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Abstract:
This essay intervenes in recent World Literature debates about untranslatability by considering a case in which one Nordic indigenous poet, Nils-Aslak Valkeapää, issued an explicit interdiction on the translation of one of his poems. Domokos considers what the ethical, pragmatic, political, and literary-critical effects of such an interdiction may be—both for its indigenous community of production and for non-Sámi readers, who must encounter this single poem on a different level of interpretability than that of close reading and its critical literacies. Domokos further explores how this case may assist World Literature theorists in further specifying the widely-traded value / vice of poetic untranslatability in a way that would acknowledge the varying stages and agents of translation practice.
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Nils-Aslak Valkeapää, an author, activist, and spokesman for the indigenous Northern European people known as the Sámi, is best known for his Nordic Literary Prize-winning work *Beaivi, Āhčážan* (1988). The book captivated the attention of an international audience, and was subsequently translated into several languages, including a 1997 English version titled *The Sun, My Father*. Puzzlingly, in light of its success, Valkeapää subsequently forbade the translation of two poems from this seminal work. How did he arrive at such a decision? What exactly was he forbidding? For whom and from whom did he want to withhold

information? And how do all these questions reveal central aspects of text-, process- and agent-driven untranslatability? These are the major questions this study will touch upon in order to elucidate various aspects of literary untranslatability and how these relate to literary diversity.

The emancipation of the Sámi and their literature

The Sámi (previously referred to as Lapps) are among the most-studied people in the world, if we compare the number of Sámi throughout history to the number of works written about them (c.f. Lehtola 2004, 16). Traditionally, Sámi societies were organized in migrating communities called siidas, whose lands stretched over 400,000–500,000 square kilometers, with definite boundaries well known to their neighbors and to each other. These closely-knit groups of hunters and reindeer herders led a life of seasonal migration, although some groups always remained in a specific area. After hundreds of years of assimilation and colonization, their political situation has steadily improved, and in recent decades they have actively contributed to the construction of a global indigenous awareness. However, the Sámi are also a remarkably diverse people. They live scattered throughout their ancestral homeland, which is now divided between four different countries (Norway, Sweden, Finland and Russia). Moreover, nine different languages are spoken among the approximately 50–70,000 Sámi living today.

This diversity complicates—but also enriches—the landscape of Sámi cultural production. Depending on how “Sáminess” is defined, one can speak of 40,000–60,000 Sámi living in Norway, 20,000–25,000 in Sweden, 8,000–12,000 in Finland and 2,000–4,000 on the Kola Peninsula in Russia. Due to the dispersion of relatively small groups over large areas, the Sámic languages include several markedly different languages. According to the twofold division of the language, Western and Eastern languages are distinguished. According to the trifold division, the Western group is divided into South (including South and Ume Saami) and Central or North (including Pite, Lule and North Sámi) languages, while the Eastern Sámi languages include Inari, Skolt, Kildin, Akkala and Ter Sámi. Many years of governmental assimilation policies widely prohibited the use of these languages; in some cases, teachers were given bonuses based upon the number of children determined to have abandoned their mother tongue. As a result, multilingual Sámi speakers were often trained in non-Sámi writing and reading cultures. On the other hand, cultural heritage has long been used to articulate resistance against colonization (e.g. reindeer hearing, clothing, handwork/duoddji, singing/yoiking).
Since the 1970s, Sámi culture has undergone a renaissance, though its position is far from secure. Sámi artists and intellectuals have canonized a considerable body of literature in their own language, stabilized institutions promoting language standardization and revitalization, propagated a widely taught orthography, nurtured a strong publishing system, and established and considerably improved their educational system. This renaissance began in the regions of the North Sámi, where the indigenous population still lives in relatively compact groups compared to the Southern and Eastern Sámi, who represent a much smaller proportion of the overall population of their regions. In the last few decades, the Sámi themselves have reformed the colonial discipline of “Lappology” into modern Sámi Studies. They are well known on the World Music scene (including artists such as Marie Boine, Wimme Saari, Sofi Yannock), their films have been internationally recognized, and their flourishing literature has been translated into many languages (e.g. books by Nils-Aslak Valkeapää, Rauni Magga Lukkari, Kirsti Paltto, and Inger-Mari Aikio Arianaick). Several Sámi scholars are well known in the world literary scene (e.g. Harald Gaski, Vuokko Hirvonen, Veli-Pekka Lehtola). Yet many Sámi still live in less than ideal conditions, especially in Russia. The one exception in this case is Norway, which has set an excellent example since the 1990s—for this reason, it is no wonder that Norway has now become the center of Sámi literary activity.

**The literary career of Nils-Aslak Valkeapää**


> Like Turi [a Sámi writer from the turn of the 20th century], Valkeapää strives to state the case for Sámi culture in an authoritative, but controversial way. While this invited participation in Turi’s case, it also provokes discussion in Valkeapää’s case. Valkeapää is markedly disenfranchised and angry, but the bite of that anger is offset by the irony of his presentation. (2003, 63)

Following his literary début, Valkeapää published nine volumes of poetry in the North Sámi language. The Norwegian translation of his fifth book, *Beaivi, Áhcážan* (translated into Norwegian by Harald Gaski, Lars Nordstrøm and Ralph Salisbury) received the Nordic Literary Prize in 1991. This not only enhanced his international reputation considerably, but also elevated Sámi literature to the world stage. The literary and musical works of *Beaivi,*
Áhčážan (published as a book in 1988 and as a CD in 1992) demonstrate the convergence of many different forms of art. Valkeapää became the most prominent poet of the Sámi literary renaissance of the twentieth century, as well as a renowned musician, visual artist, and politician. His artistic complexity helped make Sámi art a part of everyday Sámi life, and it also led to its wide acceptance by Scandinavians. His books contain paintings, graphics, musical notes, and photos. In addition to producing literature, Valkeapää sang and composed, numerous yoiks. Some of his records include: Joikuja (Yoiks, 1968), Vuoi Biret-Maaret, vuoi (Oh, Biret-Maaret, oh, 1974), Sámi eatnan duoddariid (The Fells of Sámland, 1978), Beaivi, Áhčážan (The Sun, My Father, 1992), Sámi luondu, gollerisku (Sámi Nature, Golden Brooch, 1992), Dálveleaikkat (Winter Games, 1994), and Sápmi Lottažan (Sápmi with Birds, 2000).

On the topic of “crossing the borders” among the various art forms, he explained:

When I paint, I hear it as music and words; when I make music, I see it as colours and words; when I write music is in my heart the whole time and I see colours. Different art forms are products of the same spirit, only carried out with different techniques. Crossing borders and forms has always seemed natural for me. What seems strange is someone who only writes or only draws. (Lehtola 2004, 132)

The works of this synesthetic writer pose a particular challenge to translators, critics, and scholars. Valkeapää served as president of the Sámi Girječalliiid Searvi (Sámi Writers’ Union) and established several other cultural organizations. In 1975 he was named cultural coordinator of the World Council of Indigenous People. Over his two terms in this position, he ardently defended the interests and rights of the Sámi, as well as of all indigenous peoples. In his later years, he was manager of the publishing house DAT, the largest Sámi publisher of our time.

**On Beaivi Áhčázan and its central poems**

Nils-Aslak Valkeapää’s Beaivi, Áhčázan contains altogether 571 poems and documentary photos, and is intended to serve as a national family album for the Sámi. It is an ambitious, multilayered work, with four different aspects embedded in one: the personal, communal, seasonal, and mythic. In this artistically-created universe, everyday associations are discarded and transcendental relations are established; the concrete and ideal live together with the realistic, the abstract, the traditional, and the timeless. Much of the language, imaginative power, values, and norms of these sparse, free-verse poems can indeed be expressed in translation, though the poems do bear untransferable cultural connotations. Among the collection’s most valuable historical touchstones are its poems echoing the ancient song form
of the yoik, which the Sámi performed during shamanic rituals. Thus, for Sámi readers, Valkeapää’s Sámi poetry opens up different means of signifying that are beyond language.

The central poems of the composition, Poems 272 and 273, span eight pages. They are composed of a typographical and vocal representation of a reindeer herd on the move (Poem 272) and the emotional exclamations of a herdsman (Poem 273). As Harald Gaski remarks about these pages:

… [a] herdsman is leading the flock in the opposite direction of our reading of the book, that is, we meet the herd on our wandering on the tundra (read: the pages of the book). We pass the herd, which has spread all over pages 5 and 6, because the reindeer are resting and grazing on those pages. When we further continue on our trip, we meet with the tracks and the footprints of the passing reindeer. The text in italics consists of onomatopoetic sounds from the moving herd, as well as of descriptive poetic echoing sounds of the natural surroundings. The plain text represents different reindeer, according to their age, their appearance, whether they are male or female, whether they are spotted or have any other kind of special marks and so on.¹

Aside from approximately fifty reindeer names, Valkeapää also includes nearly a hundred words referring to other aspects of reindeer herding, thereby offering a succinct depiction of North Sámi reindeer-herding terminology. Honoring the poet’s decision, every translation of Beaivi, Áhčázan preserves Poems 272 and 273 in the original Sámi language: “the terminology for the variety of deer and their behavior is simply too poor and too sparse in non-Sámi languages to do justice to the complexities of this activity” (K. Osgood 2003, 83).

**Translational interdiction and untranslatability**

Due mostly to Emily Apter’s and Barbar Cassin’s recent works (Apter 2013, Cassin 2014) untranslatability has become again a hot topic in both Translation Studies and Comparative Literature. In this context, Giulia Radaelli makes a counter-claim that:

No author can successfully claim a right to untranslatability, as soon as the text that is denied translation is published or somehow gets into a communicative context. Moreover, just as one is claiming a right to untranslatability, translation is already taking place, since the stated untranslatable is amenable to possible translations.²

In our case the author Nils-Aslak Valkeapää’s act of forbidding translation, or in Apter’s words the act of “translational interdiction” (2013, 252), is a specific phenomenon belonging to the larger framework of untranslatability. Just as Radaelli stresses that untranslatability is
closely related to translatability, translation interdiction is closely related both to questions of translatability and untranslatability. Who is enfranchised to assume the deciding role? Who is subjected to the act of a translational interdiction, and under what conditions? Is it ever even possible for authors to keep readers from translations produced against an interdiction? As we can deduce from the Sámi examples discussed above, the restriction or rejection of translation can spring from different agents and different textual stages of the translation process, and we need to deal with it accordingly.

In order to better understand this problem, I propose a three-way distinction between what I will call (1) text-driven untranslatability, (2) process-driven untranslatability, and (3) agent-driven untranslatability. By text-driven I mean those aspects of the content and form of the text that are impossible to render (e.g. realia of a culture, or the specific stylistic devices of a text). Under process-driven I would place the historical and cultural-political dynamics in which the text is preserved, written, and received in source and target communities (e.g. the physical and “semantic” preservation of Sámi drums; varying political contexts and cultural connotations, etc.). Finally, agent-driven untranslatability refers to the decisions made not only by the author, but also by the various other agents involved in the translation process, such as translators, literary agents, editors, publishers, curriculum planners, and censors. In our case, it is the author himself who has forbidden the translation of the two poems, as well as the transfer of the documentary photos.

The present investigation discusses these aspects of translational interdiction/untranslatability in four different constellations of the translation process, which I have previously termed as isotopes (Domokos 2005, 2011). While each one is composed by a subject (S), an object (O), and a process of (de/re)coding a text (P), it is productive to differentiate among the following isotope-types in the translation process:

1. the source isotope, consisting of the author (S1, here Valkeapää), his text (O1, the manuscript Poem 272), and the process of making the text (P1),

2. the interpretant source isotope, consisting of the interpreter of O1 (S2, hereby the Sámi reader), the interpreted text (O2, the printed Poem 272), and the process of interpreting (P2),

3. the target isotope, consisting of the “translator-author” (S3), the translation of O1 (O3, in this case the “iconic translation” of Poem 272), and the process of (un)translating (P3, in this case the transfer of the original from a Sámi context into an English one), and
4. the interpretant target isotope, consisting of the interpreter of O3 (S4, the reader of the English publication), the interpreted text (O4, Poem 272 embedded in English context), and the process of interpreting the text (P4).

The subject roles among the agents are not necessarily always disjoined. In our case, the S1, Valkeapää, also takes on the position of S3 (since the poem is included in its original form). Likewise, S2 (the Sámi reader) casts a shadow on S4 (other readers), and S4 (if he/she knows Sámi language) might be able to enter the position of S2 (reading the poem in original) by being able to decipher the foreign literary code.

Untranslatability and the Four Isotopes

In the source isotope the text belongs to the author, who creates it in a linguistic code dominated by the poetic/aesthetic function. On the one hand, Poem 272 has many new word formations; on the other hand, it is written in the already-normed North Sámi language (in the new orthography of 1979, the first-ever “user-friendly” transnational version). Since the text follows clear semantic and poetic rules, it can be decoded by experts in poetry and in the code/language. From this point of view, it is translatable. However, as Gaski remarks, the poem is “a linguistic challenge to every Sámi with a high proficiency in the specific terminology of reindeer names.” As a result, many readers will need to make a significant cognitive effort, akin to “translating” the poet’s unique language into their own vernacular, in order to understand the text. In particular, readers must assign some meaning to the poet’s extensive reindeer vocabulary, which, of course, is nearly impossible without being an expert in that field. After all, every poet has the right to produce an untranslatable, indecipherable text, since literature is situated on the intersection of linguistic and poetic experimentation.

In the interpretant source isotope the text is revealed to those who can access the North Sámi written language. This ability is not at all universal among the multilingual Sámi, most of whom are not educated in their mother tongue. Yet the language holds a deep emotional value for these non-Sámi-speakers, who still retain the right to identify themselves as Sámi. Thus a printed text in the Sámi language can still belong to a reader who does not understand the words. In the given social and textual context, the singularity of Poem 272 manifests not only through the selection of words, content and poetic style, but also through its form: the words themselves take the shape of a reindeer herd. Other poems in the book take a free and loose form, hardly longer than a whole or half page. Onomatopoeic words, together with the new word formations for naming reindeer, as well as the arrangement of the words in the shape of a reindeer herd, all serve to underline the poem’s singularity, and to catch the attention of the
Sámi reader in particular. These features distinguish the poem as an innovative cultural event at a unique intersection of time and culture.

By the time the target isotope is set up, the poem’s location in the middle of the book—in the heart, if you will—takes on great importance. The translator (often a team) knows where to look for these highly particular names (for example, in Konrad Nilsen’s five-volume dictionary from the 1920s, or in the studies of T.I. Itkonen). In my case, I was already in the process of translating the poem, and thinking of a suitable way to recreate its complex terminology in my mother tongue, when I thought of utilizing the similarly rich cattle terminology of the Hungarian language. The rich English equestrian terminology would have been another potential analogue. But in 1994 Nils-Aslak Valkeapää asked me to leave the poems untranslated. Retaining these two poems in the original, in the middle of the translated book, makes it uniquely possible for the Sámi literature to “migrate” into Hungarian, or English, or whatever the receiving language and culture might be.

Thus for the interpretant target isotope the act of copying the Sámi poem and embedding it, untranslated, into an otherwise translated context, can be classified as a special act of intercultural mediation, where the emphasis lies in the untranslatability, and the uniqueness, of every culture and every cultural product. This act might frustrate readers of the target language, since they have no access to the semantic level of the poem. But it may also challenge readers to undertake a “translingual” reading. Since untranslatability always implicates translinguality, we are invited to gain meaning from other semantic levels. At this stage the reader could also deduce that the poem might be incomprehensible in the original language (and why couldn’t it be?).

Just as translatability always calls to mind its opposite, untranslatability implies translatability. Subjects of the interpretant target isotope, who do not know Sámi language will need to keep the latter in mind when approaching the “untranslated” poem, while S1, S2, S3 (who in fact know Sámi) will work with the former however remembering the difficulty to translate the rich Sámi reindeer terminology into other languages. However, if any of the components of the translation process favour self-referentiality, the interlingual translation can be rejected (e.g. as writing an unintelligible text, or making a non-sense translation), though elements remaining in the original language can also stimulate referentiality from another angle. As we know, due to their phonetic shape all words can give rise to verbal and emotional associations in their readers.
Untranslatability on further semiotic levels

As mentioned above, this work is woven from a close coherence among mythical poems, documentary photos, and drum graphics spread out over more than three hundred pages. In recognition of this book, Juha Pentikäinen names Valkeapää the mythographer of the Sámi people, and compares him to Elias Lönnroth, the editor of the epic *Kalevala*. In the same way, Valkeapää can be compared to the ancient Sága writers, or the nineteenth-century Sámi informant Anders Fjellner, or Isak Saba from the turn of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Fjellner compiled longer epic poems that concentrate on the successful courting journey of *Beaivi Bárđni* (the “Son of the Sun”) to the land of the giants, culminating in his marriage to the old giant’s daughter. The present Sámi anthem, written in 1905 by Isak Saba, is also an excellent point of reference. Through his refrain of “*beaivvi bártni nana nálli*” (“the strong stock of the son of the Son”), Saba also attached elements of ethnic identification to *Beaivi*. By using the title *Beaivi, Áhčážan* (The Sun, my Father) Valkeapää transformed the collective vision of the Sámi as the children of the Sun into an internal, individual perspective: Sun, you are my father. This kind of formulation undoubtedly defines the collective identification process of the Sámi as one that is created and directed from within the community, rather than from the outside. Moreover, as Osgood Dana points out, Valkapää’s Sun-metaphor is not actually a metaphor—the Sun is really the Father, the Earth is really the Mother, and the book is really a drum.

To perceive the celestial as paternal and the earthly as maternal, the winds and seasons as brothers and sisters, is at the heart of a worldview that does not separate nature and culture, for which perception and experience, metaphor and significance exist in an intimacy that is only marginally known in Western worldviews. (K. Osgood Dana 2003, 203)

Although Valkeapää did allow most of the poems from *Beaivi, Áhčážan* to be translated, he did not permit the inclusion of nearly three hundred documentary photographs that accompanied the Sámi-language original. He did, however, allow the inclusion of graphical elements belonging to the much older Sámi visual tradition: the pictographics of drums. These visual elements are all markers of a spiritual tradition, a semantic field that is difficult to decipher and translate for any other audience.

The documentary photographs in the original work evoke the Sámi people's everyday life and customs, natural surroundings, and sacred places. It took six years for Valkeapää to collect them from museums around the world. Most date back to a period from the 1880s to the
1930s, and were taken by well-known ethnographers such as Jean Andreas Friis, Toivo Immanuel Itkonen, Eliel Lagercrantz, Karl Nickul, and Konrad Nielsen. Two photographs, taken in 1987, show Nils-Aslak Valkeapää himself. Some of the more sinister images in the collection are the comparative charts produced by the Swedish State Institute for Race Biology during the 1920s. The titles given to these photographs over the centuries are kept in the original language. This presence of other languages seems to substantiate the Sámi writer Kirsti Paltto’s claim that: “We don't have history... what has happened to us, has always meant the life of others” (Lehtola 2004, 96).

How important is it for the translation process, especially for the reception of the translated text that the poems are written as a kind of dialogue with, or commentary to, the documentary photographs? If we think of these and other graphical elements as mere illustrations to the poems, it might be easier to leave them out. But in our case the opposite seems to be true. Indeed, the main impetus for the book was Valkeapää’s indigenous emancipatory gesture of “returning” these images to his people. If textuality only represents one dimension of this rich and complex book, how can the translation of a select number of poems possibly stand in for the original? When does the translation break down? How can the translation process still be a bridging act? To what degree can the “act of giving” (the intention of the poet) deviate from the “act of receiving” (the curiosity of the target-language audience)? We must also consider the fact that these documentary photographs were made many decades ago, then “taken away” for display in museums, and only recently returned to the Sámi community. How, then, does the target-language audience’s “loss” compare to that of the Sámi reader? Do Valkeapää’s restrictions on translation actually enrich the target-language audience by providing them with an insider’s glimpse into the world of the Sámi?

Concluding Thoughts

The symbolic capacity of Valkeapää's work offered an artistic answer to the metaphysical void that opened up in Sámi society at the end of the 20th century. On a larger scale this spiritual vacuum originated with the 19th-century romantic nationalist movements, which gradually made Sámi society “homeless” and bereft of self-determining signification strategies. This crisis has been the reason why, along with many other things, a new concept of literature was sought that in turn provided a space for Sámi literature to grow stronger around the globe. The Sámi cultural crisis, compounded by the assimilation policies of the modern state, motivated Valkeapää to reach to earlier Sámi life patterns and take refuge in the contemporary indigenous movement. This reaching “backward” to go “forward” has imbued
the Sámi with a sense of collective uniqueness and centrality, their essential “Sáminess” surrounded, pressured as a wall holding back the hostile sea of cultural and geopolitical modernity. Valkeapää’s works gave birth to a hardly translatable equation of the political, poetic, and mythic in Sámi literature. This mythopoetic form of conceptualization, led to a redefinition of the nature and purpose of the Sámi people and stimulated a new understanding of life, art, history, and historiography.

Narratives are more than the production and transmission of information; they are the context for everyday life. For Valkeapää, this context is embedded in material features of the earth and Sámi oral tradition—the reindeer, the tundra, the drum, the yoik—which, together, endow his poetry with multiple forms of significance. This kind of semantic multiplicity endows each literary work with a singular character, culturally never transferable one-to-one to another context. A testament to his role as the Sámi mythographer, Valkeapää’s multimedia work *Beaivi, Áhčážan* created a poetic drum, pulsing with the heartbeat of the yoik, providing a lifeline to traditional Sámi narratives and values. Valkeapää published the book with only his own people in mind as his audience. He wanted to empower them with history and tradition, and in this he was very successful indeed. The translator Lars Nordstrom quotes Jürgen W. Kremer as reporting:

> I have seen the book in practically every Sámi household I’ve visited, and I don’t think it is an exaggeration to say that it is one of the central influences in the increasing affirmation of Sámi traditional knowledge. (BAIKI, Issue #19, 1999)³

Valkeapää was genuinely surprised by the immediate attention his book drew from the Scandinavian majority cultures (Swedish, Norwegian and Finnish), and he found a singular artistic solution for the translations to come. It would not be a typical translation, but a wholly new creative act. It would make the majority/colonizing cultures internalize, empathize, and even commiserate with the Sámi feeling of being bereft of sense, of tradition, of values. Thus, the translation became a necessary part of the original composition, and without the translation the original text could also be considered partial. Moreover, with translation, the cultural event created by Valkeapää transcends the painful experiences of colonialism and becomes a poignant symbol for intercultural dependency, cultural emergence, and cultural completion. Thanks to the conjunction of oral, printed, digital, traditional, modern, hybrid, diverse, communal, anti-, post- and noncolonial identities within the unified Sámi nation, as well as to their relationship to the Nordic majorities and other indigenous people from the globe, contemporary Sámi culture is one of Europe’s most dynamic semiospheres, where time – despite many changes – has remained “open”. These aspects are all well reflected in the
unique poetry of Nils-Aslak Valkeapää, the central figure of Sámi literature and culture on the turn of the 21st century.

Considering our case in the framework of literary diversity, we may declare that poetry/literature written in North Sámi or any other Sámi language pays tribute to glossodiversity (diversity of languages) as well as semiodiversity (diversity of meanings) in the world literary scene. By making a book available (even through translation) originating in North-Sámi language, the glossodiversity of a specific literary field (in our case, world literature available in English) is enriched by a rare example. Moreover, as so many languages are presently endangered, translations contribute to the survival and living on of those literatures. In our case the refusal to translate or transfer certain (types of) texts does not diminish literary diversity—on the contrary it can contribute to the further articulation of the world literary scene. By having an untranslated Sámi poem in an English book, the English reader is shocked into having to familiarize herself with this previously completely unexperienced language. Thus the refusal to translate, but implementing the text into the target language contributes to literary diversity, and therefore carries a pronounced humanistic value, critical to promoting intellectual, linguistic, literary and aesthetic creativity.
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