

Translating Vasilij Šukšin’s literary dialogue into Swedish Finland Swedish as an extra resource

Olga Mezhevich¹
University of Helsinki

Abstract

This article discusses the use of colloquial markers by Vasilij Šukšin in dialogues in his fictional prose and translation of these markers into Swedish. The analysis represents a case study on translation of literary dialogue between Swedish and Russian and is based on the short story by Vasilij Šukšin *Bessovestnye* and its translation into Swedish by Ben Hellman. Colloquial markers in literary texts present a complicated task for the translator because there is often no equivalent in the target language, and, thus, the translator has to use strategies related to compensating possibilities offered by the target language. The analysis shows that Šukšin uses a wide range of colloquial markers on all language levels, which usually do not have an equivalent in Swedish. However, the translator uses the compensating possibilities of Swedish language by introducing many Swedish colloquial markers into the translation, including dialect markers as well as Finland Swedish colloquial markers as an extra resource. Though the Swedish text is more normative in comparison with the source text, the translator manages to transfer the effect of colloquialness into the Swedish text without the precise rendering of every colloquial marker used by Vasilij Šukšin.

Keywords: literary translation, translation of dialogue, colloquial markers, strategy of compensation

1 Introduction

This article is related to my PhD project on translation of colloquial markers in literary texts between Russian and Swedish. The aim is to account for existing translation strategies for rendering the colloquialness of the source text into translation. Colloquial markers, such as dialecticisms, colloquialisms, repetitions and ellipsis are used by an author to create an illusion of authentic speech in a literary text. Here, I analyze the use of colloquial markers by Vasilij Šukšin in the dialogues of the short story *Bessovestnye* and its Swedish translation “De Samvetlösa” by Ben Hellman, a Finland Swedish translator. The motivation for analyzing this particular translation lies in its uniqueness as it is the only Swedish translation of Šukšin’s work made in Finland. The analysis of

¹ The author is conducting her research under a grant from The Society of Swedish Literature in Finland (SLS).

the Finland Swedish translation provides a possibility to investigate a different approach towards translation of Šukšin's work into Swedish as it relies not only on standard Swedish.

2 Methodological framework

I will conduct the analysis within the framework of Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS). First, I will describe the usage of colloquial markers in the source text and then in the target text. After that, I will find out the shifts that happen in the translation process of the colloquial markers. Finally, I will attempt generalizations, reconstructing the translation process of colloquial markers from Russian into Swedish. Moreover, I will examine the translation by Ben Hellman for signs of the law of growing standardization (Toury 1995) as well as look for similar tendencies as those observed by Englund Dimitrova (2004) in the translation of the dialect and colloquial markers.

First, I will introduce Vasilij Šukšin and the short story *Bessovestnye*, then discuss fictional speech in literary prose, as well as tendencies observed in the translation of dialect and colloquial markers. After that I will categorize the most frequent colloquial markers used by Šukšin in the short story under different language levels. Finally, I will examine Swedish translation for the most frequent and effective colloquial markers, including Finland Swedish and the shift that happens in the translation process. The main objective of the data analysis is to find existing strategies for rendering the colloquialness of the source text into translation.

3 Vasilij Šukšin and the short story *Bessovestnye*

Vasilij Makarovič Šukšin was a famous Russian actor, writer, and movie director. He appeared as an actor in more than twenty movies from 1958 until his death in 1974 and directed five films, which were adaptations of his own prose onto the big screen. One of Šukšin's most popular works was his last movie *Kalina krasnaja* ("Red Kalina Berry", 1973), which is regularly shown on Russian television.

Šukšin's literary works cover 130 short stories, ten novellas for stage and screen, and two novels. Many researchers of Šukšin's literary work paid special attention to his style of writing and language representation as the fictional speech of his characters is often filled with rural colloquialisms, dialectal elements, and vulgarisms. As Šukšin himself put it in one of his working notes: "I know when I'm writing well: when I write and it's as if the pen is extracting living human voices from the paper" (Givens 2000: 38). For him, these "living human voices" were the essence of writing and he was striving to create an illusion of presence as if the reader were a witness of the dialogue between his characters.

The short story *Bessovestnye* ("De samvetslösa" in Swedish) was first published in 1970 under a different title *Svatovstvo* ("Matchmaking") in the journal *Novij Mir*. The short story was republished under the title *Bessovestnye* ("Shameless ones") in 1973 as a part of the short story collection *Haraktery* ("Characters") and in 1975 as a part of the

collection *Brat moj* (“My Brother”). *Bessovestnye* tells about an old man Gluhov living in the countryside. Gluhov is a widower whose three older sons were killed during the Great Patriotic War and whose youngest son lives in the city and seldom visits his father. Feeling lonely, Gluhov decides to marry again. As his future wife, he chooses an old woman called Otavina, who is not originally from the village but has lived there for a long time. Feeling shy to ask Otavina to live together, Gluhov decides to ask an old woman named Malyševa to become a mediator in this delicate situation. Malyševa is quite surprised by Gluhov’s request but agrees to help him. After talking to Otavina, she finds out that Otavina would accept his offer to live together. But when they all three meet together Malyševa shames Gluhov and Otavina as being too old to marry, as egoists and shameless ones. After such an embarrassing encounter, all three never speak to each other again. The short story has a humoristic tone as do many stories by Šukšin.

4 Fictional speech in prose

Written and spoken languages are produced under different conditions and manifest themselves in different forms. Written language is more standardized than spoken, while spoken language is characterized by inexplicitness, general lack of planning and normal non-fluency (Crystal & Davy quoted in Liljestrand 1983: 34). Therefore, fictional speech is never a complete or precise rendering of an authentic speech: a dialogue between two characters in fiction strongly differs from an authentic conversation between two people (see Liljestrand 1983; Londen 1989; Larsson 1992). Moreover, fictional speech is a part of a literary work and, thus, is affected by both artistic and language restrictions. Because of these reasons, a writer can choose only some features which, according to the norms of the written and spoken language, are specific to the spoken language code and alien to the written, i.e. colloquial markers. Thereby, the writer introduces a contrast which creates an illusion of spoken language in prose to the reader (Lindqvist 1995: 83). According to Jenny Brumme and Anna Espunya (2012: 13) fictional orality is

an attempt to recreate the language of communicative immediacy in fictional texts [...] Fictional orality is not opposed to actual orality, but is conceived as a special technique which consists of mainly evocation of certain characteristics of spoken communicative situations such as spontaneity, familiarity, face-to-face interaction or physical proximity.

The author of a fiction text can combine different resources to create fictive orality. According to Susanne M. Cadera these resources exist on two levels – the narrative and the linguistic. *The narrative level* includes narrative techniques as well as graphic presentation of the text. *The linguistic level* implies various linguistic variations on different language levels (Brumme & Espunya 2012: 37–38). The linguistic level of fictive orality comprises use of markers on different language levels such as phonological, morphological, lexical, and syntactic.

As mentioned earlier, Vasilij Šukšin is very precise about rendering his characters' "speech". I will analyze the most frequent colloquial markers that Šukšin uses in the short story *Bessovestnye* on different language levels.

5 Translating colloquial markers

Birgitta Englund Dimitrova has distinguished three tendencies observed in the translation of dialect (1997, 2004):

- Translations generally tend to be more normative than original works, or to conform to codified standards, in terms of language use.
- If the translation has linguistic markers for a specific variety/register, they will tend to be fewer than in the source text. This can be the case both in each text segment and in the total number of text segments with such linguistic markers.
- Even if the source text uses both phonological/orthographical, morpho-/syntactical and lexical markers, the translation will tend mainly to use lexical markers.

However, this model can have a wider application, to account for general tendencies in reproduction of discourse, where the same movement towards the center can be observed (Englund Dimitrova 2004: 135). These tendencies can be compared to the law of growing standardization proposed by Gideon Toury. This law states that "in translation, textual relations obtaining in the original are often modified, sometimes to the point of being totally ignored, in favour of [more] habitual options offered by a target repertoire" (Toury 1995: 268).

Englund Dimitrova (2004: 131) identifies two reasons for the abovementioned tendencies:

- translators' perceptions of their own status and prestige as text producers
- translators' perception and understanding of the dialect features in the target text.

I will look for the above mentioned tendencies in the translation process of the short story *Bessovestnye* into Swedish. To make my point clear to the reader, I will translate examples of the Russian and Swedish colloquial markers into English.

6 Overall characterization of Šukšin's language in *Bessovestnye*

In the following, I will present the most prominent colloquial markers used by Vasilij Šukšin in *Bessovestnye*. The story is quite short and consists of 2845 words. It is narrated in the third person, but even the narrative text contains many colloquialisms. In addition, Vasili Šukšin uses direct speech abundantly in the story and saturates it with many colloquial markers so that we can hear the "living human voices" of the old man Gluhov and the women Malyševa and Otavina.

6.1 Morphological level

Šukšin uses many colloquial particles, adverbs, and interjections. The enclitical particle *-to* which Šukšin uses throughout the story, has an emphatic function, i.e. it is used for highlighting and stressing the word in the sentence, which the particle is attached to. Altogether, Šukšin uses the enclitical particle *-to* 29 times in the short story and it is attached to nouns, verbs, pronouns: *смысл-то* ('meaning'), *толку-то* ('any sense'), *вы жениться-то* ('to marry'), *я-то* ('me'), *четырёх-то* ('four'), *свой-то* ('own'), *думы-то* ('thoughts'), *к концу-то* ('towards the end'). Another colloquial particle *-ка* used for expressing request, prompting: *ну-ка* ('well'), *погоди-ка* ('wait a bit'), *не гони-ка* ('don't rush me'). Particle *мол* ('like') is used when referring to someone else's speech.

Russian language is rich with the possibilities of word formation. There are many suffixes which add the variation of the meaning to the original word. These suffixes can express different attitudes towards the subject: affectionate, derogatory, familiar, scornful, etc. Words formed with the help of these suffixes are used very often in the colloquial speech as they help to transfer emotions and attitudes. Vasilij Šukšin includes many nouns with the diminutive suffixes expressing affection into the speech of his characters: *сальца* (standard: 'сало' ['home-cured bacon']), *смертынька* (standard: 'смерть' ['death']), *порочка* (standard: 'пора' ['pore']), *старушка* (standard: 'старуха' ['old woman']), *избенка* (standard: 'изба' ['log hut, cottage']), *сиротинки* (standard: 'сироты' ['orphans']).

6.2 Lexical level

Lexical level is characterized primarily by the use of dialecticisms and colloquialisms. **Colloquialisms** refer to the usage of informal or everyday language in literature. **Dialecticisms** refer to the usage of the dialect (linguistic variety being spoken within a certain geographical area) in a literary text.

First of all, in dialogues Šukšin uses many dialect markers that are especially typical of Altai region in Russia where Šukšin was born and grew up. Šukšin uses dialect forms that reflect peculiarities of pronunciation as well as word formation of villagers such as: *ишо* (standard: 'ещё' ['more']), *накатывают* (standard: 'накатывает' ['coming over']), *ничо* (standard: 'ничего' ['nothing']), *регулярно* (standard: 'регулярно' ['regularly']), *чижало* (standard: 'тяжело' ['difficult']), *тада* (standard: 'тогда' ['then']), *сходятся* (original: 'сходятся' ['pair up']), *условиев* (standard: 'условий' ['conditions']). Šukšin uses dialectal elements in his story in order to give it a local color and to describe his characters as villagers of the Altai region, which was dear to the writer.

Colloquialisms are used to enrich the text: *помер* (standard: 'умер' ['died']), *схоронить* (standard: 'похоронить' ['to bury']), *ихняя* (standard: 'их' ['their']), *вытимиши* (standard: 'выпивши' ['a bit drunk']), *изозлилась* (standard: 'разозлилась' ['got angry']), *не укоротишь* (standard: 'не запретишь' ['can't forbid']), *помялись* (standard: 'не решались' ['were hesitant']), etc.

6.3 Syntactical level

Syntax also plays an important role for Šukšin when stylizing characters' speech. He uses such an arrangement of words, which is typical for the colloquial speech, which has a special way of phrase construction. With the help of "parcelling" (words parcelled from the main sentence) the writer stresses the important parts of the message:

- (1) – Ну, содержания-то, слава богу, хватало, чего доброго. С избытком. (Šukšin 1985: 435)
– There was plenty of meaning thanks to God, all right. More than enough. (my transl.)

Different types of inversion are also typical of the colloquial speech in Russian. Although the Russian language has a relatively free word order, inversion of clausal constituents helps to highlight the most important part of the message, putting it either at the beginning or at the end of the sentence. In the example (2), there is inversion of the predicate and the subject:

- (2) – Не знает она! Вот и пришел-то просить: поговорила бы ты с ей. (Šukšin 1985: 436)
– Doesn't she know anything! That's why I'm asking you – would you talk to her. (my transl.)

Šukšin uses different types of ellipsis (often the verb, but also other parts) in his characters' speech as well. In the example (3), the verb 'came' is omitted in the first sentence, and in the second sentence the object is missing:

- (3) – Я, Сергеевна, за советом. *Помоги.* (Šukšin 1985: 435)
– I, Sergejevna, (*came*) for advice. *Help.* (my transl.)

Šukšin's punctuation in the story also contributes to the expression of colloquialness of a character's speech. Punctuation marks used by Šukšin, such as suspension points and dashes, reflect the emotional side of people's speech, and its intensity and dynamism:

- (4) – Ну, жениться... это... какая уж это женитьба? Так — сойдемся для облегчения. (Šukšin 1985: 436)
– Well, to marry...well...what kind of marriage is that? Just – live together for making life easier. (my transl.)

It is important to realize that these are only some of several examples of the most prominent colloquial markers in the short story *Bessovestnye* by Šukšin. However, the following analysis of the translation of the short story into Swedish allows a deeper look at the use of the colloquial markers by Šukšin.

7 The translation of the story *Bessovestnye* into Swedish

The short story *Bessovestnye* was translated into Swedish by Ben Hellman and published in Finland in the journal *Horisont* in 1977. *Horisont* is an Ostrobothnian journal that has been issued since October 1954 in Vaasa by the Swedish Ostrobothnia Literature Association. *Horisont* publishes essays, articles, poems, and short stories in Swedish. Ben Hellman's translation in the journal is accompanied by a short

presentation of Vasilij Šukšin, his background and his literary work. A photo of Vasilij Šukšin is presented to the reader as well as a small illustration by Dan Holm for the short story. As the translation by Ben Hellman is the only Swedish translation of Vasilij Šukšin's work in Finland, it is possible to assume that the translation's main purpose is to introduce Šukšin's work primarily to the Swedish speaking readers in Finland.

The Swedish translation of the story consists of 4196 words, which is more than the original text (2485 words). Ben Hellman is consistent in his use of colloquial markers in the translation. However, sometimes the translation into Swedish lacks the colloquial marking and becomes more standardized in comparison with the Russian original. In the example (5) colloquial marker 'ихнюю' ('their') is translated neutrally to Swedish 'deras' as well as colloquial verbs 'советую' ('recommend') and 'стать' ('get up') are translated with standard verbs 'föreslår' and 'reser oss'.

(5) Jag föreslår, Olga Sergejevna, att vi reser oss och ärar deras minne. (Šuksjin 1977: 44)

Я советую, Ольга Сергеевна, стать и почтить ихнюю память. (Šukšin 1985: 434)

At the same time, it is essential to point out that even if there is often no equivalent for some Russian colloquial markers in Swedish, the translator tries to compensate for the effect elsewhere with colloquial markers available in Swedish. The table below illustrates typical colloquial markers that the translator uses consistently in his text:

Table 1: Use of Swedish/Finland Swedish colloquial markers in *De samvetslösa*

Swedish/Finland Swedish colloquial marker	How many times used in the text	Swedish/Finland Swedish colloquial marker	How many times used in the text
mej	19	ren	1
sej	8	sen	9
dej	12	varann	1
sāja, säjer, säj	16	stan	4
nånting	2	nog (Finland Swedish)	8
nånstans	1	väl (Finland Swedish)	8
nåt	1	ju (Finland Swedish)	18
sånt	2	sku (Finland Swedish)	33
nån	9	nu	4

The first group of colloquial markers in Table 1 is represented by words that have a colloquial variant of spelling: *mej* (standard: 'mig' ['me, myself']), *sej* (standard: 'sig' ['himself, herself, itself']), *dej* (standard: 'dig' ['yourself']), *sāja, säjer, säj* (standard: 'säga, säger, säg' ['say, says, say']). Though these words are pronounced the same, the colloquial spelling is a conventionalized signal for the colloquialness in the text.

The second group includes reduced colloquial forms of words, i.e. *nånting* (standard: 'någoting' ['something']), *nånstans* (standard: 'någonstans' ['somewhere']), *nåt* (standard: 'något' ['something']), *sånt* (standard: 'sådant' ['such']), *nån* (standard:

‘någon’ [‘something’]), *ren* (standard: ‘redan’ [‘already’]), *sen* (standard: ‘sedan’ [‘then’]), *varann* (standard: ‘varandra’ [‘each other’]), *stan* (standard: ‘staden’ [‘the city’]).

The third group, which will be discussed further, is formed by adverbs and particles which are mainly typical of Finland Swedish.

As described before, Vasilij Šukšin uses many dialect forms to highlight how villagers would speak. The translator does not follow this pattern because translating the source language dialect into a specific target language dialect would “naturalize” the story, removing it from the source culture and moving it into the target culture (Englund Dimitrova 2004: 131–132). However, the translator uses the Finland Swedish dialect adjective form *ordentliger* as shown in example (6) as well as the changed word order in a noun phrase, which is typical for the Swedish dialects: the possessive pronoun is in postposition towards the noun it belongs to. The translator uses this dialect marker consistently in the text: *pojken min* (‘my son’) in the example (7), *trädgården min* (‘my garden’), *dottern min* (‘my daughter’), *flickan min* (‘my girl’), *stugan sin* (‘her house’), *stugrucket mitt* (‘my house’), *livet sitt* (‘her life’).

- (6) – Det är vad man kan kalla en... *ordentliger* makt. Förr var det så att när folk blev gamla, så ville ingen veta av dem längre. Men nu får man pension. (Sjuksjin 1977: 44)
– Ведь вот какая... *аккуратная* власть! Раньше как: дожил старик до глубокой старости — никому не нужен. А теперь — пенсия. (Šukšin 1985: 433-434)
- (7) *Pojken min* brukar sticka åt mej enfemrubel när han kommer – ibland gör han det, ibland glömmar han. (Sjuksjin 1977: 44)
Мне родной сын пятерку придет сунет, и то ладно, а то и забудет. (Šukšin 1985: 434)

Another key point is that the translator uses many colloquial markers that are typical of Finland Swedish and not of standard Swedish. The most prominent example is the abundant use of the shortened version of the modal auxiliary *skulle – sku* (‘will, would’) in the translation:

- (8) Men vi *sku* åtminstone få livet att gå. Den som dör först *sku* ha nån som ser till att han kommer i jorden. (Sjuksjin 1977: 45)
А мы бы как-нибудь и скоротали бы остаток жизни-то. Кто первый *помер* — есть кому *схоронить*. (Šukšin 1985: 436)

Another Finland Swedish colloquial marker is the use of the word *fast* in the meaning “for example” which is influenced by the use of the Finnish word *vaikka* (Reuter 1993):

- (9) *Stugan sin* kan hon *fast* sälja. Eller så kan hon spika igen den och sen om vi trivs och kommer bra överens, så kan hon sälja den. (Sjuksjin 1977: 45)
А свою избу *пускай* продаст. Или так: *пускай* пока заколотит ее, поживем, уживемся — тогда уж *пускай* продает. (Šukšin 1985: 435)

Furthermore, the translator uses the following modal particles, which are typical for colloquial speech: *ju* (‘of course, as we know’), *nog* (‘probably, sort of’ or ‘definitely’ in Finland Swedish), *väl* (‘probably, I think’), *nu* (‘well’).

- (10) – Med mej är det ingenting. Det är *ju* ni som tänker gifta er, inte jag. Och så frågar du vad som fattas mej. Mej går det ingen nöd på. (Sjuksjin 1977: 45)
 – Я ничего. Вы жениться-то надумали, не я. А ты меня спрашиваешь: чего я? Я-то ничего. (Šukšin 1985: 436)

Modal particles *nog* and *nu* are especially common for Finland Swedish (Lindström 2008: 95–99) and they differ in meaning as compared to standard Swedish. Examples (11) and (12) illustrate the use of the modal particles. Moreover, in both examples the transition-marking particle *nå* ('well') is used which is also typical for Finland Swedish:

- (11) – Ja, just det. *Nog* vet man hurudana de är! Som allra först *sku* jag liksom vilja veta och kunna hoppas på att han inte börjar tränga sig på. Och sen inga svordomar. Och tobaken... *Nå*, det är *väl* så med det... alla röker, så det är *väl* inget att göra åt. (Sjuksjin 1977: 46)
 – А как? Так. Они знаешь какие! *Перво-наперво* я бы желала знать и быть в надежде, *што* он приставать не станет. И *штоб* не *матерщинничал*. Табак курит... Ну, тут уж... все *курют*, тут *не укоротишь*. (Šukšin 1985: 438)
- (12) – *Nå*, låt gå för giftermål då. Och vad är det för fel på det *nu* då? (Sjuksjin 1977: 45)
 – Ну – жениться. А что, это не поощряется? (Šukšin 1985: 436)

The example (13) is an excellent illustration of how Ben Hellman manages the task to translate a text heavily loaded with colloquial markers. He manages not only to transfer the meaning of the phrases said by the old woman Otavina in the story, but also to saturate the text with Swedish colloquial markers. As can be seen, the translator does not try to transfer all the colloquial markers used by Šukšin into Swedish: it would be almost impossible to accomplish, and even trying could make the Swedish text incomprehensible. That is why the translator chooses a strategy of compensation. He translates the text into Swedish so that the meaning is transferred fully, and saturates the text with Swedish and Finland Swedish colloquial markers, which, however, do not formally match the Russian markers.

- (13) – Vänta *nu*, driv inte på *mej* som på en häst. Jag *säger* bara att det är många villkor jag har att komma med. Det går inte och det går inte... Och då börjar gubben fundera och *säger*: »Vad får man göra *då*?» Och dit får hela frieriet. Otavina småskrattade igen. — Vem *sku* ha anat, vem *sku* ha trott... *Herre je, herre je*. Jag *säger då* det. I Bulanicha där jag bodde förr, där hade jag en god väninna och till henne *så* kom det en gubbe, prata *hit och dit* och *sa* till sist: »Ska vi inte leva tillsammans du och jag, Kuzmovna.» Och så blev det. Han är död nu *sen* några år tillbaka... Men hon bor i *huset hans*. Bra hade de, det vet jag. Hur länge? Det blev en fem år. Inte så han ska ha gjort henne förnär på något sätt. Människorna blir klokare mot slutet av livet. Men se *nu*... då man ser hur det är i dag... *herre min skapare!*.. Det är bäst att inte *säja nåt*. Bara man får leva i fred och ha det varmt i stugan... *Stugrucklet mitt* är det inte mycket bevänt med längre, jag fick vara glad då vintern tog slut, för det är inte gott att värma upp det. Man *eldar och eldar*, men det är som att bo i ett såll. (Sjuksjin 1977: 46)

– *Погоди-ка*, не *гони-ка* коней. Я *вот* и говорю: много у меня всяких *условиев* получается. То — нельзя, это — нельзя... А старик подумает да и скажет: «Чего же *тада* и *можно-то*?» И все наше *сватовство-то* само собой и распадется, — *Отавиха* опять мелко засмеялась. — *Вот не думала, не гадала...* *Господи, господи*. Оно бы — *так-то* чего? У меня *вон товарка* моя задушевная бывшая в Буланихе, где я раньше жила, тоже *вот так вот*: пришел старик, *тары-бары*, а потом и говорит: «Давай, *мол*, *Кузьмовна*, вместе жить». И жили. Он, правда, уж умер года два как... А она живет в его доме. И хорошо жили, я знаю. Сколько?... *Годов* пять жили. *Ничо*, не обижал ее. К концу-то жизни люди умней делаются. *Счас вон...* поглядишь на *нонешних-то...* *господи, господи!*.. Поглядишь, и ничего не

скажешь. Оно бы, *знамо*, и мне в покое бы дожить да в тепле... *Избенка-то* у меня вся *прохудилась*, рада, что уж зима кончилась — никак ее не натопишь. *Топишь-топишь*, *топишь-топишь*, а все как под решетом. (Šukšin 1985: 438)

Where possible, the translator uses the colloquial marker in the same place as in the original text: *господи, господи* - *herre je, herre je* ('my God, my God'); *тары-бары - hit och dit* ('hither and thither'); *избенка-то* - *stugrucket mitt* ('log hut, cottage'); *топишь-топишь* - *man eldar och eldar* ('one heats up and heats up'). Otherwise, Russian colloquial markers are translated neutrally but the effect of colloquialness is compensated by the use of Swedish and Finland Swedish colloquial markers: *mej, nu, sku, sen, säjer, då, sa, huset hans, säja nåt*. The range of colloquial markers in the original text is broader than in the translation: in the original text there are 30 markers and in the translated text – 20 markers. This conforms to the second tendency observed by Englund Dimitrova that the translation tends to have fewer linguistic markers for a specific variety/register in comparison with the source text. Moreover, a lot of markers occurring in the translation are not a direct equivalent to a colloquial unit in source text; instead, the translator uses *the strategy of compensation* and inserts colloquial units where there were none in the source text.

As shown above, Ben Hellman uses many colloquial markers in his translation of the short story *Bessovestnye* by Vasilij Šukšin. He uses not only the most conventional typical colloquial markers and dialect forms, but also traits from the variety of Finland Swedish to create an illusion of non-standard, colloquial, dialectally-flavored speech.

8 Conclusions

The analysis presented above shows that the source text is filled with colloquial markers on all language levels. The Swedish translation tends to have fewer markers in comparison to the original source text, i.e. the translation becomes more normative which conforms to the law of growing standardization in translation. It is also important to emphasize that most of the colloquial markers do not have an equivalent in the target language and are thus translated normatively. Instead, the effect of colloquialness is created by the colloquial markers which are typical for Swedish and Finland Swedish in other places of the target text, i.e. the strategy of compensation is used.

If a translator tries to translate every Russian colloquial marker into Swedish, the text will become overloaded with unnatural and strange elements for the reader of the Swedish text. It will lose its charm, easiness, and effect on the reader. The task of the translator is not to translate the text literally, but to stylize it again by means of the Swedish language while trying to preserve the essential elements and impressions where possible.

The translation of Šukšin's work is an art where the translator can show himself as a brilliant language stylist and a language specialist. Ben Hellman is not transferring the whole range of Russian colloquial markers into Swedish, but he compensates the effect produced through the consistent use of Swedish colloquial markers. It is also important to point out that Ben Hellman uses Finland Swedish as an extra resource partly because

it is his own language variety and partly because it is published in a Finland Swedish journal and the translation is aimed at a Finland Swedish reader.

List of References

Research Material

Šukšin, Vasilij 1985. *Sobranie sočinenij. Tom vtoroj*. Moskva: Molodaja gvardija.

Sjuksjin, Vasilij 1977. De samvetlösa [The Swedish translation of *Bessovestnye*.] Translated by Ben Hellman. *Horisont* 3, 42–47.

Works Cited

Brumme, Jenny & Anna Espunya 2012. *The translation of fictive dialogue*. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi.

Englund Dimitrova, Birgitta 1997. Translation of Dialect in Fictional Prose – Vilhelm Moberg in Russian and English as a Case in Point. In: *Norm, variation and change in language: Proceedings of the centenary meeting of the Nyfilologiska sällskapet, Nedre Manilla 22–23 March 1996*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 49–65.

Englund Dimitrova, Birgitta 2004. Orality, literacy, reproduction of discourse and the translation of dialect. In: Irmeli Helin (ed) *Dialektübersetzung und Dialekte im Multimedia*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 121–139.

Givens, John 2000. *Prodigal Son: Vasilij Šukšin in Soviet Russian Culture*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Larsson, Mats 1992. *Från tjeckiska till svenska. Översättningsstrategier för litterärt talspråk*. Stockholm: Stockholm universitet.

Liljestrand, Birger 1983. *Tal i prosa. Om svenska författares anföringsteknik*. Acta Universitatis Umenensis. Umeå Studies in the Humanities 54. Umeå: Umeå universitet.

Lindqvist, Yvonne 1995. Spoken Language in Literary Prose – a Translation Problem. A Case Study of the *Catcher in the Rye* by J.E. Salinger. In: Peter Jansen (ed) *Translation and the Manipulation of Discourse*. Leuven: CETRA, 77–107.

Lindström, Jan 2008. *Tur och ordning. Introduktion till svensk samtalsgrammatik*. Stockholm: Norstedts Akademiska Förlag.

Londen, Anne-Marie 1989. *Litterärt talspråk. Studier i Runar Schildts berättarteknik med särskild hänsyn till dialogen*. Helsingfors: Svenska Litteratursällskapet.

Reuter, Mikael 1993. Fast. Reuters ruta 9/9. Available at: http://www.kotus.fi/sv/publikationer/sprakspalter/reuters_rutor/1993/fast [accessed 10 September 2016].

Olga Mezhevich
*Translating Vasilij Šukšin's literary dialogue into Swedish:
Finland Swedish as an extra resource*

Toury, Gideon 1995. *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

About the Author

Olga Mezhevich is a PhD student at the Department of Finnish, Finno-Ugrian and Scandinavian Studies, University of Helsinki. Her research interests include literary translation, translation of Russian and Finland Swedish literature and translation theories.

E-mail: olga.mezhevich@helsinki.fi