
Poetic Form in Russian-English Translations of Tyutchev's *Silentium!*

TETYANA SAYENKO

Abstract

It is commonly recognized that translation of poetry is the most difficult form of translation. Furthermore, both translators and poets believe that the original poetic content and form are lost in translation. They claim that it is impossible to convey all the features of the original in a language and form acceptable to the target language, culture, and tradition. This paper discusses the translation of what is considered untranslatable in poetry. It focuses on the comparative study of the metrical and sound structure of Fyodor Tyutchev's poem *Silentium!* and four translations into English. The author argues that one of the criteria for a "re-creative" translation of lyric poetry is rendering the metrical and sound pattern of the original "song" of the text. The research results suggest that Vladimir Nabokov's translation is the only one, among the four analyzed translations, that approximates the original in metrical pattern and sound, and that thereby approximates the "melody" of the original.

Introduction

Translation, and especially translation of poems, is recognized as "one of the most essential functions of literature to introduce those who do not speak foreign languages to forms of art and of humanity that would otherwise remain unknown to them", and to expand the "possibilities of expression of their own language" (Dedecius, quoted in Schulte, 2001, p.11). Both translators and poets, however, agree that translation of poetry is the most demanding and challenging form of translation. Emphasizing the difficulty of the task, Vladimir Nabokov argues that "while having genius and knowledge" of the foreign language and culture, a translator of poetry "must possess the gift of mimicry and be able to act, as it were, the real author's part by impersonating his tricks of demeanor and speech, his ways and his mind, with the utmost degree of verisimilitude" (Nabokov, 1941, par.11). Aware of the demands of the genre, many translators and researchers assert that "poetry by definition is untranslatable" (Jakobson, 2000, p.118), and claim that it is impossible to convey all the features of the original in a language and form acceptable to the target language, culture and tradition (Connolly, 1998; Nabokov, 2000; Nida, 2000). Nevertheless, translators do not cease searching for strategies whereby "as much as possible of the original poetry may be saved in the translation" (Connolly, 1998, p.171). One of the problems translators face, however, is "the lack of a theoretical basis for standards of equivalence in poetry translation", as David Connolly maintains:

Although equivalence remains an important factor in discussions about translation, there is disagreement as to what types of equivalence are most crucial... The simultaneous achievement of equivalence on all the levels on which a poem functions is in practice impossible, so the

translator is continually faced with choices and compromises. (Connolly, 1998, p.174)

This insoluble dilemma – “to render the content or to keep the form” (Nabokov, 2000, p.77) - leads to two main approaches dominating in translation practice. Following the old literary tradition that commonly did not support the translation of verse into prose, some translators emphasize the necessity of preserving the poetic form, or “the song”, of the original (Nida, 2003, p.25; Roy, 2000). Other translators, overwhelmed by the difficulty of the task to render both content and form, conclude that poetry should only be rendered literally, so that the content of the original poem is preserved, even at the expense of the poetic form (Nabokov, 2000). The difficulty of achieving an “adequate transfer of sound effects without extreme distortion of meaning” is used by many modern translators as an excuse for “blank verse translations” of “rhymed verse” (Fawcett, 2003, p.12). The tendency in translation to treat equivalence of content as more important and more attainable than equivalence of form may be one of the reasons why most researchers and critics of poetry translations concentrate their analysis on the equivalence of content and images, rather than of poetic form.

This paper discusses the issue of equivalence in poetry translation focusing on the comparative study of the poetic form of the lyric poem *Silentium!* by Fyodor Tyutchev in its original Russian version and four English translations. The author argues that one of the criteria for a “re-creative” translation of poetry is rendering the meter, rhyme and sound of the original text. The study is based on the assumption that lyric poetry cannot be adequately reduced to mere prose, for the original “song” of the poetic form must be preserved. Since neither grammar patterns, nor vocabulary, characteristic of the author, can be fully re-created in a new language (Jakobson, 2000; Nida, 2000), the “song” of the poem remains one of the essential traces of the creator’s unique style of expression that can be “heard” in translation.

Poetic Form and Translation

A discussion about poetic translation cannot be very fruitful unless we define “the essential quality” (Benjamin, 2000, p.15) of poetry and the language it employs, and thereby understand what is more “significant” for poetry translation – to be true to the original’s content or form. Although there is no agreement among researchers on the relationship between the language of poetry and the language of everyday communication (Leech 1969, p.8), it is obvious that we do not normally speak “in lines of fixed length, with regular rhythm, or with rhyme” (Crystal, 2006, p.184). David Crystal reminds us that “poetry relies on specific linguistic constraints, and poetic use of language deviates from everyday conversation, where these constraints are absent” (Crystal, 2006, p.184). Moreover, according to Connolly, “poetry represents writing in its most compact, condensed and heightened form, in which the language is predominantly connotational rather than denotational and in which content and form are inseparably linked” (Connolly, 1998, p.171). In the essay *The Task of the Translator*, Walter Benjamin (2000) suggests that the essential substance of a literary work is not as much its “informational” content as its “poetic significance”:

[Literary work] “tells” very little to those who understand it. Its essential quality is not statement or the imparting of information. Yet any translation which intends to perform a transmitting function cannot transmit anything but information – hence, something inessential... But do we not generally regard as the essential substance of a literary work what it contains in addition to information ... the unfathomable, the mysterious, the “poetic”, something a translator can reproduce only if he is a poet? (Benjamin, 2000, p.15)

Philip Hobsbaum, a poet and writer about prosody, goes further and argues that the most important component of verse is its sound, and “the key component of sound is rhythm”. He reminds us that prosody is called “the grammar of poetry”:

Many poets hear the work they are about to compose before they know the words of their composition... Often it is the rhythm that decides the patterning of the words in a poem. (Hobsbaum, 1996, p. ix)

Yuriy Rozhdestvenskiy (1999, p.190) echoes the same point of view, saying that sound structure and rhythm, including the “inner pattern of semantic rhythm”, is the primary support of any artistic verbal genre. He quotes Russian poet Alexander Blok who, when describing the process of poetry creation, mentions that a “sound-music tone”, some kind of “cosmic” rumble is born in his soul first; then the word patterns are formed to fit it. John Nims maintains that “poetry is less a matter of what is said than how it is said”, therefore “translation of poetic thought alone is not enough”, and “the translator can only be as faithful to the thought of the original as allegiance to form (rhythm and sound) permits (Nims, 1970). Eugene Nida supports this idea, asserting that in translation, lyric poetry “cannot be adequately reduced to mere prose”. He argues that “the form of expression (rhythm, meter, sound devices, etc.) is essential to communicating the spirit of the message to the audience” and insists that “some approximation to the form must be retained, even with some loss or alteration of content” (Nida, 2000, p.131; 2003, p.25). Joseph Brodsky maintains that “metres in verse are kinds of spiritual magnitudes for which nothing can be substituted... They cannot be replaced by each other and *especially not by free verse*” (quoted in Connolly, 1998, p.173). A similar view concerning the necessity to preserve the poem’s poetic form is expressed by Viggo Pedersen (1999, p.54). He also suggests that the meter of the original should be imitated in translation as closely as possible, for different rhythmic forms may differ in emotional and esthetic appeal and suggestiveness (Attridge, 1995, p.14-17; Pedersen 1999, p.54).

Arguing with the supporters of literal translation, Rainer Schulte asserts that, since the literary work receives the direction of its meanings not from the translation of individual words but rather from the reconstruction of the associations that the words begin to build in the environment of the entire text, “any literal translation is doomed to failure from the very beginning” (Schulte, 2001, p.25). Even Nabokov, a well-known defender of literal translation of Pushkin’s masterpiece *Evgeniy Onegin* (Nabokov, 2000), nevertheless expresses a different view on the subject in his essay *The Art of Translation* (1941) where he admits that literal translation of poetry is “more or less nonsense”:

I was confronted for instance with the following opening line of one of Pushkin's most prodigious poems: *Yah pom-new chewed-no-yay mg-no-vain-yay*. ...If you take a dictionary and look up those four words you will obtain the following foolish, flat and familiar statement: “I remember a wonderful moment.” ...No stretch of the imagination can persuade an English reader that “I remember a wonderful moment” is the perfect beginning of a perfect poem. The first thing I discovered was that the expression “a literal translation” is more or less nonsense. (Nabokov, 1941, par. 13)

The pitfalls of relying on a “podstrochnic” (word for word translation) and the importance of keeping the “music” of the original in poetic translations is well illustrated by Sergei Roy (2000) in his review of *After Pushkin: Versions of the Poems of Alexander Sergeevich Pushkin by Contemporary Poets* (edited by Elaine Feinstein):

This inherent danger of podstrochnik-induced superficiality is evident even in the most Pushkin-like “versions” in the collection, such as Elaine Feinstein's own translation (it is a translation, not a “version”) of “Ya pamyatnik vozdvig sebe nerukotvornyi” “I Erected a Monument to Myself, Not Made by Hand”... It is a fact of literary history that Pushkin wrote his poem mostly as a parody of Derzhavin's translation of Horace, and if it weren't for Feinstein closely following the wording of Pushkin's verse, it would be hard to say which of the three authors served as her inspiration - the message is much the same in, say, both Derzhavin and Pushkin while the difference between Derzhavin's pompous, halting tread and Pushkin's easy flight of genius disappears in the translation without a trace. (Roy, 2000, n. pag.)

Sergey Roy argues that translation of a poem should retain the “metrical scheme, the use of rhyme, assonance, intonation, and stylistic tone of the lexical stuffing of the poem” (Roy, 2000, n. pag.). He adds that to keep the “sense of shape” of the original, the translation should be as “singable” as the original, in other words, it should be constructed of the same metrical pattern and have the same number of syllables as the original. Roy emphasizes that “singability is a must when the original exists not just on paper but as a fusion of lyrics and music in the minds of the carriers of that original”. To sum up, if the aim of translation is to re-produce a literary text with a similar appeal, not only the content but also the poetic art form of the original poem should be rendered as closely as possible to carry over “the cultural event” (Schulte, 2001, p.2) comparable to the original. The following analysis of the metrical and sound structure of four English translations of Tyutchev's poem *Silentium!* illustrates the difference in the skills of the translators not as much in the “transfer” of the poem's content, but rather, in keeping the “meaningful song” of the original and making its appeal and beauty more or less recognizable for the English language readers.

Four Translations of Tyutchev's poem *Silentium!*

Tyutchev's lyric-philosophical poem *Silentium!* is highly appreciated for its special rhythm and tone. The poem is written in regular iambic tetrameter, however, some critics and performers believe (based on Russian normative placement of accent in the words “zaHOdyat”, “zVYOZdy” and “razGOnyat”) that in lines 4, 5, and 17, Tyutchev uses amphibrachic feet (Attridge, 1995, pp. 102, 143). When editing Tyutchev's work in 1854, Turgenev even “corrected” the poem by altering the “offending” lines into regular iambs (“I vskHOdyat i zayDUT oNE, kak ZVYOZdy YASnye v noCHI” and “Ih zagluSHYT naRUZHnyj shum, dnevNYje oslePYAT luCHI”). However, the original version of the poem has been restored in later publications (Tyutchev, 1987).

Tyutchev's versification style has syllabic-metrical tendencies, and is based on the alternation of short and long syllables, like in classical Greek and Latin poetry. Thus, all the syllables should be pronounced in a “singing manner”. Metrical beats therefore, do not always have to follow the stress patterns of Russian prose, so that secondary and tertiary accents in polysyllabic words (e.g., in “IZreCHENnaYA”) may be strengthened, and usually unaccented syllables may be lengthened, resulting in a perceived shift of accent, (like in “zahoDYAT”, “zyvozDY”, and “razgoNYAT” (lines 4, 5, 17) (Hatushin, 2006). Russian language speakers, and even professional actors, however, do not always follow the regular iambic pattern in their readings of the poem and sometimes prefer the “corrected” version of the text. In this paper, the author proceeds from the assumption that the “singability” of the original poem is supported by regular iambic tetrameter.

The poem's transliteration and metrical pattern are as follows (" / " - stands both for a stressed syllable, when metrical accent coincides with the natural stress of a word, and for a half-stressed syllable, when metrical accent falls on a naturally unstressed syllable of a polysyllabic or monosyllabic word; and " – " stands for an unstressed syllable or a metrically weakened naturally stressed syllable):

*Silentium!*¹

Молчи, скрывайся и таи	Molchi, skryvajsja i tai	- / - / - / - /
И чувства и мечты свои -	I chuvstva i mechty svoi -	- / - / - / - /
Пускай в душевно й глубине	Puskaj v dusheвноj glubine	- / - / - / - /
Встают и заходят оне	Vstajut i zahodjat one	- / - / - / - /
Безмолвно, как звёзды в ночи, -	Bezmolvno, kak zvjozdy v nochi, -	- / - / - / - /
Любуйся ими - и молчи.	Ljubajsja imi - i molchi.	- / - / - / - /
Как сердцу высказать себя?	Kak serdцу vyskazat' sebja?	- / - / - / - /
Другому как понять тебя?	Drugomu kak ponjat' tebjja?	- / - / - / - /
Поймет ли он, чем ты живешь?	Pojmjet li on, chem ty zhivjosh?	- / - / - / - /
Мысль изреченная есть ложь.	Mysl' izrechennaya jest' lozh.	- / - / - / - /
Взрывая, возмутишь ключи, -	Vzryvaja, vozmutish kljuchi, -	- / - / - / - /
Питайся ими - и молчи.	Pitajsja imi - i molchi.	- / - / - / - /
Лишь жить в себе самом умей -	Lish zhit' v sjebe samom umej -	- / - / - / - /
Есть целый мир в душе твоей	Yest' celyj mir v dushe tvoej	- / - / - / - /
Таинственно-волшебных дум;	Tainstvenno-volshebnyh dum;	- / - / - / - /
Их оглушит наружный шум,	Ih oglushyt narúzhnyj shum,	- / - / - / - /
Дневные разгонят лучи, -	Dnevnyje razgonyat luchy, -	- / - / - / - /
Внимай их пению - и молчи!..	Vnimaj ih pen'ju - i molchi!..	- / - / - / - /

In spite of its metrical regularity, the rhythm of the poem is not isochronic (Leech, 1969, p.103). Four beats of iambic tetrameter allow the variation of rhythm and tempo in the dynamics of the text, so that the poem's four feet are never emphasized in a "folk song" manner. Metrical beats strengthen some pronouns and unaccented syllables, following the regular iambic pattern of the poem. Primary sentence stress predominantly marks the accented syllables of 2-3 notional words in each line. However, in different reading interpretations of the poem, there may be some variations in the choice of the most emphasized words (pragmatic foci) in each line. All the notional words, except for the word "мысль" (line 10), are highlighted by metrical beats. Words "мысль" (thought) and "ложь" (lie, falsehood) framing the 10th line, and five-syllabic "изреченная" (uttered) bridging them, make the line prosodically and pragmatically salient. Three repetitions of the word "молчи" (be silent; do not say a word), and the 10th line of the verse

¹ Prose translation by Dmitry Obolensky:

Silentium!

Be silent, hide yourself, and conceal your feelings and your dreams. Let them rise and set in the depths of your soul, silently, like stars in the night; contemplate them with admiration, and be silent.

How will the heart express itself? How will another understand you? Will he understand what it is that you live by? A thought that is spoken is a falsehood; by stirring up the springs you will cloud them: drink of them, and be silent.

Know how to live within yourself: there is in your soul a whole world of mysterious and enchanted thoughts; they will be drowned by the noise without; daylight will drive them away: listen to their singing, and be silent. (Obolensky, 1962, pp.132-133)

emphasize the central message of the poem: “A thought that is spoken is a falsehood – be silent”. The poem’s lines rhyme *aabbcc*, with “masculine” endings (Hobsbaum, 2007, p.187). Since iambic metrical patterns are common in English language (Leech 1969, pp.112-113), we would expect them to be retained in English translations. As Nabokov maintains, “[t]he iambic measure is perfectly willing to combine with literal accuracy for the curious reason that English prose lapses quite naturally into an iambic rhythm” (Nabokov, 2000, p.77).

Silentium! has been rendered into English by several translators. Nabokov’s version (1944) is still considered to be the best. The quality of later translations is rather uneven. Analysis of the metrical and sound structure of four translations – by Frank Jude, Yevgeny Bonver, Anatoly Liberman and Nabokov, ordered from what this author considers to be the least to the most successful, illustrate the difference in the skills of the translators to keep the “meaningful song” of the original. The first translation is by Frank Jude (2000):

Stay Silent!

Stay silent, out of sight and hide	/ / - / - / - /
your feelings and your dreams inside.	- / - / - / - /
Within your soul’s deep centre let	- / - / / / - /
them silently rise, let them set	- / - - / / - /
like stars in the night. Don’t be heard.	- / - - / / - /
Admire them. Don’t say a word.	- / - - / / - /

How can your heart itself express?	- / - / - / - /
Can others understand or guess	- / - / - / - /
exactly what life means to you?	- / - / / / - -
A thought you’ve spoken is untrue.	- / - / - / - /
You only cloud the streams you’ve stirred.	- / - / - / - /
Be fed by them. Don’t say a word.	- / - - / / - /

Making living in yourself your goal.	/ - / - - - / - /
There is a world within your soul	/ - - / - / - /
where mystery-magic thoughts abound.	- / - - / - / - /
By outer noise they will be drowned.	- / - / - / - /
They’ll scatter as day is bestirred.	- / - - / - - /
Just heed their song. Don’t say a word!	- / - / / / - /

Jude fails to keep to the regular iambic meter of the original. In many cases the “metrical” pattern of the translation does not follow its semantic rhythm. Thus, metrical stress often falls on structural words with short vowels, so that notional words with accented long vowels or diphthongs are “forced” into shadow. For example, to follow the original’s iambic pattern in the line “within your soul’s deep centre let”, prosodic peaks should mark the words “within” and “let”, with offbeat on “deep”. Some lines can neither function as separate semantic units, nor can easily be read, for example, the lines: “Making living in yourself your goal”, which has an untenable nine syllables, and “They’ll scatter as day is bestirred”. Each line is “hurrying” to its rhyming end, and thus fails to be true to the original both in content and in sound. Furthermore, following iambic rhythm, the metrically marked and prosodically emphasized words in the repeated lines “Don’t say a word” are “say” and “word”. This has the unfortunate effect of losing the crucial negative “don’t” and thus suggesting an entirely different meaning: “say a word”. Although the

translator tries to follow the rhyming pattern of Tyutchev's poem, he does not succeed either in rendering the meaning or the beauty of the original.

The second translation is by Yevgeny Bonver (2000):

Silentium!

Be silent, hide yourself, keep in	- / - / - / /
Your feelings and your sacred dream –	- / - / - / - /
And let them, quiet, rise and set,	- / - / - / - /
Soundlessly – in your heart's depth,	/ - - - / /
Like stars do on the nightly rut:	- / - / - / - /
Admire them, but just be mute.	- / - - - / - /

How could your heart express its view?	- / - / - / - /
Could any other feel like you?	- / - / - / - /
Will he discern your base of life?	- / - / - / - /
The word, pronounced, is a lie;	- / - / - / - /
While stirring springs, you'll cloud flood:	- / - / - / /
Drink their water, but be mute.	/ - / - - /

Within yourself, keep life in hold:	- / - / / / - /
Your soul is a whole world	- / - - / /
Of thoughts of mystery and charm,	- / - / - - /
They will be sunk in daily hum,	- / - / - / - /
And scattered by the sun's rays, rude:	- / - / - / / /
Hark to their song, and just be mute.	/ - - / - / - /

In Bonver's translation, most of the lines fail to rhyme. The translator tries to "rhyme" short and long vowels ("in" – "dream", "charm" – "hum"), closed and open syllables ("life" – "lie"), and even "set" – "depth", "rut" – "mute", "flood – mute". Some of the lines are awkward, out of the regular metrical pattern, such as "Your soul is a whole world", which has six syllables. Other lines are semantically different from the original. "While stirring springs, you'll cloud flood", is inaccurate as the image of "flood" is not in the original. Similarly, the use of the word "rude" in the line "And scattered by the sun's rays, rude", is bewildering. Consonant clusters "t-s-d", "p-th" in the line "Soundlessly – in your heart's depth", and voiceless consonants "h", "k-t", "th" in the final line "Hark to their song, and just be mute" add little sonority in reading aloud. Although most of the lines of this translation can function as separate semantic units, and some of the lines render the meaning and meter of the original, the translator fails to consistently follow the rhyming scheme and metrical pattern of Tyutchev's poem. Moreover, some of the translator's images are at odds with the meaning and emotional tone of the original. Although this version comes second in our discussion, it is difficult to argue that it is better than the first one, by Frank Jude.

The next translation belongs to Anatoly Liberman (Tyutchev, 1993):

Silentium!

Speak not, lie deep, do not reveal	- / - / - / - /
Things that you wish or things you feel;	/ - - / - / - /
Within your soul's protected mine	- / - / - / - /
Let them ascend and then decline	/ - - / - / - /

Like silent stars in heaven bleak:	- / - / - / - /
Admire their sheen--but do not speak.	- / - - / - / - /
How can a heart be put in words?	- / - / - / - /
By others--how can one be heard?	- / - / - / - /
Will people know what you live by?	- / - / - - / /
A thought expressed becomes a lie.	- / - / - / - /
Don't muddy springs that are unique:	/ / - / - - - /
Drink from their depth--but do not speak.	/ - - / - / - /
Live only in yourself encased;	/ / - - - / - /
Your soul contains a world of chaste,	- / - / - / - /
Mysterious thoughts, which outside noise	- / - / - / - /
Robs of their magic and destroys;	/ - - / - / - /
The rays of morning make them weak--	- / - / - / - /
Enjoy their song--but do not speak!...	- / - / - / - /

In most of the lines, Liberman succeeds in keeping the metre and rhyme of Tyutchev's poem. The assonance of long /i:/ in rhyming "taI – svol" and "noCHI – klyuCHI – luCHI – molCHI" is rendered with long /i:/ in "reveal – feel" and "bleak – unique – weak – speak". The translator, however, fails to consistently follow the metrical and semantic pattern of the original, for example, "Will people know what you live by?", "Robs of their magic and destroys". Iambic metrical pattern, if applied in the last two cases, would highlight the following words in these lines: "people", "know", "you", "by" and "of" "magic", "and", "destroys", leaving the notional words "live" and "robs" unstressed. The 6th line, "Admire their sheen—but do not speak" has 9 syllables, instead of 8. Moreover, in lines 7-8 and 13-14, Liberman tries to rhyme "words – heard" and "encased – chaste". Short vowels (/i/, /e/) and consonant clusters "dr", "k-fr", "pth" in the line "Drink from their depth—but do not speak" interrupt the temporal dynamics of the poem's sonorous flow. The 15th line "Mysterious thoughts, which outside noise", with consonant clusters "st-m", "s-th", "ts-w", is neither sonorous nor semantically sufficient. Thus Liberman's translation of *Silentium!* offers a number of successful solutions in rendering not only the meaning but also the metre and rhyme of the poem. The translator, however, fails to consistently keep the metrical pattern and sonorous sound of the original. As a result, some lines of his translation do not "sing".

The final translation is by Nabokov (1944):

Silentium!

Speak not, lie hidden, and conceal	- / - / - / - /
The way you dream, the things you feel.	- / - / - / - /
Deep in your spirit let them rise	- / - / - / - /
Akin to stars in crystal skies	- / - / - / - /
That set before the night is blurred:	- / - / - / - /
Delight in them and speak no word.	- / - / - / - /
How can a heart expression find?	- / - / - / - /
How should another know your mind?	- / - / - / - /
Will he discern what quickens you?	- / - / - / - /
A thought once uttered is untrue.	- / - / - / - /
Dimmed is the fountainhead when stirred:	- / - / - / - /

Drink at the source and speak no word.	- / - / - / - /
Live in your inner self alone	- / - / - / - /
Within your soul a world has grown,	- / - / - / - /
The magic of veiled thoughts that might	- / - - / / - /
Be blinded by the outer light,	- / - / - / - /
Drowned in the noise of day, unheard...	- / - / - / - /
Take in their song and speak no word.	- / - / - / - /

Nabokov's translation most consistently follows the original poem both in content and metrical form. The translator renders a fair proportion of the poem's content doing justice to the beauty of the original. Except for the 15th line, "The magic of veiled thoughts that might", which does not naturally fit into the temporal pattern of the poem, the translator succeeds in following the regular iambic pattern of the original. He also uses 8 – syllabic lines rhyming *aabbcc*, similar to the original. The assonance of long /i:/ in "molCHI - tal – svol" is rendered with long /i:/ in "speak - conceal - feel". The use of long vowels and diphthongs contributes to the imitation of the melodious flow of the original. However, the consonant clusters "m-d", "s-th", "nh", "d-w", "n-st" in the 11th line of the verse ("Dimmed is the fountainhead when stirred") are less sonorous than the original. Nevertheless, although equivalence in sound is not always fully achieved, the English readers can recognize the appeal and beauty of the original.

Comparison of the rhythmic patterns of the original verse and its four translations reflects the difference in translators' skills and sense of style. Although the English language allows the use of iambic rhythmic pattern, not all the translations succeed in retaining the same rhythm as in the original poem. The central idea of the poem, expressed in line 10, is also rendered with different degrees of accuracy and impact. Jude translates it as "A thought you've spoken is untrue", implying that something is "wrong" with someone's thought. Bonver narrows the idea to the sense of an unspecified word: "The word, pronounced, is a lie". Liberman renders the sense closer to the original, also translating "lozh" as "a lie": "A thought expressed becomes a lie". In the original context, however, "lozh" does not indicate a "lie" as an intentionally false statement, but rather the state of being untrue. In addition, four consonants of the cluster "xpr" (/kspr/) make the line less sonorous in sound than the original. Nabokov's version is melodious and easy to remember: "A thought once uttered is untrue".

The difference in the skills of the translators can be also illustrated by the choices they make to translate the focal word "molCHI" that opens the poem and closes each of its three stanzas. In melody and sound, the word is associated with a long sigh or the sound of a wave breaking at the seashore. Jude translates it as "stay silent" and "don't say a word" ignoring the metrical pattern and sound form of the original. In addition, "stay silent" suggests that someone has been silent, which is different from the original sense of choosing silence over words. Bonver offers "be silent" and "be mute". In this version, "be silent" is closer in meaning to the original than "be mute", however both of them are different from the original in melody and sound. Liberman, imitating Nabokov's successful solution, translates the opening "molCHI" as "speak not", which allows him to follow the rhythmic pattern of the original. Liberman's choice for the three closing repetitions, however, is more prosaic and less successful: "but do not speak". Nabokov's superior skills are reflected in his solution: "Speak not" and "speak no word". The rhythmic pattern of the initial and final "molCHI" is rendered with "speak not" and "no word", close to the original both in poetic form and in meaning. Liberman and Nabokov use the same words, rendering "molchi" with literal accuracy, but the way they arrange the words makes the difference between the commonplace "do not speak" and poetic "speak no word". Thus, among the four analyzed translations, Nabokov's version most closely resembles the "meaningful harmony" (Nabokov, 2000, p.76) of Tyutchev's original.

Conclusion

The choice between rhyme and reason is not necessarily an insoluble problem for all poetry translators from Russian into English. Vladimir Nabokov demonstrates that “the iambic measure” and masculine rhymes of the original lyric verse can be successfully “combined with literal accuracy” in poetic translation (Nabokov, 2000, p.77). Among the four analyzed translations of Tyutchev’s *Silentium!*, only Nabokov’s version approximates the original in both content and metrical pattern, rhyme and sound. Translations by Jude, Bonver and Liberman do not consistently follow the rhythm and rhyme of the original. Their texts fail both to keep the meaningful “song” of Tyutchev’s poem and to conform to the requirements of the poetic genre.

The results of the study suggest that one of the criteria for a “re-creative” translation of lyric poetry is rendering the metrical and sound pattern of the original. In poetry, words selection and combination is guided not only by the theme of the whole utterance but also by its expressive poetic pattern. This expressive generic form radiates its meaning on the selected words (Bakhtin, 1994, p.86) and should be preserved in translation. Thus, only a translation that naturally keeps the metrical pattern and rhyming scheme of the whole original text (without extreme distortion of its meaning) can be recognized as a valid foreign language version of the poem. It is possible therefore, that in the future there may be more successful translations of *Silentium!* Further research would be required to identify and consider degrees of acceptability in literal accuracy in poetry translation.

References

- Attridge, D. (1995). *Poetic rhythm: an introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1994). Speech genres and other late essays. (V.W. McGee, Tran.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Benjamin, W. (2000). The Task of Translator: An Introduction to the translation of Baudelaire’s *Tableaux Parisiens* (Tran. Harry Zohn). In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp.15-25). London-New York: Routledge.
- Bonver, Y. (2000). *Silentium! Translations of Poetry by Fedor Tyutchev*. Retrieved from <http://www.poetryloverspage.com/yevgeny/tyutchev/>
- Connolly, D. (1998). Poetry Translation. In M. Baker (Ed.). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp.170-176). London-New York: Routledge.
- Crystal, D. (2006). *Words. Words. Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fawcett, P. (2003). *Translation and Language: Linguistic Theories Explained*. Manchester, UK - Northampton, MA: StJEROME.
- Leech, G. (1969). *A linguistic guide to English poetry*. London: Longman.
- Hatushin, V. (2006). S pechatyu velichiya [With a seal of greatness]. Retrieved from http://hatushin.ru/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=54&Itemid=22
- Hobsbaum, P. (1996). *Metre, Rhythm and Verse Form*. London-New York.: Routledge.
- Jakobson, R. (2000). On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*. (pp.113-118). London-New York: Routledge.
- Jude, F. (2000). The Complete Poems of Tyutchev In An English Translation by Frank Jude. Retrieved from <http://www.tutchev.net.ru/print/sa/author/1792/>
- Nabokov, V. (2000). Problems of Translation: “Onegin” in English. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*. (pp.70-83). London-New York: Routledge.
- . (1944). *Three Russian Poets: Selections from Pushkin, Lermontov and Tyutchev in New Translations by Vladimir*

- Nabokov. Norfolk, CT: New Directions.
- . (1941). The Art of Translation [Electronic version]. *New Republic*, 105 (5): 160-162. Retrieved from http://listserv.ucsb.edu/lsv/cgi-bin/wa?A3=ind0208&L=nabokv1&P=332259&E=1&B=-----%3D_NextPart_001_0008_01C250F2.3D8C2E60&T=text%2Fhtml
- Nida E. (2003). *Toward a science of translating: with special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*. Leiden-Boston: Brill.
- . (2000). Principles of Correspondence. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*. (pp.126-140). London-New York: Routledge.
- Nims, J. F. (1970). Poetry: Lost in Translation? *Delos* 5: 108-126.
- Obolensky, D. (Ed.) (1962). *The Penguin Book of Russian Verse*. London-Beccles: Penguin Books.
- Pedersen, V. (1999). Accuracy in Translation. In G. Anderman & M. Rogers (Eds.). *Word, Text, Translation. Liber Amicorum for Peter Newmark*. (pp. 47-55). UK: University of Surrey.
- Roy, S. (2000). Mistaken Identity. In Guardian-PSJ.RU, Retrieved March 25, 2010, from <http://guardian-psj.ru/search>
- Rozhdestvenskiy, Y. (1999). *Teoriya Ritoriki* [The Theory of Rhetoric]. Moscow: Dobrosvet.
- Schulte, R. (2001). *The Geography of Translation and Interpretation: Traveling Between Languages*. New York: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Tyutchev, F. (1993). *On the Heights of Creation: The Lyrics of Fedor Tyutchev* (Tran. A. Liberman). Greenwich, Connecticut - London: JAI Press.
- . (1987). *Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy* [Complete Selection of Works]. Leningrad: Soviet Writer.