like. The Estonian translator wishes to preserve it at the price of somewhat clumsy wording. In Lithuanian there exist quite laconic one-word item like *nelyginant*, literally 'not comparing' that conveys the meaning:

(2)

Original

Hobn zey beyde genumen, er un der galekh, lehavdil, makhn mit di hent [...] (ShA: 124)

'[So] they both started, he and the priest, to separate, gesticulating with their hands'

Estonian

Nad hakaksid siis mõlemad, tema ja papp – andku jumal andeks kõrvutamise eest, - neile kätega märku andma [...] (E: 13)

'So they both, he and the [Orthodox] priest, god should pardon the comparison, started making sings with their hands'

Lithuanian

Tada abu, jis ir, nelyginant, popas, emė mojoti rankomis [...] (L: 212)

'Then both, he and, not comparing, the priest, started waving with their hands'

In general, the rhythm and the intonation of the narrative is preserved in both translations. Although the decision in the example (2) by the Estonian translator may appear somewhat clumsy, it nevertheless fits into the overall speech manner of the protagonist. Numerous references by the narrator to other people's speech within his own story may seem to interrupt the narrative line but are an important component in the extreme verbosity and are, therefore, retained.

However, at times the Lithuanian translation does omit or abridge parts of the original that either belong to learned style or are appellations to the hearer/reader. In Yiddish, the Hebrew origin idiom *im kakh* 'if so' brings to mind scholarly argumentation, whereas *oyb azoj* 'if so' does not have any Hebrew-origin items and sounds stylistically neutral. Estonian and Lithuanian do not have high style in the same sense as Yiddish has. The Estonian translator chooses to compensate it in a different way by rhetorically appealing to the reader and thus catching attention; as appellation to the reader is a feature of Sholem Aleichem's style, this particular solution would not appear out of place. The Estonian phrase is longer. The Lithuanian translation is just a stylistically neutral equivalent.

(3)

Original

Im kakh, iz vos? (ShA: 115)

'If so, so what?'

Estonian

Noh, ja siis, küsite, mis sellest? (E: 9)

'So, and then, you will ask, what of it?'

Lithuanian

Na ir kas? (L: 204)

'So what?'

In (4) the reported speech by Berl who explains the working mechanism of the locomotive is a fine example of verbosity. The repetitions and numerous *Berl zagt* 'Berl says', *zagt er* and *er zagt* 'he says' (six times altogether) set the rhythm and the intonation and lengthen the utterance.

The Estonian translation retains all stages of the explanation and omits only one *er zagt* 'he says'. There is also a reiteration *funem heytsn, vos me heyts* 'from heating, which/that one heats' that is maintained in Estonian by the repetition of the stem *küt-* 'to heat' in the noun and the verb: *kütmisest... kui köetakse* 'from heating... when one heats'.

The Lithuanian translator shortens the phrase by omitting the repetition of *der yiker* 'the main thing', the recurring derivations of the stem meaning 'heat' and four 'he says'.

(4)

Original

Der yiker – azoy zagt Berl aley n un makht beys-mayse mit di hent – der yiker iz der koyekh, vos nemt zikh funem heytsn, zagt er. Funem heytsn, vos me heyts, varem zikh on der kesl, zagt er, un dos vaser heybt on tsu kokhn, shtupt dos, zagt er, dem val un es dreyen zikh di reder, zagt er, af vos far a zayt ir vilt: vilt ir, zagt er, s'zol geyn rekhts –

tut a drey dem reguliator rekhts, vilt ir links, dreyt, zagt er, dem reguliator links (ShA: 118)

'The main thing, so says Berl himself and at the same time gesticulates with his hands, the main thing is the force that originates from heating, says he. From heating, when one heats, the boiler gets warm, says he, and the waters starts boiling and it pushes, he says, the shaft and the wheels turn, he says, in any direction you want: you want, he says, they should go right, turn the regulator to the right, you want left, turn, he says, the regulator to the left.'

Estonian

Peaasi – nii ütleb Berl ise ja näitab kätega -, peaasi on jõud, mis tuleb kütmisest, ütleb ta. Kütmisest, ütleb ta, kui köetakse, läheb katel soojaks, vesi hakkab keema ja pressib kolbi, rattad hakkavad keerlema, ütleb ta, kuhu poole te soovite: tahate, et hakkaksid liikuma paremale, keerake regulaatorit paremale, tahate vasakule – keerake, ütleb ta, regulaatorit vasakule. (E:11)

'The main thing, so says Berl himself and shows with his hands, the main thing is the force that comes from heating, says he. From heating, says he, when one heats, the boiler gets warm, the waters starts boiling and it presses the shaft, the wheels start turning, he says, in any direction you want: you wish they should move right, turn the regulator to the right, you want left, turn, he says, the regulator to the left.'

Lithuanian

Svarbiausia, — sako Berelis ir sakydamas mostikuoja rankomis, — tai jega, kuri eina iš kūryklos, sako, dėl to, kad kai kūrenasi, tai kaista katilas, ir vanduo ima virti, o verdantis vanduo stumia veleną, aplink kurį sukasi ratai į kairę tik nori puse: nori, kad eitų į dešinę, pasuki reguliatorių į dešinę, o kad nori į kairę — suki reguliatorių į kairę (L: 207)

'The most important, says Berl and while talking gesticulates with his hand, is the force that goes from the boiler, he says, because when it is heated, the boiler gets warm and the water starts boiling and the boiling water pushes the shaft, around which the wheels turn to any side you want: you want them to go to the right, turn the regulator to the right and if you want to the left, turn the regulator to the left'.

What was the reason behind these omissions, it is impossible to know for sure now. One possible explanation may be suggested: Urbas was a professional translator and, as the members of the profession often do, believed that repetitions of the same stems should be avoided and when possible synonyms should be preferred (Ben-Ari 1998, p. 2, calls avoidance of repetition a "universal" of translation). Ben-Ari (1998) explains this by rigid stylistic norms. In order to establish whether this is just a preference of the translator and the editor or a more general tendency, a study on Lithuanian translation norms would be necessary. This strategy is neither right nor wrong as such but in this instance repetitions are an integral element of the style (see discussion of the dominant) and their omission is not justified.

5.5. Items from Other Languages

A separate problem is the treatment of the elements in the so-called third languages (not the language of the original and that of the translation). It is also a matter where the border between own vs. foreign is in the original and the translation: what is foreign for the source culture is not necessarily foreign in the receiving culture (consider a Russian translator facing the task of rendering Sholem Aleichem's text with Russian-language items). The problem is recognized by other researchers, for instance, Schwartz (2012, p. 208) mentions that working on the Danish translation he decided to translate Russian-language in order to make the text more accessible to the reader. Indeed, a Danish reader would be entirely unfamiliar with Russian or Ukrainian. At the same time, Koller (2012: 136) notes that "deleting Yiddish multilingualism" both deletes linguistic differentiation and cultural references.

The stories under consideration take place in Ukraine. The toponyms mentioned in the stories refer to more and less known towns and cities; the Yiddish version of the toponyms is very similar to or is a slight modification of the Ukrainian version. For example, *Haysin* is *Гайсин* [Haysyn] in Ukrainian (nowadays a city in Vinnyts'ka oblast' in Ukraine); *Sobolivke* would be *Соболівка* [Sobolivka] with Yiddishizing *-e* in the end etc. The task is to identify the origin of the toponyms (Ukrainian) and to decide about the rendition, unless there exist a conventional Estonian version for toponyms like *Kiiev* for Ukrainian *Kyiv*/Russian *Kiev*.

The Estonian translator transliterates in most cases from Yiddish according to the rules of Estonian spelling, hence *Haissin*, *Sobolivke* (E: 9), *Obodivke* (E: 10). Quite logically, the Yiddish version of the two last toponyms is close to the Ukrainian one (*Соболівка*, *Ободівка*), since the Russian language is a later newcomer that became spread in the imperial times (19th century).

The Lithuanian translator rather tends to Russify the toponyms (Ukrainian and Yiddish *i* becomes *o*): *Sobolevka* (L: 203), *Obodjevka* (L: 204). At times, Yiddish renditions are inconsistent: *h* vs *g* in *Haysin* and *Golovonivsk* respectively (in Ukrainian, both are pronounced with *h*, in Russian with *g*). Sholem Aleichem has a hybrid form here, a fusion of Russian *Голованевск* [Golovanevsk] and Ukrainian *Голованівськ* [Holovanivs'k], this is preserved in both translations (E: 19, L: 204).

Other foreign elements in the stories are either from Russian or corrupt Russian. It is not about established conventionalized lexical borrowings from Russian into Yiddish but mostly about switches to Russian that either are quotations or instances ironic use. For instance, in *A Wedding without Musicians*, the pogrom organizers send a telegram consisting of the only Russian word *Yedem!* 'coming!' to likely minded people in another shtetl. The Russian word is preserved in the Estonian translation and explained in the footnote (E: 16). The Lithuanian translator chooses to translate this into Lithuanian: *Atvažiuoame!* 'arriving!' (L: 218).

However, other Russian-language items in both stories are simply translated into Estonian and the irony is lost. In the original *istochnik* 'source' (ShA: 130) is in the quotation marks, which alerts the reader's attention. It is marked and designates a source of information, a person who knows everything about everything. In the Estonia text it becomes a neutral Estonian *allikas* 'source' but still within the quotation marks; the same happens in Lithuanian with *šaltinis* 'source':

(5)

Original

Deruf hobn mir, loz zikh aykh dakhtn, a "istochnik" [...] (ShA: 130)

'For this we have, you can imagine, a "source"'

Estonian

Selle jaoks on meil, võite endale ette kujutada, üks "allikas" [...] (E: 15)
 'for this we have, you can imagine, a "source"'

Lithuanian

Turėjome tokį "šaltinį" [...] (L: 215)
 'We had a certain "source"'

The same happens to incorrect Russian forms or when a Russian stem is integrated into Yiddish grammar: *vstrechayen dem pojezd* 'to meet the train', from Russian *встречать поезд* [*vstrechat' poyezd*] (ShA: 134) becomes neutral *rongi vastu võtma* 'to meet/receive the train' (E: 17). Russian *начальник станции* [*nachal'nik stantsiyi*] 'station manager' becomes *nachalnik stantsye* (ShA: 121) in Yiddish and apparently Yiddish readers would notice the incorrect rendition but the irony is lost in the Estonian translation, as it is rendered with a common Estonian noun *jaamaülem* 'station manager' (E: 12).

Probably, every such case has to be decided separately and there can be no uniform strategy. But some Russianisms could have been retained (with a footnote translation) because an average Estonian/Lithuanian reader in 1959 would have at least some command of Russian or in any case would have been exposed to the language. Besides, Jews, Estonians and Lithuanians had a common past in the Russian Empire and the cultural context would be understandable.

However, recall that Lithuanian translation has no metatexts; partly the decision to translate may be dictated by the decision not to have any explanations or comments. Remarkably, these choices are preserved in the 1987 edition, although explanations of cultural terms and historical background are provided.

5.6. Idioms and Fixed Expressions

Rendition of idioms and fixed expressions is a well-known problem for practitioners and theoreticians. A lot depends on every particular case and a uniform strategy would be impossible. Sometimes word for word rendition does not obscure understanding and have an effect of novelty and expressivity (see Vershik 2012) but at times this is not helpful. For instance, a literal translation of *vi bam tatn in vayngortn* 'very comfortably, carelessly' (literally, 'as if in his father's vineyard', ShA: 113) into Estonian and Lithuanian is not transparent and the reader would miss the point: *nagu oma isa viinamäel* 'as in his father's vineyard' (E: 9) and *kaip tėvo vynuoginė* (L: 203) 'id.' would feel out of place because the sentence tells about the narrator's co-traveller who feels quite comfortable in the empty wagon.

At the same time, it is evident that the translators are aware of possible problems and in some instances finds solutions that are both understandable and retain the stylistic connotation of the original. In Yiddish *hoyshekh vaafelye* means literally 'darkness and darkness' and has also a figurative meaning of extreme gloomy situation. The Estonian translator has the idiom *sünnigemast sünge* 'most gloomy', literally, something like 'gloomy among gloomier' but the Lithuanian one has a completely different decision: he introduces *sqmyšis* 'chaos' and adds *Babelio bokštas* 'the tower of Babel'.

(6)

Original

[...] *un di shrekleke yediye hot zikh farshpreyt, loz zikh aykh dakhtn, in ale shtet un shtetlekh arum un arum, un s'iz gevorn, vos zol ikh aykh zogn, hoyshekh vaafelye!* (ShA: 119)

'and the horrible news spread, just imagine, in all towns and little towns in the whole vicinity and it became, what shall I tell you, darkness and darkness!'

Estonian

[...] *ja kohutav uudis levis ümberringi kõikidesse linnadesse ja linnakestesse, ning olukord muutus, mis seal enam rääkidagi, süngemast süngeks!* (E: 11)

'and the horrible news spread in all towns and little towns around and it became, what shall I tell you, gloomy among gloomier!'

Lithuanian

[...] *i baisi žinia pasiekė visus miestus ir miestelius, esančius prie to geležinkelio, ir kad kilo sqmyšis, žinotumėte, tikras Babelio bokštas!* (L:208)

'and the horrible news reached all towns and little towns that are near the railway and what a chaos started, you know, a real tower of Babel!'

The Estonian translator uses the construction which has the same underlying metaphor (physical darkness as a synonym for the dark mood) and contains the reduplication of the same stem *sünge* 'gloomy'. The Lithuanian translator's choice introduces a powerful biblical image that attracts attention and communicates the seriousness of the narrated events, which is in accordance with the overall tone of the narrative. Yet this is at risk of altering the initial idea: the author means not so much chaos but extremely pessimistic moods in the view of a possible pogrom.

5.7. Cultural Terms

Jewish cultural terms occur only in *The Miracle of Hoshanah Rabbah* and not in *A Wedding without Musicians*. The action takes place during this holiday and other holidays of the week are mentioned. The meaning of the holidays is explained in the story. The Lithuanian translation has no metatexts and the name of the holiday is preserved without comments, while the Estonian has a footnote.

In some languages there are different terms for the holidays, customs and cultural that are shared in the Jewish and Christian culture, like English Passover for the Jewish holiday and Easter for the Christian one. But this does not apply to all languages. In pre-WWII Lithuania some Jewish authors writing in Lithuanian and translators into Lithuanian felt a need to coin special terms that at time sounded strange, for instance, *žydų Velykos* means literally 'Jewish Easter', see Siaučiušaitė-Verbickienė 2017: 194-195), while some used the same *Velykos* for both 'Easter' and 'Passover'). According to Siaučiušaitė-Verbickienė (2017: 195-196), descriptive translation was often an option because the authors wanted to use terms familiar to the general Lithuanian public and not to distance (hence, the opposite to the idea of *lehavdil*). A translator into English has a much wider choice, for example Modern Hebrew rendition *Sukkot*, Yiddish *Sukes* or the descriptive *the holiday of Tabernacles*.

Here Estonian and Lithuanian text show somewhat different treatment. Theoretically, Estonian has stylistically neutral *lehtonnide püha* 'tabernacles holiday (literally, 'holiday of leaf-huts') but the translator creates blends like *sukespühad* 'tabernacle holidays' (literally, 'sukes-holidays') combined with a footnote (E: 11). The Lithuanian text has a neutral *palapinių šventė* 'tabernacles holiday'.

In another instance, Simkhat Torah (Yiddish *simkhas-toyre*) is retained in Estonian (interestingly, in the local dialect pronunciation) and substituted in Lithuanian for plain *šventės* 'holidays'.

(7)

Original

[...] *un mir hobn dokh gehat, loz zikh aykh dakht, a simkhas-toyre! Shoyn geven, vi zogt ir, eyn mol a simkhas-toyre!* (ShA: 126)

'and we had indeed, let you imagine, a Simkhat Torah! It was, as you say, once and for all a Simkhat Torah!'

Estonian

[...] *ja küll meil oli, võite endale ette kujutada, alles uhke šimhas-toire! Vaat see oli alles, nagu öeldakse, šimhas-toire...* (E: 14)

'and we really had, you can imagine yourself, indeed fabulous Simkhat Torah! This was really, as they say, Simkhat Torah!'

Lithuanian

Jūs įsivaizduojate, kokios mums buvo švėntės tais metais – ho, ho! (L: 213)

'You imagine what holidays we had that year – ho, ho!'

At a first glance this may be classified as a deletion that leads to denationalization / dehistoricization / universalization (Delabastita 1993, pp. 33–39, Torop and Osimo 2010, p. 385). However, it is possible to claim that the emphasis is not so much on whether it is a particular holiday but on the fact that after the extraordinary events and happy ending the holidays felt like real holidays. The connotation to the end of the serious days in the Jewish calendar and the joyous beginning of a new yearly cycle, coupled with the happy end of the story, is lost, though.

5.8. Other Choices: Transliteration and Personal Names

It seems that there is no consequent strategy for the rendition of Hebrew-origin names of Yiddish/Jewish cultural terms. Up to this day in the Estonian translation culture not much conventionalization has occurred. Back in 1959, the choice would be between Yiddish or Ashkenazic Hebrew (Modern Hebrew was back then familiar to few); today Yiddish/Jewish cultural terms become familiar to the general public both in Estonia and Lithuania via English and mostly US culture where renditions and spellings are inconsistent.

Tamarkin chose Yiddish renditions; apparently, this seemed most natural, as the language of the original is Yiddish. He has *sukes* 'tabernacles holiday' (E: 11) and *hoišane-rabe* 'Hoshanah Rabbah' transcribed into Estonian (one sound = one letter, both Yiddish and Estonian orthography have phonetic spelling in most of cases).

The Lithuanian translation did not retain cultural terms (names of holidays, artefacts) that would require transliteration, except for Hoshanah Rabbah. Urbas used something leaning towards Ashkenazic Hebrew: *hošano rabo* (L: 203), cf. correct Ashkenazic Hebrew *hoyshano rabo* (with the diphthong *oy*).

Not many personal names appear in the two stories but the problems they present to a translator are exemplary. For instance, Yiddish *Noykeh* (Noah) from *A Wedding without Musicians* appears in Estonian as *Noa*, the Estonian version of the name Noah in the Bible (E: 15); the same happens to Lithuanian *Nojus* (L: 215). This connotation may be misleading because the story mentions a shtetl Jew and not the character from the Bible, as the rendition may suggest.

Noyekh has a Slavic (can be treated both as Russian and Ukrainian) nickname Tonkonog, literally, 'thin leg', as well as another protagonist, Nakhmen Kosoy, literally, 'squint'. Slavic origin given names and family names were not exceptional among Jews; as Sholom Aleichem

points out, the nickname Tonkonog is transparent to the speakers of Yiddish: *Noyekh Tonkonog iz a yid, vos iz gevaksn mer in der leng vi in der breyt. Got hot im gegebn a por fis, banutst er zih mit zey* 'Noyekh the Thin Leg is a Jew who has grown more in the length than in the width. God gave him a pair of legs, so he uses them' (ShA: 131).

Both translators translate the nicknames: Noyekh Tonkonog and Nakhmen Kosoy appear in Estonian as *Noa Peenjalg* (E: 15) and *Nahmen Kõõrdsilm* (E: 16); in Lithuanian as *Nojus Laibakojis* (L: 215; there exists also a Lithuanian family name Laibakojis) and *Nachmanas Žvairys* (L: 216).

One may argue whether translation of the meaningful family names means transparency with a risk of losing the Yiddish colouring but in this particular case these are probably nicknames known to the community, rather than officially used family names. Note that Yiddish has no capital letters and this leaves room for ambiguity.

The Estonian translation employs the strategy consequently: the main protagonist of *The Miracle of Hoshanah Rabbah* is *Berl esikmakher* 'Berl the Vinegar Maker', who becomes *Berl Äädikategija* (*äädikategija* means 'vinegar maker' in Estonian; E: 10). The meaning of the nickname is important because Berl likes all kind of machines and explains that there is no much difference between the machinery for vinegar production and the mechanism of the locomotive.

In the Lithuanian translation *esikmakher* is interpreted as a family name and appears in Germanized spelling: *Esigmacheris* (L: 206). To those Lithuanian readers who have no knowledge of German or Yiddish the meaning is not evident; the connection between the machine for vinegar production and all other machines is not transparent.

6. Conclusions

The comparison of two translations was instructive because both translations appeared in similar sociocultural circumstances in a fairly similar translation culture where translation from original is preferred, translations undergo editing by someone who has a command of the language of the original, and when necessary metatexts are provided.

The translators' background and linguistic repertoire was different and apparently the work of the editors differed as well: the Lithuanian editor knew Yiddish while the Estonian one did not. The major differences are not, however, between the strategies and particular decisions but in overall packaging: the wholeness of the story cycle is maintained in Lithuanian but distorted in the Estonian translation; the Lithuanian translation is not accompanied by metatexts.

The Estonian translation is more consequent in several respects: cultural terms are preserved, "telling" nicknames are translated throughout. Most importantly, repetitions are systematically retained, helping thus to render the author's intonation.

In this respect, the Lithuanian is less consequent: some cultural terms are substituted or omitted, as well as some repetitions. Hardly the goal was denationalization of the translation: the story line, the setting, indications to Jews has been preserved. One cannot claim this for sure as the time has passed but probably once it had been decided to get by without explanations or commentaries, the number of Jewish cultural references was kept to minimum.

The surrounding multilingualism (toponyms, speech of non-Jews) as well as Jewish multilingualism (including Ukrainian or Russian) is practically lost in both translations. The decision to translate Russian-language items into Danish in the text and without highlighting of any kind was mentioned earlier. However, the difference in the degree of familiarity with Russian and overall cultural context among the readers in Denmark on the one hand and in

Estonia and Lithuania on the other is quite obvious, and it would have been possible to mark at least in several places the presence of other languages without extensive explanations.

Both Estonian and Lithuanian translations have succeeded in conveying the dominant, albeit not in all its aspects. From the point of view of translation history, both translations contribute to the making of tradition of translations from Yiddish.

References

Primary Sources

Sholem Aleikhem. 1923. Der nes fun hoyshane-rabe. *Ale verk*. New York: Sholem Aleikhem's folks-fond oysgabe, pp. 111–126.

Sholem Aleikhem. 1923. A khasene on klezmer. *Ale verk*. New York: Sholem Aleikhem's folks-fond oysgabe, pp. 127–138.

Translations

Šolem Aleichem. 1959. *Kuuskiimmend kuus*. Loomingu Raamatukogu, No 7 (67).

Šolem Aleichem. 1959. *Trys našlės*. Vilnius: Valstybinė grožinės literatūros leidykla.

Secondary Sources

Atamukas, Salomonas. 1998. *Lietuvos žydų kelias. Nuo XIV amžiaus iki XX amžiaus pabaigos*. Vilnius: Alma littera.

Ben-Ari, Nitsa. 1998 "The Ambivalent Case of Avoiding Repetitions in Literary Translation. Avoiding Repetitions: A 'Universal' of Translations?" *Meta*, 43(1), pp. 1–11.

Delabastita, Dirk. 1993. *There's a Double Tongue: An Investigation of Shakespeare's Wordplay, with Special Reference to 'Hamlet'*. Amsterdam and Atlanta, Georgia: Rodopi.

Eidintas, Alfonsas. 2002. *Žydai, lietuviai ir holokaustas* [Jews, Lithuanians and the Holocaust]. Vilnius: Vaga.

Estraikh, Gennady. 2012. "Soviet Sholem Aleichem". In: Gennady Estraikh, Jordan Finkin, Jordan, Kerstin Hoge and Mikhail Krutikov (eds.), *Translating Sholem Aleichem: History, Politics, and Art*. (Studies in Yiddish, 10.) London: Legenda, pp. 62–82.

———, Finkin, Jordan, Hoge, Kestin and Krutikov, Mikhail (eds.) 2012. *Translating Sholem Aleichem: History, Politics, and Art*. (Studies in Yiddish, 10.) London: Legenda.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. [1976] 2000. "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem". In: Lawrence Venuti (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*. (2nd Edition) New York: Routledge, pp. 199–204.

———. 1990. *Polysystem Studies*. [= *Poetics Today* 11(1)]. Durham: Duke University Press. A special issue of *Poetics Today*.

———. 1997. "The Making of Culture Repertoire and the Role of Transfer". *Target*, 9(2), pp. 373–381.

———. 1998. "The Position of Translated Literature Within the Literary Polysystem". In: Gideon Toury (ed.), *Translation Across Cultures*. New Delhi: Bahri Publications, pp. 109–117.

Finkin, Jordan. 2009. "Jewish Jokes, Yiddish Storytelling, and Sholem Aleichem: A Discursive Approach". *Jewish Social Studies: History, Culture, Society*, 16(1), pp. 85–110.

- Gruschka, Roland. 2012. "Du host zikh a demol af eybik geshtelt': The Sovietization and Heroization of Sholem Aleichem in the 1939 Jubilee Poems". In: Gennady Estraiikh, Jordan Finkin, Kerstin Hoge and Mikhail Krutikov (eds.), *Translating Sholem Aleichem: History, Politics, and Art*. (Studies in Yiddish, 10.) London: Legenda, pp. 83–97.
- House, Juliane. 2015. *Translation Quality Assessment*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hermans, Theo. 2009. *Translation in Systems*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Jakobson, Roman. [1959] 1971. "On Linguistics Aspects of Translation". In: Roman Jakobson, *Selected Writings*. Vol. 2: *Word and Language*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton, pp. 260–266.
- . 1981. "The Dominant". In: Roman Jakobson, *Selected Writings*. Vol. 3: *Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry*. Edited by S. Rudy. The Hague, Paris, New York: Mouton Publishers, pp. 751–756.
- Kasekamp, Andres. 2010. *A History of the Baltic States*. London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kvietkauskas, Mindaugas. 2007. *Vilniaus literatūry kontrapunktai. Ankstyvasis modernimas 1904–1915* [Contrapoints of Vilnius literatures. Early modernism 1904–1915]. Vilnius: Lietuvos rašytojų sąjungos leidykla.
- Koller, Sabine. 2012. "On (Un)translatability: Sholem Aleichem's Ayznban-geshiktes (Railroad Stories) in German translation". In: Gennady Estraiikh, Jordan Finkin, Kerstin Hoge and Mikhail Krutikov (eds.), *Translating Sholem Aleichem: History, Politics, and Art*. (Studies in Yiddish, 10.) London: Legenda, pp. 134–158.
- Lambert, José and Van Gorp, Hendrik. [1985] 2014. "On Describing Translation". In: Theo Hermans (ed.), *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 42–53.
- Lange, Anne and Baljasny, Boris. 2010. "Testing the Relevance of Translation". *Interlitteraria*, 15, pp. 285–299.
- Levý, Jiří. 1967. "Translation as a Decision Process". In: *To Honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday, 11 October 1966*. 3 vols., all of them in 1967. (Janua linguarum. Series maior, 31–33.)¹ The Hague & Paris: Mouton, Vol. 2, pp. 1171–1182. [The 3 vols. were reissued as e-books, Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton, 2018.]
- Monticelli, Daniele and Lange, Anne. 2014. "Translation and Totalitarianism: The Case of Soviet Estonia". *The Translator*, 20(1), pp. 95–111.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2014.899096>
- Pažūsis, Lionginas. 2014. *Vertimas ir kalba* [Translation and language]. Vilnius: Vilnius University Press.
- Pokorn, Nike K. 2005. *Challenging the Traditional Axioms: Translation into a Non-Mother Tongue*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Sadan, Dov. [1959] 1986. "Three Foundations". *Prooftexts*, 6, pp. 55–63.
- Safran, Gabriella. 2016. "Jewish Argument Style among Russian Revolutionaries". *Journal of Jewish Languages*, 4, pp. 44–68.
- Šalciūtė-Čivilienė, Gabrielė. 2011. "Strands of Literary English-to-Lithuanian Translation Criticism in Lithuania since 1990". *Lietuvių kalba*, 5,
<http://www.lietuviukalba.lt/index.php/lietuviu-kalba/article/view/41>
(accessed on 27 August 2017).
- Siaučiuonaitė-Verbickienė, Jurgita. 2017. "Translations and Self-Representations: Literature as a Tool for a Mutual Jewish–Lithuanian Acquaintance". *Jewish Culture and History*, 18(2), pp. 190–208.
- Schwartz, Jan. 2012. "Speaking Tevye der milkhiker in Translation: Performance, Humour, and World Literature". In: Gennady Estraiikh, Jordan Finkin, Kerstin Hoge and Mikhail

¹ Janua Linguarum Studia Memoriae Nicolai va Wijk Dedicata Series Maior XXXI–XXXIII.

- Krutikov (eds.), *Translating Sholem Aleichem: History, Politics, and Art*. (Studies in Yiddish, 10.) London: Legenda, 199-214.
- Sužiedėlis, Saulius. 2004. "The Historical Sources for Antisemitism in Lithuania and Jewish–Lithuanian Relations during the 1930s". In: Alvydas Nikžentaitis, Stefan Schrainger and Darius Staliūnas (eds.), *The Vanished World of Lithuanian Jews*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 119–154.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1981. "New York Jewish Conversational Style". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 30, pp. 133–149.
- Torop, Peeter. 1995. *Total'ny perevod* [Total translation]. Tartu: Tartu University Press.
- . 2010. "Translation as Communication and Auto-Communication". *Applied Semiotics / Sémiotique Appliquée*, 9(24), pp. 3–10.
- . 2016. "Total Translation in Transmedia World". Paper at the *IV Jornadas Internacionales de Traductología: "En torno a la traducción relacional"*. <http://jornadasdetraductologia.fl.unc.edu.ar/files/Resumen-Torop.pdf> (accessed on 27 August 2017).
- and Osimo, Bruno. 2010. "Historical Identity of Translation: From Describability to Translatability of Time". *Trames*, 14(64/59), 4, pp. 383–393.
- Venclova, Tomas. 1979. "Translations of World Literature and Political Censorship in Contemporary Lithuania". *Lituanus*, 25(2), http://www.lituanus.org/1979/79_2_01.htm (accessed on 27 August 2017).
- Vershik, Anna. 2012. "Sholem Aleichem in Estonian: Creating a Tradition". In: Gennady Estraikh, Jordan Finkin, Kerstin Hoge and Mikhail Krutikov (eds.), *Translating Sholem Aleichem: History, Politics, and Art*. (Studies in Yiddish, 10.) London: Legenda, pp. 182–198.
- Wiener, Meyer. [1941] 1986. "On Sholem Aleichem's Humor". *Prooftexts*, 6(1), pp. 41–54.
- Zabalbeascoa, Patric. 2005. "Humour and Translation: An Interdiscipline". *Humor*, 18(2), pp. 185–207.
- Zingeris, Emanuelis. 1987 "... jokių titulu, tik Šolom Aleichemas" ["No titles, only Sholem Aleichem"]. In: Šolom Aleichemas, *Apysakos* [Stories]. Vilnius: Vaga.

Address correspondence to Anna Vershik, at annave@tlu.ee