

Discourse camouflage in the representation of American literature in the literary magazine “Mladá tvorba”

IGOR TYŠŠ

In any empirical translation history worthy of the name, the negotiation between the textual and the social sphere remains crucial and must be – at least inherently – addressed. This issue has frequently arisen in translation studies (TS) because 1. social determination of *any* behaviour is not straightforward, let alone causal (Pym 1999, Meylaerts 2008) and because 2. the transposition of semiotics beyond language merits more than a conceptual metaphor of SOMETHING IS A SIGN OF SOMETHING ELSE¹ applied all over the map (Tyšš 2015a). To overcome the methodological paradox, interdisciplinary approaches and empirical backing are needed.

This study is based on archaeological (Pym 2010) surveys of the reception of American literature in Czech and Slovak periodicals during socialism (Semínová 2003, Jánošíková 2016, Pričšová 2016, Varačková 2016, Tyšš 2016) that sought to catalogue and document translations, related metatexts and other translation-relevant sources (here referred to simply as “sources”, i. e. translations, articles on translation and foreign literatures and whatever else related that could be found in periodicals of the time). The aim of the present study, however, is a narrow description: it aims to present, discuss and interpret selective metatextual genres of writing about American literature and culture in a particular periodical (*Mladá tvorba*) and contextualize them historically and culturally as part of a translation history. The study draws on elements of both macro-history and micro-history of translation (as delineated by Munday 2014), and thus it employs an eclectic analytical interpretative methodology based on critical cultural historical commentary and critical discourse analysis of concrete texts from the periodical under analysis.

Translation and its history are understood as complex, socially determined discursive activities embedded in a particular culture and time, both of which control and are controlled by agents with different individual and social motivations. Such a Foucauldian definition underscores the potentially “messy”, unpredictable and non-continuous nature of discourse (c. f. Foucault 1981, Marcelli 2005).

A BIPOLAR ERA

After the so-called Victorious February, essentially a coup d'état, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia tightened its grip not only on executive power but further enhanced the nationalization and monopolization of all forms of capital – economic,

social and symbolic (Bourdieu 1986). By adopting Stalinist economic policy principles, which were in fact more suitable for a developing economy, and the Zhdanov Doctrine of socialist realism, which advocated that the Leninist “Party principle” be the dominant function of all “engaged” art, the literary polysystem (c. f. Even-Zohar 1990) became heavily centralized in organizational terms (due to the virtual disappearance of private companies in Czechoslovakia, Marušiak 2000) and severely restricted in creative and ideological terms. During 1948–1956, repressive censorship severely affected the corpus of literary works (and translation), causing in effect fragmentations and discontinuities in literary and translation history in the years to come (Bednárová 2013). There were other effects: schematic socialist realism became the accepted method in writing; translations from Soviet literature hit record highs (Pašteková 2017, 92–93); writers’ associations merely served to leverage the Party’s directives; and many prominent literati chose rather to live in exile. The foundational years of the new era proved to be extremely ideological and oppressive. Even though the later years (mainly the 1960s) would witness some of the rigidity disappear, it could be argued that the 1950s set the precedent for what was to come in terms of public discourse. Various forms of lip service, smoke-screening and what we would call today “alternative facts” became part and parcel of the times. As the exiled writer Pavel Tigríd put it in 1949, the writers themselves – often unwillingly – sent events into a downward spiral:

We allowed the Communists to freely manipulate concepts. We even discussed with them the very nature of artistic freedom and asked ourselves whether art should above all serve social and political functions and culture serve the working class. Because of our irresoluteness, uncertainties, and often because of our fears, we allowed literature to be judged on the merit of its ideological and political (i.e. communist) values. In the end, the crooked conviction that art and literature should be accountable to the regime, the state, the Party, and that it should celebrate, and thus validate them, has almost become the [new] universal truth (2002, 102).²

There is always something two-sided, or even bipolar, about the Czechoslovak socialist period, its history, its art, ideology and propaganda. It was, above all, extensively – if not compulsively – bureaucratic, centralized and ostentatiously public. Yet, the discourse of the era, as we will see, displays strong incongruences between what was formally expected and what was, if needed, done informally. This is perhaps why one of the leading Slovak cultural historians researching the 1950s and 1960s, Juraj Marušiak, adopts a more porous framework of interpretation and in effect sidesteps having to define ideology. In order to present a more nuanced view of the culture in the 1950s and early 1960s he instead uses the concept of “power mechanisms” which operate in two modes. On the one hand, formal power mechanisms are “concrete repressive measures, political directives by means of which the regime enforced its decisions”. On the other hand, informal power mechanisms consist of various types of persuasion, manipulation, the power of personal and family relationships etc. (Marušiak 2001, 7). The difficult, and at times even contradictory, history and discourse of the era and the need to study it empirically – archeologically, even – prohibits us from taking a stance before taking a leap of faith into the actual material that is at hand.

MLADÁ TVORBA: ITS STATUS AND SOCIAL ROLES

Founded in the times of political uncertainty after the fall of Stalin's cult of personality when many centralist formal power mechanisms of the Stalinist monolith (Pipes 2007) were being questioned (the organization of universities, the position of students) or even weakened (many, such as socialist realism dogma, just for a time), *Mladá tvorba* (1956–1970) was destined to operate on the thin line between being a vehicle of Socialist cultural policy aimed at educating aspiring writers and being a power house of progressive literary tendencies in a time of crisis (Žemberová 1994, 65). Appearing hand in hand with the gradual de-centralization of the socialist literary system (the rise in status of literary magazines, changes in book distribution, new generations seeking to re-define what was canonical, etc.) and the general post-modern lowering of the status of “high-brow” literature in the 1960s (as signalled by the attempts to rediscover and re-evaluate popular literature such as horror, the Western and the thriller in Czechoslovakia, or the proliferation of erotic themes), this meant that *Mladá tvorba* was launched and operated under specific circumstances.

On the one hand, the periodical was established in the autumn of 1956 as one of the outcomes of *Final Resolution of the Second Congress of the Czechoslovak Writers' Union (Rezolúcia II. sjazdu čs. spisovateľov)* which called for “better and more flexible forms of treating new [literary] talents” (1956, 1). On the other hand, its establishment was a concession the cultural administrators had to make to groups of young Slovak student writers, given the social tensions between the nation's university students and the authorities that brought about two overtly political “Majáles” celebrations that year (in Bratislava and Prague), a number of politically contagious student resolutions and surprisingly critical discussions in the press (Matthews 1998, Marušiak 2001). *Mladá tvorba*, whose title can be translated as “young creation”, came into being against a backdrop of political interest aimed mainly at educating and controlling a new class of literati. However, the enthusiasm of young artists could not be tamed and controlled. *Mladá tvorba* soon started pressing the boundaries of what was allowed – and, of course, the authorities often pushed back.

Even though the magazine *Mladá tvorba* was inherently generational, its openness attracted older writers and critics as well. The journal was to become the breeding ground for a new generation of prose writers (who have come to be known as the “Mladá tvorba Generation”), two generations of poets (the “Trnava Group” and the “Lonely Runners”), and a new generation of literary critics (c. f. Hochel 2009, 244). Since there was no other progressive periodical of its kind in Slovakia, even by 1965, *Mladá tvorba* dealt with topics and initiatives beyond its original scope. Throughout its existence, the periodical featured polemics on literature, instructed writers and also featured several poetic manifestos and even one manifesto on poetry translation (Feldek 1958). The journal contains translation reviews and short studies on translation theory (most prominently perhaps Vilikovský 1959). However, *Mladá tvorba* also informed readers about the popular culture of the day such as jazz, the twist and rock & roll, and about emerging art forms as well, and it also discussed the lifestyle of the young generation. It featured a number of articles on film and theatre. All in

all, the thematic scope of the articles is by today's standards hard to comprehend, and their stylistic variability is also a vivid reflection of a turbulent era.

FIGHTING FOR AMERICAN LITERATURE – AND DEFINING IDEOLOGY AT THE SAME TIME

Given the political polarization and language barriers of the post-war era, the reception of American literature in Czechoslovakia was a problematic and contentious issue. It almost required rhetorical prowess to talk about American culture and literature in non-pejorative terms in the early 1950s. Discursive ground had to be gained, precedents established, and this was mostly done by means of discourse camouflage. When the most notable Slovak translator of the era, Zora Jesenská, decided to point out the importance of translating American literature in her address to the Second Congress of the Czechoslovak Writers' Union in 1956, she had to tread very carefully when pointing out missteps in translation policy. Only after the usual formulaic oeuvre could she hint at ideological manipulation:

In relation to Western literature, we have focused too much on translating writers who seemed to conform to our own worldview. We have treated very heavy-handedly the writers who are critical toward capitalism but who still have not freed themselves from its shackles. By this I mean contemporary critical realism, which still naturally flourishes in the West and did so also in our country not so long ago [...] Unfortunately, we also seem to have ignored devoted Western communist writers who chose not to write just about class struggle (1956, 4).

Such tongue-in-cheek polemics occurred the same year on the pages of the newly established Czech translation magazine *Světová literatura* (World Literature). It concerned the value of the works of Ernest Hemingway, and it helped pave the way for his works being translated after a period of ideologically motivated refutation in the early 1950s (Semínová 2003). Based on these examples, it can be argued that the introduction of American literature into the socialist translation field required *discourse camouflage*.

As it is understood here, *discourse camouflage* lies at the confluence of translation history, discursive practices and cultural history in the period between 1956 and 1970. Its means and the social and historical functions it served, as well as its concrete structures and realizations, are thus part of a microhistory of translation. Etymologically speaking, *camouflage* is of French origin and means 'to disguise' and it is derived from the Italian *camuffare* 'disguise, trick'. Given its origins, it is perhaps no surprise that it entered the English language during WWI when it was of grave importance to conceal and protect valuable objects and intelligence from the enemy (Ayto 2005, 89–90). Discourse camouflage served to protect literary values. The understanding of its functions and inner workings helps us unveil the intricate relations between translation policy, ideology and translation norms.

By virtue of analysing these discursive practices, a more nuanced, less black-and-white, understanding of ideology can be arrived at. Looking at the history of *Mladá tvorba*, ideology can be viewed in two ways:

1. Ideology should not be viewed as an oppressive mechanism but rather as a poli-

tical gesture affecting the real contents and potential values of the Slovak translation corpus (Bednárová 2013). The political gesture affects the organization and structure of the magazine as well as the organization behind it (editorial board, contributors, etc.).

2. Ideology should not be viewed as a forced world view but rather “as any basic pattern of meaning or frame of interpretation bearing on or involved in (an) aspect(s) of social ‘reality’ (in particular in the realm of social relations in the public sphere), felt to be commonsensical, and often functioning in a normative way” (Verschueren 2013, 10). Seeing ideology as a way of interpreting social reality enables us to see the historical discourse in an archaeological manner, that is, in its complexity, discontinuity, indeterminacy and embeddedness.

DISCOURSE CAMOUFLAGE IN CONTEXT: THREE METATEXTUAL GENRES AND THEIR DEFINITIONS

The following metatextual genres are examples of discourse camouflage and play a prominent role in the attempts to justify and establish American literature in the Slovak literary context. In terms of their structure, their metatextual qualities are understood as various degrees of attested textual derivation from a prototext, or several of them, in a source language (e. g. an article, book) or from a prototext that is a translation into the target language. Their derivational character is a result of selection and various forms of functional textual manipulation. Their classification draws on the ontological classification of text-derivation genres (*metatexts* as texts on texts; Popovič 1974) and on the spatial classification of text-derivation genres (texts on the thresholds of other texts, *paratexts*; Genette 1997). Based on the data from *Mladá tvorba*, we can distinguish three types of metatextual genre. The first two types served to defend ideologically incongruous foreign literature against the restrictive cultural policies of the era. The two types can be distinguished from each other based on their position within the conceptual space of literary education texts (c. f. Popovič 1976).

We call the first type metatextual apologetics. It features (meta)texts in a chronologically successive relation to the prototext in the source language or translations. Metatextual apologetics employs the mimicry of “literary dogmatism” (Semínová 2003) to fight ideology with its own means. It is a voluntary pastiche which helped mask consent with the values of what was presented and, therefore, helped build up precedent for more publications.

The second of the metatextual genres is what we call paratextual camouflage (as distinct from Bednárová’s narrower concept of “metatextual camouflage” (2013, 74). This type features (para)texts “on the threshold” of prototexts in the source language or translations (both functionally and ontologically, not necessarily physically). Examples include forewords, afterwords, commentaries etc. In such texts the source text is presented as though it fell in with the socialist party line. A foreign author could be presented as “progressive” and “sane”, even though it can be argued (as it often was) that they have not fully accepted the Marxist worldview. Paratextual camouflage can be read as “parallel instructions for interpretation” (75).

The third metatextual genre found in *Mladá tvorba* is synthetizing translation. It is selective metatext, i. e. a combination of translated segments with retold (synthe-

sized) segments. Since such a text was understood as a primary text, the translator was viewed as its author. Among the young authors and editors at the time it was known as *review with extracts*. In the words of Ján Vilikovský, “You basically translated what was allowed, and the rest you summarized, claiming that the translation was a review” (Vilikovský – Magová 2013, 9).

The concept of genre applies more loosely than in stylistics (c.f. Mistrík 1997, 371). The metatextual genres represent specific and, to a degree, formalized text-derivation strategies given the specific historical circumstances of the Slovak publication space in 1956–1970. Whereas with metatextual apologetics and paratextual camouflage we encounter rather non-homogeneous textual derivative strategies employed (based on affirmative, consequential relations between the prototext and the metatext, c. f. Popovič 1974, and on situational irony) in texts that have the derivative status of a seemingly repetitive and summarizing commentary (Foucault 1981, 58), synthesizing translation, with its functions and stylistic conventions (see below), stands out more as a genre in its own right, albeit a secondary one. Whereas the first two “genres” operate mostly on the basis of mere textual convention (c. f. Cuddon 1999) and conventionalized receptive modes (of the kind Jauß, 1979, introduces) and thus can and must be viewed in terms of “reading between the lines”, the third “genre” has more tangible genre characteristics.

METATEXTUAL APOLOGETICS AND THE LANGUAGE OF HARD (BUT) POETIC LABOUR

Metatextual apologetics can be seen basically as lip service that delves into situational and contextual irony. As those who have lived through the era concede, one had to utter certain words in certain situations (like in *Mladá tvorba*'s editorials, Darovec – Barborík 1996, 25).

In the second issue in 1959 we encounter a review of the Slovak translation of S. Lewis's *Kingsblood Royal* (*Z rodu kráľovského*, translated by V. Szathmáry-Vlčková). The reviewer Jozef Kot uses formulations from the political language of the day to have the author seem to conform to the socialist world view. Even though he does not consider the work to be the best of Lewis's oeuvre, he claims the author “proves himself” as a “determined democrat and humanist” (Kot 1957). Kot writes that although similar critical realist prose translations have already come out, he welcomes yet another translated work of this genre: “This work [of Lewis] helps us bust several ill-guided myths about American literature, and it demonstrates ostensibly on which side of the barricade the best American writers stand” (1957). The overtly militaristic language is very telling.

This review illustrates the metatextual apologetics of the era. This textual convention, rooted in the fact that commentators consciously employed the language of politics, is used to expand publication space for American literature and defend its “social” – if not always outright “socialist” – value. This apologetics was introduced by Jesenská who in her Second Congress address (see above) advocated looking for “streaks of [political and social] progressivism” in translation. Such “progressivism” often needed not only to be actively sought for but also vigorously defended.

The following example demonstrates the adaptability of metatextual apologetics. We can find metatextual apologetics in poet Miroslav Válek's article on modern poetry, called *Cesty poézie* (The Road to Poetry), published in *Mladá tvorba* (1958, 2–3, later in Válek, 2005, 367–372). Válek discusses the qualities of modern Slovak poetry and the thematic and formal resources it must tap into. Aligning the need to modernize and revitalize Slovak poetry after the period of schematic verse-handling of the 1950s, with translations from American poetry and French poetry on a par with Soviet poetry, is itself an act of discourse camouflage. Válek's intention becomes evident when we see the politically charged metalanguage in which he makes his assertions. He uses the conceptual metaphor POETRY IS MANUAL LABOUR, a relic of the anti-intellectual climate of the 1950s, in combination with a metaphor conceptualizing poetry as something youthful, scandalous and in fact revolutionary (i. e. POETRY IS REVOLUTION). He thus makes basically two-sided statements about poetry that would “[c]ome from the streets and talk like you do in the streets.” Appropriately so, it would “come from factories, cafes, buses, come from today's life and speak its language” (2005, 368). By metaphorically (and metatextually) connecting what was acceptable from both domains, Válek manages to put forward new arguments which would come to dominate the discourse on “socialist” poetry in the 1960s. It is at its deepest level metatextual apologetics, since the discourse strives to mask and protect values that may be deemed politically subversive. When viewed in full context, the links become evident and the craftsmanship visible.

The omnipresence and diffuse character of metatextual apologetics becomes evident when and where the apologetic tone and language are parodied and derided. This is the case with Feldek's poetry translation manifesto *Bude reč o preklade* (“Let's talk about translation”) in which he deliberately turns the apologetic mode on its head: “Of course, we in Slovakia tend to improvise when translating poetry. It's too much work and there are too few men up for the job. There's no need to fight over it. All will make a decent buck out of it. Yet, no norms apply and no fraud is ever discovered. Reviews of translations are apparently too hard, so the idle Slovak critic chooses rather not to do them” (1958, 6).

Feldek upends the conceptual metaphor POETRY IS MANUAL LABOUR as he moves from the communist understanding of work as dignified and uplifting to quite its opposite. By virtue of such criticism he basically demands that a better work ethic in “poetic work” be adhered to. Such an “unapologetic” apologetics falls in line with other critiques of the way socialism was being built in the 1950s, be it in literature (e. g. A. Bednár's novel *Sklený vrch* – The Glass Hill, 1954) or in 1960s historiography (e. g. Lipták, 2011). As the cultural sphere was liberating itself from ideology, even such subtle changes in the cultural metalanguage document a steady shift in the discourse of the era.

PARATEXTUAL CAMOUFLAGE: READING BETWEEN THE LINES

Paratextual camouflage features texts that perform secondary, adjunct roles and thus are not so directly involved in the discursive mimicry of the era. Paratexts operate on the threshold of the texts themselves and are their interpretations (Genette

1997). For translations they often serve as markers of conformity with translation policy (Tahir-Gürçağlar 2002). Paratextual camouflage is rooted in the intertextual *modus operandi* of consensus, or the proximity of *real* values, be it political, cultural or artistic. These were the values of humanism, artistic quality and social equality. Because of the conformity they might seem to display nowadays, the interpretation of paratextual camouflage must be done in context. In most cases camouflaging paratexts surrounded texts that would have seemed problematic.

The earliest examples of paratextual camouflage resemble today's news bites both in terms of their brevity and their theme: they informed readers about particular authors or works. For instance, a rather forced act of finding common ground appears in an article where the socially progressive Jack London is labelled a "proletarian" writer (*Jack London – pseudonym?* 1957). Another article says that Howard Fast's leaving the Communist Party of the USA is "yet another outcome of the chaos and helplessness some Western progressive intellectuals have felt in connection to the evaluation of recent events" (*Howard Fast* 1957). The message resonates more strongly when we realize that the "recent events" in 1957 included above all the suppression of the Hungarian anti-communist uprising. Similar short articles – both in the form of news bites or later on as brief features – are also characteristic of the way American literature news was presented in the next period of *Mladá tvorba* (1959–1963). There was always a conscious move to present what was common ground rather than the opposite.

As their nature dictates, it is the placement of paratexts that matters. This becomes evident with paratextual camouflage. The following examples are texts whose authors might not have had the intention of defending American literature or diverting attention from its politically contentious topics. However, their *placement* in *Mladá tvorba* displays a tendency – whenever a need arose to camouflage a text that could have been seen as ideologically problematic, the text was surrounded by more ideologically appropriate texts. More often than not, the latter were in fact paratexts *sensu stricto*; in some cases, however, paratextuality was the result of a conscious arrangement of articles. Examples like this include the peculiar context of a translation from Gregory Corso's poetry (1962, 42–44). The translation (of excerpts from the poem *Bomb*) was introduced with a short bio note on the poet (43). The text ostensibly fails to mention the poet's criminal past (although it was well known at the time), and he is incorrectly identified as a "student of Cambridge University" (in fact, Corso simply frequently visited the Harvard library). The translation is followed by the critical report of a Soviet literary scholar from her trip in America where she describes the dismal state of American poetry (the Bets included, Romanovová 1962, 45–49). Immediately after this article we find Bothová's review with extracts (1962, 49–50, discussed later).

SYNTHETIZING TRANSLATION WORKING BOTH WAYS

The last of the three metatextual genres had its own name in the days of *Mladá tvorba* – *review with extracts*. Given this fact, re-naming it may seem counterproductive. However, research (Tyšš 2016) suggests that the phenomenon was broader

and more widely and systematically used than originally described or discussed (e. g. Vilikovský – Magová 2013, Semínová 2003, Jánošíková 2016). As seen in the discussed examples, synthetizing translation was not only used to defend Western literature, but it quite often was also employed to denounce it. Structurally the genre involves a possible combination of three text-derivation strategies:

1. imitational text-derivation (whose aim is the affirmative functional equivalence of the metatext in relation to the prototext);

2. selective text-derivation (whose aim is either affirmative or controversial typization and explanation of the prototext in the metatext) (both Popovič 1974, 24–25, 29; Popovič 1975, 224–226);

3. quasi-metatext (in this case pseudotranslation) (Popovič 1983, 132–133).

The first example is a very peculiar, syncretic text by Zuzana Bothová (1962). On the surface, it seems to be a review with extracts of Ferlinghetti's *Her*; that is, it combines the above-mentioned strategies 1 and 2. However, hidden between the lines of retelling and interpretation are ruminations on the stream of consciousness technique and the poetics of the Beat Generation. The text thus provides Slovak readers with alternative instructions for the interpretation of Beat poetry. It moves from translation to review and metatext for literary education (Popovič 1983, 135–136). On the whole, the synthetizing translation defends values considered possibly subversive.

The second example claims to have more than one prototext. The article in question is one in a series of articles presented as digests from international news. It was written by Andrej Kozma and its evocative title, *Kde nájdú ideál?* (“Where will they find their ideals?”) (1959), foreshadows its rationale quite fittingly. It is an ideologically biased read about the horrors of gangs of young criminals in America who murder, rape and incite racial conflict. The article is replete with quasi-references (e. g. “statistics show”, “based on several sources”) with no sources mentioned and unnaturally stylized segments of conversation purporting to be authentic court transcripts. Both the seeming metatextuality, the audacious manipulation of facts and hyperbolic descriptions of cruelty serve to depict America's seemingly dysfunctional school system and ailing society. Contrary to the first example, Kozma's synthetizing translation aims to defend the dominant views of the day.

Even though both examples can be considered somewhat extreme, they fully illustrate the scope of synthetizing translation. Of course, it must be said that there were also many rather less contentious synthetizing translations – for example reviews of academic books containing by design mostly excerpts (Podľa Inostr. lit. C. U. 1958) or short articles containing translated fragments of interviews with authors (e. g. an article about Arthur Miller's views on American culture; -kf- 1961).

However, the mere choice of topics covered by synthetizing translations more often than not reveals ideological motivations. Synthetizing translations operate on the basis of metatextual relations between the prototext and the metatext. As it is, the nature of these relations is determined by the intentions of the author of the metatext and his/her motivations. As Popovič has it, “metatexts are not only matters of textual ontology but also of their own extratextual realities” (1975, 238). Thus, it is not so

much the reality of the prototext (i. e. its factual nature or its very existence) that matters – the intention of the author of the synthetizing translation dictates its contents and purposes. Text-derivational relations, real or otherwise, serve a communicative function. This is why the corpus of synthetizing translations from the period abounds in discrepancies.

CONCLUSIONS, CAVEATS AND PERSPECTIVES

Post-socialist translation studies research must display scepticism towards grand narratives (Pokorn 2012). Therefore, it is often necessary to look at the microhistorical level, to deconstruct the field of translational activities along centre-periphery vectors (Even-Zohar 1990), and to emphasize margins. As ample contemporary research suggests, many “disruptive innovations” in Slovak translation history during socialism started in peripheral publication spaces – that is, mainly in literary magazines. The three discussed metatextual genres are products of an era of restriction, concession and political intervention, and they are an integral part of such a microhistory of translation during 1956–1970.

In order to round off this discussion, it is useful to present conclusions along with caveats. The presented study was a limited descriptive and interpretative survey. It illustrates a number of peculiar discursive practices rooted in the field of translation as pertaining to *Mladá tvorba*. However, the three metatextual genres are not limited to this magazine. In fact, the famous *reviews with extracts* in *Revue svetovej literatúry* are excellent examples of synthetizing translations (often accompanied by paratextual camouflage, c. f. Jánošíková 2016, or Kerlik 2005). An infamous example of a synthetizing translation used for an ideological purge is the translation of segments from the diary of Beatnik Allen Ginsberg stolen from him in Prague and published in the pro-regime press (Lass 2000, Blažek 2011, Tyšš 2015b).

In terms of proportionality, the three metatextual genres in *Mladá tvorba* vary greatly. While paratextual camouflage started out as marginal and gained prominence gradually (as it moved from brief, peripheral literary news bites to fully fledged articles in the 1960s), metatextual apologetics had been a diffuse staple of most literary polemics, especially when it came to politically contentious topics. Surprisingly enough, the extent and variability of synthetizing translation, which was always present, document that discourse camouflage could be used for the defence of American literature and culture as well as for ideologically motivated attacks against them.

All in all, it could be argued that a sample-based study will inevitably present only a bare-bones image of the discourse of the era. The functioning and significance of the discussed metatextual genres goes hand in hand with the various social roles *Mladá tvorba* had to perform. As is the case with complex historical phenomena created by human social activities, they are so deeply embedded in their socio-cultural environment that any attempts to separate them from it would be methodologically futile and irrelevant in terms of outcome (Saldanha – O’Brien 2013). Even though it would be tempting to create a neat new map – or at least a typology – of historical metatexts or paratexts in translation history, doing so without context and data would be a useless exercise in theory-building and would contradict the very notion

of historiography. More context is and will be needed. In fact, *Mladá tvorba* was just one of many Czechoslovak literary magazines that played a role in socialist translation history. As we have seen, some relevant research in translation archaeology, historical explanation and criticism (Pym 2010) has already been done, and some research-based hypotheses and preliminary conclusions can be formulated. Much more research remains to be done. However preliminary, peculiar or even audacious, a friendly pastiche in homage to James S. Holmes is warranted for Slovak socialist translation history in times to come: let the empirical and research-based meta-discussion continue.

NOTES

- ¹ When referring to so-called conceptual metaphors all caps are used, as it is standard practice in cognitive linguistics (cf. Lakoff and Johnson 2003).
- ² All translations by I. T. if not stated otherwise.

SOURCES

- “Howard Fast.” 1957. *Mladá tvorba* II, 5: last section.
- “Jack London – pseudonym?” 1957. *Mladá tvorba* II, 3: last section.
- “Rezolúcia II. sjazdu čs. spisovateľov.” 1956. *Kultúrny život* XI, 18: 1.
- Bothová, Zuzana. 1962. “Na hraniciach vlastného ja.” *Mladá tvorba* VII, 6-7: 49–50.
- Corso, Gregory. 1962. “Bomba.” From the literal translation by Anna Hečková and Zora Váľková. Style adjustments by Miroslav Válek. *Mladá tvorba* VII, 6-7: 42–44.
- Feldek, Lubomír. 1958. “Bude reč o preklade.” *Mladá tvorba* III, 4: 6–8.
- Jesenská, Zora. 1956. “Zvýšiť majstrovstvo prekladu umeleckej literatúry.” *Kultúrny život* XI, 18: 4–6 .
- kf-. 1961. Arthur Miller o dnešnej americkej kultúre. *Mladá tvorba* VI, 4: 40.
- Kot, Jozef. 1957. “Znova Sinclair Lewis.” *Mladá tvorba* II, 6–7: last section.
- Kozma, Andrej. 1959. “Kde nájdu ideál?” *Mladá tvorba* VI, 10: 16–18.
- Podľa Inostr. lit. C. U. 1958. “Hovoríme o preklade.” *Mladá tvorba* III, 8–9: 45.
- Romanovová, E. S. 1962. “Zoči voči poézii dnešnej Ameriky.” *Mladá tvorba* VII, 6–7: 45–49.
- Tigríd, Pavel. 2002. “Zrada našich vzdelanců.” In *Z dějin českého myšlení o literatuře 2. 1948 – 1958. Antologie k Dějinám české literatury 1945 – 1990*, edited by Ústav pro českou literaturu AV ČR, 99–102. Praha: Ústav pro českou literaturu AV ČR. Originaly Tigríd, Pavel. 1949. “Zrada našich vzdelanců.” *Doba* 2, 7: 3–5.
- Válek, Miroslav. 1958. “Cesty poézie.” *Mladá tvorba* III, 3: 2–3.
- Vilikovský, Ján. 1959. “Niekoľko poznámok o preklade.” *Mladá tvorba* IV, 8–9: 44–46.

LITERATURE

- Ayto, John. 2005. *Word Origins. The Hidden Histories of English Words from A to Z*. Second edition. London: A & C Black.
- Bednárová, Katarína. 2013. *Dejiny umeleckého prekladu na Slovensku I. Od sakrálného k profánnemu*. Bratislava: VEDA.
- Blažek, Petr. 2011. “Vyhoštění krále majálesu. Allen Ginsberg a Státní bezpečnost.” *Paměť a dejiny* 2: 28–43.

- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. "The forms of capital." In *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, edited by John G. Richardson, 241–258. New York: Greenwood.
- Cuddon, J. A. 1999. *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. Revised by C. E. Preston. Fourth edition. London: Penguin Books.
- Darovec, Peter – Vladimír Barborík. 1996. *Mladá tvorba 1956 – 1970 – 1996. Časopis po čase*. Levice: L. C. A.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. 1990. *Polysystem studies [= Poetics Today]* 11, 1. Monothematic issue.
- Foucault, Michel. 1981. "The Order of Discourse." Translated by Ian McLeod. In *Untying the Text. A Post-Structuralist Reader*, edited and introduced by Robert Young, 51–78. Boston – London – Henley: Routledge – Kegan Paul.
- Genette, Gérard. 1997. *Paratexts. Thresholds of interpretation*. Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hochel, Igor. 2009. Premeny slovenskej literatúry v 50. – 80. rokoch 20. storočia. In *Dejiny slovenskej literatúry II*, Imrich Sedlák et al., 228–256. Martin: Matica slovenská.
- Jánošíková, Zuzana. 2016. "Americká literatúra v Revue svetovej literatúry v r. 1965 – 1990." [MA Thesis.] Nitra: Dept. of Translation Studies FA CPU in Nitra.
- Jauß, Hans Robert. 1979. Literaturgeschichte als Provokation der Literaturwissenschaft. In *Rezeptions-ästhetik*, edited by Rainer Warning, 126–162. München: Fink.
- Kerlik, Peter. 2005. *Bibliografia Revue svetovej literatúry 1965 – 2004*. Bratislava: SSPUL.
- Lakoff, George – Mark Johnson. 2003. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lass, Andrew. 2000. "Allen Ginsberg – Král majálesu." Translated by Kateřina Piňosová. *Analagon* 2000, 30: 37–46.
- Lipták, Lubomír. 2011. *Slovensko v dvadsiatom storočí*. Fourth edition, third in Kalligram. Bratislava: Kalligram.
- Marcelli, Miroslav. 2005. *Michel Foucault, alebo Stať sa iným*. Bratislava: Kalligram.
- Marušiak, Juraj. 2000. *Slovak Policy, 1956 – 1960*. Prague: Research Support Scheme.
- Marušiak, Juraj. 2001. *Slovenská literatúra a moc v druhej polovici 50. rokov*. Brno – Praha: Prius – Ústav pro soudobé dějiny AV ČR.
- Matthews, John. P. C. 1998. *Majales: The Abortive Student Revolt In Czechoslovakia in 1956*. Working Paper No. 24. Washington, D. C.: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.
- Meylaerts, Reine. 2008. "Translators and (their) norms. Towards a sociological construction of the individual." In *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies. Investigations in homage to Gideon Toury*, eds. Anthony Pym – Miriam Schlesinger – Daniel Simeoni, 91–102. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Mistrík, Jozef. 1997. *Štylistika*. Bratislava: SPN.
- Munday, Jeremy. 2014. "Using primary sources to produce a microhistory of translation and translators: theoretical and methodological concerns." *The Translator* 20, 1, April 2014: 64–80.
- Pašteková, Soňa. 2017. "Transformácie obrazu ruskej literatúry (1945 – 1970)." In *Ruská literatúra v slovenskej kultúre v rokoch 1825 – 2015*, ed. Mária Kusá, 87–107. Bratislava: VEDA.
- Pipes, Richard. 2007. *Komunizmus. Dejiny intelektuálneho a politického hnutia*. Translated by Marína Zavacká. Bratislava: Slovart.
- Pokorn, Nike. 2012. *Post-Socialist Translation Practices. Ideological struggle in children's literature*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Popovič, Anton. 1974. *Teória metatextov*. Nitra: Kabinet literárnej komunikácie a experimentálnej metodiky.
- Popovič, Anton. 1975. *Teória umeleckého prekladu. Aspekty textu a literárnej metakomunikácie*. Bratislava: Tatran.
- Popovič, Anton, ed. 1976. *Literárne vzdelanie. Štúdie*. Martin: Matica slovenská.
- Popovič, Anton, ed. 1983. *Originál – Preklad. Interpretačná terminológia*. Bratislava: Tatran.
- Priščová, Dominika. 2016. "Preklad v socialistických Slovenských pohľadoch. Anotovaná bibliografia z r. 1969 – 1989." [BA Thesis.] Nitra: Dept. of Translation Studies FA CPU in Nitra.
- Pym, Anthony – Miriam Schlesinger – Daniel Simeoni, eds. 2008. *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies. Investigations in homage to Gideon Toury*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Pym, Anthony. 1999. "Okay, So How Are Translation Norms Negotiated?." In *Translation and Norms*, ed. Christina Schäffner, 106–112. Clevedon: Multilingual Matter.
- Pym, Anthony. 2010. *Method in Translation History*. Reprinted. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Saldanha, Gabriela – Sharon O'Brien. 2013. *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Seminová, Zuzana. 2003. "Počátky časopisu Světová literatura a angloameričtí autoři." *Souvislosti*, 1–2. March 10, 2017. <http://bit.ly/1SvpRsn>.
- Tahir-Gürçaçlar, Şehnaz. 2002. "What Texts Don't Tell. The Uses of Paratexts in Translation Research." In *Crosscultural Transgressions. Research Models in Translation Studies II. Historical and Ideological Issues*, ed. Theo Hermans, 45–60. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Tyšš, Igor. 2015a. "Semiotika ako základ sociológie prekladu?." In *Semiotika literatúry. Teoretické východiská a súčasné dilemy*, ed. Dušan Teplan, 95–107. Nitra: UKF.
- Tyšš, Igor. 2015b. "Kauza Ginsberg v dejinách prekladu." In *Letná škola prekladu 14*, ed. Dáša Zvončeková, 78–92. Bratislava: SSPUL.
- Tyšš, Igor. 2016. "Ideológia a preklad. Obraz sveta v prekladoch americkej literatúry v r. 1948 – 1989." [Dissertation Thesis.] Nitra: Dept. of Translation Studies FA CPU in Nitra.
- Válek, Miroslav. 2005. *Básnické dielo*. Editions, afterwords, commentaries, and explanation by Valér Mikula. Bratislava: Kalligram – Ústav slovenskej literatúry SAV.
- Varačková, Lucia. 2016. "Preklad v socialistických Slovenských pohľadoch. Anotovaná bibliografia z r. 1948 – 1969." [BA Thesis.] Nitra: Dept. of Translation Studies FA CPU in Nitra.
- Verschueren, Jeff. 2013. *Ideology in Language Use. Pragmatic Guidelines for Empirical Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vilikovský, Ján – Gabriela Magová. 2013. "Jazyk je nejlepší detektor lži. Rozhovor s prekladateľom Jánom Vilikovským." *Romboid* 47, 5-6: 7–22.
- Žemberová, Viera. 1994. "Mladá tvorba v súvislostiach." In *Časopis Květen a jeho doba. Sborník materiálů z literárněvědné konference 36. Bezručovy Opavy (15. – 16. 9. 1993)*, ed. Bohumil Svozil, 64–67. Praha: Ústav pro českou literaturu.

Discourse camouflage in the representation of American literature in the literary magazine "Mladá tvorba"

Metatext. Paratext. Translation history. American literature. Ideology. Socialism.

The study surveys meta- and paratexts about American literature in the *Mladá tvorba* magazine. Drawing on the ontological (metatexts, Popovič, 1974) and on the spatial classification of text-derivation genres (paratexts, Genette, 1997), the study combines historical criticism (Pym, 2010) and pragmatic analysis (Verschueren, 2013) to interpret three metatext genres from the corpus. These include: metatextual apologetics, based on discourse mimicry; paratextual camouflage, based on contextualization; synthesizing translation, based on imitational and selective text derivation and quasi-metatext.

Mgr. Igor Tyšš, PhD.
 Department of Translation Studies
 Faculty of Arts
 Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra
 Štefánikova 67
 949 74 Nitra
 Slovak Republic
 igor.tyss@gmail.com