

The Sociology of Translation: At the Intersection of Social Sciences and the Humanities. *The Case of The Golden Key, or the Adventures of Buratino*

Marcin Kosman 

University of Warsaw

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18778/1733-8069.16.2.05>

Keywords:

cultural turn in translation studies, field, habitus, sociology of translation

Abstract: The article discusses the relationship between translation studies and sociology. It is argued that the latter can prove valuable in a deepened analysis of a given society. Surprisingly, little research has been done with regard to this issue. In order to justify the point of view that translation studies can consort with social sciences in many ways, *The Golden Key, or the Adventures of Buratino* – a Soviet adaptation of Collodi's *Pinocchio* – is analyzed. The choices of the translator are influenced by the trends and norms in the Soviet society. These norms are further analyzed through the lenses of Pierre Bourdieu's concepts and the Manipulation School. Thus, combining sociology and translation studies can provide an interdisciplinary perspective on social phenomena.

Marcin Kosman holds M.A. degrees in Linguistics and Applied Psychology from the Jagiellonian University. He was awarded twice with the Scholarship of the Minister of Science and Higher Education for Outstanding Achievements. His research interests include the sociology of translation; language contacts between Polish, English, and Russian; as well as political discourse.

Contact details:

University of Warsaw
Faculty of Psychology
ul. Stawki 5/7
00-183 Warszawa
email address: marcin.j.kosman@gmail.com

The Sociology of Translation: In Search of a Discipline

Translation is not solely a linguistic phenomenon; in fact, it is deeply grounded in social and cultural contexts. It is worth noting that translation has been surprisingly under-researched when it comes to sociological analyses. While branches of sociology such as sociology of literature, culture, or language are well-developed, there has not been much space dedicated to translation as such even though – particularly in the wake of multiculturalism and informational society – translation has become an ubiquitous part of a plethora of societies. The main focus of this article is to highlight the significance of translation and how it helps shape a particular set of values in a given society. This will be done by examining Aleksey Nikolayevich Tolstoy's¹ translation/adaptation of Carlo Collodi's *The Adventures of Pinocchio* (It. *Le avventure di Pinocchio: storia di un burattino* [edition from 1958; the original was published in 1883]), called *The Golden Key, or the Adventures of Buratino* (Rus. *Золотой ключик, или Приключения Буратино* [1951]).

Language has been an instrumental part of sociological research. Multiple scholars have referred to it as a valid component of their theories. For example, Pierre Bourdieu claimed that means of communication (language, culture, or discourse) are instruments of symbolic power. As Bourdieu (1991) highlighted, symbolic power is power used to construct and influence reality; thus, it is a tool of social domination, achieved with the help of language:

¹ The patronymic here was used in order not to confuse the author with the other Aleksey Tolstoy, namely Aleksey Konstantinovich Tolstoy – the author of *The Silver Knight* and *Tsar Boris*. In the course of this article, Aleksey Nikolayevich Tolstoy will be referred to as Aleksey Tolstoy.

[t]he dominant culture contributes to the real integration of the dominant class (by facilitating the communication between all its members and by distinguishing them from other classes); it also contributes to the fictitious integration of society as a whole, and thus to the apathy (false consciousness) of the doomed classes; and finally, it contributes to the legitimization of the established order by establishing distinctions (hierarchies) and legitimating these distinctions. (p. 167)

Similarly, Michel Foucault states that the power relationship is expressed through language. Further, discourse is what unites power and knowledge, and in every society one can observe imposing authority through it (Foucault 1972). For Foucault and Bourdieu, language is not a neutral representation of the world, but a means of symbolic violence. The relationship between language and power is discussed at length in critical discourse analysis (CDA) – an interdisciplinary approach uniting methodologies of sociology, linguistics, anthropology, and philosophy (Fairclough 1995).² Another branch of sociolinguistic research is represented by John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes (1972), who – in their book titled *Directions in Sociolinguistics. The Ethnography of Communication* – argue that in the past linguistics had disregarded the social use of language, which was a faulty practice, since language policies (e.g. language planning) play a crucial role in forming an identity.

Before I begin the proper analysis, I shall outline the foundations of the sociology of translation and reveal its place in the world of sociology; how it combines the elements of the humanities and social sciences. The common ground between sociology and

² For a more detailed discussion on critical discourse analysis (CDA), see: Schiffrin, Tannen, and Hamilton (2001); Duszak and Fairclough (2008).

translation studies seems to be rather clear. Lawrence Venuti has called for foreignization in translation, which he understands in terms of conforming to the norms of the source culture rather than the target culture, thus emphasizing the original context and ideology. Further, Venuti argues that translators should not be invisible; on the contrary – their work has to be seen and respected (Venuti 1995:7-8). This statement does not refer strictly to cultural or commercial acclaim, but – to quote Antoine Berman (2000:284) – “the trial of the foreign.” Venuti also observes that in the Anglo-Saxon culture, the most important quality of a translation is fluency. However, Venuti states that fluency enables readers to experience the text through their domestic cultural and ideological lenses, whereas preserving the original ideology of the text is crucial in modern translation studies (Venuti 1995:12-13). Bogusia Temple (2006) sees the rise in the interest of translation studies in the question of ideology as an opportunity to combine sociological and translation/interpretation research, particularly in the context of biographical research. Also, Wolf Lepenies (1988:7) located sociology as a discipline between the natural sciences and the humanities, but one that is, in general, closer to literature than to biology or physics.

According to Magdalena Czech (2011), translation can be treated as a form of social interaction on the border between cultures and societies of source, and target languages. Further, it can be treated as a collective action. The author writes that in the act of creating translation – aside from the translator themselves – the author of the source text and their potential readers can also be considered actors. Moreover, the importance of social institutions cannot be overstated. André Lefevere, one of the founders of the Manipulation School, argues that in a given literary system the institution of patron-

age is, in fact, responsible for the kind of literature that is read and endorsed. Lefevere (2000) argues that patronage have been present in all the societies since time immemorial. One can differentiate between three major components of patronage. Firstly, an ideological one, as – in the opinion of Lefevere – literature should be in line with the other systems in a given society. One needs to bear in mind that in translation studies ideology is frequently connected with politics. According to Şehnaz Tahir-Gurcaglar (2003):

[t]ranslation is political because, both as activity and product, it displays process of negotiation among different agents. On micro-level, these agents are translators, authors, critics, publishers, editors, and readers. (p. 113)

Thus, when translating a text, the translator has to be cautious of not just grammatical rules, but also of the ideology in the target society, i.e. how certain ideological elements from the source text would function in the target text, and how the translation would function in the whole literary system. The importance of ideology in translation often led to adjusting texts so that they could be in line with certain standards accepted by editors and institutions; or, in more extreme cases, censorship. For example, that was the case with numerous books in Franco's Spain, where Joseph Wambaugh's *The New Centurions* – a novel describing the difficult work of police officers in Los Angeles of the 1960s – was published only after cutting many fragments that were considered inappropriate. Mostly, the fragments that were cut included swear words which were inextricably linked with the language of the policemen in the book, but the censors argued that that language might be seen as offensive. Similarly, in Erich Segal's *Love Story*, one can find numerous fragments

in which the Catholic Church is disregarded, since the characters do not agree with its ideology. These fragments, along with coarse words, were also omitted in Spanish translations, except the first one (Gómez Castro 2008).

The second component of patronage is an economic factor, as it is the patron who assures the writer's living and material situation. If this is the case, then the latter one has to comply with the terms of the former one. This component seems rather natural and obvious, since the position of a poet laureate has been present in various societies since time immemorial. The third and final component is a status factor, since – owing to their work – the writer can achieve a certain position in their society. Translation can thus be seen as a means of improving one's social status as well as it can serve as motivation (Lefevere 2000).

It is important to mention that patronage can be non-homogeneous. If this is the case, the economic status of the translator does not depend on ideological factors and they have enough financial support from other sources than the patron. Moreover, when translating literary works does not entail the rise in one's social status, it also means non-homogeneity of patronage. On the other hand, if all the components are in the hands of the same person or institution, whose major goal is to ensure the stability and sustainability of the social system (and literature is one of the tools that they use), then patronage is homogenous (Szymańska 2010). What is more, patrons usually influence the system in an indirect way; it is the critics, reviewers, and academic scholars who do it for them. Using the Manipulists' terminology, they are called "professional readers" (Lefevere 1992:4). On the other hand, *non-professional* readers, who claim to have read a text, actually know it

with the whole corpora of other texts that comment it further: reviews, film adaptations, illustrations, and fore- or afterwords. This is because, according to this paradigm, a translation (or, in Lefeverian terms, refraction) is always in a way adjusted to the expectations and knowledge of the target society. Lefevere (2000) observes the ubiquitous nature of refractions and points out that the scope of translation studies should encompass categories broader than just literature:

[f]irst of all, let us accept that refractions—the adaptation of a work of literature to a different audience, with the intention of influencing the way in which that audience reads the work—have always been with us in literature. Refractions are to be found in the obvious form of translation, or in the less obvious forms of criticism (the wholesale allegorization of the literature of Antiquity by the Church Fathers, e.g.), commentary, historiography (of the plot summary of famous works cum evaluation type, in which the evaluation is unabashedly based on the current concept of what "good" literature should be), teaching, the collection of works in anthologies, the production of plays. (p. 235)

Lefevere's approach is one of the examples of what the so-called cultural turn meant for translation studies – it shifted the attention from language to culture and, most importantly to the translator. Regarding translation studies, the cultural turn refers to a cultural approach which is nowadays predominant in many branches of the humanities. Culture-oriented translation studies are not concentrated on interlanguage transfer; rather, they are focused on a complex and multidimensional sphere of intercultural contacts. It is culture – not language, words or texts – that is, as Magda Heydel (2009:21-22) concludes, basic operational unit of translation

studies. It is worth noting that before the cultural turn, which scholars date to the 1960s, translation studies had not taken into account cognitive, social, cultural, or historical factors. Rather, the translator was perceived as completely subordinate to the author. The ideal translator was loyal and faithful, however vague the definition seems now (Tryuk 2011:376). That stage of translation studies is often referred to as the linguistic period, considering the focus of the research.

The seminal work of James S. Holmes, namely *The Name and Nature of Translation Studies* – in which the author moves away from the prescriptive approach – is generally considered the beginning of the cultural turn in translation studies (Snell-Hornby 2006:41). In his work, Holmes argues that the discussion about translation is not solely a discussion of a reductive and objective character; rather, it is a discussion typical of linguistically-oriented approach. Instead, Holmes argues that there are two subdisciplines of translation studies: pure and applied. The latter one is a strictly practical branch. It encompasses translation criticism, the evaluation of translations, and a search for appropriate translation strategies. The pure sector, on the other hand, can be further divided into theoretical and descriptive branches. The former one focuses on translation theories and discourse analysis; the latter one is product- (analyses of existing translations), process- (refers to psychological aspects of translation, i.e. analyzes how cognitive processes inside the translator's mind work), and function-oriented (focuses not just on the text, but, predominantly, on the context; refers to the socio-cultural situation in the target culture). On the other hand, and according to Holmes, descriptive translation studies can be divided into three categories: product-oriented, process-oriented, and function-oriented. In the context of the article herein, the

last branch seems to be most relevant as, while discussing it, Holmes (1988) signaled the emergence of the sociology of translation:

[f]unction-oriented DTS is not interested in the description of translations in themselves, but in the description of their function in the recipient socio-cultural situation: it is a study of contexts rather than texts. Pursuing such questions as which texts were (and, often as important, were not) translated at a certain time in a certain place, and what influences were exerted in consequence, this area of research is one that has attracted less concentrated attention than the area just mentioned, though it is often introduced as a kind of sub-theme or counter-theme in histories of translations and in literary histories. Greater emphasis on it could lead to the development of a field of translation sociology (or -- less felicitous but more accurate, since it is a legitimate area of translation studies as well as of sociology -- socio-translation studies). (p. 72)

Thus, descriptive research – according to Holmes – focuses on the description of certain tendencies in order to formulate more general laws. Empirical research should concentrate on the description of the actual connections between source text and its translations, not on theoretical and linguistic aspects of translation. This stance does not mean that, concerning methodology, empirical research is to be devoid of theoretical aspects. Holmes simply claims that it is crucial to find the proper balance between empirical and theoretical aspects of research (Holmes 1988:78-79).³

³ Although translation studies have been developing rapidly and numerous approaches to the problem of cultural aspects in translation have been proposed, one needs to acknowledge that the intention of this paper is not to give a complex overview of the issue. The most seminal works with regard to the discipline have been adequately discussed in the existing literature. For a more detailed discussion on the Skopos theory,

Michaela Wolf (2014) writes extensively about the rapid development of the sociology of translation. She argues that nowadays scholars focus on issues which had not been given enough attention in the past. In other words, translation studies have begun to broaden their scope:

[t]he milestones which marked the development of a “sociology of translation” are characterized by the insight that translation is an activity deeply affected by social configurations. Once translation was viewed as a social practice, the understanding of the mechanisms underlying translation needed the development of analytical tools. These tools were intended to help shed light on the various constituents accounting for the involvement of translation in larger social contexts in general and the social nature of translation in particular. The conceptualization of new approaches implied a shift of focus to a variety of research fields which so far have been under-researched, such as institutions of translators’ training, professional institutions and their impact on translation practices, working conditions, questions of ethics in translation, political aspects of translation, and many more. (p. 11)

Moreover, since – according to the author – these issues pertain to sociology, one needs to adopt a sociological perspective in order to properly analyze the new issues in translation studies. Some scholars have argued that the last two decades have seen a shift in the dominant paradigm in the discipline: from the cultural turn to the sociological turn (Lisheng 2016:304). Translation studies scholars have intended to incorporate sociological theories into their research. One of the most influential works in

postcolonial theories of translation, or Polysystem theory, see: Munday 2012.

this regard is Daniel Simeoni’s article titled *The Pivotal Status of the Translator’s Habitus* (1998), in which he analyzed the translator’s social and individual trajectories in order to explain translation strategies and choices with the use of Pierre Bourdieu’s concepts. Simeoni’s venture has been successfully replicated and revised by multiple scholars, e.g., Moira Inghilleri (2003), Jean-Marc Gouanvic (2005), Reine Meylaerts (2008), and Kristiina Abdallah (2014). Thus, adopting a Bourdieusian perspective is justified in terms of sociological insights in translation studies.

I shall now define the most important concepts proposed by Pierre Bourdieu: field, capital, agent, and habitus. According to the author (1984:170-172), the field is understood as a social microcosm, a network in a social space which is governed by certain norms and in which one can recognize certain relations of power between the entities. This is a setting in which agents and their social positions are situated. Bourdieu (1990) introduced the term in order to avoid confusion and a lack of precision in descriptions of social spaces:

[t]he notion of field of cultural production (which is specified as artistic field, literary field, scientific field, etc.) allows one to break away from vague references to the social worlds (via words such as ‘context’, ‘milieu’, ‘social base’, ‘social background’) with which the social history of art and literature usually contents itself. The field of cultural production is this altogether particular social world referred to in the traditional notion of a republic of letters. (...)

I would say that the literary field is a force-field as well as a field of struggles which aim at transforming or maintaining the established relation of forces: each of the agents commits the force (the capital) that he

has acquired through previous struggles to strategies that depend for their general direction on his position in the power struggle, that is, on his specific capital. (pp. 140, 143)

The position of agents within the field depends on interactions between the rules that govern the field, agents' habitus, and capital. As Małgorzata Tryuk argues, translation studies are a good example of the Bourdieusian field (2011:377-378). If for a field to function during certain challenges there have to be people ready to take on them – people who have the knowledge to do so – this can also be applied to translation studies, since they have not only their own challenges, but also agents (translators), institutions, publications, conferences, and scientific research. The field is also a space in which different powers – institutional or individual – interact with one another, which leads to the creation of capital used in a given field. There are four types of capital: economic (material goods such as money), cultural (education, knowledge), symbolic (prestige, fame), and social (social relations) (Bourdieu 1984). One of the main qualities of the field is the way in which one of the types of capital can be changed into another; e.g. knowledge – a part of educational capital – can be transferred into economic capital, i.e. money. Johan Heilborn and Gisèle Sapiro (2007:95) claim that a sociological approach to translation should involve perceiving translation in terms of an international transfer, since the act of translation is described as a circulation of cultural goods between the fields, and this exchange may be impeded or enhanced by other factors (political and economic). To provide another example connected with translation studies, Tryuk (2011:378) writes that a proficient and well-educated translator should receive more money for their services than an average one; given that it is not always the case, this is a situation in which

educational capital does not translate into economic capital. On the other hand, given that conference translators are usually among the most respected types of those providing translation services, one might observe that in their case educational capital does translate into symbolic capital. One can spot here a distinct similarity to Lefevre's concept of patronage: in both theories, prestige, wealth, and social status are dependent on other institutions (field/patrons). It also seems interesting to examine the literary field of the USSR as it was a particularly oppressive state which often used radical censorship in order to control language, culture, and thoughts.

Agents – another important concept in Bourdieu's theory – who are situated in the same field, interact with one another. Agent's position in the field determines their area of operations – the way how an agent performs their activities depends on the so-called habitus. Markus Eberharter (2014:116) describes agent's habitus as their *modus operandi* and claims that one's habitus is absolutely crucial with regard to the way one perceives the reality they live in and how they operate within it. The habitus is acquired in two ways: through individual experiences – since childhood – and through the collective experience of people who operate in a given field. Thus, the field and habitus influence one another.

Given that Bourdieu's concepts seem to be largely concentrated around agents, one can draw an interesting parallel between his claims and the modern translation studies. Magda Heydel (2009:23-24) argues that translation is considered as a key mechanism in creating a culture; the translator is not treated as a neutral party; rather, he is often treated as an active participant in identity creation, as well as power struggle and cultural conflicts. Therefore, the translator is depicted as an agent of a literary (or,

more properly, translation) field; their capabilities, motivation, and strategies could be depicted with the help of the habitus (Eberharter 2014:117).

Consequently, in this article I use the methodology pertaining to modern translation studies, particularly 'the Manipulists': I concentrate on the social impact of translation, how it functions within a given society, and what implications the translator's strategies and choices have with regard to politics and identity creation. In order to properly describe these processes, I depict them in Bourdieu's terms so that a sociological perspective could be amplified; this will demonstrate that adopting a sociological orientation for translation studies can prove beneficial and methodologically justified. Thus, the investigation of Tolstoy's strategies will be twofold. It will begin with the analysis of his biography and socio-political background so that the field and potential capital can be identified. Then, the status of the translator in the USSR will be examined in order to properly describe the habitus. Secondly, Tolstoy's choices concerning proper names and culture-specific items will be discussed. This way a sociological perspective is being combined with a translation studies approach.

Aleksey Tolstoy's Life: An Overview

Aleksey Nikolayevich Tolstoy was born on 10 January, 1883, in Nikolaevsk.⁴ He was the son of a nobleman Nikolay Alexandrovich Tolstoy, who was distantly related to Leo Tolstoy. His mother, Alexandra Leontievna Turgeneva, was related to Ivan Sergeyeovich Turgenev, a renowned Russian writer known as one of the best Russian realists. Both parents belonged to the noble houses, which is of

⁴ Renamed in 1918 to Pugachyov.

particular significance given the attitude towards gentry in the Soviet Union. Also, when his mother was two-months pregnant with Aleksey, she left the family together with Aleksey Apollonovich Bostrom, her lover. She actually did not re-marry, but Aleksey, until the age of thirteen, lived under her mother's lover's name. After some time, he was re-registered as Aleksey Nikolayevich Tolstoy and inherited a considerable sum of money after Nikolai's death in 1900 – around thirty-thousand rubles (Petelin 1978:25).

Though nowadays he is seen as a propagandist and a Stalin supporter (Petelin: 1978:205), Aleksey Tolstoy, during his early age, displayed a strong apprehension towards the Soviet Revolution. In the 1910s and 1920s, he emigrated to Paris where he would write his symbolist poems. During the October Revolution and the Civil War, he sided with the Whites and remained abroad as a member of White émigrés. His transition into a supporter of communism can be traced to his stint in Berlin in the early 1920s, where he began his collaboration with Maxim Gorky, a founder of the socialist realist method. The two writers worked together for the literary journal called *Nakanune* (Rus. 'Eve'). In many literary circles to this day, Aleksey Tolstoy's motivation is perceived as shady. Gleb Struve (1941) – a literary poet and historian, a member of the White Army, and a strong opponent of communism – writes about Tolstoy in the following way:

Alexei Nikolaevich Tolstoy is, without doubt, one of the most gifted Russian writers of the 20th century... But—and this is the point—this man, endowed with so many extraordinary gifts and sharing the heritage of the great age of Russian literature, lacks one quality which distinguished all of the great Russian poets and writers: a sense of moral and social respon-

sibility. His essence is that of a cynic and opportunist. After about five years' exile in Berlin, during which he professed to be a monarchist, he returned to Russia. His subsequent change over from monarchism to communism was too quick and effortless to be sincere. He surpassed his less able colleagues in the art of glorifying Stalin by drawing subtle analogies between the latter and Peter the Great. He made a rapid career, became one of the leaders of the officially sponsored Association of Authors, and was recently awarded the highest academic distinction in Russia, the Stalin Prize I think this is sufficient to show that Alexei has not got a grain of that grandeur which made his namesake the undisputed moral authority in Russia, of whom even the most obscurantist Tsarist Ministers were afraid. No one in Russia, not even Alexei's most ardent admirers (and there are many), would dream of putting him into the same category as that great, sincere and fiery old heretic, Leo Tolstoy. There is, therefore, nothing remarkable in the fact that this brilliant and faithful bard of Stalin was called upon to extol Pan-Slavism, if that is what his master wanted. (p. 14)

Although Struve does not derogate Tolstoy's great talent, he calls him an opportunist whose actions were not driven by sincerity and morality; therefore, he cannot be considered a truly great Russian writer. Still, his career achievements after his 'conversion' are impressive: he was twice awarded with the Stalin Prize, one of the highest state honors in the Soviet Union. In 1941, he was awarded for *The Road to Calvary*, a trilogy describing the fate of the Russian intelligentsia in the period of the Russian Revolution. Two years later, he was honored for the second time – for the novel called *Peter I*. Both books contain numerous elements and fragments which are considered as pertaining to the Soviet propaganda. For example, at the end of *The Road to Calvary*,

after a tumultuous series of events, the protagonists are listening to Gleb Krzhizhanovsky's reading; it was the first-ever Soviet plan for national economic recovery (the so-called GOELRO plan). The plan is being read-out in the presence of Stalin and Lenin, and the main heroes display a considerable deal of enthusiasm while listening to Krzhizhanovsky's words. This shows that even the intelligentsia sees the importance of the Soviet Revolution as the new plan can finally bring peace to a conflicted country. On the other hand, *Peter I* is seen as a metaphorical allegory of Stalin's reign. Further, the novel was actually ordered by Stalin himself, who was often, also implicitly, depicted in works of art during the early years of the Soviet Union – Mikhail Romm's *Lenin in October*, Sergei Eisenstein's *Ivan the Terrible*, or Sergei Yutkevich' *The Man with the Gun*. This shows that art was a powerful tool in the hands of Soviets and could serve as a valuable tool with regard to didacticism (Zwierzchowski 2003). It is also worth noting that Tolstoy was known among the Soviets as "count comrade" or "red count," i.e. as one of the few members of former Russian nobility who was respected enough to be given a high social position. This is particularly curious given the disparaging attitude of the new system towards people of noble origin. This demonstrates that Aleksey Tolstoy's transformation from a White opponent of communism to its staunch supporter was complete and thorough.

Literary and Translation Norms in the USSR

As mentioned before, one should bear in mind that there are two dimensions connected with one's habitus: individual experience and collective experience. In the subsection above, individual experiences of Tolstoy were outlined. The following part

of the paper will focus on the latter aspect, i.e. how literary norms of that age shaped his habitus and, therefore, his translation strategies.

It is worth noting that certain tendencies to control the literary sphere of the Soviet Union were present since its early years. In 1919, Gosizdat (the State Publishing House) was founded. Its aim was to put all private publishing under control of the State. Although Gosizdat's plans were grand, the organization was actually not very efficient, since they had numerous problems with execution of their goals, e.g. they experienced considerable obstacles with paper delivery and lack of printers (Fitzpatrick 2002:264). Furthermore, during the early years of the Bolshevik regime, the number of books imported from other countries regressed considerably. Nailya Safiullina and Rachel Platonov (2012:241) note that in 1921 only nineteen foreign-language books were translated; two years earlier this number was much higher, as 134 books were translated in 1919. This fact stemmed from cultural isolation and the further nationalization of publishing houses. Therefore, in the early USSR one could observe two major processes: the Soviets tried to seize control over private publishing houses and, at the same time, they made it difficult for people to read foreign authors.

After Stalin's rise to power and the proclamation of the first five-year plan, the Soviets began to put a hold on folklore stories. In order to achieve this, the Soviets established the RAPP organization (Russian Association of Proletarian Writers), which was an important instrument in the class struggle. Among the most prominent members of the organization were Vladimir Mayakovsky and Mikhail Sholokhov. The RAPP managed to ban the works of the intelligentsia who used allegories and satire to describe the political situation in the USSR at that

time. Among the authors who could not get published legally due to the actions taken by the RAPP were Mikhail Bulgakov, Yevgeny Zamyatin, and Boris Pilnyak (Skorospelova 2003:34). In 1932, the organization was incorporated into the Union of Soviet Writers, which also aimed to seize control over literature and culture. The first chairman of the Union was Maxim Gorky. Gorky was one of the first editors who recognized the significance of children's literature regarding propaganda. Gorky (1953) argued that the educational value hidden in stories for children could prove beneficial in creating a new Soviet man. He believed that if the young generation read in the fairytales about the achievements of the Soviet men and learn about the effort and struggle connected with them, then they would more appreciate the Soviet ideology. Further, Nadezhda Krupskaya, the widow of Lenin, argued that a fairytale should be adjusted to the needs of the young Soviet reader. Therefore, certain elements of classic tales had to be removed (Kaliszewska-Henczel 2017:14).

The Soviets began to censor children's literature relatively quickly. In 1921, only thirty-three books for children were published (Balina 2008:8). This was because folktales and fairytales have many elements that were not in accordance with the Soviets' line of thinking. The references to monarchy, God, and religion were disregarded. Also, the stories of writers such as Alexander Afanasyev and Sergey Aksakov were removed from libraries and burnt; Soviet censors wanted to make sure that the unwanted elements would not be read. The Soviets were against the traditional style of fairytales, which promoted a positive attitude to imagination and emotions. The traditional fairytales encouraged children to recognize metaphorical thinking and reinforce imagination development. The Soviet critics were against such stories, because they did not believe that such

stories could contribute to the new society. Instead, didacticism was promoted and the authors who used the motifs and tropes pertaining to the old stories were called absurdists (Branson 2014:7-8).

Another interesting aspect of the attitude of the Soviets towards literature can be investigated by analyzing the case of Korney Chukovsky. His own poetry, which relied on absurd, ambiguity, and wordplay, was disregarded; the aforementioned Krupskaya would call it “bourgeoisie folly” (Kosman 2017:56), which was considered as a serious insult. On the other hand, Chukovsky’s work as a translator was respected and praised, because he would domesticate American and British stories for children, making them understandable for the Soviets (e.g. his rendition of the Doctor Dolittle stories into *Dr. Ow-It-Hurts*⁵). The Korney Chukovsky conundrum shows how rigid and ideology-oriented translation norms were at that time. The instruments of control of literature – mentioned at length in the previous subsection – were as strong here as with regard to translations. Numerous Soviet translators were loyal to the Party from the inception of the Soviet Union and they acted according to the right policy. Samuil Marshak was one of the most important editors and translators of his time. His rendition of Robert Burns sheds some light on the translation ideology of the USSR. Burns, universally acknowledged as Scotland’s national poet (Sikorska 2002:360), is a different author in Marshak’s translation. In Marshak’s rendition, his poetry is devoid of its typical characteristics. Furthermore, it exemplifies the policy of rewriting classic authors. Burns had been translated decades before Marshak (by Ivan Kozlov or Vsevolod Kostomarov), but the previous translators were rather accurate. In Marshak’s

translations, there is no Scottish dialect. The protagonists speak contemporary Russian. Also, in Marshak’s versions there is not a single mention of God, which is an important deviation from Burns, a Romantic poet. Yang De-you (1987:23-26) states that while Marshak’s translations are well-written, the incompatibility between the author and his translator is so conspicuous that the poems should be seen as adaptations, since Marshak’s work has little to do with the literary translation. Another element present in Marshak’s translations is the class struggle, since the negative attitude towards the gentry is absent in Burns’s original poems. Marshak, an editor of important literary journals, was a significant figure who often decided which translations were valid and in line with the Party’s directions.

Having recognized the translation and literary norms of the USSR during the years of Aleksey Tolstoy’s activity, one can see the field that the author operated in. It was shown that in the Soviet Union one’s social status depended on their loyalty towards the Party and one’s accordance with its directives. I shall now begin the analysis of Tolstoy’s translation strategies with regard to *The Golden Key*.

Differences in Tone and Message Between the Two Books

It is worth noting that the first translation of Carlo Collodi’s story had been published in 1906. The translator was a Russian writer of Italian descent, Kamill Danini (Camillo Dagnini in Italian). Tolstoy claimed to have read the story multiple times as a little boy who, ultimately, lost the book and decided to write *The Golden Key* in order to recreate his memories and share the story with other children (Baluch 2008:173). The problem with this explanation is that Tolstoy was twenty-three years old when Danini’s

⁵ In Polish known as *Doktor Ojboli*.

translation was published, so not exactly the little boy he claimed to be. Further, he began his translation when he was still on emigration with Nina Petrovskaya, another important literary émigré with regard to the Whites. Still, the story was published in 1933, only after Tolstoy had returned to Russia. Given these factors, one can question Tolstoy's seemingly innocent reasons which propelled him to come up with a drastically altered story.

The first of many conspicuous changes in the original story is the use of magic. Probably the most famous characteristic of Collodi's Pinocchio is the fact that his nose grows when the characters tells a lie. Multiple times in the novel this fact works against him, as Pinocchio lies a lot and it helps others distinguish between the truth and lies. Further, it is obviously an indication of magical powers that are present in the story. Tolstoy completely omits this aspect; in his version, Buratino's nose never transforms. Even though the character does have a tendency to lie, his lies never affect him in the way presented in the original. Moreover, Collodi's Fairy, a person often seen as Pinocchio's spiritual mother (Kleczkowska 2011:81), is replaced by Malvina, another puppet from Karabas Barabas's theatre. This change has a twofold impact on the story. Firstly, the main character's guarding angel has no magical powers; he cannot rely on the supernatural that would save him. This is because there is not much supernatural activity in the Soviet story at all. Secondly, Malvina is equal to Buratino in terms of status – they are, in a way, from the same class. The Fairy, a mighty magical creature who has more power than humans, would not be a character whose presence could be justified during the Soviet paradigm for literature. Broadly speaking, magic was not seen as a desired trophy during those years, and the replacement of the Fairy with a rather ideologically neutral Malvi-

na can be justified in light of the Soviet norms. Further, the Fairy's magical powers are not an integral part of the story, since Buratino does not dream of becoming a real boy. This motif is not mentioned in Tolstoy's story. In fact, the characters do not find it strange that Papa Carlo (Tolstoy's version of Gepetto) created a living creature from wood. Again, one might look at the situations from two perspectives: this shows what can be done if one works hard; labor seems larger than life – there is no need to involve magic in Buratino's transformation into a real boy, as he had been a real boy all along and it all was possible owing to hard work and Carlo's dedication. This not only highlights the relevance of hard work – one of the most important aspects of Soviet prose (Clark 1985) – but also shows that one might achieve great goals without the supernatural which can be seen as a parallel to religion, another motif that was not recommended and avoided by Tolstoy's contemporaries.

The fact that Malvina is of the same origin as Buratino – has its impact in the story because it pertains to another motif highlighted by Tolstoy, which seems to be absent in Collodi's original story. It is the fact that in the story the importance of magic is replaced by the importance of collectivism. Marina Balina (2008:51-52) argues that Tolstoy's rendition sends the message that even an uneducated vagabond who had something in common with thieves (the Fox and the Cat) could actually change into a proper citizen. This was possible due to the power of hard work and collective efforts. The turning point in Buratino's story is the encounter with Karabas Barabas – a greedy owner of the circus of puppets. In Collodi's story, he is named Mangiafuoco (Italian: Fire Eater, from Italian words *mangiare* – to eat; *fuoco* – fire) and is just a tertiary character with limited relevance as far as the story is concerned.

In Tolstoy's rendition, Mangiafuoco is a much more prominent character. According to Rachel Branson (2014:18), he is depicted by Tolstoy as a capitalist and exploiter. He is money- and power-hungry as he authoritatively rules the puppet theatre. It is the brave Buratino who takes the role of the leader of the puppets. At the end of the story, Barabas's tyranny comes to an end, which results in a changed moral of the story. Tolstoy's ultimate lesson for the young reader is that the money that comes from exploiting poor puppets is immoral *per se* and the exploiter should be stripped of it and his wealth should be redistributed among the puppets. Balina (2008) argues that this change results in introducing the class-struggle motif. There is a distinct contrast between the heroes on both sides and Barabas's exaggerated portrayal clearly makes him a suspicious character. The eponymous golden key is, on the other hand, seen as a symbol of the Soviet values (Kaloh-Vid 2013:101). The key is mentioned in the middle of the story and Buratino begins to think of it obsessively, since it might be the ultimate tool that gives the puppets liberty. The key as a magical tool is also one of the few magical elements present in the story, which might imply that only the Soviet values can pertain to being supernatural and belonging to a different, better world.

Another important aspect of Soviet censorship was adding elements which resonate in the target culture to original story. This method is known among translation studies scholars as domestication. Domestication relies on making the story less foreign and more comprehensible for target-culture readers. This can be done by, for example, changing proper names into ones that are more accessible to the readers (e.g. replacing a foreign name with its equivalent; Hejwowski 2004:46). Replacing Italian proper names with their Russian equivalents (although

some of the names, including the one of the main hero, clearly sound Italian) is just one of the most basic strategies as far as domestication is concerned. Omission and modulations are also considered to be important aspects of domestication (Fernández Guerra 2012:6). Multiple elements which are essential for the Italian culture were omitted or modulated, because Tolstoy considered them too brutal or moralistic. These elements involve the story with the shark (who devours Pinocchio and Geppetto alive) and the torturing of Pinocchio (e.g. him having his feet burnt). Thus, Tolstoy's story is not as didactic as Collodi's version, because the protagonist does not undergo any significant changes with regard to his personality. Malvina, who takes the role of the Fairy, is rather unsuccessful in her actions. Finally, Buratino takes the role of the leader of the rebellion and, ultimately, he is one of the main reasons why evil is punished in the story. Natalya Klimovich (2018:102) argues that Buratino is rewarded by being a nonconformist. This is radically different from Collodi's moral, since Pinocchio gets his reward by being obedient to his father and transforming from a spoiled and ill-mannered boy to a kind and empathic person. Therefore, changing the moral plays the vital role in the reception of the story. At first glance, Tolstoy's strategies seem to run counter to the premises of the Soviet critics, because he rejects Collodi's didacticism and moralistic character of the original story. What needs to be taken into account, though, is the fact that in the Italian book the protagonist strives to achieve the Western, bourgeois values, such as desire for self-improvement (Valerio 2013:990). In Tolstoy's story, the protagonist cannot change his values, because the values that are contrasted with his are the capitalistic and oppressive values of Barabas and Duremar, his right-hand man who is also a leech-catcher. Thus, Buratino's disobedience and nonconformism should actually be

appreciated by the Soviet reader, because he rebels against those principles that communism fought against. Therefore, in Tolstoy's story didacticism is not expressed directly, but it is clear which side is favored by the author.

Concluding Remarks

Aleksey Tolstoy's choices as a translator are predominantly determined by the norms and tendencies in the USSR at that time. As it was demonstrated above, for the Soviets literature was just a tool to raise a proper citizen. Tolstoy, having conformed to the norms, was one of the writers obedient to the system. Using Pierre Bourdieu's terminology, the field dictated the position of the agent (Tolstoy) by giving him certain capital (social position, status, and fame) that could not have been acquired otherwise. Given Tolstoy's background as one of the Whites, one can speculate that he was driven by this capital and, ultimately, he succumbed to it. He might have foreseen that the best strategy would be to act in accordance with the field. Therefore, his habitus was also tainted by other people who operated in his field – adaptation and domestication were considered the norm in the early Soviet Union. We can thus infer that certain strategies and choices might not have been random, but, rather, were rooted in the social convention of Tolstoy's times.

Nowadays, a rendition of a classic story done in a way resembling Tolstoy's *Golden Key* would probably be impossible, since the awareness as regards the status of translators has increased considerably. It seems that now the translator is not perceived as the rival of the author – that point of view was particularly strong during the age of the romantics (Kvartnik 2014). This stance has changed over time. It is worth mentioning that Jacek Dukaj – who

used similar strategies to that of the romantics in his translation⁶ of Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* – was considered provocative and scandalous (Dudek 2018). Even if in the 21st century translators stopped being creators and co-authors, the analysis of *The Golden Key* shows the impact of translation on society. It could radically taint the reception of the translated piece. It was demonstrated that *The Golden Key* does not share many elements with *Pinochio*, and the moral messages of the two books are much different. The readers can thus have certain misconceptions about the original author if they are not familiar with the relevant literary norms. Moreover, the analysis showed that language can have a considerable impact on society; as shown through the example of the USSR, it can influence people's identity and – with the use of censorship or a selection of appropriate topics for literary works – have an impact on culture. Thus, Tolstoy's example and his high status echoes the thoughts of Michel Foucault (1972) and Bourdieu (1990; 1991), namely that language can be a powerful tool of oppression, influencing more than just linguistic phenomena.

Finally, a deepened analysis of an ideologically driven translation can result in extracting more data from the point of view of anthropology. Through the lenses of translation, one can see not only how a given society functioned in a given period of time, but also how it viewed another society at the same time. In conclusion, using translation studies methodology as far as sociology is concerned seems encouraging and it may prove essential in adopting an interdisciplinary perspective on phenomena such as linguistics, social impact, and ideology.

⁶ In order to highlight the importance of his own role as the translator of the novel, Dukaj used the word 'polonization' ('*spolszczenie*').

References

- Abdallah, Kristiina. 2014. "The Interface between Bourdieu's Habitus and Latour's Agency: The Work Trajectories of Two Finnish Translators." Pp. 111-132 in *Remapping Habitus in Translation Studies*, edited by G. M. Vorderobermeier. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Balina, Marina. 2008. "Creativity through Restraint: The Beginnings of Soviet Children's Literature." Pp. 1-18 in *Russian Children's Literature and Culture*, edited by M. Balina and L. Rudova. New York: Routledge.
- Baluch, Alicja. 2008. *Od form prostych do arcydzieła*. Cracow: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Akademii Pedagogicznej.
- Berman, Antoine. 2000. "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign." Pp. 284-297 in *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by L. Venuti. New York: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990. *In Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language & Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Branson, Rachel. 2014. "Carving the Perfect Citizen: The Adventures of Italian Pinocchio in the Soviet Union and the United States." *Honors Projects* 2. Retrieved June 11, 2019 (<https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1010&context=crisscross>).
- Clark, Katerina. 1985. *The Soviet Novel: History as Ritual*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Collodi, Carlo. 1958. *Le avventure di Pinocchio: storia di un burattino*. Firenze: Casa Editrice Adriano Salani.
- Czech, Magdalena. 2011. „Tłumaczenie społecznego świata. Socjologia i przekład.” *Kultura i Polityka* 10:19-28.
- De-you, Yang. 1987. "On Marshak's Russian Translation of Robert Burns." *Studies in Scottish Literature* 22:10-29.
- Dudek, Anna. 2018. "Heart of Message. An Overview of Stylistic Devices Used by Jacek Dukaj in *Serce ciemności*." *Translatologica: A Journal of Translation, Language, and Literature* 2:97-110.
- Duszak, Anna and Fairclough Norman. 2008. *Krytyczna analiza dyskursu. Interdyscyplinarne podejście do komunikacji społecznej*. Cracow: Universitas.
- Eberharter, Markus. 2014. "Socjologiczne spojrzenie na rolę tłumaczy literatury. Na przykładzie Wandy Kragen i recepcji literatur niemieckojęzycznych w Polsce po 1945 roku." *Rocznik Przekładoznawczy. Studia nad teorią, praktyką i dydaktyką przekładu* 9:115-128.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1995. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.
- Fernández Guerra, Ana. 2012. "Translating Culture: Problems, Strategies and Practical Realities." *Art and Subversion* 1:1-27.
- Fitzpatrick, Sheila. 2002. *Education and Social Mobility in the Soviet Union 1921-1934*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock.
- Gómez Castro, Cristina. 2008. "Translation and Censorship in Franco's Spain: Negotiation as a Pathway for Authorization." Pp. 63-76 in *Proceedings of the 7th Annual Portsmouth Translation Conference*, edited by C. O'Sullivan. Portsmouth: University of Portsmouth.
- Gorky, Maxim. 1953. *Sobranie sochinenij v 30 tomah. Tom 27. Stat'i, doklady, rechi, priwetstvija. 1933-1936*. Moskva: GIHL.
- Gouanvic, Jean-Marc. 2005. "A Bourdieusian Theory of Translation." *The Translator* 11(2):147-163.
- Gumprez, John J. and Dell Hymes. 1972. *Directions in Sociolinguistics. The Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Heilbron, Johan and Sapiro Gisèle. 2007. "Outline for a sociology of translation. Current issues and future prospects." Pp. 93-108 in *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*, edited by M. Wolf and A. Fukari. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hejwowski, Krzysztof. 2004. *Kognitywno-komunikacyjna teoria przekładu*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Heydel, Magda. 2009. „Zwrot kulturowy w badaniach nad przekładem.” *Teksty Drugie* 6:21-33.

- Holmes, James S. 1988. *Translated!: Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Inghilleri, Moira. 2003. "Habitus, Field and Discourse: Interpreting as a Socially Situated Activity." *Target* 15(2):243-268.
- Kaliszewska-Henczel, Magdalena. 2017. „Kręte ścieżki baśni i wszędobylskość Kopciuszka – o rozmaitych sposobach interpretacji literatury baśniowej.” *Zeszyty Naukowe Uczelnianej Rady Doktorantów Uniwersytetu Kazimierza Wielkiego* 4:8-23.
- Kaloh Vid, Natalia. 2013. "Translation of Children's Literature in the Soviet Union: How Pinocchio Got a Golden Key." *International Research in Children's Literature* 1:90-103.
- Kleczkowska, Katarzyna. 2011. „Kiedy dzieło wymyka się twórcy. Losy pajacyka Pinokio od powieści Carla Collodiego po kulturę współczesną.” *Maska* 12:85-98.
- Klimovich, Natalya. 2018. "Manipulative Strategies in the Translations of Literary Texts Carried Out in the Soviet Union." *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences* 3:543-550.
- Kosman, Marcin. 2017. "Toto, we are in the Soviet Union. Jaka Kraina Oz istnieje w Związku Radzieckim?" *Konteksty Kultury* 14(4):55-69.
- Kvartnik, Tatyana A. 2014. *Literatura, Universal'nyy spravochnik shkol'nika, 100 samykh vazhnykh tem*. Moskva: Eksmo.
- Lefevre, André. 1992. *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Lefevre, André. 2000. "Mother Courage's Cucumbers: Text, System and Refraction in a Theory of Literature." Pp. 233-249 in *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by L. Venuti. New York: Routledge.
- Lepenies, Wolf. 1988. *Between Literature and Science: The Rise of Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lisheng, Liu. 2016. "Hanna, S. (2016). Bourdieu in translation studies: The socio-cultural dynamics of Shakespeare translation in Egypt. New York, NY: Routledge. 231p." *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series – Themes in Translation Studies* 15:303-308.
- Meylaerts, Reine. 2008. "Translators and (Their) Norms: Towards a Sociological Construction of the Individual." Pp. 91-102 in *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies: Investigations in Homage to Gideon Toury*, edited by A. Pym, M. Shlesinger and D. Simeoni. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Munday, Jeremy. 2012. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Petelin, Victor V. 1978. *Aleksey Tolstoy*. Moskva: Molodaya gvardiya.
- Safiullina, Nailya and Rachel Platonov. 2012. "Literary Translation and Soviet Cultural Politics in the 1930s: The Role of the Journal *Internacional'naja Literatura*." *Russian Literature* 72:239-269.
- Schiffrin, Deborah, Deborah Tannen, and Heidi E. Hamilton. 2001. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Sikorska, Liliana. 2002. *An Outline History of English Literature*. Poznan: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie.
- Simeoni, Daniel. 1998. "The Pivotal Status of the Translator's Habitus." *Target* 10(1):1-39.
- Skorospelova, Yekaterina B. 2003. *Russkaya proza XX veka. Ot A. Belogo («Peterburg») do B. Pasternaka («Doktor Zhivago»)*. Moskva: TEIS.
- Snell-Hornby, Mary. 2006. *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints?* Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Struve, Gleb. 1941. "Alexei Tolstoy." *The Tablet*, October 11. Retrieved May 22, 2019 (<http://archive.thetablet.co.uk/article/11th-october-1941/14/alexei-tolstoy-learn-from-mr-gleb-struve-lecturer->).
- Szymańska, Katarzyna. 2010. „Przekład literacki – manipulacja: refrakcja i instytucja patronatu według André Lefevre'a i Manipulation School." *Polisemia* 2. Retrieved June 26, 2019 (<http://www.polisemia.com.pl/numery-czasopisma/numer-2-2010-2/przeklad-literacki---manipulacja>).
- Tahir-Gurcaglar, Şehnaz. 2003. "The Translation Bureau Revisited: Translation as Symbol." Pp. 113-129 in *Apropos of Ideology*, edited by M. Calzada-Pérez. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Temple, Bogusia. 2006. "Representation Across Languages: Biographical Sociology Meets Translation and Interpretation Studies." *Qualitative Sociology Review* 2(1):7-21.

Tolstoy, Aleksey N. 1951. *Zolotoy klyuchik, ili Priklyucheniya Buratino*. Moskva-Kiyev: Gosudarstvennoye Izdatel'stvo Khudozhestvennoy Literatury.

Tryuk, Małgorzata. 2011. „Tłumacz w sytuacjach konfliktowych i kryzysowych. Ujęcie socjologiczne.” Pp. 375-390 in *Przekład jako produkt i kontekst jego odbioru*, edited by I. Kasperska and A. Żuchelkowska. Poznan: Wydawnictwo Rys.

Valerio, Anna. 2013. “Translation and Ideology: A Critical Reading.” *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 70:986-996.

Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.

Wolf, Michaela. 2014. “The Sociology of Translation and Its ‘Activist Turn’.” Pp. 7-22 in *The Sociological Turn in Translation and Interpreting Studies*, edited by C. V. Angelelli. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Zwierzchowski, Piotr. 2003. „Piotr I, czyli stalinowska baśń o mądrym i dobrym carze.” *BLOK* 2:53-69.

Citation

Kosman, Marcin. 2020. “The Sociology of Translation: At the Intersection of Social Sciences and the Humanities. *The Case of The Golden Key, or the Adventures of Buratino*.” *Przegląd Socjologii Jakościowej* 16(2):62-78. Retrieved Month, Year (www.przegladsocjologii.jakosciowej.org). DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18778/1733-8069.16.2.05>

Socjologia przekładu – na styku nauk społecznych i humanistycznych. Na przykładzie książki pt. „Złoty klucz, czyli niezwykle przygody pajacyka Buratino”

Abstrakt: Artykuł omawia związek pomiędzy naukami o przekładzie (*translation studies*) oraz socjologią. Uważa się, iż osiągnięcia przekładoznawstwa mogą okazać się użyteczne w analizie danego społeczeństwa. Powstało jednak relatywnie niewiele opracowań w tej kwestii. W celu uzasadnienia poglądu głoszącego, iż *translation studies* mogą współgrać z naukami o społeczeństwie, skupiono się na sowieckiej adaptacji „Pinokia” Collodiego: „Złoty klucz, czyli niezwykle przygody pajacyka Buratino” pióra Aleksieja Tołstoja. Wybory tłumacza są zdeterminowane przez trendy i normy panujące w sowieckim społeczeństwie. Te normy zostały również zanalizowane zgodnie z koncepcjami pola i habitusu Pierre’a Bourdieu oraz założeniami szkoły manipulistów. Połączenie socjologii z przekładoznawstwem daje zatem interdyscyplinarną perspektywę na zjawiska społeczne.

Słowa kluczowe: habitus, pole, socjologia przekładu, zwrot kulturowy w badaniach nad przekładem