This study shows how crucial translators are as cultural mediators contributing to the fabric of interconnections between countries. W.S.R. Ralston (1828–1889) and Arthur Ransome (1884–1967), mediating Russia through its folklore, left an indelible mark on the British-Russian cultural interaction. Ralston’s Russian Folk-Tales (1873) has long served as an important scholarly source while Ransome’s Old Peter’s Russian Tales (1916) has found its place among children’s classics.
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ABSTRACT

With the ubiquity of translation activity in the modern world followed by the present “boom” in translation studies, there is a growing understanding that translation is an integral part of cultural interaction and mediation while translators are increasingly appreciated as influential agents of the intercultural process in the past and present. This research is focused on the two British translators – W.S.R. Ralston (1828–1889) and Arthur Ransome (1884–1967) – who are considered to be of key importance in the internationalization of the Russian folktale.

A close reading of their translated products first in terms of textual and paratextual agency (visibility) indicates both the general translation approaches and specific translation techniques employed by the translators in rendering the folklore material. In particular, a comparative analysis of the texts has revealed two major tendencies in the British tradition of folklore translation: straightforward and literal translation of a scholarly type (Ralston), with culture specific information pertaining to the original texts presented in numerous notes, references, and commentaries; and an imaginative retelling intended for children (Ransome), with frame stories and further elucidations in the text introduced by the translator to alleviate the foreignness of the Russian magic world.

The next step was to explore their extratextual agency, which required looking beyond the translated texts and into the structures in which their agency was embedded. In particular, this included reconstruction of the translators’ microhistories on the documentary evidence of personal papers, archival and other relevant material, as well as inquiry into the contemporaneous cultural and literary contexts both in England and Russia. Thus, the translators were considered, interpreted, and appreciated as historical subjects engaged in everyday translation work, pursuing cosmopolitan interests, developing intercultural contacts, and renegotiating the structures they were embedded in to finally leave indelible footprints in the history of British-Russian interconnections.

Ralston’s agency was thus examined against the prevailing translation concepts and practices of the late Victorian period, as well as the specialized discussions of folklore issues of the time, which shaped his own translation practice. His letters to Russian correspondents, the only extant translator’s documents, shed light on the microhistory of an ardent cultural mediator he had become thanks to his self-taught Russian, his growing expertise in the field of Russian literature and folklore, and his contacts and friendships with some of the leading men of letters in St Petersburg and
Moscow. His scrupulously accurate translation of Russian folktales, supplemented with a detailed scientific apparatus, served as a principal scholarly source and an informative introduction to the Russian oral tradition up to the mid-twentieth century; remaining of relevance even today. In fact, it was Ralston’s work that inspired, as well as informed Ransome to take up his own translation project. But, in contrast to his predecessor, Ransome intended his fairy book for children, in accordance with the canon of the nineteenth-century popular collections of folklore. The microscopic analysis of the translator’s Russian experience in 1913–1916, via a study of archival material (mostly in Brotherton Collections, University of Leeds Library) and other relevant documents, allowed to reconstruct it in detail, shedding light on the larger picture as well. Ransome’s contribution, the outcome of his intercultural experience, is an interesting and innovative interpretation of the Russian folktale for world audiences, as well as one of the key documents in the history of the British-Russian interaction at the turn of the twentieth century.

Importantly, by way of an active engagement in the cultural mediation between the languages, the peoples, and the worlds, both translators were to become committed intercultural agents and to establish an important folklore link between them. Close observations of their translation activities and intercultural experiences, as well as minute studies of their works, have given a detailed picture of the way the fabric of interconnections is mediated and fostered between cultures and peoples.

**Keywords:** William Ralston, Arthur Ransome, agency, intercultural agent, cultural mediation, folktale, fairy tale, translation history, microhistory, translation strategies and techniques, British-Russian cultural interaction

Heidän käännöstuotantonsa lähiluku tekstuaalisen ja paratekstuaalisen toimijuuden (näkyvyys) kannalta tutkimuksen ensimmäisessä vaiheessa tuo esille sekä käännösten yleiset lähestymistavat että käännöstekniikat, joita kääntäjät ovat käyttäneet kansansatuaineistoa kääntäessään. Erityisesti tekstien vertaileva analyysi on paljas tiedossa kaksi merkittävää suuntaa isobritannialaisessa kulttuurivälityksessä: nauhollinen ja kirjaimellinen käännöksessä (Ralston), jossa alkuperäistä teksteä koskeva kulttuurisoloinnin tieto esitettiin lukuisina huomautuksina ja viitauksina sekä lapsille suunnattu luova uudelleenkerronta (Ransome), jossa kääntäjä esittelee tekstissä kehyskertomuksia ja muita selvennyksiä lieventäen tekstissä käännösviestin kunnioituminen ja maailmaa lähentäen Ison-Britannian ja Venäjän välisten suhteiden historiaan.

Tutkimuksen seuraavassa vaiheessa tutkittiin ekstratekstuaalista toimijuutta, mikä vaati katseen suuntaamista käännetyistä teksteistä niihin rakenteisiin, joihin heidän toimijutensa sijoittui. Tähän kuului erityisesti kääntäjien mikrohistorialoisten rekonskriptio henkilökohtaisen dokumenttien, arkiäsiakirjojen ja muun relevantin aineiston avulla sekä Englannin ja Venäjän tuolloisista kulttuurisista ja kirjallisuudesta tehdyn selvityksen pohjalta. Kääntäjä siis pidettiin, tulkittiin ja arvostettu historiallisina toimijoina, jotka osallistuivat jokapäiväiseen käännöstyöhön, tavoittelivat yleismaailmallisia intressejä, edistivät kulttuurivälisiä kontaktteja ja neuvottelivat rakenteita, joiden osana he olivat, jättääkseen jälkeensä myös jäljellä olevien tietojen ja käännösten käytön ympärillä olevan historialian.

Ralstonin toimijuutta tarkasteltiin siis suhteessa myöhemmen viktoriaanisen ajan jaksollisesti vallinneessa kääntämisessä käsitteisiin sekä senaikaisiin kansansatuisten kysymyksiin erikoistuneisiin keskusteluihin, jotka muokkasivat hänen käännöskäytännönsä. Hänen kirjeensä Venäjälle ovat ainoita tallella olevia kääntäjän dokumentteja, jotka selvensivät tämän hartaan kulttuurinvälittämän ohettavuuden. Sellaisen hänenä olisi tullut venäjän kielen itseopiskelun, kasvavan venäläisen kaukkiralli-suunnut ja kansansatuisten asiantuntelumukset sekä henkilökohtaisen kontakt-
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PART I

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 THESIS FOCUS, IMPETUS AND AIM

This research focuses on two translators – W.S.R. Ralston (1828–1889) and Arthur Ransome (1884–1967) – important actors in the British-Russian cultural interaction at the turn of the twentieth century. To my knowledge, their agency in translation of Russian folklore has not been specially examined, and the significance of their contributions as cultural mediators has not as yet been fully appreciated. The only biography of Ralston, an enthusiastic popularizer of Russian folklore and literature in the West, was written and published in Russia (Alekseev and Levin 1994), where his role was recognized already in the translator’s lifetime. Also, the largely forgotten folklorist has recently attracted some attention as one of the founders of *The Folklore Society* (London, 1878) (Ryan 2009). But, Ralston’s most important translations of Russian folklore, and, in particular, his *Russian Folk-Tales* (1873) have not received all the attention they deserve, especially in terms of translation history studies and history of British-Russian cultural interaction; hence, the present research attempts to fill in the gap. Due attention should also be drawn to Ransome, who stepped in to continue Ralston’s work on building the cultural bridge between the countries with his highly successful *Old Peter’s Russian Tales* (1916). In his younger days, the famous British author of children’s literature that Ransome was to become had spent some ten years in Russia from 1913 to 1925, first, working on his fairy book and, then, as a journalist of the *Daily News* and the *Manchester Guardian*, reporting on the events of the country’s turbulent period. Ransome’s contribution, too, needs to be revisited, especially in the light of the latest theoretical and methodological developments in translation history.

Therefore, this dissertation aims at examining the two translators’ agency in an appropriate comparative mode. This is done, first, by looking into the translated texts

---

2 There seems to be a preference for the term ‘interaction’ to ‘relations’ in the literature in the field (see e.g. Tyulenev 2010), which may be justified if, like here, the purpose is to stress the largely active and reciprocal character of contacts between individuals, groups, and countries. Cf.: interaction as ‘a mutual or reciprocal action or influence’ vs relations as ‘social, political, or personal connections or dealings between or among individuals’ (https://www.collinsdictionary.com).

3 Of relevance for this paper is also an earlier work, the unpublished PhD dissertation by Werner Lauter (1962).

4 Translation history or history of translation is understood here as a branch of translation studies.

5 According to Ransome (1976: 179), “By 1956 more than 24,000 copies had been sold, besides another 25,000 in cheaper editions. These figures do not include American editions”; also, Brogan (1984: 110) points out that “The book was a success from the first, has been more or less continuously in print ever since, and has today attained classic status”.

6 To my knowledge, except for Peter France’s important article (1995) little attention has been given to Ransome’s collection and its social-cultural contexts so far.
to analyze their textual and paratextual agency (visibility). Then, the focus is shifted to the translators’ extratextual agency (visibility) explored against the background of the British-Russian cultural interaction. The examination of the structures in which their translation activity and textual practice were embedded gives a better understanding of their agency. But, also, one gains an important insight into the influence these committed intercultural agents were to exert on these very structures by way of bringing the Russian folktale to British (also to international English-speaking) audiences and thus contributing to its internationalization.

While involved with the past, our initial point of departure, in Anthony Pym’s words, is always ‘the here and now’, the priority of the present ‘highly desirable’ in doing translation history (Pym 2014). My own serious subjective involvement in translation history, even before I became a doctoral candidate of the UEF in Joensuu, can be explained by at least two reasons. First, I thought that I could make use of my specialization in Germanic languages (English and German), the education I received at the Moscow Pedagogical Institute (now University) and the Lomonosov Moscow State University, as well as of my Kalmyk and Russian bilingual and bicultural background. Then, as a foreign language teacher and a translator (with some written translation experience), I have become aware both of the complexity and increasing relevance of intercultural translation landscapes and thought that exploring experiences of this kind in a more sophisticated, academic way might be both worthwhile and interesting.

Importantly, the seemingly plain, and often crude, texts of folktales, now also transformed as more literary and consumer-tailored fairy tales, continue to fascinate both the young and the not-very-young, both those just enchanted and more sophisticated others in search of their ever-escaping meaning. Thanks to facilitators, they often cross borders while international audiences have developed a taste and an appreciation of indigenous and imported popular literature. As general readers and academics mostly agree, these are important and rewarding texts to enjoy and to explore.

---

7 See more on this below in 1.3.

8 According to Richard Bauman (1993: 248), ‘The agents, power relations, media, epistemologies, rhetorics, institutions, and other organizing elements of … national and international folklore arenas are eminently worthy of examination in both historical and contemporary scope’. Of interest is not merely ‘the making available the folkloric materials – texts – to ever-widening audiences of readers’ but mostly ‘the range of means and devices by which an item of folklore is contextualized and recontextualized as relevant to or part of a national-level or international arena of discourse’ (Bauman 1993: 249–250; cf. Roth 1998). Recently there seems to be more and more interest in ‘a full history of textualization for texts claiming orality or traditionality’ (Honko 2000: 3; cf. Foley 1991, 1992), while translations are seen as a necessary part of these processes (Foley 2005: 237). These developments are of relevance for scholars of translation studies involved in translating folklore texts or theorizing about them, including important publications of Maria Tymoczko (1995, 1999) and Jennifer Schacker (2003).

9 Pym (2014) argues that we do translation history in order to express, address and try to solve problems relevant for our own situation; hence, the priority of the present is not only unavoidable but highly desirable; and if humans are to stand at the centre of our object in translation history, then our historiographical subjectivity must also be humanized.
1.2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions I was interested in when starting my work on Ralston’s and Ransome’s translations were as follows: i) What are (if any) specific features of folklore texts to be taken into account by translators in their work? ii) What major linguistic and cultural problems did Ralston and Ransome encounter while translating Russian folktales and how did they deal with them? iii) Who were their intended audiences and what were the strategies they employed to produce the texts to meet their needs and interests? and iv) What were the commonalities and the differences between their approaches and translation styles?

Hence, at its first stage the research was chiefly organized around these four questions and focused on the texts, which were closely examined in terms of the translators’ individual styles and the translation strategies and techniques they employed (articles 1–2).

Of no less relevance and urgency were other research questions as well, such as v) Who were these people and how did they learn the Russian language and develop their interest in the country, people, and folklore? vi) Why did they take up their translation projects (What were their motivations and influences)? and vii) What was the translators’ role in British-Russian cultural interaction?

To deal with these issues, the focus shifted on the translators themselves, while to substantiate the findings of my textual analysis conceptually and methodologically, appropriate frameworks were looked for and found in the agency and translation history studies. Drawing on the concept of agency and case studies of agents in translation history, enhanced by a microhistorical perspective, I have been able to relate the translators in question and their works to their wider contexts in general – the late Victorian age in Ralston’s case and early twentieth century in Ransome’s – and to their professional environments in particular, i.e. the literary and translation issues that the translators were specifically interested in and informed by. This has resulted in a nuanced understanding of their motivations for embarking on their Russian translation projects and then developing close connections with the people and the culture to finally become committed agents of cultural mediation (articles 3–5).

1.3 MAIN CONCEPTS BRIEFLY DISCUSSED

The present work is a further attempt at investigating the agency of translators as creators of texts but also as cultural mediators along the general lines outlined in such key sources as Translators’ Agency (Kinnunen and Koskinen 2010) and Agents of Translation (Milton and Bandia 2009). In the former, there is a working definition of agency as ‘willingness and ability to act’. Willingness, in a broad sense, has to do with ‘a particular internal state and disposition linked to consciousness, reflectivity and intentionality’; hence, entailing moral or ethical undertones. Ability is associated with issues of power, powerlessness, and, also, with the notion of choice. If the Latin origin of agency (agere, or to do) is taken into consideration, it may also be understood as a ‘relational, fluid and constantly evolving series of acts’ located in time and space. Importantly, agency is embedded in structures that are a constraining factor in relation to agency but at the same time the structures are constantly renegotiated by the agents (Kinnunen and Koskinen 2010: 6–8). Agents of translation are therefore responsible for ‘major historical, literary and cultural transitions/changes/innovations’ through
translation; devoting ‘great amounts of energy and even their own lives to the cause of a foreign literature, author or literary school’ (Milton and Bandia 2009: 1–2). They often act as committed cultural mediators establishing and fostering literary and cultural links between peoples and countries (see in detail 3.3).

In examining texts that are raw material in studying translators’ agency, and especially in organizing the data, I draw on a distinction between textual, paratextual and extratextual agency (visibility),11 which Kaisa Koskinnen (2000: 99) introduced in her discussion of ethical issues in translation studies and Outi Paloposki (2009: 191) applies to agency. Textual agency (visibility) would refer to the translator’s voice in the text; the translator’s notes and prefaces, etc., indicate their paratextual agency (visibility), while to tap into their extratextual agency (visibility), a wider corpus of the translator’s documents should be examined, including first and foremost their statements on translation issues. These are usually contained in the prefaces and introductions to the translations in question, but also in the translator’s other works and translations; of much relevance is also biographical material, including archival papers (when available), the translator’s life writings, etc.12 Thus, the textual agency of the translators under study was most visible both in their general translation approaches (strategies) and particular techniques (solutions), i.e. their individual styles, especially when analysed in a comparative mode for commonalities and differences between them. Both Ralston and Ransome were actively engaged in using paratextual elements too; hence, paratextually visible in their own manner. The analysis of their extratextual agency has chiefly been organized around the second series of research questions indicated above (1.2).

Importantly, history of translation is recognized today as ‘a viable independent research area’ with a history of its own (Bastin and Bandia 2006: 2–3; Santoyo 2006; Olohan 2014: 11–14). To become a more broad-based and comprehensive study, however, it should be directed towards exploring interconnections between cultures because ‘history of humanity is expressed in interconnected bodies of writing and experiences’ (Bandia 2006: 51). While texts are seen as the main raw material for ‘letting history come to life’, translators that produce them are increasingly ‘taken into consideration, scrutinized, and elevated as historical subjects’ (Bastin and Bandia 2006: 10).

10 Notably, Pym (2012: 9) proposes that one should translate in order ‘to promote cooperation’. Admitting that the principle is abstract, he argues that it is also ‘situational’ because ‘the nature of cooperation depends on numerous factors specific in each case’.

11 Both terms are used interchangeably in this context.

12 It should be noted that in his book Seuls (1987), translated into English as Paratexts: The Thresholds of Interpretation (1997), Gérard Genette elaborated on devices and conventions, both within a book and outside it, such as titles and subtitles, pseudonyms, forewords, dedications, epigraphs, prefaces, intertitles, notes, epilogues, and afterwords which mediate the work to the reader (Macksey 1997: xviii; Gürçağlar 2011: 113). Paratextual analyses, now part and parcel of translation studies as well, are often employed as a means of situating translated works in their wider socio-cultural context (Deane-Cox 2014: 27). When used by the translator, paratexts, both peritextual (i.e. within a book) and epitextual (i.e. outside a book), are highly relevant in shedding useful light on the visibility of the translator, the target readership, the aim of the translation, etc.

Genette’s elaborate conceptualization of paratextuality was thus thoroughly welcomed in the field and applied in now quite numerous studies of the paratextual features of translations (see, for example, Deane-Cox 2014; Batchelor 2018). At the same time, his remark on the ‘undeniable’ paratextual relevance of translations, particularly of self-translations (1997: 405), was found controversial as reinforcing the conventional hierarchy between the source text and translation and encouraging a disregard of the often independent existence of translated texts in target contexts (Gürçağlar 2011: 114).
The fabric of translation as a cultural practice (as of any other social structure) is the result of interaction and of numerous individual strategies, which can be reconstructed only from close observation, i.e. via a microscopic analysis and an intensive study of the documentary material (Levi 1991: 95; Ginzburg 1993: 33; and Ginzburg 1980). This renders a microhistorical perspective most promising for the particular purposes of investigating translators as cultural agents, as well as for the task of further raising historical awareness of translation historians in general (Adamo 2006: 85). Agency in translation has always to do with environmental factors, professional and otherwise, so that to properly investigate it one has to look into particular contexts and communities in which it is embedded. Importantly, close observations of everyday experiences of individuals and their actual working conditions, by way of examining manuscripts and personal papers to be found in archives, can give an idea of the history of translation in specific socio-historical and cultural contexts, as well as of the picture of cultural interaction (Kinnunen and Koskinen 2010: 9; Munday 2014: 64–65; and Paloposki 2016).

Historicizing the translators of Russian folklore into English required an additional inquiry into the nineteenth-century folklore studies (folkloristics, formerly also Folk-Lore and Folk-lore) both in England and Russia, with a special focus on The Folklore Society discussions of contemporaneous collections of folktales and fairy tales and their audiences. At present fairy tales, ancient or modern, are understood as stories of magic, set in the indefinite past and incorporating traditional themes and materials; they may be about giants, dwarfs, witches, talking animals, and a variety of other creatures, as well as good and bad fairies, princes, poor widows and youngest sons. There is an important distinction between folktales and fairy tales: the former are the traditional tales of the people, ‘folk’, indicating the origin and ‘fairy’, the nature of the story. The expressions ‘fairy tale’ and ‘fairy story’ came into the English language from the term contes de fees, used as a designation of such stories in France at the end of the seventeenth century (Townsend 1974: 90; Carpenter and Prichard 1984: 177–179).

In dealing with their translations of Russian folktales, Ralston and Ransome employed different translation strategies (general approaches as contrasted to microtextual translation techniques employed, or particular solutions to linguistic interface issues encountered), in which they were chiefly guided by the kind of audiences they catered for (see more on strategies below in 3.1). Despite his pronouncements to the contrary, Ralston’s straightforward and literal translations addressed the scholarly community, for which it has been a reliable and accurate source. Conversely, Ransome intended his Russian fairy tales for the younger British reader, which in practice

13 Historicization, in a very basic and broad sense, is described as the attempt to historicize all our thinking about the human and natural world, and “to historicize” means showing how something is the product of history, i.e. the result of historical events or processes’ (Beiser 2016: 43–44).

Notably, Bauman (1993: 250) finds it useful to explore issues of the internationalization of folklore at certain ‘formative moments or periods of in the development of conceptions of folklore; i.e. points at which intellectual frameworks and textual practices in the field have not yet become taken for granted or routinized, but require a degree of exploratory innovation’.
required their rewriting, or writing new stories for unsophisticated audiences,\(^{14}\) that involved devising special textual and paratextual resources of cultural mediation.\(^{15}\)

### 1.4 THESIS STRUCTURE

This dissertation consists of four parts, each consisting of two chapters except for Part IV that comprises the articles, forming the basis of the dissertation.

Part I is divided into two chapters. Chapter 1 provides the introduction to the work and presents the major concepts used; Chapter 2 discusses the methodological issues of the dissertation and its database.

Part II consists of Chapter 3 that introduces the work’s central conceptual frameworks and Chapter 4 that deals with the translators’ biographical data and social-cultural background.

Part III includes Chapter 5 that presents the findings of each of the articles separately and Chapter 6 that contains the conclusion and discussion of the dissertation and draws together the dissertation’s major findings. Also, it presents the work’s theoretical contributions and discusses its limitations. In this section, I also review how the five articles form a coherent whole. Finally, I discuss possible future research avenues based on the findings of the dissertation.

Part IV consists of the articles themselves. The five independent articles form the core of the dissertation; the first three were published in 2010–2013 while the fourth and fifth have appeared in print recently. In these articles, the theoretical foundations of the research are developed and the analyses of the data conducted. The first two articles (in Russian) reflect the research initially begun as the textual analysis of translation products, focusing on strategies and linguistic (lexical and stylistic) features of the texts. The next three articles are associated with the research turn to its major theoretical framework of agency examined through a microscopic lens, with the translators and their texts situated into the structures they were embedded in; the structures, in their turn, to be influenced by their agency of cultural mediators. Hence, the present case studies based on the translators’ reconstructed microhistories further demonstrate the viability of the conceptual framework in terms of translation history studies, as well as shows its potentiality in exploring intercultural spaces, networks, and cultural interaction issues.

\(^{14}\) Defining (after André Lefevere) translation as a form of refraction, a form of writing that is rewriting, Tymoczko (1995: 11–12) finds this framework ‘particularly potent’ for the discussion of the translation of a non-canonical or marginalized literature such as early Irish literature, but also traditional tales.

\(^{15}\) Tiina Puurtinen (1995), for example, argues that translating for children may be even harder than for adults; to succeed, the translator should avoid as much as possible an abundance of foreign names, titles, terms of measurement, complex syntax, etc.; also, M.I. Alekseeva (2011: 79) stresses the fact that the adaptation of folklore material is of a character that is far from trivial, requiring high professionalism and special skills on the part of the children’s author.
In this chapter, I will deal with the practical side of my work by discussing the data and methods that I have used in conducting the research.

As has been mentioned above, initially the focus was largely on the translation products as the two early articles discuss the textual issues of folklore translation, the translators’ practice and styles. The source and target texts on which the analysis is based are key primary sources or ‘primary text products’ (Toury 1995: 65). They are the basic raw material of descriptive translation studies (DTS), the most readily available sources; while ‘more sophisticated studies’ may involve the analysis, where they exist, of multiple translations of a single source text in their socio-historical context of production (Munday 2014: 65). In the present case, for example, the source-target texts comparison (see Tables 1–2) is complemented by the analysis of the English translations between themselves (see Table 3), as well as against the textual practice of the British editors of relevant folklore collections published in the period under study (Tables 5–6). Apparently, when, first, Ralston’s (TT1) and, then, Ransome’s translations (TT2) are examined against their sources (ST), one gets a preliminary idea about their general approaches to the rendering of folklore material. These are also helpfully outlined by Ralston (1873: vii–xi, xi–xii) in the preface, with the list of Russian sources and other references attached to it; while, respectively, Ransome’s brief note opening his fairy book makes it clear for whom his Russian tales, written mostly from memory, are intended. In his only reference to the originals he mentions coloured chap-books, as well as Afanasyev’s great collection, and other solemn, serious volumes of folklorists writing for the learned where one can find these tales or their versions (Ransome 1957: vii). The subsequent close reading of the English texts shows that both translators practice what they preach while a comparative analysis of their English versions to the same Russian tales reveals an even more nuanced picture of their individual translation styles: the great lengths both went to in implementing their translation agendas are especially obvious in this juxtaposition (articles 1–2).

Hence, whenever there is need to refer to Ransome’s elaborate rewriting of the original material (Bogrdanova 2010b, 2012b); it can be most convincingly and conveniently done when presented against Ralston’s “copies”.

A further examination of Ransome’s work, now within a wider British tradition of folklore translations for children, i.e. against the textual frameworks and practices characteristic of the nineteenth-century popular folktale and fairy tale collections, reveals a more discerning attitude, as well as a greater responsibility in presenting the culture-specific character of the Russian folktale (article 2). Thus, in dealing with the first portion of the research questions (see 1.2 above), I have been mainly preoccupied with the translation products, focusing on their textual and paratextual features, examined both in the ST–TT mode and, wherever possible, the TT1–TT2, TT2–TT3 mode as well (tables 3, 5).

---

16 Notably, France too (1995) discusses Ransome’s texts against the background of literal versions of another translation.

17 The findings of this analysis (article 2; also Bogrdanova 2010b, 2012b) open avenues for further research, especially in view of increasing attention given to retranslations (Paloposki and Koskinen 2004; Deane-Cox 2014; and Van Poucke 2018, 2019).
In the light of these findings one cannot wholly agree with Jeremy Munday arguing that DTS limiting themselves to the analysis of the primary text product are dependent on the more or less subjective deductions of the process which underpinned them (Munday 2014: 65–66). However, to understand translations in terms of ‘the ends they serve and the effects they trigger’ (Hermans 2012: 243), i.e. to encompass how translation (as product, process and function) is related to the socio-cultural context in which it occurs, one has to focus on the wider picture (Rosa 2010: 98). Hence, the issues of historicization and translation archeology have been foregrounded at the next stage of the research (articles 3–5).

In the following, I will first give a survey of primary text products that have been used as the research material and briefly describe textual methods employed in the analysis of the material (2.1). The next section (2.2) introduces the microhistorical methodological perspective and archives in historicizing the translators and their work.

### 2.1 PRIMARY TEXT PRODUCTS AND TEXTUAL METHODS

The key primary sources, closely examined in the empirical part of the present work, include *Narodnye russkie skazki A.N. Afanasyeva* [Popular Russian Tales by A.N. Afanasyev] (Moscow, 1984–1985); *Narodnye russkie legendy A.N. Afanasyeva* [Popular Russian Legends by A.N. Afanasyev] (London, 1859), 18 Ralston’s *Russian Folk-Tales* (1873), and Ransome’s *Old Peter’s Russian Tales* (1916) (see also Table 4).

Of the great collections of Russian folktales, published in the latter half of the nineteenth century and the first two decades of the twentieth, first and foremost was that of Aleksandr N. Afanasyev, ‘which in its breadth takes the first place among European collections of folktales’. It was first published in eight fascicles over the years 1855–1863 and subsequently in three volumes, the last edition appearing in 1984 (Haney 2015: xviii). 19 With as many as 640 specimens of tales it is ‘still unsurpassed, so far as quantity is concerned’ (Sokolov 1950: 386). The 1859 publication of Afanasyev’s collection of Russian legends in Moscow followed after it was published by Alexander Herzen in London the same year. According to specialists, these are textually similar editions (Barag and Novikov 1984: 391, 425).

Fifty-one texts fully translated by Ralston (besides short retellings of others) were based on Afanasyev’s collection of folktales, except for four tales borrowed from other sources and four legends from Afanasyev’s collection of legends (Table 1); his references are to the first editions of the Russian folklorist’s works (Ralston 1873: xi; Barag and Novikov 1984: 377, 383, 409).

In contrast to Ralston, Ransome did not indicate any particular folklore collections for his work, though a closer examination of the twenty-one translated texts in his fairy book shows that they were mainly derived from the same Russian source. In particular, according to Ted Alexander and Tatiana Verizhnikova (2003: 50–51), Ransome made use of several contemporaneous folklore collections, including

---

18 The folktales are now available via The Fundamental Digital Library of Russian Literature and Folklore (FEB-web), a repository of primary, secondary, and reference texts designed for scholars (http://feb-web.ru/leben/feb/about1.htm). The facsimile of the London edition of Russian legends is provided by the non-commercial electronic library ‘InWerden’ (see Nikitin-Perenskii 2009).

19 See, for example, Haney (2014) for the life and work of Afanasyev in English.
‘Russian Tales (five volumes), Moscow 1914’, i.e. the fourth edition of *Popular Russian Tales*, edited by A.Y. Gruzinskii (1913–1914). This edition includes an introductory essay devoted to the Russian folklorist’s life and work and also his preface to the second (posthumous) edition of 1873, which was prepared and edited by Afanasyev himself. The same preface and an enlarged biographical essay appear in the latest edition too (Barag and Novikov 1984). Importantly, both essays contain references to Ralston: while Gruzinskii (1913: xlvi) briefly mentions his translation of Russian folktales, Lev G. Barag and Nikolai V. Novikov (1984: 402, 405–406) report in more detail on the translator’s journal publications devoted to the Russian folklorist. In fact, Ralston highly appreciated Afanasyev as the preeminent figure in the Russian letters of the time, which shows among other things in the dedication of his work to the Russian scholar.

While the 1873 edition of Ralston’s book and one of the first editions of Ransome’s were consulted by the present author in the Gladstone’s Library (Hawarden, UK) and the Library of the University of Leeds (UK), respectively, this work mostly draws on their electronic reprints: first, The Project Gutenberg EBooks were used but presently the Internet Archive electronic texts in the PDF format have been consulted to additionally check the data. For example, it turns out that the Internet Archive reprint is based on the first London edition of Ralston’s *Russian Folk-Tales* while The Project Gutenberg provides a copy of an American edition (New York: Hurst), with the original title distorted. But, then, coloured illustrations to Ransome’s book available in The Project Gutenberg Ebook are absent in the 1957 edition of the Internet Archive reprint.

The textual analysis of Ralston’s and Ransome’s translations begins with their examination against the original *skazki* (see Tables 1, 2), supplemented by a close reading of the two translators’ versions of the same Russian tales (Table 3). Also, other English versions were taken into consideration, including two of Ralston’s texts (“Koshchei the Deathless” and “The Norka”) borrowed almost verbatim in Andrew Lang’s *Red Book* ([1890] 1907) and “The Flying Ship”, a version of the Russian tale “Letuchii korabl’” contained in Lang’s *Yellow Fairy Book* ([1894] 1906), which was compared with Ransome’s “The Fool of the World and the Flying Ship”. A more detailed picture of Ralston’s and, especially, Ransome’s individual styles has thus been drawn when analysed against the background of Lang’s editing practice, in particular, and the nineteenth-century practice of compiling and editing folklore material, in general (article 2; Tables 5–6).

As briefly discussed above (1.3), in organizing the analysis of my data I have drawn on a distinction between textual, paratextual and extratextual agency (visibility) (Koskinen 2000: 99; Paloposki 2009: 191). Thus, the translators’ textual agency (visibility) was examined via a comparative analysis method, first, of the source and target texts, i.e. a close parallel reading of the original and its translated version, while paying attention to recurrent patterns in respective renderings, as well as individual treatments of mostly lexical and stylistic features of the source texts. This analysis finally contributes to an understanding of the translators’ strategies in approaching the material and techniques they use in their translation practice, i.e. their distinct translation styles. The preliminary findings are further verified by way of examining

---

20 The Russian National Library (St Petersburg) has one of the early editions of Ransome’s fairy book as well.

21 Page references in this work are to the Internet Archive reprints.
the English versions to the same Russian tales (mostly Ralston’s and Ransome’s translations but also texts from Lang’s anthologies mentioned above) against the background of the textual and editing practice of some of the key nineteenth-century folklore collections.

Of no less importance in terms of studying their textual frameworks and translation practice was the examination of the translators’ paratextual agency. Notably, this aspect only gives enough evidence of the enthusiasm and commitment with which they took their translation task, as well as of their awareness of the difficulties and responsibilities of mediating between the interacting cultures. Thus, besides a substantial scientific apparatus to his book, including the preface with a list of main sources, detailed footnotes and references, and an index, Ralston went so far as to embed the fully translated texts as illustrative material in his own text. This largely represents scholarly commentaries on the ‘principal characteristics’ of the Russian folktale, with additional shorter retellings of other tales provided, and comparisons made with the sources more familiar to his reader, such as, for example, the Grimms’ tales (Ralston 1873: 3–4). When it was Ransome’s turn to introduce the reader into the still new and strange magic world of the Russian folklore, he was obliged to provide a whole framework that included a short note to the reader, an introductory chapter, two interludes and a concluding chapter, besides explanations in the texts of tales themselves. Notably, the visual aspect of Ransome’s book, represented by Dmitri Mitrokhin’s illustrations, greatly assisted the translator’s task of mediating between the two worlds (article 5).

Thus, at the first stage of the research, with its focus on the textual and paratextual agency of the translators in question, a comparative method of reading the texts was quite relevant in supplying the answers to the first series of the research questions I was interested in (1.2 above). The importance of the two translators I am chiefly concerned with was quite apparent, granted the quality of their collections and the role they played in the cultural interaction between the countries. A close reading of the Russian-English, English-English, original and translated texts of a particular folklore genre collected for the purposes of the present research indicates both the translation strategies employed to reach the intended audiences (experts in Ralston’s case and children in Ransome’s), as well as major cultural and linguistic issues they encountered and dealt with in accordance with their own agendas. Importantly, a comparative framework has been particularly useful in revealing the differences of their overall strategies in rendering and interpreting the folklore material and of their translation practice.

At the next stage of the present research, with its focus on what was happening before and after translation per se, the study of the translation products in question and the textual methods employed have to be complemented by further research into the translators’ motivations and of the influences that shaped their translation decisions, as well as of the scope and character of their own contributions. In other words, there was a need for further examination of the nature of their agency (in particular, extratextual agency) and the structures they were embedded in, as well as their own effect on these structures. This required a different set of methods, methods

22 Characteristically, the strangeness of the tales is emphasized again and again; e.g. the TLS review of Russian Magic Tales from Pushkin to Platonov (Chandler 2013) describes it as ‘captivating and enigmatic’ but also notes that the collection ‘surprises and perplexes, inviting us into a world where logic and understanding must yield to imagination’, etc. (Glaser 2013).
allowing to relate the texts and their creators to wider contexts (historicization), on the one hand, and to get a more intimate acquaintance with the translators and their ways of working on the translation projects (archival work and microhistory), on the other hand.

2.2 HISTORICIZING THE TRANSLATOR AND TRANSLATION: MICROHISTORY AND ARCHIVE

According to Theo Hermans, the field now commonly referred to as translation studies includes ‘anyone, of whatever persuasion, with a scholarly interest in any aspect of translation’ (Hermans 2012: 243–244). Researchers may be influenced by various theoretical approaches developed in philosophy, sociology, historiography, linguistics, literary theory, cultural studies, media studies, etc. (Pokorn and Koskinen 2013: 3); hence, ‘the diversity of themes and objects, encompassing a huge array of communicative forms’ is the most characteristic feature of the field (Wolf 2015: xiii).

The present research subscribes to empirical, interdisciplinary approaches to the study of translation, focusing especially on its role in cultural history, which are the general characteristics of DTS (Rosa 2010: 94; also Marinetti 2011). Descriptivism (in opposition to prescriptivism) ‘wanted to study translation as it was’, i.e. ‘as it appears on the ground’; but, also, tries to understand translations in terms of the ends they serve and the effects they trigger. The vast majority of historical research concerning translation is descriptive in this sense (Hermans 2012: 243).

However, with a recent shift from largely descriptive research of historical events and facts to work based on their interpretation, as well as with the development of methodologies grounded in historiography, translation history was recognized as a research area within translation studies with an agenda of its own (Bastin and Bandia 2006: 1–2). This has been found due reflection in encyclopaedias, handbooks, textbooks, and publications in the field, like, for example, The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies (2013) or Researching Translation and Interpreting (2016). Sometimes, though, researchers refer to “histories of translation” rather than to a single and uniform History of Translation in view of the use of alternative methodologies in the field such as microhistory, oral history, or gender-based approaches (Gürçağlar 2013: 135).

As has been mentioned above (1.3), the present historicization of the two British translators of Russian folklore was largely informed by the concept of agency enhanced by a microhistorical perspective. Advocating for a greater historical awareness of translation historians, Sergia Adamo (2006) drew their attention to the method of microhistory (Levi 1991; Ginzburg 1980, 1993) and its potentialities for translation studies. The method is endorsed by other researchers as well; they point out that it is most likely to attract greater attention in the future (Gürçağlar 2013: 140; cf. Wakabayashi 2018).

Indeed, in contrast to quantitative macro-social history, microhistory is essentially based on the reduction of the scale of observation, on a microscopic analysis and an intensive study of the documentary material (Levi 1991: 95). Other advantages are: i) its appeal to a wider public than to the specialist only, ii) its “realistic” character, iii)

23 As far as literary translation alone is concerned, Dirk Delabastita (2011: 73) provides ‘a highly selective and randomly organized list’ in the corresponding reference entry of the Handbook of Translation Studies, which ‘doesn’t even begin to do justice to the abundance of research avenues’ in the field.
its rendering of personal experience, and iv) linking the individual case study with the general socio-historical context (Szijártó 2002: 209). The last two, according to Munday (2014: 75), are most vital for translation studies scholars, with their focus on particular translators, establishing details of their working and living lives, as well as finding out about their interdependence within translation communities. Indispensable in this respect are such resources as archival material, including manuscripts and translators’ personal papers. Despite their somewhat subjective character (that does require careful evaluation), this is valuable testimony into translators’ individual cases, as well as into the history of translation in specific socio-historical and cultural contexts (Munday 2014: 64–65; see also Paloposki 2009, 2016).

2.2.1 Archival Data and Other Sources

The translators’ extra-textual primary sources, such as personal papers, have proved relevant in reconstructing their microhistories and in further illuminating their agency. Other pertinent materials are works and publications by the individuals concerned; their ‘post-hoc accounts’, in the form of memoirs or autobiographies, i.e. ‘overly mediated testimonies’ (Munday 2014: 64); the contemporaries’ memoirs; as well as important secondary sources (chapter 4).

Ralston: In the absence of any British archival material related to Ralston, of special importance was the evidence of his Russian connections. In fact, he was in active correspondence with Russian scholars from 1860s to 1880s. Most of it is published by his Russian biographers: 158 letters to 18 correspondents, supplemented with their Russian translations (Alekseev and Levin 1994: 85-319). Among Ralston’s addressees are such names as I.S. Turgenev, L.N. Tolstoy, V.V. Stasov, Y.K. Grot, I.I. Sreznevskii, M.M. Stasiulevich, etc. The collection of letters is of great value as a source for Russian literary and cultural studies, in general, and the nineteenth-century history of Russian-British literary interaction, in particular. Besides, they contain important autobiographical evidence of special interest for the present research.

Ralston’s other translations were also of relevance, including Turgenev’s famous novel Dvoriankoe gnezdo that appeared in English as Liza; Or A Nest of Nobles (1869);27 Krilof and his Fables (1869); as well as The Songs of the Russian People as Illustrative of Slavonic Mythology and Russian Social Life (1872). Among his other works, Notes on Folk-Tales, the article written for The Folklore Society and published in the Folk-lore Record in 1878, was taken into special account as one of Ralston’s original contributions.

24 In the description of archival data, I have made use of my reports submitted to the UEF Philosophical Faculty after my study trips.

25 Ralston destroyed most of his personal papers not long before his death.

26 In the manuscript sections of the Institute of Russian Literature (the Pushkin House) and of the Russian National Library (St. Petersburg), I examined the autographs of a number of Ralston’s letters while the search for any unpublished material of this kind had to be postponed for another time and project.

27 The author himself thought Liza’ exceptionally well translated’ (Lowe 1983: 73; quoted in Garnett 1991: 95); Constance Garnett who began her famous career as a Russian translator in 1890s with Turgenev’s novels (first Rudin, then A House of Gentlefolk) wrote to Olive Garnett on 10 January 1894: ‘oh! it is difficult. I am amazed now at my impudence in undertaking it, and Ralston is so good, that I must make a decent job of it somehow’ (Garnett 1991: 96).

28 Further in text: The Songs of the Russian People.
to folklore scholarship (Tilney 1976: 319), illuminating the ethical aspects of folklore studies that influenced his translated work as well (article 3).

**Ransome:** During my two-week study trip to the University of Leeds Library (Leeds, UK) in 2014 I concentrated on the research in the Brotherton Special Collections where most of Ransome’s archival materials are kept. While examining his diaries, notebooks, as well as manuscripts (MS) and typescripts (TS), I was particularly interested in the period before his first trip to Russia in 1913 and the following two to three years; I was searching for the clues that prompted the trip in the first place and also for detail of his everyday life and experiences while in Russia working on his folklore translation project. However, the entries in the diaries from 1911 to 1919 that I looked through were as scant as possible, often containing a sentence or two at most; these might have served as mere memory signposts for the diarist to reconstruct the whole picture. Important as first-hand evidence concerning some dates and names, they were lacking detail, let alone confessions and intimations of inner thoughts and feelings, etc. that might be expected from such papers. The only exception was probably a MS titled *Flight to Russia* (*Running away*), where Ransome gives some detail of his personal circumstance preceding his Russian trip.

Of certain interest were also the MS and TS drafts of the folktales contained in the box of Ransome’s early writings, including “Concerning the Poor Man Covetous” (Jewish-Caucasian, as indicated in pencil), “The Costly Ring” (Georgian-Mingrelian), “The Two Mountains”, “Bel and Belita”, and “How the Dog Sought a Master for Himself” (Mingrelian). These were mostly translations from *Kavkazskie skazki* [*Fairy Tales of the Caucasus*], collected and related in Russian from a number of national traditions; and published in several issues in Moscow in 1904–1906. Ransome translated them in 1913–1914 from Russian as was indicated at least in one case (“Bel and Belita”). These were his first attempts, which evidence both his serious interest in folklore from Russia and the progress he made in learning the language during his first three-month trip to the country in 1913. These, as well as other folklore material like short stories Ransome wrote to illustrate proverbs in 1910, were of interest as part of his numerous efforts at mastering the technique of the narrative.

During my second short visit to the Brotherton Special Collections I focused on Ransome’s correspondence with his mother. These proved to be a rich source for the autobiographical detail and his translation practice (see 4.2).

The studies in the archive and in the library in Leeds gave me a sufficiently good idea about the translator’s personality and his motivations in taking up Russian

---

29 The latter were related to *The Autobiography of Arthur Ransome* that he was to write later in life (Ransome 1976); further in text *The Autobiography*.

30 Ransome himself bemoaned the absence of detailed recordings in his diaries while working on *The Autobiography*: ‘I regret now that I have never kept a proper diary... I have nothing but staccato notes to stimulate my wretched memory’ (Ransome 1976: 174).


32 ‘...bad linguist as I am, I was able at the end of a very few weeks to begin filling notebooks with rough translations of stories from the Russian. The first of these were more or less word-for-word translations into English from a good collection of Caucasian tales’ (Ransome 1976: 162).

33 Unfortunately, the archive contained no material pertaining to *Old Peter’s Russian Tales*.

34 This short visit to Leeds was made while attending the “Mobilities and Place” Symposium organized by The Liverpool Travel Seminar in Liverpool (the UK) on 9 May 2015 to give my presentation *To Russia for Escape and Magic: Arthur Ransome’s Russian Works*.
folklore materials to write his fairy book. Importantly, they indicated that it was only at first sight that his ‘escape’ to Russia seemed to have been a sudden decision dictated by personal circumstance. In fact, it was quite logical in view of his long-standing interest in folklore and his efforts at mastering the technique of the narrative which were to consummate in his first best-selling book of Russian tales.

Study trips to St Petersburg and Moscow in 2015 were undertaken to continue exploring Ransome’s Russian network. Importantly, in the Russian State Archive of Literature and Arts (RGALI) in Moscow I was able to examine papers related to the Russian artist Mitrokhin who illustrated Ransome’s fairy book and was actively involved in an artistic lifestyle in St Petersburg in 1908–1917. Of special interest proved to be the 1960s correspondence between the artist and the writer (article 5).

Also, Ransome’s early (now out of print) works, including his French translation, as well as his biographies, and memoirs of the period were important sources used in the present paper (see chapter 4).

---

35 The data collected during my trips to Leeds was used in writing two of my recent articles (4 and 5).
36 Part of my plan was a visit to Vergezha (Novgorodskai Oblast’), where in 1915 Ransome stayed at his friends’ place to complete his translation project, but it was realized later. On 17 September 2016, a group of British enthusiasts, members of The Arthur Ransome Society (TARS) and I, witnessed very little that remained of the village that had suffered heavy damage and severe human losses during the last war.

I am indebted to Aleksandr Andreevich Khodiakov, Director of Chudovskii local museum for assistance in organizing this trip.
PART II

3 THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES TO HISTORICIZING THE TRANSLATOR

This chapter deals with the theoretical premises that informed the focus of the present research, which shifted from textual analysis of translation products to issues related to the translator as an intercultural agent and a cultural mediator.

3.1 STRATEGIES: WHY TRANSLATE AND HOW TO TRANSLATE

At this point it may be necessary to indicate, even if briefly, those of the conceptualizations of strategies, which are of particular relevance for the present project, especially in view of the confusion in the literature regarding the terminology and the concept.37 Helpful for the present discussion are, for example, Yves Gambier’s introductory remarks on the subject in his article in the Handbook for Translation Studies (2010: 412). Gambier points out that the difference (in military terms) between strategy as a planned, explicit, goal-oriented procedure or programme, adopted to achieve a certain objective and tactics as a locally implemented sequence of steps,38 remains relevant for the use of the terms in translation studies. What is happening before or after translation per se refers to the domain of strategies, and this should be differentiated from tactics in a translation act. Munday (2013: 22) argues that the distinction is important even if sometimes blurred in the literature, defining strategy as ‘the overall orientation of a translated text’, which is to be kept apart from procedures, specific techniques used at a given point in a text. Still others (e.g. Jääskeläinen 2009, Kearns 2011) differentiate between global and local strategies; global strategies ‘contain general guidelines, plans and principles which are used to govern local strategies relating to problem-solving and decision-making of individual ST items’ (cf. Hönig and Kußmaul 1982; quoted in Jääskeläinen 2009: 380). It seems that the overall (global) orientation of the translated text largely depends on what is happening before or after translation per se, or on ‘higher-level text-related phenomena, such as translation policies’ (Jääskeläinen 2009: 377).

According to Lawrence Venuti, cultural, economic, and political factors play their role in the translator’s basic decision-making, such as choosing a foreign text to translate and developing a method to translate it.39 The different strategies that have

37 Pym (2012: 6) suggests that it may be worthwhile to explore the question ‘Why translate?’ instead of the basic question ‘How should I translate?’ But, in fact, it is difficult to separate the two because they are closely related.

38 Cf.: ‘a teleological course of action undertaken to achieve a particular goal in an optimal way’ (Kearns 2011: 282).

39 Cf.: His or her decision not to translate a certain kind of texts may also inform of the translator’s activity in strategic terms (Kearns 2011: 284; emphasis added); cf. Pym’s discussion of the question ‘Why translate?’(Pym 2012: 6–12).
emerged since antiquity may be divided into two large categories: domesticating in case of translation projects that conform to values currently dominating the target-language culture or foreignizing ones, ‘motivated by an impulse to preserve linguistic and cultural differences by deviating from prevailing domestic values’ (Venuti 2001: 240). The former have ‘their strongest and most influential advocates in the French and English translation traditions, particularly during the early modern period’ (e.g. Nicolas Perrot D’Ablancourt and Sir John Denham among many others) (Venuti 2001: 241). The latter go back to Friedrich Schleiermacher and his ideas of two possible translating methods: either the translator leaving the author in peace, as much as possible, and moving the reader toward him; or the translator leaving the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moving the author toward him (Lefevere 1992: 149). Schleiermacher himself preferred a foreignizing strategy, i.e. sending the reader abroad and thus ‘making the translated text a site where a cultural other is manifested’ but manifested in terms of the target language because even if evoking a sense of the foreign foreignizing translation answers a domestic situation (Berman 1985: 87–91; quoted in Venuti 2001: 241–242).\(^\text{40}\) Categorizing a translation project as domesticating or foreignizing, however, requires a detailed reconstruction of the cultural situation in which it was produced and consumed like, for example, in the case of Frances Newman’s foreignizing translation of *The Iliad* (1856) as opposed to the prevailing critical opinion defended by Matthew Arnold in his Oxford lectures *On Translating Homer* (1860) (Venuti 2001: 243; Venuti 2004: 118–140). It is precisely such convincing reconstructions in Venuti’s *The Translator’s Invisibility* that are the main attraction of the book for the present paper.

It should be noted, too, that Venuti’s program of foreignization has been much criticized for ‘the non-systematic use of concepts and the belligerent rhetoric’ (among other things) but, nevertheless, the influence of his work on modern translation studies has been widely recognized (Paloposki 2011: 40).\(^\text{41}\) In particular, it is acknowledged that besides initiating a discussion of important theoretical and methodological issues in the field he ‘has given impetus to a wealth of research testing his claims’. Paloposki’s information based on a key-word survey of *Translation Studies Bibliography and Translation Studies Abstracts* indicates that the scope of research along the lines covers ‘dozens of empirical studies, from Brazil to China’ (Paloposki 2011: 40). Interestingly, Russia seems to be an exception, according to Hannu Kemppanen who points out an infrequent use of Venuti’s concepts in Russian publications in the field and a preference given to traditional divisions between literal and free strategies (Kemppanen 2012: 60); Alexandra Borisenko (2012) gives further detail on the fear of foreignization in the ‘Soviet school’ of the Russian literary translation tradition.

Notably, the existing research in the field seems to confirm that pure and homogeneous translations are exceptions rather than the rule. The concepts of domestication and foreignization may be convenient as ‘shorthand’ to describe two opposite ways (strategies) of translating, but their largely ‘abstract character’ should be kept in mind when applied in empirical studies (Paloposki 2011: 40–41). An interesting attempt to operationalize Venuti’s concept of foreignization has recently been made in Piet Van Poucke’s paper, along other such efforts in *Domestication and Foreignization*

\(^{40}\) “...the impossibility of a translation ever being only foreignizing is evident in Venuti’s reading” (Paloposki 2011: 40; emphasis in text).

\(^{41}\) For a survey of critical responses see, for example, Myskja (2013).
in Translation Studies (2012) cited above. In his opinion, qualitative analysis, generally helpful in disclosing the domesticating or foreignizing character of a translation, may be furthered by quantitative methods; these taking into account the different levels at which translation strategies interfere in the original text during the process of translating. A clear distinction in this respect is made between strategies and shifts; the latter understood as the changes which occur in translation, i.e. ‘departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from the SL to the TL’ (Catford 1965: 73; quoted in Van Poucke 2012: 141). While there are different taxonomies for translation shifts (also designated as procedures, methods, solutions, etc.), Van Poucke (2012: 141) is probably one of the first to suggest their further differentiation into foreignizing (SL-oriented) and domesticating (TL-oriented), alongside an earlier Vinay and Darbelnet classification of direct or literal and oblique shifts and a number of others discussed in the paper (Van Poucke 2012: 141–143). In his opinion, translation shifts may be arranged into four or five larger fields, such as Strong Foreignization (F), Moderate Foreignization (f), Moderate Domestication (d), Strong Domestication (D) and Neutral Translation (0); each of the fields containing one or more shifts. For example, on the lexical-semantic level strong foreignizing shifts will be all forms of borrowing, including transcription, transliteration, loanwords, etc. Conversely, when there is no trace of the ST in the translation, neither of the original form, nor the original meaning, the translation shift is strongly domesticating (including e.g. all kinds of mutations such as additions, deletions or radical changes of meaning, etc.) (Van Poucke 2012: 144–147). The suggested scheme is verified on the basis of three (two Dutch and one English) translations from Dostoevsky, the results allowing for clear conclusions on the degree of foreignization. In fact, the statistical data confirms preliminary ideas on the foreignizing strategy employed by the Dutch translators; while Garnett’s English translation is found less balanced (with over a dozen omissions, which are strongly domesticating shifts, against about several dozens of literalisms and cases of Russian word order left unchanged). The quantitative model thus proves to be quite reliable in measuring foreignization when applied to small corpuses, although there are a number of reservations indicated too (Van Poucke 2012: 154–156).

Clearly, translators have to deal with, at least, the two key questions (‘Why translate?’ and ‘How should I translate?’) before the translation act itself and thus formulate their strategies (general approaches) to the material being translated, which often informs their subsequent textual practices. This basic decision-making largely depends on translators’ motivations and aims, as well as their social-cultural contexts; and it is through textual practices closely observed (after the translation act) that an idea may be formed of strategies adopted and of their implementation in the texts. However, the findings of textual analysis need to be corroborated with further research, this time, into translators’ extratextual agency. And it is by way of historicizing the creators of texts and their translations that it becomes possible to draw a more detailed and nuanced picture of translation strategies involved, in particular, and history of translation, in general.

\[42\] In cases of descriptive-qualitative research, like the present one, Van Poucke’s strongly foreignizing and strongly domesticating translation shifts may, still, be useful as clear indicators of the strategies involved in translations (see below in 5.1 and 5.2).
3.2  HISTORY AND TRANSLATION HISTORY: A DIALOGUE

Georges Bastin and Paul Bandia (2006: 2–3) linked the recent progress in the history of translation (an independent research area within translation studies) with a shift to research based on the interpretation (rather than mere description) of events and historical facts within the frameworks of otherness, ideology, manipulation, and power, as well as with furthering its links with contemporary historiography. Translation historians’ duty is seen as ‘two-pronged’: while dealing with translation-related discourses, they should be keeping abreast of the latest theories and methodologies in the academic discipline of history (Bandia 2006: 46). Also, Ann Malena (2011: 88, 105) argues that translation scholars have to think like historians, familiarizing themselves with methods used by historians to interpret the differences of the past and to define their own philosophical position with regards to history.

However, a recent Forum discussion in Translation Studies (Vol. 5, no. 2, 2012) has shown that the task of reconciling translation studies and history may not always be easy (Hermans 2012: 244). Christopher Rundle, for example, perceives the tension between the two, pointing out that, on the one hand, the research embedded in the relevant historiography may become less enlightening for other translation scholars who are not familiar with this historiography. On the other hand, if too deeply ingrained in translation studies, it may be of less relevance to the historical field it attempts to contribute to. In other words, as a result of immersion in a given historical field, translation historians may end up having more in common with historians than with other scholars in translation studies. Their interest in a historical subject, rather than a more abstract interest in translation, will ‘inevitably’ draw them to historians interested in the subject (Rundle 2012: 232, 236).

In his response to Rundle’s paper Theo Hermans argues that translation history works on reconstructing the historical background of the discipline but at the same time contributes to history shedding light on historical contexts from its own specific perspective. In fact, to appreciate the role of translation in a particular historical configuration, one needs to have a sense of how translation was practiced and perceived at the time; without knowledge of its history, translation in history cannot be understood. Thus, translation history is a part of the study of history as such and one can work on it in more ways than one, and the insights gained may benefit more than one community (Hermans 2012: 244–245).

According to Delabastita (2012: 246), for all its ‘perfect intuitive sense’, one cannot completely agree with Rundle’s position paper, which ‘very much overstates the case’. Even if there is a tension between history focusing more on the specifics of the translation project being investigated and translation studies aiming for more general models of translation, the forces that are seemingly pulling in opposite directions, it is still the task of the scholar to keep the dialogue going between the two. Moreover, the tension is conducive to in-depth historical understanding.

Delabastita (2012: 246–248) builds his arguments on logical interdependence that exists between generality and specificity. For all their uniqueness, it is against the background of recurrent features that historical events stand out, while, conversely, this background becomes more visible against the specificities of historical events and facts. Translation studies proves indispensable, because it provides a metalanguage giving ‘a firmer grip on the differences and similarities, and also because it offers hypothetical narratives to help us make sense of any patterns that may appear’. In his opinion, one cannot overestimate in this respect the importance of the historical
frameworks presented by descriptive translation scholars and despite all his critical argument Rundle owes much to the same frameworks. While addressing the full range of translational action from individual agency and idiosyncratic behaviour to strong regularities, DTS can accommodate a wide range of explanatory hypotheses. Any historically oriented research project will require both a relentless historical focus on texts and their immediate contexts, and a willingness to interrogate the historical data with the help of a range of theoretical perspectives, including those offered by translation studies. In fact, Delabastita concludes, all translation research requires thorough historical contextualization and historians require more rather than less of the expertise conventionally associated with translation scholars.

For his part, Paul St. Pierre (2012: 241–242) argues that numerous case studies, as well as the work of researchers who are interested in defining trends and tendencies within particular contexts, do place an emphasis on the specificity of the contexts in which the translations are produced. As he points out, in his earlier work (1993) he suggested that translations should be considered as ‘regulated transformations’ (rather than accurate or inaccurate reproductions) of their source texts, while their relation to their originals depend on the contexts. The contextual nature of the translations, recognized in such approaches, makes it possible to connect translations to the historical events and structures prevalent within the cultures producing them.

Thus, for all the tension that may arise between the two duties of translation history scholars, it is clear that they should keep the dialogue going between translation-related discourses and the academic discipline of history in order to reach in-depth historical understanding. Also, there is every reason to approach ‘interconnected bodies of writings and experiences’ from the perspective of translators as key agents of cultural interaction and mediation, often remaining roughly sketched or simplified. To make sense of translators as historical subjects involved in the interconnecting work, one should look into the possibilities that may be opened by a microhistorical perspective as one of the effective methods used by historians since the 1970s.

### 3.2.1 Microhistorical Perspective to Translators’ Agency

In his survey of the twentieth century historiography, Georg Iggers (1997: 14) associates ‘a human face’ acquired recently by history with new attention given to individuals, particularly to the ‘common folks’. The study of macrohistorical and macrosocial processes has been replaced by microhistory, concentrating on small social units consisting of concrete individuals. The view of history as ‘a grand narrative in which the many individuals are submerged’ is substituted by that of ‘a multifaceted flow with many individual centers’. What matters now is not history but histories, or stories, of individuals; however, it is also clear that microhistory cannot stand without a macrosocial context (Iggers 1997: 103, 105). Moreover, Francesca Trivellato (2011: 12–14) sees the possibilities for links between microhistory and global history in a number of Northern American studies where reconstructions of individuals’ lives lead to establishing ‘the multiple and overlapping connections across cultures and groups from the perspective of the actors involved in them’. The protagonists of these

---

43 For a recent example of such dialogue opportunities see Rundle and Rafael (2016).
“global microhistories” are individuals who often come from minority groups that were bound to be on the move and played a role as linguistic and cultural interpreters.

Special attention within the new movement was given to documents and archives. But besides a rethinking of issues regarding sources, microhistory has enhanced an awareness of the narrative nature of history in relation to the subjective position of the historian and redefined the relationship with the past, seeing it as a fragmentary dialogue. Notably, the new methodological and theoretical conception of history, according to Sergia Adamo (2006: 81–85, 96), can pose a number of challenges and hints to the history of translation; in particular, the microhistorical goal to discover or rediscover previously neglected subjects resonates with a general concern of translation histories often concerned with the neglect of translation’s role as a cultural practice and of translators as cultural agents. The link is probably most obvious in studies with a focus on translators’ agency constrained by structures in which their agency is always embedded, but also renegotiated by them (Kinnunen and Koskinen 2010). Within microhistorical framework, too, any social structure is seen as the result of interaction and of numerous individual strategies, i.e. negotiation, manipulation, choices and decisions in the face of a ‘normative reality which, though pervasive, nevertheless offers many possibilities for personal interpretations and freedoms’; and this fabric can be reconstituted only from ‘close observation’ (Ginzburg 1993: 33; Levi 1991: 93–94).

Thus, like in microhistorical works, in translation studies the focus is on individuals, human actors, their agency explored against the surrounding practices and professional environments in which it is embedded. Hence, it is the study of particular material contexts and communities that gives a deeper understanding of translators’ agency (Kinnunen and Koskinen 2010: 8–9). To illustrate, in his reconstruction of translators’ network and their narrative agenda, Pekka Kujamäki (2010) explores the agency of mediators between Finland and Germany through its embeddedness in the ideological and political structures of the first half of the twentieth century, making use of archival material. In Agents of Translation (Milton and Bandia 2009) the protagonists’ agency, including their renegotiating of the contemporaneous structures, leads to major historical, literary and cultural transitions, changes, and innovations like, for example, in Denise Merkle’s and Carol O’Sullivan’s contrasting stories of two such agents. Merkle (2009: 85, 90) argues that the monopoly of the circulating libraries was undermined thanks to translation and publishing activities of intercultural agents like Henry Vizetelly, introducing to the British book market inexpensive editions. However, in late Victorian England, with ‘delicacy and aversion to bawdiness’ becoming an obsession, he is sent to prison for an attempt to introduce popular translations of Zola for the general readership and dies a broken man. In the same moral climate an agent ‘much more attuned to the Victorian mind’ finds ways to negotiate ‘canons of respectability’ to get away with publishing some of the more notorious works of European literature to a wide readership. Henry G. Bohn, according to O’Sullivan, was also a pioneer in the publishing of translated classics for the general market, establishing for the purpose his ‘Standard’ and ‘Classical Libraries’ in the late 1840s.

44 125 leading men of letters signed the petition against the publisher’s imprisonment (Vizetelly 1904: 298; Phelps 1956: 29), including Ralston, Vizetelly’s friend who assumingly advised the firm on its Russian publications. Conversely, Andrew Lang, Ralston’s fellow-folklorist (see below 4.4) and George Eliot with whom Ralston was on friendly terms, were among moralists who ‘targeted aggressively’ the English translations of Zola’s novels (Merkle 2009: 98).
The key criterion in the ‘Standard Library’ translations was fidelity; similarly, the ‘Classical Library’ offered straightforward literal prose translations both for students and those readers who were not sufficiently fluent in the classical languages. The literalism of translations in Bohn’s series was a reflection of the prevailing attitude to classical source texts; they were always attributed and translators’ prefaces and notes were standard (O’Sullivan 2009: 108, 111–112).

Another study of special relevance for the present discussion is Paloposki’s exploration of the agency of the translator, based on archives, manuscripts, and translator papers. It is an interesting parallel to the present work in terms of the attitudes and perceptions of particular Russian authors (such as Turgenev, whose works were translated by Ralston) and Russian literature, in general, in the period between the end of the nineteenth and mid-twentieth centuries’ Finland. This microscopic investigation of two Finnish translators reconstructs their routines and decision-making via personal papers, such as their correspondence, found in important archives. Samuli Suomalainen (1850–1907) introduced, among other things, Russian literature to Finns, which was, despite geographical proximity, ‘almost completely unknown and/or ignored’ at the time. His 1882 translation of Mertvye Dushi (Dead Souls) by Nikolai Gogol, marked with the first prize in a competition for translated literature, was a great success; recognized as classical, it is still read today alongside new translations that appeared later. He also translated Turgenev, Tolstoy, and Gorky (Paloposki 2009: 194–195). Interestingly, Turgenev’s special symbolism for Suomalainen was that he was ‘an admirer of the West’; and it was thanks to portraying the author as a Westerner that the translator managed to introduce him to the Finnish reader, when Russian literature was not ‘universally favored’ in the country (Paloposki 2009: 198).

At a later period, Juhani Konkka (1904–1970) was to become one of the most prolific translators of Russian literature into Finnish (and awarded a prize for his translations by the Soviet Writers’ Union). In addition to classics, Konkka translated Soviet writers; so that for some time, he was ‘the personification of Russian literature in Finnish’ (Paloposki 2009: 198–203).

These are illustrative examples of agency studies taken into account in the present dissertation with a similar conceptual basis; they are of interest here, first of all, for their microhistorical perspective on individual intercultural agents. Besides, Merkle’s and O’Sullivan’s papers contained informative details of the nineteenth-century publishing scene and translation policies in England, i.e. the surrounding practices and professional environments in which Ralston’s agency was embedded (in about half a century Ransome would practice a different translation strategy).  

3.3 TRANSLATORS AS CULTURAL MEDIATORS

Importantly, microhistorical perspectives help draw much more nuanced pictures of translators playing an active role in interactions between countries and cultures. Thanks to their contributions to ‘interconnected bodies of writings and experiences’, they are increasingly recognized as important cultural mediators.

The term was first introduced in cross-culture research (Taft 1981: 53; quoted in Katan 1999: 12); a cultural mediator defined as ‘a person who facilitates communication,  

45 See 4.3 below.
understanding, and action between persons and groups who differ with respect to language and culture’. His/her mediating role consists in establishing and balancing this communication; hence, the mediator ‘must be able to participate to some extent in both cultures’, i.e. ‘to be to a certain extent bicultural’. Cultural mediators should thus have a number of competences in both cultures, including knowledge of societies (history, folklore, traditions, values, etc.); communication (verbal, non-verbal), technical (e.g. computer literacy, dress codes, etc.), and social skills (knowledge of social conventions, etc.).

Also, one of the recent EST State-of-the-Art Research Reports locates translation within the Intercultural Communication, translation seen as mediation (Fina 2013; emphasis in text). While the terms ‘intercultural’ and ‘cross-cultural’ are often used interchangeably, the paper makes a distinction between the two fields, discussing their differences. Cross-cultural communication is a major part of Intercultural Communication but the latter implies interaction between cultures and the former is largely comparative, including comparisons of communication across cultures. Importantly, most scholars agree that translation is a communicative act (e.g. Hatim and Mason 1997; Schäffner 2003 among others) and, also, an intercultural communicative act: from Newmark (1995: 2) suggesting ‘translation mediates cultures’ to Pym (2003: 7) describing it as a ‘relatively high-effort high-cost mode of mediated cross-cultural communication’ (quoted in Fina 2013).

The concepts and terms ‘mediator’ and ‘mediation’ may have been in use in translation studies for some time but it is only recently that the terminology has been elaborated in some detail. In Roig-Sanz and Meylaerts’ opinion (2018: 6–8), Translation Studies and Cultural Transfer Studies, have paid increasing attention over the last decade to the role of the social and cultural agents who are involved in the process of intercultural interaction. The translator as a mediator between cultures came to the fore, with the 1980s cultural turn in translation studies, with its emphasis on the cultural context of the translated texts rather than on the linguistic equivalence between source and target text. They argue that this focus was, however, rather general and no attempt was made at conceptualizing mediators in terms of their ‘plural and overlapping transfer roles’ such as writers, and translators, and art and literary critics, and publishers, and journalists, etc. In accordance with their ‘innovative conceptual and methodological understanding’, the cultural mediator is defined as ‘a cultural actor active across linguistic, cultural and geographical borders, occupying strategic positions within large networks and being the carrier of cultural transfer’ (Roig-Sanz and Meylaerts 2018: 3–4). One of the most convincing case studies in this respect is

---

46 Cf.: ‘translation is a major form of cultural activity that involves language interface, cultural mediation, restructuring of perspective, challenges to existing norms, and importation of difference’ (Tymoczko 2003: 31).

47 Notably, one of Pym’s recent works has the title On Translator Ethics: Principles for mediation between cultures, while no straightforward discussion of the term ‘mediation’ follows in the text; Kujamäki (2010: 1), too, gives an interesting case of mediating practice in the first half of the 20th century without defining explicitly the terms in question.

48 According to Snell-Hornby (2018: 144), the “cultural turn” proved to be one of the central concepts of the new discipline of translation studies and has remained the most marked “turn” it has taken (emphasis in text). Michaela Wolf (2015: 14) points out that ‘it was the “cultural turn” in the humanities and sciences more generally that brought about a really profound transformation in concepts, models and methods’.

49 Cf. with an earlier definition: “The translator is first and foremost a mediator between two parties for whom mutual communication might otherwise be problematic...” (Hatim and Mason 1990: 224).
an earlier paper by Meylaerts in collaboration with Gonne (2014) “Transferring the city – transgressing borders: Cultural mediators in Antwerp (1850–1930)”, which contains a thick description of the two cultural mediators operating against the background of the Antwerpian culturally and linguistically diverse milieu. In Roig-Sanz and Meylaerts’ approach translation thus seems to be only one of the aspects cultural mediators are involved in, with particularly diverse social-cultural contexts playing a major role in their positionings and repositioning in the networks, as well as in their complex transfer activities.

It is precisely the complexities of cultural translation that is one of the major themes in Tymoczko’s *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators*. Pointing out that cultural differences have become ‘the most explosive issues’ today, she indicates that cultural mediation is moving to the centre of concern in translation studies (Tymoczko 2007: 245). In this respect, her ‘holistic approach to translating culture’, i.e. considering ‘the entire scope of cultural underpinnings that come into play in the specific source text being translated’ is meant to guide the translator in the decision-making process about how to manage and convey cultural differences (Tymoczko 2007: 234). The ‘holistic approach’ is thus designed to promote the translator’s agency in choosing a translation strategy and in executing that strategy effectively so that translators give broader, deeper and more cohesive representations of the source culture; hence, empowering them in their role of cultural mediators (Tymoczko 2007: 247–249).

When practices of intercultural mediation realized in translation are specifically examined, the researcher’s focus shifts to translated (target) texts. Anthony Liddicoat (2015), for example, argues that the mediation process is, on the one hand, ‘mediation for the self’ and, on the other hand, ‘mediation for others’; the former involves aspects internal to the translator and the latter associates with the aspects that appeals to the reader of the target text. This is a further development of the idea that intercultural mediation is a relational and interpretative activity and intercultural mediators are engaged both in analysing the meanings of others constructed within cultural framings and in providing those who do not share a cultural framing with the means to understand diverse others (Gohard-Radenkovic et al 2004; quoted in Liddicoat 2015) Notably, the act of translation is seen as a form of intercultural mediation that operates on texts, relocating them within other literary traditions. In rewriting the text for target audiences, the translator mediates the language of the source text being translated, as well as its cultural context.

Earlier, Hatim and Mason (1990: 242) defined mediation as the extent to which text producers and receivers feed their own beliefs into their processing of a given text. They argue that the translation of intertextual references may supply a useful insight in this respect: a Shakesperian reference, for example, might involve minimal mediation by those who share a Western culture, but maximal mediation for readers from other cultural background. Given their central position in the process of intercultural communication and the responsibilities involved, translators, equipped with not only a bilingual ability but also a ‘bi-cultural vision’, mediate between cultures, ‘seeking

---

50 For an incisive treatment of the concept of cultural translation see Michaela Wolf (2015: 19–26).
51 For more detail and examples, see her earlier work as well (Tymoczko 1999).
52 Cf. ‘mediation for self’ and the translator as a ‘privileged reader of the SL text’: “Unlike the ordinary ST or TT reader, the translator reads to produce, decodes in order to re-encode” (Hatim and Mason 1990: 224).
53 Also, see Liddicoat and Scarino (2013).
to overcome those incompatibilities which stand in the way of transfer of meaning’ (Hatim and Mason 1990: 223–224).

Thus, one can see that the issues of cultural mediation, including the role of translators as cultural mediators have recently been given more attention in translation studies but, still, with few exceptions, conceptualizations and wider discussions of the terms and concepts involved are lacking. This interest might have been stimulated and inspired by parallel studies in the neighbouring fields of intercultural communication, cross-cultural communication, foreign language teaching, cultural transfer studies, etc. Conversely, translation seen as a form of intercultural mediation seems to attract the attention of the scholars in these very disciplines as well. As our brief overview has shown, the role of translators in cultural mediation may be approached from the perspective of their i) multifarious functions of cultural mediators within diverse cultural environments; ii) important decision-making process prior to the translating act; and iii) textual mediation practices.

The present study of the two British translators of Russian folklore that began with the examination of their textual practices expanded to explore their extratextual agency in becoming cultural mediators. The subsequent close observation of the translators’ motivations against the translation and wider cultural frameworks that informed their approaches to the material they chose to translate, as well as of their practice in textual mediation, helps draw a picture of the responsible agents cultivating an awareness of cultural differences and realizing the entailing responsibilities in their translation and other activities.
4 TRANSLATORS AGAINST THEIR SOCIAL-CULTURAL BACKGROUND

Russia long remained a distant and strange country for the British. In fact, it took more than three centuries (from the sixteenth to the nineteenth) before Russian culture achieved ‘wide recognition in Britain, both for its distinctive nature and for the significant contribution and enrichment that it was seen to bring to western literary and artistic endeavours’. It was after the Crimean war that this process gained the momentum, leading to the ‘Russian Fever’, that over the years 1890–1930 developed, peaked and ebbed away to be replaced by the challenge of the Soviet Union (Cross 2012: 1–2). According to Donald Davie, ‘the awakening of the Anglo-Saxon people to Russian literature’ happened in the period between 1885 and 1920; and it was ‘a turning point no less momentous than the discovery of Italian literature by the generations of English Renaissance’ (Davie 1990: 276; quoted in Bullock 2016: 20–21). Importantly, Philip Bullock points out that readers turned to initially a small, but increasing, number of translations in order to learn more about the culture and history of the opponent in the wake of the Crimean war (Bullock 2016: 21). Translation became more systematic in the mid-1880s, ‘inspired’, according to Beasley and Bullock (2011: 283–284), by the combined factors of Turgenev’s popularity in the United States and the publication of Ernest Dupuy’s and É. M. de Vogüé’s studies of Russian literature. Also, there was an influential group of Russian émigrés in London who ‘translated, interpreted, and promoted Russian literature’. However, there were a number of constraining factors too, such as its geographical remoteness, its language known to very few, general ignorance of its history and culture, etc. These made Russia ‘the province of a particularly select group of specialists and enthusiasts’; and the reception of Russian culture in England was ‘a contingent and often haphazard affair, dependent on accidents of friendships and circumstance, individual taste and

54 This period of Russomania was variously described as ‘Russian craze’, ‘Russian fever’, ‘discovery of Russian novelists’, etc. Somerset Maugham, for example, wrote in Ashenden (quoted in Soboleva and Wrenn 2017: 17):

Everyone was reading the Russian novelists, the Russian dancers captivated the civilised world, and the Russian composers set shivering the sensibility of persons who were beginning to want a change from Wagner. Russian art seized upon Europe with the virulence of an epidemic of influenza. New phrases became the fashion, new colours, new emotions, and the highbrows described themselves without a moment’s hesitation as members of the intelligentsia.

55 For a survey of individuals and events that contributed to this recognition see the same author (Cross 1985, 2012). Notably, a recent publication looks at those almost three hundred years through Said’s Orientalistic perspective which indicates that ‘Russia was inscribed into the construct of Western knowledge as dangerously uncontrolled or weak and exotic, cunningly malicious or uncivilised and backward, overwhelmingly rich or dreadfully poor’ (Soboleva and Wrenn 2017: 23–24).

56 Les grands maîtres de la littérature russe (1885) by Dupuy and Le roman russe de Vogüé (1885, 1886) were translated almost immediately into English (Beasley and Bullock 2011: 284).

57 See in detail Peaker (2006); also, Garnett (1991) and Vernitski (2005).
ideologies’. Hence, according to Bullock (2016: 20) the best way to reconstruct the process is via ‘an accumulation of particularities and the sketching of personalities’.

The ‘literary discoveries’ of the nineteenth century, in general, were dependent on accident as well as design, on minor figures as well as major ones. The necessary groundwork for ‘awakening’ of British audiences to Russian literature, folklore and culture was thus laid by many individuals, including the protagonists of this project, Ralston and Ransome.

4.1 RALSTON: HIS TIME AND AGENDA

Characterizing the 1860s as a period of insular Anglocentrism, Rachel May discerns, nevertheless, ‘a mild burst of interest’, especially in Turgenev, between 1869 and 1874. In her opinion, Ralston was the one serious scholar of Russian letters at this time, ‘admired as a perceptive critic and a capable translator by Russian intellectuals’. However, ‘no such recognition accrued to him at home’, where his influence was short-lived; ‘by the late 1870s hostility towards Russia had reached new heights, and artistic merits of Russian literature were almost entirely lost from view’ (May 1994: 17). In Russia, though, the efforts of ‘an indefatigable popularizer of the Russian language and literature in England’, as Ralston was characterized by his Russian biographers (Alekseev and Levin 1994), were recognized in his lifetime and he was appointed corresponding member of several Russian societies, including the Imperial Academy of Sciences.

His activities, alongside those of other enthusiasts, were a forerunner of later Anglo-Russian rapport, even if he had to bear the brunt of less happy times.

Notably, Russo-English and Anglo-Russian relations have been increasingly attracting the attention of researchers on both sides, who started drawing more detailed pictures of the individuals and their active roles in cross-cultural interactions (Smith 2000; Kaznina 2005; Vyazova 2005; and Bullock 2016).

According to Rachel Polonsky’s account of how Russian readers came to and understood English writers, ‘the destinies of literary texts and tastes’ were tangled into the very lives of the agents of cultural mediation and transmission, such as obscure translators, academics and publishers (Polonsky 1998: 7).

Similarly, the British discovery of German literature was the product of various accidents as “dispersed enthusiasts” laid necessary groundwork by way of building personal contacts and local associations (Renwick 1963: 6; quoted in Haynes 2006: 4–5). Stark, too, points out that ‘German literature and scholarship was widely received through the discussion and the scrutiny of a small but intellectually high powered number of nineteenth century intellectuals’ (Stark 1999: 17–18).

The period between 1860s and 1870s in late Victorian England was most productive in the life of this translator of Russian literature and folklore.

Not quite entirely, according to the works cited above (e.g. Beasley and Bullock 2011; Bullock 2016; Cross 1985, 2012). Also, see the graphs in Soboleva and Wrenn’s research (2017, chapter 1; 36–37; fig.2, 3), which show the relatively brief interest in Russia associated with the Crimean War, the second peak that happened during the Great Eastern Crisis and in the aftermath of the Russo-Turkish war (1877–1878); and widespread and relatively long-lasting attraction to the Russian subject in the pre-World War I decade.
‘The Russian Don Quixote’:62 The publications devoted to this now largely forgotten scholar and translator are not numerous.63 Of special note among them is the entry in the Dictionary of National Biography (1896: 224–225) describing him as a Russian scholar. It was written by Sir Robert Kennaway Douglas (1838–1913), the first keeper of the British Museum’s department of Oriental Printed Books and Manuscripts (Brown 1998), who knew Ralston through his work in the British Library and was one of the executors of his will (Lauter 1962: 11).64

Ralston matriculated at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1846 and graduated with a B.A. in 1850; he had been called to the bar, but ‘the change in the fortunes of his family compelled him to seek at once some remunerative employment’.65 In 1853 he entered the British Museum as an assistant in the printed-book department, and, according to Douglas, ‘by his zeal and ability won the respect of the superior officers’. He started learning Russian, while revising the Slavic part of the museum catalogue. It was ‘then a language which was very little studied, and this circumstance, combined with its difficulty, impelled Ralston to master it’ with ‘untiring perseverance’. In Douglas’s words, this knowledge proved to be of great value to the museum, and ‘he would doubtless have risen to the highest post had his health not shown signs of giving way’ and after twenty-two years’ service Ralston resigned his appointment in 1875.66

It might as well have been pure accident that Ralston started learning Russian with the help of a dictionary for absence of any available teaching material at the time. But it was thanks to his own effort and enthusiasm that he gradually acquired the necessary competence and confidence to communicate with the Russians that he met in the library (Boborykin, Onegin, Yanzhul, etc.) and make friends with many of them (e.g. with Onegin, his confidante especially in the later period of the translator’s

62 “Nicknamed the “Russian Don Quixote”, Ralston saw his vocation as tilting at British ignorance about Russia” (Waddington 2004).

63 A number of journal publications, though, shed light on particular aspects of his translation activities and folklore studies, such as Cross’s “The English and Krylov” (1983; also, more recently Kritskaya 2012); Philip Tilney’s “Slavic Folklore Studies in Nineteenth-Century Britain” (1976), W.F. Ryan’s publications, including his Presidential address given to The Folklore Society on 4 April 2008 that was devoted to Ralston and the Russian folktale; and Patrick Waddington’s works. Besides Ralston’s only biography (Alekseev and Levin 1994), the earliest work written outside Britain was Lauter’s unpublished doctoral dissertation (1962), based mostly on British and Russian contemporaneous newspaper and magazine publications.

64 Also, the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography contains a recent article written by Waddington (2004), the author of a bibliography of Ralston’s writings and of a major study Turgenev and England where Ralston features as Turgenev’s English self-appointed impresario, as well as a close friend.

65 Ralston’s father made ample fortune in India but lost all his money through litigation upon his return to England; this family story is not unlike the one described in Dickens’ Bleak House. Notably, in his portrait of Victorian age G.M. Young (1936: 49) singles out Oliver Twist, Nicholas Nickleby, The Old Curiosity Shop as “charged with the atmosphere of the thirties”.

Of further importance in understanding the historical situation and cultural atmosphere were memoirs and biographies, including, for example, those by John Passmore Edwards (1823–1911), a British journalist, newspaper owner and philanthropist, by Vizetelly (1820–1894), an English publisher and writer mentioned above, by Anthony Trollope (1815–1882), an English novelist of the Victorian era, by Walter Crane (1845–1915), an English artist and book illustrator, also a major influence in Russia at the turn of the twentieth century, and by J.W. Mackail (1859–1945), whose The Life of William Morris (1899) inspired young Ransome to take up his writing career (see Bibliography).

66 After his early retirement ‘Ralston’s existence became increasingly lonely’; he never married; and when he died in London on 6 August 1889 ‘many believed it was suicide’ (Waddington 1980a: 2).
Most importantly, he discovered, first for himself and, then, for his reader, the Russian authors that were to become, along with the Russian ‘folk’ and their songs and skazki, his major interest, or even passion. He was lucky to have Turgenev himself as his mentor and friend to learn more about the new land and culture (Waddington 1980b; 2004). Thanks to his great friend he was welcome to make the most of his two visits to the country, establishing necessary contacts with the important figures of the Russian letters in St Petersburg and Moscow and maintaining a network of scholarly cooperation: exchanging the necessary materials, news, advice, etc.68

Ralston’s long-standing correspondence with three of his Russian acquaintances and friends, in particular, helped reconstruct important aspects of the translator’s personality, as well as details of his translation projects. Thus, his letters to Acad. Yakov Karlovich Grot (1812–1893), written from the 1860s to 1880s, show us the scholar and translator diligently and enthusiastically pursuing Russian studies. Grot, the Russian linguist and literary historian, was obviously the key figure in Ralston’s network of friends and acquaintances in the St Petersburg scholarly world and his twenty-one letters to Grot give an interesting view of the international cooperation of scholars of the day.69 It seems that the more indulged Ralston was with his studies, the more impatient he became with the general ignorance about Russia back at home, so that gradually he turned into a most enthusiastic and committed propagandist of Russian literature and folklore both by way of oral and written word (lecturing, telling Russian tales, writing numerous articles, and working on translations).70 For example, on 19 February 1870 in a letter to Grot he writes,

I have become more and more enthusiastic about the Russian language and literature. I cannot understand how it is that no English literary man (except, perhaps, for Sir John Bowring) has taken up the subject. The more I work at it the more I like it.... As far as I have gone yet I have been quite successful in proving to my countrymen the merits of Russian literature. Krllov’s Fables and Tourgénieff’s Дворянское гнездо (Liza) have been received by the Press with a hearty and unanimous welcome such as is very rarely bestowed upon English books. I hope my next book will make even more impression. It is to be on Russian Folk-Lore (Alekseev and Levin 1994: 94).

Ralston did not manage to go and stay in Russia for longer periods to improve his Russian as was his cherished dream, but, nevertheless, he succeeded in creating his own intercultural space by way of keeping close ties with his Russian correspondents

67 See more on Onegin below in 4.3; I.I. Yanzhul (1846–1914), an eminent Russian economist, and P.D. Boborykin (1836–1921), a Russian writer, journalist and translator, visited London, worked in the British Library, and knew Ralston, whom they mention in their memoirs (see Bibliography). Both are portrayed in Andrei Bely’s (Boris Bugaev’s) important memoir as central nineteenth-century figures; according to the memoirist, Yanzhul of his childhood (who lived next door to the Bugaevs in the professors’ apartment building) had a reputation of an Englishman always singing praises to London while finding fault with everything in Moscow (Bely 1989: 130).

68 Douglas (1896: 225) mentions that Ralston had numerous acquaintances among the literary classes in Russia, and his ‘lasting friendship’ with ‘Tourguénieff’.

69 Of note in this respect is Iz semeinoi khroniki: Vospominania dla detei i vnukov Natalii Grot [From the Family Chronicle: Natal’ia Grot’s Memoirs for Children and Grandchildren] by N. P. Grot (née Semënova, 1828–1899), the wife of Grot that sheds light on the family history and the academic environment of St Petersburg of the period.

70 See Lauter (1962) and Waddington (1980a; 2004) on his lectures and other events involving telling Russian tales.
and engaging in all sorts of activities, translation most important of them.\(^{72}\) In fact, he seems to have been well aware of his ‘responsibility’ of an intercultural mediator which he took seriously and diligently pursued (see his correspondence in Alekseev and Levin 1994; also Waddington 1980a; 2004). On 20 April 1874 in a letter to P.P. Viazemskii he informs that he is printing a few lectures on Early Russian History and asks him ‘to glance at them with a lenient eye’, adding ‘I hope you will be able to recognise in them a desire to clear up some of the fog of ignorance which has so long concealed the Russia of olden days from English eyes’ (Alekseev and Levin 1994: 50).

One can get glimpses of his everyday life of ‘a recluse and a philosopher’ (as he calls himself), performing his duties at the British Museum during the day and writing and translating in the evening hours or intervals, in some of the forty-six letters, or rather short notes, written in a great hurry to Ol’ga Alekseevna Novikova (née Kireeva) (1840–1925). Better known as ‘the MP for Russia’, Novikova, a journalist and writer who lived mostly abroad, was at the peak of her popularity in London in the 1870s (the letters refer to this period) where her fashionable salon was visited by the literati and politicians of the day, including W.E. Gladstone and his supporters (Stead 1909: v–xi). Despite their obvious differences, both Novikova and Ralston shared an interest in promoting the image of, as well as the knowledge about, Russia in England. This is apparent when one reads his letters concerned with a variety of everyday matters such as the materials and information they exchanged, the people they helped in various ways, as well as, importantly, the lectures that Ralston delivered on various subjects of Russian literature and folklore, to which his correspondent with her friends were invariably invited.\(^{72}\)

The richest in providing the biographical detail, especially of the last ten years of Ralston’s life (from 1881 to 1889), are the fifty-three letters he wrote to Aleksandr F. Onegin, his closest friend among the Russians he knew. In these Ralston was most open, sharing with his correspondent the stories of misfortunes, big and small, of hopes mostly unrealized, and of illnesses, that seemed to never part with the Englishman until his last moment.

Recent publications give due credit to his extraordinary agency in promoting Russian folklore and literature. The tone of Waddington’s articles on Ralston is especially remarkable:

\[
\text{...although Ralston’s life was often clouded with frustrations and disappointments, it was largely thanks to him that the British public maintained and developed an interest in the culture of Slavonic nations and of Russia in particular. Krylov, Lermontov, Nekrasov, Turgenev and Tolstoy are some of the writers whose reputation in England could scarcely have stood so high so soon were it not for this quiet propagandist (Waddington 1980: 2).}^{73}\]

\(^{71}\) Ralston’s translations and works on Russian literature, including ‘a most interesting’ volume on the ‘Songs of the Russian People’ and ‘a somewhat diffuse’ collection of ‘Russian Folk Tales’ are duly mentioned in the DNB entry. Notably, ‘he possessed a rare power of narrating stories orally’ and appeared as a raconteur before large audiences from the platforms of lecture-halls, several times (with great success) at St. George’s and St. James’s Halls; and, not infrequently he gave story-tellings before the young princes and princesses at Marlborough House and at well-known social gatherings; but also very often ‘in aid of a charity, especially in the east of London or provincial cities’ (Douglas 1896: 225).

\(^{72}\) See more on the lectures in Lauter (1962: 110–118).

\(^{73}\) He was ‘a large contributor to contemporary literature’ and wrote constantly in the ‘Athenæum’ and ‘Saturday Review,’ as well as the ‘Nineteenth Century’ and other magazines (Douglas 1896: 225).
4.2 RANSOME: HIS TIME AND AGENDA

Notably, Ransome’s early sojourns in Russia in 1913–1916 coincided with a most interesting but, also, controversial period of Russian culture known as Russian Modernism (also Silver age), on which there is a constantly growing literature in the West and now also in Russia.

A book with a characteristic title The Soul of Russia gives a glimpse of the literary and artistic developments of the period as early as 1916. It was compiled, according to its editor, in the hope that ‘engaging freely in this common labour of love and mercy, Russian and British contributors may perchance find their sympathies with one another deepened’, and also, by revealing to readers ‘if only the merest glimpse into her noble, but sometimes unfathomable soul, these pages may serve to knit more closely those bonds of mutual interest and friendship which unite us to our heroic Ally’ (Whale 1916: v–vi). For the purpose, the volume covers a fairly wide field from the early icon to the music of Stravinsky, the paintings of Goncharova, and the elaborate representations of the Russian ballet, while the poems, tales, and critical essays by K. Balmont, V. Bryusov, Z. Gippius, A. Kuprin, F. Sologub, etc. portrayed the influences, the ideals, and the ardent sentiments of contemporary Russian thought. Also, there are illustrations after paintings by L. Bakst, N. Goncharova, M. Larionov, N. Roerich, D.S. Stelletsky, etc. With one of its chapters devoted to folklore, as well as with special contributions on folk songs and peasant industries, this period piece, among other things, aptly illustrates Russian modernists’ inspiration found in popular literature and art. In Nicholas Roerich’s words, a recently awakened interest in contemporary art, as well as the study of the country’s past, helped discover its original treasure. At the same time Russian art was recognized by Russia’s allies in the West: ‘Our theatre was rapturously acclaimed in Paris and in London. Parisians and Londoners appreciated our artistes, went into ecstasies over singers and music’ (Whale 1916: vi; 24–25).

On the British side, C. Hagberg Wright commented on the enthusiastic reception of Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, and Gorky, who portrayed ‘the moujik with a sensitive and intimate touch’ so that all ‘intellectual Europe was converted, and the seeds of international understanding were sown’; Moscow becoming the new Mecca of the lover of literature and the student of the art of the stage. Maurice Baring’s series of sonnets on Russian themes served as lyrical introductions to the chapters of the volume: Russia opens “Russian Spirit”, the first section of the book; A June Night in Russia and Harvest in Russia – the chapter on “Art”; and Dostoevsky – the chapter on “Literature”. Hugh Walpole’s Epikhodov attracts the attention of the reader to one of

---

It is approximately the period between 1895 and 1930, according to Edward Mozejko (2007: 892). See also the discussion of the designation Silver age in Omry Ronen (2000) and in the Viacheslav Vs. Ivanov’s introductory article in the same volume. Polonsky (1998) opines that the turn of the nineteenth century was both ‘a time of exceptional creativity in Russia’ and ‘a time of great receptivity to foreign cultural influences’, including English poetry and aesthetic thought. Her exploration of the intellectual background to these influences illuminates a common interest in myth, folklore, anthropology and the origins of language.

Notably, there is a whole corpus of remarkable Russian life-writings of the period as almost every literary figure (most of them émigrés after the Russian Revolution) left their memoirs, such as, for example, Bely’s work mentioned above (see Bibliography). These, too, are important sources shedding light on the cultural situation in St Petersburg (Petrograd) and Moscow, in which Ransome, as well as others of his compatriots, found themselves upon arriving in the country.
Chekhov’s secondary characters as the bona fide embodiment of the Russian (Whale 1916: 3, 15, 23, 42, 83; 34–39). Baring, however, was less definitive: his Russia begins with the important question: ‘What can the secret link between us be?’ followed by others serving as further reflections on the theme:

Why does the song that rolls across your land / Speak to my soul with notes I understand? / Why does the burden of your mystery / Come like the message of a friend to me? / Why do I love the spaces of your plain, / Your dancing mirth, your elemental pain, / Your rivers and your sad immensity? ...

(Whale 1916: 3)

The answer that arrives in the end may appear discouragingly short and plain: ‘I cannot say’. But there may be few rational explanations offered for deep emotional attachments that were often developed by those who were involved, like Baring, Walpole or Ransome, in the Russian quest that they undertook in the early years of the twentieth century. The Russian works and memoirs, resulting from their mostly genuine and enthusiastic effort to understand and embrace the largely strange culture and literature, may serve to illustrate the approaches ‘with an open mind’ that G.K. Chesterton hoped for in the relations between the countries (Whale 1916: 5–7).

In particular, Walpole, then a young author like Ransome, used his first-hand experiences of a ‘sanitar’ in the Russian Red Cross ‘Otryad’ on the Eastern Front to produce The Dark Forest, one of his best works. The famous Russian artist Konstantine Samoff (the novel was dedicated to him by ‘his friend the author’) thought that it differed from other, usually banal and stereotyped, portrayals of the country (Walpole 1916: 1; Konstantin Andreevich Somov 1979: 147). And Ransome, writing from Petrograd on 6 March 1916, commends it to his mother: ‘It is the first book I have read which gives anything like a true impression of Russians as seen by English’ (BC Ransome Box C7, File 5, # 100).

According to Walpole, there is much to the Russian character that will remain closed for their British friend:

... to those whom Russia and her people draw back again and again, however sternly they may resist, this sure truth stands: that here there is a mystery, a mystery that may never be discovered. In the very soul of Russia the mystery is stirring; here the restlessness, the eagerness, the disappointment, the vision of the pursuit is working; and some who are outside her gates she has drawn into that same search (Walpole 1916: 63).

Importantly, even if their search left both Baring and Walpole mystified and enchanted, the deliberations, discoveries, doubts, and mistakes accompanying the process form an interesting and attractive aspect of the publications of the period, including, notably, Ransome’s book (article 4).

A London Bohemian in St Petersburg (Petrograd): Ransome was in his early twenties when he wrote his Bohemia in London, ‘of which he was extremely proud’ upon its publication but much later admitted that ‘It has much rubbish in it but is not wholly bad, though I should be sorry if it were to be reprinted’ (Ransome 1976: 75).
114–115). According to Brogan, it was an account of his early manhood, breathing ‘an air, or rather a gale, of exuberant enjoyment’ (Brogan 1984: 30). But it was also the time of educating himself as a writer by ‘constant scribbling’ (and earning his living), omnivorous reading, and, importantly, meeting and discussing things with friends, including the Collingwoods who would play such a crucial role in his life, Edward Thomas, Lascelles Abercrombie, Gordon Bottomley, and the Chesterton brothers, etc., all of them leaving their mark on twentieth-century English literature. Thus, it is not simply autobiographical, but also a guidebook to Bohemia as it existed in London in the early years of the twentieth century, ‘suffused with the author’s intelligence, warm feeling and perceptive humor’. Its effect is enhanced by excellent illustrations – ‘a splendid series of black-and-white drawings’ by Fred Taylor, which makes *Bohemia in London* ‘easily the best-looking Ransome volume ever produced’ (Brogan 1984: 55).

In general, according to Rupert Hart-Davis, Ransome’s early writings were all ‘literary’ and most of them are out of print now: *A History of Story-Telling: Studies in the Development of Narrative* (1909); *The Imp, and the Elf and the Ogre* (1910);87 *The Hoofmarks of the Faun* (1911); *Portraits and Speculations* (1913), etc. The author later looked on most of them as ‘false starts’; but they were also important ‘exercises’ that paved the way for his later success (Ransome 1976: 10, 101). They are of certain interest here as evidence of Ransome’s early life and work in the first decade of the twentieth literary and publishing scene and, in particular, of his serious studies of the narrative technique. The *World’s Story Tellers: Stories by Théophile Gauthier* (1908), edited by Ransome and, especially, his own translation of Remy de Gourmont’s *Une Nuit au Luxembourg* (*A Night in the Luxembourg*) manifest of his Francophile indulgences (also part of the education of a Bohemian of the day);88 while Ransome’s works of literary criticism *Edgar Allan Poe* (1910) and *Oscar Wilde* (1912) contain perceptive discussions of translation issues that evidence his early interest in the subject (see below 4.3).

In fact, it was probably thanks to his expertise of French authors such as de Gourmont, as well as to his critical study of Wilde, that he first attracted the attention of Russian symbolists, with whom these particular authors enjoyed remarkable popularity. Michael Lykiardopoulos (himself an authority on Wilde and a reputed translator of Wilde’s works into Russian) paid Ransome a visit in England and they became friends. Notably, he translated Ransome’s *Oscar Wilde* into Russian in 1915 but it was never published because of the war (Ransome 1976: 173; Erofeev 2015: 85).89

---

87 Notably, *Old Peter* was dedicated to Barbara Collingwood, the eldest daughter in the family and one of the earliest of Ransome’s romantic attachments.

88 Interestingly, there is an obvious parallel between the main characters of the former work – the storytelling Ogre and the younger Imp and Elf and old Peter and his two grandchildren of Ransome’s fairy book.

89 On Gourmont, see a recent publication by Paul Cohen (2014) in *The Fortnightly Review.*

89 Lykiardopoulos’s was the first of Russian names to appear in Ransome’s diaries in 1911–1912. After his visit to Wiltshire Ransome had a few of his short stories and articles printed in Russian reviews in 1912, which he mentions in *The Autobiography.* Lykiardopoulos (1883–1925), the Secretary of the Moscow Arts Theatre, well-known for his English translations, appears to be one of Ransome’s close friends in his expatriate life. For instance, writing about his Moscow trip to his mother on 17 January 1915, Ransome described Lyki (the name by which he was known to his many English friends) as ‘being very decent in showing me all sorts of things that are interesting to see’ (BC Ransome, Box C7, File 4, # 60).
For all the seeming abundance of primary and secondary sources on Ransome, the translator’s papers directly concerning *Old Peter’s Russian Tales*, as well as other material of the period between 1913 and 1915 are in fact not many. Of major interest in this respect is apparently *The Autobiography* itself written by Ransome between 1949 and 1961. Published in 1976, after the author’s death, it was edited by his friend Hart-Davis who also wrote the prologue and epilogue. In the prologue, Hart-Davis gives some detail of his editing practice, indicating that the bulk of the memoir was written by the author, while the editor limited himself to removing repetitions and transposing some passages. Also, he ‘restricted’ Ransome’s narrative concerning the Russian Revolution to events in which he was involved as actor or eyewitness. On the whole, though, ‘except for a few linking sentences and some of the chapter-titles, all the words in the book are Ransome’s’ (Ransome 1976: 9–10). *The Autobiography* ends in 1932, and a brief account of the author’s remaining thirty-five years is given by Hart-Davis in the epilogue. Of immediate interest for the present research are several chapters including “Journey to the Moon” (XVII), which deals with Ransome’s escape to Russia from his home troubles (disastrous first marriage) and his stay in the country in 1913–1914; “Russia goes to War” (XVIII), his experiences of the initial stage of the war while working on his fairy book; “The Elixir of Life” (XIX), devoted to Ransome’s stay in Moscow in the winter of 1915 during which he wrote his only romance of the same title; and “From Patient to Correspondent” (XX), describing how despite health troubles he managed to finish his fairy book and take up the job of the Russian correspondent for the *Daily News*. Hence, these are four out of forty-three chapters of the book, relating the events of the author’s first three remarkable years in Russia, including a brief account of his work on *Old Peter* in Vergezha.

*The Autobiography*, as well as Ransome’s diaries, and other archival material pertaining to it, were certainly important in shedding light on his life in Russia, especially in its pre-revolutionary period when he was working on his translation project. For one interested in exploring his working conditions, as well as the thoughts and ideas he was preoccupied with at the time (his inner life as it were), Ransome’s letters to his mother proved to be the indispensable first-hand resource.

---

81 Besides *The Autobiography*, there are a number of Ransome’s biographies, including *The Life of Arthur Ransome* by Brogan (1984); *Ransome in Russia: Arthur’s Adventures in Eastern Europe* by Alexander and Verizhnikova (2003; also Verizhnikova 2000); *The Last Englishman: The Double Life of Arthur Ransome* by Roland Chambers (2009); and *The World of Arthur Ransome* by Christina Hardyment (2012). Of these, Brogan’s work, recognized as authoritative, was a major source for this paper while the rest have been consulted for additional detail.

Also, there is literature devoted to the study of the language and style of Ransome’s famous *Swallows and Amazons* children’s novels such as Roger Lancelyn Green’s *Tellers of Tales* (1969) and Peter Hunt’s *Approaching Arthur Ransome* (1992).

82 This may be due to two calamities: in April 1920 he visited his old Petrograd lodgings on Glinka street to find newspapers from February 1917 to February 1918 he had collected for the British Museum destroyed and most valuable belongings stolen; then, in 1923 the house at Riga where they lived with Evgenia Shelepina, his second wife who he was going to marry at the time, was burned down (Brogan 1984: 251, 260).

83 In fact, after his father’s illness and untimely death when Arthur was still a schoolboy, Edith Rachel Ransome (née Boulton) was not only his only parent on whom he relied both for material and moral support (‘her cause for distress and anxiety for thirty-five years’) but also in the years of his manhood she was ‘a valuable friend and confidante’, of which more than three hundred surviving letters are clear evidence (Brogan 1984: 20–21). Most of these, beginning with the year 1914, were selected and published by Brogan (1997) but those which refer to an earlier time, as well as some others written in the period between 1913–1914 (also cited in article 4) are left unpublished (BC Ransome correspondence Box C7).
I singled out those of the letters where he dwelled on his impressions of the country, the people he met and made friends, and his folklore translation and plans for more work on Russian themes. They are those that Ransome wrote mostly from Petrograd in 1914 (#46 of 11 May; #48 of 23 May, #58 of 31 December), in 1915 (#60 of 17 January; #62 of 4 February; #70 of 28 April; #72 of 10 May; #74 of 31 May; #75 of 6 June; #76 of 15 June; #78 of 14 July; #87 of 27 August; #88 of 2 September), and in 1916 (#100 of 6 March; #105 of 4 August). Especially important, as well as revealing his thoughts and emotions, are some of these letters.

For instance, the letter of 23 May 1914 (#48) where Ransome first mentions his fairy book:

*You know, I have a publisher ready for a fairy book for grown up people. ...I want to do my best with it, as it’s the first chance of the kind I’ve had, and will probably be the last if I don’t succeed.*

The letter of 17 January 1915 (#60) is full of happy impressions of his Moscow trip and, of course, his book, when he writes, among other things:

*Moscow is perfectly delightful, and easily most suggestive place, historically, that I have ever been in. ... I’ve borrowed some fairy books, and am getting on with that book too. ...If people who read it do not fall in love with Russia I shall be awfully disappointed. But I think they will, because I love it so much myself.*

In the same letter he also mentions that he was going to visit the Tyrkovs’ estate in Vergezha that would play such a crucial role in his Russian experience: ‘... a country house actually built on the Volkhov, which you remember is the river in the story of Sadko. That ought to be a very pleasant and interesting experience’.

There is more on Vergezha and its atmosphere conducive for his book of fairy tales in some other letters, like, for instance, in the one written on 6 June 1915 (#75):

*My life has been nothing but steady work, so many hours each day, with a little fishing either at sunset or before breakfast. This week again my total is fifty three pages. ... It’s rather jolly, the stuff I’ve been doing here, and I think better than the stuff that was lost...; I simply love being in this place, better than anywhere else I have been in Russia. ...; I would like to stay here for ever....*

There is also a very long and detailed letter written on 27 August 1915 (#87) from Petrograd when he was recovering after an operation in his friends’ flat and planning a number of romances based on Russian history. These plans (or rather dreams) were probably too beautiful to come true and were never realized, with turbulent events and times ahead and hard journalistic work that Ransome had to take up instead of writing fairy books and historical romances. Nevertheless, this is a first-hand piece of evidence of his ardent Russian sympathies, as well as of the stance of a committed intercultural mediator he had become:

---

84 Later, in the introductory note to *Old Peter* Ransome made it clear that he intends it for children (but also grown-up people who are fond of fairy tales and hence never grow up).

The English friendship with France is strong and reliable, because the English do really know something about France. And it seems to me that for the good of the world there must be built up a similar real understanding between England and Russia. If I could only feel I were able to help in bringing that about, even in a very little way...

Thus, both Ralston and Ransome became closely associated with the Russian culture and people; and, with the expertise they acquired due to their intercultural experiences, the translators were full of enthusiasm to mediate their understanding of Russia to the reader in the West. For Ransome, a young author still striving to find his voice, Russia seemed to be just a way of escaping from his home troubles when he first left for the country. But, he had already authored several pieces of literary criticism, as well as collections of stories, and, importantly, had planned to write his own book of fairy tales after he came across Ralston’s work. He knew at once that there was a treasure here to be discovered, rescued, and imported for his home, still largely ignorant, audience. His situation nevertheless was of a different kind as compared with Ralston’s, who was a lonely figure in the largely indifferent, or even, hostile environment. With the close of the great Victorian age, the fin de siècle England was more open to continental and other influences (Hynes 1968), while the intellectuals were more and more engaged in cosmopolitan interests and, in particular, developed a kind of obsession about Russian authors. Moreover, at the time quite a number of them went to visit and stay in the country to explore and understand the Russian mysterious “soul” (see above). Either the goal was unattainable in principle or the explorers were quite vague about the object of their searches, but it turns out that most of them were to find out that Russia was past understanding (Baring, Walpole). However, their effort merits further study as it associates with the period that may be characterized as the highest point in the history of the British-Russian cultural interaction (article 4). Ransome was the one to make the most of his Russian experiences that he had thoroughly enjoyed, learning the language, exploring the Russian countryside, and completing his translation project (article 4). Moreover, he took advantage of his intercultural networking, making friends and collaborating with Mitrokhin, the talented Russian artist who contributed to their mutual success (article 5).

4.3 THE TRANSLATORS’ AGENCY VS TRANSLATION POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Volume 4 of The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English (2006) that covers the period between 1790 and 1900 draws a picture of the general literary atmosphere and translation policies and practices of the nineteenth century. In their brief introduction to the 110-year period, the editors point out its characteristic features: translation was

---

86 The objective has not lost its urgency even if one just looks at the titles of numerous recent studies; one of the earlier works is Harvey Pitcher’s Understanding the Russians (1964).

87 Here, policies and practices are understood as strategies and techniques in a somewhat broader sense and as applied to a wider temporary scope.

Notably, Ralston in this compendium is mentioned in the group of enthusiasts, along with FitzGerald, Guest or Burton, as a ‘less eye-catching’, but equally devoted, modest scholar whose work in the British Museum enabled him to develop a taste for Russian literature and folklore and to champion and translate Turgenev (Waddington 1995: 17–56; quoted in France 2006a: 101).
concerned not only with widely known literatures but also with new ones, opening up Anglo-American culture to ‘world literature’; published translations were made from an ever-wider range of sources to meet the demands of dramatically increasing readership, with translators adopting a variety of different styles (France and Haynes 2006: xiii; emphasis in text). Apparently, if by the turn of the nineteenth century ‘a translation method of eliding the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text was firmly entrenched as a canon in English-language translation’ (Venuti 2004: 76), towards the middle and later part of the century the translation scene was becoming much more diverse. Susan Bassnett (2002: 76–77) lists five main translation currents of the period: (1) translation as a scholar’s activity, where the stress is on the pre-eminence of the source text over translated variants; (2) translation intended to encourage the reader to return to the original; (3) translation characterized by a deliberately contrived foreignness; (4) translation as the translator’s pragmatic choice to the reader; and (5) translation as a means of upgrading the status of the original. According to Bassnett, types (1) and (2) would be very literal translations; types (4) and (5) much freer translations that might alter the original completely; and, finally, type (3) translations, most interesting and typical of all, would be full of archaisms of form and language.

The central episode in the translation history of the century was probably the ‘Victorian controversy’ over Newman’s foreignizing translation of *The Iliad* and its critique by Arnold (Arnold 1861; Newman 1861; Venuti 2004), which highlighted, among other things, the centrality, as well as the complexity of issues involved in choosing translation strategies for both translation theory and practice. Besides Newman, Venuti (2004: 141) singles out William Morris as another advocate of foreignizing translation, characterizing his translation method as the translator’s ‘socialist investment in medievalism that led him to cultivate an archaic lexicon drawn from various literary forms, elite and popular’. Bassnett and France (2006: 51–52) argue that conscious archaizing on Morris’s part, as well as on that of other leading literary figures of the century, was intended to forge a link between contemporary England and those ancient societies, whose heroes were viewed as models of manliness and physical courage; an archaic form of English reminding readers of that past continuity.

Indeed, by mid-century, ‘literalness’ was a quality often manifested and welcomed in translation. Carlyle’s German translations, ‘with a new respect for national difference, and a new interest in its embodiment in language’, were setting the norm. His stance was ‘extreme’ but other translators in the second and third decades of the century also responded to the German emphasis on national difference (Reynolds
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88 Stark (1999: 85), for example, opines that the issues which emerged in the nineteenth century discussions of the topic form the foundation for twentieth century thinking about translation both in Germany and Britain.

89 As compared with Newman’s, the reviews in this case were ‘much more appreciative’ but, still, there was much negative criticism (Venuti 2004: 141).

90 Also, O’Sullivan (2009: 108, 111–112) argues that literalism was the prevailing attitude to classical source texts in Victorian England and ‘Standard’ and ‘Classical Libraries’ of Bohn’s publishing firm offered straightforward literal prose translations of classical source texts (attributed and accompanied with translators’ prefaces and notes, too); these were addressed both for students and those readers who were not sufficiently fluent in the classical languages.
It should be noted that the German Romantics argued for a method that intended to give the reader an image of the original in its foreignness so that to enrich the national culture through contacts with the foreign. Schleiermacher was not wholly original in proposing his famous ideas on translation but successfully incorporated and developed the insights expressed earlier by his contemporaries, such as Goethe, Herder, and A.W. Schlegel (Koskinen 2000: 48–49). Koskinen opines that Schleiermacher’s lecture “über der verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens” (1813, in English in Lefevere 1977), presently one of the canonical texts in translation theory, must have been known to English practitioners of the foreignizing method. It appears that the English cultural elite, including, for example, Coleridge, De Quincey, George Eliot, and especially Carlyle, was largely aware of the novel ideas entertained by the German scholars and translators.

Notably, in Ralston’s case the high esteem and respect he felt for the Russian folklore scholars (manifest in his Afanasyev’s dedication, as well as in his letters to Grot and others) equalled only those he had for the German folklorists. This shows in numerous references to their works, as well as in more detailed commentaries to translations in his Russian Folk-Tales, including, for example, Max Müller, Theodor Benfey with his Panchatantra studies, and also Bernhard Jülg and his translation of Kalmyk and Mongolian tales (Ralston 1873: x, 3, 39). Especially revealing in this respect is the following extract from one of his letters:

I want to make my book as good as I can; of course it will be but a poor performance from a Russian point of view, but I hope my Russian critics will be able to see I have done my best, and not shown carelessness or indolence. ... I do not propose to publish my book till about November. If I only thought of English critics, I could bring it out by May, but I think a great deal more of what will be said in Germany and Russia than of what English reviewers will say. At present England is perfectly ignorant of what has been done in Russia with respect to its popular literature (In a letter to Grot, 1 April 1871; Alekseev and Levin 1994: 100–101).

According to Stark (1999: 76), Carlyle, no doubt, was ‘one of the most powerful advocates of the German approach’; the ‘wild and at times chaotic energy’ of his translations, or ‘Carlylese’, as they were known at the time, ‘alienated, and sometimes offended, English readers so much that they started to reconsider their own use of language’.

In Germany of the nineteenth century, the leading translating country in Europe, translators would generally follow the original as closely as possible, the tendency to literalness especially prominent in folklore translations (Neliubin and Khukhuli 2008: 130).

Stark (1999: 70) points at the more immediate relevance of Goethe’s ideas, given that they became common knowledge thanks to Carlyle’s and Sarah Austin’s mediation while Schleiermacher and Wilhelm von Humboldt remained untranslated and largely unknown at the time.

Coleridge, Carlyle, and De Quincey, also William Taylor, John Sterling, and G.H. Lewes were the few English authorities on German literature and philosophy of the century (Houghton 1957: 143, note 22). Recent research shows that “Germanophile circles” were in Edinburgh, Norwich, Bristol, and Liverpool (Stark 1999: 18–21). Also, George Eliot began her literary career by translating David Friedrich Strauss’ Das Lebe Iesu and Ludwig Feuerbach’s Das Wesen des Christentumms (Stark 1999: 34).

Notably, according to Douglas (1896: 225), besides Russia, Ralston frequently visited Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, etc; also, he had an important folklore translation from German to his credit (Ralston 1906). Ralston knew Müller at least through his involvement with The Folklore Society; for more on Ralston, Müller, and Turgenev, see Waddington (1980b: 243–244, 259).

The Songs of the Russian People (1872).
In fact, in his views of the English reviewers and readers in general Ralston was not alone. Walter E. Houghton (1957: 143) in his seminal study of the Victorians’ frame of mind quotes Arnold who pointed at ‘English provincialism, cutting off educated men from the latest developments of thought and general standards of judgment in European intellectual circles’. Discussing dogmatism as the characteristic feature of both professional critics and Victorian writers, Houghton argues that it was fostered by the ignorance of the audience: “The new reading public, far larger than that of the eighteenth century, had much less knowledge than the analogous audience would have today”. “In the middle classes”, he points out “there was no tradition of serious reading outside of divinity” (Houghton 1957: 141; cf. Cruse 1936). At Oxford and Cambridge, the curriculum was ‘largely confined to classics, mathematics, and theology’ up to the reforms of the sixties; the study of art introduced in 1870, and that of modern literatures still later (Houghton 1957: 142).

An interesting case of stressing ‘the foreignness of the foreign’ are the translations issued with ‘implied parallel texts’, such as, for example, Specimens of the Russian Poets and similar collections translated by John Bowring in the 1820s that ‘kept the absence of the source text present in the reader’s mind by allowing shards of it onto the page in titles and notes’; while poets appear as ‘specimens’ of their nationality (Reynolds 2006: 66, 71; emphasis in text). Ralston’s texts belong to the same category as he also tends to constantly remind the reader of the original, introducing Russian words in his translations, his own folkloristic sketches, and notes; also, overstretching the lexical potentialities of English (finding them deficient in some aspects) to render the slightest nuances of the ST.

The leitmotif of literal translation makes one of its early appearances in the preface to his Krylov’s fables, Ralston’s first and most successful translation from Russian:

*The poems of which a literal prose translation is now offered to the English reader enjoy popularity in their native land which they can scarcely expect to obtain in a foreign country. ... Much of their special excellence depends upon the choice felicity of their language and the artistic structure of their verse; it is, therefore, scarcely possible for anyone to form a fair idea of their original merits who makes their acquaintance only after they have been interpreted into alien prose. But, even in a foreign dress, I think that they cannot fail to interest and to please such readers as will make fair allowance for the disadvantages under which they labour (Ralston 1869: vii).*

And then:

*Most of the translators of these fables have tried to turn them into verse. I have not ventured a similar task, but have confined my efforts to the production of what I hope is a faithful prose rendering of Krilof’s poetry. The version may be disfigured by the ungainliness of a photographic portrait, but its aims at possessing something of a photograph’s fidelity (Ralston 1869: ix).*

It follows from the above quotation that Ralston paid due attention to his predecessors, while working on his own translations. Also in the preface to *Liza; Or “A

---

96 It is now recognized that Krylov became ‘firmly established in the English consciousness’ thanks to Ralston with his prose translation (Cross 1983: 104).
Nest of Nobles”, his version of Turgenev’s famous novel (still read alongside Constance Garnett’s translation), Ralston discusses first the French and German translations which he commends as excellent. He is sure that the general reader may form a very good idea of their merits from these works, while for his own part he is grateful to the translators of the Dvorianskoe Gnezdo for the assistance their versions rendered him in his own work. Notably, Ralston singles out the German version as ‘wonderfully literal’ (Ralston 1873: 14). He adds that he, too, kept as closely as he possibly could to the original. The first draft of the translation was absolutely literal, regardless of style or even idiom. Then, the translator scrupulously describes every detail of the work on his manuscript:

It was revised by the Russian friend who assisted me in my translation of Krilof’s Fables – M. Alexander Onegine – and to his painstaking kindness I am greatly indebted for the hope I venture to entertain that I have not “traduced” the author I have undertaken to translate. The few passages in which my version differs designedly from the ordinary text of the original, I have followed the alterations which M. Turgenieff made with his own hand in the copy of the story on which I worked, and the title of the story has been altered to its present form with his consent (Ralston 1873: 14–15).

Thus, in accordance with the spirit of the age with its interesting debates on translation, Ralston finds it important to explain his own stance in the prefaces to his translations, while their title pages list the translator’s credentials, which also befitted the practice of the day. In contrast to prose that could be translated anonymously, in scholarly versions, the translator’s signature (a marker of genre) mattered because it functioned as a certificate of competence and authority; the title pages often bearing relevant qualifications (Reynolds 2006: 74).

While for Ralston some of the leading Victorian literary figures and scholars mentioned above such as, for example, George Eliot, Carlyle, Morris, and Müller, were not simply contemporaries but often acquaintances and friends (Lauter 1962; Waddington 1980a; 1980b); for Ransome they already belonged to history. There is an interesting (also personal) reflection of this in his Bohemia in London, mentioned above (4.2), when he draws a picture of modern Bohemia and Bohemians like himself against the literary background of predecessors, which gives him, among other things, an ample opportunity of dwelling on his favourite authors and works. While these parallels are recurrent throughout the book, there are particular chapters based on such comparisons like, for example, “Old and New Soho”, when he draws attention to De Quincey, young and new to London who found lodging in an unfurnished house in Greek street in Soho, or “Old and New Fleet Street”, where he recalls Coleridge ‘too familiar with the ills of journalistic life’, etc. Hence, these are shadows of the past in the time ‘when the Decadence was swiftly and amazingly modulating into what would come to be called Georgianism’ (Brogan 1984: 32). It was an altogether different period when, according to Yeats, ‘everybody got down off his stilts; henceforth nobody drank absinthe with his black coffee; nobody went mad; nobody committed suicide; nobody joined the Catholic Church; or if they did I have forgotten’ (quoted in Brogan 1984: 32). Its clichés were beer and dog-roses and the open road. Ransome, himself a great walker and a lover of the countryside in the Lake Country and, then, in Russia, sang praises to the spirit of the day in his book as well (“Country in Bohemia”).

Notably, with the changes of the literary and intellectual scene in the last decade of the nineteenth century and early years of the next, translation seems to have lost much
of its previous appeal: the narrow producing and receiving milieux of the literary journals of the day considered themselves generally able to read in French if not German. Lack of concern for linguistic accuracy left translators, either authors in their own right or attached to small modernist periodicals, free ‘to move about between foreign languages and indeed between foreign aesthetics’ (Pym 2000: 73–74). One such an enthusiastic student of the French culture and literature, Ransome took up the translation of his favourite author’s work – de Gourmont’s Une Nuit au Luxembourg. Characteristically, while explaining his approach in the translator’s preface, he argues against fidelity as the duty of a translator. According to Ransome:

... he must remember (and beg his readers to remember) that the intellectual background on which the work will appear in its new language is different from that against which it was conceived. When the new background is as different from the old as English from French, he cannot but recognise that it disturbs the chiaroscuro of his work with a quite incalculable light...His own accuracy may thus give his work an atmosphere not that which its original author designed (Ransome 1912: 10).

Also, his works of literary criticism, such as Edgar Allan Poe (1910) and Oscar Wilde (1912), include interesting discussions of translation matters. While focusing mostly on Poe’s self-conscious technique of writing, he calls the reader’s attention to the fact that conversely to English critics it is the French who praise most Poe’s poetry. In his opinion, while there is something in it that annoys the English reader, ‘if ever so slightly’, that something disappears for the foreigner. In other words, a novelty of language in much new poetry, distressful until the reader is accustomed to it, is less keenly perceived by a foreigner. Baudelaire and Mallarmé, in his opinion, are not ‘shocked’ by the strangeness of Poe’s poetry, because they do not see it, and, in their wonderful prose versions, it naturally disappears. His suggestion to the English reader is that reading French translations in this case is worthwhile even if as a way of learning the pleasure of the originals (Ransome 1910: 135–136).

It was one well-versed in the French literature to opine that The Picture of Dorian Gray is ‘the first French novel to be written in the English language’ (Ransome 1912: 95). While discussing fairy tales (A House of Pomegranates), Ransome points out that with ‘the pen of Flaubert’ Wilde wrote stories akin in imagination to Andersen’s; in addition, he does not exclude the presence of Baudelaire. Despite the various influences, though, the critic argues that one recognizes Wilde himself thanks to ‘a round mellowness of voice, a smooth solidity of suggested movement, a delight in magnificence; and, primarily, a wonderful feeling for decorative effect’ (Ransome 1912: 90–91).

Therefore, the translators’ agency analysed against the prevalent nineteenth-century translation policies and practices shows that conversely to a clear-cut case that Ralston seems to present, Ransome’s tends to be more complicated. Apparently, the literalness and accuracy of the former were not the virtues of the younger translator, who finds Ralston’s style too literary. Neither was he interested in Ralston’s scholarly agenda, as was made clear in the short note to his collection (Ransome 1957: vii). Hence, he seems to belong to an intermediate category of translators, neither presenting a case of those adhering to ‘naturalization of the foreign’, nor making an effort at ‘a deliberately contrived foreignness in the TL text’.

While there is no indication of Ransome’s interest in the German culture and literature or translation practice, he was certainly a Francophile before his Russian travel and experience.
4.4 TRANSLATORS IN THE FOLKLORE MOVEMENT: MEDIATING RUSSIA THROUGH FOLKLORE

To get a more nuanced understanding of the agency of the translators concerned, it was necessary to look into the history of folklore, especially in the nineteenth-century Britain and Russia (Kokk’iara 1960; Bendix 1997; and Azadovskii 1958–1963). Part of this history was the emergence of the popular tale collection and the genre of the literary fairy tale itself, with the agendas and textual practices of folklorists and folklore translators, especially in relation to their audiences, playing a constitutive role.

Both Ralston and Ransome were involved. The former was a founding member of The Folklore Society, its vice-president for some time, then a member of its Council for the rest of his life (Ryan 2009: 123). His was the beginning of the golden age of folklore when learned people were turning their attention to all aspects of folk life and the oral traditions of folktales, recording, editing, and publishing them; in many countries museums, archives, and societies were founded to “preserve” the artefacts of cultural heritages (Zipes 2012: 109–110). In Ralston’s words, the folk tale was ‘sedulously tended and held in high honor by the ripest of scholars’ (Ralston 1873: 16). The impetus to this international movement was given (as everyone seems to agree) by the Grimm brothers: the publication of Kinder and Hausmärchen (Children’s and Household Tales) in 1812 and 1815 set off ‘a chain reaction’, with ‘massive repercussions’ in Europe and North America (Zipes 2012: 111). Ralston (1878: 2), for his part, pointed out the importance of the two ‘largest and most valuable’ collections: Afanasyev’s Russian stories (Moscow 1863) and Dr. Giuseppe Pitré’s Sicilian stories (Palermo, 1875).

Importantly, the Grimms’ tales were almost immediately translated into foreign languages; the earliest was the translation into Danish (Dollerup 1999; Joosen 2014). Edgar Taylor produced his English translation of German Popular Tales in 1823; its second volume followed in 1826. It was an adaptation for young readers that enjoyed great popularity in Great Britain and the United States to remain the primary translation of the Grimms’ tales until the 1880s. Taylor’s ‘successful Anglicization and infantilization’ of the tales set a model for literary fairy tales in nineteenth-century England; also, everywhere in Europe followed an immense production of folktale collections, in most cases edited and rewritten in the language of the educated elite (Zipes 2012: 112; cf. Pokorn 2010). Thus, if the first stage was that of collecting and preserving the national “treasury” (a metaphor commonly used at the time); the second stage of the movement was characterized by ‘winnowing and disciplining’ folklore to produce ‘standardized abridgments suitable for bourgeois domestic consumption’ (Noyes 2012: 20).

The old fairy tales began to find their place in ‘approved’ children’s literature. John R. Townsend (1974: 90) names among most important Victorian translations, revivals and retellings of the tales of Perrault, Grimm, and Hans Christian Andersen that were all available in English by the middle of the nineteenth century; Antony Montalba’s Fairy Tales of All Nations (1849) and Sir George Dasent’s Popular Tales from the Norse (1859) followed the publication of Felix Summerly’s Home Treasure in the 1840s; Andrew Lang’s ever-extending spectrum of “coloured” fairy books that began with the Blue Fairy Book in 1889; and Joseph Jacobs’s English, Celtic, and Indian tales collected and retold between 1890 and 1894. According to The Oxford Companion to Children’s Literature, it was earlier, in the eighteenth century, that fairy stories first ‘gained a firm footing’ in English culture, despite the opposition to them that was ‘even stronger than that launched earlier by the Puritans’: the tales of the supernatural were attacked by educated people who sought
after bringing up their own children in the Christian religion and avoiding superstition. However, there always was an audience for stories of magic and collections of them followed one after another. *The Oxford Companion's* list includes most of those mentioned by Townsend, such as *English Fairy Tales* (1890) edited by Jacobs and translations of collections of Danish, Indian and Russian tales by the end of the century (Ralston’s *Russian Folk-Tales* obviously implied here). Many of these printed folklore materials, as well as tales which were available only in manuscript, obscure books, and oral tradition were sources of Lang’s series of *Fairy Books*. The result was a ‘wealth of stories’, retold for English-speaking children, from many countries of the world (Carpenter and Prichard 1984: 177–179), as well as the emergence of the popular tale collection as a form of popular reading material in England and of the genre of the literary fairy tale itself.

In his framework for a social history of the genre, Zipes argues that the staple of the literary fairy tale for children was the folktale which, first, had to be adapted to be used for the purposes of entertaining and instructing children. For instance, the first writers of *contes de fees* had to meet the discursive requirements of the French salons and show the social value of the genre before they could publish them. Educated writers thus purposively appropriated the oral folktale and converted it into a type of literary discourse about mores, values, and manners so that children would become civilized according to the social code of that time (Zipes 1991: 3, 9; also, Seago 1995). Also, in her study of fairy tale collections in nineteenth-century England, Jennifer Schacker argues that there is a set of ideologically charged textual practices and interpretative frameworks in the field that reveal as much about Victorian literary culture as they do about oral folk cultures. The translators, editors, or tale collectors of the period developed strategies for rendering imported narrative traditions readable, interpretable, entertaining and, most of all, relevant to the interests of their audience. Importantly, the reading of popular tales – ‘transcribed, translated, transnationalized’ – became a ‘form of cultural and historical adventure, a space in which to encounter and then reflect upon national identities and differences’ (Schacker 2003: 1–2).

Notably, while folklore was emerging as a ‘distinct cognitive category, a subject of widespread interest, and a scholarly pursuit’, publishers’ conceptions of the English reading public were shifting to embrace an increasing number of literate working-class and middle-class consumers to finally turn the early nineteenth-century England into the centre of folklore publishing (Schacker 2003: 4). The issue of translating folklore should be understood, then, against this larger scene of shifting reading practices, publishers’ policies, and, importantly, as part of heated scholarly discussions within the folkloristic field of study often directed against the popular wave of ‘commodification and objectivation of folklore forms’ (as Schacker put it). Opinions were divided even within The Folklore Society itself, with Ralston and Edwin Sydney Hartland (1848–1927) (article 3), for example, staunchly supporting scientific methods of authenticity in recording folklore materials, while others, like Lang (1844–1912) and Jacobs (1854–1916), were themselves involved in producing popular collections of folklore (article 97 All these scholars belonged to the ‘great team of British folklorists’ as described by Richard Dorson (1968); see also Allan Gomme (1952). According to *A Dictionary of English Folklore* (Simpson and Roud 2003), Hartland was President of The Folklore Society in 1899–1901; Jacobs was an active member in the Council of the Society between 1889 and 1900; he was also the Editor of the Society’s journal *Folk-Lore* (1890–1893) and remained on the editorial board till 1900; and Lang joined the Folklore Society on its formation in 1878, serving as its President in 1889–1891.

On the controversial character of the term authenticity, see more in Bendix (1997).
2). These, according to Hartland, were ‘furbished up by literary art’ and served for amusement; hence of comparatively little use for the science of folklore (Hartland 1891: 11). At the same time in the preface to his English Fairy Tales, a fellow-scholar admits his rewriting of the tales as ‘a good old nurse’ will tell them (Jacobs 1890: x); his book of English fairy tales was intended for English children who will listen to them.

Jacobs reveals some of the shop talk of the day when he refers in the same preface to his fellow-students and the study of folklore that ‘has pretensions to be a science’ with its special terminology and its own methods of investigation. On some future occasion, he promises, he will treat the subject of the English folktale on a larger scale and with all the necessary ‘paraphernalia of prolegomena and excursus’. Then, ‘of course’, the originals will be reproduced with literal accuracy (Jacobs 1890: xi). Here Jacobs might as well have referred to Ralston who tried to impress on collectors the absolute necessity of accurately recording the stories they hear, and of accompanying them by ample references for the sake of verification. Unlike his colleague, Ralston was strongly against the ‘temptation to alter, to piece together, and to improve’ and finally to amuse the reader (Ralston 1878: 2) (article 3).

Lang, the anthropologist, was known in his day also as the folklorist, the classicist, the romantic poet, the literary scholar, the journalist, the historian, the parapsychologist, the author of 120 books and a contributor to 150 more. Today, however, the most significant of all these roles is that of “the Master of Fairyland”, chosen in honour of his editions of folktales for children, ‘enormously popular in their day’ and ‘gracing the shelves of better bookstores today’ (Black 1988: 24–25, 27). However, between 1889 and 1910 when the Colour Fairy Books were published, his scholarly reputation suffered from the connection with children’s literature, and his enterprise ‘drew a lot of fire’ (Sundmark 2004: 1–2). Characteristically, it is to this audience that Lang appeals for support in the preface to the Yellow Fairy Book: ‘If children are pleased, and they are so kind as to say that they are pleased, the Editor does not care very much for what other people may say’. Still, he finds it necessary to mention one of his critics: ‘Now, there is one gentleman who seems to think that it is not quite right to print so many fairy tales, with pictures, and to publish them in red and blue covers. He is named Mr. G. Laurence Gomme, and he is president of a learned body called the Folk Lore Society’ (Lang 1906: ix).

Thus, the heated discussions of folklorists even within The Folklore Society, briefly described above, has shown how crucial it was (and probably still is) for folklore translators to make their choices while deciding on their translation strategies and their audiences. Much depends here on the agenda that they subscribe to, as well as their social stance and emotionality, i.e. an awareness of their own agency. In the folklorists’ debate, Ralston sided with Hartland and Gomme against Lang’s and Jacobs’s efforts at producing folklore collections where the material was largely adapted to the taste and interest of the young reader. Ralston’s translation strategy, in general, can be
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98 See article 2 for a comparative analysis of the parallel texts of one of the preeminent English folktales, “Jack the Giant Killer”, in Hartland’s and Jacobs’s editions

99 The Folio Society has recently announced its plans for publishing ‘the full series of Lang’s fairy books, in beautiful hardback editions with classic illustrations’ (http://www.foliosociety.com/category/9319/andrew-lang-s-fairy-books). Also, Edinburgh University Press is planning to release new collected editions of Lang’s works and Stevenson’s collected writings that ‘demonstrate that there is a renewed enthusiasm for Victorian and Edwardian writers’ (Shaw 2016: 502). Of interest is also a recent attempt (Hensley 2013) at reexamining Lang’s literary career through the prism of relational sociology of Pierre Bourdieu and Bruno Latour.
briefly described in his own words when he writes that the fifty-one stories which he
translated he rendered ‘as literally as possible’, thus trying to produce a ‘photograph
of the Russian story-teller’ and not an ‘ideal portrait’ (Ralston 1873: x–xi). Notably,
this translation strategy conformed to his scholarly agenda and Ralston was most
likely to have addressed his collection to the folklorist rather than the general reader.
Ryan also stresses the fact that Ralston’s book was ‘a serious scholarly exercise’; in
fact, it had been an authoritative source for scholars up to the mid-twentieth century,
and is ‘still quoted with respect’ (Ryan 2009: 127–128).

However, with the British publishing industry expanding ‘enormously’, translation
flourished in certain genres such as children’s fiction (Hale 2006: 34; also Hines 2013:
225) and it was to this section of readers that the tales often appealed (many imported
from a variety of oral traditions of the world). Accordingly, adapted to fit in the same
linguistic and cultural style, they were intended to please rather than to instruct; and
Lang, explaining his editing practice in the prefaces to the books, notes that the stories
were altered in many ways to make them suitable for children; they were ‘softened
down’ as much as possible in the interests of propriety (quoted in Sundmark 2004:
2–3). Lang’s editing methods in this respect were sometimes even more radical than
Jacobs’s, as the results of a comparative textual analysis have shown (article 2).

Like Ralston (see above), whose translation of Russian folktales was his major
inspiration, Ransome, too, entertained a keen interest in folklore throughout his early
career (even if he never belonged to any folklore society), which was to culminate in his
most successful fairy book. While folklore as a key intellectual framework of his time
helped shape Ralston’s scholarly and literary ambitions and his works, Ransome’s
translation project was to be accomplished in no less remarkable atmosphere of the early
twentieth-century Russia. Alongside the achievements of the Russian Geographical
Society and its Commission on Skazki headed by S.F. Oldenburg (Ivanova 2009,
Howell 2015), there was a renewed interest in folklore in the society at large as visual
artists, musicians, and choreographers began to take a different approach to folk art in
revival movements and modernist compositions (Olson 2004: 26). Celebrated from ‘an
explicitly modernist perspective’ in articles by leading painters and sculptors, folk art
shared and in large part inspired ‘exuberant fantasy’ of the new movements (Taruskin
1986: 25, 27). In painting, Wassily Kandinsky, Natalia Goncharova, and others evolved
new, abstract artistic techniques from the folk designs. The Ballets Russes produced
many ballets incorporating Slavic folk themes, while the artists emphasized aspects
of Russian art that were striking to Western audiences (Olson 2004: 27).

Even if originally it was Ralston that motivated him in taking up the Russian
material, as well as served as a reliable guide into the Russian oral tradition, it was
to Lang’s textual practices that Ransome subscribed to when working on his own
collection of Russian tales. Ransome’s texts are not literal and accurate translations
of the scholarly type like Ralston’s were but, rather, retellings, bearing clear signs of
an effort to adapt them to the taste of the young British reader (article 4). The matter
of the reader, however, is complicated, given that children’s books often have a dual
or, according to Peter Hunt, there are adults’ children’s books, i.e. those children’s

100 In fact, the photography, a major nineteenth-century development in the visual arts, had its ‘repercussion’
in the field of translation too. A preference was now given to naturalistic black and white photograph rather
than to a colour portrait idealizing the form and contents of the original text, a predominant image for
translation in the eighteenth century (Stark 1999: 12).
books that adults like (and valorise) and children’s books (Hunt 1995: 10; emphasis in text). Notably, Ransome’s ambivalence on the matter is obvious when, first, he says that his book is not for the learned or grown-up people but, then, in his opinion, people who really like fairy stories never grow up; probably implying himself in the first place (Ransome 1957: vii–viii). Riitta Oittinen argues that an issue of intentionality should be taken into consideration in deciding on the matter as, in her opinion, if the original author has intended or directed her/his book to be read by children, it is a children’s book (Oittinen 2000: 62). In this sense it seems easy to categorize Old Peter’s Russian Tales as its author was quite outspoken on the point: ‘This is a book written far away in Russia, for English children who play in deep lanes with wild roses above them in the high hedges, or by the small singing becks that dance down the gray fells at home’ (Ransome 1957: viii).

A close reading of the translation (article 4) shows that indeed Old Peter is a children’s book, especially as the translator took great pains to rewrite the original tales adapting them for his audience. But, even if somewhat trivialized in the process of elaboration and polishing, some of the stories are still not altogether appropriate for children (or at least for young children). Here one recalls the whole controversial issue of relegating the folktale to the realm of children’s literature. It is well-known that originally fairy stories are only ‘vaguely moral, usually in a haphazard way’ (Carpenter 1985: 3). In fact it took quite long for them to become acceptable as an educational tool so that today the objectives of amusement and instruction, often regarded as a dichotomy paralleled by child versus adult, are seen not only as compatible but also complementary in the popular folktale collections (Seago 1995: 19; Schacker 2003: 11). In particular, ‘the vogue’ of the fairy stories in upper-class French circles of the seventeenth century, according to Peter France, was founded on the possibility of taking a sophisticated, detached, but possibly nostalgic pleasure in the naive; and Perrault recreated his stories, drawing on various sources, making no claim for faithful transcription, playing the game of naivety with consenting adults (France 1995: 31–33). Notably, Ransome’s book written in the last days of pre-revolutionary Russia bears clear marks of the time. It is imbued with nostalgic colouring, emphasized by the beauty of Mitrokhin’s illustrations; hence, even more appealing to the grown-up audience.

To return to the issue of Ransome’s model in rewriting the Russian folktale, he seems to be well aware that it was not only ‘the magnetism’ of Lang’s name that explained his success but also the illustrations, the printing, the covers – the whole package that was appealing (Sundmark 2004: 2; also Hines 2013: 234–239). This was obviously taken into account, especially given that Ransome had previously collaborated with artists on a number of his literary projects, such as Bohemia in London with excellent Taylor’s black and white illustrations mentioned above (4.2.) or A History of Story-Telling with J. Gavin’s impressive portraits to each of his essays. With artists in his family (e.g. his mother’s amateur interest in water colour painting that she practiced throughout her life) and his own interest in art, Ransome was probably only glad to find himself in the flourishing artistic scene in Petrograd, not very unlike his Bohemian London days, too.

101 Interestingly, Hart-Davis stresses two very different characters that his friend combined in himself: ‘a dedicated man of letters, with a passion for language and literature’ and ‘a perpetual schoolboy’, the ‘amalgamation’ that produced his books for children (Ransome 1976: 10).

102 I would agree here with Hardyment (2012: 53) that the author was thinking about his daughter he had left at home and missed so much.
Walpole, his friend Somov, a Russian artist already famous at the time, other artists, including most importantly Mitrokhin, were part of Ransome’s British-Russian circle of friends and acquaintances at the time.\textsuperscript{103}

In 1910–1913 Mitrokhin, of the younger generation of \textit{Mir Iskusstva} [World of Art] artistic circle had already made his name as an illustrator of Wilhelm Hauff’s \textit{Der Kleine Muck} and V.A. Zhukovsky’s \textit{Roland-oruzhenosets} while working for I.N. Knebel, the well-known publisher of children’s illustrated books in the early twentieth Russia. Mitrokhin’s works, with his ‘distinctly individual ornamental style’, are recognized as exemplary of graphic arts in the illustrious pre-revolutionary Russia (Gerchuk 2013: 246, 262; \textit{Kniga o Mitrokhine} 1986).

While Ralston’s collection of Russian folktales does not include any images,\textsuperscript{104} Ransome and his publisher were especially pleased with the artist’s illustrations to their collection of Russian folklore. Of significance is an apparent affinity of the translator and illustrator in their joint work, the outcome of a friendship of ardent lovers of literature and art (article 5). Ransome’s elaborate rendering of a distinctly individual style of the Russian folktale is further enhanced by the artist’s effort to acquaint the foreign reader with the Russian peasant world. His black and white head- and tail-pieces, realistic, but also poetic, depictions of everyday ordinary items and life of the rustic Russia, as well as a few elaborate coloured plates, highly emotional and beautiful portrayals of the fairyland, allude to other texts and images and reflect current artistic norms, trends and tastes.

Therefore, thanks largely to a direct involvement in the folklore movement or a profound interest in the field, both Ralston and Ransome became closely associated with the Russian culture and people, learning the language (self-taught, each with his own method), visiting the country (Ralston’s two short stays and Ransome’s nearly ten years with intervals), and developing an affinity with it to finally take up their translation projects. Their translation strategies and techniques, however, proved to be different, in accordance with the agendas they subscribed to either as folklorists with largely scholarly interests addressing experts’ community or authors and compilers of popular folklore collections appealing to an expanding market of children’s literature.

\textsuperscript{103}His letters and diaries have evidence of their meetings, dinners together, etc.

\textsuperscript{104}While the Internet Archive Reprint of the first edition of Ralston’s book includes no images, the Gutenberg Reprint of an American edition features an opening black and white image (unattributed). It may be assumed that his disappointment with illustrations to his Krylov’s fables (Ralston 1869) was a reason that Ralston abstained from any collaboration with artists for his volume of Russian folktales.
PART III

5 SUMMARIES OF ARTICLES

In this chapter, I will provide a brief introduction to each of the articles, and after having first summarized the article, I will discuss its research findings.

5.1 THE TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF DATA: LANGUAGES IN FOLKLORE TRANSLATION

Article 1, Problema peredachi natsional’nogo kolorita russkoi skazki v britanskoi perevodcheskoj traditsii [Ways of Rendering the Culture Specific Character of the Russian Folktale in the British Translation Tradition], was one of a series of my 2010–2011 Russian publications in peer-reviewed scientific journals (see the Bibliography). They were chiefly based on the textual analysis of translations and Russian source texts.

After a general contrastive overview of Ralston’s Russian Folk-Tales and Ransome’s Old Peter’s Russian Tales to indicate their differences in terms of composition, as well as the translators’ statements on their general translation approaches and intended audiences, the article deals with the analysis of the texts. The Russian folktale “Ved’ma i Soltseva sestra” is first compared with Ralston’s translation “The Witch and the Sun’s Sister”. This, in its turn, is compared with Ransome’s text “Prince Ivan, the Witch Baby, and the Little Sister of the Sun”, supplemented with my Russian gloss translations. The examples illustrate the differences of the translators’ strategies and the particular techniques employed in dealing with the culture-specific items of the original texts.

In accordance with his idea of a ‘transcript of nature’ that he was interested in, Ralston follows the original as closely as possible, sometimes introducing Russian words, if dissatisfied with the English corresponding item: e.g. skazki (skazochki) instead of tales or stories; or resorting to literalisms in an effort to render even the slightest nuances of some Russian lexical-stylistic formulas, like, for example, poezzhai otsiudova kuda glaza gliadiat, poekhal kuda glaza gliadiat, translated in the former instance as ride away whithersoever your eyes guide you, and in the latter as rode off without caring where he went, with an additional note ‘Whither [his] eyes look.’\(^{105}\) Thus, as he strives for producing a photograph of the Russian peasant and his tale, Ralston’s translations are as literal as possible, surely appealing to the scholar of the day who firmly believed in the authenticity of their folklore material (Bendix 1997; also, see above 4.1 and 4.3). There is also a pronounced archaizing tendency (see 4.3 above) (e.g. whithersoever, whither of the examples cited above) in an apparent effort to assign greater respect to the original oral tradition. Archaisms, in addition to mostly literary or stylistically neutral vocabulary of the translations (e.g. podnachal’nikh liudei – subjects; s rodu upervoi

---

\(^{105}\) These are obviously examples of ‘strong foreignization’ solutions, or shifts, according to Van Poucke’s classification (2012: 145).
– for the first time in his life), are largely incongruous, given the highly colloquial style of the original (effected by the so-called Russian prostorech’ e, i.e. substandard speech).\textsuperscript{106} Ransome closely follows the plotline of the Russian folktale but, sometimes, may combine original variants to suit his purposes. Also, he finds it necessary to add numerous details to explain or to make the story more dramatic, emotional, and attractive to his younger reader. This is achieved by choosing appropriate vocabulary (e.g. the ever-present adjective little; simple but effective metaphors such as gallop like the wind, grow like a seed of corn),\textsuperscript{107} as well as direct speech, inversion, and, importantly, repetitions. In following the original closely, Ralston too cannot avoid the repetitions in his texts, but Ransome makes the most of them, so that to produce in the end stylized translations. His texts are made in imitation of the sing-song (melodious, musical) style of the Russian folktale with its numerous tautologies effected by ways of sound, syllable, words, phrases, and super-phrasal units, thus rendering the largely formulaic character of the original (see Gusarova 1986: 25; Vasil’eva 2005).

There is also an issue of culture-specific vocabulary (realia) in folklore texts (e.g. Ivan, tsar), indicating their place of origin, even if few of these are present.\textsuperscript{108} Ransome tends to sparely introduce such loan words, limiting their use to the items that became part of the exotic vocabulary of the target culture, otherwise preferring to translate them. For example, his variants are Tree-rooter, Mountaintosser (with giant appended to them by way of explication) for Ralston’s transliterations giant Vertodub, giant Vertogor, explained in the notes (Vertodub, the Tree-extractor; Vertogor, the Mountain leveller).\textsuperscript{109} In some cases Ralston may also use various translations for such original items, like the abode of the Sun’s Sister, the chamber of the Sun’s Sister; the dwelling of the Sun’s Sister, obviously groping for an accurate rendering of the Russian terem (duly explained in a detailed note to the text). Ransome in this case uses English items, like, the castle of the little sister of the Sun, the battlements of rosy cloud, the topmost turret of the castle, expanding on his image of the Sun’s sister as a child living in the castle of clouds with all the necessary additional details.\textsuperscript{110}

The conclusions arrived at in the end of this article (consistent throughout this series of my publications) are that, firstly, there seems to be two radically different tendencies (approaches, strategies) within the British translation tradition of folklore materials: the one embodied in Ralston’s scholarly transcripts, literal and accurate, while the other is manifest in Ransome’s imaginative retellings. The former is selective in the choice of folktales designed to illustrate their particular, culture-specific character; as well as informative in his commentaries and notes, thus appealing to the scholar, rather than the general reader. The latter, on the other hand, addresses the children, now the primary audience for fairy tales (their interests and tastes to be attended to as closely as possible), also more successful with his book in commercial

\footnotetext{106}{The folktale contains a wealth of such Russian lexis (Anikin 1977: 208).}

\footnotetext{107}{When information is added like in these cases, the translation shift is categorized as ‘strongly domesticating’ (Van Poucke 2012: 147).}

\footnotetext{108}{See on realia, e.g. Leppihalme (2011) and Vlahov and Florin (1980).}

\footnotetext{109}{Clearly, Ralston’s transliterations, which are additionally explained in a note, and Ransome’s English equivalents are examples of ‘strongly foreignizing’ vs. ‘moderately domesticating’ translation shifts (Van Poucke 2012: 145–148).}

\footnotetext{110}{While using castle instead of dwelling, for the Russian item terem, the translator additionally introduces other English lexemes such as battlement, turret; hence further ‘mutating’ the ST, i.e. using a ‘strongly domesticating’ translation shift (Van Poucke 2012: 147).}
terms. Ransome’s variants tend to transform (rewrite) the original in respect of style, vocabulary, and imagery to reach the British child, to amuse and educate them. They are effective as attractive and convincing stylizations, but also at a cost, because the originals have to be adapted, simplified, and hence trivialized.

5.2 THE TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF DATA: RANSOME’S TRANSLATION AGAINST THE TEXTUAL PRACTICE OF POPULAR FAIRY BOOKS

Article 2, Rol’ Andriu Langa v transformatii fol’klornoi skazki dlia detei [Andrew Lang’s Role in the Transformation of Folk Tales for Children], my other Russian article, examines Ransome’s texts against the background of the nineteenth-century folklore collections with their editing and textual practices. If Ralston’s translation was influential in informing Ransome of the richness of the Russian folklore tradition and hence gave him an idea of his future fairy book, Lang was another crucial influence, especially in terms of Ransome’s actual rewriting of the Russian folktale. The latter with his Colour Fairy Books (see 4.4) was probably the key figure in the field, having established the canon and the cultic status of fairy tales in the English-speaking world. As has been mentioned above, he was Ralston’s colleague in The Folklore Society, but also a major opponent, like Jacobs, in the controversy over the issue of authenticity and scientific principles to be adhered to in collecting folklore material, on the one hand, and commodification of folklore, increasingly packaged to appeal and cater to the taste of the younger reader, on the other hand.

I have analysed for the purpose three different versions of the famous story of “Jack the Giant Killer” from Hartland’s, Jacobs’s, and Lang’s collections of folk and fairy tales, as well as the translation of a Russian tale from Lang’s Yellow Fairy Book. According to A Dictionary of English Folklore (Simpson and Roud 2003), Hartland’s primary scholarly interest was in the folktale and he was one the leading experts in the field. His publications included English Fairy and Other Folk Tales (1890), an anthology of texts, and The Science of Fairytales: An Enquiry into the Fairy Mythology (1891), which ‘attempted a theory of the subject’. Like Ralston, he was against the popular wave of ‘commodification and objectivation of folklore forms’ (Schacker), staunchly defending the scientific principles of accurate transcripts of folklore material, the principle he adhered to in his own collection of folklore (1890). Conversely, Jacobs’s collection of English fairy tales, published the same year, was a rewriting of folklore texts to please his younger audience, as he explains in the preface to his work (see 4.4 above).

The analysis of the textual material in article 2 begins with a comparison between Hartland’s and Jacobs’s variants of the English tale. In accordance with their approaches, the former follows closely the chapbook, from which it was borrowed, while the latter rewrites it: two of the rather loosely combined episodes dealing with the protagonist’s feats against giants and other enemies of the crown are omitted; dialogues are used instead of reported speech, simple sentences are preferred to complex ones, participial constructions are simplified into verbs or nominal constructions, and formal items are substituted by stylistically neutral, familiar ones. Changes, similar to these and even more radical (more parts and details are left out), are introduced in the Lang’s version of the same tale as its comparison with the Jacobs’s edited text shows.111

111 Omissions are considered a ‘strongly domesticating’ translation shift (Van Poucke 2012: 147).
The next important step in the analysis of Lang’s editing practice was to examine translations in his anthologies, which were based on stories collected from all over the world, including Russia. The one of apparent interest for the analysis was “Flying Ship” [Letuchii korabl’], especially as Ransome’s collection contains a version of the same Russian tale titled “The Fool of the World and the Flying Ship”. It should be noted here that, according to The Autobiography, Ransome grew up with Lang’s Fairy Books and had all the volumes of the series in his private collection. Apparently, the favourite read of his formative years had a lasting effect on him as the future translator of Russian tales (see also article 4). Appealing to the younger reader, as well as striving for a commercial success of his retellings, Ransome fashioned them in accordance with the canon of the nineteenth century, hence transforming the Russian folktale into a British fairy tale (or children’s story as suggested by France (1995)). Also, my comparative analysis of the two versions of this particular tale shows that, even if making use of his predecessor’s textual frameworks, Ransome differs from Lang in the most important aspect – his emphasis on the careful rendering of the culture-specific character of the Russian tale. Especially as his knowledge of the original folklore tradition, based on first-hand experience, was superior to that of Lang and his translators who seem to have mostly relied on German sources.

5.3 RALSTON AS AN INTERCULTURAL AGENT

Article 3, Russian Folklore for the English Reader: William Ralston as an Intercultural Agent, deals with Ralston’s case study. It explores the significant role of individual agency in Anglo-Russian literary and cultural interaction, promoted thanks to the enthusiasm of the motivated translator familiarizing the English reader with Russian folklore in the 1870s. The personality of the ‘one serious scholar of Russian letters at this time’ and his works are examined in the context of a call for humanization of translation studies and active discussions of agency.

While his role in the popularization of Russian folklore and literature has long been recognized, especially in Russia (Alekseev and Levin 1994), Ralston’s collection of skazki (1873), published in London at a time when the ‘discovery’ of Russian literature was yet to be made, has been largely overlooked. Also, there was a need for a more focused and detailed study of his agency as a translator of folklore and an intercultural mediator, as well as of the social structures and translation practices in which this agency was embedded; hence the focus of this article was on Ralston’s folklore translations in the cultural context of the period in question. In keeping with the character of his personality and social stance, as well as with his scholarly and literary ambitions, Ralston’s interest in the Russian language, pursued with enthusiasm and diligence, led him to become an expert in the field of Russian folklore and literature. This rare expertise was quite appropriate in the intellectual atmosphere of the nineteenth century, ‘the golden age of folklore in Europe and North America’,

112 In contrast to a few other stories (scant or no information on their sources), the identification of the Russian original for the “Flying Ship” was rather easy.

Another two Russian tales that appear in the Red Book were borrowed from Ralston’s collection, which was mentioned in the preface, as well as in a note to the tales. The changes in them were minimal: in one a couple of Russian transliterated words were substituted by English equivalents and the other had a new title.
and, it should be added, in Russia too. It was during his Russian trips that Ralston became so impressed with the scholars’ contributions to the field that he became an enthusiastic popularizer of Russian scholarship and folklore. Thus, a closer critical analysis of the translator’s agency within the social structures of the period shows that his social stance, as well as the scholarly agenda he subscribed to, were major factors that influenced Ralston’s choice of material to translate and his translation strategy of literalness.

Notably, the important and rather sensitive issue of translation in the field of folklore has not been fully recognized, let alone sufficiently explored, despite having been present at least since the time of the Grimms’ publication of German folktales and the translations that followed. In Ralston’s day when folklore studies strove to establish itself as a science, elaborating its professional ethics of collecting and recording folklore materials, it had to encounter the issue of their commodification associated with an immense production of folktale and fairy tale collections targeted at the general reader. This involved translators in making ethical choices, in accordance with their willingness and ability to act and influence. To explore and understand how Ralston approached his material, i.e. his strategy and practice in coping with his translation task, his extratextual, paratextual and textual agency were scrutinized. As has been shown, the translator did not limit himself to merely professing the philosophy of literalness in the general spirit of the day (the translator’s stance echoing the working ethics of a folklore scholar as well), but scrupulously adhered to his chosen strategy in his translations of Russian popular literature in strict accord with his scholarly agenda.

5.4 RANSOME AS AN INTERCULTURAL AGENT: A MICROHISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Article 4, Arthur Ransome’s Rewriting of the Russian Folktale Historicised, focuses on the first two to three years of Ransome’s life in Russia, during which he worked and completed his translation project of Old Peter’s Russian Tales (1916). The first major success of the then young striving author, it has today attained classic status and may outlast, according to Brogan, the success of his children’s novels of a later period that made him famous both in Britain and abroad. Ransome’s collection of Russian tales is of major interest, in my opinion, as one of the key texts, as well as a unique experience, in the history of the British-Russian cultural interaction and interconnections at the turn of the twentieth century. In an attempt at historicizing the author-translator in his creative effort of rewriting the Russian folktale, this paper focused on his Russian quest, as well as his collection of fairy stories, that bears clear marks of this interaction with the place and the people. A microscopic analysis of the translator’s Russian life and work, via a study of archival material and other relevant documents, has helped to reconstruct them in the richness of detail that sheds light on the larger picture of British-Russian cultural relationship. The translator’s gift to his reader, a token of happy experiences in the new and exciting fairyland, was in fact the product of his mediation agency between the two worlds, the role that Ransome had found crucial and realized successfully in practice. As a result, another cultural and emotional bridge was built to interconnect the countries.

The task of reaching the most receptive audience, British children, fell to Ransome, whose Old Peter, the retelling of his favourite skazki, was a milestone in his
distinguished career as a children’s author. Its style was quite distinct from that of his major predecessor (Ralston), chiefly because Ransome’s premises were of a different nature: in the golden age of the fairy tale he had chosen to follow Lang’s popular style with his famous adaptations of international folktales for British children and to rewrite (transform) the original folktales, mostly to entertain but also to educate his audience. While the obstacles in dealing with folklore translation are ‘massive’ and the reception problems are acute for the audience, familiar neither with the content nor with the intertextual framework of the strange folklore tradition (Tymoczko 1995; also Kazakova 2003: 250–302; and article 4), the translator’s most challenging task was that of mediation between the two worlds. To make the foreign world comprehensible, as well as attractive to the reader, Ransome employed a number of effective methods including frame stories, that he introduced as informative and realistic sketches of the country and the people, which were both entertaining and educating in the ways and stories of the Russian countryside. A variety of the original types of the genre: wonder tales, animal tales, tales of everyday life, etc., represented in the collection, were carefully and skillfully rewritten to include additional explanations and elucidations; their didactic side, as well as happy endings, now typical features of the popular fairy stories, often accentuated; and their language and style polished and elaborated. As a result, Ransome produced an interesting interpretation of the Russian fairyland, marked by a distinctly individual character.

Besides, one cannot fail to notice something of a nostalgic colouring of Ransome’s fairy book, which is obviously an appeal to the sensibilities of an adult reader. A snapshot of the last days of the rustic and idyllic Russia, Old Peter is in fact a rare period piece bearing clear marks of the time and place.

5.5 IMAGES IN TRANSLATION

Article 5, Arthur Ransome and Dmitri Mitrokhin: Translating the Russian Folktales, coauthored with Asya Usmanova of the Lomonosov Moscow State University, focuses on creative collaboration of the British author and Russian artist in retelling Russian tales to children. Among many of his friends and acquaintances, mentioned in The Autobiography and Ransome’s biographies, Mitrokhin had a special place thanks to his admirable illustrations made for Old Peter (highly appraised by the translator and his publishers). It was natural too that they became friends, granted their many common interests and passions, such as, for example, Paris and French culture, British and French authors, art and artists, Russia, and, most importantly, everything concerning books as both were avid readers and book collectors. They were especially close to each other in Petrograd of the 1915–1916, when they often met for discussions and talks while ‘sharing a samovar’ (as Ransome put it in a letter he wrote to Mitrokhin in some forty years).

This affinity on a personal level shows in their joint work: Ransome’s book of over three hundred pages aptly illustrated with Mitrokhin’s seven coloured plates and twenty nine black and white head-pieces and end-pieces. The atmosphere of a joyous meeting with the reader created by the decorative dust jacket is further maintained by the emotionally powerful coloured pictures, and the black-and-white vignettes rendering the countryside background contribute to the rustic poetics of the stories. While Ransome’s translation strategy was largely domesticating, he was careful in conveying the culturally specific character of the Russian tale. This was enhanced by
Mitrokhin’s effort to educate the foreign reader in the ways of the Russian peasant world and story. Imbued with a nostalgic appeal of the Russian Silver age, his pictures add to the bright colours and charm of the book, while the friendship and cooperation of the translator and artist are illustrative of the British-Russian enchantment at the turn of the twentieth century.
6 CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

This dissertation, with its focus on the agency and cultural mediation of William Ralston and Arthur Ransome, the two translators of Russian folklore and prominent figures in the British-Russian cultural interaction at the turn of the twentieth century, draws on the latest theoretical and methodological developments in translation history studies and is meant to be a further contribution to the field. Thus, for all the tension that may arise between the two duties of translation history scholars, it is clear that they should keep the dialogue going between translation-related discourses and the academic discipline of history in order to reach an in-depth historical understanding of translation issues in the cultural history of humanity. Importantly, there is every reason to approach ‘interconnected bodies of writings and experiences’, in which history of humanity is expressed, from the perspective of translators as key agents of cultural interaction and mediation, often remaining roughly sketched or simplified. To make sense of translators as historical subjects involved in the interconnecting work, the possibilities that may be opened by a microhistorical perspective, an effective method used by historians since the 1970s, should be fully employed; hence a special emphasis of this work on the microhistories of the intercultural agents, like Ralston and Ransome.

The main empirical findings, as well as methodological and theoretical contributions of the research have been presented in the five articles included in the thesis. The first two of them (articles 1 and 2) deal with a comparative analysis of translated texts and originals, as well as Ralston’s and Ransome’s versions of translations to one and the same original tales, and a number of relevant non-translated texts. This was the first stage of the present research, exploring the specific character of Russian folktales in relation to major linguistic and cultural problems of folklore translation; the strategies and solutions the translators used to specifically cater to the tastes and needs of their intended audiences, and the commonalities and differences between their translation styles. Notably, already at this stage there was an interest in relating mostly textual analysis of the particular translation products with questions of textual and editing practice of contemporaneous folktale and fairy tale collections (especially popular editions addressing children) against the background of folklore studies in its formative period. The next two articles (3 and 4) discuss the issues of the second stage of research, with the results of the primary text product analysis substantiated by way of situating the translators and their works within their specific historical contexts, i.e. digging into the literary and translation issues that the translators were specifically interested in and exploring their particular motivations for Russian associations, as well as their actual experiences, that finally turned them into committed agents, operating in the intercultural spaces and effecting their cosmopolitan stance.

Ralston’s translation, designed to be a photograph of the Russian peasant and his tale, is as literal as possible, though the archaising tendency emphasized in the English texts, makes them a marked difference from the highly colloquial style of the original tales. Ransome’s are apt stylizations, effectively imitating the melodious style of the Russian folktale with its numerous tautologies of sound, syllable, word, phrase, and super-phrasal unit; hence, rendering its largely formulaic character. These translation styles evidence two radically different tendencies within the British translation tradition of folklore materials: scholarly transcripts like Ralston’s and imaginative
retellings like Ransome’s. The former, which is as literal as possible, selective in the choice of folktales designed to illustrate their culture-specific character, informative in commentaries and notes, appeals to the scholar, rather than the general reader. The latter, on the other hand, addresses children (after the famous Lang’s anthologies) as the primary audience for fairy tales, transforming the original texts in respect of style, vocabulary, and imagery with the purpose of both amusing and instructing the addressee. Thus tailored, the transformed fairy tales are attractive and convincing, though the original texts undergo adaptation, simplification, and hence trivialization in the process of rewriting.

Article 3 concerns Ralston’s individual agency as an early enthusiastic and motivated translator in promoting Anglo-Russian cultural interaction in Victorian England; his expertise in the field of Russian folklore and literature was a rare but quite an appropriate achievement in “the golden age of folklore”. The folklore studies of the day strove to establish itself as a science, professing scientific principles of recording folklore in stark opposition to its commodification, manifest in an immense production of popular folklore collections. Under the circumstance, in full accord with the working ethics of a folklore scholar (as well as with the prevailing translation policies and practices) Ralston’s choices were literalness and accuracy. Article 4 focuses on Ransome’s early life in Russia and work on his translation. Produced in the context of British intellectuals’ quest for understanding Russia, with the countries having struck an alliance before WWI, it is an interesting and innovative interpretation of the Russian folktale intended for the younger reader, as well as a remarkable period piece; a snapshot of the rustic and idyllic Russia in the last days of the Empire. The country’s attractive world of magic is rendered through the emotional lens of the translator, the interested cultural mediator between the two worlds. Finally, article 5 explores the visual aspect of Ransome’s rewriting of the Russian folk tale, which shows the importance of Mitrokhin’s images in rendering the attractiveness of the strange fairyland to the international reader, as well as illustrates the personal intercultural dimension of the British-Russian cultural interaction.

6.1 METHODOLOGICAL AND THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Having started with the empirical study of translated texts, I have become more and more interested in the translators themselves and their motivations in choosing the texts and strategies to translate them, which required exploring the wider cultural contexts, in which the translators and their translation products were situated and which they were to finally influence building important links between texts, peoples, and cultures. Importantly, this answers current calls for humanization of translation studies and greater emphasis on translators as agents of translation and cultural interaction, i.e. historical subjects with agendas of their own, their works and intercultural experiences promoting interconnections between cultures and peoples. Hence, the present work contributes to further elaborating the concept of agency in translation, exploring and reconstructing the agents’ microhistories, i.e. closely observing the specificity of facts and events pertaining to the two British translators of the Russian folktale to finally shed light on the larger picture of the cultural interaction between the countries in its most interesting and important period. In other words, while keeping one eye on particular translation issues I have also tried to think like
a historian, particularly in my emphasis on historicizing the translators’ works and experiences from a microhistorical perspective based on their personal papers and other relevant documentary evidence.

6.1.1 The Translator as a Committed Intercultural Agent

The agency of the translators under study specifically stands out, granted that they operated before the current boom of translation activities and the development of the respective field of studies. Rather than part of institutions, corporate businesses, and international networks of today (Koskinen 2008; Abdallah 2012), it was more of an individual enterprise where much depended on the initiative and commitment of translators who were ready to take risks while indulging with their translation activities.

Interestingly, Ralston was not so much after remuneration while undertaking his translations but rather acted out of a genuine interest in Russian popular literature. He might also have cherished literary and scholarly ambitions at the time when the folklore movement was on the increase. In the end, he made his mark as the eminent scholar and popularizer of Russian literature and folklore; a forerunner of the movement, he was one of key figures who prepared a wider reception of the Russian culture and literature in the West in the early twentieth century. His is the case of rare commitment and enthusiasm of an independent student of Russian at the time when the country and the people were largely unknown to the British general reader, thus illustrative of the relevance of the personal stance and the emotional dimension of the translator’s agency in the cultural interaction.

With the great age of British prosperity and confidence on the wane, the Victorian isolationism of Ralston’s day was giving way to a new openness and receptiveness to other cultures and foreign influences (Hynes 1968), including a ‘discovery’ of Russian literature (France 2006b: 308). Ransome’s translation project, a part of the British intellectuals’ effort at understanding Russia on the eve of WWI, was very much the result of his passion for folklore, cosmopolitan yearnings, and personal sentiments vis-à-vis the pre-revolutionary Russian countryside and the magic of its fairyland. The success of the Russian folktale rewritten as the English fairy tale, in accordance with the canon of the genre, was justified by Ransome’s ingenious appeal to the younger reader long accustomed to the consumer-tailored folklore collections of the nineteenth century, as well as by a growing interest in the country and the people in the early twentieth century. Importantly, even if domesticating and adapting the original tale to the tastes of the British child as he understood them, Ransome took great pains to carefully render its culture-specific character and make the strangeness of the Russian fairyland as attractive to the reader as possible. He was much assisted in this by Mitrokhin’s illustrations.

6.1.2 The Translator’s Microhistory versus History

In general, the present study, as well as a selection of those cited above (3.2.1), show that the history of cultural relations between countries and peoples is in fact a complex interaction of particular individuals who might be motivated to cross borders for a variety of reasons (mainly pursuing their literary interests) to establish international
contacts and often become cultural mediators thanks to their expertise in languages and cultures acquired during their travel and life in foreign countries. Of special relevance in this respect are certain categories of individuals, such as translators, with their cosmopolitan interests and tastes that seem to be conducive to this kind of activities. Accordingly, their microhistories provide the appropriate vantage point to look into the processes of internationalization in the world cultural field.

Ralston was a major figure in the British-Russian cultural interaction in the 1870–1880s especially with his translations of Russian folklore, granted the importance and popularity of the folklore movement in the nineteenth century. His works and personal papers, mostly letters to his Russian correspondents that survived in the Russian archives, contain important detail, pertaining both to the translator and his correspondents (mostly leading men of Russian letters), of no small historical interest, for example, in terms of the international cooperation of scholars at the time, as well as concerning other issues, which merit further consideration. Notably, he was an important predecessor for Ransome, whose task as a translator and a student of Russian folklore was made much easier with Ralston’s translation solutions and the appropriate cultural background to the stories provided.

Interestingly, Ransome happened to have been one of the witnesses of the brilliant period of pre-revolutionary Russia (the Silver age), a major area of research interest for scholars in the West and now also in Russia. Both the translator’s unique experience, reconstructed from a microhistorical perspective, with the use of archival materials and other evidence, and his translation product, a remarkable period piece, are of relevance as shedding light on the specificity of facts and events in the period of intensive cultural interaction between the countries, as well as of the cultural scene in the last days of Imperial Russia. The British translator’s and Russian artist’s creative collaboration is a part of this cultural landscape, alluding to other texts and images and reflecting current artistic norms, trends, and tastes. Importantly, the story of their friendship and joint work is an interesting and significant episode illustrative of the turn of the twentieth-century British-Russian enchantment.

Also, translators are often insiders and outsiders in relation to the cultures they interpret. Their views reflected in translations provide the interpreted cultures with opportunities for self-reflection and self-exploration that might have important implications for their cultural interaction with others, especially in terms of promoting their images worldwide.¹¹³

¹¹³ Hence, one cannot but agree with other researchers who have recognized that ‘the “cultural turn” of the nineties was indeed innovative and almost prophetic in its tireless championing of translation as a vital concept that should become central to all disciplines involved in the study of cultural interaction’ (Marinetti 2011: 31).

Of much interest in this respect is the recent effort at connecting translation studies and imagology (Doorslaer, Flynn, and Leerssen 2016).
6.1.3 The Cosmopolitan Translator Mediating Alterities

Most of the time translators become mediators between cultures thanks to their intercultural experiences as these result in acquiring an understanding and skills to work on their translation projects and deal with alterities of foreign languages and cultures.\(^{114}\)

According to Annie Brisset (2003: 101; her emphasis), alterity is constitutive of both translation itself and of translation studies. If translation is the “trial of the foreign” (Berman 1984), the metaphor suggests that translation constitutes the ultimate cognitive experience of alterity. Going against the grain of standard definitions of translation, it shifts the object of this experience from logos to anthropos: beyond languages, translation establishes relationships among people. The truth of this important theoretical and methodological premise is manifest in the present research with its focus on individuals, their interests, motivations, perceptions, connections and personal ties with other individuals, as well as their largely mundane everyday preoccupations with texts they create and bring to their audiences, texts that finally result in making a difference in the intercultural landscapes.

It appears that the alterity that translators grapple with is a historically transient concept.\(^{115}\) Obviously, in Ralston’s case the distance between the countries was relatively greater as compared with the later period, for example, of Ransome’s day. In the second half of the nineteenth century Russia, still mostly a stranger, distant, exotic, and sometimes hostile, Russian literature was non-existent for the general public, and few British people had the knowledge of the Russian language or were interested in learning it so that Ralston was obliged to learn the language with a dictionary in the absence of any teaching manuals. Meanwhile, his fascination with the language, as well as respect and admiration for the Russian peasant and their stories, and for the Russian folklorists’ expertise growing, his translations were becoming even more formidable (or scrupulously accurate) copies, or photographs, as the translator preferred to call them. Also, they bear clear marks of lexical alterity, in accordance with the foreignizing translation strategy of the day and with the folklorist’s striving for authenticity in recording the material of scholarly interest in the first place. Ralston, with his Cambridge educated background (Trinity College), and his knowledge of foreign languages, chiefly French, but also German in his case, belonged to the British intellectual elite entertaining cosmopolitan interests and tastes, which explains his open-mindedness and readiness to extend his sympathies towards new countries and cultures.

Ransome, on the other hand, with no formal university education (he left Yorkshire college for London to pursue a writer’s career) seems to have preferred an experiential kind of learning of his art of author and translator, complimenting his immense portions of reading with discussions and talks with fellow authors, artists, and story-tellers in the conducive atmosphere of the cosmopolitan London of his youth (Ransome 1912).

\(^{114}\) Alterity (alterities) is used here as defined in dictionaries: “The state of being other or different; otherness” (https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/alterity); cf. otherness specifically: the quality or state of being radically alien to the conscious self or a particular cultural orientation (https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/alterity).

\(^{115}\) Cf.: Lefevere (1982: 17) points out that ‘cultural communities tend to grow closer to each other’ so that some realia (his example is Russian ‘borsht’) that once required detailed elucidations have gradually become more well-known with their spread outside the country of their origin.
Remarkably, as his next step, he made special effort at teaching himself French while undertaking a serious study of French authors and artists through their works but, also, meeting them in person (Anatole France, Paul Fort, and de Gourmont among others), and making friends. Much of this experiential learning of the foreign and intercultural skills acquired proved to be useful in Ransome’s exploration of the Russian realities in 1913–1916 to prepare him for their alterity, as well as for his role of a cultural mediator and a translator of the Russian folktale. The London bohemian, well-versed in the latest French literary fashions, must have found the cosmopolitan literary and artistic scene in St Petersburg and Moscow conducive to his project, taking advantage of it before a drastic change of the political and cultural climate in the country. In his imaginative retelling of the Russian tale he made every effort to reach his major audience of young readers by alleviating the foreignness of the foreign on the one hand and rendering its attractiveness on the other hand.

6.1.4 Creating Zones of Contact: Folklore as a Link

Translators and translations leave their indelible mark on the history of cultural interaction, and their effect on the scene is quite tangible. Ralston’s work, the major source for the scholar interested in Russian studies and folklore in the late nineteenth century and the first half of the next, is still of significant interest as an important event in the British-Russian scholarly and literary communication, as well as in the history of folklore translation between the countries as the first serious introduction into the Russian magic world. It gave the impetus to Ransome’s creative effort, which proved to be successful enough to foster the folklore link, as well as to internationalize the Russian folktale for the English-speaking world audiences. Moreover, *Old Peter’s Russian Tales* is an excellent example of the way folklore has been increasingly packaged for the book market. Ransome achieved the necessary effect thanks to his craft, but also complying with the British canon of the fairy tale collections for children well established in the field by his time, including illustrations as a traditional element of a children’s book.

In the absence of appropriate infrastructure, personal ties kept mostly through correspondence were important for Ralston who sought for the latest news in the field, for advice and encouragement, asked for and received Russian books, magazines, and other materials he needed for his translation projects, as well as meeting similar requests of his Russian colleagues. With the mutual British-Russian interest increasing in the early twentieth century, regular patterns of exchange were being established and developed between the countries (business probably the most long-standing of the links) based again on personal interconnections that were growing in importance. For instance, Ransome’s creative collaboration with the Russian artist was not only a particular instance of friendships made at the time but also a characteristic feature of the new epoch of cooperation and mutual support (at least as far as the particular period of British-Russian alliance in question is concerned).

116 Interestingly, this is in stark contrast to Clive Bell whom Ransome commends in *The Autobiography* as the one who introduced him to Paris and the French artistic world: ‘Bell, a year or two older with his fluent French and knowledge of a wider world, ‘had so impressed me long ago’. Unlike Ransome, however, in his first year in Paris in 1904 Bell had no French friends, ‘no real friends’; it was much later that he got to know Cocteau, Matisse, and Picasso, among others, though he ‘may not call them intimate’ friends (Bell 1956: 138).
6.2 RESEARCH LIMITATIONS

The focus of this research was on the two translators and their translation products as the key actors and texts in their respective periods, other translators and works have necessarily fallen outside the scope of the paper. However, while contextualizing Ransome’s translation strategy, it was necessary to discuss in some detail Lang’s fairy tale books for children as his other major influence besides Ralston. In addition, in presenting the general translation and folklore background I have drawn on the definitive reference works such as, for example, *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English* and recent studies of translation agency and folklore collections (see 3.2.1 and 4.4 above).

The proponents of grand historical narratives may argue against the limited microhistorical scope of such studies, but in fact it is both relevant and appropriate for the aim and objectives of the present research with its preoccupation with the specificity of cultural history. Moreover, particular microhistories reconstructed in the richness of detail in fact promote an in-depth understanding of larger cultural scenes, as well as of the agency of committed mediators, the motor and driving force in building connections between countries and cultures.\(^{117}\)

In addition to being descriptive, the work is interdisciplinary by virtue of the cosmopolitan character of translation studies in general and its special interest in folklore, folklore studies, the history of the folklore movement in the nineteenth century, and folklore translated and consumer-tailored for children. This has presented a certain challenge because there was an obvious need to attend, among other things, to the issues concerning the character of folklore texts in the context of their respective traditions and, also, forming the basis of popular folktale and fairy tale collections to finally become a part of accepted children’s literature. Clearly, this has been done to an extent required by the special objectives of the research.

There are certain tensions between translation studies and history as discussed in the literature recently (see in detail 3.2 above) which raises a number of questions. Probably, the most urgent of them is the issue of fitting in translators’ microhistories into the wider picture of history of cultural interaction between countries and historiography in general. This might be perceived as a limitation of the present research as well. Clearly, the problem can be resolved with further studies of the kind to be undertaken to provide for detailed reconstructions and on their basis achieving an understanding of recurrent patterns as well.

6.3 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Apparently, the previous section already suggests some possible lines of research that follow from this work. Firstly, it is clear that folklore translation as an area within literary translation merits further research in terms of translation strategies and techniques employed while dealing with them, granted their oral-literary character and embeddedness in the respective traditions and cultures, which require, among

\(^{117}\) Also, Judy Wakabayashi (2018: 253) argues that “Criticisms of microhistories focus on their selectivity and lack of representativeness, although generalizability is not the goal and each micro-context sheds light on the broader context”.
other things, special skills of cultural mediation. Folklore translations have been explored here with a focus on the target culture and translation tradition, while there are similar rich traditions in other countries as well, including Russia and Finland, for example, for which the present work may become the starting point. There is also an obvious need to continue and explore the book history of folklore translations and their materialities, illustrations in the first place, which has been indicated in this work.\footnote{Cf.: Fernández-Ocampo and Wolf (2014); Littau (2016).}

Secondly, there is a whole range of issues of cultural interaction and internationalization of literatures and cultures, with translators as the obvious agents involved in the processes. Surprisingly, there is little research conducted along the line so far, at least as far as British-Russian cultural relations are concerned, while case studies devoted to agents who operated on both sides of the border (or rather inbetween) with the specificity of their microhistories reconstructed are sure to give a more complete and interesting picture of the history of these relations. It seems some historical periods, like the turn of the twentieth century under study in this work, when the mutual attraction and fertilization between the cultures are most intense and productive, should become an area of special interest for scholars in translation history and cultural history.

Thirdly, there are issues of methodological and theoretical frameworks to be elaborated, including the tensions between translators’ microhistories and translation history, on the one hand, and general historiography, on the other hand, which are naturally of special complexity granted the vast area of the past and a diversity of approaches of modern historians. Terminology in the field is a special concern because it seems the more widespread and current some terms are (alterity, other, interaction, mediation are just a few of them), the less satisfactory they are at least for the absence of clear-cut definitions, which may also indicate the need for further elaboration of their conceptual bases.

Therefore, by way of indulging in my interest in particular translators and their texts, as well as trying to make sense of their decision-making both in terms of textual practices and cultural mediation, I think I have ‘discovered’ for myself and for the interested reader the fascinating art and science of historicizing past universes, which are in fact never too far from our present, that allows to better understand past events and facts and, most importantly, the historical subjects who make them happen via their agency. They are no longer distant figures (especially as you immerse yourself in their personal papers and writings, and learn more about their unique experiences) but rather familiar as one may find a certain affinity with their ambitions, feelings, passions, and deeds.
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Table 1. Russian Folktales Translated by Ralston and the Original Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Упырь: [Сказка] № 363</td>
<td>I The Fiend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II [Сказка] № 361</td>
<td>II The Dead Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Рассказы о ведьмах: [Сказка] № 369</td>
<td>III The Dead Witch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Клад: [Тексты сказок] № 258</td>
<td>IV The Treasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Крест-порука: [Тексты сказок] № 450</td>
<td>V The Cross-Surety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Горький пьяница Легенды № 29</td>
<td>VI The Awful Drunkard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII Сказка о злой жене: [Сказка] № 433</td>
<td>VII The Bad Wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII Головка: [Сказка] № 444</td>
<td>VIII The Golovikha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX Три колечки: [Сказка] № 217</td>
<td>IX The Three Copecks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Ограбитель: [Сказка] № 452</td>
<td>X The Miser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI Дурак и береза: [Сказка] № 402</td>
<td>XI The Fool and the Birch-Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII Мизгирь: [Сказка] № 85</td>
<td>XII The Mizgir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII Кузнец и черт Легенды № 31</td>
<td>XIII The Smith and the Demon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV Иван Попялов</td>
<td>XIV Ivan Popyakov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV Норка</td>
<td>XV The Norka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI Марья Моревна</td>
<td>XVI Marya Morevna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII Кощей Бессмертный: [Тексты сказок] № 156</td>
<td>XVII Koshchei the Deathless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII Морской царь и Василиса Премудрая: [Сказка] № 222</td>
<td>XVIII The Water Snake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX Василиса Прекрасная: [Сказка] № 104</td>
<td>XIX The Water King and Vasilissa the Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX Всё в шоколаде [Сказка] № 135</td>
<td>XX The Baba Yaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI Василиса Прекрасная: [Сказка] № 108</td>
<td>XXI Vasilissa the Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII Иван Смок и Ведьма: [Сказка] № 93</td>
<td>XXII The Witch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII Ведьма и Солнцева сестра: [Тексты сказок] № 302</td>
<td>XXIII The Witch and the Sun’s Sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV Лихо одноглазое: [Сказка] № 303</td>
<td>XXIV One-Eyed Likho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXV Горе: [Сказка] № 106</td>
<td>XXV Woe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVI Середа</td>
<td>XXVI Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVII Середа</td>
<td>XXVII Wednesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVIII Лешь</td>
<td>XXVIII Лёш: [Сказка] № 374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIX Вазуза и Волга</td>
<td>XXIX Vazuza and Volga: [Сказка] № 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX Сохи и Днепр (Афанасьев [1688])</td>
<td>XXX Sozh and Dnieper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXI Морозко: [Сказка] № 95</td>
<td>XXXI The Metamorphosis of the Dnieper, the Volga, and the Dvina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXII Морозко: [Сказка] № 95</td>
<td>XXXII The Metamorphosis of the Dnieper, the Volga, and the Dvina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIII Морозко: [Сказка] № 95</td>
<td>XXXIII The Metamorphosis of the Dnieper, the Volga, and the Dvina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIV Принцесса Ирина: [Сказка] № 198</td>
<td>XXXIV Princess Helena the Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXV Емеля-дурак: [Сказка] № 166</td>
<td>XXXV Emilian the Fool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXVI Чибис: [Сказка] № 365</td>
<td>XXXVI The Witch Girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXVII Белогрудое: [Сказка] № 366</td>
<td>XXXVII The Headless Princess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXVIII Солнышко: [Сказка] № 367</td>
<td>XXXVIII The Soldier’s Midnight Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIX Морозко: [Сказка] № 95</td>
<td>XXXIX The Metamorphosis of the Dnieper, the Volga, and the Dvina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XL Лиса-лекарка: [Сказка] № 18</td>
<td>XL The Fox-Physician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLI Скрипач в аду: [Сказка] № 371</td>
<td>XLI The Fiddler in Hell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19 Tales XXVII and XXIX were borrowed from L.A. Khudiakov’s collection (1860–1862); the translation of tale XXX is based on Afanasyev’s text from vol. II of his Poeticheskie vozzreniia slavian [1868]. Tale XVIII was borrowed from Narodnye skazki, sobrannye sel’skimi uchiteliami (1863); and XXXI derives from Tereshchenko (Ralston1873: 210).
Table 2. Ransome’s Russian Tales and their Original Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Title</th>
<th>Russian Title</th>
<th>Original Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Hut in the Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 The Tale of the Silver Saucer and the Transparent Apple</td>
<td>1 Сказка о серебряном блюдечке и наливгли яблочке: [Сказка] № 569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sadko</td>
<td>3 Морозко: [Сказка] № 95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Frost</td>
<td>4 Летучий корабль: [Тексты сказок] № 144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 The Fool of the World and Flying Ship</td>
<td>5 Баба-яга: [Сказка] № 103</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Baba Yaga</td>
<td>6 Кот и лиса: [Сказка] № 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 The Cat Who Became Head-Forester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring in the Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 The Little Daughter of the Snow</td>
<td>7 Снегурушка и лиса: [Тексты сказок] № 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Prince Ivan, the Witch Baby, and the Little Sister of the Sun</td>
<td>8 Ведьма и Солнцева сестра: [Тексты сказок] № 93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 The Stolen Turnips, the Magic Tablecloth, the Sneezing Goat, and the Wooden Whistle</td>
<td>10 Горе: [Тексты сказок] № 303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Little Master Misery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Chapter of Fish (includes an untitled tale about the Pike and the Ersh)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 The Golden Fish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Who Lived in the Skull?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Alenoushka and her Brother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 The Fire-Bird, the Horse of Power, and the Princess Vasilissia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 The Hunter and his Wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 The Three Men of Power - Evening, Midnight, and Sunrise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Salt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Christening in the Village (includes The Vazuza and the Volga and Mr. Crane and Miss Heron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

120 There are many Russian variants of the story about Sadko (originally an epic saga) that Ransome probably made use of to compile his retelling.

121 The source text for this tale has been unidentified.

122 Of many variants of this popular tale there is one in Afanasyev’s collection, which may have been used by Ransome alongside others.
### Table 3. Russian Folktales Translated by both Ralston and Ransome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Text (ST)</th>
<th>Ralston (TT1)</th>
<th>Ransome (TT2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Морозко: [Сказка] № 95</td>
<td>Frost</td>
<td>Frost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Баба-яга: [Сказка] № 103</td>
<td>The Baba Yaga</td>
<td>Baba Yaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ведьма и Солнцева сестра: [Тексты сказок] № 93</td>
<td>The Witch and the Sun’s Sister</td>
<td>Prince Ivan, the Witch Baby, and the Little Sister of the Sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Горе: [Тексты сказок] № 303</td>
<td>Woe</td>
<td>Little Master Misery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Вазуза и Волга: [Сказка] № 94</td>
<td>Vazuza and Volga</td>
<td>The Vazuza and the Volga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. Key Primary Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Texts (ST)</th>
<th>Target Texts (TT1, TT2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Popular Russian Tales by A.N. Afanasyev (Народные русские сказки А.Н. Афанасьева) (Moscow, 1984–1985)</td>
<td>Ralston’s Russian Folk-Tales (1873)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular Russian Legends by A.N. Afanasyev (Народные русские легенды А.Н. Афанасьева) (London, 1859)</td>
<td>Ransome’s Old Peter’s Russian Tales (1916)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5. Other English Translated Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ralston (TT1)</th>
<th>Lang (TT3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Koshchei the Deathless” (Ralston 1873)</td>
<td>“The Death of Koshchei the Deathless”. In The Red Fairy Book (Lang [1890] 1907: 42-53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ransome (TT2)</td>
<td>Lang (TT3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6. “Jack the Giant Killer” in the Nineteenth-Century Folklore Collections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hartland</th>
<th>Jacobs</th>
<th>Lang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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ARTICLE I
ПРОБЛЕМА ПЕРЕДАЧИ НАЦИОНАЛЬНОГО КОЛОРИТА РУССКОЙ СКАЗКИ В БРITАНСКОЙ ПЕРЕВОДЧЕСКОЙ ТРАДИЦИИ

Т.Н. Богрданова

Проблема передачи национального колорита приобретает особую актуальность для прецедентных текстов, насыщенных культурно-специфической информацией, представляющей иногда непреодолимую преграду для их восприятия иноязычным читателем [1]. Однако в общей теории художественного перевода проблема специфических требований передачи фольклорных образцов до сих пор не была в должной мере исследована, и только в последнее время наметился интерес к ней как в самой фольклористике, так и в переводоведении [1–4]. В плане методологической основы подобных исследований подчеркнем необходимость корпусного подхода к анализу материала, т.е. рассмотрения всей совокупности параллельных текстов определенной жанровой разновидности, что в значительной степени увеличивает достоверность результатов сопоставительного исследования [5]. Кроме того, такой подход неизбежно носит междисциплинарный характер, предполагая рассмотрение текстуальных систем вовлеченных в межкультурный диалог сторон [6, 7].

В настоящей статье рассматривается проблема передачи национального колорита русской народной сказки на английском языке на основе корпусного исследования переводных текстов, не получивших, к сожалению, до сих пор специального рассмотрения. При этом принимаем во внимание развитие английской переводческой традиции в этом направлении, а также особенности фольклорных традиций, взаимодействующих в межкультурном диалоге языков.


Глава начинается с краткого описания Змея Горыныча, Кошку Бесцермянного и Морского царя. В качестве иллюстрации к описанию Змея Горыныча — змея, отличающегося от сородичей наличием крылыш и множества голов, приводится сказка Ivan Popyalov, сюжет которой затем сравнивается с другими вариантами, данными в кратком пересказе. В качестве модификаций Змея Горыныча представлены Норка-зерь и одноименной

* Здесь и далее перевод автора статьи.
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сказке The Norka, Чудо-юдо (Chudo-Yudo) в кратком пересказе сказки об Иване Быковиче [8]. В комментарии, следующем за текстом перевода той или иной сказки, Ролстон кратко останавливается на параллельных сюжетах не только из русского фольклора, но и из индийской сказки. Кошеч Бессмертный представлен читателю следующим образом: «Кошеч всего лишь один из многих воплощений темного духа, принимающий столь многочисленные формы монстров в сказках данного типа. Иногда он появляется исключительно в виде змеи, иногда в нем могут проявляться, помимо змеиной сущности, и черты человеческого облика, превалирующие в иных сказках. Его называют Бессмертным (“Immortal” or “The Deathless”) в сильном, что для него не существует обычных для смертных законов...» [8]. В качестве иллюстрации к этому персонажу приводится, в частности, сказка Marya Morevna, выделяемая Ролстоном как одна из лучших в русском фольклоре. Морской царь представлен англоязычному читателю в сказке The Water King and Vasilissa the Wise [8].

В главе 2 речь идет также и о женских персонификациях зла, в частности, о Бабе-Яге; для иллюстрации составитель отбирает и полностью переводит сказку “Баба-Яга”, а также “живую и полную драматизм” сказку о Василисе Прекрасной [8]. При этом Ролстон проводит четкую границу между Бабой-Ягой как могущественным сказочным существом, воплощающим темные силы (Baba Yaga), и ведьмой — обычной женщиной, практикующей черную магию, т.е. колдуньей (witch) [8; 2, с. 281–282]. Кроме главных темных сил, в русских сказках и легендах действуют такие, достаточно неожиданные для англоязычного читателя персонажи (“strange group of figures”, “singular beings”), как Одноглазое лихо, Горе; Пятница, Среда и Суббота, женские духи; Леший, лесной дух; Морозко — молодецкий жених и даже реки (глава 3) [8]. Своеобразие других сказочный переводчик видит в уникальном характере и свойствах волшебных предметов, таких как, например, куколки или вода, живая и мертвая, прибавляющая и отнимающая силы (глава 4). В двух заключительных главах книги содержится перевод сказок о мертвецах, легенд о святых и историй о нечистой силе, также отличающихся от традиционных европейских сказок такого типа [8].

Следующим шагом в популяризации русского фольклора для англоязычного читателя стал сборник Артура Рэнсома (Old Peter's Russian Tales, 1916), дебют известного детского писателя, переизданный до сих пор [9]. В предисловии автор подчеркивает: “Я думаю, что в России волшебных сказок больше, чем где-либо еще в мире. В этой книге вы найдете несколько историй из тех, что мне нравятся больше всего, и я позволил себе некоторую свободу, пересказав их главным образом по памяти. Моя книга не для специалистов, и вообще не для взрослых, хотя настоящие любители сказок так никогда не расстаются с детьством” [9]. Повествование ведется от лица вымышленного рассказчика, дедушки Петра, что позволяет автору, впервые, следовать традиции фольклорных сборников, часто имеющих такое обрамление, и, во-вторых, использовать восточные рассказы для ввода страноведческой информации, не прибегая к строгому комментированию реалей, принятому в работах научного характера. Так, например, во вводном рассказе “The Hut in The Forest” (“Изба в лесу”) описываются рассказчик, его внучки и избушка, в которой они живут посреди зимнего леса. Подробное пояснение получают реалии крестьянского быта, встречающиеся дальше в сказочном повествовании. В этом рассказе и ряде других (“Spring in the Forest” / “Весна в лесу”; “Chris- tening in the Village” / “Крестины в деревне”), автор вводит фоновую информацию, необходимо для подготовки маленького читателя к восприятию сказочных сюжетов. Так, глава под названием “Баба-Яга”, начинается с разговора между дедом и внуками о Бабе-Яге, где без излишней назидательности вводится необходимая информация: “Баба-Яга — это ведьма, — пояснил дед Петр, — страшная старуха, но иногда она бывает и доброй. Вы помните, что именно она помогала царевичу Ивану завоевать сердце одной из дочерей Морского царя, самую лучшую из них, Василису Пре- мудрую. Но обычно она злая, как помните в сказке о Василисе Прекрасной, которая спаслась от ее железных зубов благодаря хитрости Волшебной Кукольки”. “Она вся косматая, глаза ее сверкают, перемещается она в стуле, который пестром погоняет, племелом след за- мает, так что и не узнаешь, куда она направилась” [9].

Итак, сравнительный анализ материала показывает, что сборник Ролстона, первая работа такого рода, изданная в обстоятельствах только укреплявшихся англо-русских
литературных связей [10], отмеченный стремлением к фундаментальности и строгому научному комментированию фольклорных материалов, вводимых в научный оборот на английском языке, а также в круг чтения более широкой публики; в то время как сборник Рээсона носит, скорее, развлекательный характер, решающая, однако, и образовательно-воспитательные задачи: расширение кругозора маленького читателя, которому он и адресуется, за счет ненавязчивой, свободной подачи странноведческого материала и привлечение его внимания к урокам добра в русской сказке. Примечательно, что книга Рээсона выходит в период наивысшего интеллектуального интереса литературы языка Великобритании к русской культуре [10]. Таким образом, первый английский сборник русских сказок адресован, скорее, специалистам, чем широкой аудитории, второй — написан для детей. С одной стороны, ставится задача представить англоязычному читателю наиболее интересные, своеобразные истории, отличающиеся от привычных для него сюжетов, чему соответствует тщательный отбор материала, с другой стороны, в этом вопросе руководствуются личными пристрастиями; и, наконец, отличаются переводческие установки: "фотография", а не создание художественного портрета рассказчика у Рээсона, и пересказ по памяти у Рээсона.

Соответственно, эти переводные установки реализуются в английских параллельных текстах; рассмотрим их на примере сказки "Ведьма и Солнцева сестра" [11]. В комментарии, предшествующем перевод, Рээсона поясняет: "Но существуют иного рода сказки, в которых ведьма предстает как существо, отличное от Бабы-Яги, поскольку она — дочь обычных родителей. Так, без всякого предшествующих причин, царевна одного из царских домов начинает вести себя как ненормальное существо, разрушающее жизнь на своем пути и развивающаяся при этом непомерную силу по мере роста своего чудовищного аппетита. Единственно возможным объяснением может быть предположение, что на этот раз злой дух принимает человеческое обличье. Именно такова ведьма, о которой идет речь в следующей несколько странный истории" [8]. В послетекстовом комментарии, как всегда, переводчик проводит параллели со сходными сюжетами, а также приводит интерпретации, объясняющие происхождение данных сказочных персонажей.

Приведем отрывок — начало сказки и соответствующий перевод Рээсона:

**Оригинал**

В некотором царстве, далеко от государства, жил-был царь с царицей, у них был сын Иван-царевич, с роду немой. Было ему лет двадцать, и пошел он раз в конюшню к любимому своему коню. Конюх этот сказывал ему звездные сказки, и теперь Иван-царевич принес послушать от него сказочку, да не то услышал. "Иван-царевич! — сказала конюха. — У твоей матери скоро родится дочь, а тебе сестра; будет она странная ведьма, сестра и отца и мамы, и всех подчиненных людей..." [11, с. 110].

**Перевод**

In a certain far-off country there once lived a king and queen. And they had an only son, Prince Ivan, who was dumb from birth. One day, when he was twelve years old, he went into the stable to see a groom who was a great friend of his. That groom always used to tell him stories [skazki]! [6] and on this occasion Prince Ivan went to him expecting to hear some stories [skazochki], but that wasn't what he heard. "Prince Ivan!" said the groom, "your mother will soon have a daughter and you a sister. She will be a terrible witch, and she will eat up her father, and her mother, and all their subjects..." [8].

Как можно заметить, Рээсона следует буквально оригиналу, вводя в текст даже русские слова: skazki (skazochki) для уточнения английских лексем tales, stories, имеющих более широкое значение. Под влиянием русского текста (поэемый от сюда куда глаза глядят, поехал куда глаза глядят) в английском переводе используются коллокации [6, с. 52–54; 12] не вполне узуального характера: ride away with thithersoever your eyes guide you, rode off without caring where he went; так что во втором случае словосочетание уточняется в ссылке: "Whither [his] eyes look" [8]. При этом, однако, разговорный, просторечный стиль русской сказки, реализуемый преимущественно на лексическом уровне [13], не находит адекватного выражения в переводе, отражающем, скорее, литературную норму. Достаточно сравнить, например, следующие параллельные конструкции: and then – on this occasion, приняло послушать – expecting to hear; подчиненных людей — subjects, отсюда куда — with thithersoever, с роду впервые – for the first time in his life и т.п. Таким образом, важная стилистическая характеристика оригинала, "богатство образности, скрытое в разговорной речи", оказывается утраченной при переводе [14].

Рассмотрим для сравнения текст Рээсона:

* Здесь и далее выделено в тексте автором статьи.
Приведенный отрывок наглядно демонстрирует авторскую манеру Рэнсома, для которого сюжетная линия оригинала — это всего лишь основа, обрастающая в его пересказе деталями дополняющего и поясняющего характера. Так, меняются название сказки, зачин; акцентируется внимание читателя на немое царевича и его сложных взаимоотношениях с родителями, которые будут называться прислужников; царь, коня, сестры-ведьмы, родившейся с железными зубами (примечательная деталь, встречающаяся у автора в и описании Бабы-Яги). Трансформации исходного сказочного сюжета не являются, однако, самоцелью для автора, а продиктованы его установкой адаптировать рассказ к уровню и интересам конкретного адресата — англоязычной детской аудитории.

Автор стремится разговаривать с маленьким читателем на простом, доступном для него языке, используя, в том числе, и лексику, специфическую для детской речи [15]: отметим характерный диминутив little, повторяющийся неоднократно только в данном тексте. Этой же цели служат образная идиоматика: bear the sight of him, gallop like the wind, grow like a seed of corn, screaming like a little fury, shook in his shoes, took no sort of care, а также пряма речь. Имитация разговорной нитониации и речи достигается за счет вводных конструкций: Indeed, Anyway, Well, And see; лексико-синтаксических повторов: And for that wish they were punished (характерный союз в начале предложений); He was a wise man was the old grooms; with her iron teeth she will eat up your father, and eat up your mother, and eat up you too; разговорной лексики: tongue-tied brat (informal I a badly behaved child: a spoiled brat) [16]. Иверсия используется для выделения важных смыслов и придает речи необходимый эмоциональный колорит: Never a word had he spoken; A great sorrow he was to his father; A poor sort of Tar will a dumb boy make; And for that wish they were punished; A witch she is; Black it was. При использовании реалий, отсылающих к исходному тексту и культуре, предпочтение отдается лексике, уже в достаточной степени укрепившейся в языке-реципиенте: Ivan, Tar.

Приведем еще один отрывок из рассмотриваемой сказки, в которой Иван-царевич вынужден покинуть отчий дом и пуститься по свету в поисках приюта, и сравним оригинала с переводом Ролстона.

Приведенный отрывок наглядно демонстрирует авторскую манеру Рэнсома, для которого сюжетная линия оригинала — это всего лишь основа, обрастающая в его пересказе деталями дополняющего и поясняющего характера. Так, меняются название сказки, зачин; акцентируется внимание читателя на немое царевича и его сложных взаимоотношениях с родителями, которые будут называться прислужников; царь, коня, сестры-ведьмы, родившейся с железными зубами (примечательная деталь, встречающаяся у автора в и описании Бабы-Яги). Трансформации исходного сказочного сюжета не являются, однако, самоцелью для автора, а продиктованы его установкой адаптировать рассказ к уровню и интересам конкретного адресата — англоязычной детской аудитории.

Автор стремится разговаривать с маленьким читателем на простом, доступном для него языке, используя, в том числе, и лексику, специфичную для детской речи [15]: отметим характерный диминутив little, повторяющийся неоднократно только в данном тексте. Этой же цели служат образная идиоматика: bear the sight of him, gallop like the wind, grow like a seed of corn, screaming like a little fury, shook in his shoes, took no sort of care, а также пряма речь. Имитация разговорной нитониации и речи достигается за счет вводных конструкций: Indeed, Anyway, Well, And see; лексико-синтаксических повторов: And for that wish they were punished (характерный союз в начале предложений); He was a wise man was the old grooms; with her iron teeth she will eat up your father, and eat up your mother, and eat up you too; разговорной лексики: tongue-tied brat (informal I a badly behaved child: a spoiled brat) [16]. Иверсия используется для выделения важных смыслов и придает речи необходимый эмоциональный колорит: Never a word had he spoken; A great sorrow he was to his father; A poor sort of Tar will a dumb boy make; And for that wish they were punished; A witch she is; Black it was. При использовании реалий, отсылающих к исходному тексту и культуре, предпочтение отдается лексике, уже в достаточной степени укрепившейся в языке-реципиенте: Ivan, Tar.

Приведем еще один отрывок из рассмотриваемой сказки, в которой Иван-царевич вынужден покинуть отчий дом и пуститься по свету в поисках приюта, и сравним оригинала с переводом Ролстона.
Оригинал

Долго-долго он ехал, наседал на двух старых швеях и просил, чтоб они взяли его с собой жить. Старушки сказали: “Мы бо́ды рады тебя взять, Иван-царевич, да нам уже немного живь. Вот дольше-дольше сундукушок да изоземь сундук ниток – тотчас и смерть придет.” Иван-царевич заплакал и поехал дальше. Долго-долго ехал, подъезжал к Вертогорку и просил: “Прими меня к себе!” – “Рад бы тебя принять, Иван-царевич, да мне жить осталось немного. Вот как повыше все эти дубы с корнями – тотчас и смерть моя!”. Пуше прежнему заплакал царевич и поехал дальше. Подъезжал к Вертогорку: стал его просить, а он в ответ... [11, с. 110–111]

Русская сказка тяготеет к повторам, “тавтология ощущается как некий сигнал фольклорного стиля” [17], что находится в выражении и в буквальном переводе Ролстона. Однако там, где она почти монотонна: и просит, и просит, стал просить, в переводе используются синонимичные выражения: и he begged, and he besought him, and made the same request to him. Точно так же в передаче поэтических формул, таких как, например: Долго ли, коротко ли; в английском переводе следует функциональные эквиваленты: After a time: By-and-by. Еще более показателен в этом отношении вариант Рнсома, широко использующий лексические, лексико-синтаксические повторы, благодаря которым сказочный текст приобретает клишированный характер. Так, следующий отрывок “составлен” из блоков, тематически организованных вокруг сказочных персонажей и отличающихся устойчивостью лексического состава. Это в значительной степени способствует передаче формульного ритмизированного изложения, характерного для русской сказки:

Prince Ivan, the Witch Baby, and the Little Sister of the Sun

On and on galloped the little Prince on the great black horse. There were no houses anywhere to be seen. It was a long time since they had passed any people, and little Prince Ivan felt to begin very lonely, and to wonder if indeed he had come to the end of the world, and could bring his journey to an end. Suddenly, on a wide, sandy plain, he saw two old, old women sitting in the road. They were bent double over their work, sewing and weaving, and now one and now the other broke a needle, and took a new one out of a box between them, and threaded the needle with thread from another box, and went on sewing and weaving. Their old noses nearly touched their knees as they bent over their work. Little Prince Ivan pulled up the great black horse in a cloud of dust, and spoke to the old women.

“Grandmothers,” said he, “Is this the end of the world? Let me stay here and live with you, and be safe from my baby sister, who is a witch and has iron teeth. Please let me stay with you, and I’ll be very little trouble, and thread your needles for you when you break them.” “Prince Ivan, my dear,” said one of the old women, “this is not the end of the world, and little good would it be to you to stay with us. For as soon as we have broken all our needles and used up all our thread we shall die, and then where would you be?”... [9].

Царевич сказет и скажет вперед на своем охрому черном скакуне, и уже не было видно никаких домов, и уж даже им никто не встречался на пути, так что царевну стало одиночко, и он стал думать, что возможно он уже добрылся до самого края света; и его путешествие приняло к концу. Вдруг на широкой песчаной равнине он увидел двух древних старух, сидящих на дорожке, склонившись назыло над своей работой. Они сидели и плакали, отвезшаясь точно тогда, когда то у одной из них, то у другой ломался иголок, и они вынимали новую иглу из коробочка, что была между ними, заправляя его сотен из другой коробки и продолжая шить. Они склонились так низко над шитьем, что соснулись почти пополам, и их морщинистые носы касались колен. Маленький царевич остановил своего охрому черного коня, подъехал к ним, и обратился к старухам: “Бабушки, – сказал он, – это я ес края света? Позвольте мне остаться с вами и жить у вас, чтобы спасти от моей младшей сестры: она ведь с жезленьем зубами. Позвольте мне остаться с вами, я не достаточно вам никакого беспокойства, и буду заботиться вам паточку в ихлодиях, когда вы их замените.” “Царевич, дорогой ты мой, – сказала одна из старух, – это еще не самый край света, и видя ли тебе пойдет искать остаться с нами, потому что как только мы покончим все наши иголки и кончим нитки, мы умрем, и тогда куда тебе податься?”... (подстрочный перевод мой. – Т.Б.)

Как можно заметить, в отличие от Ролжона, Рнсом целенаправленно добивается
формулы пересказа, используя, в том числе, постоянные эпитеты: the great black horse, the wide world, бинарные формулы: galloping and galloping, поэтические формулы: far, far away, beyond the mountains, beyond the forests, beyond the wide plains; клише: “My dear”, says the Sun’s little sister, “why are your eyes so red?”; “It is the wind up there,” says little Prince Ivan; “My dear”, says the Sun’s little sister, “your eyes are red again”. “It is the wind,” says little Prince Ivan [9]. Таким образом, основная стиличная черта русской сказки акцентируется в его пересказе, приобретающим стилизованный характер.

Отдельный комментарий требуют мифонымы “Вертодуб”, “Вертогор”. Так, если читателю (слушателю) русской сказки достаточно информации, содержащейся в именах и в соответствующих описаниях, в английском тексте Ролстон вводит поясняющее слово: the giant Vertodub, the giant Vertogor, объясняя далее значение в имени в примечаниях: Vertodub, the Tree-extractor; Vertogor, the Mountain leveler. Рисом в этом случае отделяет приблизительное переводу: Tree-rooter, Mountain-tosser, одновременно используя, как и Ролстон, поясняющее слово giant.

Буквальный перевод Ролстона создает напряжение коллокационных возможностей переводящего языка. Искусственный характер переводного текста в таких случаях сигнализируется многословием, а также дополнительными пояснениями в виде ссылок: видимо-невидимо – And the number of them was such that there were more than the eye could see (Vidimo-nevidimo, visibly-invisibly); вокруг зашумели – Immediately from somewhere or other there came a sound of trees (Zashumyeli, they began to produce a shum or noise) [8]. Эти же выражения в вольном переводе Рисома переданы на базе английской идиоматики при сохранении смысла оригинала: There was a noise of spreading branches, of swishing leaves, of opening buds, all together, and there before them was a forest of great oaks stretching farther than the giant could see, tall though he was [9].

В отличие от текста Ролстона с характерными бокуализмами, переложение Рисома опирается на английскую идиоматику с ее лексико-фразеологическими особенностями. Так, например, в описании старух из русской сказки узуальные английские словосочетания: mumbling with their old mouths, old shaking fingers, gray hair, используемые как дополнительные детали, придают большую наглядность образам, приближающим их к маленькому читателю. Однако за счет повторов, поддерживающих формульный стиль повествования, а также деталей, адаптирующих непростой и драматичный рассказ для детской аудитории, текст Рисома разрастается, увеличиваясь почти в два-три раза в сравнении с оригиналом. Но даже там, где автор вносит перевод, он все же остается в пределах, доступных читателю: так если дворец Солнечной сестры находится высоко на небе, то естественно вообразить себе, что он сделан из облака, и висит он, подобно ветвям роз, на живых английских изгородях. Таким образом, возможно, и тривиализуя в чем-то оригинала, автор придает ему большую наглядность, оставляя, кроме того, английского читателя в знакомых для него реалиях: the castle of the little sister of the Sun, the battle- ments of rosy cloud, the topmost turret of the castle [9]. Ясности и доступности принесена в жертву точность до бокуализма, хотя и у Ролстона в этих случаях – приблизительный перевод: the abode of the Sun’s Sister, the chamber of the Sun’s Sister; the dwelling of the Sun’s Sister [8].

Таким образом, корпусный анализ английских параллельных текстов одной жанровой разновидности позволил установить, что британская переводческая традиция в передаче национального колорита русского фольклорного материала характеризуется двумя различными тенденциями: точный, буквальный перевод (У. Ролстон) и литературно-художественный пересказ (А. Рисом). В первом случае отбор материала для перевода, комментарии, а также точное следование тексту оригинала подчеркивают преимущественно научный характер переложения, ориентированного на специалистов, при этом Ролстон руководствуется критерием национального своеобразия, представляя англоговорящему читателю образцы, отличающиеся индивидуальным характером. Однако при всем значении первого опыта в популяризации русского фольклора, на мой взгляд, именно укрупнённо-предметный характер не позволил ему получить широкого признания у читателей в условиях, когда уже детская аудитория становится основным потребителем такого рода материалов, предъявляющим особые требования к стилю и языку фольклорных произведений.
В этом смысле более успешным следует признать перевод-пересказ Рэнсома, трансформирующий сказочный жанр соответственно уровню и интересам англоязычной детской аудитории, актуализирующий развлекательно-познавательную и воспитательную функции сказки. Стилизация формульного характера оригинала является примечательной чертой переводческого стиля этого автора. Вместе с тем значительны авторские отступления и дополнения с целью экспликации и адаптации иногда достаточно сложного содержания русской сказки, что, на мой взгляд, приводит к ее тривиализации.
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ARTICLE II
РОЛЬ ЭНДРЮ ЛАНГА В ТРАНСФОРМАЦИИ ФОЛЬКЛОРНОЙ СКАЗКИ ДЛЯ ДЕТЕЙ

Т.Н. Богдацева

Сказка, оказывая столь заметное влияние на становление ряда литературных жанров и не утратившая этого своего значения в современности, характеризуется также своим бытованием в межкультурном пространстве, что определяет актуальность ее исследования в рамках смежных гуманитарных наук и междисциплинарных направлений. В рамках настоящей статьи остановимся, в частности, на трансформации устной народной прозы в популярный жанр английской детской сказки, преимущественно переводной.

что потребует рассмотрения как собственно переводческого и лингвистического аспектов, так и некоторых особенностей сопоставляемых фольклорных и переводческих традиций. На наш взгляд, в таком междисциплинарном и межкультурном аспекте английская сказка не получила должного внимания со стороны исследователей.

Период рубежа XIX—XX столетий характеризуют как золотой век сказки, связанный в Англии, прежде всего, с именем Эндру Ланга (Andrew Lang, 1844—1912) [1, p. 302—303]. Как отмечает Дж. Блэк, возможно
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именно форма волшебной сказки в наибольшей степени подходит и к изложению биографии самого Ланга, если принять во внимание причудливость и фантастичность увеличений его многосторонней личности. Он был известен как фольклорист, знаток античности, поэт-романтик, литературный критик, журналист, историк, пацифист, автор 120 и соавтор 150 книг [2, p. 24–25]. Статьи «талантливейшего непрофессионала» ("Divine Amateur"), как его называли, выходившие в известных журналах, были посвящены самым разнообразным темам, начиная от спиритуализма дикара до истории гольфа. Такая интеллектуальная вседелиность, впрочем, была характерна для «неосвободительского» духа викторианской Англии конца столетия [2, p. 27]. Ланг был также и превосходным переводчиком, сочетавшим широкую эрудицию с талантом одного из лучших стилистов своего времени; среди его достижений называют переводы "Одиссеи", "Илиады", греческой булеконической поэзии, а также старинной французской песни-сказки "Окассен и Николетта" [3, p. 7].

Как отмечает его первый биограф Р.Л. Грин, самый значительный из всех этих ролей все же следует признать роль "Волшебника" (Master of Fairyland), редактора знаменитой разноцветной серии сказок для детей [2, p. 25; 3, p. 80]. Дж. Р. Р. Толкин призывал: "На сегодняшний день существует огромное количество сборников сказок. В Англии, наверное, ни один из них не сравняется по популярности, по широте охвата и по добротности в целом с двенадцатью книжками двенадцати разных цветов, которыми мы обязаны Эндрю Лангу и его жене" [4, с. 135]. По свидетельству исследователей, эта антология до сих пор служит образцом для подобного рода изданий [5, p. 1].

Ланг стал первым специалистом, адаптировавшим свои сборники широкой читательской аудитории (преимущественно детям), и ему пришлось выдержать критику коллег. Издание, однако, имело огромный успех, что объясняется в первую очередь авторитетом Ланга как фольклориста. Начинаясь и эрудиция Ланга пришлись весьма кстати особенно в отношении нового (неевропейского) сказочного материала, предлагавшегося читателю. В успехе издания сыграли свою роль также качество и обещанное оформление книг. Язык и стиль сказок были выдержаны в одном ключе, большинство переводов принадлежали жене Ланга, Леоноре Ланг. Переводы не были буквальными, тексты подверглись многочисленным правкам, адаптирующим их для детской аудитории. Сказка таким образом "приобретала хорошее вание": из нее удалялось все, что не отвечало строгим меркам викторианской эпохи. Тексты сокращались (за счет описаний, сцен, связанных с жестокостью и насилием); как более предпочтительная форма для детей был выбран диалог; прямая речь заменяла косвенную; истории потеряли местный колорит; сложная лексика была заменена легкой и т. п. В конечном счете подобная трансформация фольклорной сказки имела цель адаптировать ее для вполне определенного читателя — британских детей. И чтобы развлечь их, удалялось и корректировалось все, что могло показаться неуместным и чужеродным [5, p. 3].

По мнению Е. Дунаевской, детское увлечение Эндрю Ланга французской салонной сказкой и романами Вальтера Скотта проявилось в его сказочном творчестве, сыграло важную роль в формировании канона английской литературной сказки золотого века и становлении современной литературной сказки в целом [6, с. 22]. На самом деле, в рамках всей серии сказок, состоящей из двенадцати книг; салонная французская сказка и авторские сказки в целом занимают достаточно скромное место, уступая в количественном отношении переводной сказке из других стран, в том числе и из русской фольклорной традиции. Так, если первые в серии "Голубая" и "Красная" книги были в основном европейскими по содержанию, то в последующие сборники вошли истории уже из десяти стран мира. Исследователи отмечают, что именно разноцветные сборники положили начало культовому статусу волшебной сказки в западной традиции, прежде всего, это такие сказки, как: "Красная Шапочка" / Little Red Riding Hood; "Спящая красавица" / Sleeping Beauty; "Золушка" / Cinderella; "Румплитюль" / Rumpelstiltskin; "Гензель и Гретель" / Hansel and Gretel; "Красавица и чудовище" / Beauty and the Beast; "Принцесса-золотые локоны" / Goldilocks; "Мальчик с пальчиком" / Little Thumb; "Синяя Борода" / Blue Beard; "Джек — победитель великанов" / Jack the Giant Killer [5, p. 5].

Примечательно, что этот список представляет собой преимущественно переводную английскую сказку, собственно английская сказка из них только одна, что отражает...
в данном случае реальную ситуацию: практическую полную утрату волшебной сказки английской традицией. В антологии Ланга английская волшебная сказка представлена всего лишь тремя образцами. В сборнике английских сказок Эвдии Сиднея Гартлenda таких сказок только шесть; Jack the Giant Killer, The Princess of Canterbury, The Princess of Colchester, Mr. Fox, Tom Tit Tot, Jack and the Bean-stalk; большую часть материалов сборника составляли саги [4]. Примечателен в этом отношении комментарий Гартлenda к сказке «Джек — победитель великанов». Так, он отмечает что, «как время, ни условия бытования не поощряли ее, как и многие другие английские сказки; она несет на себе следы жестокой работы времени, утратив детали, столь четкие и ясные в сказках других народов; более того, степень ее разрушения такова, что потеряны и многие более существенные части, и в результате перед нами — жалкая калейка, и что прискорбно, такова участь и остальных английских волшебных сказок» (тезис и далее — пер. авт.) [7, p. 7–8]. Согласно другому фольклористу Джозефу Джейкобсу, отношение народное к английской волшебной сказке сравнительно с отношением мачехи к падчерице; из-за влияния переводной французской и немецкой сказки английская сказка «Tom Tit Tom» уступила место «Румелицветене», «Три сестры» и «Гензело и Гретель»; и английская волшебная сказка представлена как некое смешение сказок французской с немецкой [8, p. 265].

Первоначально сказка, как известно, не предназначалась для детского чтения, и в течение XVI–XVII вв. попытки адаптировать ее для детской аудитории не предпринимались, поскольку волшебство и чудеса не поощрялись писателями пуританских взглядов, стоявшими у истоков английской литературы в Англии. Тем не менее XVIII в. стал временем, с которого берет начало волшебная сказка в ее современном виде как часть английской культуры, хотя и в этот период ей также пришлось испытать противодействие, и более мощное, чем пуританское. Среди образованных части общества, стремившейся воспитать своих детей в христианском духе, возникло широко распространенное неприятие сказок с их верой в сверхъестественное [1, p. 177–178]. Перелом в общественном мнении происходит в начале XIX в., и, как отмечает Дж. Таунсенд, один из исследователей английской детской литературы, «старинные сказки, существовавшие главным образом в устном обращении и в виде дешевых лубочных изданий, нашли, наконец, свое достойное место в ряду литературы, рекомендованнойся для детского чтения» [9, p. 90]. С переводами сказок братьев Гримм, Г.Х. Андерсена, выходом сборника ирландских волшебных сказок, серии стихотворных английских фольклоров растет число и разнообразие сказок на английском языке, что значительно обогащает английскую детскую литературу. К концу XIX столетия выходят сборники собственных английских сказок под редакцией Д. Джейкобса [8] и Э. Гартлenda [7]. Сборник Джейкобса получил большую известность, возможно, не в последнюю очередь благодаря своей направленности на детскую аудиторию. Если Гартленд выступал против переосмысления фольклорного текста, то и Джейкобс, и Ланг считали возможным и необходимым адаптировать сказку для детей. Таким образом, у истоков трансформации фольклорного жанра и развития литературных форм народной сказки на английской почве стали такие известные фольклористы, как Э. Ланг и Д. Джейкобс, принципы и практика редактирования которых требуют, на наш взгляд, специального изучения.

Рассмотрим в связи с этим знаменитую сказку «Джек — победитель великанов», представленную в сборниках трех английских фольклористов. Сравнительный анализ текстов Гартлenda (вариант 1) и Джейкобса (вариант 2) показывает, что первый вариант наиболее близок к оригинальной убийственной версии английской сказки, построенной на контаминации повторяющихся эпизодов о подвигах героя против великанов и иных врагов короля и королевы. Во втором варианте сокращаются два из этих эпизодов, довольно значительных по объему. Правка коснулась также грамматической и лексической стороны текста (выделено в тексте – Т.Б.). Так, второй вариант несколько упрощается в плане синтаксиса, причастные формы заменяются личными формами глагола, что также указывает на содержательной стороне, придавая большую динамичность повествованию. Вместо косвенной речи во втором варианте чаще используется прямая речь. Например:
Вариант 1
One day Jack, happening to be present at the town hall when the magistrates were sitting in council about the giant, asked what reward would be given to the person who destroyed him. The giant's treasure, they said, was the recompense; [7, p. 4].

Вариант 2
One day Jack happened to be at the town-hall when the magistrates were sitting in council about the Giant. He asked: «What reward will be given to the man who kills Cormoran?» «The giant's treasure,» they said, «will be the reward». [8, p. 96].

Перевод варианта 2
Но вот в городской ратуше созвали совет, чтобы решить, как бороться с великаном, и туда зашел Джек. И Джек спросил: — Какую награду получит тот, кто убьет Корморана? — Все сокровища великанов! — ответили Джеку [10, с. 111].


Приведем еще примеры подобной лексико-синтаксической адаптации:

Вариант 1
1) In those days the Mount of Cornwall was kept by a huge and monstrous giant of eighteen feet in height, and about three yards in compass;
2) The good folk, at his approach, forsook their habitations; [7, p. 3–4].

Вариант 2
1) In those days the Mount of Cornwall was kept by a huge giant named Cormoran. He was eighteen feet in height, and about three yards round the waist;
2) Everybody at his approach ran out of their houses; [8, p. 96].

Перевод варианта 2
1) В те дни на острове, именуемом Корнуэллская гора, обитал страшный великан — Корморан. Ростом он был восемнадцать футов, и обхватом целиком три ярда ....
2) Завидев его, люди покинули свои дома и разбежались кто куда [10, с. 111].


Дальнейший сравнительный анализ приведенного второго варианта текста английской сказки (из антологии Ланга) показывает, что последний подвигается еще более радикальной правке. Приведем отрывки из сказки в редакции Джейкобса (вариант 2) и Ланга (вариант 3):

Вариант 2
So he got a horn, shovel, and pickaxe, and went over to the Mount in the beginning of a dark winter's evening, when he fell to work, and before morning had dug a pit twenty-two feet deep, and nearly as broad, covering it over with long sticks and straw.
Then he strewed a little mould over it, so that it appeared like plain ground. Jack then placed himself on the opposite side of the pit, farthest from the giant's lodging, and, just at the break of day, he put the horn to his mouth, and blew, Tantivy, Tantivy. This noise roused the giant, who rushed from his cave, crying: «You incorrigible villain, are you come here to disturb my rest? You shall pay dearly for this. Satisfaction I will have, and this it shall be, I will take you whole and broil you for breakfast.» He had no sooner uttered this, than he tumbled into the pit, and made the very foundations of the Mount to shake. «Oh, Giant,» quoth Jack, «where are you now? Oh, faith, you are gotten

Вариант 3
Jack took a horn, a shovel, a pickaxe, his armor, and a dark lantern, and one winter's evening he went to the mount. There he dug a pit twenty-two feet deep and twenty broad. He covered the top over so as to make it look like solid ground. He then blew his horn so loudly that the giant awoke and came out of his den crying out: “You saucy villain! You shall pay for this! I'll broil you for my breakfast!”
now into Lob’s Pound, where I will surely plague you for your threatening words: what do you think now of broiling me for your breakfast? Will no other diet serve you but poor Jack?

Then having tantalised the giant for a while, he gave him a most weighty knock with his pickaxe on the very crown of his head, and killed him on the spot.

Jack then filled up the pit with earth, and went to search the cave, which he found contained much treasure. When the magistrates heard of this they made a declaration he should henceforth be termed JACK THE GIANT-KILLER and presented him with a sword and a belt, on which were written these words embroidered in letters of gold:

«Here’s the right valiant Cornish man, Who slew the giant Cormoran.» [8, p. 96].

He had just finished, when, taking one step further, he tumbled headlong into the pit, and Jack struck him a blow on the head with his pickaxe which killed him.

Jack then returned home to cheer his friends with the news [12].

Приведенный пример иллюстрирует, что в третьем варианте текст значительно сокращается: опускаются детали и подробности. Эпизод расправы с монстром во втором варианте, включающий пространственный диалог между сторонами (выделено в тексте — Т.Б.), в третьем сокращается: великан успешно лишил пригожий Джеку, что он сбежит его на завтра, как в следующую секунду падает в заранее подготовленную яму, и здесь герою остается только прикончить его ударом топора по макушке. Точно так же и читатель Ланга не узнает о том, что Джек обнаруживает сокровища великана в пещере, и городской магistrate объявляет его «Джеком — победителем великанов» с соответствующей надписью, вышитой золотом на преподнесенном ему поясу, а также вручит ему меч (подчеркнуто в тексте — Т.Б.). Соответственно, происходят изменения в сторону упрощения и в грамматическом, и лексическом оформлении текста.

Таким образом, очевидно, что привнесение фольклорной сказки литературной формы стало результатом тщательной редакторской правки. При этом в сборнике Ланга сказка подвергается адаптации для детской аудитории в наибольшей степени. Этот вариант значительно сокращается за счет ряда повторяющихся эпизодов сказки Гарднера, наиболее приближенной к оригинальной лубочной версии. В лексическом плане упрощение происходит за счет использования простой, стилистически нейтральной лексики. Грамматические трансформации носились сложного предложения, преобразуемого в простое, причастных оборотов — в словосочетание, косвенной речи — в прямую. Эти же изменения отмечены и в редакции Джейкобса.
Летучий корабль


The flying ship / вариант 1

And the ship rose and rose, and in another minute was flying through the air, when the Simpleton, who was on the look out, cast his eyes down to the earth and saw a man beneath him on the road, who was kneeling with his ear upon the damp ground.

'Hello!' he called out, 'what are you doing down there?'

'I am listening to what is going on in the world,' replied the man. 'Come with me in my ship,' said the Simpleton.

So the man was only too glad, and got in beside him; and the ship flew, and flew, and flew through the air, till again from his outlook the Simpleton saw a man on the road below, who was hopping on one leg, while his other leg was tied up behind his ear. So he hailed him, calling out: 'Hello! what are you doing, hopping on one leg?'

'I can't help it,' replied the man. 'I walk so fast that unless I tied up one leg I should be at the end of the earth in a bound.'

'Come with us on my ship,' he answered; and the man made no objections, but joined them; and the ship flew on, and on, and on... [13].

The fool of the world and the flying ship / вариант 2

He flew on and on, and looked down, and saw a man lying in the road below him with his ear on the damp ground.

'Good-day to you, uncle,' cried the Fool.

'Good-day to you, Sky-fellow,' cried the man.

'What are you doing down there?' says the Fool.

'I am listening to all that is being done in the world.'

'Take your place in the ship with me.' The man was willing enough, and sat down in the ship with the Fool, and they flew on together singing songs.

They flew on and on, and looked down, and there was a man on one leg, with the other tied up to his head.

'Good-day, uncle,' says the Fool, bringing the ship to the ground.

'Why are you hopping along on one foot?'

'If I were to unite the other I should move too fast. I should be stepping across the world in single stride.'

'Sit down with us,' says the Fool.

The man sat down with them in the ship, and they flew on together singing songs [12].

**hello** [11], оно используется также и для привлечения внимания (3 used when calling to get someone's attention) [11]. Второй английский вариант good day (old-fashioned especially British English used to say hello or goodbye, especially in the morning or afternoon; устаревшая, преимущественно британская формула приветствия и прощания, используемая утром и после полудня) [11] более официален по стилю, чем русский просторечный эквивалент.

Значительную трудность для английского перевода представляет также обращение, характерное для русской сказочной прозы, что очевидно в рассматриваемых примерах. Например, "Good-day, uncle," буквальный перевод обращения к незнакомцу (Здоров, дядьку!), противоречит нормам английской культуры; к тому же русское слово дядьку в данном случае не используется в значении «родственник». В следующем примере: Good-day to you, Sky-fellow (букв. Добрый день и тебе, небесный человек) — английский перевод также не отражает значения русского обращения: Здоров, небоже. Однако все же примечательно, что Раемв не оставил без внимания такую характерную особенность русской сказочной речи, как обращение, по-видимому, осознавая ее значение, в то время как в первом варианте перевода эти обращения опущены.

При переадресации прецедентных текстов (к которым относят и фольклорный
текст) необходимость особого внимания к переводимой фольклорной традиции совершено очевидна [15]. Проиллюстрируем сказанное на примере из приведенных отрывков. В обоих достаточно вольных вариантах переложения словосочетание сырья земля переведено буквально: *damp ground*, что, конечно, не отражает особенностей оригинала, осложненного в данном случае мифологическими ассоциациями. Однако в целом, при несомненном влиянии на пересказ Рэйсона канонов английской переводной сказки, заложенных Лангом, вариант Рэйсона имеет важное отличие: он сохраняет в большей степени национальный колорит оригинала. Так, например, заметим, что в первом английском варианте главный персонаж русской сказки описывается с помощью устаревшей лексики *dance (old-fashioned someone who is slow at learning things)*, *dolt (old-fashioned a silly or stupid person)*, *Simpleton (old-fashioned someone who has a very low level of intelligence)* в значении «глупый», «умственно отсталый» [11]. Во втором — предпочтение отдано лексеме *the Fool* (глупый человек или кто-то, кто совершал глупый поступок) [11]. Анализ словарной статьи свидетельствует о преимущественно разговорной сфере употребления данной лексемы в ее основном значении: *someone who has done something stupid*. Сравнительный лексико-семантический анализ приводит далее принципиальное в данном случае отличие синонимов. Так, в слове *fool* в отличие от лексем *dance, dolt, Simpleton* отсутствует обязательная корреляция с умственной отсталостью (глупым в той или иной ситуации может быть любой человек). Соответственно, на наш взгляд, лексема *fool* более адекватно передает смысл оригинала, в котором «дурак» на самом деле вовсе и не дурак, это — маска, избавившаяся от которой, главный персонаж выступает в своем настоящем героическом облике. Таким образом, и в выборе ключевой лексики Рэйсон демонстрирует достаточно глубокое знание русского фольклора.

Итак, в настоящей статье кратко охарактеризован значительную роль английского фольклориста Э. Ланга в трансформации фольклорной сказки для детской аудитории. Его антология международной детской сказки остается до сих пор образом для подобных изданий в западноевропейской традиции. Редакторская практика адаптации фольклорного материала для адресной аудитории распространена, на наш взгляд, и в отношении переводной сказки, в частности, русской сказки на английском языке. Влияние данной английской переводной традиции очевидно в литературном переложении русских сказок А. Рэйсона, также обращенных детям, однако важное отличие его переводов-пересказов заключается в сохранении им национального колорита оригинала.
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ABSTRACT
The present case study attempts to explore a significant role of individual agency in promoting Anglo-Russian literary and cultural interaction: the enthusiasm of a motivated translator familiarizing the English reader with Russian folklore in the 1870s. William Ralston, the “one serious scholar of Russian letters at this time”, as well as his works, are examined in the context of a call for humanization of translation studies and active discussions of agency. A closer critical analysis of the translator’s agency within the social structures of the period shows that his social stance, as well as the scholarly agenda he subscribed to, was influential in Ralston’s choice of materials to translate and his literal translation strategy.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Harish Trivedi (2007:277) traces back the historical reasons for the “present boom” of translation and translation studies to “three distinct moments across the span of the twentieth century”. He sees the first of these “in the concerted movement of translating Russian fiction into English which began in the 1890s and went on until the 1930s”. As a

1 I would like to express my very great appreciation to the editors of this volume and my anonymous reviewers for their valuable and constructive suggestions during the work on this research paper. I would also like to thank Dr. Robert Montgomery of Baldwin-Wallace University (Ohio, USA) for his many suggestions in improving the English text of the article. My special thanks are also extended to Emeritus Professor W.F. Ryan (FBA, FSA) and Dr Jack V. Haney, Seattle. The willingness to give their time in reading the final version of my article and sharing their wisdom has been very much appreciated.
result, “a body of imaginative work from an area outside Western Europe, so new and exciting as to be shocking” was revealed to readers in English; “writers as diverse as Virginia Woolf and D. H. Lawrence” were not left untouched by the “Russian fever” and actually helped “to translate the newly discovered nineteenth-century masters of Russian fiction”.

However, it is important to remember that, in fact, more than three centuries of contact passed before Russian culture achieved wide recognition in Britain. Anthony Cross (2012:2) argues that along this long road (from the 16th century to the last decades of the 19th) “there were many individuals who in works of history and travels and in articles in journals attempted to acquaint the reading public with notable aspects of Russian culture”. Events, mainly political and military, he notes, also “focused public attention on Russia and heightened interest in its people and their customs, traditions and history”, although traditional stereotypes and hardened prejudices, particularly with regard to nations, are hard to eradicate.

As the case study on the following pages illustrates, it is largely through human agency that literary and cultural ties between countries are promoted: the enthusiasm of a highly motivated translator was no small matter in familiarizing the English reader with Russian folklore and literature in the 1870s. William Ralston, who translated works by Krylov and Turgenev, among others, and wrote articles on Russian folklore and major literary figures, was the “one serious scholar of Russian letters at this time” (May 1994:17).

Special reference to his “accurate and lively accounts of Russian epic poems and popular tales” was made by Maxime Kovalevsky (1891) in his opening Ilchester lecture on Modern Customs and Ancient Laws of Russia at the University of Oxford. In his opinion, “in England the works of Ralston were the first to deal with the vast field of Slavonic, and more especially of Russian, folk-lore.” Thus Ralston was “perhaps the most outstanding British Slavist of the nineteenth century” (Waddington 1980:1). “The Russian Don Quixote”, as he was nicknamed, “saw his vocation as tilting at British ignorance about Russia” (Waddington 2004).

This paper attempts to explore the translator’s agency in the context of a recent call for humanizing translation studies (Pym 2009), as well as in terms of agency discussions in the field (Kinnunen & Koskinen 2010; Milton & Bandia 2009).

2 AGENCY AND MAKING NARRATIVE SENSE OF RELATIONS BETWEEN CULTURES

Anthony Pym’s idea of progressive humanization of translation studies calls for greater attention to social roles played by translators in mediating between cultures. Pym (2009:23-24) argues that one should not be satisfied with “just raw data about texts, dates, places, and names”; portraying “active people in the picture, and some kind of human interaction at work” also is required if the task of translation history is “to make narrative sense of relations between cultures”. “Asking biographical and sociological questions or
looking critically at the language in prefaces, correspondence and the subject’s texts other than translations” are seen as ways of attaining this goal (Pym 2009:36).

Humanization, however, is described not as a strict methodology, but “at best a mode of asking questions that may lead to unforeseen answers”. Thus, “a focus on individual translators should... lead researchers to model intercultural decision-making as an ethical activity, a question of actively choosing between alternatives, rather than mere compliance to rules, norms or laws” (Pym 2009:45).

Two recent publications on agency may serve, in my opinion, as vivid examples of such an approach. In their introduction to Translators’ Agency (Kinnunen & Koskinen 2010), a collection of articles published by the Tampere University Press, the Finnish researchers define the concept of agency as “the willingness and ability to act”, further elaborating that willingness, largely individualistic and psychological by nature, describes a particular internal state and disposition linked to consciousness, reflectivity and intentionality; hence entailing moral or ethical undertones. Ability relates the concept of agency to constraints and issues of power and powerlessness, also underlining the notion of choice. Agency is not only individual but also collective by nature. Pointing out that in the social sciences ‘agency’ is commonly discussed in connection with its twin concept, ‘structure’, agency maintaining structure and this structure in turn constraining agency, they argue that “[i]n any given structure, the actors will have agency, but this agency (or habitus) is structured by the context. The structures, however, are not permanent but constantly renegotiated by the agents” (Kinnunen & Koskinen 2010:6-8; their emphasis).

The focus of attention in Translators’ Agency is on the human actors, the analysis of whose agency is “deeply embedded in the surrounding practices and professional environments of the translators and interpreters in question” (Kinnunen & Koskinen 2010:8-9). One of the articles, Pekka Kujamäki’s Reconstructing a translator’s network and their narrative agenda is quite illustrative in this respect, showing the embeddedness of the agency of the Öhquists as mediators between Finland and Germany in the first half of the 20th century in the ideological and political structures of the period (Kujamäki 2010:61-85).

Agents of Translation (Milton & Bandia 2009:1), the other book under discussion, examines the concept of agency in translation studies by “considering certain cases in which agents are responsible for major historical, literary and cultural transitions/changes/innovations through translation”. Translators are thus included amongst agents, i.e., “patrons of literature, Maecenas, salon organizers, politicians or companies which help to change cultural and linguistic policies”, etc. They are seen as “individuals who devote great amounts of energy and even their own lives to the cause of a foreign literature, author or literary school, translating, writing articles, teaching and dissemination of knowledge and culture”.

Of special relevance for the present paper are two chapters of this book: Denise Merkle’s ‘Vizetelly & Company as (ex)change agent: Towards the modernization of the British publishing industry’ and Carol O’Sullivan’s ‘Translation within the margin: The “Libraries” of Henry Bohn’. These are two contrasting stories, dealing, on the one hand,
with a publisher attempting to broaden the English mind by introducing popular translations of Zola into England and falling victim to “Victorian England’s obsession with delicacy and aversion to bawdiness, especially in the public arena”; and, on the other hand, with “an agent much more attuned to the Victorian mind”, who thanks to the ingenious ways in which he “negotiated canons of respectability in a climate of growing moral severity” was able to contribute to the circulation of some of the more notorious works of European literature among a wide readership (Milton & Bandia 2009:15, 90, 108).

Henry Vizetelly of the first case study may serve as an example of “innovative agents” who “may go against the grain, challenge commonplaces and contemporary assumptions, endanger their professional and personal lives, risk fines, imprisonment, and even death” (Milton & Bandia 2009:1). As Merkle (2009:85) argues, he may be “credited with having contributed to successfully undermining the monopoly of the circulating libraries and introducing to the British publishing marketplace inexpensive editions in a single volume through his translation and publishing activities”. She characterizes Henry and Ernest Vizetelly as “agents of metamorphosis”: living abroad had changed their worldview and hence they operated from within a changed universe that was no longer late Victorian; thus the case study shows the role of the translator as an intercultural agent.

O’Sullivan (2009:111-112), on the other hand, considers the Victorian publisher Henry G. Bohn as a pioneer in the publishing of translated classics for a general market. Her article sheds light on the strategies and practices of translation employed in his Standard and Classical Libraries (established in 1846 and 1848), which are also of relevance for the present discussion. Thus “accessibility and textual integrity” were the emphasis in the Standard Library and the key criterion for translations was fidelity. “Straightforward literal prose translations” of the Classical Library were offered “for students of the classics and the many whose knowledge of Latin and Greek was not sufficient to allow them to read easily in the original”, the literalism reflecting the prevailing attitude to classical source texts; translations in Bohn’s series were always attributed and translators’ prefaces and notes were standard.

Almost the same chronological period is covered in another chapter of the book, Outi Paloposki’s ‘Limits of freedom: Agency, choice and constraints in the work of the translator’, which “[outlines] concrete day-to-day routines and decision-making of two translators in Finland at the end of the 19th and mid-20th centuries”. Paloposki (2009:190; her emphasis) argues that the study of their lives helps to explore the issues which determine the balance between individual agency and collective norms; thus translation can be studied “both from the point of view of the individual translators’ choice and decision processes and the effect of these in the target culture, and from the point of view of the norms and constraints surrounding translators”. As will be shown later, this holds true for the present study of the cultural biography of the English translator as well.

Also of interest is the “useful distinction between textual, paratextual and extratextual visibility” of a translator, introduced in the discussion of ethical issues in translation studies, that Paloposki applies to the data used in the study of agency (Koskinen 2000:99;
cited in Paloposki 2009:191). Thus, according to Paloposki, textual agency refers to the translator’s voice in the text; paratextual agency consists of the translator’s role in inserting and adding notes and prefaces, and extratextual agency relates to the selection of books to be translated, the use of different editions and intermediary translations, and to the role of translators in “speaking out”, publicizing their translations, explaining their methods and strategies, and the like.

3 WILLIAM RALSTON, “AN INDEFATIGABLE POPULARIZER OF THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE IN ENGLAND”

The main issues to be dealt with in this part of the paper are William Ralston’s personality and interests that influenced his decision-making in choosing Russian materials to translate.

There are several recent publications, articles in folkloristic or Slavonic studies journals, (e.g. Waddington 1980, Cross 1983, Ryan 2006, 2009) that are devoted either to some particular aspects of Ralston’s folklore studies and literary translations or their general overview. There is also his only biography written in Russian by Alekseev & Levin (1994), as well as a recent study of the English translation tradition of the Russian fables, including Ralston’s contribution (Kritskaya 2008). However, in my opinion, there is still a need for a focused and detailed study of his agency as a translator of folklore and an intercultural mediator, as well as of the social structures and practices in which this agency was embedded; hence the focus of my research is on Ralston’s folklore translations in the cultural context of the period in question.

Some basic facts of Ralston’s biography are to be found in an article in the Dictionary of National Biography (1896), written by Robert Kennaway Douglas who knew Ralston in his lifetime; then, in a recent article by Patrick Waddington published in the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (2004), as well as in his sketch cited here for its brevity:

Born in London of an India merchant on 4 April 1828, he was educated privately in Brighton and at Brixham before entering Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1846. After graduating in 1850 he began a career at the bar; but family misfortunes drove him to seek more regular work and he became an assistant at the British Museum’s department of printed books. Here he taught himself Russian in order to catalogue Cyrillic titles, and his interest in Slavonic matters soon brought a keen taste for popular literature and folklore (Waddington 1980:1).

While at the British Museum, writes Douglas, Ralston “won the respect of the superior officers by his zeal and ability”; with untiring perseverance he devoted himself to the study of Russian, and having acquired the knowledge of the then ‘exotic’ language “he would doubtless have risen to the highest post had his health not shown signs of giving way”. In Douglas’s opinion, “extremely sensitive nature, as well as [his] weakly constitution”, were behind his resignation in 1875, after twenty-two years’ service (Douglas 1896:224-5; cf. also McCrimmon 1988). After his early retirement “Ralston’s
existence became increasingly lonely”; he never married; and when he died in London on 6 August 1889 “many believed it was suicide” (Waddington 1980:2).

Rachel May (1994:17) argues that “although Ralston was admired as a perceptive critic and a capable translator by Russian intellectuals … no such recognition accrued to him at home”, where, in her opinion, his influence was short-lived as by the late 1870s hostility towards Russia had reached new heights, and the artistic merits of Russian literature were almost entirely lost from view.

It may be noted, however, that Ralston finally received the recognition that he deserved. In recent publications due credit is given to his extraordinary agency in promoting Russian folklore and literature. The tone of Waddington’s article in the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography is remarkable in this respect:

Slim, about 6 feet 6 inches tall, with receding dark hair above a wistful face and flowing pepper-and-salt beard, he was an imposing but kindly figure; his presence was said to bring sunlight to the darkest room (Waddington 2004).

Also:

Although Ralston’s life was often clouded with frustrations and disappointments, it was largely thanks to him that the British public maintained and developed an interest in the culture of Slavonic nations and of Russia in particular. Krylov, Lermontov, Nekrasov, Turgenev and Tolstoy are some of the writers whose reputation in England could scarcely have stood so high so soon were it not for this quiet propagandist (Waddington 1980:2).

Alekseev and Levin (1994:7; my translation) called Ralston “an indefatigable popularizer of the Russian language and literature in England”, praising him as one of the most important mediators between the Russian and British literary worlds in the second half of the 19th century; his activity of over twenty years attracted attention both in Western Europe and America and gained him recognition in Russia already in his lifetime.

Ralston’s first success as a translator was associated with the name of the famous Russian fabulist Krylov. His book *Krilof and his Fables* (1869) which had three subsequent enlarged editions and included Krylov’s 148 most important fables and detailed commentaries upon them proved to be seminal in familiarizing the British reader with Russian literature and the Russian people (Alekseev & Levin 1994:24-5). It was highly praised by Ivan Turgenev (1982:266) who wrote that, “The words “third edition” are particularly agreeable to the ears of a Russian … as they prove that English readers are beginning to feel an interest in the literature of his country”. The English translation “leaves nothing to desire in the matter of accuracy and coloring”; the short preface and literary notes have been done “conscientiously and con amore”; and “it will not be the translator’s fault if Krilof does not prove to be thoroughly “naturalised” in England” (Turgenev 1982:267; his emphasis).
In fact, Turgenev’s words proved prophetic as the Russian fabulist was finally “firmly established in the English consciousness” thanks to Ralston’s “faithful prose rendering” in the first place (Cross 1983:104). Waddington (2004) also argues that Ralston’s first book was “a landmark in the reception of Russian literature in Britain”, although, in his opinion, Ralston as a translator and critic is associated primarily with Turgenev, with whom he enjoyed a warm and productive friendship. Turgenev considered Liza (his Dvoryanskoye gnezdo [A Nest of the Gentry]; 1869) as the best translation ever made of any of his works.

It was during Ralston’s 1868 visit to Turgenev’s country estate that his interest in Russian folklore “seems to have been seriously aroused” (Ryan 2006:124). He began to write about Russia and “from the first exhibited his love of the common people, whose rich, lucid language, strong traditions, and unaffected religion he witnessed for himself in 1868 and 1870” (Waddington 2004). During his trips to Russia, Ralston made friends with many prominent folklore scholars of the day, whose works he studied diligently and drew upon in his own publications. He kept a lively correspondence with quite a number of his Russian friends (Ralston’s 158 letters are included in the biography by Alekseev & Levin).

It should be noted here that the later 19th century was “a fruitful period for Russian folklore scholarship both in that country and abroad”: “scholarly interest in folklore reached a level which has not been equalled since”, with the publication of well-known bylindy collections of Kirsha Danilov and P.N. Rybnikov and “the extraordinary folktale compilations of A.N. Afanas’ev” (Tilney 1976:313). Ralston felt a special affinity for Afanas’ev, whom he held in great esteem as a scholar and a famous collector of folklore, and to whom he dedicated his Russian Folk Tales (1873). Philip Tilney argues that “it seems to have been Afanas’ev’s work which inspired him to begin a study of Russian folklore”, while, in Waddington’s opinion, “Ralston’s passion for folklore was undoubtedly connected with his deep sympathy for the poor and oppressed, with whom he worked unsparingly and on whom he spent much of his income” (Waddington 1980:1).

Notably, a great degree of affinity between the social stance of the translator and the material he chooses for translating can be discerned, for example, in the following extracts from the first introductory chapter of his Russian Folk Tales:

In these poorer dwellings we witness much suffering; but we learn to respect the patience and resignation with which it is generally borne, and in the greater part of the humble homes we visit we become aware of the existence of many domestic virtues, we see numerous tokens of family affection, of filial reverence, of parental love. And when, as we pass along the village street at night, we see gleaming through the utter darkness the faint rays which tell that even in many a poverty-stricken home a lamp is burning before the “holy pictures,” we feel that these poor tillers of the soil, ignorant and uncouth though they too often are, may be raised at times by lofty thoughts and noble aspirations far above the
low level of the dull and hard lives which they are forced to lead (Ralston 1873:23).

And the stories which are current among the Russian peasantry are for the most part exceedingly well narrated. Their language is simple and pleasantly quaint, their humor is natural and unobtrusive, and their descriptions, whether of persons or of events, are often excellent (Ralston 1873:20).

Ralston acquired a serious scholarly reputation and in 1871 was invited to give the second series of Ilchester lectures at the University of Oxford’s Taylorian Institution. The three lectures, and the material upon which they were based, were published as his two most important folklore works: The Songs of the Russian People as Illustrative of Slavonic Mythology and Russian Social Life (Ralston 1872) and Russian Folk Tales (Ralston 1873). The latter also appeared in several editions in the USA, its French edition ‘Contes populaires de la Russie’ was published in 1874 (Ryan 2009:125-6).

Thus, in keeping with the character of his personality and social stance, as well as his scholarly and literary ambitions, Ralston’s interest in the Russian language, pursued with enthusiasm and diligence, led him to become an expert in the field of Russian folklore and literature. As it turns out, this rare expertise was quite appropriate to the intellectual atmosphere in England at this period, which will be discussed at some length below.

4 “THE GOLDEN AGE OF FOLKLORE IN EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA”

If we have only a glimpse into the intellectual atmosphere of the late 19th century in England, it seems only natural that Ralston was to become a scholar and translator of folklore because for such an ambitious intellectual as him, the science of folklore, still in its formative years, was a promising field. According to Jack Zipes (2012:109-10), an expert in folkloristics, “initially, the collecting and study of folk tales was undertaken in the nineteenth century by professionals outside the university until their work was recognized as invaluable for gaining a full sense of history”. It was “the golden age of folklore in Europe and North America” as “learned people finally began turning their attention to all aspects of folk life and the oral traditions of folk tales, recording, editing, and publishing them”. The movement was international in character: everywhere museums, archives, and other institutions were founded to “preserve” or safeguard the artifacts of cultural heritages.

Ralston describes this atmosphere in a more picturesque and metaphoric way:

Somewhat like the fortunes of Cinderella have been those of the popular tale itself. Long did it dwell beside the hearths of the common people, utterly ignored by their superiors in social rank. Then came a period during which the cultured world recognized its existence, but accorded to it no higher rank than that allotted to “nursery stories” and “old wives’ tales”- except, indeed, on those rare occasions when the charity of a condescending scholar had invested it with
such a garb as was supposed to enable it to make a respectable appearance in
polite society. At length there arrived the season of its final change, when,
transferred from the dusk of the peasant’s hut into the full light of the outer day,
and freed from the unbecoming garments by which it had been disfigured, it
was recognized as the scion of a family so truly royal that some of its members
deduce their origin from the olden gods themselves.

In our days the folk-tale, instead of being left to the careless
guardianship of youth and ignorance, is sedulously tended and held in high
honor by the ripest of scholars (Ralston 1873:16).

Among the ranks of “the ripest of scholars” we find Ralston himself as one of the
founders of The Folklore Society (1878) (“a mixed bag of enthusiasts”, according to
William Ryan); he remained the Society’s vice-president or a member of its Council until
his death in 1889 (Ryan 2009:123).

Everyone seems to agree that the impetus to this international movement, or folklore
studies in its initial stage, was given by the famous collection by the Brothers Grimm.
Zipes (2012:111) argues that the publication of their Kinder and Hausmärchen (Children’s
and Household Tales) in 1812 and 1815, intended primarily for learned adults, set off “a
chain reaction that had massive repercussions for the dissemination and study of folk
tales in Europe and North America”. In fact, the movement was much more widespread.
Thus, Ralston (1878:2) pointed out the importance of two of the largest and most valuable
collections made in Russia and in Sicily: “Afanasiy’s 332 Russian stories (Moscow 1863),
and Dr. Giuseppe Pitrè’s 300 Sicilian stories (Palermo, 1875)”.

At this point, it is necessary to touch upon an important and, rather sensitive, issue of
translation in the field of folklore, which, in my opinion, has not been fully recognized
and let alone sufficiently explored, although it seems to have been present at least since
the time of the Grimms’ publication, and its almost simultaneous translation from
German into foreign languages. Edgar Taylor’s first English translation of their tales
(German Popular Tales, 1823; a second volume published in 1826) “went through many
different editions in Great Britain and the United States, and was the primary translation
of the Grimms’ tales until the 1880s” (Zipes 2012:112). Characteristically, it was “more of
a free adaptation that catered to young readers”; and Taylor’s “successful Anglicization
and infantilization of the tales set a ‘model’ for literary fairy tales in England in the
nineteenth century” (Zipes 2012:112).

However, Taylor was not the only responsible party in this transformation of folk
tales into literary fairy tales. In Zipes’s opinion, the fusion of the oral and the literary into
the “classic type” of fairy tale was due to the Grimms themselves who modified the
“raw” tales, told in diverse dialects, and these were modified further by the English
translator. As a result, according to Zipes, there is a strange case of misrepresentation of
so-called genuine folk tales or tales suitable for children. Zipes admits “heavy editing and
translations into the language of the educated elite”, alongside the immense production
of folk-tale collections in different countries of Europe (Zipes 2012:112; cf. also Pokorn
2010).
As follows from the above discussion, the issue of translating folklore was not a simple one, with folklore striving to establish itself as a science and translators having to do their own decision-making, depending, of course, on the nature of their agency, their willingness and ability to act and influence.

Thus, the next important question to deal with in our discussion is how Ralston approached his material, i.e. his strategy and practice in coping with his translating task. Shedding light on this aspect of his agency is certainly his involvement in the activities of The Folklore Society, which entailed the responsibilities of a folklore scholar. These responsibilities were in fact the hot topic of the day, which can be seen, for example, in the following extract from a work of one of Ralston’s colleagues, with the characteristic title *The Science of Fairy Tales*:

There is, however, one caution - namely, to be assured that the documents are gathered direct from the lips of the illiterate story-teller, and set down with accuracy and good faith. Every turn of phrase, awkward or coarse though it may seem to cultured ears, must be unrelentingly reported; and every grotesquery, each strange word, or incomprehensible or silly incident, must be given without flinching. Any attempt to soften down inconsistencies, vulgarities or stupidities, detracts from the value of the text, and may hide or destroy something from which the student may be able to make a discovery of importance to science (Hartland 1891:11; here and below emphasis added).

Then the author adds:

Happily the collectors of the present day are fully alive to this need. The pains they take to ensure correctness are great, and their experiences in so doing are often very interesting. Happily, too, the student soon learns to distinguish the collections whose sincerity is certain from those furbished up by literary art. The latter may have purposes of amusement to serve, but beyond that they are of comparatively little use (Hartland 1891:11).

As this quotation establishes, the folklore scholar saw the need to make a clear distinction between the collections based on scientific principles of “accuracy and good faith”, on the one hand, and those “furbished up by literary art” for amusement and hence of little value for the “science of fairy tales”, on the other.

What side Ralston was on in this debate can be clearly seen from his *Notes on Folk-Tales* where he makes almost the same arguments:

It is impossible to impress too strongly on collectors the absolute necessity of accurately recording the stories they hear, and of accompanying them by ample references for the sake of verification. The temptation to alter, to piece together, and to improve, is one which many minds find extremely seductive; but
yielding to it deprives the result of any value, except for the purpose of mere amusement (Ralston 1878:2).

The following passage is of particular interest in our discussion of agency because it is not merely an instruction for an amateur collector of folklore but, more importantly, it sheds light on the work ethics of the scholar and translator, to which he adhered “unrelentingly” in his own work:

**Patience, industry, and conscientiousness** are the main qualifications required in the case of gatherers of material. But examiners and sifters of gathered stores ought to possess, in addition to these virtues, **exceptional prudence and cautiousness**, while the final dealer with the accumulated stores, he who is to turn them to ultimate account, to piece together scattered fragments, to resolve disorder into symmetrical arrangement, to rebuild out of shapeless ruins temples of ancient goods, must have still higher qualifications, **wide and deep learning, matured judgment, and well-trained skill** (Ralston 1878:3).

To see how heated these discussions were, as well as their lasting character (they continued well after Ralston’s lifetime), suffice it to cite a fact from the biography of another eminent Victorian folklore scholar, Andrew Lang. When between 1889 and 1910 Lang published his *Colour Fairy Books*, twelve anthologies of folk tales “enormously popular in their day” and “gracing the shelves of better bookstores today” (Black 1988:27), he was the first British folklore specialist to compile a fairy tale anthology for children; but his scholarly reputation suffered from this connection with children’s literature, and his enterprise drew a lot of fire (Sundmark 2004:1-2).

### 5 RALSTON’S PHILOSOPHY OF LITERAL TRANSLATION

From what has been discussed above, especially as concerns Ralston’s work ethics, one can already form a general idea about the way he thought best to work with the folklore material he had chosen for translation, but a more detailed picture also may be drawn.

As I have mentioned above, Ralston, inspired by his success with Krylov’s fables, continued with his work and his next book was *The Songs of the Russian People as Illustrative of Slavonic Mythology and Russian Social Life* (1872). The title alone indicates that this was not just a collection of translations, but rather a scholarly treatise on the theoretical issues of Russian folklore (based on Russian primary and secondary sources), along with translations of Russian folk songs as illustrations of those issues. This was, in fact, the same approach the author adopted with his *Russian Folk Tales* (1873). In my opinion, this approach emphasizes the social role of a folklore scholar, which is influential in defining his second role: that of a translator, which is finally reflected in his translated texts.

In the preface to his *Songs of the Russian People*, Ralston (1872:VI) explained that in the translations contained in the volume he had attempted “to give, in every case, as literal a
version of the original as possible”; his rule was “to translate the songs into prose, line for line and word for word”. However, he also was aware of the specific nature of his material with its “vein of natural and genuine poetry”. Among the merits of the Russian folk songs he pointed out “untutored freshness of their thought, the nervous vigour of their language, [and] the musical ring of their versification”. Sometimes frustrated by the challenges of translating poetry into prose, he complained that “it is next to impossible to give in a translation, however faithful it may be, any idea of the greater part of these merits”; or as he vividly puts it, “The stuffed nightingale of the taxidermist is but a poor exchange for the living songster of the woodland” (Ralston 1872:3, 15).

Undaunted, however, he continued to translate Russian popular stories in the same manner in his next work, professing the same philosophy of literalism. Notably, the translator’s stance expressed clearly in the citations echoes the aforementioned working ethics of a folklore scholar, and once again Ralston’s folkloristic interests stand out:

The fifty-one stories which I have translated at length I have rendered as literally as possible. … In giving summaries, also, I have kept closely to the text, and always translated literally the passages marked as quotations (Ralston 1873:9).

By way of justifying his strict rule he added:

In the imitation of a finished work of art, elaboration and polish are meet and due, but in a transcript from nature what is most required is fidelity. An “untouched” photograph is in certain cases infinitely preferable to one which has been carefully “worked upon.” And it is, as it were, a photograph of the Russian story-teller that I have tried to produce, and not an ideal portrait (Ralston 1873:9).

It should be noted here that the invention of photography was a major 19th century development in the visual arts. Susanne Starke (1999:12) argues that “a colour portrait idealizing the form and contents of the original text” had been the predominant imagery for translation in the eighteenth century, but “nineteenth-century thinking about the topic appropriated the analogy of a photographic, naturalistic black and white reproduction”.

To illustrate how Ralston implemented this strategy in his translations, let us adduce an example: an opening extract of the Russian folk tale “Ведьма и Солнцева сестра” and its English translation The Witch and the Sun’s Sister:

(1)В некотором царстве, далеком государстве, жил-был царь с царицей, у них был сын Иван-царевич, с роду немой. Было ему лет двенадцать, и пошел он раз в конюшню к любимому своему конюху. Конюх этот сказывал ему всегда сказки, и теперь Иван-царевич пришел послушать от него сказочки, да не то услышал. "Иван-царевич! - сказал
In a certain far-off country there once lived a king and queen. And they had an
only son, Prince Ivan, who was dumb from his birth. One day, when he was
twelve years old, he went into the stable to see a groom who was a great friend of
his. That groom always used to tell him tales [skazki], and on this occasion Prince
Ivan went to him expecting to hear some stories [skazochki], but that wasn't what
he heard. "Prince Ivan!" said the groom, "your mother will soon have a daughter
and you a sister. She will be a terrible witch, and she will eat up her father, and
her mother, and all their subjects. . ." (Ralston 2007; emphasis added).

As we can see, this is a straightforward literal translation of the Russian original. In one
instance, the translator, obviously dissatisfied with the English lexical items
tales and stories, (which have a somewhat broader meaning than their Russian counterparts), even
introduced the Russian words (transliterated in brackets) into his text. Obviously,
Ralston's fidelity to the original cannot be complete, for example, when it comes to
rendering the Russian formulas characteristic of the folk tale, such as В некотором
царстве, далеком государстве; жил-был, etc. (In a certain far-off country, there once lived,
etc). Nor does he reproduce the original colloquial style (e.g. отсюда куда –
whithersoever, с роду впервой - for the first time in his life, etc.), as the translated text tends to
be of a more literary character.

Let us adduce another example from the same story:

(2) Долго-долго он ехал; наезжает на двух старых швей и просит, чтоб они
взяли его с собой жить. Старухи сказали: «Мы бы рады тебя взять, Иван-
царевич, да нам уж немного жить. Вот доложем сундук иголок да изошем
сундук ниток - тотчас и смерть придет!» Иван-царевич заплакал и поехал
далее. Долго-долго ехал, подъезжает к Вертодубу и просит: «Прими меня
к себе!» - «Рад бы тебя принять, Иван-царевич, да мне жить остается
немного. Вот как повыдерну все эти дубы с кореньями - тотчас и смерть
моя!» Пуще прежнего заплакал царевич и поехал все дальше да дальше. Подъезжает к Вертогору; стал его просить, а он в ответ...
(Ved’ma i Solntseva sestra 1984:110-111);

Long, long did he ride. At length he came to where two old women were sewing
and he begged them to let him live with them. But they said: "Gladly would we do
so, Prince Ivan, only we have now but a short time to live. As soon as we have
broken that trunkful of needles, and used up that trunkful of thread, that instant
will death arrive!" Prince Ivan burst into tears and rode on. Long, long did he ride.
At length he came to where the giant Vertodub was, and he besought him, saying:
"Take me to live with you." "Gladly would I have taken you, Prince Ivan!" replied the
giant, "but now I have very little longer to live. As soon as I have pulled up all these
trees by the roots, instantly will come my death!" More bitterly still did the prince
weep as he rode farther and farther on. By-and-by he came to where the giant Vertogor was, and made the same request to him, but he replied ... (Ralston 2007).

This extract is quite illustrative of the way Ralston manages to faithfully render lexical-phraseological and syntactical repetitions characteristic of the poetic structure of the Russian original (emphasized in bold). However, the ‘monotony’ of the Russian narrative based on the verb repeated three times и просит, и просит, стал просить is broken in the translation where a set of synonyms is used instead: he begged, and he besought him, and made the same request to him. In another instance, the repetitions of the verb Иван-царевич заплакал; Пуще прежнего заплакал царевич are similarly rendered with synonymous expressions as Prince Ivan burst into tears; More bitterly still did the prince weep; etc. Notably, Ralston transliterates the names of the folk tale personages Vertodub – Вертодуб; Vertogor – Вертогор, adding one word (giant) to explain their character; he provides additional comments in the notes (Vertodub, the Tree-extractor; Vertogor, the Mountain leveler).

Thus, the examples adduced above clearly demonstrate how accurately and scrupulously Ralston adhered to his chosen strategy of literalism in his translations of Russian popular literature, which was in strict accord with his scholarly agenda, as well as the prevalent translation tendencies of his day (see O'Sullivan 2009; Starke 1999 cited above), but also had a number of other implications.

Contrary to Ralston’s pronouncement that he intended to address his translated folk tales to the general reader, the translations – which were part of his scholarly discourse and thus were heavily annotated - were more appropriate for experts. The “translator’s footprints”, it may be noted, were so numerous as to become almost a hindrance to their reception by less sophisticated readers. Besides, at this, still-early stage of the British perception of the Russian folklore and culture, the gap between the two cultures may have become a problem if we also take into consideration the fact that Ralston had chosen to translate tales that had a singularly individual, culturally specific character. To be commercially successful and reach a wider audience, perhaps his translations should have been domesticated and edited (not to say bowdlerized) to meet the interests of the young readers, a strategy successfully employed at the turn of the century by his fellow folklore scholar Andrew Lang. But that was impossible for Ralston because it definitely went against his professional ethics of a folklore scholar and the philosophy of literal translation to which he adhered.

Apparently, Ralston’s translations were an important first introduction into the new and fascinating (but also strange and unfamiliar) world of Russian magic, thus paving the way for other translators and interpreters to come (Bogrdanova 2012). It was thanks to his efforts that the European reader was familiarized with the wealth of Russian oral tradition; folklore data were made available to Western scholars who had had no access to them before (Alekseev & Levin 1994:42).

Moreover, as Ryan (2009:127-8) stresses, unlike the other publications of Russian folktales in English that would follow in the next few decades, “Ralston’s book was not really for the general reader or for children – it was a serious scholarly exercise”, and was
“the most extensive collection of Russian tales in English until the publication in New York in 1945 of the misnamed Russian Fairy Tales translated by Norbert Guterman”. He adds that “up to that time Ralston’s book was widely quoted in scholarly literature and was treated as authoritative; and it is still quoted with respect”.

6 CONCLUSION

Pym’s (2009:45) idea of progressive humanization of translation studies calls for greater attention to social roles played by translators in mediating between cultures so that researchers would be able “to model intercultural decision-making as an ethical activity, a question of actively choosing between alternatives”. At the same time, Kinnunen and Koskinen (2010:8-9) have argued that we must see translators as agents and recognize that their agency is “deeply embedded in the surrounding practices and professional environments”. Though Ralston’s role as the “one serious scholar of Russian letters” in the 1870s has been recognized, there is still a need for a more focused and detailed study of his agency as a translator of folklore and an intercultural mediator, as well as of the social structures and practices in which this agency was embedded; hence the focus of my research has been on Ralston’s folklore translations in the cultural context of the period in question. In keeping with the character of his personality and social stance, as well as with his scholarly and literary ambitions, Ralston’s interest in the Russian language, pursued with enthusiasm and diligence, led him to become an expert in the field of Russian folklore and literature. This rare expertise was quite appropriate to the intellectual atmosphere of “the golden age of folklore in Europe and North America”; as well as in Russia, it should be added, where the most important contributions to the study of folklore impressed Ralston to such an extent that he became an enthusiastic popularizer of Russian scholarship and folklore.

At the same time, the important and rather sensitive issue of translation in the field of folklore has not been fully recognized, let alone sufficiently explored, despite having been present at least since the time of the Grimms’ publication and its translations from German into foreign languages. Characteristically, the first English translation was a free adaptation that catered to young readers and set a “model” for literary fairy tales in England in the 19th century. Thus the issue of translating folklore was a rather controversial one. On the one hand, folklore studies was striving to establish itself as a science and to elaborate its professional ethics on recording folklore materials; on the other hand, there was an immense production of folk-tale collections targeted at the general reader. This involved translators in making ethical choices that depended upon their willingness and ability to act and influence. To explore how Ralston approached his material, i.e. his strategy and practice in coping with his translating task, this case study has scrutinized his extratextual, paratextual and textual agency. It is clear that Ralston did not limit himself to merely professing the philosophy of literalism (the translator’s stance echoing the working ethics of a folklore scholar) but scrupulously adhered to his chosen strategy in his translations of Russian popular literature. This was in strict accord with his scholarly agenda but also had a number of implications to be explored further.
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ABSTRACT
The young Arthur Ransome’s Old Peter’s Russian Tales (1916) that has today attained the status of a classic is of chief interest here as part of the British–Russian cultural interaction and interconnections at the turn of the twentieth century. In an attempt to historicise the author-translator in his creative effort to rewrite the Russian folktale, this paper focuses on his quest for magic and the collection of fairy stories, resulting from interacting with both place and people. A microscopic analysis of the translator’s life and work in his early years in Russia, via a study of archival material (Brotherton Collections, University of Leeds Library) and other relevant documents, has helped to reconstruct them in a richness of detail that sheds light on the bigger picture of the British–Russian relationship. The translator’s gift to his reader, a token of fruitful experiences in this new and exciting fairyland, was, in fact, the product of mediation agency between the two worlds, the role that Ransome had found crucial and realised successfully in practice. As a result, another cultural and emotional bridge was built to interconnect these two countries.
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1. Introduction
Arthur Ransome (1884–1967), most famous for his Swallows and Amazons, wrote this series of children’s holiday adventure novels between 1930 and 1947. However, his first major success was Old Peter’s Russian Tales, the translation product of the early years of the author’s ten-year stay in Russia, published by Messrs Jack of Edinburgh in 1916. This is a collection of Russian folktales of over three-hundred pages long, its first editions illustrated by Dmitri Mitrokhin (1883–1973), a Mir Iskusstva (World of Art) artist. It has today attained classic status and, according to Hugh Brogan, in the end may outlast Ransome’s later success. My chief interest in this milestone of the author-translator’s career is in it being a part of the British–Russian cultural interaction and interconnections. As Paul Bandia argues, ‘the history of humanity is expressed in interconnected bodies of writing and experiences’, and the research in translation history should be directed towards exploring these interconnections to become a more broad-based and comprehensive study.

Texts are thus seen as ‘the main raw material for letting history come to life’, and translators that produce them are increasingly ‘taken into consideration, scrutinised, and
elevated as historical subjects. The fabric of translation as a cultural practice (as of any other social structure) is the result of interaction and of numerous individual strategies, which can be reconstructed only from close observation, i.e. via a microscopic analysis and an intensive study of the documentary material. This renders a microhistoric perspective most promising for the particular purposes of investigating translators as cultural agents, as well as for the task of further raising historical awareness of translation historians in general. Agency in translation, deeply embedded in the surrounding practices and professional environments, becomes a meaningful concept in relation to particular material contexts and communities. Importantly, close observations of everyday experience of individuals, based on archives, manuscripts and, especially, translator papers, still ‘under-utilised’ in translation studies research, can shed light on the bigger picture of the history of translation in specific socio-historical and cultural contexts.

Hence, a microhistorical approach has been foregrounded in the present attempt at historicising the translator’s agency. For this purpose, I have mostly drawn on Ransome’s personal papers, *Autobiography*, early works, as well as biographies, and then on Russian memoirs and works of associates and colleagues in St Petersburg (Petrograd) in 1913–1916. These were useful in shedding light on the perceptions and motivations of the translator’s immersion in the cultural realities of pre-revolutionary Russia that was to prepare him for his mission. The source and target texts, or ‘primary text products’, are examined against the background of parallel translations by W.R.S. Ralston (1828–1889), Ransome’s important predecessor.

Specifically, I am looking into Ransome’s quest for magic and then its rendering back to his audience as a collection of Russian folklore. The young author’s experiences are examined for clues that turned him into an enthusiast whom ‘Russia and her people draw back again and again’ (Hugh Walpole) and a cultural mediator rewriting the Russian folktale for the British reader. As a result, I conclude, Ransome’s token of emotional attachments and expertise built another bridge interconnecting the countries.

2. The translator and translation in the British–Russian interaction at the turn of the twentieth century

2.1. ‘Incredibly glad to be here’

Anthony Cross observes that more than three centuries of contact passed, with ‘the exceptional individuals’ from the sixteenth century to the last decades of the nineteenth acquainting the reading public with Russian culture in works of history and travel, and in articles in journals, before it achieved wide recognition in Britain. The ‘Russian Fever’, as it was dubbed, ‘developed, peaked and ebbed away’ over the years 1890–1930 to be substituted by the challenge of the Soviet Union. Also, some political and military events from time to time attracted public attention to Russia, heightening interest in its people and their customs, traditions and history. Such conditions obtained when the two countries formed an alliance on the eve of WW I, and a moment of intense British–Russian interaction followed, with quite a number of British intellectuals embarking on trips to Russia.

Ransome’s own departure (or rather escape) for his first three-month stay in 1913, mostly in the vicinity of St Petersburg, came as a shock not only to his wife, from whom
especially it had been kept secret, but equally to most of his friends and acquaintances. It marked a dramatic moment in the personal life and in the literary career of the author dissatisfied with his previous output and ‘still hankering after the writing of stories’.

His diaries are sparse on the motives for choosing this particular destination, but still there are various indications of Russian interests and contacts before his trip. Thus, his *The World’s Story-tellers* (1908–10) series included Turgenev’s and Tolstoy’s smaller compositions, while among his associates and friends there were ‘several Russophiles, including Lascelles Abercrombie, and, more recently, Robert Ross’, as well as the Chesterton brothers.

Importantly, in 1912 he had a few of his short stories and articles printed in Russian reviews thanks to Michael Lykiardopoulos (1883–1925) who had visited him in Wiltshire. The Secretary of the Moscow Art Theatre, well-known for his English translations would become a close friend in Ransome’s expatriate life.

His personal papers, especially letters to his mother Edith Rachel Ransome, were indispensable in acquiring first-hand knowledge of Ransome’s Russian experiences, while memoirs and works of the people he knew at the time were also helpful. Thus, Bruce Lockhart’s recollections give, among other things, an idea of some of the contemporaneous British perceptions. These were controversial, at best, in the face of the immense attractiveness of the ‘delightful’ and ‘exotic’ Russian world, on the one hand, and its repulsive ‘coarseness’, ‘primitiveness’, and ‘immensity’, on the other. Walpole, then a young author like Ransome, used his first-hand experiences of a ‘sanitar’ in the Russian Red Cross ‘Otryad’ on the Eastern Front to produce *The Dark Forest*, one of his best works.

The famous Russian artist ‘Konstantine Samoff’ (the novel was dedicated to him by ‘his friend the author’) thought that it differed from other, usually banal and stereotyped, portrayals of the country. Ransome, writing from Petrograd on 6 March 1916, commends it to his mother: ‘It is the first book I have read which gives anything like a true impression of Russians as seen by English’.

According to Walpole, there is much to the Russian character that will remain closed for their British friend:

[…] to those whom Russia and her people draw back again and again, however sternly they may resist, this sure truth stands: that here there is a mystery, a mystery that may never be discovered. In the very soul of Russia the mystery is stirring; here the restlessness, the eagerness, the disappointment, the vision of the pursuit is working; and some who are outside her gates she has drawn into that same search.

Apparently, their search for understanding Russia, left the like of Walpole both mystified and enchanted. The deliberations, discoveries, doubts, and mistakes accompanying the process form an interesting and attractive aspect of this novel, as well as of other publications of the period, including, notably, Ransome’s book.

In fact, the latter arrived in Russia with a very particular and clear objective: to learn enough of the language to be able to read and translate Russian folklore into English. Ralston’s *Russian Folk-Tales* (London, 1873), that he discovered in the London Library, gave him an idea ‘what a rich material was there;’ ‘different from Scandinavian folk lore […]’, different again from Grimm and folklore of Brittany, Wales or the Highlands’. Dissatisfied with the too literary and somewhat old-fashioned style of the nineteenth-century translation as much as he liked the stories themselves, he decided that he would write his own book of Russian folklore. But first ‘he made himself fluent enough in Russian to
engage with absolute ease in conversations with Russians of all types, including, eventually, the Bolshevik leaders and his second wife.\textsuperscript{17} An earliest impression shows his immediate enchantment with the country too:

I asked leave of the ferryman, pushed the canoe into the water, balanced timorously on the stern-post, and, with unskilful paddle, got out into mid-stream, ducked under the ferry-rope, and moved slowly down the river into the sunset. The padding was easily mastered, the motion so restful after the bumping of the road, that among other pleasant resolves for my old age I laid another; of settling in a wooden house beside a Russian river, of fishing from just such a primitive canoe, of idly chasing sunsets among the water lilies, and of padding home at night to drink my tea beside a samovar hissing in the dusk.\textsuperscript{18}

Thus, far from the idea of dwelling at length on the mysteries of the ‘Russian soul’, Ransome seems to have been ready to settle down beside a Russian river to pursue his favourite pastimes. Jumping at the first opportunity to return to the country the next year, he writes to his mother already from Petrograd on 31 December 1914, ‘I am very, very happy to be here again’, then on 17 January 1915 from Moscow, ‘I am incredibly glad to be here, and I think the result will be a jolly interesting book’.\textsuperscript{19}

2.2. Old Peter’s Russian Tales: ‘a jolly interesting book’

Russia with its wealth of folktales was naturally of interest to scholars, as well as to authors looking for new folklore material for children. With his translation of Russian folktales, Ralston, the folklorist and Russian scholar, catered mostly to the tastes of the specialist. At the time a huge interest in folklore was evinced by the learned of the British society as part of their effort to rescue the idyll and story of the countryside against the forces of industrialisation and urbanisation. The enthusiasm for collecting and thus preserving the relics of ancient traditions, including folktales, was instigated to a large extent by the Grimms’ Children’s and Household Tales. Notably, the German tales were almost immediately translated into foreign languages, Danish and English in the first place; translation was therefore not only the necessary part of this movement from its beginning but indeed it contributed to the emergence of the literary genre of the international fairy tale itself. Of special importance in this respect were Andrew Lang’s anthologies of folktales from all over the world translated and edited for the British children at the turn of the twentieth century, their success ascribed chiefly to the popularity with the young reader, now apparently the major target audience of the fairy tale.\textsuperscript{20} Thus, it was the opportune time for Ransome to step in with his rewriting of the Russian folktale to add it to the store of international children’s literature.

As Riitta Oittinen points out, translators bring to translation their reading experience, and, importantly, their own ‘child image’ if they intend their work for children.\textsuperscript{21} As far as Ransome is concerned, his decision to take up this task was certainly far from accidental: his previous works show a keen interest in the art of story-telling while his readings of folklore, as well as of literature on folklore, were quite extensive, though, in his own words, he learned more from simple folktales he had heard from a friend in his bohemian days in London that he later ‘used to tell for many years in many places’.\textsuperscript{22} Also, before his Russian trips he had served a kind of apprenticeship as an independent student of the French language, literature and folklore, making useful literary contacts, developing his own method of learning languages (that he would successfully apply in mastering
Russian, and making some translations from French (tales of Brittany, the first English translation of de Gourmont’s *Une Nuit au Luxembourg*) along the way. It seems that much of this knowledge (experience) of the *foreign* proved to have been quite useful in his Russian quest.

A more complex issue, according to Oittinen, is the child (childhood) image in itself: it is based on each individual’s personal history (hence unique) but, also, on general perceptions shared by a given society even if there is little consensus on the definition of childhood, child, and children’s literature. In her opinion, children’s literature can be considered ‘an issue of intentionality: if the original author has intended or directed her/his book to be read by children, it is a children’s book’. In this sense it is easy to categorise *Old Peter’s Russian Tales (Old Peter)* as a children’s book as his author was quite outspoken on the point.

Hence, his is a much more arduous task too, involving besides the issues of linguistic interface skills and strategies of retelling and interpreting for a special audience. It is true that he had at his disposal, besides Ralston’s texts to consult, a whole set of textual practices and interpretative frameworks ‘for rendering imported narrative traditions readable, interpretable, entertaining and, most of all, relevant to the interests of their audience’. These he certainly employs to a degree (Lang, in the first place). But, there is also a principal difference: having developed a certain intimacy in interacting with the country and the people, Ransome was particularly interested in sharing his perceptions and attitudes of an expert with his reader.

The matter of the reader, however, is also complicated, given that children’s books often have a dual audience: children and adults. Ransome himself is ambivalent, when he says first, ‘My book is not for the learned or grown-up people at all’ but, then, adds, ‘[n]o people who really like fairy stories ever grow up altogether’, probably implying himself in the first place. Then, one should take into consideration the whole controversial issue of relegating the folktale with its originally ‘vaguely moral’ character to the realm of children’s literature. In particular, ‘the vogue’ of the fairy stories in upper-class French circles of the seventeenth century, according to Peter France, was ‘founded on the possibility of taking a sophisticated, detached, but possibly nostalgic pleasure in the naïve;’ and ‘Perrault recreated his stories, drawing on various sources, making no claim for faithful transcription, playing the game of naivety with consenting adults’. Of relevance in this respect may be a distinction made by Peter Hunt between ‘adults’ children’s books’, i.e. ‘those children’s books that adults like (and valorise)’ and ‘children’s children’s books’, based on the essential differences of the two groups and their interests. In particular, he argues, many classic children’s books that appear on the college book-lists, such as *The Wind in the Willows, Puck of Pook’s Hill, Winnie-the-Pooh, Swallows and Amazons*, etc. have certain themes in common, including, for example, ‘nostalgia’.

Thus, all of these are important considerations taken into account in the following examination of Ransome’s translation project.

### 3. Rewriting the Russian folktale

Notably, Ransome’s texts are not literal and accurate translations of the scholarly type like Ralston’s were (as I have shown elsewhere) but, rather, retellings, bearing clear signs of efforts to adapt them to the taste of the young British reader. His personal account of why he thought direct translation was not the way to tell Russian tales to English children
and how he finally came to write them is of key interest in understanding his general approach:

The Russian peasant storytellers, telling stories to each other, could count on a wide range of knowledge that their listeners, no matter how young, shared with them. Young English listeners knew nothing of the world that in Russia listeners and storytellers alike were able to take for granted. Continual explanation would have been as destructive of the tales as an endless series of asides. The storyteller, if he were to tell the tales as they should be told, had to stand between two worlds and never allow himself to feel that he was showing one world to the other. In the end I used to read as many variants of a folk-story as I could find and then lay them all aside while writing the story for myself.30

As already Ralston’s example evidences, folklore translation, especially for the general public and, in particular, for the younger reader, is a serious undertaking, given the nature of folklore texts themselves. Most challenging is probably their inherent rootedness in particular cultural contexts that they flourish in, i.e. ‘the content, form, and performance patterns of any given song or tale all belong to established traditions that the teller or singer inherits and in turn passes on to succeeding tellers or singers’. Defining (after André Lefevere) translation as a form of refraction, a form of writing that is rewriting, Maria Tymoczko finds this framework ‘particularly potent’ for the discussion of the translation of a non-canonical or marginalised literature such as early Irish literature, but also traditional tales.31 The obstacles translators face when working with such material are ‘massive’ because they have to deal with issues related to material and social culture, including law, economics, history, as well as values, world view, etc.; then, there are serious problems with the transference of literary features (genre, form, performance conventions, allusions) and issues of linguistic interface. Hence, the information load of translations of such texts is often very high, sometimes ‘intolerably high’.32 The reception problems are thus acute, given that for the receptor audience, familiar neither with the content nor with the intertextual framework, these are new stories told by the translator; and the more remote the source culture and literature, the more radically new the story will be for the receiving audience.33

3.1. Frame stories: negotiating alterity

Thus, the translator’s most challenging task was that of mediation between the two worlds so as to make the foreign comprehensible to the audience. Notably, the issue seems to remain relevant even today (after a century since Old Peter was published), with the strangeness of the Russian tales emphasised again and again. For instance, in her recent TLS review of the latest translation a specialist in Russian literature describes it as ‘captivating’ but also ‘enigmatic’, adding that the collection ‘surprises and perplexes, inviting us into a world where logic and understanding must yield to imagination’.34

Ransome’s solution in this case were frame stories, an important paratextual tool to introduce the necessary background information.35 There are four of such stories written by the translator, with tales based on the Russian originals following (or sometimes embedded in) them, thus roughly dividing the Old Peter into four parts. Of obvious significance is the introductory chapter ‘The Hut in the Forest’, which describes the place and its dwellers in the winter season with snow and cold outside: old Peter, the storyteller, Vanya and Maroosia, his grandchildren and his audience. The miniature portrayal of peasant life
includes such important everyday items like the stove that ‘filled a quarter of the hut, but that was because it was a bed as well’, the samovar, ‘wooden spoons, deep like ladles’, etc. The children are snug and ‘as warm as little baking cakes’ in their hut made of pine logs; old Peter ‘was very kind to them and did all he could to keep them warm and well fed’. To complete the picture of a happy company there is Vladimir, ‘a big black cat, as stately as an emperor’, and Bayan, ‘a tall gray wolf-dog’. Of the six tales that follow the introductory frame story (The Tale of the Silver Saucer and the Transparent Apple; Sadko; Frost; The Fool of the World and the Flying Ship; Baba Yaga; and The Cat Who Became Head-Forester) only one of them (Frost) directly associates with the winter season and snow landscapes, rendered so poetically in the beautiful Mitrokhin’s colour illustration.

While ‘The Hut in the Forest’ was a general introduction to the book, as well as a glimpse of the rustic Russia drawn by the author quite realistically, the next frame stories – ‘Spring in the Forest’ and ‘A Chapter on Fish’ – were much shorter interludes, which served to introduce some particular tales while loosely connected with others. Thus, after ‘Spring in the Forest’ there are another four tales: The Little Daughter of the Snow; Prince Ivan, the Witch Baby and the Little Sister of the Sun; The Stolen Turnips, the Magic Tablecloth, the Sneezing Goat and the Wooden Whistle; and Little Master Misery. The early spring and snow melting described in this interlude is the scene appropriate for The Little Daughter of the Snow but has no direct connection with others. Again, there is an obvious association between the topic of the other frame story ‘A Chapter of Fish’ (already containing two small untitled tales about fish told by old Peter netting fish and also mending his nets on a summer day) and the next tale The Golden Fish, after which follow the final six tales, which have nothing to do with fish or fishing: Who Lived in the Skull?; Alenoushka and Her Brother; The Fire-Bird, the Horse of Power, and the Princess Vasilissa; The Hunter and His Wife; The Three Men of Power – Evening, Midnight, and Sunrise; and Salt.

The concluding chapter titled ‘The Christening in the Village’ continues the theme of the first, bringing peasant Russia vividly before the reader, ‘in an almost anthropological belief that it was worth recording for its own sake’. Thus, it is the fourth and final frame story written by the author, though it contains two of old Peter’s tales (the one is about the dispute between the Vazuza and the Volga rivers and the other deals with Mr. Crane and Miss Heron who seem to be permanently stuck with their difficult relationship). There is also a minute description of the village church interior and preparations to the ceremony of christening, illustrative of the Ransome’s first-hand knowledge of Russian village life, as well of the indulgence in what he describes. Apparently, it was based on some of the festivities he might have attended while in Vergezha where all traditional feasts were thoroughly kept up. Vergezha is the name of his ‘Russian paradise’, where he worked hard on his book while immersed in the very world he was trying to recreate, with welcome breaks for fishing too. A brief introductory ‘Note’ to Old Peter contains a poetic description of the physical background to the stories, providing a glimpse of the place as it was in 1915:

Under my windows the wavelets of the Volkhov (which has its part in one of the stories) are beating quietly in the dusk. A gold light burns on a timber raft floating down the river. Beyond the river in the blue midsummer twilight are the broad Russian plain and the distant forest. Somewhere in that forest of great trees – a forest so big that the forests of England are little woods beside it – is the hut where old Peter sits at night and tells these stories to his grandchildren.
Thus, the frame stories, which were in fact ethnographic sketches of the country and the people the author knew and loved, were designed to acquaint the reader with the Russian world. Brogan argues that the Russian tales ‘would have been harder to understand without the meditating voice and presence of old Peter and his grandchildren’. Of importance for the purpose were also Mitrokhin’s ‘admirable series of pictures’. The Mir Iskusstva younger generation artist had a distinct ornamental style, representative of the fine book artistry in Russia of the turn of the twentieth century. His elaborate design and bright primary colours of the book cover, visually particular and contextualised coloured illustrations, and black and white miniatures, opening and closing the chapters, enhance the tone and poetics of the stories, adding to their distinctly Russian character, as well as helping to elucidate the texts.

3.2. Choice and arrangement of stories

The framework and illustrations were undoubtedly of relevance in dealing with the alterities of the Russian fairyland, but then there was the principal question of stories themselves, including such issues as which of them to select and how to represent them to the target audience. Their close reading indicates that besides the translator’s personal taste (‘In this book there are a few of those I like best’), there might have been other considerations in choosing the particular stories. Thus, ‘The Tale of the Silver Saucer and the Transparent Apple’ might have been chosen as the opening one because thanks to the agency of the magic objects mentioned in the title it gives a panoramic view of the Russian world, including the Tsar, ‘the little father of all good Russians’, and his subjects. ‘Sadko’, originally an epic saga associated with Novgorod on the Volkhov was of special interest to Ransome who at one time contemplated the idea of writing a historical romance on the subject. In his letter of 27 August 1915 from Petrograd, being only two days out of hospital after an operation, he dwells on ‘his wild and enticing dream’ of writing historical romances on Russian themes, the first of them to be ‘Lord Novgorod the Great’. Sadko’s river (associated with Vergezha as well), where he was to spend many of his happy hours fishing, enjoying the landscape and the company of his friends, ordinary fishermen, is mentioned in a number of his letters. His interest in the subject is reflected further in a legend about the Volga and the Vazuza, related by the translator as a story about a quarrel between the older and younger sisters. A combination of Ransome’s indulgences in folklore and fishing shows in a special chapter on fish, as well as in the tale of the ‘Golden Fish’, mentioned above.

‘The Cat who Became the Head-Forester’ is one of the favourite animal tales of Russian children, the most archaic of Russian folktales ‘essentially relegated to the nursery’, which easily explains why this was selected for the collection. But, most of them (thirteen out of twenty one), such as ‘The Tale of the Silver Saucer and the Transparent Apple’, ‘The Fool of the World and the Flying Ship’, ‘Baba Yaga’, ‘The Little Daughter of the Snow’, ‘Prince Ivan, the Witch Baby, and the Little Sister of the Sun’, etc., are ‘wonder’ tales (or fairy tales), ‘best-known and most-loved in Russia’. They are basically oral stories about ‘a young man’s, or less often a girl’s, initial venture into the frightening adult world’. The adventures of fairy princes and princesses, encountering snakes, and giants, and demons, related in most of them ‘are quite out of keeping with ordinary men and women; ‘the air we breathe in them is that of Fairy-land’. Others, like ‘The Stolen Turnips, the Magic Tablecloth, the Sneezing
Goat, and the Wooden Whistle’ or ‘The Hunter and his Wife’, are representative of tales of
everyday life, another important part of the Russian folktale canon, which often deals with
the antagonism between husbands and wives.

Thus, importantly, even if guided by his personal taste, emotion, or interest, Ransome
gave credit to the genre metonymics of the Russian folktale, with the stories illustrative of
the important original types (wonder tales, animal tales, tales of everyday life, etc.). Having
a classic status in the original culture, now, thanks to their elaborate English versions, they
are available to the English-speaking reader as well.49

3.3. Audiences

To render these tales to a young audience, while mediating their alterities, additional expla-
nations and elucidations were often required. These are often contained in the opening
lines of the stories as comments relegated to the story-teller and his listeners. Illustrative
in this respect is the one, in which the reader encounters a remarkable character of the
Russian skazka, Baba Yaga, ‘a female fiend’, introduced to the English reader already by
Ralston as ‘a tall, gaunt hag, with dishevelled hair’; sometimes seen ‘lying stretched out
from one corner to the other of a miserable hut, through the ceiling of which passes
her long iron nose’. Mitrokhin’s coloured illustration gives ample evidence of her very
appearance that ‘would frighten anyone’.50 Hence, Ransome has to prepare his reader
for the meeting with the formidable character:

“Tell us about Baba Yaga,” begged Maroosia.

“Yes,” said Vanya, “please, grandfather, and about the little hut on hen’s legs.”

“Baba Yaga is a witch,” said old Peter; “a terrible old woman she is, but sometimes kind
enough. You know it was she who told Prince Ivan how to win one of the daughters of the
Tzar of the Sea, and that was the best daughter of the bunch, Vasilissa the Very Wise. But
then Baba Yaga is usually bad, as in the case of Vasilissa the Very Beautiful, who was only
saved from her iron teeth by the cleverness of her Magic Doll.51

For all her ugly looks and controversial reputation, then, Baba Yaga appears quite attrac-
tive to those not inclined to shun horrors.

The stories are often told not only to entertain but also to instruct. The emphasis on
their didactic side is another important aspect of the translator’s visibility in the text.
This may be illustrated, for example, with the following remarkable passage that concludes
the tale of ‘Frost’:

As for Martha, Fedor Ivanovitch sought her in marriage, as he had meant to do all along – yes,
and married her; and pretty she looked in the furs that Frost had given her. And she had the
prettiest children that ever were seen – yes, and the best behaved. For if ever they thought of
being naughty, the old grandfather told them the story of crackling Frost, and how kind words
won kindness, and cross words cold treatment. And now, listen to Frost. Hear how he crackles
away! And mind, if ever he asks you if you are warm, be as polite to him as you can. And to do
that, the best way is to be good always, like little Martha. Then it comes easy.52

One should think that the lessons taught by such examples have a truly lasting effect.
However, originally ‘fairy stories are only vaguely moral, usually in a haphazard way’;
and in fact it took quite long for them to become acceptable as an educational tool.
Today the objectives of amusement and instruction, often regarded as a dichotomy ‘paralleled by child versus adult’, are seen not only as ‘compatible but also complementary’ in the popular folktale collections.53

It seems a happy ending is another typical feature of stories, especially if intended for children. This is often accentuated (as in the previous example) or added to them if absent in the original, like in the following example from the tale of ‘The Little Daughter of the Snow’:

And just then the door blew open from the yard, and a cold wind filled the room, and the little daughter of the Snow was gone.

“You always used to say something else, grandfather,” said Maroosia.

Old Peter patted her head, and went on.

“I haven’t forgotten. The little snow girl leapt into the arms of Frost her father and Snow her mother, and they carried her away over the stars to the far north, and there she plays all through the summer on the frozen seas. In winter she comes back to Russia, and some day, you know, when you are making a snow woman, you may find the little daughter of the Snow standing there instead.”

“Wouldn’t that be lovely!” said Maroosia.54

Finally, it should be added that besides the careful choice and arrangement of the stories, the introductions and comments to them, there is also their elaborate styling, adapting the Russian tales to the needs and interests of the reader. For illustration one may refer, for example, to the story of ‘Little Master Misery’, which belongs to the category ‘in which Harm or Misery figures as a living agent’ (‘Góré, or Woe’ of popular poetry, also known as ‘Béda or Misery’, chase and ultimately destroy the unhappy victims of destiny).55 Accurate enough in conveying the gist of the narrative, in all other respects Ransome’s ‘reworking of the tale exhibits striving after physical, visual effect and a strengthening of the emotional element’. Thus amplified with details his narrative is sometimes ‘massively expanded’, and this is apparently done to ‘increase the emotional effect’, as well as ‘the sheer pleasure of images’.56 Ransome’s elaborate description can be seen, for example, in the following extract, relating how the poor brother prospers after getting rid of the Little Master Misery:

As soon as the week was over, he bought a forest and built himself a fine house, and began to live twice as richly as his brother in the town. And his wife had two new dresses, perhaps more; with a lot of gold and silver braid, and necklaces of big yellow stones, and bracelets and sparkling rings. His children were well fed every day – rivers of milk between banks of kisel jelly, and mushrooms with sauce, and soup, and cakes with little balls of egg and meat hidden in the middle. And they had toys that squeaked, a little boy feeding a goose that poked its head into a dish, and a painted hen with a lot of chickens that all squeaked together.57

4. From folktales to fairy tales

Thus, Old Peter’s Russian Tales has been of chief interest here as the translator’s generous gift to his reader brought from his travels in a distant and strange country. Importantly, in sharing his happy experiences in the new world and its fairyland he had found so exciting, Ransome’s creative effort built another emotional link between the peoples, another
cultural bridge between the countries. An awareness of his role as a cultural mediator between the two worlds grew, with his interaction with the place and the people becoming more intimate. The fabric of rewriting the Russian folktale for new audiences and the translator’s individual strategies at establishing this understanding are visible in the work itself upon its close reading, enhanced by insights gained from examining the translator’s personal papers and other relevant material, i.e. reconstructed ‘from close observation’.

Ransome’s translation was thus an important instance of cultural mediation agency that brought the Russian folktale to the international reader. Given that neither the content nor the intertextual framework of such texts were familiar to the receiving audience, the translator was to tell ‘a new story’, making use of a number of textual strategies. First, to make the foreign world comprehensible, as well as attractive to the reader, Ransome introduced his frame stories, realistic sketches of the country and the people, complemented by ‘admirable series of pictures’ of the Russian illustrator. Then, as far as the important issue of selecting and arranging stories for the benefit of the reader is concerned, the translator gives credit to the original types of the genre: wonder tales, animal tales, tales of everyday life, etc. all represented in the collection. Third, to render them to the young audience (i) additional explanations and elucidations were often introduced in the texts as part of the narrative; (ii) emphasis was placed on their didactic side, now a typical feature of the popular folktale collections; and (iii) happy endings were often accentuated or added to them. Finally, of special note is their creative styling, or ‘elaboration and polish’, that produces Ransome’s ‘imitation of a finished work of art’. An interesting interpretation with a distinctly individual character, it was a milestone in his career too, resulting from all his previous experience of compiling miscellaneous anthologies, as well as researching both theory and practice of storytelling.

Their elaborate rewriting notwithstanding, some of the tales may appear questionable in terms of their suitability for the target audience (most conspicuous are probably ‘Little Master Misery’ discussed above, which deals with drinking as a serious social evil, or tales of everyday life relating to the antagonism between husbands and wives) as they often appeal to a more experienced and sophisticated reader. Hence, one may categorise Ransome’s translation as an ‘adults’ children’s book’, according to Hunt’s typology discussed above, granted also that its happy pictures of Old Russia are imbued with a nostalgic yearning for a world gone by.

In his study of the Golden Age of children’s literature Humphrey Carpenter disagrees with many readers’ opinions that Ransome with his Swallows and Amazons is a Golden Age figure. But using the evidence of his translation product, resulting from an ardent quest for Russian magic during a brief period of British–Russian enchantment, one tends to consent this time to the readers’, rather than to the expert’s judgment.

5. Conclusion
This has been an attempt to historicise the young Ransome’s experiences in the Russia of 1913–1915 that consummated in his classic Old Peter’s Russian Tales, an important contribution to British–Russian cultural links. The microscopic approach to the study of the translator and his work based on personal papers and other relevant material allowed for a close observation of an instance of effective cultural mediation agency to bring the two...
worlds together, also shedding light on the bigger picture of the relationship between the sides at a time of their intensive interaction.

Translation’s role as a cultural practice and translators as cultural agents often remain roughly sketched or simplified; hence there is a need for a concerted effort to produce further microscopic studies of individuals and their works in order to reconstruct the fabric interconnecting people, cultures, and countries in all its intricacy and intrigue. This may give a better appreciation of the ‘human face’ (to use Georg Iggers’s expression) of history, i.e. of the role of ‘common folks’ in international relations.61
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This paper focuses on Arthur Ransome’s and Dmitri Mitrokhin’s collaboration in translating the Russian folktales. Old Peter’s Russian Tales (1916), Ransome’s first serious (and sustained) success, was the translation product of his early sojourns in Russia, illustrated by Dmitri Mitrokhin. The aims of the research are threefold: (1) to explore the cooperation between the British translator and the Russian artist in translating Russian folktales as an insight into the intense British-Russian dialogues of the time; (2) to examine the interaction of the translated texts and the images in terms of the translation strategy employed, as well as the influences of the contemporaneous tastes and trends; (3) to gain a better understanding of the translator’s agency and human interaction in building an important link between the cultures and the countries. The research has required close reading of primary and secondary sources, including archival materials, as well as the textual analysis of the translated stories, the translator’s correspondence and other papers pertaining to his micro-history. These latter are used to explore the interplay of the translated text and the pictures against the background of personal, as well as wider British-Russian cultural interaction at the turn of the twentieth century.
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Introduction

With the ubiquity of the translation activity in the modern world followed by the present ‘boom’ in translation studies, there is a growing understanding that translation is an integral part of cultural interaction and mediation, and translators are increasingly appreciated as influential agents of that process in the past and present. Importantly, Anthony Pym argues that to make “narrative sense of relations between cultures”, translation history should focus on portraying “active people in the picture and some kind of human interaction at work” (2009, 23-24). This calls for a detailed examination of the agency of translators, that is, their willingness and ability to act, embedded in their surrounding practices and professional environments (Kinnunen and Koskinen, 2010, 6-8).

This is the general conceptual and methodological framework of the present paper, which focuses on the agency of a translator of Russian folklore in the early twentieth century, as well as on the intercultural contexts in which he worked. Hence, a close reading of primary and secondary sources has been undertaken to reconstruct the general atmosphere of the time. The case study of the British translator’s cooperation with the Russian artist in translating the Russian folktales for international audiences gives a deeper insight into the human interaction in the contemporary literary and artistic field. Also, by exploring the translated texts in terms of the translation strategy and techniques employed, the paper draws the reader’s attention to the interplay between text and image. Illustrations, an important visual presence in translation products, are, unfortunately, often overlooked: they may in fact domesticate or foreignize a story by bringing it closer to or further away from the target culture (Oittinen, 2005, 55), as well as realize a number of functions in the texts including: (i) interacting with the text and its message; (ii) alluding to other texts or images; (iii) reflecting current artistic norms, trends, and tastes; (iv) informing about the cultural context; (v) adding to the emotional dimension of the text (Fischer, 2008, 99).

The cultural environment at the turn of the twentieth century can be characterized by mutual interest and a search for understanding between Britain and Russia, especially as far as the intellectual circles were concerned. It was conducive to the success of Ransome and Mitrokhin’s undertaking, despite obvious difficulties, that the folklore material presents both in terms of translation and reception by target audiences (Timoczek, 1995; Ter-Minasova, 2000). Ransome took great pains to render the attractiveness of the new magic world he had discovered by rewriting Russian folktales in accordance with the British tradition of fairy tales whose avid readership he counted himself among. Mitrokhin’s illustrations were, in fact, the final touches in this ingenious appeal to the young British reader, notably, imparting something of the brilliance and beauty of the epoch to the book.

Research: Aims, Data, and Methods

The aims of the research are, firstly, to explore the cooperation between the British translator and the Russian artist in translating Russian folktales as an insight into the intense British-Russian dialogues of the time; secondly, to examine the interaction of the translated texts and the images in terms of the translation strategy employed, as well as the influences of the contemporaneous tastes and trends; finally, to gain a better understanding of the translator’s agency and human interaction in building an important link between the cultures and the countries.

The translator in question is Arthur Ransome (1884-1967), most famous for his Swallows and Amazons (1950-47) series of children’s holiday adventure novels, which he wrote in his forties after settling down in the Lake District. Prior to becoming a children’s literature classic, he spent apprenticeship years in London and then in journalistic service as a correspondent for the Daily News and the Manchester Guardian in Russia, the Middle East and China (Ransome, 1976; Brogan, 1984).

The primary source of data analyzed is Old Peter’s Russian Tales (1916), the translation product of his early sojourns in Russia and Ransome’s first serious (and sustained) success. It is three hundred and thirty-four pages long, and is rather sparingly but nevertheless effectively illustrated with seven coloured full-page pictures, twenty black and white head-pieces, and nine black and white end-pieces by Mitrokhin. This book, which has today attained status as a classic, was also the concluding chapter of the first period in the literary career of the young author who left England for Russia to pursue a passion for folklore, as well as to escape his unhappy marriage. His first trips in 1913-14 left him enchanted with the country and the people: back home in England on November 14, 1914, he began working on the translation of Russian folktales and also looking for a job to use the Russian experience he had acquired. Too near-sighted for military service in the army, he eventually took up a journalistic career with the Daily News and then with the Manchester Guardian to report on the dramatic Russian events up to 1924 (Brogan, 1984, 95-110).

In Russia, Dmitri Isidorovich Mitrokhin (1883-1973) was to play a most important role in Ransome’s intercultural environment. At first, Mitrokhin was a student at the Moscow College for Art, Sculpture and Architecture, then at the Stroganovsky College for Arts and Crafts. Evgeni Lansere lent a helping hand to the young artist, securing commissions from publishers and thus encouraging Mitrokhin in his career as a book and magazine illustrator. In 1908, Mitrokhin was invited to participate in the Mir Iskusstva (World of Art) exposition arranged by Alexander Benois and Konstantin Somov, the well-known artists and the founding members of the society. In 1910-13, Mitrokhin made his name as an illustrator of W. Hauff’s Der Kleine Muck and V.A. Zhukovsky’s Ro-
land-oruzhenosets while working for I.N. Knebel, the publisher of popular illustrated children’s books. Mitrokhin’s works, with his “distinctly individual ornamental style” (Gerchuk, 2013, 246, 262) are recognized as exemplary of graphic arts in the illustrious pre-revolutionary Russia (Kniga o Mitrokhine, 1986).

Close reading of both primary and secondary sources, including the translated texts under study and related archival materials, such as personal correspondence, as well as exploring other papers pertaining to the translator’s micro-history (Pym, 2009; Monday, 2014) have all been employed here as particularly relevant methods for translation history research.

The textual features of the translated stories have been analyzed in other publications (Bogrdanova, 2010, 2010a, 2012) and will not be revisited here; instead, this paper focuses specifically on the interplay of text and image against the background of personal communication between the translator and the artist, as well as the wider context of British-Russian cultural interaction at the turn of the twentieth century.

Thus, the paper explores Ransome’s agency as a translator by reconstructing the general intercultural atmosphere of the period, as well as focusing on his cooperation with the Russian artist Mitrokhin. The analysis of the textual and visual components of the translated texts indicates their complex interplay that helped to produce an interesting interpretation of the Russian folktale for international audiences. Resulting from Ransome’s own immersion in the culture he was translating for the young English reader, his book is a major contribution to the internationalization of the Russian folktale, as well as to building an important link between the two cultures and countries.

Discussion

Of the numerous and ever-growing literature on that most interesting period known as Russian modernism, or the Silver Age, one book with a characteristic title, The Soul of Russia, deserves special attention. It was compiled with the specific aim of celebrating and fostering the British-Russian alliance during the Great War, and it recalls the voices of the actors engaged in the contemporaneous cultural practices and interactions on both sides. Contributions by K. Balmont, V. Bryusov, Z. Gippius, etc., as well as illustrations after paintings by L. Bakst, N. Goncharova, M. Larionov, N. Roerich, D.S. Stelletsky, "portray the influences which direct, the ideals which inspire, and the ardent sentiments which impassion contemporary Russian thought" (The Soul of Russia, 1916, vi).

This cultural atmosphere was most conducive for an enthusiastic student of folklore like Ransome was at the time of his arrival in Russia, where visual artists, musicians, and choreographers took a different approach to folk art in revival movements and modernist compositions (Olson, 2004, 26). In painting, Vasili Kandinski, Natal’ia Goncharova, and others evolved new, abstract artistic techniques based on folk designs. The Ballets Russes produced many ballets incorporating Slavic folk themes, while the artists "emphasized aspects of Russian art that were striking to Western audiences" (Olson, 2004, 27). In Nicholas Roerich’s words, "By means of a recently awakened interest in contemporary Art, by the study of our past, we have realised what an original treasure we possess" (The Soul of Russia, 1916, 24).

At the same time, "Russian Art has received great recognition from our friends, our Allies in the West", according to Roerich who remembers his share in Dyagilev’s dramatic representations "with a feeling of deep emotion" as "hands unknown, but sincerely friendly, were stretched out to us" (The Soul of Russia, 1916, 24-25). C. Hagberg Wright, on the British side, commented on the enthusiastic reception of Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, Gorky, who portrayed "the moujik with a sensitive and intimate touch" so that all "intellectual Europe was converted, and the seeds of international understanding were sown" (The Soul of Russia, 1916, 25, 15). The translation of the Russian literary canon into English, which was "arguably the major translation project of British modernism" revealed to English readers a body of imaginative work, "so new and exciting as to be shocking" (Beasley and Bullock, 2011, 283; Trivedi, 2007, 277).

Interestingly, the ‘Russian fever’ of British intellectual circles seems to have been counterbalanced at this time by the ‘Anglomania’ of the Russian modernists, as convincingly stated by Ekaterina Vyazova (2009). At the end of the nineteenth century, the Russian public developed a passion for interior and furniture design, book and art magazines, as well as interest in English painting and graphic works (Vyazova, 2005, 284). The very image of England was, at times, shaped by English books and magazines. Alexander Benois (mentioned above) left compelling evidence of his first visit to England in 1899 where the countryside increasingly resembled “the classic English sets, against which lovely dressed girls strolled and romped or ardent hunters clad in red tails rode in children’s books by Kate Greenaway and Caldecott” (as cited in Vyazova, 2005, 286).

Between 1897 and 1905, five major exhibitions were staged in Moscow and St Petersburg with a focus on English art; they were of special importance to the 1890s generation of artists who went on their first trips to Europe (Vyazova, 2005, 286), including Mitrokhin. The artistic traditions of the countries were revealing “surprising parallels”, such as the similar technique of folk motif stylization used by Walter Crane, Maria Iakunchikova and Elena Polonova; a huge influence of Beardsley; and the similarity of some iconographic motifs. Boris Anrep noted that Russian works were admired precisely for those features that, at the turn of the century, Russian artists admired so much in English art, such as the “relation [...] between the artists and their original Russian culture; the Russians’ ability to compose fantastic pictures; decorativeness; and deeply religious profession...
of art” (as cited in Vyazova, 2005, 295-296). Also, while interest in Russia and Russians was “sharpened by a war that united the British, French and Russians in a military alliance”, personal contacts were more actively engaged; these too contributed to the positive reception of Russian art in Europe (Kaznina, 2005, 340-341).

Such were the cosmopolitan tendencies of the period that, when in pursuit for his passion for folklore, Ransome found himself again in St Petersburg (Petrograd) in 1915 to focus on his translation project. According to his personal papers from this time, he fully took advantage of a short pause when the deprivations of the war were not yet acutely felt and before journalistic duties took up all his time.

Steady progress is accurately recorded in the diaries, but there is more detail in the letters, when Ransome reports happily to his mother that he was “working away here, gradually getting together material for a rather charming book, very much improving my Russian, translating fairy stories and rewriting them” (Ransome, no 62, February 4 1915). But then his health started to fail him; fortunately the Tyrykov-Williamses, his close friends at the time, came to the rescue, inviting to pay a long visit to Vergezha on the river Volkov: “We go down by a train leaving Petrograd at midnight, and at four in the morning get on board a little steamer and go up the river to the place where they live, a beautiful old house, judging from pictures I’ve seen on a promontory in the river itself” (Ransome, 1915).

It was here, in the midst of the Russian countryside, while immersed in the world he was recreating, that he finished his book that bears clear marks of happy experiences: “my life has been nothing but steady work, so many hours each day, with a little fishing either at sunset or before breakfast. This week again my total is fifty-three pages. […] It’s rather jolly, the stuff I’ve been doing here”. The romantic side of the great lover of the rustic idyll is also revealed: “I would like to stay here for ever, and live in a hut with the timbers criss-crossing at the corners, and sleep on the stove at night, and have a flat-bottomed boat for summer and a sledge for winter and a little pony with a ragged tail” (Ransome, 1915).

In the mid-summer of 1915, “the last of the fairy stories has gone off to Jack [his publisher]” when, to his great disappointment, he learned “that the Russian fairy stories won’t be published till next year, 1916” (Ransome, no 78, July 14 1915). But there is good news too as “they have decided to let me have coloured illustrations to my Russian fairy tales and […] I am finding an artist out there to do the job” (Brogan, 1997, 32).

Back in Petrograd while “working extremely hard for the Daily News”, Ransome was going steadily on with his translations, “if only a sentence a day”, seeing also his Russian friends and “particularly Dmitri Mitrokhin, who was just finishing the admirable series of pictures […] for Old Peter’s Russian Tales”. The artist was recommended to him by Konstantin Somov (mentioned above), who he knew through Hugh Walpole, one of a closely-knit British community of journalists and authors that crowded Petrograd. The publisher being “very pleased with the Russian illustrations to the fairy stories”, the whole lot of Mitrokhin’s pictures and final corrections to Old Peter were sent safely home in the Embassy bag (Ransome, no 104, July 17 1916; Ransome, 1976, 195).

Although many texts “allow” or “demand” new illustrations from time to time, there are books that are inextricably related to the pictures of one artist (for example, John Tenniel’s illustrations for Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland), for there is a “symbiotically empathic relationship between the author and the illustrator” (Fischer, 2008, 98). This seems to be the case regarding Ransome and Mitrokhin, who developed an affinity both on a personal level and in terms of their joint work. Being of nearly the same age, they appear to have shared a number of interests, among these: Paris, which Ransome frequented as a London bohemian and where Mitrokhin in became acquainted with Western art; British art and artists, with Mitrokhin’s special interest in Walter Crane, one of whose books he translated; and, of course, Russia and the Russians. Importantly, they shared a common passion as both were keenly interested in books and everything related to books.

For his love of reading, Ransome pays tribute to his mother, “I do not think that there was anything in my childhood for which I have more reason to be grateful than my mother’s regular reading aloud, and the habit of eager reading to myself that her reading encouraged”; in fact, books and authors he mentions show a wide range of reading interests (Ransome, 1976, 37, 43, 60). Notably, his only complaint from wartime Petrograd was that “I have no time for reading. I’ve never read so few folk stories a week since first I came to Russia. And that’s one of the things I don’t want to let slip” (Brogan, 1997, 33). Similarly, Mitrokhin’s profound understanding of everything concerning books was noted by his fellow colleague in a review of the artist’s early work (Voyinov, 1921, 32-33). Books are a constant topic in the life-long correspondence he maintained with his sister even in old age (Mitrokhin, RGALI, #589), when he writes, for example, that he was “very-very happy” to have recently purchased a German book on Rembrandt, “a rare wonderful treat” he made himself (Mitrokhin, April 25 1964).

Details of his work on Old Peter’s illustrations are not sufficiently documented; however, there are some relevant references in Mitrokhin’s notes of a more personal character (Mitrokhin, RGALI, #573). For example, in a note from 1958 made in pencil, he mentions his acquaintance with Ransome in 1915 and his drawings. Also of interest is the artist’s comment on his illustrations to French folktales, where he writes that he is quite interested in them, trying to realize in full all his understanding of a book illustration based on the text, adding and

---

1 Tatiana Bogdanova’s visits to study Ransome’s archive of the Brothers Collection (Leeds, UK) in 2014-15 and Mitrokhin’s papers in RGALI (Moscow) in 2015 were possible thanks to Research Abroad Grants of the Philosophical faculty, University of Eastern Finland.

2 Translations from Russian here and further in text are our own.
explicating it (Mitrokhin, May 3 1958). The artist was delighted to learn that his sister had Knebel editions and Ransome’s book, the latter, he notes, marked the end of his Knebel period (Mitrokhin, August 11 1962).

A brief exchange of letters that followed in the 1960s after a long pause reveals the character of their relationship (Mitrokhin, RGALI, #750). Notably, Mitrokhin addresses Ransome in Russian: “I am not sure of the address on the envelope that I am using for absence of any other; but I do want to write to you and I do want my letter to reach you” (Mitrokhin, April 4 1962). “Artur Kirillovich” was so delighted that he tries to answer in Russian, but then has to confess that after such a long interval, it is too difficult for him though he can “still read Russian quite freely” (his second wife Evgeniya Shelepina was Russian): “You can have no idea how delighted I was to have your letter. It brought back the happiest memories of Petrograd and of my great good fortune in finding the best of all possible illustrators for the Russian tales that gave me so much pleasure. That book of stories is still alive and has been often reprinted”. He adds that, “I have often wished to visit Russia again, but it is too late now. I am 78 and very crippled with arthritis”, though he adds, “it would be very pleasant if I had a magic carpet and could fly to the other side of Europe and share a samovar with my old friends of forty years ago” (Ransome, May 8 1962).

Thus, the British author never changed his high opinion of the Russian artist who greatly contributed to their success, even though later editions of the book were illustrated by other artists as well. Having grown up with beautifully illustrated Andrew Lang’s Fairy Books, Ransome must have been aware of the importance of an artist’s contributions to the art of children’s books, while Old Peter was meant to be part of the stock. Furthermore, he fully realized that it would be quite challenging for the young reader at home to understand and appreciate the magic of a strange world, and so took great pains to rewrite and adapt his retellings, also adding some framework stories that focused on explaining the wider context of Russian life and the folklore tradition (Bogrdanova, 2010).

Under the circumstances, Mitrokhin’s contribution was more than welcome. His miniature head-pieces “made in the Mir iskusstvo best style” – including, for example, such images as a river bank and a boat, a town-scape with sharp angular tops of terens, a house in the forest, a sleeping winter forest blanketed by snow – associate with the spatial aspect of the tales rendered in an arbitrary and a fragmentary way. These, as well as such visual elements of the peasant world such as bales of hay, a horseman, a peasant woman in the field, butterflies and lily-of-the valley flowers, which are the themes of the end-pieces, offer information about the cultural context, as well as contribute to the rustic poetics of the stories. In the art critic’s opinion, they are closer to the sharply expressive style of British book illustrators of the period, recalling such masters as Robert Anning Bell, Arthur Rackham, and Charles Robinson (Verizhnikova, 2000, 29-30). Thus, Mitrokhin’s visual vignettes with their cosmopolitan leanings, were effectively adding to Ransome’s cultural mediation between the two worlds.

Notably, Ransome’s translation strategy in retelling Russian tales to home audiences was largely domesticating, in keeping with the tradition established by Lang, the folklorist and editor of colored fairy books targeted at children. The addressee factor determined Lang’s editing practice of transforming folklore material from all over the world into a specific genre of English children’s literature (Bogrdanova 2010a). Similarly, in his collection of stories “written far away in Russia, for English children”, Ransome transforms the Russian folk tale to appeal to his younger reader at home. First, he is obviously interested in the original folktales that are meant for the target audience (for example, “The Cat who Became the Head-Forester”, “Who Lived in the Skull?”, “The Little Daughter of the Snow”, etc.). But more often, Ransome rewrites them from the child’s perspective so that, for example, a legend about a dispute between two rivers turns into a story about an argument between a younger and elder sister (see Example 1); or the wickedness of a witch may be downplayed and downsized (“Prince Ivan, the Baby Witch, and the Little Sister of the Sun”; see Examples 2 and 3) when it is only a witch baby playing games (though of a sinister kind) with her brother and the Sun’s little sister (hence the frequency of the adjective little in the texts). Some examples of re-writings are included below:

1) And the little Vazouza was jealous of the Volga. “You are big and noisy,” she says to the Volga, “and terribly strong; but as for brains,” says she, “why, I have more brains in a single ripple than you in all that lump of water.” Of course the Volga told her not to be so rude, and said that little rivers should know their place and not argue with the great (Ransome, 1916, pp. 521-22); “Волга с Вазузой долго спорили, кто из них умнее, сильнее и достойней большого почета” (Vazouza i Volga, 1984, 112).

2) He left his horse at the edge of the garden, and crept up to the ruined palace and peeped through a hole. Inside, in the great hall, was sitting a huge baby girl, filling the whole hall. There was no room for her to move. She had knocked off the roof with a shake of her head. And she sat there in the ruined hall, sucking her thumb.

And while Prince Ivan was watching through the hole he heard her mutter to herself, –

“Eaten the father, eaten the mother, And now to eat the little brother”

And she began shrinking, getting smaller and smaller every minute (Ransome, 1916, pp. 148-49); “Приезжает Иван-царевич домой. Сестра выбежала, встретила его, и проголубила: Сядь, - говорит, - братец, поиграй на гуслях, а я пойду - обед приготовлю” (Ved’ma i Solntseva sestra, 1984, 111).

3) How the witch baby gnashed her iron teeth!
“Give him up!” she screams.
“I will not,” says the Sun’s little sister.
“See you here,” says the witch baby, and she makes herself smaller and smaller, till she was just like a real little girl. “Let us be weighed in the great scales, and if I am heavier than Prince Ivan, I can take him; and if he is heavier than I am, I’ll say no more about it.”
The Sun’s little sister laughed at the witch baby and teased her, and she hung the great scales out of the cloud castle so that they swung above the end of the world. (Ransome, 1916, p. 153) "Ведьма стала просить, чтоб ей выдали брата головою; Солнцева сестра ее не пошутала и не выдала. Тогда говорит ведьма: Пусть Иван-царевич идет со мной на весы, кто кого перевесит! Если я перевешу - так я его съем, а если он перевесит - пусть меня убьет!" (Ved’ma i Solntseva sestra, 1984, 112).

As evidenced, the original story is often amplified as details are added either to explain or to make it more interesting and entertaining. Additionally, the events are rendered in a dramatic and emotional way with appropriate syntactic and lexical features of the texts producing the effect. Furthermore, the rhythm and musicality of the Russian tale, emphasized in the English retellings, becomes their prominent stylistic feature. The emotional dimension of the texts is aptly enhanced by the illustrations. For example, the bright primary colours and the decorative pattern of the dust jacket (III. 1) have a clear emotional appeal, creating the atmosphere of a joyous meeting with the reader, which is maintained by the coloured pictures. The frontispiece, also an illustration to a story The Fool of the World and the Flying Ship ("They sailed away once more over the blue sea") (Ransome, 1916, 70), beckons the reader to join the journey to the Russian fairyland in the company of seagulls, clouds, and fantastic waves. The boat of dark solid wood with rows of planks for a roof looks rather like a hut but a steady and strong one to be able to withstand storms and other dangers, the sails with picturesque patches notwithstanding (III. 2).

Importantly, there is a difference between the Russian texts in Lang’s anthologies and Old Peter. In contrast to his predecessor, Ransome is careful to convey the distinctly individual character of the Russian tale (Bogdanova, 2010a), which is further enhanced by Mitrokhin’s effort to acquaint the foreign reader with the Russian peasant world and story. His coloured pictures interact with the text and, though they may refer to particular episodes of the stories and depict particular characters, the overall effect created by their colour, brilliance, and decorative details are emotionally powerful renderings of the beauty, magic, and elaborate style of the Russian fairy tale.

Mitrokhin’s “admirable series of pictures” are imbued with a nostalgic appeal to the Silver Age, adding to the charm of the book. The most attractive of the full-page pictures is probably that of a poor step-daughter who was sent by her step-mother to the forest to die, but through the magic help of Frost (Morozko) himself, not only survives but is showered with riches for her sweet temper (“There she was, a good fur cloak about her shoulders and costly blankets round her feet”) (Ransome, 1916, 64). There is beauty and peace in the picture that breathes perfect harmony: the goodness of a girl, not an otherworldly princess but a peasant girl attired in a colourful scarf and a warm fur jacket, sitting quietly on an ornately painted chest lost in her thoughts (no doubt about a happy life with a worthy husband). Her posture and mood echoed by those of a red breasted bird on a branch opposite, by immense fir trees in the foreground with branches heavy with snow counterbalanced by the snow-topped birch tree with its long delicate drooping branches and bright patches of red, yellow, mellow brown with touches of black enhancing and enlivening the white-blue-grey world of a pristine winter landscape (III. 3).

Thus, the overall purpose of the coloured full-page illustrations is to show the harmonious unity of nature and man, the Russian landscape and the peasant: elements of hyperbole or even grotesque are added to the otherwise quite typical and convincing images of the characters of the tales. Colour is used sparingly, as the artist’s palette with bright red, golden yellow, green of the warmest shade, and almost transparent ultramarine contributes to the decorativeness of the illustrations (Verizhnikova, 2000, 31).

Interestingly, while exploring the intertextuality of Ransome’s texts, Peter France finds parallels with the author’s previous works, as well as with contemporaneous writing, such as a concern for detail (due to his study of Mabinogion) and “taste for the decorative” (deriving from his closeness to the Decadence and the Yellow Book) (France, 1995, 34-55). But, more importantly, he notes that Ransome, the teller of Russian stories, is striving to make them “works of art” while the world he is evoking is in some ways “the exotic world” of Ballets Russes, of Russian painters or art books such as the Russian folktales illustrated by Bilibin (France, 1995, 44), though France does not comment on Mitrokhin’s illustrations.

Through a close reading, one can easily see the affinity of the translator and the illustrator in their joint work that alludes to other texts and images and reflects current artistic norms, trends, and tastes. Importantly, the story of their friendship and collaboration is an interesting and significant episode, illustrative of the atmosphere of the British-Russian enchantment at the turn of the twentieth century.

Conclusion

In conclusion it may be emphasized that, firstly, the primary and the secondary sources carefully selected and analyzed above give convincing evidence of the characteristic developments in the British-Russian literary and artistic dialogues at the turn of the twentieth century, especially as reconstructed in the case study of the British translator’s remarkable cooperation with the Russian artist. Secondly, their joint work is the product of
a symbiotic empathy: the pictures emphasize, enhance, and expand the message of the texts, imparting to them the luster and radiance of the Russian Silver Age; moreover, the analysis of the interplay between the text and the picture shows the specific relevance of aesthetically and emotionally powerful images in rendering the culturally distinct character of folktales. Finally, the study of translators’ micro-histories, with a focus on their agency embedded in the contemporaneous cultural practices, appears to be an effective instrument to make narrative sense of relations between cultures.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Katja Dindar</td>
<td>Researching social interaction in autism. Shifting the focus from ‘within individuals’ to ‘in interaction’.</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Terttu Rajala</td>
<td>Mishima Yukio kirjallisuuskäsitys ja dialogi Nihon rönnah-ryhmän kanssa toisen maailmansodan aikaisen ja sen jälkeisen Japanin kulttuuristen muutosten kontekstissa.</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Salli Anttonen</td>
<td>A Feel for the Real: Discourses of Authenticity in Popular Music Cultures through Three Case Studies.</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Janne Rantala</td>
<td>Rakenne, julkinen muisti ja vastakulttuuri Maputon räp-musiikkissa (Mosambik) ja pohjoismaisessa uusspiritualistisessa yhteisössä.</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Titta Kettukangas</td>
<td>Perustoiminnot-käsitle varhaiskasvatuksessa.</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Riitta Sikiö</td>
<td>Reading and spelling skill development in elementary school: Effects of minority languages and parental home involvement.</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Jaakko Pappinen</td>
<td>Functions of Satan in Early Christianity.</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Katarina Waltzer</td>
<td>Rikoksen uusijan elämänkulkua: hyvinvoinnin ja syrjäytymisen polut.</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Barnali Sarkar</td>
<td>Space, place, and the environment in the contemporary Anglophone Indian novel.</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Sanni Sivonen</td>
<td>Gods for tourists. Stone carving and tourist arts in Mamallapuram, South India.</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Jingoo Kang</td>
<td>Implementation and implication of inquiry-based science education in the Finnish context. Evidence from international large-scale assessments: PISA and TIMSS.</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Milla Uusitupa</td>
<td>Rajakarjalaismuurteiden avoin perusvastumattomuus.</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Timo Hirvonen</td>
<td>Suomenkielinen ja irrotettavissa kirurgisissa liikkeissä.</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Milla Karttunen</td>
<td>No pitää kahtto. Puhujan tulevan toiminnan ilmausten kieliviikakka ja pragmatiikka.</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Eeva-Liisa Juvonen</td>
<td>Työ tekijäänsä neuvo: Luomupuutarhavirrätään asiantuntijuuden ja toimijuuden kehityminen.</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Lea Häyrinto</td>
<td>Virkistyminen koulupäivän aikana: oppilaiden kokemuksia kahdessa maaseutukouluympäristössä.</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Juuso Pursiainen</td>
<td>”Kumpi oli positiivine? Hyvä vai huono?” Vahvuuslähtöinen ja oppilaan sosioemotionalta kompetenssia tukevan mallin luominen kouluyhteisöön.</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Hanna-Maija Huhtala</td>
<td>Adornian critiques of reason: autonomy, morality and education.</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Ekaterina Prosandeeva</td>
<td>Norm and deviance in contemporary Anglophone fiction and autobiography.</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Harri Valkonen</td>
<td>The dynamics of self-observation in patients with borderline personality disorder (BPD) diagnosis.</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Sini Kontkanen</td>
<td>Starting points of pre-service teachers’ Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) – introducing a proto-TPACK model.</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Katja Vilhunen</td>
<td>Neuleblogi osana käsitöitä – neulebloggaajien kokemuksia blogin ja käsitöiden yhdäntämisestä.</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Inka Turunen</td>
<td>Tietokoneavustetun sukupolven oppiminen kirjoittamalla -menetelmän käytön yhteys 1. ja 2. luokan oppilaiden luku- ja kirjoitusopetuksen sekä lukemismotivaatioon.</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Olli Rissanen</td>
<td>Ammatillaksi putkivaloltaan ja verkostoituun asiantuntijautuun.</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Ilona Raunola</td>
<td>Tulkintoja valosta ja henkisyydestä. Etnografinen tutkimus uususkonnollisesta Valorukous-toiminnasta.</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Eeva Raunela</td>
<td>”Opin oppimaan itseltäni” – Autoetnografinen toimintatutkimus kieltietoisuuuden kehittymisestä sokratistisesti opetusmenetelmän hyödyntäen lukion äidinkielen ja kirjallisuuden opetuksessa.</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Liisa Penttinen</td>
<td>Väliaikahoidosta yhdistysmuotoiseen seurakuntadiakoniaan. Diakoniatyö Kuopion kaupunki- ja maaseurakunnassa sekä siitä eronneissa seurakunnissa 1850–1944.</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This study shows how crucial translators are as cultural mediators contributing to the fabric of interconnections between countries. W.S.R. Ralston (1828–1889) and Arthur Ransome (1884–1967), mediating Russia through its folklore, left an indelible mark on the British-Russian cultural interaction. Ralston’s Russian Folk-Tales (1873) has long served as an important scholarly source while Ransome’s Old Peter’s Russian Tales (1916) has found its place among children’s classics.